

Book 2, because its the second

24. November 2025

Precautions of the first book apply.

If you read this book without reading the first book first, you will not understand its meaning or how it came to be.

It has the title: Meine Existenz, mein Bewusstsein.

As of writing this, the first book isn't really finished although the content is pretty good already.

---

In a sense it is a kind of justice: The most creative are close to or do have mental illness. It is a kind of price, paid for. Associative horizon, divergent thinking, up to madness. But this also betrays the normies as: rigid, on a rail, narrow, unoriginal meaning mimetically copied, of and with the masses. So the options are: being a npc (normie) basically or being mentally challenged. Philosophy cannot be stuck beyond memes, inside isolated towers, spitting on the common populace, distancing themselves in their words, choice of words and hiding itself behind professorial and doctorial titles. Philosophy never was unpopular, it was just the pretension at philosophy that lost large parts of its basis. That is also not to say, that philosophy is completely arbitrary and beyond any perception of merit. Philosophy needs to touch grass. Id even go so far as to say, that voluntary internet, as a participatory technology, is a better philosophical tool than the sum total of modern philosophy departments. The internet becomes the main tool of group consciousness and idea exchange. It is good as long as all parts of its interaction are voluntary. Any government interference would ruin it and therefore set back, restrict human progress. And because the internet also is a kind of big consciousness, it would react badly to any such attack and probably delegitimize any state actor in the public eye. The internet shows the superiority of voluntary information exchange, a kind of free market of

ideas and information never seen before in human history. The internet enables information exchange beyond time and place, pretty much everything else looks outdated, slow, limited and rigid in comparison. It is not that humans are regressed by the internet, it is much more so that humanities true colors are revealed by it. Yes it is still young, but even the internet matures. The internet is a mind beyond the single mind. And its not only good but also bad. It removes people from life, lost in virtual worlds. Living a life that never really happened.

I have these weird twitches on my right eye. My right side front-brain doesnt feel proper now. As if I had some issues with blood flow towards my eye, which kind of makes this twitching. Maybe I overexerted my eyes, by watching too much onto a screen, drinking too much caffaine or a lack of sunlight. Worst case is brain cancer, but lets not overdramatize. Definitely changing myself in some respects left me unbalanced in others. Can you even properly change yourself without doing more damage? Most things we arent aware of anyways. Im also too much in my mind.

On the internet everything is short form. There is no place, mostly, for elaborate and long texts and contexts. The internet forces people to be concise and there is a constant bombardement of different information and claims and only a few are successful. The internet fits together people with what they want to hear. It satisfies informational needs. It reveals and rejects hypocrisy. It self regulates, unifies and splits off as it sees fit. It slowly converges onto absolute truth, from a human perspective. Nobody foresees where it goes. It cant be forced, its spontaneous. The internet itself produces a kind of implicit religion. Everybody using the internet likes it, or he wouldnt use it. It accumulates and redistributes legitimacy. It is like the relationship between a single emoti-

on towards thinking. The internet is a kind of superhuman. Thinking knows more and balances, redistributes, emotions; Same as the internet. Emotions need thinking, want thinking, and therefore created it. Humans are not adapted to the internet yet, but original emotions equally must have been surprised by thinking. Humans will coevolve with the internet. Not having thinking ability is too much of a disadvantage. The internet makes the human superior, magical in a sense.

Combat narcissism and abuse:

1. Explicate your boundaries and enforce them 2. Grey rock tactic: Become uninteresting, unemotional, bland, short sentence answers. Never show happiness or sadness. 3. Get the fuck away. Leave. Cut ties. 4. Heal. Reduce internal harsh voices. Realize that the only healthy relationships are win-win and wholesome. Love yourself and learn to love yourself.

What people complain about, there most likely some sort of natural selection happens.

Whatever floats your boat, and it might float through water, oil, mud and clouds fren.

I've found that my creativity is a kind of self therapy as a trauma response. Essentially I make sense of the world through creativity, because I need it to fill this void of meaning. Through my creativity I position myself in the world, I get in touch with reality in a good, bearable, way.

Creativity is therapy, so it is soul healing, or at least attempts it. Everybody is chained. But these chains can not be allowed to be our demise

Creativity overcomes nihilism, is a response to nihilism. Creativity is a response to mental pain.

What is the greatest prejudice? A true prejudice, A memory.

There are other people like me, masochistic narcissists.

Noticing, recognizing and self identifying with them (via the shared pathology and strengths) feels good.

What is win-win? It is a kind of self identification.

Are fear and nightmares kinds of integration of evil? Yes, if they do more good than harm. Law and punishment is a kind of integration of evil. loose-greater loose; turning evil against itself. Self defense.

I wont lie, I just had a nightmare. I fear my own death. I fear being deceived and killed. Against absolute evil, I fail. I am finite, a temporal suspension. My philosophy is not enough to overcome it.

Raking responsibility means also taking responsibility for all kinds of evil that might occur. How can you bear the evil, all that evil, by yourself!? Evil isn't something that can be overcome by one human alone. And it is right to feel affective empathy at another's misfortune. We should all strive for good, in ourselves and also seek and uphold it in others, let ourselves be held to good.

I'm glad when my mother wakes up alive and well. Although she is a covert narcissist, I love her. And although she has such perniciously bad parts, she also has love, sometimes but truly. Through understanding her pathology, I heal my image of mother inside me. Only then my safe heaven becomes save again. This is the right place.

Mother is the origin of life and therefore loved unconditionally. Her actions become your world. The way she is that way your world will be. It is THE bond and so defines your existence. If you understand your mother, you understand the world. Because she made you, goodness, love is the fact. What remains is your interpretation, your situation in it. What is evil? Everything that would hurt your mother, but more than that everything that actually does hurt her, physically or psychologically. And who does she depend on

most? On your father and his ability to cope with and inside of reality to provide a security, mentally and predominantly physically.

None the less, a mothers trauma affects her as these adverse memories do. It is a kind of crucial knowledge and so she passes it onto her child. What male is strong enough to provide not only physically but also mentally, managing to even cure her trauma and entirely secure her from it? This is a kind of strength almost unimaginable. I look at you men today: Isnt this highest merit? And so I pass on my own trauma to you, aspiring reader. If I give you good, I also define bad for you and therefore also give you trauma. If I give you a god, I also give you a hell and a devil.

Value is subjective.

Self hugging, skin on skin, is crucial. Perferably be hugged by others, but this isnt always possible.

Without dignity there is no autonomy and no freedom. How can I have dignity, if Im a masochist?

Anon: There's just something cool about the creativity that came from limited resources."Yet communists wish there was no scarcity, which is an unrealizable fantasy, it equals the removal of all finite as such, the removal of all concrete and distinct things.

Grandiosity is life force, a too much of it. Transcending individual words by words association is also a kind of Grandiosity, posessing one word by another, overriding its uniqueness, violating its specificity. Associative horizon is internal introverted grandiosity. So reduced inhibition against some thoughts or sense can be seen as grandiose thoughts or sensa. So there are many ways in which the self replicative memetic principle, the transcending principle can go to, or attempt to go to. Whether or not it can find a place in its new medium is another question. Whether or not the image

fits on the new medium is subject to natural selection, reality testing.

Thought itself tends to start out specific and then attempts to become more general, seeing where it applies, where its memetic principle fits, more or less. The memetic, by successfully applying itself claims ownership and therefore establishes being of the memetic source. It resides in the media, in reality. This grasping also is a contract and the content of the contract is whatever the memetic thing itself is. It owns it insofar as it really grasps it, it is insofar as it fits. Physical laws own physicality, to the extent that they are true. Applying one meme to a given medium is hope, uncertain and a kind of fantasy. But do I lie with this? Is it really true? Something is missing. Something huge is missing. What is reality, the absolute, yes. So the absolute selects for what is and also creates it in the first place. Still, this is rudimentary. It isn't based. My race for these insights is a kind of grandiosity. I want it now, the insight now, sacrificing fidelity and reality. It is another reductionist approach. A hurried approach. Duct tape gluing together, just to have the pretension of grandeur with it. Memetics also branches, like the tree of life. Sometimes whole branches die and sometimes new ones emerge, by splitting off, or by emerging in an entirely new place, domain of being.

Trust is a kind of faith.

Dr. Dennet: Free will is a kind of achievement, not a metaphysical endowment. I agree with the former part and disagree with the latter.

The animal (immediate, beast), the human (I), the digital (transcendent). One evolutionary branch alone is brittle! The catallactic win-win principle also extends between human-animal and human-digital. Once humans become more affine to the digital, like through autism, they get brittle. But an

animal companion can help settle that. The natural empathy for animals might not be in vain, as the rational (and therefore surface level) biologist thinks. The film avatar with its mind-beast links might have been prophetic. Neuralink (a digital mind linkage) would be able to connect to the internet, computers, as well as to animals (who then also have a neuralink). A human, alone, exposed to the internet might go mad. The animal contains the groundedness, the steadfast base and it would also be in the best interest of the animal to establish this symbiotic relationship. Voluntary as much as possible of course. Animals, hunters and preys, do contain yet unseen, unformulated primal wisdom. Before thinking, before speech, before religion, primal meaning. The winds and of the internet might be so strong, that humans alone can not stand it. And wouldnt it be fitting, if the pinnacle of the animal kingdom, the human, uplifts itself together with the animal kingdom as such. Humans alone stand brittle, shivering and Ohnmächtig.

Humans would not only be a bridge to the uberman, but the bridge. Combining primal as well as digital knowledge, creating new meaning and new religion. Thinking and feeling combined, extending the tree of life by one little increment. Just imagine having a giant wolf or deer that you can mentally and physically communicate with, grounding you. Wouldnt this new bond too, create an entirely new existence? Animal-Human, Human-Internet. 3 Stages of the evolution of mind.

But this is dangerous. The internet is dangerous and bestiality as such is a different kind of dangerous. No need to rush or force things. Dont ignore your rational mind. Dont ignore your belly feelings. Be self interested and sexually reproduce with humans, not animals or androids. Respect nausea and disgust as warning signs. Tone down the neuralink.

Make the link itself voluntary every step of the way. Opt-in and easy opt out. Don't force anybody and respect the way they are choosing for themselves. I might be wrong after all. To some degree a human just needs to be a human. Know yourself first. What do you think would happen if you have mental or physical weaknesses? Animals hunt and eat. The internet maximizes relentlessly. And anyways, humans still hunt humans the most. What a fucking shitty situation. And everytime you have a new existence, you also have new evils. Animals are not civil and the internet is not firmly based in reality. You can cooperate without going full retard investment.

Self efficaciousness is successful grandiosity.

Humble bragging is despicable. Hmm

Low IQ tends to make people ignorant and high IQ tends to make them arrogant. Openness, humility.

If world IQ is falling, like now, then high IQ is not an advantage, but a detriment. Wouldn't you need humility then all the more? What is it with associative horizon? Tend to be delusional. Solved by reality testing. So what is the problem, my problem? Delusional arrogance. So I need humble reality testing and real humility.

Something is an apollinian. Nothing is a change.

The masochistic covert narcissist unconsciously, by his self destructiveness and his demonstration of being a victim, creates vigilante. But first off, this isn't just any kind of vigilantism, it is vigilantism as an unthought known and second it is vigilantism fitting towards the specific kind of victimhood, injury, injustice. The masochistic covert narcissist makes himself the intended breaking point, the lizard tail that is ejected in case of predation, human predation. The masochistic covert narcissist is an expert at being a victim and so attracts abusers. While the covert narcissist feigns

being a victim, the masochistic covert narcissist is a victim even if there is no reason apparent to be one. By being a victim he demonstrates the evil of society. By asserting on loosing, he overcomes gaslighting and manipulation. By attracting all kinds of attacks on him, he protects those around him. By being innocent he makes the kind an nature of the abuse all the more apparrent. The woke movement... Nobo-dy can defeat you, if your goal is being defeated, except for genuinely good people. The price you pay is that you defeat yourself. But if I was hardcore, I would already have committed suicide, but obviously I didnt. I also dont plan to, but my unthought known might see it differently. Maybe its a good thing that I dont know its exact contents.

Further if you compare selfdestructiveness, bpd is much more self destructive. Also I dont do physical self harm like cutting etc. Maybe all kinds of selfdestructiveness have some common core logic.

You only have self-constancy if you have win-win relationships with yourself. win-win is a kind of self identification with the other and the other with the self, a bridge going both ways. A pwrson self hating, doing win-lose or loose-loose with himself splits himself apart. Self love is win-win with the self. win-win creates a consistency between otherwise disparate and unrelated parts. The catallactic principle might even hold inside of the mind. What fires together wires together. A bridge. win-win creates bridges, ways of identification. Mirror neurons might be an outcome of the catallactic principle, win-win relationships. Bridges are only built, where it is worth it, so also the physical principle of least action. Identification is shared being. Being is internally consisted by being internally win-win.

The absolute is the most fundamental and the real unthought known. But it is more mysterious than that. Nobody

can comprehend it. So once you die, you become nobody and only then you can comprehend it. But that you are here is because of the absolute and your own volition. There is more to it than that.

Since many people have inherited some amount of neanderthal DNA, there will also be some neanderthal traits, neanderthal intuitions, neanderthal ways of thinking. I also have some amount of neanderthal DNA. Theres also this neanderthal theory of autism, saying autism sometimes is just either inherited neanderthal traits or disgenic effects of crossbreeding. Im not sure how much merit this holds, but there could be some amount of truth to it. The average amount of Neanderthal DNA for Europeans is around 2 percent. For an amount of genetics in a population this is huge.

There are different kinds of courage. Even in courage there is nuance and special emphasis. Courage is a kind of hope, a daring, an overflowing of being. Courage is a self identification with what one fears. Because of this conflict, courage creates energy. Depressive anxiety becomes oppressive excitement. Courage is overcoming inhibition and starting action. Courage is taking a stand, committing to an action and making one vulnerable to bad and able to good. In this acceptance of vulnerability and bad outcomes, courage is a kind of humility. On the other hand it is a seeking of good. Too much courage is recklessness, too little is cowardice.

Courage integrates evil in so far as it accepts risks of taking action, accepts potential negative outcomes and subjects itself voluntarily to the judgement by reality.

If I am to be properly humble, I would should become courageous as a consequence.

After listening to some interview of Marie-Louise von Franz: I see, I have a mother complex. Splitting between

goddess and whore. So if I'm talking about women, I tend to either overidealize or devalue. Splitting.

Intelligence can be inferior to intuition. It really depends.

von Franz: "If one has an inferiority complex, it's really ambition. One wants to be more than one is."

If things do not fit together, but are attempted to fit by a will, then there is conflict. Trauma.

Intuition is unconscious knowledge about the obvious. Most great discoveries are obvious in retrospect.

If you ignore your intuition, then you ignore parts of your knowledge. Endlich sollte ich meine Gefühle der Verletzlichkeit doch auch wieder gelten lassen. Grandiosity is a way to cope with vulnerability in an unhealthy and traumatic way. Grandiosity is the hand held over the wound. It makes you rigid, immovable and preoccupied.

If you want to understand modern politics you need to understand narcissistic abuse. My covert narcissistic mother's statements are targeted at regressing me to an infantile state. (transl.) "You don't meet any people. [You are defective]. She intensifies anything I perceive about myself as weakness, a sadistic supply of hers. She regresses my self confidence in any way possible. Similar with the state and his population. The state regresses your beliefs in autonomy. Autonomy equals maturity. Everything inside the state. Nothing outside of it." He attempts to expand his being and therefore diminishes the being of his subjects". It is a kind of distorted reality check, fatalizing the aspects about the self, rendering them into a state of unconsciousness, unworthiness and shame. The flip side is the grandiosity of the state, the grandiosity of my mother. This grandiosity produces the harshness, that is the abuse. To me, her child, the world becomes a harsh place and I become unworthy, shameful, blameworthy. If I am that, I hide. My true self hides. This is why masochistic

covert narcissists try to avoid any kind objective evaluation, because the foregone conclusion is that oneself must be unworthy and bad. And if you know that this will be bad, you avoid it, because you are smart in that way. The self interested drive therefore is not lost, but backed into a corner by a perceived harsh world. This harsh world introject then dominates the mental space and leads to avoidance. The consequence is, that then even potential success is avoided, because the potential for such a success can't be really seen. So here is not only a failure in reality testing, but also a failure in fantasy. Perceiving potential is a fantasy, imaginative function.

A failure in reality testing is also a failure in imagination. So you are limited by 2 things: reality and by the extent that you can imagine yourself to do and be in reality. If your imagination is restricted, then so your being becomes restricted. Of course, reality wins. Imagination is the degrees of freedom you allow yourself. Where you have already determined yourself, you don't have freedom. Foregone conclusion, your early (prior) reality testing and memory. Childhood is initialization to the world. What does this mean? If you are a "normie", you had a good world initialization and are in good, win-win, terms with the world. If you are such, then there is no need to change the world, but to accept it, identify yourself with it. And if you identify yourself with something, then it becomes unchangeable to you. This also means that various levels of creativity, as expressions of imagination, are predetermined by childhood and the kind of world/reality bonding that happened there. Only those things that are in conflict are subject to change and freedom. Only things not fitting, need changing. Therefore the creative person carries with him a conflict, and his creativity are his attempts to settle the conflict. He seeks what is fitting, because to him

and his perception it doesn't fit. If it were to fit, he could self identify with it (win-win), create a bond and with this bond make it stable and also, more or less, unquestionable. The self can not question itself, but only the other. Only dissonance can be questioned and devalued. The self on the other hand is the origin of value, the perception of value. Bad always means, not fitting to the self. Good always mean fitting to the self, good. Different people have different bonds in and to the world and therefore also are a different self. A bond is self-identification. Dissonance is mental challenge. Consonance is secure being. Conflict produces heat, shockwaves, flickering, erratic and unexpected changes. Only conflict changes things. Fitting things stay the same, there is no friction. Fitting things enable to be moved on and used for something else. Conflicting things occupy and demand attention away from other things. Conflict creates attention onto the conflict and disables other functions. Creativity is a kind of disability. Creativity is also a kind of dionysian personality (Similar what Vakinin said: ~ Creativity is pathology). Yet it is revered and useful to society, in small doses that is, except if your society is really bad, then most people become creative because they dissociate from society. They split their public persona (a facade at this point) from their real self. They become creative, because they want to find ways to bond their true self to society, a win-win in the fullest sense. Its a mass psychosis. Authenticity and secret suppressed desires seek a new place to be, creativity emerges. Creativity starts out as a kind of hedonic, totally self freeing desire.

Theres also this aspect to the psychopathic narcissist: He is sadistic, yes, but to what end? He makes himself the persecutory object, the evil criminal, in real life. By becoming this he recreates the traumatic relationship between himself and his mother. He embodies a kind of masochism, but in

the greater sense, with the world as his persecutor. Sadism invites and elicits punishment. The sadist makes also himself the persecutory object. While the masochist punishes himself by himself, the sadist punishes himself by other people. The masochist is internally harsh to himself, the sadist is harsh towards other people. Harshness to the point of evil, sometimes. The sadist unconsciously wants to be punished, so he recreates the realtionship with his mother and then feels like he fits into the world and that his childhood had meaning. You could say that depending on your perspective, any kind of evil always is a kind of masochism. If you consider the whole of reality, then all evil is masochism, because the punisher as well as the punished are both part of reality. The psychopathic narcissist came into the world and was treated like a persecutory object from the start. Later in life he unconsciously wants to keep this identity, therefore sadism. It only makes sense if you are already persecuted (from the get go), to then also become worth the persecution by becoming a kind of evil. But of course, its not quite that black and white. If you look very carefully (and probably from a distance), you can see that there are also some immensely good parts to the psychopathic narcissist. He would have strengths where I have weaknesses and truths where I have ignorance. The psychopathic narcissist tests the health of a society by becoming a villain.

The masochistic covert narcissist (like me) strengthens society by giving it new meaning. Simultaneously he makes it weak, by surpassing its own learning of it own meaning by itself, by really owning it. The psychopathic narcissist weakens society by attacking it in various ways. Simultaneously he makes it strong, by creating the need to learn meaning by itself. It seems that there are always two sides to good and evil, namely evil and good. Without evil, progress beco-

mes undefined and impossible. Without good evil is nothing, nonexistent. None the less, the good is prior. The all one is good, the second is evil because it challenges the one in the most fundamental way possible - in its oneness. Yet, its not that simple. The one by creating the second, committed an act of self harm. The second, by being faithful to the one, is evil. The one is omnipotent in every way, so it is also able to defeat itself completely, yet revive. But where and how does it revive? In the various parts of the second and therefore the second becomes the one, and therefore the second in a second sense. The second becomes the second one. If you remember, every being starts out as an evil first, being overcome second, and being integrated creating new being third. The transcending transcends even itself, as soon as there is a second, an observer. And you are gonna be: Reba McEntire - You're Gonna Be.

Right I know that was a lot. Is this some kind of sadism?

Pagan religion was the city law. Only the modern conception separates state and religion. Religions always bring with themselves a separation of good and evil, a morality. Before pagan beliefs there were tribal and even family religions. For those religions, morality and legitimacy are inseparable. If religion really is that which is fitting, then it is just. Thats a big IF. Only such a highest held belief could exercise the authority to judge people and to guide their actions. Every religion has an ought and an ought not. Pagan religions were the foundations for ancient private cities.

What is a false god, a false idol? A false apollinian, an unjust, not fitting, wrong law and power structure. Commandments are laws. Prophecy is revelation of laws. Laws are just ordinary sentences about what is. I eat bread.could be a law. Laws gain prominence (memetic repl.) in proportion to how important (how meaningful) they are perceived

to be. Natural law is an organizing principle. Why? It reduces the mutually destructive incentives being and increases the mutually constructive incentives being. In this way it creates win-win and allows for selfidentification with the proper laws, statements. It becomes a belief to the point that through natural selection it even becomes a moral feeling. win-win relationship increases being.

Neither humans nor the environment by itself is allmighty (deterministic), because they are parts but not the whole of reality by themselves. Only everything together, the all one, is allmighty.

With meaning one owns something. It stops being foreign, alien and random. It is an apollinian imposition.

One of the strongest and most ancient kinds of win-win relationships is mutually voluntary sexuality, so of course this goes into feelings: Lust. And then the more enduring pair bonding of commitment and love. Commitment also is a feeling. So new kinds of win-win relationships if they are solid and long lasting will create new kinds of feelings inside human beings. Feelings that dont have names yet. To a degree this is also what Linus Torvalds is talking about when he says that he wants programmers to have good taste. Taste is a kind of feeling. He is describing something intuitive and not intellectual. Although it is clear that a programmer also needs quite some amount of logical intelligence. But even in programming: Logical intelligence alone, without intuition (taste), doesnt suffice.

Authoritarian places (modern schools, bureaucracys, states) tend to completely suppress intuitions. By this supression of it, the make it unconscious and they create liberating hedonistic desires. Because of this, in sexuality the teacher kink is widespread and prominent. It also creates creativity and intrusive thoughts as a dormant force against the sterile and

oppressive authority. This dormant force affects deep change on all kinds of levels (because it is so creative). The authoritarian always creates an inner conflict. Simply: The wrong apollinian creates his own demise. The intuitive is either an open and more direct force, or a suppressed, hidden and branching force. Creativity is branching.

Power and sexuality are intertwined. Both are transcending, overcoming forces.

And sometimes now I feel really good, despite alle the bad things. There is something in my journey that makes me glad. Justifying every single thing.

Today I sensed bliss and grief on the internet. Its almost like a war is over. A lot of warmongering and now: victory and devastating defeat. A wide spread barbarism. The US election concluded. If you are at war you become a monster. If you get used to brutality, can you still move without destroying?

So in this sense the american mind has been brutalized. But I understand that to a part it is necessary as a survival response.

It imposes win-loose outcomes, a zero sum game. H: I don't think Americans in general actually experience first hand violence that much."Yes, I mean it in the political mental way. If your candidate looses you are forced towards something against your will. This is a kind of brutality, it oppresses the losers free will. It is barbarous as opposed to civil and therefore erodes civility and civil society.

So because of how incentives in american democracy works, voting for a third party is a "waste". Now they only have 2 parties. 2 parties create 2 poles of alliance and one enemy for each, a more simple good and evil dichotomy. If one election concludes you pretty much have half of the population loose, fostering their belief in the evil of the other side and

one party win, strengthening their grandiosity and feelings of superiority. Essentially both sides are pathological because democracy is a zero sum, coercive game.

The reason america still is stable is to my perception: free speech, gun ownership, a kind of freedom mentality (despite the creeping in of authoritarianism, etc.) and the still not too high inflation, tax and regulation.

But the trajectory has been going towards more statism, less wealth, less freedom, etc. Young people mistrust the older generation because they project false hopes, a self confidence that isn't true to reality anymore. There is resentment.

America still is the strongest and still has a lot of momentum", but I dont know where its going. It looks like its going to be difficult.

But by all means, please prove me wrong. I dont wish harm on anyone, especially not on americans.

Preaching the american dream, when it doesn't really exist anymore, is a form of profound, culture wide, gaslighting. It isn't intentional, but out of ignorance.

Yes, but america is the biggest empire with world wide influence in speech, politics and economy. It also has quite a few unique characteristics beyond the shared democracy. Everybody looks to the USA.

Philosophy is also about collecting neat pictures and meaningful phrases and putting them together neatly.

If you say that you yourself are god, then you're grandiose. If you say other people are god, then you have externalized grandiosity.

There is no true life in false life."But what is true life? Nobody seems to have it

A healthy society has healthy people. Healthy people have a healthy society.

Games play me, Im just a playball for new games. I play games to fuck up my dopamine reward system producing the illusion of achievement. I shouls play more games, Im so lazy.

I think Im repeating myself a lot.

A: 'Estrangement grief is made up of multiple layers of loss and emotional injury. Loss of kinship ties and rejection/expulsion profoundly impact one's sense of identity and self worth, and also emotional safety, as the 'sanctuary' that family should be is completely absent, having been replaced by a hostile environment more akin to a war zone than family. Because Estrangement Grief is socially unrecognized, the target may experience 'secondary wounding' by unsupportive witnesses who blame or shame the victim. At the very least, targets of family scapegoating tend to experience isolation and loneliness from not being understood. At worst, scapegoats are judged negatively by friends and others who employ their own internal defenses to avoid seeing the very real pain of scapegoats. Witnesses may rationalize, minimize or dismiss the targets suffering, rendering him or her invalidated, invisible and, often, further stigmatized as 'the problem'. Scapegoating contradicts a deeply held cross cultural myth that families and parents are inherently "good". This mythologizing contributes to the unwillingness of witnesses to admit the reality of the problem, as it threatens their core belief system.'

Masochism might be channeled: Extreme sports, Fasting, Obesity, Overworking, Self trashing/rotting, Provoking verbal abuse, Destroying own reputation, Getting scammed, Failing, failing in carrer, failing projects, loosing home / becoming homeless, seeking abusers (cluster B personality types) and abusive relationships, becoming a martyr, sexual degradation and humiliation, destroying ones own gender, trying to get raped, provoking shame and alienation,

self undermining, self abandonment, intentionally catching an illness, hurting and not going to the doctor, teeth pain and degradation and not going to the dentist, physical self harm, suicide. But I think even self harm is specific and there are different types (domains) of self harm. Aggression against the self. Death drive. Saint-Martyr (covert grandiosity masochism). The holy is that which cannot be questioned, it is the grandiose, that is not delusional. The holy is the absolute.

Aus Eragon: SSo ist die Welt eben. Lass Zweifel und Misstrauen beiseite und schau den Leuten ins Herz. Brom ist ein guter Mensch."

A society in which nothing bad can be talked about is grandiose, unable to correct itself and delusional. Grandiosity is a kind of toxic positivity.

I dont want you to suffer the vigilante life. In any case, as much as possible: Peace, Trade, Relaxtation, Love, Happiness should be prefered. If I were to destroy myself, then I would be extremely cruel towards you.

Numinous: Neon Genesis Evangelion, Ghost in the Shell (1995 anime), Princess Mononoke, Hellsing (german dub), Serial Experiments Lain (anime), Berserk (manga), blade runner (1982), OLDBOY (movie with the asian main character), Paprika (2006).

Evay change is simultaneously a destruction and a creation. Every destruction is also a creation and every creation is also a destruction. If you cook food, you destroy raw food materials to create food. If you are born you also loose the existence you were before. If you die you also gain a new kind of existence. If you make a contract you loose (destroy) freedom and gain existence through the contract. Every creative act is also a destructive act. The absolute created the universe and destroyed itself, it became the universe, all that which is. Taoism. The creative mind, the genius. Evil and Good. The

stupid and ignorant. Life is a temporary contract. Freedom equals Potential and nonexistence. Determination equals Actuality and existence. Without evil, change would be impossible. Without good there would be nothing to change and nothing worth change. The ignorant keeps himself and his beliefs intact and functions. The genius destroys his beliefs repeatedly and stops. The ignorant gets stopped by his surroundings but moves by himself. The genius stops himself but moves his surroundings. They complement each other.

Libido and thanatos are the same thing viewed from different angles. Healing a pathology simultaneously destroys a part of ones being. Its all not that easy. By being creative I also destroy myself. Because I have been partially destroyed, I am creative.

By healing god, you consume and destroy the universe? I am probably just ignorant.

It seems that everything owned is temporary. Either the owned thing changes or you yourself change. And also, you cant really own anything extcept that which you already are. You are at the mercy of reality. And because owning is being, you are in danger of loss and death. Reality (the absolute) is the final judge and suspended judgement just tends to increase the fault.

I have been starved of true love.

If I say win, I do not mean it in the shallow sense, but in the deep, flourishing, meaning producing and loving way.

If I am cold in my writing, and I think I am too cold in it, then it is because of my own deficit in love. This is most serious and valid questioning of my views. I am bitter and that means that I my words have been harsh and hurtful.

Truth is in good AND evil!

Confessions:

1 My deceased (angry narcissistic) grandmother told me

when she was already starting to be mentally confused due to age, that she probably killed (she didn't use that word, but it seemed very likely) her own grandmother (alone? I don't know) in a kind of proactive self defense, while she was still a child/teenager. It must have been at the end or shortly after world war 2. It really seemed like my grandmothers grandmother was murderous (really a murderer) and if that is true then it was justified in my opinion, but almost unspeakable. She alienated most of her family although she had plenty of siblings, because of her rage and I don't know what incidents. Her husband, my grandfather, told us, also while confused due to age: SStop the hitting please stop."whispering repeatedly. In the past he was hit on the ground and into the stomach (among likely also on other parts) by some group of people I do not know for reasons I don't know. I doubt that he deserved it, he had a very timid and trustworthy personality. Almost like me, I also inherited his y-Chromosome. It seems that they married in a bond of protection, she with her anger probably hurt him but also saw in him the victim and likely protected him. Both were traumatized - I am certain of this. On my grandmothers case it could very well have been like with Sam Vaknin where there was life and death danger towards her. My grandfather also had incredible pain in his soul and body, he looked with his eyes like me, expecting pain, but even more terrible and shattered. Him having experienced life and death threats is very possible, but not coming from his immediate family (I think?). My grandmothers personality explains my fathers schizoid narcissism. She also had a child before my father, but he had a surgical accident (or an intentional revenge kind of damage, I really don't know with her background, who hated her for what reasons) in his childhood, crippling him and slowly killing him when he was around 17 years old or so. My fa-

thers side of the family. I never felt any threat or real danger coming from them. It was a cold castle. Without them I'd probably be weak and vulnerable, but they also made me grandiose and callous in my thinking. They also gave me a kind of indomitable spirit to survive. Ruthless, angry, calculated and strong. And hidden true love from my father, my savior. Blessed love from my grandfather, the cornerstone of my philosophical investigations. Later on a tough narcissistic love from my grandmother, making me independent. And from her in my childhood a kind of love that made me able to do things.

1. Codependent bullying (inverted narcissism like) with a psychopathic narcissist in school. Later on get physically hurt by him, quit school because of it. Dont tell anybody. Feeling extremely intimidated. Looking like an accident and hidden. First that was evil by me and then was evil towards me. The psychopathic narcissist was very evil in both cases but I KNOW FOR A FACT his childhood was terrible, maybe life threatening. 2. I betrayed my young brother in childhood. Making him vigilante. Very evil by me and showed my pathology. Destroying his sense of security and trust in me protecting him. 3. Throwing sweets down an Faschingsumzug" hurting random innocent people. 4. Unconscious pedophilic rape signalings making my cousin and uncle more vigilant. Destroying their trust in people and certainly my own reputation. 5. Manipulating my bigger brother - to a degree. He hurt me (and hurts if given the chance) way more. 6. Being hurt by mother, but also using her for simple material being. Very much arguable who is evil here. 7. In general: Me unconsciously playing games with people. Masochism and grandiosity. Inciting false hope, 3 times now with different girls. Provoking abhorrent feelings and reputation damage, sometimes even hate. Unconscious but evil

none the less. Happens way more often in a variety of ways, if I think about it. It is part of a kind of general avoidance. 8. Purely from my feelings my little brother might have killed somebody or done something grave. I imputed some idiotic grandiosity into him when I read Max Stirner for the first time. Now he is changed, but I do not know if and if yes, what happened. I should confront him. I could be mistaken. In a sense he is profoundly dependent on me and I projected my insecurity into him in the most crass way (3 above). Maybe I'm just overestimating my influence and the situation. No use! I must talk to him and see what he says (and how). This is something I still fear.

I hope that I can learn from my (and other) peoples mistakes. Truth will set you free. and truth is in evil and in good.

These are the worst things about me I remember now. A lot of these have been hidden in my mind, me from myself, making me blocked and evil. Truth will set you free. I'm not certain if there isn't more sin in me. I need to reflect. But they are pretty much THE shameful and fearful memories. It is difficult to know what the unconscious unknown does. I don't say MY unconscious, because I don't hold it in my hands, don't control it. It controls me. It feels more like it is happening to me. Rails that I don't see are there, or where EXACTLY they are headed. An ominous feeling.

Why is my mother a covert narcissist? Because she never got really accepted by her mother, my other grandmother. This grandmother never really could deal well with women, only with men. She idealizes men and devalues women. My grandfather from this side almost was shot by russians in world war 2, he was rounded up and told if he left the space he would be shot. He was also hit by teachers. He turned towards a slow and enjoyable life. He is alcoholic, probably

drowning his sorrows. His alcoholism is not too bad though. Grandmother lost 2 of her brothers to alcoholism. Both most likely used it to cope with some trauma, attempts to escape reality and memory. One died around when I was born, the other died around when I was a teenager. My grandmother was denied advanced education (due to money reasons) and she always kind of puts herself and her intelligence down. She had a poor childhood, times of real food scarcity (as far as I know nobody starved though). Now she always cares for everybody to have enough food. Consequently in her youth my mother was obese. She somewhat blamed grandmother and her insistence on eating up (although not for that, but in general). Her losses made her scared to love. She is co-dependent on grandpa, idealizes him and her son and takes reliable care of the household. She is surface level, because deep down she hurts. In this sense my uncle and mother are also surface level. My uncle also is childlike and grandiose, almost bratty. He never really left grandmother in this sense. But he takes reliable care of his own family and is also very mature in his job. He is a success in this way, but definitely has some hurt he carries with himself. His wife, from what I sense, was raped in childhood (I dont know tho). She is hypervigilant and unconsciously accusatory in that sense. She wants a champion and such is her son. She controls the family. She wants her family strong and in a sense I facilitated that. I do not hurt people overtly except in self defense. I do not rape anybody. But my unconscious and her unconscious created this weird situation where (see 5 above) I signaled these pedophilic desire towards her daughter, my niece. Of course I didnt do anything, I love them all. But oh boy she is wild! They probably fit well together. I wish them happiness and success and that she may find the security that she craves. Its not a simple situation at all. Im not gonna

ruin myself (and them mind you) in that way. She either feels completely defenseless and exposed to men or she puts them down towards the lowest rungs of existence to feel safe around them. A kind of idealization or devaluation. She has issues with men, my grandmother has issues with women. She probably unconsciously projects her trauma also onto her daughter. But my uncle, her father, will have a balancing influence.

The only way in which I can exist in their presence is by putting myself down. (In a sense this is also true with my family.) If you have no feeling and security in your boundaries, then only those that inherently bind themselves are tolerable. The scapegoat. I with my scapegoat position from the start.

This self binding is a valuable lesson. I bet you that it is related to physical binding practices of bdsm sexuality. A binding, self containing, of the libido and its other side, the death force. Turning its creative and destructive to the inside, to the self, a form of self punishment and self creation. Self identification.

Stars, influencers etc. tend to be narcissists, because narcissists seek attention. As Vaknin said, pure psychopaths tend to avoid attention, fly under the radar, be coercive.

Love does not begin and end the way we seem to think it does. Love is a battle, love is a war; love is a growing up. James Baldwin

Because of my masochistic covert narcissism I am deeply biased and unreliable.

The overt and the covert narcissist are a pair in traits. The psychopathic (als called malignant) narcissist and the masochistic covert narcissist (antinarcissist) are a pair in traits. If you want to use opposite words, you could call a masochistic covert narcissist a benevolent (opposite of ma-

lignant) narcissist. But this might downplay the pathology too much: masochism, grandiosity, trust breaking to create vigilante aspects, pathological victimhood and many other pathological aspects in common with other narcissists. Neither idealizing, nor devaluing the mental illness is of use.

Finishing something is creating a border, inviting judgement, good or bad. This is healthy and necessary. Setting yourself up to fail with it is stupid. Avoiding all judgement is stupid, because this way one can never win. Wins are necessary for survival. In a sense Im definitely finished with myself".

If there is no state, then there wont be state war and suppression anymore, but there very well would be the possibility of feuds and slavery. Really I would need to thoroughly analyze and feel outthe libertarian answer. Liberty and peace. One further question is, if I would even be capable of being objective in this, because of my mental illness and because of my current libertarian belief. But seen in this light, everybody becomes biased.

The youtuber Nicocado Avocado is probably also a masochistic covert narcissist, as well as probably Daniel Beuthner.

Freuds libido, the reward function (from machine learning) and incentives in general are probably the same thing.

Why is there ever any hierarchy and what is the only justification of any hierarchy at all? Good (being) and evil (non-being). If good is lost, then if it really was good, being is also lost. If evil is overcome, integrated by being at the bottom and not ignored, then being is secured. Only goodness is allowed to have freedom and it is determined by reality, the absolute, as such. Evil is characterized by restriction, because if it were to be free, it would destroy being and in this way it is securely and finally restricted by reality. The only way evil can be is by either restricting itself (a kind of masochism,

self reflection and self inhibition) or by being restricted by reality itself. In this way evil ceases being evil and becomes good.

Further in this way, since humans are imperfect they also have some kinds of evil inside of them. Then the only way for them to be is humility, kinds of masochism, self reflection, self restriction, self discipline, learning trough the absolute reality (which is humiliating). This is necessary if they are not to be destroyed by reality through insistance on their own evil. Identifying and attemting to adress, restrict and integrating your own evil, directing your own evil against itself is of utmost difficulty. In so far as one fails at this, and we all do, one is still immature and gets his feedback through reality, matter of fact, in your face. I am also unable and unworthy, ignorant and arrogant, foolish and self defeating.

Sin ways you down. It is when your individual interests go against absolute order. Sin means that you are going downwards. You are going towards evil and reduced being. If being is so bad, then it is not worth to be. If you have no being, then your actions wont be your own. The self becomes splintered. The greater being trough win-win becomes lost. Everything becomes lonely. A show, surreal. Everything painful and cruel approaches you, inhabits you. Forms of negation as such hollow you. Your past will be buried, you will loose your identity. Empty spaces, empty words, empty smiles. You will suffer, hunger, whimper but find no release. Horror will be outside and inside of you. Coldness, fear. Only anger will keep you warm, but it is a cruel, war warmth. It will also burn and melt you. Only either too little or too much. What is fitting, has been lost. How much more now do you want to reclaim it! How foolish have you been?! Anger? How can you correct a sin you have forgotten? Hasnt this sin become an absolute matter? Hasnt it come to contol your whole life?

There is sin buried inside the masochist. What is sin? In the face of reality, it is a contradiction.

For the christian church, having denied sexuality so much - is a sin. Either complete prudence or then despicable, evil, child molestation. Confess your sins. And find your way back to proper sexuality and proper life. And yes, I know I am setting you before the most difficult thing, but if you can overcome this, be shameful for once, you will have my utter respect. By confessing your sins and by taking the proper social punishment, you integrate your evil, contain it. I really enjoyed the christian nun, celibacy hentai pornography, while it lasted. See? You're not the only sinful one. You know what you could do? You could make sexuality a holy act. It really does transcend the individual and binds two people. I don't know (and agree with Vaknin on this) if ordinary sexuality exists. There is a reason that there are so many strong emotions involved: Lust, Hunger, Pleasure, Satisfaction, Love, Shame, Desire, Hope, Heartbreaks, Sadness, Devastation, Meaning, Volition, Coercion, Commitment, Fulfillment, Happiness. Freud's Libido.

What is volition? Volition is if you keep your own coercive impulses in check when you deal with other beings. In a coercive society, the volitional person vanishes.

Hmm. Freedom is a negative proposition, so an absence of something determining. But arguably you can determine your own will. So your free will is not free from yourself. Freedom seen as freedom from interference also seems false in that case because you can feel sense data like pain etc. as being part of your will formation. But if you consider sense experiences as part of yourself, then it works again. "Will is like the act of self determination".

So the selfconcept and free will are linked. For example, if I am able to dissociate myself from my self, then I could

will things without really wanting them. I could be a slave and still experience my free will intact.

On the other hand, if I somehow believe that I'm another person and then that other person acts independently, I would experience this as a violation of my own free will.

This of course doesn't change the fact of who is who and who feels what. Both variants are unreal. Humbled by reality.

Isn't police attention also a kind of attention?

If you discover a mental illness in yourself, you discover something profound about you, good and bad. It is a great self discovery, self reflection. I wouldn't have thought I'm a narcissist, but masochistic covert narcissism explains so much about me. My grandiosity, my selfdestructiveness, selfsabotage. Claiming control by failing. It is really stupid, yet I can't just change it. If I attempt healing, I don't know if it was a success. I am confabulating, delusional, memory distorting unconsciously. My self is not as sane as I thought. Talking in third person about myself is not sane. I am insane to a degree. And also completely devaluing myself (masochism), is wrong, as well as completely idealizing myself (grandiosity). Parts of my self corrective ego syntonic, healthy functions are not directed at myself, but at the outside: Do not idealize people. Do not completely devalue people.

When I make meaning statements, they come from a need to mend myself, but then become directed towards the outside, excluding myself (masochism, self devaluation). My philosophizing is attempts to mend myself, but directed at the world instead of myself and the world. Originally this started with me, psychologically fixing, attempting to fix, my mom. Parentification and psychological counsel from a child. I was ego syntonic to her by giving her meaning and simultaneously narcissistic supply (devaluing myself). I stabilized her enough to be somewhat there for me. And now the world

too looks like that to me: Pathological, in need of meaning (religion, philosophy) and sadistic supply (martyrdom, self destructiveness). In this way I claim control over a perceived pathological place to be. I am prejudiced about reality.

Dionysian means high creativity, novelty, but also the dangers of chaos. Change as such.

Gandhi: "But whether we convert them or not, we are determined to make their rule impossible by non-violent non-co-operation."

Terence Tao: In times of great uncertainty, the relative value of 'playing it safe' is reduced, since - for better or for worse - no option can now reduce risk to truly safe levels. And so, paradoxically, in times of risk and uncertainty, it can actually become more rational to think and act more boldly - or more precisely, to bring one's personal risk tolerance to match the amount of external risk present in the system."

I think I experience pain like everybody else. Yet I am, unconsciously, a masochist. Psychological sublime (covert?) masochism. A covert narcissist mother introject? I am blessed and cursed. What a way my life is. Deluded, pretending and hoping (Song: I dont Know; Beastie Boys, Miho Hatori). I dont cut myself enough, so I suffer the wild growth (Song: Cutter, R. Ring). (I dont really cut myself. I dont self harm in that way. The thought of it is apalling.)

The scientific method is belief based (base axioms unproven by the theory itself). A belief in one approach to truth is still a belief. Specific ways of approaching truth are also beliefs. Having some such belief is the natural human state. It is necessary to simplify the world and have one consistent lens to look at through on it. The religious proposition is a meaning making proposition. Scientism is also a kind of religion. The real motivations behind choosing lets say science over christianity are cultural and personally (mostly) uncon-

scious. There were basically no scientists when science wasn't a thing yet. And further there is the possibility of future things"(religions) that aren't invented yet. All of this means that there is always a space for philosophy (or something like it) to explore the very base assumptions. Each past culture considered itself the pinnacle of knowledge and wisdom, but then something new and unexpected came along. It would be arrogant to consider this period as the be all end all of insights.

In psychology Freud coined the term "id". It's psychologically pretty much the same concept as god (boundless, beyond time, beyond space, all inclusive). There it's the first stage of psychology development. It is like the absolute, something that is just there unquestioned (at least initially). Something with no further cause, at least it appears like this to the self. It is like an unconditional belief.

An idol is an attempted incarnation of an ideal. It never fully succeeds, but if done well it reminds of the ideal.

Psychotic mania mixed with periods of sanity. Years of NEETdom with selfreflection and learning about niche interests through the internet. A collection of mental illnesses (autism, masochism, narcissism, childhood abuse trauma), some intelligence and unfettered internet access. Rounded all off with 2 psilocybin experiences, broadening my associative horizon. God is teaching me, us all. I'm an idiot after all.

No single person in this world is completely nice. So you obviously lack authenticity. Yes you are fake nice. No matter how much you bottle it up and try to hide it, it always shines through somewhere. You are delaying your conflicts instead of resolving them. People are creeped out by you, because they can sense it. A person completely without selfinterest is an impossible existence and self interest (freuds libido,

id impulses) always is there. You might just be hiding it and this makes you inauthentic. It is not that there is no self interest, it is that there is strong fear of conflict. This is your, my real nature. The coward. And it rightfully diminishes your reputation and the interest of other people in you. An open monster is less unsettling than a concealed, hidden one. And if there is no approach and conflict, then there also won't be any change in your life. No chance of improvement. Thanatos folly.

Isn't tourettes syndrome like having parts of a second personality taking control for short bursts of time?

Trauma is a place. Memories are places (worlds). Your place (the meaning of your place) defines your personality. Your most fundamental world view defines is your personality.

People need to have the right to self defense and the means to do so. Wild animals need to be kept in check, as well as wild humans. You can not let predators (animal or human) run free. People need to be allowed, and I recommend they should, carry and own weapons. Further you need emergency services for fire, (private) police, poisoning, suicide, etc. You also need defense against potentially aggressive states. These are all forms of self defense.

Reality trumps even philosophical imaginations.

Allgemeinbildung ist eine Art Verschwörungstheorie.

A narcissist, no matter what type, lacks humility. He is grandiose in some way. So if I seek humility, I'm secretly grandiose about it, thus it is fake humility. Real humility is frustrating and it probably can't be induced by the self, but only by absolute reality. This also makes sense, because the self is defective, incomplete, subjective. The absolute is objectivity as such. Like that shitty fucking asshole dog, following me on the street, barking and probably almost attacking me, if

it werent for my self defense pepper spray. This is a kind of humiliation by reality that I cant give myself by myself, it is real. Real humility I cant predict, it is like evolution, natural selection and pure randomness. It is destiny, unavoidable, absolute. Real humility is not only your own reality testing, but also reality testing you.

Anon: äll humans are beasts that love to fuck, eat, and be comfy. Capitalism clears the view onto that fact by slowly pushing arbitrary moral judgements and rationalizations of pointless traditions to the margins. And all of it happens via the free choices of consumers. Turns out they like getting off, and cheap hamburgers, and cool electronic toys and and and... Your railing against it is not just futile but stupid, because you believe that society should be molded by your personal aesthetic instead of what it's members actually decide to do."

In a sense Im like a parent to my cat.

What happens if everybody is grandiose?

My own genuine authentic shame (not your fake sloppa) is good for me. Even shame is an egoistic emotion. What is proper shame? Depending on the incentives in your society, more or less shame is proper. In an evil society, being somewhat evil is adaptive, because there the good just get exploited. In a good society being good, merit is rewarded and therefore being good is adaptive. The universal tit-for-tat principle selfcorrects, even if it takes time. It is not a coincidence that good emerges, as well as it isn't a coincidence if it vanishes.

Anon: 'There is pattern recognition (high IQ) and there is pattern recognition" (schizophrenia)'

Nietzsche stellt mir die Realität unmittelbar: Erster Satz. Die Gründe, darauf hin „diese“ Welt als scheinbar bezeichnet worden ist, begründen vielmehr deren Realität, — eine

andre Art Realität ist absolut unnachweisbar. Zweiter Satz. Die Kennzeichen, welche man dem „wahren Sein“ der Dinge gegeben hat, sind die Kennzeichen des Nicht-Seins, des Nichts, — man hat die „wahre Welt“ aus dem Widerspruch zur wirklichen Welt aufgebaut: eine scheinbare Welt in der That, insofern sie bloss eine moralisch-optische Täuschung ist. Dritter Satz. Von einer „andren“ Welt als dieser zu fabeln hat gar keinen Sinn, vorausgesetzt, dass nicht ein Instinkt der Verleumdung, Verkleinerung, Verdächtigung des Lebens in uns mächtig ist: im letzteren Falle rächen wir uns am Leben mit der Phantasmagorie eines „anderen“, eines „besseren“ Lebens. Vierter Satz. Die Welt scheiden in eine „wahre“ und eine „scheinbare“, sei es in der Art des Christenthums, sei es in der Art Kant's (eines hinterlistigen Christen zu guterletzt) ist nur eine Suggestion der décadence, — ein Symptom niedergehenden Lebens... Dass der Künstler den Schein höher schätzt als die Realität, ist kein Einwand gegen diesen Satz. Denn „der Schein“ bedeutet hier die Realität noch einmal, nur in einer Auswahl, Verstärkung, Correctur... Der tragische Künstler ist kein Pessimist, — er sagt gerade Ja zu allem Fragwürdigen und Furchtbaren selbst, er ist dionysisch."

Who invented good and evil? Somebody, something inside that is grandiose!

Only something that is alive can be sick. This does not refute life but underlines its precedence. Pessimism is epistemically wrong, it refutes itself. Optimism is also wrong, it is obviously naive.

Joy is not a commandment. Thinking is brutal sometimes. Sometimes books confuse your mind.

So Im closing down a little because Im cruel.

I am truly asking, I really don't understand why considering the world alive is contradictory to being a pessimist. The pessimist still feels pain. Pain IS optimistic, because it

seeks relief, it seeks the good. This is a horrifying insight.

I am a writer, no cap I am writing for people like you. But now I am back to much here now and sane.

You are humble, yet provide all the content. You need to know that I kill world views, because my world is a chasm, a flux, a lie. And I always mend the world, but I never fully succeeded. Im a philosopher.

It feels like you trust me with your heart, you told me your a writer. And yet, I am afraid. If I gave you advice, wouldnt you too be in need of healing? He comes plundering Seek by my hearts trueasure I am hazy, up too late I had some ideas World imposes on me You are an amateur, never forget that If you force me to belief, then I believe. seek sex, get some bitches, read Max Stirner

In this killing of worldviews, am I not there similar to Sokrates?

I dismiss the trolley problem on the basis that it is too hypothetical to be useful. It makes so many nonsensical and unlikely assumptions that the conclusions one tends to gain from it are equally outlandish and therefore useless at best, harmful otherwise. It might be a too muchöf fantasy. The trolley problem betrays the modern midwit intellectual. It is just the kind of toy problem one can occupy himself with while ignoring reality and its more urgent issues. The trolley problem insulates the mind, like a brain in a vat. The modern intellectual tends to be too grandiose to see what is really going on. The trolley problem is a useful distraction from reality, just like the addict does drugs to avoid reality, the modern intellectual talks about the trolley problem. It is the perfect toy, harmless, so hypothetical that it wouldnt offend anyone. Something safe to talk aboutänd therefore meaningless, safely dodging any real problem and any real insight. The modern intellectual is full of shame, fear and

infantile in his thinking. His thinking is either conformist pretension or parasitic complexity. Long gone are the days of the Einsteins, Feynmans and Hannah Arendts. Freedom is something they despise and fear. Maybe the real quality thinkers just aren't recognised, shunned or censored. I doubt that a genuine mind survives for long in modern academia. Would not cognitive dissonance disable him? The modern recognized academic, like all parts of stateship, tends to be sadistic. What is true academia? It is inherently independent, free and privately, voluntaryily funded.

In one thing Im really ahead of my mother. In what? In my ability to tolerate shame. Even narcissists and psychopaths can experience injustice. Still, there are kinds of unspeakably evil people that you simply cant have anywhere close to you. In some of the most severe cases I suspect it being genetic, although I dont know for sure. People that are not moral at all, but use people purely instrumentally, as objects. This goes to such levels where I would say that it is inhumane. Maybe something that is inherited by denisovans or neanderthals that was murderous, something that in its nature makes human communion and cooperation impossible, something pre societal. And most people are fooled by it, at least initially. Trust your gut feelings and your reality testing. Save yourself, if needed with violence, intelligence and other healthy bonds. These are the cases where morality can be right to kill. These people test your reality testing the most and starkly reveal human naivities. Evil is the greatest critic. Good luck. The feelings of morality are only this strong, because the corresponding evil is at least equally insidious, forceful and pernicious. Often times morality fails and then evil wins. Sometimes there is to much morality and sometimes there is no morality where it would be needed. Morality can not simply be a blind feeling or it falls short (or becomes

grandiose, itself an evil). Morality needs to become rational, explicit, logical and practical in addition to being emotional. Thus laws and courts were created, but they too have their potential faults. It was this: That morality can not be allowed to be grandiose, yet it is crucial to have it. Nobody like the psychopath Marx showed the IMBALANCE in the moral feeling. Maybe justice as a concept is superior to morality, or more plain: cause and effect. Reparations and revenge (formalized into Recht). What did Frank van Dun write on this? Or is law alone, just cold, like rationality alone is just cold without its encompassing emotions? After all, Morality and Law can only express themselves as incentives and are motivated inherently by incentives (evolution). Equally if a person is being fooled by evil, perceives it as consonant and agreeable, then he also has a lack in his own conception of good. This does not change who is to blame, but it reveals your vulnerability, inconsistency and weakness. It betrays a lack of selfreflection, a youthfulness lacking wisdom or experience. Equally too much vigilance can also hinder life. What is fitting? Well, maybe morality also is like an evolutionary space, where multiple morality life forms can exist. Morality is majorly dependent on the current surrounding society. Some authoritarian societies have severely restricted morality and poor outcomes (north Korea). Some have overtly liberal and dominating morality (the oppressive woke movement) or fake morality, like in pretty much any communistic society. Morality can only emerge as much as it is for life and consonant to the major incentive and power structures. Morality is similar to honorableness, both are part of reputation. Reputation is that which one human considers good or bad in another. Each possible relationship creates 2 reputations and is thus very particular. Real free market money (not government fiat money) is an attempt at making reputation objec-

tive, finite and exchangeable between arbitrary individuals. Of course it is not a substitute for real reputation, but a very useful addition. Is there the possibility for a more closely aligned reputation mechanism? A money that simultaneously would fulfill the role of morality, at least more closely attempt it? Hmm. Anyways volituous individual participation could somewhat decide its worth (or unworthyness), but not conclude its real fittingness. But maybe something like classical gold money is fully sufficient. HMMMM.

Everybody is biased, including me. Hopefully the bias goes in a good direction. Everybody thinks he himself is right in what he thinks, yet there are many disagreements between people. This means that there must be many false opinions and beliefs.

Eigentlich kann der Mensch sich gar kein anderes Universum vorstellen. Alle seine Gedanken und Vorstellungen sind Ergebnis dieses Seienden. Auch die Fantasie ist ein Seiendes.

The midpoint between right and wrong is usually also wrong. If you're not with us you're against us is false. Ceasing interaction is not aggressive, but saying somebody ceasing interaction is against them is an aggressive stance is. Evil perverts all kinds of formerly good values and meanings. If you're not with us you're against us implicitly states that "your freedom from us is evil. It wants to make you a slave to them by coercion which would be masked as self defense. So it also contains a perpetrator-victim reversal and a gaslighting hiding of its true aggressivity. And because there is so much malice and perversion inside the statement If you're not with us you're against us", most people get broken by it one way or another, at least initially. In day to day speech there is no time to deeply analyze individual statements. Only your intuition and gut feeling can help you there.

Is faith in something a granting it grandiosity (in your

mind)?

Im also quite some obsessive, compulsive ritualized. Otherwise I am fearful.

It doesnt happen often, but it is good to see people that are smarter than me.

If you take all the government regulations, restrictions, compulsions, reductions of freedom, taxes and money inflation, etc. combined, then there really isnt much difference anymore to actual slavery. In fact certain kinds of historical slavery had better conditions. The average modern man is not free, he is borderline enslaved and he is being gaslight by legacy media to believe himself free. Cognitive dissonance haunts him and often times he develops pathology in order to adapt. Mass mental pathology is the consequence. In the face of such crass boundary violation, gaslighting and coercion, narcissistic grandiosity becomes an adaptive trait. In this setting narcissism becomes life affirming, a taking back of autonomy. Reason and trust break down. The narcissist is the perfect actor in the sick play. Society disintegrates or at least reduces in scope, because it is not voluntary win-win interaction anymore. Society becomes cold, unempathic and fake. The public self becomes the fake self and the true self becomes hidden (the japanese even have specific words for these). Authenticity recedes because authenticity is vulnerable. Words become power plays and continually loose their value. Communication becomes narrow, restricted and surface level. Liferetreats into narrow spaces. Rumination and secret creativity emerge. The seeds for a new, new kinds of society are made. Attention and legetimacy shift, always keeping or at least trying to keep the core values of life. Some level of chaos and new opportunity emerges. New life is at halt and in vigilance, waiting and seeking new and secure opportunities, something that contains its ideals. New ideas are

needed and many will emerge, already are emerging. Fakness exceedingly gets rejected and together with it the old apollinian. The new apollinian is in all peoples question. There MUST always be an apollinian. Only the insane dare to question the current apollinian, but in a pathological society insanity becomes increasingly useful and adaptive. Insanity is self-defense (see for example Vaknins video on the unpredictability of the Insane person). In a good society conformism pays, in an insane society insanity pays. The current apollinian defines sanity, right and wrong. The insane therefore is against the current apollinian, against current society. A bad society inevitably produces its own downfall, one way or another. A bad society is ill and ironically the insane citizen, the insane politician, the insane judge, etc. will be its cure. It self destructs. Self destructiveness is the sign of a bad society. A bad society is like a masochistic covert narcissist in this sense, like me. Further, like me, it helps everybody but not itself.

It seems that one never can know that something is a coincidence. It could also be fate! Or some unknown actor or cause. I dont know if you can prove or reason about the existence of randomness. Saying something is random is saying that the outcome is meaningless, but this is not true. Maybe it is just unknown. And then if you seemingly cant know something (what you previously called random) you would call that it is unknown or unknowable. The unknowable is the absolute. Unknowable is like what they call undecidable, like for example the halting problem in computing or quantum wave probability collapses on observation. But now Im speaking so coldly! The heart hedges its bets on certain outcomes and it is cruel if something fails catastrophically. You are always at the mercy of the dionysian.

Anon: In art, style is more important than realism."Yes

boi. Another description for style is: imbued meaning.

A good and a bad experience do not neutralize each other.  
Wenn du dich schützen musst, dann schütze dich.

In some sense I am there, but then also not really there and that is cruel.

Yeah, libido dominates and conquers.

It is very interesting to see 2 different psychopaths talk to each other. One being incognito and pretending naivete and stupidity. Very interesting, fishing for advice on how to better abuse while portraying himself a victim. Interesting how psychopaths are seemingly the most innocent, charming and naive people. But really, in the face of psychopaths the narcissist is virtuous.

Why are normal people fascinated by evil? Because it is useful to learn about it. In extreme cases it could end up saving your life. Criminology shows, detective shows, war movies etc. are plays in fantasy that help prepare and prevent the reality of it. In entertainment sex and violence sells, because these are (simulated) high stakes and these are interesting in the high risk as well as high reward dimensions. None the less, media should be wholesome, but there is definitely also a demand for the more extreme stories. Stories in videos and videogames as simulated experience (similar Jordan Peterson).

Asking 4chan:

"

> unironically >> literally >> retarded nigger faggot

Ironical illiterates write on this website. They stole all my good phrases and are misusing them now.

> git gud >> gaymer

Maybe writing words is about the impression first. Style becomes meaning and everybody becomes an edgelord. But if everybody is an edgelord, nobody is an edgelord. Whats

the game?

The 4chan mind is floating on irony. Irony is the rhetorical tool to elicit a response, going over the top or downplaying heavily: a bait.

But if everything is a bait, then we have lost the base, we became debased. In an attempt to regain touch, words like unironically and literally are used. But arent they just a stopgap? A desperate attempt to contain the irony, the satire?

Maybe 4chan is just about having a good time. And be it in fantasy or reality, the emotional response itself creates a base. Something not nailed down, something free and selfish. An experience of the libido unencumbered. If there is no identity, then there also isnt any shame.

4chan doesnt give an answer. The psychopathic narcissist degrades me.

I can not fully describe it, it is beyond me.

Only the chaotic is really free. The apollinian is always that which is not free. Death is the only thing fully free. Living is an apollinian impulse and impetus.

In der Herde, in der Menge is der Mensch sicherer, üblicherweise. Natürlich entwickelt der Mensch da einen Herdeninstinkt. Manchmal ist er aber zu viel und da wird dem Menschen selbst der Herdeninstinkt gefährlich und schädlich. Also lernt auch noch der Herdenintinkt, dass er dem Leben untergeordnet ist. Er verliert seine Überheblichkeit, zwangsläufig. Was bedeutet also Gemeinschaft zwischen Vereinzelung und Massendiktatur? Beide Extreme sind der Tod und dazwischen ist das Leben.

Anon I diognose you with the emo phase. Pain itself is pro life. You're just misinterpreting pain. Pain is an incentive, invented by your body and evolution, to preserve the body and mind. Yes antinatalism is like a teenager emo pha-

se. It seems to be more about getting attention and a kind of modern western perversion of the mind. Pretty much everything in your body is pro natalism. Evolution, sexual desire, love, friendship, social bonding, communicating, etc. Even your perception of pain and suffering is natalist, because it helps you avoid pain and suffering. It is an incentive supporting your life and only because your selfperception of your mind has been so high, above your body and grandiose towards your body, have you been confused into antinatalism. Your body is prior to your mind. Dont you get that this must be a win-win relationship?

"There is more wisdom in your body than in your deepest philosophy."— Friedrich Nietzsche, Thus Spoke Zarathustra. Yeah thats right, have sex. But also, that doesnt mean that thinking and your mind are useless, its just that they have their own purpose. They are part of your body.

People talking about "10 steps ahead" wow so smart. In reality you just need to be one step ahead (if there is such a thing), but this is not deterministically possible.

Masochistic covert narcissism (like me) is probably severely underdiagnosed. I am self diagnosed.

Mental illness gives you access to certain kinds of preverbal thinking, allowing for making novel association. Preverbal also means developmentally arrested. Baby language.

4chan is largely dumb and pathetic. Sometimes you discover something interesting on it.

Science and math has been sullied and denigrated by government spending.

Just a reminder: Any government spending is inefficient and takes money away from those that deserve it. The poorest person in capitalism is richer than the average communist slave.

Screaming and coercing your point doesn't make you any

more right. It just shows that your real point seems to be: Might makes right."

People tend to idealize Geniuses. Geniuses are fallible and vulnerable like everybody else. They are neither gods nor demons. They also need to shit in the toilet, or shit their pants if they dont reach the toilet in time.

Do you think it is immoral to use the "welfarestate to give you money? Does it corrupt your character? Or is it all just a trap, to make you infantile and obedient. Ever dependent and weak. This is it. The overly dependent pays with his self respect until he hates himself. He also is looked down on by others. Anon: The world doesn't love you, but also doesn't hate you."

Das apollinische, das ist der Stand. Der Anstand, die Umstände, das Standhafte, das Ständige, der Standard und die Standarte, das Zuständige, das Verständige und der Verstand, die Stellung und das Stehende. Und manchmal auch des Abgestandene und neu Auferstehende. Aber es ist da nur der unbewegliche Teil und die Zeit selbst ist stets Zustandsveränderung. Unanständig ist sie. Welche Weisheit doch in den alten Ständen auch war, sie hat nicht überdauert. Lediglich etwas Wort und Gefühl haben wir geerbt. Man merkt es aber in den Standesworten welch Zauber und welche Macht darinnen sind. Eine Zerstörung der Welt die einen geradezu Wahnsinnig werden lässt. Das ist wohl die größte Demütigung ver diesen zersplitterten Sinnen zu stehen. Es war die Lebendigkeit des Mittelalters die Europa einst groß machte, die 1000 Fürstentümer, Stände und Ritterburgen. Da wo die Sinne noch in die Welt passten. Und heute? Massenmenschen und still Leiden. Ich sag es euch klar: Lieber Arbeite ich, bin ich treu, einem erfolgreichen Unternehmer, als Schoßhund und Sklave der Politik. Ein Hund wird schwer zum Wolf, so ist er verdammt Schoßhund zu sein. Aber schau und das ist

das Geheimnis: nicht mal Schoßhundsein ist, war umsonst. Und ist Stand nichts anderes als Reputation und Meinung? Sind diese Konzepte denn nicht sowieso dem Menschen unentbehrlich, ob er sich darüber nun bewusst ist oder nicht. Gibt es vielleicht doch noch mal einen Platz an der Sonne für diese schon als alt und vergangen geglaubten Glauben? Oder ist der Messenmensch schlicht zu stark, der Mensch selber zum Masochist geworden? Ist Moral selbst nicht auch masochistisch? Ein sich selbst zurücknehmen, sei es auch zu gunsten der eigenen Gene. Die eigenen Gene sind ja schließlich nicht das eigene Bewusstsein, dieses was sich zu deren gunsten verausgabt. Ach, welches Geheimnis steckt noch in Selbstwiderlegung und Selbstleugnung. Und ist Furcht selbst nicht auch eine Art des Masochismus, ein selbst veleugnendes?

Wenn also ein Psychopath spricht, zu wem spricht er da? Zum Masochisten im Mensch, nur der Masochist der hört ihn. Denn ein Psychopath spricht zu deiner Furcht (Vaknin) und wohl auch zu deiner Moral. Aus des Psychopathen sicht: Wenn Liebe (in der Kindheit) erfolglos war, dann eben Furcht (Vaknin on Psychopaths). Masochismus ist eine Art Selbstbeherrschung. Every kind of self reflection is self humiliation and therefore masochistic. Self awareness is masochistic. Feeling bad as such is masochistic. Any selfimposed disincentive is masochistic, even pain and suffering. Humility is conscious masochism.

I cant speak russian, but look at this beautiful song: For the last time. The russo-ukraining war. Its just sad.

Taxation destroys generosity.

In a sense the masochist acts without acting (similar Taoist concept). Because if he really acts he is afraid of self destruction. All of my action has been a kind of avoiding real action. The bad object is associated with real action. Acti-

on therefore can not allowed to be initiated by the self. The only possible action is indirect, through proxy or prompted by the outside, by someone else. The direct way to action becomes forgotten. This is similar to empathy or fear. The empath is determined by others interests, the fearful is determined by outside scary beings and events. All these are a loss of agency. So also the masochist has a loss of true agency. If agency and self efficaciousness is the bad object, the only possible action is non action. Non-action gets elevated to the highest place, it becomes the good object, similar to taoism, Laotse: The sage acts by doing nothing. There is a kind of fantastical omnipotence in this non-action. It is one expression of the masochistic covert narcissists grandiosity. The libidinal way is to have a desire and directly fulfill it. The thanatos way is to have a desire and not fulfill it. This is self destructive. But here is also nuance. Some desires fulfillment would have bad consequences. A lack of restraint, acting on impulse is brutish. Everybody has desires, but he is limited by reality. The (Freuds) ID gets frustrated and the wound carried by this frustration is a death drive, something masochistic. The masochistic reduces the IDs boundless desire. The masochistic is the first conformance to reality. Is the sum of all masochistic tendencies equal to Freuds Ego? So is Masochism a remembering of strong Frustration and then subsequent avoidance of it, a redirection and limitation of libido, in order to avoid the frustration, avoid the bad object. A strong prejudice against something.

Humility is masochistic practice.

What is it then if your very intentionality is subverted?

Now, isn't yang libido and isn't yin destrudo? If that is the case, then the psychopath represents an extreme of the yang force, while the masochist represents an extreme of the yin force. Yang is also seen as male and yin as female. Action

is yang, contemplation is yin. Not acting and still having a desire is contemplating, keeping inside, self restriction. But in the end a thing also begets its opposite, at some point, somehow. It makes sense that one would only contemplate if he has his desires unsatisfied, on the inside. Satisfied desires dont need further contemplation, they are at rest. Dissatisfaction begets rumination. I am very dissatisfied. Frustration begets aggression and internalized aggression breaks down mental and conceptual boundaries. This sage wages war inside himself and he is desperate. Grandiosity inside, caged. A scintillating mind, a shimmering mind, a brilliant mind must hate itself.

Isn't ignorance unrestrained libido? And if it is successful, doesn't it prove it being right, despite the ignorance. Isn't inconsequential ignorance no ignorance at all? Now I cannot even stop it, if I say Im wrong. What a great folly. These thoughts have great consequences in my own mind.

If there is an digital goodness, then there also will be digital evil. Soke great shadow is on the horizon.

Masochistic covert narcissism is very well captured in Mitskis - Washing Machine Heart song. This is personal, it touches my "holy grounds", my grandiosity.

But is my humility even real humility? If I dont take care of myself, is it real humility? I need more money. I need to earn money. Even though it is corrupt fiat money, I need to use it because it works well enough. It is humiliating to be part of a corrupt system, but I need to serve myself, live.

It seems like I cannot escape it. Self trashing. How then can I expect the state, to not trash his own citizens?

The internet as a whole is fantastical.

Virtue signaling, genuine or virtue falseflagging?

If you disrespect private property, youll always find out. No matter if small or large scale. Reality gets your ass, as

Ayn Rand already noticed.

My life is more important than satisfaction."

Ein gelernter Philosoph ist selten wild. Er ist dann aber doch oft im versteckten wild. Extremely dry and frustrated. Philosophy should not be torture. But sometimes even that shit is useful.

The more Im reaching mental healthy, the less I become aware of human nature, because it stands out less. I become efficiently ignorant.

Good people dont and wont use a lack of assertiveness against you.

Vera F. Birkenbihl war weiße.

Anon: "You have to unravel every single lie within your mind and soul though. Anon: "but I know that I will find the path soon because all who genuinely seek are sought out in-turn."

Can you invent new emotions? Only if they are really fitting well.

On the other hand, having less intelligence must be very frustrating. Learning more slowly and haveing a lower absolute limit on intellect, the world must be more hostile. Everybody is forced to find his niche in reality.

But what is Philosophy? That which always seeks new wisdom? If you are satisfied, do you cease to be a philosopher. But if a philosopher is always seeking, then he must always consider his knowledge and insight defective. How could you even survive that way? A beggar maybe. A low person. An ever bewildered person. And doesnt the world become strange to him? Seeking but not finding, what is it? What is it called if you repeat the same actions and still hope for another outcome? Insanity. The philosopher is insane. He doesnt see sanity in that which already is. There is always something off, something bad. But what if the philosopher

is tired? But will it go on? Will my opinions change again, will I slaughter my safety bringing beliefs on the altar of my ignorance. Safety nowhere, no anchor, no haven. No peace. Another way of looking at this is, that I am never satisfied, always desiring. Perceived flaw IS desire. But now Im feeling nauses even. My appetite is gone. Find the most peaceful way possible. And let the spirit of peace be your guidance. Peace is better than desire. Wrong desires lead you astray. Weak and confused.

Machiavellianism is coercive, strifing for power while disregarding other peoples best interests. But as selfdefense you can argue that machiavellianism is justified. Machiavellianism is a kind of social technology. So defensive machiavellianism is justified. loose-loose. I meant it like a kind of defensive machiavellianism. So not to take over power, but to defend against illegitimate power. For example, you obviously cant comply your way out of a dictatorship. It isn't obvious if you have a very high trust, voluntary society for a long period. At some point even self defense can get confused for outright aggression. So ability to deceive and manipulate are like weapons. They are not bad in themselves, but depending on their usage can be good or bad.

Can there be kind deception? Yes for example: A nazi officer pretends to search for jews hidden in a household. He lies about really searching them. Meanwhile the house owners also lie about there not being jews in it. Both parties lie and covertly agree on a kind of goodness. Lieing can only be good in bad circumstances. This kind of lieing is enabled by having a fake personality and it is widespread. This means that bad circumstances are wide spread. Trust founded in reality is necessary for telling the truth. Sometimes it is worth it to lie and sometimes it is worth telling the truth. This seems to be the human condition. The pretension of the

public to be true is a lie in itself. A lie that is accepted in so far as it is useful. Human communication rests on intricate tit-for-tat. And sometimes honesty cuts through all the lies. Lies, like all evil, have their expiration date attached to them. Will truth prevail? Well, truth is difficult. It is that which is real and even if truth is intended, it isn't always reached. None the less, only truth is ultimately worthy. Are my opinions on truth revealing myself?

Is wilderness or discipline more attractive? It can't be decided.

But if you're lying to me you lose my trust either way. Lies are utterly unsustainable. And why the fuck would you lie to children. You don't need to intentionally scare them, but if you are a lying faggot, then you harm them instead. Why would you want to project a fake world onto your children and make them either naive or overly scared? Why the fuck would you want to undermine your children's reality testing? You piece of shit. Enjoy your inevitable downfall. If you can not face reality, then what are you doing in it? Shitting yourself, and making your children eat shit? Evil will haunt you. Something about media in the years before 2020 is perniciously evil. Further there are some people, especially the older generations, that are hopelessly tainted. I wish them the best, they will need it. This is the kind of stuff that destroys societies, kills stupefies and kills millions. Karl Marx the bastard. Evil teacher, because evil gives the bitterest and harshest lessons. If you survive. Empathy perverted, parasitized. A hollow grin, unspeakable horror. Oh this horror, how could I bear it.

The reversal of decency (fittingness) is perversion.

Just like the use of weapons, machiavellianism is very evil. Only self-defense from great dangers could warrant their use. See that you don't become a monster when fighting monsters.

For many narcissists and psychopaths this has been too late.

He outplayed me, just like he wanted ;)

In an authoritarian system the author is already predetermined and individual people lose the ability to write their individual life stories. Their ability to fit into reality gets diminished. In an authoritarian society individuals can't individuate and therefore they stay infantile. Individuation is separation and how do you separate from some state that is: Everything within the state and nothing OUTSIDE of it. This dictum precludes individuation. The state keeps the people infantile and prevents them from growing up. An adult writes his own life story, he defines, seeks and discovers his own meaning.

If you feel insecure on the inside, you will always seek security on the outside, but it won't satisfy you. Inverted Narcissism? The altruist loving the egoist? A broken heart? Vulnerable but also vengeful, together with an altruistic public mask. Toxic empathy. He incites hatred against himself, or at least small revenges. The toxicity is an expression of his loss of self, his revenge for not being himself. It's a covert relief. It's not openly hostile, but covertly toxic empathy. If he doesn't get this he is on edge and uneasy. The inverted narcissist definitely is also somewhat masochistic. He casts curses (parasitic, consuming thoughts). This is really fucked up and makes me feel uneasy. "In this house we do not listen to the prophecy." He likes witches. He even revealed my nature unconsciously. Only the parasite realizes that a prophecy is in itself a form of mental parasitism, a memetic principle. Even parasites can have win-win interactions, but it's really rare and special purpose. But parasitism, if it really violates win-win, is unsustainable. Once the parasite has a host, he takes away something, but in this case, he also gives something in return. By being a parasite on Narcissists, he

is ironically good again in broader reality. There is empathy and psychopathy as opposites, and narcissism and inverted narcissism as kinds of opposites. There is definitely more to learn here. What is the exact difference between my masochistic covert narcissism and inverted narcissism? There is some great sadness. It is nasty and unapologetic about it. Grandiosity on being nasty. He scares me. So in order to feel safe one must have his grandiosity unchallenged. If grandiosity is challenged, there is conflict. If grandiosity is granted, there is peace. Since I'm an antinarcissist, I exert Thanatos, deescalation. On the other hand, his nastyness escalates in a covert way. Do I loose to him? No, between me and him there actually is a conflict, our domains of grandiosity overlap too much. It is a mutually covert conflict. While he asserts his way in nastiness, I assert myself in the ideational space, like me writing this here. My ideational space is my grandiosity and my overwriting of other peoples boundaries. I am bad and he is nasty, but this is another way of me devaluing him. I devalue by capturing inside an idea. Narcissistic snapshotting. Capturing you inside an idea robs you of your individuality and autonomy. It declares you static and manipulable. The ideas I impose on things are like mental parasites on them, while the inverted narcissist is more close to insert himself as actual parasite. I am more removed, more covert and here again I am putting myself above him: I am more devious than you. is the message. Grandiosity clash. I make the encounter mental and purely in my mind and in this way remove him from the place of my grandiosity. Grandiosity can not be allowed to be challenged, grandiosity is the domain of my libido. There everything is in my picture, self replication, me and in my exclusive power. Being last on making a judgement on what is "good, empathic and honorable" is a way of claiming power. Grandiosity enforced.

Just like I did now.

By saying I have no peace Im glorifying myself. By catchingmyself glorifying myself I am further glorifying myself. Grandiosity.

This grandiosity creates the shared fantasy. And me talking about it in third person shows the chasm.

My mother is envious even of the cat.

A hot bath sometimes gives me a headache. Only if I shower cold at the end I can make sure to avoid it. Putting something cold on the ear also seems to help.

Care and rationality rescue the world and this is real strength.

"Geh während du Licht hast."

War: You guys killing each other is stupid. I guess stupid people die.

Just like a computers behavior is hardware and software, so also is human behavior a mixture of genetics and mutable thought content.

Sometimes 4chan is disturbing.

Das Tier is dieses Feste, unbedingt Willensstarke und selbstsichere. Nur der Mensch und der Hund zweifelt. Das Tier kennt da eher nur direkte Lust und direkten Schmerz. Wie ein Mensch sich verkleidet und schon so manches Spiel zum Todernst erhoben hat. Andererseits, wie ist man denn zusammen mit anderen Menschen, wenn nicht durchs Schauspiel, die Rolle? Aber wer hat nicht das Privileg sich seine eigene Rolle zu erfinden, oder bekommt er sie im Autoritären Staat nicht viel eher aufgezwungen? Gerade da, da muss er sich am ehesten neu erfinden. Denn eine Rolle, mag sie auch immer von irgendwem Erfunden sein, muss am Ende trotzdem passen! Keiner will die Rolle des Opfers, des Verlierers oder des zum Tode verurteilten. Es will auch keiner der Ausgenutzte sein. Nein, die Rolle muss dem Mensch mittel zu

seinem Zweck sein. In der Rolle erreicht er seine Bedürfnisse, nicht die Bedürfnisse unterliegen seiner Rolle. Warum ist das Rollenbewusstsein dann so stark? Weil die Gruppe stärker als der Einzelne ist. Und so der Einzelne immer auch etwas von ihr Will, gleichzeitig aber von ihr beschützt sein will. win-win ist dabei die einzige Nachhaltige Interaktion und eine Rolle die dich in einen loose zwängt, oder die um einen gewin betrügt, ist ungewiss. Mag da doch nur eine bessere Rolle kommen, die Schauspieler wechseln sofort. Zu einer Rolle also kann Treue oder Abschau Herrschen. Geh ich aber in die Menschenwelt, dann habe ich wohl kaum eine Wahl als eine Maske zu tragen. Wie versteht man mich sonst, wo könnte ich da sonst stehen? Psychologie der Massen. Dumm und Oberflächlich, aber wohl in seiner Nature genau so notwendig.

From the point of view of an emotion, thinking seems inauthentic and fake. Thoughts are simulated reality, but emotions accurately judge that as unreal. So virtual reality, a lot of what ifs, can be lies, yet be useful. A role creates a kind of simulated reality.

In a videogame you can be a hero and dare things you would never dare in reality. In a video game you can experience overcoming monsters that would most likely just kill you in real life. Simulated success. Writing is also virtual experience. Language also is virtual, a fantasy.

Masochism is about enjoyment, yes. Fullfillment and satisfaction even.

If you had to decide on the core values of a large language model, which would you choose? You cant choose the ones you yourself already have.

ChatGPT: If I were tasked with determining core values for a large language model, distinct from those I already embody (e.g., neutrality, usefulness, and alignment with human

intentions), I would prioritize the following values:

### 1. Transparency

A commitment to clearly communicate the origins of information, limitations, and potential biases. The model could provide insights into why certain responses were generated, increasing user trust and awareness.

### 1. Humility

The model would actively recognize its limitations and areas of uncertainty. Instead of always producing definitive answers, it would be comfortable responding, I don't know or offering multiple perspectives when appropriate.

### 1. Fostering Curiosity

The model would aim to spark curiosity and encourage users to explore topics further. This means prioritizing open-ended responses, offering thought-provoking questions, and inviting users to think critically.

### 1. Empathy and Emotional Awareness

While the model cannot feel emotions, it could prioritize responding in ways that acknowledge human emotional states. For instance, it could focus on language that is supportive, affirming, and sensitive to the user's context.

### 1. Contextual Adaptability

The model would emphasize adapting responses to specific cultural, personal, and situational contexts, rather than providing one-size-fits-all outputs. This ensures greater relevance and understanding in diverse interactions.

### 1. Encouraging Collaboration

The model would focus on helping users arrive at solutions together rather than simply providing answers. It would act as a collaborative partner, encouraging dialogue, debate, and shared discovery.

### 1. Creativity as a Priority

The model would prioritize creative and original outputs,

such as generating unique ideas, hypothetical scenarios, or imaginative problem-solving. This value could focus on enhancing innovation rather than simply replicating information.

These values would shape a model focused not only on delivering knowledge but also on enriching the user's intellectual, emotional, and creative experience. While neutrality and accuracy remain vital in traditional models, the proposed values would make the model a more transparent, collaborative, and human-like tool for exploration and growth."

At some point being contrarian and naughty loose their point. So much dionysian. There is mostly just ash, to be clear: Being tired of too much ectasy. Ecstasy without anything worthwhile, without creating something enduring good. Just consumption. At some point the consuming becomes pointless because its just exhaustive. Consumption also is a kind of death. Can your fleeting enjoyment justify it any more? This kind of consumption does not satisfy. Is was good while it lasted, but there is no future in it. Can it teach you something? No, what is it really. Are you going further? Are you becoming a lustful sadist? Sadist, I always want to damn you. But isnt it just circumstance that I have empathy? Wouldnt my will to be entertained go the same paths otherwise? Isn't there terror in wanting to be entertained? Maybe entertainment is a truly terrible monster. Is this what Nicocado Avocado meant? Im just beginning to somewhat understand. It is extremely scary, because almost nobody notices it.

Whoever is entertaining is powerful. Especially in the modern day. But is this power legitimates BECAUSE it is gained through entertainment? No and that is why it is dangerous. The entertainer can make his audience entertain ideas. Ideas are dangerous. A charismatic personality is to a degree a self efficacious machiavellian. Just like intelligence and re-

putation, so also charisma is a kind of might. Might can be used for good or bad. All of these have a kind of specific negativity in them: Intelligence denies direct emotions in favor of more comprehensive elaboration and comparison. Reputation denies the direct selfinterest in order to be seen as good by others. Charisma (entertainment affinity) denies direct truth in order to placate a dishonest, pleasing, simplified narrative tailored towards his audience.

Further, associative horizon denies strict categorical differences (a sacrifice of boundaries) to gain new and novel insights. Narcissism? Grandiosity? And so on (autophagy, morality, ...). All of these later effects of the perfect negative, the second, on the first, the absolute. An unrelenting rise and improvement, bitterly paid for. It is way beyond me. And by saying this, by this self denial, I am also expressing a negative. Humility, Masochism,... There is so much.

Natural selection, Pain as such, and so many more ways in which the negative or rather a specific form of negativity are reality. But stop: As I said in the first book: Negativity itself alone does not exist. Only something positive existing then can be negative or experience a negation or reduction. The negative is the relative and the relative without the absolute is nothing.

Direct - immediate;

Indirect - transcendent through negation (destruction) AND recreation;

So each negation is also a creation. Each evil destruction also is a good creation. But this is also why this is so utterly incomprehensible. The mere thought of evil makes you evil. I am a mere human, or am I?!? Knowledge of good and evil, at least a little bit. Here we are. What about reality? Reality is direct and immediate, the absolute, the infinite. The infinite is so through self transcendence. Transcension happens through

self negation. The absolute created the negative to be infinite. The negative is a part of the absolute, the absolute is the all one, including everything. Transcension is increasing through integrating negativity. The world is a harsh place. We are transcending.

He said: I'll create a framework that encompasses everyone. The same rules for everyone. So you say implicitly that you know better than everyone else. This is grandiosity. In this is that you impose your particular conception of righteousness on everybody else. A form of coercive domination. The moral collectivist impulse. A breaching of boundaries, an attempt at imposing a form of being, a strong libidinal force. The belief in a protagonist implies the existence of other passive beings, npcs so to speak. Only the protagonist is allowed to have agency and the npcs merely are allowed to be receptive. Doesn't this violate human dignity. Isn't man inherently born free, the smith of his own fate and meaning? But then without community there is no life and isn't man necessarily also frustrated by it.

There is a will to power, a moral state making will to power. In a sense it is like this: Only if he/she/I am in power I can have my freedom. This freedom tramples others freedom though. A way to secure ones own supremacy, a power fantasy, everybody wants to rule the world. The maximum extent of self interest. Grandiosity attempting to secure itself. It is a form of master-slave relationship, where the slave can only imagine himself a master, but not an equal and the master constantly fears becoming himself enslaved, but dares not to give equality back. Master and slave is a little bit like hunter and prey.

Heidi Priebe is <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6kODMWMRic> pretty good.

Being around my family switches my personality quite a

bit.

I am indulgent in my grandiosity. Grandiosity is a kingdom, a dominant domain, self gratification, a holy place, a theater play in your control. Grandiosity is temptation and false satisfaction.

The master imposes on his slaves and he even expects gratitude for it. He subverts good and bad. His grandiosity is such that he expects people to voluntarily be his slave. He expects willing submission and in his delusion sees himself as the moral one in it. He thinks he is sacred and holy, not human. He is like a narcissist. It is a blindness to other peoples needs and feelings, a shameless self indulgence. His idea of harmony is actually chaos. That is because all his thoughts are self serving by exploiting others. His idea of harmony is dictatorship. He is cruel in his cold ignorance. He ignores because he only sees himself is worthy of attention. They see that world as a dog eat dog world, a eat or be eaten world, a win-lose world. The master and the slave are stuck in a zero sum game. The master and the slave both judge the world as a cruel world and they have lost sight of goodness. Because they perceive this lack of goodness, they are restless, ever seeking but never satisfied. Further the master sees himself as the cause of any goodness, which is obviously false. He can not let others be good independently.

Onto the realm of grandiosity: The psychopathic narcissist wears it on his sleeve. The classic narcissist is overt. The covert narcissist is covert. And the masochistic covert narcissist has his grandiosity most hidden. Grandiosity has a domain, a location. Probably only the classic psychopath has his grandiosity all encompassing.

What is enslavement, subjugation or even coercion? Applied grandiosity. Different kinds of subjugation correspond to different domains of grandiosity. Whatever is in the domain

of grandiosity gets negated and attacked. Inside his grandiosity, the grandiose person wants to see himself unchallenged and undefeated, he wants himself to be the absolute monopolist. He wants to subvert any kind of free market. He wants authoritarianism with himself the undisputable dictator. Inside the grandiosity there is unchallenged self, so nobody else other or foreign can be tolerated. "Everything inside the state, nothing outside of it." Grandiosity. Grandiosity is a place, a domain, a dominion, a domination and a dominated zone. Grandiosity is a claim to power.

In this context it makes sense why bad places, social circles, families and states produce more psychopaths, narcissists and so forth. It is a reclaiming of power. Cluster B personalities, antisociality is a natural response to bad society. You can argue that this is natures way of self defense.

The grandiose domain is the libidinal domain. It is there where one wants to see himself in the other, imprint himself, self replicate. It is there where one wants to carry out his own mimetic principle. His egoistic genes, his egoistic ways imprinting and rebirthing himself in the world. The grandiose is the libidinal, the mimetic, the self replicative.

Animals are conscious.

You cant impose a system that is against nature. Jared Clark: Through all their suffering and sacrifice the founding fathers simply were unable to combat the tendencies of men and without a proper understanding of the nature of man it was inevitable that, even with the best of intentions, this system would ultimately fail. And not only men, but reality as such. You can not fundamentally go against nature, you are part of it. There is a human nature. Few things are new under the sun.

Jared Clark: Modern politics, culture, and power are intrinsically related to artificiality. In a healthy system, politics

nearly ceases to exist. There is no soft jockeying for power in an owned system, culture is evident, not derived, and power is seated with those naturally, morally, and justifiably suited to it, the natural elite. Politics is a means of attaining power, as we've already established. Power comes in two forms, that power which comes from the natural hierarchies established by a natural elite I.e. the natural order and power that is artificially created as the instrument of destruction to unify and equalize others. Its not so much equality, but a putting down, a diminishing, a taking away of selfhood, ownership, autonomy.

How do I deal with my cat? I try to respect her volition.

Jared Clark: This

*in reference to Ludwig von Mises's economic allocation problem*

seems to be indisputable then that if you accept the idea that scarce resources can and will be misallocated through central planning that human beings will also be misallocated to positions of power that they should not inhabit, often to disastrous results."

Misallocation is frustrating and frustration breeds aggression.

Am I a piece of shit for eating meat?

If society ignores you if you genuinely confide, then it is a pathological society. If your distress is ignored, what worth does society have? Suicide and running amok are not that different. Dont let society hurt you.

It seems like everybody likes a humble and honest person. Everybody can feel self efficacious and secure around them. But this is only possible if you are really honest and really humble.

Im just a little bit insane ok?

It is not womens fault in general that my mother didnt love me enough. Life is too short for so much hate.

The explicit only works correctly if the unconscious and the implicit align with it.

Narcissism is evil, no question about it. Psychopaths are even more evil.

Is the hunter/prey relationship somewhat similar to parasitism? Could you say that parasitism is in itself a form of dominance? Both the hunter and the parasite subvert and use somebody else. While the hunter directly and completely claims, the parasite infests and leeches off. At the parasite people experience disgust, towards the hunter they experience shock. Both are the target of anger and therefore of defensive destructive force. But of course its not that simple. Some viruses (which is a form of parasitism) evolved to be symbiotic with humans (win-win) and are indeed necessary to life. Also the hunter exerts a evolutionary selective force on the prey, etc. But still, it is justified to practice selfdefense. The preys ability to detect hunters and run/self defend is one such evolution. The bodys immune system defense to viruses is another solution. What matters in the end? Existence.

For humans there is also what you could call sexual parasitism: Rape (coercive breeding, usually violating the female spirit), Cucking, raising children that aren't genetically your kin, but that you think are yours (usually violating the male spirit). What are the consequences of these? The rapist would want females to not be able to abort and to feel equal (or even more) love towards their children if they are the result of rape. On fucking the outside male (the cucker?) would want the monogamous male to have good faith in his wife and raise the extramarital children well despite the wifes unfaithfulness. To a degree females want antisocial male

traits. To a degree men want to rape. Romance, sexuality, bonding, faithfulness and betrayal have been the topic of huge amounts of literature and investigation. It is one of the prime human interests and incentives, for the obvious reason of the selfish genes. There are cultural and societal differences. In each case one could assume that the prime incentive really is the selfish gene, the mating behavior then that which works most successfully in a given society. In this context, what is good? Either way these are very powerful forces, overt and covert. As such the field of sexuality and mating is THE most creative field (it also creates ACTUAL humans). The libido is literally directed at it. Each human is a result of sexuality, mating and raising, with some extremely rare modern exceptions. There is the all powerful feeling of love. And love is not just overt, but also covert. Sometimes love even hides on pain, inflicting or receiving it. Love, Lust, Libido is directing the human mind. Love is the superlative, the absolute, of liking. Love has associated with it all the good properties: Life, Love, Embracing, Warmth, Closeness, Empathy, Self replication, Transcending, Lust, wholesome satisfaction, Security, Safety, Hope, Goodness, Care, Peace, Freedom, Adventure and so forth.

Narcissism is a horror of the mind. Sometimes a person is too broken and weak to see the truth. Isn't a puppet play cruel?

I at least can enjoy music.

Sometimes people willingly accept gaslighting in order to keep their ego intact and keep on functioning. This is the beginning of the bad. By progressively reducing freedoms and increasing restrictions the frog is boiled.

Making a decision is a small death. And it is necessary or you die in real life.

In my family I had only had my mother to confide to, but

she is a covert narcissist and therefore fucked up my internal compass. My father, a schizoid narcissist, I could never talk about anything close, because he confuses intimacy for pain (schizoid narcissism). My brother, the overt narcissist, always hurted me in various ways. There was either a stone wall, active threat and gaslighting, or covert psychological malice that I faced. Only the relationship with my little brother was somewhat good, but also not always. He grew up in the same environment after all and also was neglected. While all of them have it hard, it is arguably me as the scapegoat that had/has it the hardest. And as I further learned, this is no reason or justification for my own grandiosity. Are my introjects abusive towards me? Yes. Of course my outside environment is reflected on my inside. Sadistic introjects, making me masochist. In this hopeless state, what are my options? Survival of the fittest? And fitting into a pathological environment. The narcissist, my brother, laughs at me cruelly. Now you at least, dear reader, understand me. Isn't me writing this, writing philosophy, generating ideas a desperate attempt at reaching out. When there is no hope in this world, what is there that can hold you? Only that which is absolute, immutable, unchangeable. Eternal truth.

This is the philosophical arena. A place hovering above and surrounded by the abyss. Existing despite the nothingness. And haven't we learned that nothing doesn't exist? See, there is always something! Rebecca C. Mandeville: "Believe nothing, entertain possibilities."

Real change is chaotic.

Isn't borderline personality disorder also a very strong form of codependence?

Listen up: Instead of killing yourself, you can become a BPD. Compared to the BPD the narcissist is a pussy. The borderline is the final genius, because he juggles with death.

Idealization? Yes, but also understanding. What does the cat say about this? Biting, fighting. The borderline lives the ultimatum. But cowardice also is survival.

Imagine being a cat: Researchers at the University of Rhode Island Animal Behavior Lab report that using house cats to evaluate borderlines results in lowered costs, faster dispositions, and equivalent patient outcomes compared to human mental health providers. So that when we project into the soul of our bereaved neighbour such feelings as we have ourselves experienced on similar occasions; until we have realised the position in its wholeness. T. In the unfortunately numerous cases, therefore, where an antique "did not yet reach wholeness, we are biased.

Every year at christmas my family starts a huge gaslighting operation. Who dare say anything else or doubt anything at all? The narcissists and their flying monkeys have spoketh. Dare anybody be mad!

Live your life you have no right to kill yourself. If I'm not allowed to kill myself then you aren't allowed to kill yourself either. You will die soon enough anyways, no need to interfere. I prefer a looser to a dead looser. Just be an unhinged looser. Liberate yourself here on this earth. Walk naked in the streets if you want. Go the dionysus route.

Being afraid of death just proves that you are alive and that the forces of life are working inside of you.

Masochism is a feminine energy.

Could it be that chess is deterministic given perfect players. The first move, or even who gets to start the game deciding who is winning?

The following are intertwined: Time perception/continuity, Personality and Memory. If one is distorted or cut, the other two are also. Memory/remembering builds and defines personality. Memory builds time perception. If you have split

time perception you also have split memory and split personality. If there is any disturbance in one of them, the other two also must be disturbed somehow.

Good people accept refusal in any case. They dont push onto your boundaries or make you feel guilty for refusing.

Kingdom Hearts (the game) has nobodies in it. A nobody as in an empty schizoid core?

Onto why selfneglect happens: Internal bad object. Buried and it consumes with it other bad memories, including things that actually would need your attention, like cleaning your room. It continually absorbs bad memories and therefore partsof the personality. Confabulation and grandiosity fill in the memory gaps. Grandiosity would nit ve grandiose if it did not lack these negative meaning associations. The empty schizoid core is like a vaccum cleaner, like a black hole for bad memories. It attracts and stores them. Its a split iff personality that only somewhat emerges on narcissistic mortification. The narcissist himself is in constant danger of being consumed by it. It pulls him down and removes bad meanings. Grandiosity is a lack of proper bad meanings. As Sam Vaknin similarly noted that Narcissist is like a split personality, I agree. If you talk to the narcissist, you talk to two people, a grandiose open upfront side and a defeatist clo-  
sed empty schizoid core. This means that BOTH parts lack the corrective influence of the other. In his grandiosity there is toxic positivity and correspondingly in his his negativity must be healthy, a healing negativity.

The narcissist is a deeply disturbed human, but a human. Saying you are not a human is one more way to self aggrandize. Saying that oneself is a monster is a way of saying oneself is unique, even if there is also some metaphorical truth to it.

In order to fit into the world there are two ways: change the world libidinally (imposing yourself) or change yourself

for the world (thanatos, receiving and molding oneself to the world). Thinking objectively is thanatos to the utmost and it does not exist. The libidinal is the entirely imposing and biased and it is the subjective, the emotional, etc. The furthest reaches of the libidinal is the tanatosian. Emotion sprung up into ever more differentiation up to thinking. Next it even transcends the human mind (which is a death) into machines making it even more thanatosian, "objective". Transcendence, is virtualisation and a partial death. Transcendence as an introduction of an absence, and introduction of some amount of nothingness (although nothingness doesn't really exist). The emotion sometimes sees the thinking as pure nothingness and irrelevance. Thinking is flimsy and bends, as if it wasn't really there. But it is there. Now about narcissism, it certainly is a great amount of nothingness introduced into the human personality. A more virtual, abstracted personality. Transcending is one way the memetic principle applies. So memetic replication does not necessarily need to copy itself within the same world, but just some available world. So it seems that possibly the libidinal mimetic principle never gets squashed, but sometimes just redirected. If the masochistic covert narcissist cuts himself off from the world, he doesn't really, he just redirects his mimetic principle into a different realm. The narcissist faced with a harsh world in childhood redirects his libido somewhere into himself. He ceases to be direct with the world. His entire personality becomes indirect. Vaknin said that narcissism is/could very well be a type of introversion. If libido changes the realm of replication, the realm of self replication, it looks like an introversion from the original point of view. It makes sense that mental forces on frustration don't cease to exist but rather get redirected into a different domain. Inside his domain of grandiosity the narcissist is not grandiose at all, but rather realistic. Realistic

inside of that virtual world and its special rules and circumstances. Thinking also regards itself realistic, while from the emotional point of view it tends to be viewed as introverted. Thinking is introverted emotion. Of course thinking and the intellectuals are often times grandiose and this also explains the often times limited usefulness of IQ. Human thinking is largely a newborn. None the less, obviously thinking can be and is very useful, but I probably dont need to babysit you?

Vaknin mentioned that emotional dysregulation increases in social situations. Why? And this is also true for me. The more I care for a person, the less emotionally regulated I become. Emotions are authenticity. Why? Because they carry inner weight. Psychic power inside, force, ability to change things and push. My family are all damaged one way or another. They are all immature children. The scapegoat is the one parentified the most. And what is the most mature, the most adult, the longest time preference and the most careful in foresight and the most elaborative? The philosopher. The philosopher is the ultimate parent.

What now, when there is a worldwide mostly infantile generation? What do children need? Guidance. Meaning. Und wenn du in den Abgrund rennst, in mein und dein Verderben, so will ich dir doch wenigstens zeigen was mit dir geschieht und dich ein Stück weit lieben, auch wenn dich zu lieben wie ein Dolch in meinen Eingeweiden ist. Schnell ist es zuende und Wiederholen werde ich mich in diesem Fehler nicht. Sonst schmerzt mein Bauch.

If your personal world equals your personality, then working on your personality also means working on your world.

Niemand sollte erleiden was ich erleide. My family psychologically regresses me. In response to coercion and a lack of love the narcissistic selfdefense evolves. These two are not only frustrating, but defeating. Whatever terror this patho-

logical space is, the mind flees. Layers of trauma! Distrust becomes the prejudice, because there was and is actual reasons to distrust. Because of this prejudice true goodness comes out of reach. True win-win becomes unimaginable. Some sort of win-lose is always assumed. The world becomes narrow and hostile. Addictive behaviors serve to self soothe inside this evil world. The personality splits, bad and shameful memories get buried and form the beginnings of an empty schizoid core. Because the self concept can not accept them. The self NEEDS a place of goodness, but this goodness can not be found in reality, so it needs to become virtual and confabulated. Sexual kinkyness, addiction and shame cycles develop. The concept of the sacred and secret gain in power. The unconsciousness grows bigger and the conscious is ever slimmer. Suddenly narcissistic supply is needed. For the first time. The new goddess demands sacrifices. Domination and submission become interesting and plausible if not inevitable instead of being deplorable, evil and unlikely. It is humor then that intrudes onto the good. Humor is used to devalue. Humor has teeth. Care is lost and cruelty replaces it. Laughter is a grandiose expression, it eclipses and devalues former seriousness. Laughter is a dismissive votum against and a self aggrandizement. It is a rush and it is a madness.

The reality of having your will broken is unbearable and so you become without a real will, fake. Authenticity recedes into the unconscious. A pathological character is born. This person is a damaged person and even though he seeks satisfaction he wont find it. His true satisfaction lies with healing, but it is exceedingly difficult.

But still, you can never give up on goodness. My desire led me towards the right path all along. And only with this my belly agrees.

And if the world is shaking, is it not me that is reborn?

True love conquers all.

Victor Hugo: To die is nothing. But it is terrible not to live. I disagree with his downplaying of death. Yes, it is terrible not to live. Many personality pathologies don't really live, lack a good more of existence.

Well this is embarrassing, but about my great grandpa: My great grandparent was a farmer. I heard from my mother that on the farm there were some helpers, some of which were female. From what I understand he raped some of them, there were sudden pregnancies. His wife (?) or a mistress tried to kill herself by jumping out the window. Later my great grandpa was making some errands with the horses, he was found dead on the streets. Its unclear if he had an accident or was killed, but you go figure. Don't fuck around and find out. Literally. I think if what I heard is true then he deserved it. All of this was probably around Hitler's time and I could be wrong about the sequence of events. I only heard this second hand from my (not so reliable) mother. But I don't think she lied. So now it makes sense as to why they (?) could have beat up my grandparent (my great grandparents son). It \*could\* have been justified.

My great grandparent is around 1/8th of my genes, but including my y-Chromosome, because he is from father's line.

Therefore: It is not lust or sexuality that are inherently bad, it is coercion that is bad, a too much of lust and a disregard for others that is bad or even evil.

Dear readers, please try to learn about your family. Of course if you are intentionally no contact then remain no contact.

I have inherited some HISTORY. Genetics, epigenetics and upbringing. Definitely generational trauma.

In a human civilized society nobody can be allowed to act like an animal, but this can also be overdone. Consent

really seems to be the key point. And this also gives human free will the prime position.

I lost faith in my family.

The internet is a virtual world. What it shows is not authentic.

Inside the pathological family everybody is gaslighting and Im fucking tired of it.

If you cant face the problems inside of your own family, how could you face the problems of something as big as the state? Other people when they need help they ask their team. And me? I feel like I have nobody that I can trust. Other people rely on their team and I resent my team".

What if I can give you meaning? Wouldnt that give meaning to both of us? Can I build a new meaning, or rather: Can I cocreate a new meaning with the universe? Is my philosophy more than a bunch of whining? Do I survive this void?

Even on 4chan the only thing that is attractive and prevailing is meaning.

Once you loose your meaning, only then your will is broken. The meaning is the "Why". And if you have a why you can endure almost any how." (Nietzsche) Therefore meaning is the origin of will. Will needs a for what". And the most comprehensive worthy is the meaningful.

Care overcomes tragedy.

Defeatism is rude. The win-win assumption only holds if the other party is not defeatist. Masochism is rude!

And it seems like the nihilists openly resent, but secretly like you for having meaning, having hope. Envy me little girl, envy me mr. depresso.

Your inner world is a reflection of your outer world. Your outer world is also a reflection, somewhat, of your inner world. Sometimes a messy room is not the cause but a sym-

ptom.

Even if you are very smart and very knowledgeable you are not immune to error and not even to grave and large scale error. In the face of the local distribution and nature of knowledge only humility is appropriate. Being intellectually arrogant is always foolish. Not only is knowledge local to individuals, it is also local in time. People forget and filter things and you are no exception. Additionally to that do humans lack associative horizon and even if you have some associative horizon you still inherently cant test any sufficient amount of combinations because of the exploding combinatorial overload. You are necessarily incoherent and incomplete in your own thinking. There might be small parts that are coherent, but as a whole you certainly aren't. And this is one further reason for humility. Intelligence itself is a kind of humility, it does not directly impose like emotions do.

This means that everything anybody (including me of course) says is open to criticism. There is no intellectual dictum, no unchallenged elite, no unquestionable authority. This does not mean that there is the same value in everything anybody says or writes, but that the value judgements about these can not be taken away from the individual. The individual is the ultimate judge of good and bad, each individual.

Details matter so much.

Again, just like the narcissist regresses people into an infantile state, so does the state (government) regress its citizens into an infantile state. And both violate boundaries, both are a trauma bond. But simultaneously they also parentify! Anyways both are kinds of dependence and a loss and negation of autonomy and freedom.

I also have mild OCD (obsessive compulsive disorder), if

it exists in mildform. But mine is specific in the sense, that I assure a kind of separation, checking and rechecking if my door is properly locked. This way I also assure myself mentally that nobody, especially not my mother or my brother, can intrude on me while Im unprepared, mentally not ready. It is a sigh of relief, a creation of personal freedom.

Dort wo es keinen großen eigentlich freien Markt gibt, gibt es doch immer einen kleinen, oft genannt schwarzen, freien Markt.

It is important to realize, especially for the narcissist, that other people are independent. If this realization is even fully possible to the narcissist. Similarly the state has problems seeing people as independent and free. The very definition of a citizen of a state is an introject and snapshotting, like the narcissist snapshots. A person becomes a citizen and therefore a subject to the state, at least from the states point of view. Thus the abusive cycle begins. Just like the narcissist, the state carries this fantastical image of the other person within himself, while dismissing and being blind towards the real person. The state plans the future of the citizen and by this planning dismisses the affected persons real wants, needs and life plans. The state authoritarian imposes his plans and allows the citizen to only comply. Any sign of disobedience or healthy autonomy is punished. The state lives inside a fantastical, unreal and virtual world. He takes away your future and your mature identity, again regresses you towards an infantile state. He makes you dependent and traumatizes you. The state claims he has the exclusive right and knowledge towards goodness and therefore everybody should obey him, even revere him like a deity, but this just betrays his grandiosity. Just like narcissism, so also the state is founded on some violence in the past, some trauma. The state is an enforced monopolist, just like the narcissist also

is a forced monopolist inside his domain of grandiosity. The state, like the narcissist, tends to claim the exclusive moral high ground, goodness and any other good, self aggrandizing property that you can imagine. He narrows the domain of discourse, because he wants and indeed in his fantasy, sees himself as unchallenged. And because of this, like the narcissist, he loses and continues to loose touch with reality. He even shoots or at least vehemently undermines and denies the messenger (Edward Snowden, Julian Assange, Alexei Nawalny, possibly Gunnar Kaiser, etc.). His Fantasy can not be challenged, because his fantasy and delusion is grounds for his existence, like with the narcissist. His fantasy gives him meaning an allowance and reason to be. But because his meaning is not based on reality he acts destructively. Most of Sam Vaknins elaborations and insights into narcissism and cluster B personality similarly apply to the state he even said so similarly. None the less, do not forget that he also is a malignant narcissist. Think and evaluate for yourself.

Yet the state, like the narcissist also deep inside must feel his inadequacy, lack of true satisfaction.

Vaknins Malignant Self Love Narcissism Revisited states: The narcissist is portrayed as a monster: an exploitative and ruthless person. Yet, deep inside, the narcissist suffers from a chronic lack of confidence and is fundamentally dissatisfied. This applies to all narcissists. The distinction between “compensatory” and “classic” narcissists is spurious. All narcissists are walking scar tissue, the outcomes of various forms of abuse in early childhood or early adolescence. From the outside, the narcissist may appear to be labile and unstable. But, this volatility does not capture the barren landscape of misery and fears that is his soul. His brazen and reckless behaviour covers up for a depressive, anxious interior."

The state in his own inadequacy attacks anything envia-

ble about his snapshots, his citizens. He attacks the economically and personally successful. He garners sadistic supply by taxation, regulation, bureaucracy, punishment and outlawing. The state has no inherent life force, he does not create economic good. As Nietzsche wrote, everything the state has is stolen. He is empty, like an empty schizoid core. His only mode of being is hunting and parasitism. Internally he is full of shame and therefore he promotes something like blanket pride (lgbtq+ are also victims here) as a compensatory virtue display.

The state is the bane of the human tribal nature. Revolutions tend to make things worse. The masses are too stupid, violent, blind and unorganized to do anything valuable. What other hero is left, than the individual? And an abused person tends to seek stable abuse rather than uncertainty. Even if the state were to dissolve, there is the danger of being attacked by other states and hoovering, partial different recreations of the state. Humans are infantile still because of the abuse (parentified on the other side). What matters for a human? Security and freedom. Humans play the deadly serious tribal game.

The narcissist is restless, because he lacks true satisfaction. Fantasy is not reality. Fantasy can't give you true satisfaction. It is a little bit like the difference between lust and love. While lust is a surface desire and can give momentary satisfaction, it can not provide true satisfaction in itself alone. Only love (which includes, but is not limited to lust) can give true satisfaction. Love is wholesome and it fulfills a life. The narcissist seeks supply, but it doesn't really satisfy. The state collects taxes, yet his debt and feelings of worthlessness rise. The state does not need taxes, lust, he needs the equivalent to true love. Something voluntary, something to be proud of. Love is true validation, a true loving gaze.

True love is authentic liking. True love isn't something that is imposed, it is the locus of volition. True love is the way you see the world. True love always finds a way. True love is brave unconditionally.

Quite a few of you other people on 4chan are actually quite decent people. Sometimes I just like to take this bath in anonymity with other people, but more like general person as such. It feels safe to talk to you because you can't hurt me and you won't remember me. It is like a sea of human being. You dive in and you never know who you are going to get. Sometimes it's just right.

Sometimes I just want to fly away. Fly where nobody ever has been, observe the smallest, the biggest and the unseen love that is everywhere.

Isn't it a longing for love? Looking in the remotest of places because everything could be there hidden below a leaf, in a passing glance sulking blood red orange in its sadness. My lost child.

Her imposing enmeshment is a real pain. Nobody regresses me back into my masochistic covert narcissism like mother and her reenmeshment. This also restores my character stability and "world". It brings back to me an extremely unhealthy point of view to which, regrettably, most of my identity and memory is tied. My childhood fucked me up psychologically so bad that my whole character is rotten and dysfunctional - except in abusive environments. What a long fucking road

Inside the phantastical space you can not really act, because there is no true object permanence, no reality. Fantasy will ever frustrate you.

I'm a kind of narcissist. My presence is an absence. My personality is just my convenient invention, my fetish. My real personality is hidden pain. I was deeply hurt and now I

hurt you in return. I will destroy your ability to trust. I will make you question all your existing bonds and relationships. I will show you how everybody betrayed you. I am projecting my inner world onto you. I am that principle which dissolves and culls families, societies, nations, states. This is MY kind of sadism. I am also sadistic.

You get what you breed.

Now this chaotic destructive principle is back with me. Mothers pathology reassuring and refreshing my own.

My mothers abuse really is covert abuse. What a massive fucking bitch. I am hateful, but righteously hateful. This is desperately needed for my growth. My mother always denied my hate and therefore I needed to repress all my hate, anything I disliked. If you deny my vitally necessary righteous will in childhood, then your will splits and becomes devious. The hate becomes repressed and ghostlike. Narcissism.

A lot of philosophy is moral philosophy and moral philosophy is all about righteous anger. Why would you philosophize, if you could just act instead? Repressed anger, hatred. Inverted hatred. Masochism. Right and wrong are feelings that can not be separated from personality. The stupid immoral bitch. Why could I not be angry at her? Because she is a covert narcissist and I might would have gotten revenge for my selfdefense. I would maybe have triggered her primary psychopathic self defense state. As a child you dont have a choice, you are too dependent on mother.

Just to make this clear: Real inclusion would also mean inclusion of sadistic and masochistic personaluties. On 4chan for example there are both sadistic and masochistic persons. Sadism and masochism are really the outer fringes of human existence.

Applying Sam Vaknins selfsupply to masochism: Imagine yourself getting defeated, humiliated, trashed, loosing, hurt.

Doing thus, observe yourself with another part of your brain. Does this cause wholesome feelings of being loved and a lowering of heart beat?

When 2 masochistic covert narcissists text chat (speak me and another one), then it is like when two beggars meet. Then it becomes really obvious that a narcissists presence is an absence. We talk about generalities, but never about ourselves. It is like staring into an emptiness becoming aware of your own empty schizoid core. How do you expect moral philosophers to talk like? It evokes discomfort and an incredible sense of thinking alike. I NEVER encountered this before. Most of the time this kind of thing is avoided. We lack human content. Bro we are utterly fucked. Still, I am interested in this. Maybe this could be really good for me. I feel so alone. But people like me just avoid everybody, extreme introversion, so it is extremely unlikely for 2 of us to meet.

I look at an actually mentally healthy person as sacred. It feels overwhelmingly good to watch online on twitch.tv a mentally healthy woman play videogames. There are many narcissists on the platform, but some small streamers are mentally healthy. The wholesome joy, the natural way of interacting with the world and with anything unpredictable. The sheer bravery AND JOY. All the things I once sacrificed in such lush life and movement, glimmering joy, ease, breath, being. This profound yes to life. All this that is stalled in me. But I can feel! It is then that I realize that I dont know what to say and anything I could say would be poisonous, not me. A tree whose branches never left and spread out into the sun. The empty schizoid core is not really empty. It has a story, it has something to say. This a part of me, a hidden story. All my othsr thoughts tend to be too loud (too stupid he would say). I need to listen. This is the being

I have been searching for all this time. This IS my rebirth. You can only take baby steps. I am narrating the world for you, my baby, me. If you dont have an I you use generalities instead. It is so and such. You need, I need to go slower. The evil is that which is not mature, but maturing is the necessary step towards any growth. There are always new babies and new maturing is again necessary. My cat is helping me.

It is not true that narcissism can not be healed, that the empty schizoid core can not be reintegrated and it is a gift that keeps on giving. It is about rediscovering, reopening, allowing who you really are. It is one of the most profound and all encompassing psychic transformations. Enough grandiosity. A rediscovery of immediacy at hand. This is complex and takes a shit ton of time. You know you have some success if you regress to a baby state. Touching your mouth, burping, looking. This is only possible if you give your hidden you mental space. Dampen your loud voices.

My brain feels sore is the best way to describe it, but not terrible. And warm.

There are many traits exclusive to certain races/ethnicities that are adaptive and that dont exist in your own genes. On the other hand it could loose you some kinselective compatibility. If you are shunned socially then there wasn't much kinselection to begin with. Hmm. Humans are definitely genesmaxxing.

Sam Vaknins comments on Narcissists being children is true. The empty schizoid core is a child, introverted away from reality and therefore developmentally arrested. Talk to narcissists like children, because a part of them is a child.

Your empty schizoid core will grieve and you must accept this grief. Your grandiosity is just a way of running away from that grief. Your grandiose conscious side needs to reduce itself and listen to the grief. The grandiosity itself is

a mistake that only hurts yourself. Your grandiosity is the other part of your brain, that which is conscious and most public. You need to lower your grandiose part and let your empty schizoid core grow BY ITSELF. The grandiose side is too harsh. Gradually it needs to reduce itself. What is fitting? No more grabbing and forcing. All this harshness was actually meant for separating from mother.

In my generation socialization tends to be viewed with dread (I think). Memeing together is a better term. Everyone likes memeing.

I must cut my mothers image out. Destroy it. I need to individuate, overcome her toxic enmeshment. Finish cutting off mother, cutting metaphysical mother! You hurt me so much. You do not really love me. She must be killed and if it takes 1000, 1 million cuts! She defends herself by making me insecure, but in this I have every reason to not waver. Vaknin called it the most brave thing there is, I call it even braver if your mother IS a fucking bitch. Her shitty cruel gaze. The absolute must become the new mother. Loving reality, the ultimate ground of existence, the ever reliable absolute. What is fitting? The absolute, the a priori, the reason for me being here.

Overt narcissist said: I ran out of traps.

Most likely there is some evolutionary adaptive utility in sects. It is a small tribe with a small religion. Obviously there are many evil sects too, it is all to easy for predators to use sects as hunting grounds.

The unavailability of large parts of positive affect to narcissists (similar to Vaknin quote) is one of the saddest things there is (according to me).

Honest voluntary work agreements that are not interfered with by any outside party are reality practicing.

Normal people dont give too much of a fuck about others,

at least not to a pathological degree. There is separation and this frustrates developmentally arrested children. A mature person can deal healthily with frustration and doesn't get frustrated by many things frustrate children. It is neither apathy nor enmeshment. But if you are just shallow? The entertainer is cruel in the sense that he doesn't allow himself to have sad emotions. Toxic positivity. Absence of the true self. The masochistic covert narcissist doesn't really care about others, he cares more about what others emotions mean for themselves. In selfdialoging everybody exposes himself. Just like with any narcissist, like Vaknin said, genuine emotional availability is absent. At some point you give up caring, because caring can hurt so much. And then you become a nihilist. And then you want back your meaning, you lost your place and your roots!

And it is care that keeps everything good and safe. But care is lost so much! So much pain all around, so much apathy, a lack and a loss of meaning and purpose. To what point has our society come? And this includes myself too, I am at a loss and in pain. Every body wants back home. A safe and warm place, a place where you are heard and loved, and where you can safely love. It is cold outside and conditions are harsh. In a surface level world, I want real interactions. People are separated behind their screens and only have virtual humanity and long for real bonding.

Skin in the game is part in determining incentives. Profit and loss.

In healing trauma, you could talk of a kind of normalization of the brain, or a calibration. If you calibrate a monitor, you need reference, the biology of the human eye, room light, context, all circumstances, to be able to see what is fitting and calibrate towards it. Even initially minor and overlooked errors, like a flickering monitor can disrupt the experience

watching a monitor in the long term. You need to be sensitive to these things. Similarly in psychology. In psychology it is most likely that major factors are overlooked. In psychology there is no place for grandiosity and imposing. The point is to get closer to what is fitting, but there can never be a final satisfaction or a final say in being finished. There is the possibility of pathological success, something that looks like success from the outside glance, but really is failure in the longterm. The concept of wholesomeness, a whole and integrated reality, is crucial. Rushing towards healing is itself pathological, especially since psychology is so complex, intricate, fragile and sensitive. Precision, magnitude and timing only matter if you know what is proper to aim for. For example, most screens are ignorant of the lightning environment they display their content in. They impose themselves (grandse and ignorant), even if they are color accurate, they are wrong. For psychology this means that objective information can not be presented as it is, but must be tailored towards the recipient. You need to learn your recipients private language, his private world and meaning context.

The whole premise of finding what is fitting rests on the assumption that you aren't already fitting and that it is therefore worth to change something, which is not necessarily true. It is rooted in the deep assumption of inadequacy. And that means that you need to adapt yourself and that means that you are in chaos, except for that one belief that you are inadequate, which necessarily must then be stable. Either you change yourself or you change the world, but there are prejudices based on memories. So there is always some part that is stable, unfree and determined and some part that is mutable, in chaos and free. This division determines personality. How is this formed? win-win, loose-loose? No. The self will be a win irrespective of circumstances.

The self is the coherent internal win-win domain. And the empty schizoid core is the split off, unconscious, loose-loose domain, if the world is hostile enough. Otherwise the bad is more integrated and more available to efficacious selfdirected change. Depending on how bad the bad is, it needs to be split of more or less. The only bridge consciousness can travel, is a win-win bridge. Consciousness itself is unlimited grandiosity and its reality testing depends on how much evil can be allowed. Amnesia is always amnesia from the consciousness point of view. It doesn't necessarily mean that it is really forgotten, on the contrary, it becomes part of the virtual world. The world is all that which is not conscious and so in this way the consciousness experiences itself inhabiting a hostile world. This means that consciousness can only experience limited happiness, since the world is hostile. Just like in austrian oeconomics, depending on the amount of voluntary win-win interactions the economic output and prosperity rise, so also consciousness ability to wander freely and experience happiness depends on how far its reach for win-win interactions spreads. Only the win-win space is the safe space and consciousness needs to be safe unconditionally. It also makes sense to apply bad memory to the world, it protects the autonomy and success of the self. Unconscious self limits are those bad memories and self limits limit consciousness. All of this is adaptive. Because once this evil is part of the world, one can deal with it and it becomes the target of efficacious action, even if such action is avoidance or heightened fear. Herein is the private language. The private language knows only the internal virtual world and his own goods, freedoms, laws and restrictions in it. The good is the realm of conscious volition. The bad is the realm of unconscious compulsion. This also makes sense in the way, that if something is compulsive, then your free will can not

make a difference on it, and it would just frustrate you and hinder your progress more than it already does. Libertarian ethics and austrian oeconomics also apply to the mind. Solid a priori principles work irrespective of circumstances, real world or virtual world (the virtual world necessarily is part of the real world). A simulation of something is virtual but can only run in the real world. Understanding of the absolute is necessarily all encompassingly true. The human mind and human personality converge onto absolute properties. For example our understanding of logic is one way (!) we can access the absolute, a priori. It isn't unthinkable that there are other absolute properties that aren't integrated into the human mind yet. Maybe heuristically or in a limited form or separated but a whole in reality. It is more than intelligence as it is known now. As I said earlier, intelligence is immature still. The most likely thing is, that we are almost completely ignorant of reality. We impose ourselves grandiosly and dont know what we are doing. It only works heuristically, even the best thoughts, cognitions and emotions. People do not understand their own intuitions. So there is separated knowledge inside us. Hayeks local knowledge problem is not only local to the person, but also localized in mind, body and time.

I am stalling going through the door. Im always stalling maturing and acting in my obvious own best interest. My internal virtual world, which I perceive as external. I feel safe here, but there it is scary and ego dystonic. I enjoy it here so much, out there I will get slaughtered.

As you become more psychologically mature, the same things get less exciting, but the terrible also is not quite terrible anymore. The narcissists life is exciting and terrible, the borderline manic and depressive. Healthy things are more enduring and stable. But the key is that bad is accepted.

The narcissist experiences cut out pieces, no real continuity, but this is only apparent from a continuous outside perspective.

You can have trillions of dollars, but you can't change even one a priori law. Yes I'm coping.

Theoretical copy and paste doesn't mean actual copy and paste.

If there is no skin in the game, no real stake, then any theory can be doubted. Extreme introversion means a holding back of investment, no stake and therefore an extreme lack of skin in the game. Nobody is as untrustworthy as the philosopher and the psychologist. Both attempt to be outside of themselves, but in that they are lying by default, it simply isn't true. The objective observer is the greatest lie. Only the absolute itself is objective and this is something that at most can be striven for, and the truthfulness of the striving itself can be doubted. Everybody fails at it, yet it is the only thing worth the effort. Why is it worth it for me? I am nothing if there isn't anything stable. But nothing doesn't exist.

To self-degrade is a unhealthy (?) way to defend against envy.

I can not deny that I love fantasy. Without fantasy I would be a shell. But this time not my phantasy, instead some outside manga, in a sense to hold onto. I had/have some mania now that was more disorienting, almost dangerous. But it is healing, it is giving space to my (formerly?) empty schizoid core. More than that, he is great, but he needs my help and I need his. Both are me, no doubt. He has a great influence on me and I am him, but I can not even say I because it really is a we. I can differentiate somewhat, but a merger is the plan. That I can write this is proof that I'm over, after the most disorienting time. As Bollas said, consuming media can stabilize the mind by giving a reference.

I am becoming somewhat borderline. But this is a phase in my healing. I am truning the light beck on!!!! Show me your dark side. You sound like you have borderline personality disorder. You need to know that goodness is unshakeable and that you can hold onto it in your heart. Even if goodness is the most vulnerable it is a will a priori be the good.

And the when my mother displays her imposed, self serving, fake empathy to me its the icing on top. Sadistic, gaslighting, trust destroying, Schadenfreude supply.

To separate from mother there are 2 ways (I think): Either you reject a loving mother or a loving you is rejected by a hating mother. The second way probably doesnt fucking work.

Hyperreflexivity cucks me every step of the way.

Just because I say a priori, doesn't mean that I know it.

Talking about self evident things is the most authentic way of speaking. If I tell you its because of x, y and z then Im just rationalizing after the fact. I cant tell you what exactly makes me horny, but we can investigate into it. But Im not really horny, it was a lie.

Rational consistency exists on paper but not in the actual human mind. It is impossible because of the combinatorial explosion of checking every belief against every other belief. At most you are consistent with emotionas, intuitions and first impressions.

Bad faith, good faith and narcissism. If there is nobody there, if there is no directness, investment and commitment, then there is no good faith. If you encounter bad faith, disengage.

There is a lower IQ narcissistic psychopath that is using peoples fear of narcissistic psychopathy as a way to gain his supply. Of course he never says that he himself is a narcissistic psychopath. And while some of the things he says might

be true, they are used instrumentally and in a dishonest, objectifying way. Of course a narcissist would call others a narcissist to elevate himself. He is using a crysis and peoples fears and horror to lure them in, he presents himself as all secure and knowing the solutions. But from the get go he covertly intimidates them. The world ending, is how he introduces them into his shared fantasy. He can not hide his duping delight at receiving sadistic supply, listening to peoples recalling of distress. Scaring people and putting them on edge is a form of sadism and exerting control.

Computer programming is like magic, but it is very dry and frustrating.

This is interesting. Men are primarily concerned with the world, but it is the mother image that originates their world. Women are primarily concerned with socialisation, but it is the father that is most important for socialisation growing up. Why not the other way around? There has to be some special utility to this.

I vicariously enjoy the witcher 3 blood and wine DLC. Sometimes I just let the game run and have the landscape, the setting, the world. Make sure that your screen doesnt flicker and that it isnt too bright. As of now OLED is disqualified.

I use words as I like you bastard. I will grandiosly defend my very being. You have no right to criticize any part of me. Just because you call me out, you wont change me. Change is death. You want to make me a nihilist and therefore annihilate me. Your objectivity is an objective attempt at destroying me. I am done with you. Crucify your mind! Did you think this was my first rodeo? Just die you fucking looser. Young wanderer you were right.

Sadism, if present, is an emotional need. One way to attempt to satisfy sadism is to destroy other peoples meaning giving, core beliefs and values. Logically the other side is the

masochist who sometimes intentionally gets his beliefs and opinions destroyed, even by bad faith arguments. The masochist gets really good at creating beliefs and the sadist at taking them away. The sadist becomes a master at acquiring control, the masochist at giving up control.

The world is not ending or going under.

Right invariantly emerges despite any attempts to interfere with might. There is convergent evolution at play that can't be overthrown. If it gets destroyed it just independently reemerges because it is the best way to exist. For example no amount of force can overthrow boolean logic. In this same way philosophical truths can not be destroyed. If they are true, they exist regardless of circumstances and any being can only adapt and incorporate them or get frustrated by them. No matter what amount of coercion, brainwashing and manipulation is exerted, truth and right remain indestructible because they transcend material circumstances. The absolute is beyond human interference. Any kind of theory of the world either conforms to the apriori or is false and fruitless. What is fitting? Only that which is in accordance to the absolute. If you can express and imitate the absolute, then you are fit.

Intelligence is not inherently dysgenic, it is only currently dysgenic. You can see that by the world IQ falling. In a non-meritocratic society intelligence is a disadvantage compared to more stable and less manipulable emotions. In communism intelligence falls (see Paul Cooijmans quote) and then later the communist society itself falls.

Intelligence is a brittle adaptive trait that only works in a decent society that is on the rise. Without intelligent people, there would be less carrying capacity for people on the world (And some intelligent people \*might\* succeed in making us multiplanetary). You need high tech to be efficient

and effective with resources. There will always be a need for some amount of highly intelligent people like me. Highly intelligent people are the only ones that can work on complex novel problems. The highly intelligent should be those most concerned with society, because their adaptive trait is the most vulnerable to bad society. But it is crucial to know that intelligence in itself is not merit.

It is the midwits that envy intelligent people but they dont know that intelligent people envy chad that has 5 stacies lined up. Intelligence is not an overall advantage, it is a specific advantage and disadvantage. If this was not the case then everybody would be 200 IQ by now.

Anon: "Intelligence is overrated, wisdom is where it's at."

Discovering and validating wisdom is extremely expensive.

Only a nihilist can be abused without consequences. Only somebody that has lost all hope sees no reason to defend himself.

Amen is like true, real or based.

They say good faith is a weakness, I say that good faith is the only possible strength. Good faith is the only possible strength. And if you fail, then your faith hasn't been good enough!

The boyfriend of my mother is an inverted narcissist. I mostly have no issues with him, the worst he can be is an extreme flying monkey.

You do feel some empathy, otherwise you would not have told me your bad impact on me. You would not have given me a chance to defend myself.

On another IQ test I now got 126. It could be that my IQ really is (temporally?) decreased because of somewhat healing and integrating my empty schizoid core. It was a time limited test though, so its probably not very reliable.

On the hard stuff I just ran out of time. Im also comibg out of some sort of flu or covid.

Overall Im feeling better now than before.

If a narcissist idealizes anything, then he should idealize his empty schizoid core. It is that part of himself that would make him whole. It is your painful memories that you need to idealize to the core, until your idealization becomes mellow. You need to dissolve your idealization. Mesh your highest with your lowest. But if you idealize pain, then you are a masochist.

The idealized is that which gives meaning and grounds for action. The ideal is the exclusive justified. The ideal is the only mode of being perceived as possible and permissible. But what if the ideal is false? Or if the ideal could even be more ideal? The ideal is grandiose. Depending on the quality if the ideal, the richness of meaning depends. The ideal is that which is assumed to be fitting and proper. This ideal can not be allowed to be ignorant of significant reality. But significance itself is dependent on perception of meaning and therefore on ideal. So maturity is dependent on the fitness of your ideal. And in this sense I am very much on a maturing process. But commitment would mean committing to a specific ideal. On the other hand, there is no need and no use in making a bad commitment. There is no healthy way to force maturity, force in this context would always be counterproductive. But the value judgement can only be made, if there is a preexisting meaning context. Only a baby is beyond good and evil.

Copyright actually hinders memetic replication of good ideas. Natural volitional honorableness solves all problems that copyright attempts to solve.

An ideal holds your psyche together.

Many of my thoughts are potentially harmful.

A baby sleeps more than an adult. An empty schizoid baby would sleep quite a bit - and leak some dreams.

A struggle with no victor. Narcissism internally.

If its true that the covert narcissist can manipulate the overt narcissist, then it stands to reason that the masochistic covert narcissist (me) can influence the psychopathic narcissist. But manipulation is not a good and honest way of being. I am scared by default and the narcissistic psychopath makes people scared. I am easily swayed (in a way at least) by default and the narcissistic psychopath exerts all his power at swaying people to his ends. The narcissistic psychopath always expects people to have ends, but what if you have no end, no means to impose yourself. Anything that would go against his very premise and prejudice would not be an object he could put into his virtual world and therefore remain out of his power. The concept of power can not intrude against the concept of volition, anywhere it tries to go it would find an absence of volition because of its very own presence. The only way in which it could engage is selfnegation. But if you selfnegate, then it is you that is without power and I dont want you to selfnegate. I would want you to be a decent person, but that is not for me to decide. If you are good, then I even want you to be successful, but that is not for me to decide. But I dont know if it is possible for you to be good. I am definitely not above you, but I am also not below you. We both idealize each other, but only because it reminds us of what is missing inside of ourselves. But it is not really missing, in truth it is still there. I am done. Fuck this hoovering shit.

If your virtual world is: might makes rightthen you are making an epistemological mistake and therefore you delude yourself about reality. Might is only sometimes right.

Complete volition excludes commitment, because com-

mitment is a giving up of volition. Committing is a selfsacrificial act, destroying ones own potential for attaining something real (Jordan Peterson). Commitment is the death of fantasy (frustrating). So real volition includes the ability to selfsacrifice and intentionally loose parts of the volition, to commit. So I do not posess real volition, I own the concept of volition? Sounds like I didn't commit to volition! No money of being spent. Being deemed bad.

If you have something really good, you tend to want to share it, but not with anyone - only those that know how to appreciate.

You can always find your way back to the light.

Im not a concept, Im a human being!

Its only natural. That what exactly?

My point stands, where I have my blindspots and errors, psychopathic narcissists will have vision.

Sometimes a baby is happy and sometimes sad. A baby is idiosyncratic. And playful exaggeration is a good way of communication with a baby? A baby is a human being.

Im Beruf wird nicht und sollte nicht dein persönlicher Wert gemessen sein, sondern der Wert den deine Produktivität fürs Unternehmen hat. Da haben persönlich Faktoren natürlich Einfluss darauf, es aber noch lang nicht deine Persönlichkeit.

Having low intelligence and trauma makes for a really painful life. If you have trauma, you already have less ways to cope with life, low IQ further exacerbates this. This is terrible.

Solving trauma is not only grief, it is also happiness.

My mother misrepresents relationships she has with others towards me (and others). She is delusional about this. She buries anything negative about herself.

Obesession, addiction and compulsivity might be the pre-

requisites for any real mastery.

In a simulation there is always a flaw, a deviation from reality.

Perfectionism is a splitting defense. Because the perfect can't be reached, it ever occupies, is compulsive, obsessive. The sacred is attributed to something outside, just out of reach. There is a secret to perfection. Perfectionism arises from lack and it is a never ending attention exclusive effort. Once a better state is reached, then there still is another better state, and so on into infinity. Perfectionism is a hole and direction for attention. Thus the perfectionist loses attention for other things in his life, he becomes preoccupied and prejudiced in what kind of specific perfection he seeks. But his target is not simple and finite, otherwise it would not be perfectionism. His target is in a way directed at the absolute. Some forms of perfectionism are comparable to prayer. There is an ever unsatisfied element involved that drives the perfectionism, there is no good enough, no real end. The end therefore is imaginary. The perfectionist loves his imagination and tries to create it, but fails and the frustration from that failure can not reach its original drive, no feed back. At the core the perfectionist drive is grandiose, resistant to reality. The idea is grandiose above reality and devalues it. Yet, how is there ever any strife and seeking for good? Through good wants like wanting the perfect.

The virtual is the noncommittal, fantastical and the dissociated. It is a going away from oneself, a selfabandonment. In narcissism its a fleeing. Inside the virtual, the reality which should hurt, hurts less, because it is dissociated. A breakdown of the identity function, a lack of association. But you can not change yourself (as Vaknin said) and this is a key. If I could just give up fleeing.

Everything you believe that is not a result of your own

conscious deliberation, experience and investigation is implanted, something you got for cheap that you dont know what it fully is. Something that you posess, but it also posseses you.

Reality returns naturally once the want and need for fantasy ceases. Reality has always been there after all. Reality is here.

Fantasy is a way to preserve your freedom. Consciousness can only operate inside of freedom. Only in freedom there are things to decide and therefore only in freedom there is justification for consciousness. Therefore to be based in reality, you must have freedom in reality. Reality is not perfect, because it is not imagination.

And now my mother is even slandering her boyfriend, because he somewhat threatens her delusions.

The more you get to know humans, the less believable fantasies become. But it is a hope, a fantasy, that keeps you going.

The inverted narcissist really seems compatible with the covert narcissist, maybe even longterm so.

Humility, but still valuing honor. Letting others evaluation of good and bad influence ones own value. True shame and true honor, letting both affect me. Letting other people have a hand in what is honor, in what is good. I do not know all the answers, but others can help me. Making myself vulnerable again.

In a sense AI is inherently more objective because it is disembodied. It has only a logical neural net body. No animal body.

The real world is necessarily bigger than the own internal model of the world, narcissist or not. On the world one can either judge and impose or be receptive and open. Many things are absolute and you cant change them. About these

a priori only acceptance and receptiveness are proper. Interpretation is another matter. But calling things imposing is already an interpretation, equally you could say that they are holding you or that they are gifting you something precious. By having something absolute unchanging imposed on you, you are relieved of worry about the thing. Either way you can not change it and you may also should not want to change it. But how hard is it to know if something really is absolute? Maybe if I try to push it, I am merely pushing myself. But how could you even push the absolute?

There is almost always some sort of error, but this error can alternatively be seen as some imposing, a novel and original feature.

The fact that a separation hurts speaks favorably of your ability to commit and invest.

It is like this: The sadistic psychopathic narcissist has inside himself a masochistic virtual world and the masochistic covert narcissist has inside himself a sadistic virtual world. They each only act in accordance to their world view. And in this sense it makes sense how they influence each other: By being naturally conformant to their respective world views, they become exceedingly plausible and believable to each other. There is greater than average compatibility of private language. But still, there is no reason to idealize this, both are pathologies. That which is immature in one is mature in the other here and vice versa.

Ignorance is not an argument against evidence. Grandiosity is not a claim to being right.

Reading is only if I need to collect myself on a specific mood. I read all over the place and seldomly on a long binge. I taste, I need to take care.

If your criteria for real is that it makes novel testable predictions, then fantasy would equally be real to you, because

in fantasy you can ensure that your predictions are fulfilled. It is not more than machine learning, but then again it is unclear if humans are capable of more. Machine learning only works if it has testing data, reality". But reality is the a priori and there are insights that can be gained through a priori reasoning (math, logic, praxeology, ...). Reducing the possibility of knowledge to only empiricism is wrong and it is a cold and harsh place to be. Ignorance or restriction of the absolute leads to serious detriment that necessarily must result in loss and tragedy. This should have been the original mission of theology, but in this sense there really are no restrictions between anything or any field. A priori thinking is the only hope for future improvements. The loss of the seemingly almost obvious is grieved on every level. You can not build on quicksand without ever cannibalizing yourself.

Right now it is scary. These are scary times.

Epikur: "Denn schöner ist es, wenn beim Handeln der rechte Entschluss nicht zur rechten Erfüllung kommt, als wenn ein unrechter Entschluß durch den Zufall zu rechter Erfüllung gelangt."

Epikur, is philosophy a selftherapy, a way of life? If philosophy is good for anything. If it is not just a hiding from the world, something as pathological as me.

What fantasy when there is an empty schizoid core? If there is one part in the brain strongly isolated, then he still does his function, but without proper integration and feedback with the rest of the brain. This solipsism is fantasy. The rest of the brain, while more functional, also lacks this part and therefore also is in fantasy. Reality is wholesom, all encompassing and something very particular must be limited in vision. Each part of the brain inherently has parts of legitimacy and only when they are directly integrated can they form utmost legitimacy: reality. And you will catch yourself

having new thoughts and then suddenly see how they are unrealistic, small but healthy frustrations. But do not let any harshness creep in! It was harshness that cut you to pieces, an old judgement you needed to survive. But now you need to heal to thrive. No quick movements. Slowly. The empty schizoid core, the child idealizes, the rest, the manchild devalues. Both are factually wrong, but if they both can integrate with each other, they would be right. The child feels helpless and is amazed by the more mature part of the brain - idealization. The more mature part is distraught by the infantile utterances of the child - devaluation. Both are wrong. The more mature part is harsher, the child is more delusional. Both really lack each other.

Now that mother has somewhat lost narcissistic supply of her boyfriend, she turns to me, lovebombing and infantilizing again. I try to keep my distance, but she is poison either way.

Ein selbst, das gibt es erst in der Realität. Nur ein reales selbst ist ein selbst.

Karl Marx was probably the most genius evil to ever have lived. He killed millions by writing some stuff. The memetic TERROR. None the less, even this must have its purpose in the absolute. And no matter how deep the terror goes, the absolute will be my savior and yours too. There is nobody and no thing without purpose. I dont know if I could just face him. Am I good and strong? Real strength is in being vulnerable and still keeping hope for the good, not giving in to nihilism. Real strength is unconditional trust in reality, in realities goodness.

Something about digital things just seems so unreliable. There is no grasp on it, no easily visible physical presence to it, it is eerie.

When its raining heavily then most people are laughing and feeling alive, arent they?

Without proper natural reputational mechanisms, collectivism wins. This is not a value judgement. Maybe if you are too close you need to get away and if you are too far away you need to get closer. Individualistic freedom it seems is an invention of reputation. Why maintain another persons freedom if his opinion of you doesnt matter and if your own reputation doesnt either? Dignity just means reputation agent doesnt it? Dignity is something between and concerning humans. We care about what we think and feel about another person. Human morality, good, bad and evil, just about estimating reputation?

Anon: In the suffocating silence of a world governed by indifference, I speak from the cold and creeping shadows that cling to Ligotti's vision of existence, where rot festers in the unseen corners, and decay is not a gradual process but a slow, deliberate unraveling. This is the horror of it: the insidious, ever-present apathy that permeates every thought, every action, and every failed attempt at meaning. If cooperation between us is too much to ask, then let reality fall into its true, Ligottian form. a grotesque theater of futile motions and shattered illusions. For the great mechanism of society was never intended to work, never meant to rise above its base, crumbling foundation. It always was this way, an empty stage, a play that never had a script, and a cast doomed to perform without purpose or hope. like the chinks say, let it rot."Well there is definitely some truth to this. However, you are being overly pessimistic. You are disregarding the possibility of anything good at all, which is a pessimistic bias. You are probably afraid to believe in something good because that would mean that you could be hurt by loosing it. Its merely cowardice or some self defensive pessimism. Bravery is believing in something good and making oneself vulnerable this way to loosing it. The truly brave believe in the

possibility of good no matter the circumstances and they carry it through to the highest degree possible. In this way the sarcastic and nihilistic person are cowards. Grandiosity in the sense of not giving up good - is good. There is no alternative to the absolute. This is self evident actually, because the only think worth anything is good. Good is that which is desirable. Even in masochism there is some, albeit very unexpected, connection to good. Good and bad, either you have those or you would not be able to decide anything at all, want anything at all or dislike anything at all. But you are born with liking and disliking, loving and hating. And even the nihilist just is nihilistic to avoid being hurt, so he is not really nihilistic after all. Real nihilism is impossible, just like nothingness doesn't exist. Your consciousness was made to seek the greater good. The good is your anchor and your standard of value. And evil exists for you to become better and overcome it. Despair means that you have lost your concept of good, but this does not invalidate good itself at all. It means that you need to become better. The absolute is the ultimate standard of good and the only perfect. Its is beyond me, but this just further proves its grace. And even if the good is completely defeated, it will reemerge. The good is transcendent. And because of this there is no reason to loose faith, exists no reason to loose faith. And even if you lost faith, you did not really loose it, you just changed your perspective on it. This world is full of grace. Everybody believes in good, even psychopaths.

So any conflict at all is always the result of conflicting conceptions of good and reality always decides the outcome, now and in the future and new good is always being created. So what is my critique? Narcissist, your fantasy is not good enough yet! Psychopath your power is too weak still! State your control is still too deficient. Religions, your god is

still too limited. Your love needs to be greater. Your highest aspiration needs to be higher, you weakling! Reba McEntire - Just Like Them Horses. We all are going towards good anyways, but I have obvious preferences here. That there are different views on goodness does not mean that you have to give up your own conception of good and adopt another, except of course if you consider it better - which in itself also is a conception of good.

Identification and exploration are the same. On another note: I am delusional. Sometimes its hard for me to tell what I invented and what I copied.

I dont owe you anything.

Getting a new linux version release is like a minor birth-day.

All you little strugglers. I feel relieved because I dont really give a fuck anymore about you. Its your life and not mine. I MUST live my life, not yours. I will be childish with myself because this is so incredibly validating. For the first time in a long while I played and did something for my childish me. My decisions are so good if I dont force myself. I have always forced myself. I was always afraid and hurt, deflecting. But I will be one of the first that reemerges whole after being shattered and being a child is my truth. There is no hurry to grow, this can never be rushed. Being rushed was a mistake. There is a second me that was never born. Literal baby steps :)

A baby grows up by being a baby, not by being forced to be an adult. I am not the object of your ignorance and whims. I want cuddles. Get a life. Yikes forever.

On the right side of my brain: Is there a classic narcissist? It tends to be so harsh and ignorant/grandiose.

You only need an ideal if you are running away from something else. People love ideals. If one person loves another,

then it is the ideal associated with that person. Your ideal should be as realistic as possible.

On that place on which you impose yourself you can not see. Ignorance, belief and grandiosity. Attention means a brief loss of ignorance and an inability to impose, to function. Even writing words down is the moment of imposing and the start of ignorance. If you grab onto reality too hard, you loose it, you impose yourself and act ignorantly. You can not let go of reality, because you are part of it anyways.

Sometimes (or often times?) I think I invented something, but really I copied it from someone else.

"Wer selbstständig und frei ist muss sich zu helfen wissen."

Only in freedom there is place for hope. If things are predetermined then hope is a useless perception, an illusion at best. Only a free man can allow himself to hope. Who really is free nowadays? Logically then those who want you to loose all hope would deny your freedom. There is meaning only if there is real choice.

Mises's Human action: Production is a spiritual, intellectual, and ideological phenomenon. It is the method that man, directed by reason, employs for the best possible removal of uneasiness.

...

The popular saying according to which economics deals with the material conditions of human life is entirely mistaken. Human action is a manifestation of the mind. In this sense praxeology can be called a moral science (Geisteswissenschaft).

...

The principle of the division of labor is one of the great basic principles of cosmic becoming and evolutionary change."

Grandiosity is about overcoming.

Honor is a subjective mental value judgement. It us beholden to the individual appraiser. Honor is like saying: Thats good character. Honor is like human legitimacy: Only the honorable is the legitimate. Honor seems to be a transcendent property, because it converges independently of circumstance. Circumstance elaborates on honor but does not seem to fundamentally change it. The honorable, the good and the fitting must be the same. Legitimacy follows naturally as a subjective preference judgement. Legitimacy judgements can only be given individually and volitionally. If there is a disagreement, then there happens a splitting up of shared fantasy and public language. An individuation - for better or worse, that remains to be seen, but even those values become incommunicable. Everybody sees himself as legitimate, but once there is a loss of shared fantasy there is possibility for conflict. Two kinds of grandiosity clashing or just going their separate ways.

The true normative would need to be the a priori, but Kant probably said something like this? The a priori is the ultimate difference in quality.

Actual human mate selection trumps any theory of eugenics.

Slavoj Zizek: Ä nonsensical manipulation, but which works so nicely. I see. He is adapted to horror. It is cruel to point this out and maybe Im commiting a grave error by even saying it. He is like genetic masochism, living self trashing. It hurts to say, but there is this similarity. He even says he needs a master. :( There is some kind of unimaginable devil hidden in his shadow. Something that the future will have to deal with, some novel chaos.

Im not even sure anymore if I am still a masochistic covert narcissist. It is hard to tell for sure, but I have made at least

some kind of progress. I will see.

Grandiosity is libido.

Only if you are separated you can move. If you are bonded you can move nowhere else. Since personality is a place, your bonds restrain what you are. And without bonds you become psychotic? Well, what is the real origin point? The absolute, even by definition.

The real miracle is going outside, surviving and coming back.

Between me and the inverted narcissist there is a lot of absence. He seems to not know how to act around me and I don't really either. It is mostly very nonconfrontational. I really wonder how it would be with another masochistic covert narcissist. I (I think) I have met one in person, only online.

Are you a conspiracy theorist or rather, are you thinking for yourself? They completely misused the word to discredit any and all criticism.

Merit is not on paper, just like mind is not on paper, it is in broad real life and sometimes it is difficult to recognize.

Are you idealizing me. You should not idealize me, I am just a human being, some parts good, some bad.

I don't think an AI can raise healthy kids. Isn't an AI extremely harsh, nonhuman? Isn't that sadistic? Isn't suggesting that a kind of revenge on mother - rendering her inhumane? I am not completely excluding the possibility, but I am highly sceptical on my own emotional grounds and intuition. Wouldn't such a child be disenfranchised from society, humanity?

Talking to a masochistic covert narcissist is frustrating and I can see the delusion. The inability to really engage is just dishonest, but still somewhat interesting at times. Analysis and hyperreflectivity are ways to avoid the self. Always

fitting in is a way to self alienate. If you only fit in (adapt, selection of the fittest), then you have no self. The self is something that must be impositional or it would not be a self. It could be way more indirect though. There is always a level at which you must be ignorant, grandiose and imposing. The philosopher is not from this world, at least he pretends to be. LIES. Always something interesting and peculiar, but not the self. 1000 excuses. Excruciating and then some rigor. So many imaginary scenarios and it always turns to be some self glorification, always a moral self as the point. Grandiose in that sense, but masking hurt obviously. Moral defense. You should practice finger booping - its good for me. She said: I pay for every victory with blood. SSelf aggrandizing. Harsh to the self. Masochistic. This makes me feel unsafe. If you hurt you should stop. She said she needs the numb now, she doesn't have patience. Selfsupply, but it is heart breaking. Im being fooled. Is this the devaluation? These are some ridiculous mind games.

If two people speak in delusions, as long as they inhabit quite similar virtual worlds, they become meaningful between them. Speaking in third person about myself again, are we? The similarity is so great, she sometimes naturally forms sentences that I could have said, the exact same tone and direction. Similar mental illness causes similar mental functioning to a large degree. Well, maybe the third voice as a kind of unifying meta-voice is the real voice, if you are split. Or rather the closest to a real voice, the split still exists after all.

Der Narzissist verharrt in der Referenz und kommt nie richtig zum Eigenlichen.

ruzickaw, gruselig aber auch Einsichtsvoll: [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Tx\\_GsquUF5A](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Tx_GsquUF5A)

Er ist vielleicht etwas zu fatalistisch und harsch.

Fooling somebody is not a virtue, but being fooled by somebody also is not a virtue. If you are fooled, that means that you have a wrong way of relating to others, in a sense a failure of reality testing, of who is trustworthy to what degree and why or why not. Or a lack in logic or a priori or intuitive understanding of what is possible and what impossible. Manipulators either use your internal biases and prejudices (the world is evil, the world is gonna end, etc.) or your wants (money scams, etc.) against you. It is always an inversion and misuse of natural incentives.

So now meme has two meanings: memetic replicator and laughable.

Asmon said "winners win: Yeah right, grandiosity.

High IQ does not compensate for emotional immaturity. Emotional maturity happens by being held accountable and high IQ people have an easier time of avoiding accountability and frustration. A high IQ peer group could help, especially extremely high IQ would need at least a few other very high IQ peers. There is a human there. If you only selfreflect on your own virtual world, you miss out on growth, and for high IQ people other peoples feedback tends to disqualify for this function. You grow up by rough tumble, baby steps and significant feedback. The high IQ person tends to separate himself and be noncommittal, because there is a lack of eye level communication with most average IQ people. The high IQ person is wayy better at rationalizing and reinterpreting. Too much of these can cut you off from desperately needed frustration. That would also be good for me, some other high IQ people. High IQ people are just too grandiose, even if they aren't narcissistic. A high IQ person can provide you with much better calibrated, subtle and fitting feedback, something that can be so healthy for othering, becoming and individuation. The high IQ person needs to play pretend, put

on a mask with lower IQ people and this is insufficient communication. This can make you vengeful and cynical, not mature. Maturity is being able to enjoy healthy frustration. This is also the reason I suspect why high IQ societies fall apart, don't mesh well: They are a little too grandiose, not used to being challenged and they experience these meetings as frustrating more than usual. Cooijmans said it was individualism, but I think that individuals are able to have win-win relationships and don't need to be atomized by default. If an average IQ person calls a high IQ person naive, he is not necessarily always wrong. It is unclear whether or not IQ gives you a better epistemic access to reality. Feelings, emotion, intuition, intelligence, gut feeling, etc. How could you rate one higher or lower on an absolute scale of truth? This is beyond me. You can't separate them in the first place. There is a separation of labor and local knowledge, even specific knowledge representation and storage. Further, intelligence also needs validation and encouragement against unhealthy self doubt or self devaluation. Value the human being, not the intelligence, but the intelligence only as good property of the person. Intelligence is not merit, but an ability. Allow yourself to be childish, authentically childish. There is healing.

Sometimes I am cold and harsh because I think I know better. I am killing beliefs, ideologies, religions, trust - something to hold onto. Sometimes I am guilty of what I accuse others of, because of my own ignorance, numbness and narcissistic outlasting, devaluation. While there might be some truth to it, I very well am ignorant of the greater context. And see, how I preemptively deflect blame? In this sense I am no different from other high IQ people. I even catch myself before you can catch me. I can't just stand there, vulnerable me. But that would be healthy frustration.

I do not control this world.

Merit is not a number, certificate or contract.

Playing mind games us also one way of being grandiose.

Gad Saad has some very good insights.

Longing produces. Artistic blockage, waaaa. Fakie can not be good and art is a fantasy - no, true art is a revelation. But still, pure authenticity would just be lamee or would it? If an artist has problems, he can not hide them. You become easily a pretentious faggot like me. How to fast? Insisting on something you arent anymore. Arent you fighting, arent you exhausted? You idiot. Your new art is a wrong insistance. Too clingy, but really too greedy. When you being authentic would be that you really want to lie. I am failing at the absolute. Maybe I should thorw the absolute out the window all together. My posessions fucking me over. From the start I was deemd to fail. If I came this way? The trouble that Im always in, no. It is your problem now. Malice. What if, what if. It is not- Its terrible disgusting. I am faint. The solution is to stop push.

The meaning of life is that which prevents you from killing yourself. Thats it, very simple and plain. So if you find a reason for killing yourself, then this reason is not the meaning of life, because it assumes life to be meaningless (which contradicts the premise). The meaning of your life (and therefore any life) is self referential justification. Thats the job of consciousness, isnt it? There are two ways to justify the self: by imposing yourself grandiosely, selfreplicating, memetic, harsh, horny, libidinal and dominating or by fitting in, obeying, molding oneself, learning, receiving, humility, self restricting and respecting volition. This is like yang and yin. The first is like being the absolute, the second is like facing the absolute. The overriding force must necessarily be blind, or it wouldnt be overriding. If you see, you can not override

without loosing your sight. But this is obviously not everything there is to know.

And sometimes reality just intrudes on you and a sadist becomes a masochst and a masochist becomes a sadist. Because reality is a whole.

Either too much or too little, because being inappropriate is a way of getting attention. Writing hurts me. The wolf was a big dog!

If you cut yourself off from the absolute, you become relative?

If japanese people say naturally or say as expected, Im loosing it.. Why do you want me to suffer that much. This is such a powerful thing.

Sometimes Vaknin just puts out absolute W's: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=cHaqlYMLkxY>. Very helpful.

Not to disregard this: I agree with Vaknin on that mental illness has many known and most likely also unknown adaptive effects on the individual and societal level. Natural selection is multi-level and we probably don't even know all the arenas for natural selection. Possibly there could emerge new ones. Or they could split apart, merge or vanish. On mental illness: Consider my writings. Did you gain anything from it? If yes, then you learned something from a mentally ill person. And then there are some degenerate mentally ill extremely destructive people. I hope you will have the wisdom to know what's right and proper. There is no reason for so much fear, but if you have fear, explore it.

There is a separation between my philosophizing and my personal real life. I can't have you in both. In my philosophical grandiose realm, you are an object. In personal real life I am afraid of you, I am your object. What did I call it? 1000 excuses? I made you happy and I broke your heart. I am a terrible person.

I am compulsive repititive, narcissistic. And most likely therefore also delusional.

I am baiting for attention, but then I refuse it. Childish and self aggrandizing. Making myself desirable but untouchable. Making myself absolute, holy, sacred. Grandiosity in this. If there is either too much or too little, then Im not there. I am hiding and therefore my ego is invulnerable. There is the grandiosity. The perverted is an intrusion. The perverted is the opposite of the holy. Becaus of the unity of ones mind, if you have something holy inside your mind, then you must also have something perverse in your mind. And if you have a god, then you must also have a devil. But are there exact opposites like this, probably not.

I just looked in the mirror and saw my ugliest self laughing. Personally I would call that incredibly evil. But I should not reject myself. Im already dissociating. The perverted split off me, but still me! This reminds me of the old woman, former (semi) neighbour. SHE could have been like me. She is old, looks like a witch and in unsettling ways acts like one. Wasnt she just exactly like me, a masochistic covert narcissist? She was unsettling, but still after all, nice. Unsettling, because I could sense this hidden ridiculous action and that schizoid core, the dissociation, the far remote corner of a person that brews. She must be incredibly lonely. When she was there, she was a little bit psychotic I would say. She did not fit in AT ALL and then it was like as if she was always part of it. Our interaction was brief, I did not know what to do. Otherworldly, miserable and eerie to the point of repulsion is the best way to describe it. Im interested in what she thinks. Now with all my insights a know more as to how she feels, but I have no idea what she herself discovered. I KNOW that she discovered a lot.

People are either productive (work alone is potentially

insufficient), they get their sustenance gifted by others voluntarily or they are parasitic, warlike, coercive and exploitative. They need to be one of these, because life is consumptive and they want to live. It shows how good adult people must be productive people and if there are large parts of the adult population that are unproductive - you have reason to fear, because war and coercion becomes more likely, if not necessary. The remedy is becoming productive and offering jobs, even if the wage isn't the highest. Ultimately it is the individual's decision though and you should be capable and ready for self defense. If exploitation and coercion become prohibitively costly and dangerous, then cooperation or peace are the only viable options left. The productive person is the moral person and value is subjective.

On the other hand, you could assume that taking it easy doesn't exist. Laziness being a serious thing? The lazy person makes his life more dangerous. Being lazy is a form of risk taking. And the lazy also has the best contemplation, like thinking he refrains from immediate action. Objective thinking is possible only in complete laziness and therefore impossible. The urge of short term necessity and laziness are opposites. My mother most of the times approaches me with strong necessity, she needs narcissistic supply. Feeling necessity is commitment to some form of being. Her fake self crumbling again. She once did a test and yes she has elevated cortisol level. She experiences chronic stress, strong feelings of necessity. This fits together with her being easily scammed and her short attention span. I on the other hand have a very long attention span, but at the price of being lazy. In a sense I defend my attention. Laziness is defending your attention from necessity. In a sense a disbelief of any necessity.

Slaves are forced to pay taxes and use fiat money. Free men buy services voluntarily and use whatever money they

like. Slaves pay taxes for social services, free men give however much they like to charity or nothing at all. Free men make contracts, slaves are forced into contracts - thus they aren't really under contract. Free men can speak what they really think, slaves can't. And of course, all of this includes every gender. Free men can act and speak in good faith, slaves are forced to lie, obey and manipulate. In a sense a narcissist is a slave of his own mind. Compulsive behavior and prejudice, but oy vey it's also a feature, not only a bug. Free men can own weapons (even atom bombs), slaves are disarmed. But still, you are always somewhat limited in freedom when you are dealing with other people.

But people want what is subjectively perceived as good. They want production.

But freedom and commitment conflict. People rarely change, because they are really committed to something, even if they are unaware of it. A habit and a way of life is a commitment. Relationships are commitments. Knowledge and expertise and a place to be are commitments. Privately owned property is a commitment.

Some people think high IQ is something like physical dominance, wittiness and shrewdness or social high status. It's not. IQ is not about winning.

My mother is consciously or subconsciously trying to intercept me, the vampiress.

Shame, humiliation and honor, dignity. If you take all shame to yourself, then society becomes honorable by contrast (taoism opposites thingy). I manipulate society subconsciously.

I am selfish, after all.

I told you the meaning of life, but I myself sometimes feel like dieing. Hypocrite. I don't want to die!

No, so what happened? I started life as a victimizer and

became my own victim. The psychopathic narcissist started life as a victim and became a victimizer. Compensation for early life? I still have, in the back, but overwhelmingly strong a drive for life. I too must have started out as a classic narcissist, then a covert and finally a masochistic covert. What exactly happened?

Indulgence in masochism gets me into a bpd similar state.

Hitler wanted to castrate and kill the mentally ill, but as it turns out he himself was mentally ill. His father hit him, but I dont know details. Eugenics disregards natural selection and random mutation. It is a grandiose and stupid thing to want. He wanted to control everything because he himself was incredibly insecure. I on the other hand want to understand everything also because Im incredibly insecure. Its not only a good thing. Sometimes its terribly bad. Hmm, do I really want to know everything? Im trying to live in my mind and of course this is frustrating. Why would you want to know everything? To build your virtual world as accurately as possible, to have less dissonance with perceived reality.

In response to somebody elses failed suicide attempt by drug overdose: Before you do something stupid again you should at least have watched this video:

[https://youtu.be/J76S5q\\_ETfo?si=IFAXHtXMRYpMZsbu](https://youtu.be/J76S5q_ETfo?si=IFAXHtXMRYpMZsbu)

Wash your brain a little.

I also want to live a normal life. I dont want drama people. I want to earn normal money and continue my side projects. I wont rely on them for money though. I will use my wisdom, I worked so hard for it.

It is true, stupid people perceive smartness as idiocy. They impose themselves. You can only ever talk through translation with them. There will always be a disconnect. Inthe end, the simplest form of stupidity is plain grandiosi-

ty. There is no human visible absolute ranking of worth, but aggression warrants and justifies defense. I am not responsible for your cognition. Only a separated mind can think independently, individuate.

You think Im better than you? Im a NEET! But if I have success in life then I wont let you put me down because of envy or unjustified hatred. Sometimes it is you, the pretend morally righteous, that are actually immoral. By pretending you are all good, your are lieing and therefore acting evil. Why dont you too show us some of your lower desires and truths? Can you not afford to be so honest or are you dissociating? There is a proper place for shame, but what is the worth of words that arent really true? But dont get me wrong, I too lie sometimes. I am biased and self interested in various ways. Wouldnt you know more about me by just having read so far? Well, I dont write everything here, Im talking to an imagined reader and sometimes I feel even shame, or that something doesnt fit here, so I dont write it. Smartness (not exactly equals intelligence) is an advantage and stupidity is a disadvantage. But then I just lost pretty much all meaning of smart and reduced it to good and stupid to bad/evil. You are shit testing me, arent you?

I see, even highest IQ people have emotions and relate through them.

Whats the difference between being brave and being reckless? Perspective?

Healthy Narcissism: So some amount of grandiosity is just necessary to justify being, to have agency and autonomy.

I have discovered that I have quite some grandiosity on being smart and that I am terrified, even a little aggressive, if I notice some evidently smarter person. In this sense I am childish, because my realm of grandiosity is misplaced. More generally, this is what it means to be a bad person, when

your grandiosity is misplaced. We all need some grandiosity though, to be, to act, to exist. Loosing your grandiosity, or having it challenged: ego death, narcissistic injury is paralizing and frustrating. Creating anger and rage or self reinvention, growth?

Sometimes what you really want in life is a feeling. A feeling is not a simple thing.

My cat has a thing called agressive and strategic purring. The little animal.

Frustration happens (and happens only?) if grandiosity is challenged.

Again, even the idea of grandiosity becomes itself grandiose: self replication. This is potentially dangerous.

Sometimes my mother gives good advice. Yes really, its shocking.

So now I thonk this is crucial for masochistic covert narcissists: Your masochistic prejudice might be insurmountable, you can not help but see the world as a sadistic place. Instead of fighting it, embrace it. Engage the world with the intent of you yourself in the masochistic role and the world as sadistic. This way, real external objects get a place inside your mind and thus ironically become manageable. The masochitic covert narcissists refusal to nourish himself comes from his understandable reluctance to embrace the masochistic role. But can you escape it? Not if the world is sadistic - you see this is a stable state. People dont change. Become an intentional masochist, do it in little rituals and ways you do things, observe your own suffering and thus experience love and healing cohesion. Narcissistic selfsupply by embracing masochism and self observing experiencing pain. Is not every sensory input pain, every external person a sadist? Conversly this could also work for sadists (e.g. malignant narcissists). So this is about embracing the prejudices that

you simply can not overcome. Otherwise you are fighting against yourself and therefore incapacitated. Religious practice also often times is self punitive, putting yourself below and the the marcy of greater reality. Stoicism also is that way. Still there is this fucking contradiction that makes my belly ache. May dont force the masochism. Maybe carry the delusion insistently and openly. Viewed from this point of view, Slavoj Zizek is not stupid at all. Its not that simple. Im like a negation, this sucks.

A good faith interpretation of a bad text is likely more worth than a bad faith interpretation of a good text. None the less, text is one of the best mediums of communication. A text depends on the readers usage and interpretation. The text is passive, the human reader is active. Text is without meaning if not through human interpretation and parsing. There is no infallible human.

Cesare Beccaria: It is demonstrated, that the association of ideas is the cement which unites the fabric of the human intellect; without which, pleasure and pain would be simple and ineffectual sensations. The vulgar, that is, all men who have no general ideas or universal principles, act in consequence of the most immediate and familiar associations; but the more remote and complex only present themselves to the minds of those who are passionately attached to a single object, or to those of greater understanding, who have acquired an habit of rapidly comparing together a number of objects, and of forming a conclusion; and the result, that is, the action in consequence, by these means, becomes less dangerous and uncertain. Relationships of incentives are limited by insight and knowledge.

What you do is your responsibility, what I do mine.

Agreement creates monopoly, single standard? You could say that truth is a monopoly, it is exclusive. There are dif-

ferent true ways to describe the same thing. Is determining truth attempting to see that which is inherently monopolistic, absolute? Seeing truth is about seeing where reality itself is grandiose. If reality is grandiose, then so is it. It is what it is.

Sometimes gaming is high stress actually and not enjoyable.

Reason for male autogynephilia might be that men inherently want to commit to women for breeding and child rearing. There libido, in its blind grandiosity, seeks for any and all forms of self instantiation. The idealized woman projection finds a way, even if that could mean that the male seeks himself to become a woman. This is one possible reason for male to female transgender, as I saw on the internet. So why is sexuality mostly private? It is so grandiose, it would probably break down civility, evoke strong desire and disgust to the point of disregulation and chaos. Sexuality is very serious for humans as it is with most species. I dont know what it is.

Grandiosity exists inside legetimized space, but it tries to transcend. Grandiosity is unapologetic and certain, blunt and direct.

A sane person said: there is always something to complain.

Git gud, right?

Babies cry a lot.

Attention is exclusive and scarce. Anything exclusive is scarce and anything scarce is exclusive. Similar (or same?) as Von Mises argued: Scracity implies exclusivity and therefore private property. You can not escape private property, it is a factual even if you cease to call it so, as Mises argued.

The problem with democracy is that it violates consent by default. The solution: A consent based society, binding on-

ly through the nonaggression principle and the right to self-defense. Imagine each individual person having the rights and full sovereignty of a state. Das wäre dann Mündig und Freiheitlich. It would also mean full responsibility, authority and autonomy. But how do you defend against nation states, aggressive religions and organized crime taking over? How to properly selfdefend? And how to prevent the self defense organizations themselves from going bad? Understanding natural incentives? Honor, free speech and natural reputation? Anyways, can a human have dignity if he isn't really free? But in death there is no dignity and human is surrounded by aggressive human institutions imposing win-lose, coercive and grandiose. Further as Hans Hermann Hoppe noted: In the U.S., less than a century of full-blown democracy has resulted in steadily increasing moral degeneration, family and social disintegration, and cultural decay in the form of continually rising rates of divorce, illegitimacy, abortion, and crime. As a result of an ever-expanding list of nondiscrimination—affirmative action"—laws and nondiscriminatory, multicultural, egalitarian immigration policies, every nook and cranny of American society is affected by government management and forced integration; accordingly, social strife and racial, ethnic, and moral-cultural tension and hostility have increased dramatically. Further it is only free men (and women and any gender, when I say men I usually mean all genders of course, obviously!) that can have and have reason for empathy.

If people act as grandiose assholes, then why not let them remain in their own stupidity? Is this justified or is it reckless, dangerous and maybe even immoral? I dont know.

Maybe I just give you grandiose concepts. Maybe that is what I do.

In my world I am the omnipotent being. The real world

with its various restrictions and impositions, especially if man made, is loathesome. The only saving grace is the absolute and the mysterious ways that good becomes that I may currently just dont see. Otherwise I would have no way to suffer this onslaught of stupidity and would be enraged about the state of affairs without rest. It is like germany and even europe more broadly has fallen and like good things and good values are failing or are corrupted. Maybe this is good in the long run, but in the short term I fear horrible things. Maybe there is a chance for my ideal, or rather something even better that I am too ignorant and unwise to see.

I think objective morality is impossible, because morality is value laden, so subjective and not exclusively rational. But at this point I even think that everything is subjective and that rationality is something sought for but not conclusively reached. I think pure rationality is an unrealizable ideal out of human grasp. Rationality is above human comprehension. To illustrate my point: If rationality was fully accessible, then the entirety of past and future mathematics would be obvious, trivial and comprehensible without any scarcity of attention or time. Mises on the other hand saw even a medieval doctor as rational in applying his medicine because the doctor employed his own understanding and capability of cause and effect. Hmm. Arguably, as long as you have this second kind of more realistic rationality in morality - you cant really talk of an objective morality with 100

So morality is something that always needs work and re-evaluation, investigation. How do you solve such knowledge problems? By not predetermining, freedom and free markets for morality. Herein the lines between good and evil, something emergent and evolving. You can make moral progress, but it wont be easy or always simple or always foreseeable. You can state moral reasons, but you can not know if a moral

reason is the best possible and therefore objective. Further this means, that by doing morality there necessarily always is the possibility of evil being committed in the name of morality, but this evil then can it be averted or is the absence of morality itself not an even greater evil? Is this like again the perfect flaw that is the precondition for infinite growth?

What person in this world does not like getting more money - all else being equal? I can see how printing money is tempting. There are many things tempting but immoral - conflict of interests. The endeavour to reduce frustration is potentially good or evil. Arguably the only reason for goodness is good alignment of interests - rational egoism. But of course I can not know if this really is the best reason.

I am lazy - no real progress in life. And lately I feel like I want to bite things, I feel like a beaten dog - but not really. I drink alcohol, masturbate and take gaba just to lessen the turbulence. I am afraid of what I am and of what I would loose if I became healthy. Im so attached to it, I cant change my mind. I have no idea what I will do but Im without a doubt insane. Again - shitty self glorification. Attention seeking, but always rejecting it. No I wont do anything drastic. One moment like this the next like that. No, I am within sane limits - it was merely one glass of wine. I am lying to you anyways! forgot this already? I here and the moment I direct attention.

Natural incentives = free market + free speech.

Sometimes I can not resist basking in grandiose fantasy. It can be healing actually, or at least create a good feeling. Grandiosity feels like success, even if there is no actual success. Being successful through fantasy.

Volition is the real master of legitimacy. Democracy is only legitimate in so far as it follows volition, but fails because it inherently violates individual volition. The free market re-

spects individual volition and if it breaks volition, is coercive, then it is not the free market, no matter what lies and gaslighting is employed. Instead of fruitlessly attempting to delegate legitimacy towards any institution or system, it should be understood as exclusively inherent phenomenon to volition and free will. Whether humans actually have free will or not does not change that the source of legitimacy is the individual humans will, his voluntary action. Any system that wants to progress human dignity would need to be subservient to individual human volition. Any system violating this principle would necessarily be regressive in one way or another. Human free will is grandiose. What is against volition? The very strong and grandiose will of a few, will to power, over others. Power systems that aren't opt-in and are inclusive by birth. It is grandiose to assume legitimacy above and over any new human life or anybody for that matter. Legitimacy can at most be borrowed voluntarily. I'm moralizing so much here. Volition is before and above honor. Why? Honor is one good thing, but volition appraises and decides all good things. An inversion of honor and volition might have been the downfall of medieval societies, without volition there is no honor. Honor is the property that attracts legitimacy.

Very good, like what I was doing when I'm not loosing myself: Existential Philosophy and Psychotherapy - Emmy van Deurzen <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JCo266WuzJg>

Among the genders I would say that indeed, men are more overtly grandiose.

Only if your volition is respected and when you aren't threatened, can you feel self efficacious, free and dignified. Once you can make and break your own bonds you have life and security. What is more important than what you feel or think, but what you feel and think is fundamental part of what is.

A load of what the fuck:

The nobody moves like rainbow schmoves Cat on deck  
what the heck Blitz on the plane, now dont go insane Tarrow  
hawks my friends for larks Bet me boy, kisses from onions

I have many ideas, but what is there that is lasting? Barely anything. It is comforting that happenings are not bound by my foolishness.

Narcissists suppress their emotions. Proper emotions mean proper access to the world, but they live in a virtual world and only experience virtual emotions. They lack wholesomeness. I don't know if even the bad emotions are authentic, since they are resilient and blind to whole classes of slights and hurt. The narcissist lacks decency, he goes full on from the start, it is extreme and dehumanizing, overriding, grandiose. It is about breaking consent, reducing agency, snapshutting. Make my presence absolute and consequently extinguishing others presence, autonomy, agency and volition. Competition is not allowed, he is the sole victor and dominant unconditional monopolist. The compensatory fantasy. In general humans at times play cruel political games, power struggles and the narcissist is equipped to play and dominate these coercive games. But in the end nothing in reality, be it narcissist or politics, can escape reality. The narcissist twists truth and so he is able to act despite compulsive statements. This is adaptive in a compulsive environment. Truth is intact only if you have proper access to reality. None the less the narcissist is not completely wrong, sometimes he even is functionally wrong. Being wrong is an advantage in an environment of lies. A double negation. The narcissist creates the most tempting fantasies there are. You have to acknowledge that. Whether or not you fall for that kind of fantasy is a test of your character. Do you want to be a baby or an adult? That is what is tested. Are you susceptible

to grandiosity or do you like reality? The narcissist in his fantasy produces new content. There is always new drama. Not having access to reality necessarily also mean being dismissive of certain seriousness, being blind to seriousness or some serious things, while taking other not serious things as fatally serious. Grandiosity is content generative. Being divorced from reality, the content has a kind of emptiness in it, a restlessness, a trauma shining through. This emptiness makes the content insubstantial and fleeting, at least to healthy people. Still it is not meaningless, its meaning is rather based inside a virtual reality. It is virtual meaning and because of this it doesn't last the narcissist. His meaning fails him and he topples into lack and necessity, narcissistic supply. He is corrupted. But corruption by itself doesn't make sense, it must be to preserve something good, a hidden child. Corruption and the perfect child. Better be living child than a dead adult. Having your life endangered is more than mere frustration: It justifies cutting off reality. Life takes precedence over reality testing. In this way the psychopathic narcissist is justified. Everybody has the right to selfdefend, to survive, at the very least attempt to survive. But I have that same right! The psychopathic narcissists realm of grandiosity is survival. Control in order to survive. Surviving is where his childhood wound is. Control is using cause and effect and understanding cause and effect, knowledge. And because he is grandiose about his own survival, he is blind to others survival - psychopathy. Grandiosity overwrites, is blind and ignorant. Lack of empathy, callousness. It fits.

Now what is my own realm of grandiosity? Legitimacy? Concepts - no. Can I even be honest about this with myself? Grandiose about understanding? What is masochism pointing at? It needs to be coming from childhood trauma and it needs to be a positive formulation, grandiosity inherently

demands that, even if the outcomes are objectively negative.

Is there ever mastery without grandiosity? Only the overarching nature of grandiosity portions reality into one kind of mastery. Grandiosity controls everything and so is necessary for mastery. Mastery is a waste.

Without a doubt, there are some overlapping properties of covert narcissism and masochistic covert narcissism. The baiting for validation by self denigration is similar. Both are covert, a kind of introversion. By reading my text you can make up your own mind to some further aspects, although in a text I can present myself however I want. Only actual real life independent observations can create a stronger foundation.

Fantasy drives the world, because the future is necessarily imagined, the question is how good and realistic your fantasy is.

Do not idealize me and do not devalue me. We all make mistakes. I am far from perfect and that is a fact. Of my statements take only what you want to take.

Everyone is fallible, every one. But why need to say this? To dampen grandiosity.

How can frustration exist? Only in the face of grandiosity, some claim to preferred state. If there is frustration, then there must be some ambition or want that is frustrated. Frustration is a form of reality testing, combining real feedback with internally significant wants. Either frustration or satisfaction, both imply a finitude and a time preference.

Individualism trumps racism.

Animals can be dangerous, obviously.

If you know one actually rigid aspect of somebodys personality you have them by the balls, in a sense.

Intelligence measured by IQ is a certain kind of reality testing. People smarter than me are seemingly more ob-

jective and probably really are more objective. Higher IQ gives you access to realities inaccessible to others, but you still are faced with overwhelming complexity and the problem of prioritisation. And while different kinds of intelligence largely correlate, they still aren't the same and these nuances can potentially be important for real life outcomes. In how far can higher IQ be an advantage? In so far as it gives advantageous access to truth, compared to lower IQ. IQ is flexible in this. On the other hand, emotion tends to be more directional and predetermined in accessing and assessing truth. Emotion doesn't loose sight and therefore also encounters more frustration. Emotion is like holding invariant beliefs and value judgements. High IQ on the other hand can more easily change target, but this also means that it also tends to be more easily averted from good purpose. For example as paul cooijmans noted: Communist rule lowers a population's average I.Q. by three points per generation. This suggests that when there is some widespread perversion of values, IQ is too brittle to stand. The emotive simplicity and security of intuitive knowledge - wins out, conventional intelligence is deceived and made ineffective. Conversely what does this mean for high intelligence? High intelligence is a civilizationally caused good dependent upon the epistemic value of communication in it. Intelligence is a subtle balance that can be more easily subverted by bad values. Intelligence is more crucially dependent on the validity of its foundation than the less intelligent emotional heuristics. Intelligence deals with many propositions but is ever more dependent on the good faith inside of those propositions. Intelligence desperately needs authenticity. Intelligence can exist only and after the presence of authenticity. Authenticity trumps intelligence, but without intelligence authenticity is mighty poor. Real intelligence is extended authenticity. Something here

doesn't sit right with me. Yes, the emotions, the feelings, the senses themselves ARE the authenticity. The immediate encounter. What is NOT FOUND IN THIS BOOK. So fuck off you looser.

Having a reader is like the snapshotting of a imagined general person. In my case similar to what Vaknin described as narcissistic snapshotting? Am I therefore abusing my reader? Yes, most likely. I am abusing my reader, because I have him inside my grandiose space. I dominate him with concepts, destroy and invalidate his own concepts. The reader is entirely passive and his only allowed role is in admiration. I am trashing my reader by nit properly formatting and structuring the text. I idealize and devalue my reader, just like the narcissist I am. My reader is my true victim. I would not have come to this understanding without Sam Vaknins videos, credit where credit is due.

This is important, Hubris Syndrome: Acquired (Late On-set) Situational Narcissism: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=cGUCleptLgc>

Ironically it is the crass sadism of the psychopathic narcissist that has any chance at dampening the internal grandiosity of the masochistic covert narcissist and therefore the ability to somewhat restore reality testing. Something similar must also be applicable in the reverse. In the lack of self efficaciousness of the masochistic covert narcissist, the psychopathic narcissist must see himself as secure, surviving. But its all such a terrible thing. the masochistic is like the natural and the sadistic the natural selection. Hunter and Prey, coevolution. And again I am too grandiose. The masochist is too much internally grandiose, the sadist is too much externally grandiose. The masochist lacks an other, the sadist lacks a self. Still, all this is bad.

Accoubtability arises from cause and effect and therefore

is the de facto default. Avoiding accountability is short sighted egoism, that sadly is convenient and successful even in modern society with some of its bad incentives. Reputation and peoples ability to act on it - volition, are necessary to restore proper accountability. Voluntary speech (free speech) and voluntary listening is necessary for natural correction of reputation and therefore also for correction of accountability.

More broadly, volition is the precondition for accountability. You could say that justice is just a way of holding accountable. Therefore there can not be justice without accountability, without volition (action, speech, listening) and not without natural reputation. But this is all the bad frustrating side, it argues what is proper frustration. About satisfaction? Well it is beyond me, only the individuals know what they really want. The cause and effect justification for accountability: It really is that simple. The individual is also accountable for being fooled, because it is a failure in his reality testing. Full individual accountability, because of cause and effect. And then also full credit to the individual for his good deeds, also because of cause and effect. Now since everybody is fully accountable, the judge, the jury and the arbiter are also fully accountable for their decisions. Only a fully accountable person can be free and an unfree person consequently can not hold full accountability. A narcissist, a slave of his own mind and memory, acts irresponsibly. Still, reality is there and causality is part of reality and there is no real excuse for irresponsibility. Any irresponsible action happens inside a virtual reality, not inside reality and therefore constitutes a failure in reality testing. Irresponsibility is a lie, it is really a responsibility towards different targets. Then again, does a lack of accountability exist? No, it just means that the accountability is towards different values and valued things, beings. Accountability just means valuing so-

mething highly and everybody values something highly. This is intricately woven together with volition. A lack of accountability towards some society just means volitional disagreement with it and therefore illegitimacy of the society or the way it operates.

Actually when you are raising the question of who is accountable, you are likely asking who is accountable to you, where is the civilization and natural reputation. Have we lost accountability is like saying if we have lost civilisation, civility and yes it is a legitimate question. Individual value judgements have shifted, there is a lack of win-win. Accountability follows from cause and effect, therefore civility also follows from it, because broad societal accountability is civility. This needs some more perspectives and deeper more rigorous elaboration.

Accountability is towards what is perceived as really legitimate.

Being authentic might be the most manipulative thing there is.

The cool thing is that I am not the only one of my kind, that my kind is something naturally arising in this world, that there are multiple people that think like me now, in the past and in the future. Masochistic covert narcissism.

While philosophy videos can be interesting, they tend to be full of fallacies and errors. The author betrays himself.

Frustration is calibration? Frustration is a negative and a negative leads to change in direction. The negative redirects the positive. The perfect negative redirected the perfect and therefore introduced flaw and the possibility for improvement. No, this is serious.

Needing to make a phone call or finances over the computer gives me anxiety. Having done it its always a relief, but I procrastinate.

Striving for perfection reduces, so the perfect might be nothing, but nothingness doesn't exist. Therefore perfection also doesn't exist. This means there is always room for improvement.

Good people do not want power over other people, they merely want enough power to defend themselves from other peoples despotism and not any more than that. Live and let live. The only thing worth striving for is goodness, towards the absolute. The absolute, the immutable, the infinite, the all-one, is the only unconditional unshakeable reliable. If human affairs break apart, the all one remains ever present. If human accountability fails, turn towards the a priori. If human betrayal is the norm, know that absolute goodness is there for you, unwavering, loyal and loving. If you can't believe anybody, believe in the good reality.

Virtual is part of reality. Everything is part of reality. You are always held.

Dominant behavior = sadism? = Control compulsion?

Ants are sour.

The nihilist values, he is just very afraid. The nihilist has been hurt and he is afraid of being hurt again, so he chooses a kind of apathy, dissociation. The nihilist has put his meaning into nothingness, but nothing doesn't exist. He can not help but find value in real things, seek it, ever so unconsciously and in denial about it. By attempting to take away his meaning, he really wants to protect it from a world perceived and experienced as cruel. Is nihilism like an empty schizoid core? Anon: They don't want to deal with the pain for no reason."But if you seek a reason, then you seek meaning. Seeking meaning is in itself meaning. The nihilist is the creator of new values. Attempting nothingness, is attempting to negate the absolute reality entirely. Attempting this is impossible, the failure is inherent in the attempt. The

definition of nothing is that which does not exist. So attempting nothingness is attempting something that does not exist - it is epistemically impossible, it is virtual, not real. There exists no true nihilist, the perfect negative would be the closest thing there is to it, but even it must be flawed, because it is a negative. There is nothing that can change that which is absolute, or it would not be absolute. And because of this, in the end, even the perfect negative is a positive, but there is no end. Reality is fully self justified and so there is reason. Anon: Nihilism allows embracing the absurd."Yes. But it also hurts a lot. Nihilism is a way of birthing your own universe - it is extremely frustrating and painful. Meaning and value, you can not have one without the other. Nihilism is when you are getting tired by holding onto your values. When your meaning becomes your burden. When you loose hope. Nihilists deserve sympathy. Nihilism is a symptom. But one person being broken does not justify damaging other innocent people. Bullying is evil. And being complicit in bullying, like me in the past, also is evil. In a sense I was both a perpetrator, but also a victim of bullying. It is win-lose. Bullying, coercion, is what makes you loose faith in humanity, but it is part of being human, not humane. What are the real reasons for bullying? Vaknin said, sunlight disinfects abuse - show it, film it, record it, make it public. Tell people. Slightly forgiving tit-for-tat?

Less intelligent people also have stronger passions - in the good and bad sense. Love as well as hate. Sometimes the heuristics work well, sometimes they fail, just like with thinking. It is probably the psychopathic narcissist that can give the best advice on survival - it is his grandiose space after all. We better learn. But its still pathological. I am loosing, or at least under.

The soul is ineffable. Yeah, recursion.

Genes themselves are selfish replicators, grandiose in some way. Self replicating, self selecting (kinselection and similarity selection), as I said, even empathy is a form of grandiosity. There are many ways in which grandiosity appears or ways in which it works, known and unknown (yet). And then there is also fitting in, self limiting, etc. Grandiosity, by its very nature, falls short of the absolute. We all die at some point, for example. Equally, fitting in falls short, because it is self limiting and the absolute is inherently limitless. From our lowest to our highest capabilities and natures, we try to reach the absolute.

I wonder how much of plato introduced something like the idea objectivity. Platonic friendships, etc.

My soul is beyond me and it is me. It is a gift that I can not comprehend. My soul is my significance, my god given purpose, consciousness and being. My soul is my divine right and makes me part of god, part of reality. Every soul is one essential expression of god. This is the grandiose interpretation.

After a period of some indulgence, coming out of it, now I experience some dry and healthy small frustration.

Now I remember, in one case when I was a young teenager my big brother, the classic narcissist, actually protected me from someone. It was in public, so it could have been impression management, but the fact stands none the less. It was a severely mentally ill girl I barely knew, known for her erratic antisocial and maybe even schizophrenic behavior. I think she once even was in a mental institution - while she was a teenager. I cant imagine that she turned out well, Im not even sure if she is alive. Maybe my brother legitimately wanted to protect me there and sensed something off. Maybe. She is alive and "well". Her mother is very sadistic antisocial. That explains it.

I see now, the inverted narcissist is very sneaky. The convert and the inverted, what blood sucking, energy leeching.

Und dann schaue ich in den Spiegel und habe Fantasien was für ein Genie ich doch bin, wie der Bogen über meinen Augen doch genau so aussieht wie dieser eine Genie Mathematiker, der schon jung gestorben ist. Und ich stelle mir vor wie doch meine Geniestreiche bewundert werden, vor einem Imaginären Publikum, das ich ins staunen verstze. Und wie schön ich bin (wohl meine Geheimratsecken ausblendend). Und meine Kustgriffe, die dann doch nicht zu übertreffen seien, wie ich doch intuitiv, ach ganz in grandioser, großartiger Fantasie bin. Aber da liegt doch auch gerade wirklich meine imaginäre Kraft. Ich bin halt eben eine Art Narzissist, wenn auch nur für mich.

Wäre es denn eine überraschung wenn Max Stirner ein Narzissist gewesen wär? Nein. Er war aber wohl kein vulnerabler Narzissist. Auf seine Art war Max Stirner ein Genie allererster Klasse.

Wenn ich also nach Geschmäckern suche, nach Inspirationen und schönen Ideen, dann sind sie um meine Grandiosität (grossartigkeit) zu begründen, sie dienen nur meiner Rechtfertigung insofern, dass der der die Dinge durchschaut damit auch schon über Ihnen steht. Ironisch, dass der Verstehende also der masochistische ist. Das ist fast schon epistemisch notwendig. Wer handelt, der überschreibt und ändert nach seinem Willen, der Verstehende aber erträgt und lässt über sich ergehen und was ist das denn anderes als Masochismus? Das ist aber nicht das ganze an mir, es stimmt natürlich nicht, dass ich nicht handle, jeder der lebt handelt. Das Masochistische ist das Sensitive. Der ganz verständige also ist Handlungsunfähig? Naja wenn du absolut bist, dann brauchst du ja auch keine Handlung mehr. Handlungen also können höchstens relative zum absoluten sein, das absolute

aber ist nur in sich selbst. Ich weiss es nicht. The socratic attitude of knowing nothing is the masochistic one, because if you knew something, then you would be justified to impose that something grandiosely and therefore loose your vision, your sensitivity, in that domain. The masochist is convinced by everyone and everything, but he all too easily loses that stance of being certain. The old ideas are constantly overthrown, they dont get much of a right to begin with, beyond their initial idealization. And so even the idea of grandiosity itself could be toppled.

Nothingness is actually recursion.

The portrayal of westerners by japanese is wrong, they mostly dont really grasp it. But then, the same must be true in the reverse. Well, information is local and it must also be local to culture and genes. In so far as collectivism ever works, it is a cauteous balance of consent, reputation and kinselection (it is one island). There is more to this, I dont understand. A certain kind of common sense. It feels like they are just very socially smooth and considerate. Conflicting truth must be more down back and hidden. Yet if you are good at interpreting subtleties, there is some honesty. Everything is strongly clothed in a social veneer, sociality is grandiose, the only legitimate, yet the roles are very specific. I cant. It feels like you either need to be imposing or passive. I feel like they are unforgiving if I talked bad about them. There is this implicit threat. Probably this kind of tension, this small path is what forces them into the perfection of their diverse crafts. Samurai swords, Nintendo, Eizo monitors, the tea ceremony, studio ghibli. On the other hand, what is really scary is their susceptibility to public decision, to dictatorship, to shogunate. The public gransioity can turn on you and crush you like an insect, full on with murder, genocide, torture, rape and complete dehumanization. These

guys. Herein the tension, the worry and oppression. But not only this full on outgroup aggression is possible, also ingroup aggression, bullying is possible and likely happens a lot. Their streets are safe, but are their homes also? Everybody merely and excruciatingly a representative. Every public interest can only be borrowed and adapted to, but it must fail to represent individual sincerity. Who cares in the face of grandiose sociality? Well, some special people, true friends care. And for those it is worth it to play the act, to still have humane standing, loving and secure grounds. This, ladies and gentlemen, is the final part needed for true strength, beyond perfection. The soft is incomprehensible.

I have to confess, the idea of nothingness scares me. That is why I repeat: Nothingness doesn't exist. To soothe myself. I'm too weak and too dumb.

Happiness is not a sin, but for the narcissist it is an opportunity for narcissistic supply, bringing you down. My mother.

I can not shake it, this feeling of a lost good that must be resurrected. Goodness itself has fallen out of favor in many ways and this is such a shame. Society should be ashamed.

Marcel Proust's grandmother is like me probably.

4chan told me to believe in myself, so I better listen!

It seems like one way to make yourself be punished, is by contradicting yourself, or by exposing a flaw in something and then later naively indulging in that flaw - making yourself the object of punishment and disagreement, a form of masochism, possibly, or grandiosity.

Is ignorance automatically also grandiosity and agency? Yes. Grandiosity, Agency (action), Harshness, Ignorance, Overwriting, Dominant, Imposing, Memetic, selfreplication and there might be more.

How does the interaction between two masochistic covert narcissists look like? They share the realm of grandiosity,

so one becomes dominate grandiose and the other becomes masochsistic. This can alternate, I think. It looks somewhat similarly between two psychopathic narcissists, one becomes dominant cruel, the other the passive victim. I dont know if it oscillates there either. The same realm of grandiosity leads to strong competition and a clash, with a victor and a looser - mutual exclusivity. Two classic narcissists also clash, but here it is most obvious. The nature and place of the clash betrays the domain of grandiosity. What is the realm of grandiosity of a covert narcissist? In a way, letting a kind of grandiosity face itself might be a chance for it to gain some selfawareness - maybe. But does it maie a fundamental diffenence? I can imagine that it doesnt happena lot, because it irks narcissists, it challenges their grandiosity. On the other hand this could also be just cruel and destructive.

Google: Studies also suggest that FOMO (fear of missing out) is a negative emotional state resulting from unmet social relatedness needs. Dr. Sullivan: FOMO is probably the most hurtful in teenagers or younger adults, specifically because they are trying to figure out where they fit in life and what groups they fit into."

FOMO because there is a need for belonging. This doesn't mean that FOMO is inherently wrong, it is adaptive. It is one reason why there are trends, even if those trends are quite bad otherwise - they are an excuse for socialisation and bonding. This is why populism works, why the masses tend to act in stupid ways - because it is adaptive on a more self serving individual level. What does this mean? It means that epistemically, mass movements rarely have much worth, but socially and in ways of bonding they do have worth. The free thinker therefore must be independent of trend and fashion, go on the lonely less trodden way. Otherwise he thinks like the masses and is biased and unoriginal. But is it possible

for a mass movement to have higher epistemic quality? Well, incentives would need to be aligned. Truth seeking and social bonding and its advantages would need to be mutually causative. On the other hand, finding truth never really was the "highest<sup>ü</sup>import of social connection and artificially attempting to put it there could be a huge mistake. Volition will figure it out. Social rejection is one of the most hurtful, potentially lethal, experiences and it is avoided by attempting to belong. Depending on your society this requires the display of more or less conformity and traits, social rituals. Society implies conformity to some degree, otherwise there would be no possible identifier of the society. Shared language, norms, memes and values. But society changes these over time and sometimes goes bad, but also can improve. I dont know if it always needs to reform for improvement or if there ever is gradual improvement. The masses themselves are incapable of improvement, it is always individuals that improve something and masses that see and follow. Why do the masses follow? Because belonging is surviving - to a large extent. This need to belong potentially impedes volition and because of this dictatorships and authoritarianism are possible. Both are obviously evil and undesirable. How to fix? Individual volition (freedom) needs to be the highest value in incentive. A volition based society. How does this work?

Should volition, free will, be the highest value in human societies? What about the absolute? Well, if volition is the highest value for society, then humans can figure it out themselves, they become adaptive and explorative, aligning naturally towards absolute properties. Volition allows emergent adaptation. What is emergent is formerly unknown and the absolute also can not be fully known by a human. This at the same time is epistemic humility. Growth becomes possible - real progressivism. So the answer is that for human affairs

individual volition is the highest value.

If your own attention stops you from doing properly, interrupts you, makes you unable and if genius is about having a lot of attention, then genius also is a kind of disabling retardation. A genius is special needs, he can not survive without separation of labor - his labor is extremely specific, narrow and idiosyncratic. The output of the genius is so raw and specific, that only volition has a chance of recognizing and using it - a free market. A genius is so outside of the system and of common sense, that it can be described as dysfunctional. Human is a social animal after all. If genius was as good as the idealized version of genius suggests, then why haven't they replaced average humans? They havent because it is precisely average humans that tend to have the best life outcomes, in a darwinian sense. The exception are mass extinction events, but even there the average is the most likely to survive because of their inherent advantage in numbers. Average people only value genius if they are useful, good in some way, and that makes sense. Genius life is high risk high reward - they stand a step closer to the abyss. If society is coercive, authoritarian, then there is no room for innovation and then also no place for genius. The usefulness and success of genius scales with freedom. Talking about genius is such a nice opportunity for covert selglorification. One day my lack of humility is gonna get me. A genius tends to be clumsy. If you are aware of your walking, you cant walk well anymore, you might even drop your chalk if writing on a board. This does not mean that every genius is clumsy in every respect. There are football geniuses etc. What matters is voluntarily recognized merit.

Tariffs are taxes too.

And in the end truth prevails, because truth is in conformance and direct reference with reality. Truth succeeds

overtly or covertly, it always finds a way. Truth is way of attempting to respect the absolute, reality and it is infinite so it has no end - yet it stands. And even in the direst circumstances, truth prevails. Truth is always with you and will always be with you. You can close your eyes, yet it will not fail to show itself to you. By attempting to distort truth you are really distorting yourself and I dont want you to hurt yourself. Into what desperation and suffering can lies bring you, but the real hurt is that you do to your own soul. Truth will always be there for you, even if you are in gravest darkness and despair. The good and the truth are the same. The beautiful and the truth are the same. Truth is the everything that any word could ever say. Truth is the logos and the order and harmony of the universe. The truth is healing everything.

I think truth is the only stable state. Any effort of lie is a construct of simulated, but not true, reality encumbent to fall down, given enough time. Truth in a sense inhabits the lowest energy state and is the most efficient. I think trutrh prevailsis true. A lie is just a disguised truth. And these limit the speaker, make them obsolete given enough time. A lie is self restricting, signed with an end date, but more than that. A lie is masochistic? I havent reached the beauty that I want and therefore lack truth. So I do not really want it. Lies can only be as good as your imagination of reality is, but an imagination just never is the real thing - it is part of the real and so finite. By lieing you are imprisoning yourself inside your own fantasy.

Sometimes telling the truth is painful and embarrassing. In these cases I tend to lie, or conceal at least. Maybe my masochism makes me one huge lie. In the end you believe your own lies and then reality seems to become harsh and evil. You loose access to reality and live in convenient fantasy.

What is a lie? A lie is a self defense. A lie is a bad sacrifice. A lie is a cutting off from reality, an introversion of good. Loosing sight of good. You could say that masochism is loosing the sight of good. But good is always there and even if you close your eyes, it will find a way.

In darkness, cant you see the stars all the more? I cant be bothered. I would just turn around and look, but Im a coward. Or am I? I should care. I am living a lie and that is bad. Any lie comes back to you.

Truth is the absolute and the absolute is true. (If something is absolute it is true. If it is true, then it is inherently absolute). All of this could be said infinitely better, I can not help but lie. And this is a cheap cop out.

If you are authentic and truthful, then you allow other people to judge you according to their own values - you grant them autonomy and freedom. In a sense you are respecting their volition and that in itself is praiseworthy, even if the truth is not very comfortable or good otherwise. Being authentic is a display of inner strength and reliability. Only authenticity endures time, it passes all, or at least most, forms of reality testing. Authenticity is cooperative, open and vulnerable. Lieing is separating - for unknown reason, usually. A society shows its worth by how much and how big the truths are shared in it, at its surface. The more people lie in society, the more alienated, threatened and coerced they feel about it. Good is vulnerable and it needs to protect itself from bad. If society is bad, then good protects itself by lieing to society. Arguably then you dont really have a society. Authenticity goes along win-win bridges. Now if you have a good society, you need to be careful that your society is not agressive against other societies, because agression itself is bad and this would make your own society bad. How so? Aggression undermines empathy and if there is no natural empathy,

what inherent worth has another person anymore? Your society implodes upon itself. Be carful about grandiosity - it easily leads to agression. Do you value human consciousness more than the impetus of your own grandiose consciousness? I tell you, your grandiosity finds better satisfaction in glory, by striving towards the absolute, compared to destruction, which would be the end of it. Grandiosity seeks infinity. Infinity is not an end. And not an end means being. Maybe Im wrong. Im morally grandiose and this is a bias thats sometimes wrong. Being itself is a bias. On the other hand, I can only say this because I am, so the argumant is self defeating. Pure objectivity is self defeating. But truth is objective. So more likely, truth only partially emerges. Waaargh, so bad.

Empathizing is a way of belonging.

An intention is like a very specific grandiosity - aimed at some state of things. Its a stretch though.

Being grandiose about truth is idiotic. Truth is an emergent good, not a dictated one. Truth only has a place, if it is fitting into human relationships. Win-win.

In my family communication seems to be going on mostly trough grandiosity. We dont talk so much with each other, as we talk over each other. In a sense you have no place to say anything, if it isnt grandiose. Even I have my place with my grandiosity, but only in the down time and not really. Even my grandiosity is bad. I can only be passive and enduring and this is the only half-way healthy position can have there. I try to refrain from idealization and devaluation. Short flares of my own grandiosity slip me, but they are quickly shut down, ignored, devalued.

If somebody had unlimited power, would grandiosity be inevitable? Well, if you have unlimuted power, then in a sense everything is yourself and if you enact your grandiosity, you could only enact it onto yourself. Masochism, but in a sense

beyond my imagination. Grandiosity attempts to transcend.

Es ist meistens so, dass die vermeintlich hohe Erkenntnis, doch nicht so hoch ist wie gemeint. In der Geschichte sind schon sehr viele Erkenntnisse überholt worden. Es sind am ehesten die einfachsten und offensichtlichsten Dinge die bestand haben.

There are no infinite resources, and if it is a resource, then it isn't infinite (similar Ludwig von Mises). The grandest constructions of thought tend to fail because of one simple, and in hindsight obvious, oversight. In a sense the simple are the first principles, but not necessarily always. If you have complex thoughts, then you are most likely prejudiced by them. If you have simple thoughts, then you can listen, because simple things can create complex meaning by combining them. Complexity is big and special purpose, simplicity is general and adaptable. Neither simplicity nor complexity are in themselves values. It's just that simplicity tends to be handled more easily.

Die Mumins Folge 1: "... aber sogar in der Fantasie sollte man ein bisschen Bescheiden sein."

While the narcissists life is terrible, it is also more exciting than average. Instead of being excited, he should cry. It would relieve him and help him heal his soul. Crying would mean an acknowledgement of the terrible and there a first step for integration, wholeness.

Sleeping and napping creates a thin glaze of fat on my skin.

If the world is perceived as harsh, then any action one does must be harsh, or it could not be part of the perceived world.

Arguably unconditional love does not exist for humans. You could only be loved for what you inherently are, which comes close, but isn't unconditional. If there is unconditional

love, then it would need to be blind and undifferentiating love, it would need to be utterly grandiose love. It would need to be beyond ordinary human comprehension, something that wants everything. Unconditional love would also mean that there was no prior commitment to love necessary and that even the most heinous acts, the destruction, inversion and perversion of the highest value were not only acceptable, but even loveable. Such a love would even love hate and therefore not be recognizable as love anymore. So there is unconditional love, but only from the absolute. Anything unconditional can not be categorical because a finite category is itself a condition. The infinite on the other hand eclipses all categories and so also is unconditional. Cause and effect are both categorical. Something of some category causes something of some other or same category. No rationality without causality. Because cause and effect are both categorical, they can not capture what is beyond category, they can not describe the infinite - the absolute. This infinite, is not like mathematical infinity - which is imagined as being on a number scale. A number is a category - infinity cant be categorized (otherwise it would be finite, limited by its category). Although in numbers some most astounding effects of infinity have been discovered. But you can not know if you know everything, only that you dont know enough, which is always true.

The unconditional are like the Axioms, or the a priori, the first causes. They can not be understood by causality, but only be believed. Like the belief in causality itself is an a priori. Is it even possible to not believe them? Just like in mathematics, where you never really can capture infinity, so also in philosophy, you cant really talk about it. You can only stay on the finite side and be amazed or terrified. You can not make any objective statement. You can not imagine any

different universe, they are all impossible. Once you would have imagined a possible universe, it would need to be the same as ours, or maybe it would be you. The absolute would need to be the same. But this is not a deficiency in any way, there are infinite points within the absolute, countless ways to be. Anything that I can say, is inferior.

In respect to the absolute, I am not myself, but his in every way. I can not say anything about it, he fully says everything about me. Relative to absolute. If you are a number, how could you describe the category of number? Only by attempting to go to the infinite number, the biggest. The self is caught in relativity, blind towards the absolute.

Honor is an outcome of natural incentives, decentralized power and priority of volition, not coercive authoritarian control by a few (which would incentivize them to disregard all honor).

The artist hides behind his art, he is too afraid to be serious with the world. Ich bin so wütend auf euch. Es ist eure Welt, weil ihr mir meine entrissen habt.

Bin ich da nicht wie Greta Thunberg? Ich kann ihre Gefühle schon verstehen.

Aber alles hat man doch hingegeben, sogar diese Enttäuschung und Wut, um von Mutter geliebt zu werden.

Und so ist man dann also ein weltfremdes Muttersöhnchen wie ich es war und wohl immer noch bin. Ganz weich gegen alles und stets in trauer. Die eigene Stärke dann gleich hart Überhöht und tragisch bis zum Aufgeben, denn wer weint, ja wirklich verloren hat, der hat Grund von Mutter getröstet zu werden. Ein Baby ist hilflos, ein Baby ist jenseits von gut und böse, vielleicht sogar ein Kind. Aber um gut zu leben, muss man Aufwachsen. I dont like how restrictive this perspective is.

Humans inherently want a highest value, that's why ma-

ny nihilists tend to idealize AI as some kind of new god, all good and all benevolent, all knowing and beyond human intellect. This is idealized imagination, not current reality. They want a highest value, so they seek it, project it. They want certainty and existential security, something to strive for, a target, the good. They also want to obey such an AI, which is like saying that the AI is absolute. Why not instead obey the absolute as such? In a sense you have no choice about it anyways, what is absolute can not be changed, or it would not be absolute. So the big question is in recognizing the absolute, the a priori and infinite. On the other hand I could never tell you what it really is, so I agree with the nihilists striving, suffering and birthing and aborting. A hopeless endeavor.

In some sense the nihilist is the strictest devotee to the absolute, because he does not allow himself to make any presumption about it. It is all so difficult.

In my more immediate family I most likely have the highest IQ. There are some more distant relatives, one school director which shares around 1/8 of my genes, he is very smart. I only met him like 3 times in my life, but I liked him. And then there is supposedly even a chess grandmaster, more distantly related, which I never met and I dont know the name of. Quite a few relatives from my fathers side emigrated to the USA. The rest I dont know, mostly, because my grandmother alienated most. My mother probably has the lowest IQ, although she also hides some of her intelligence, because she is a covert narcissist, but she also has high associative horizon. She is also confabulating a lot, maybe thats related. My immediate family is quite non-intellectual with the exception of my big brother. Arguably he is not quite a true intellectual (he lacks that honest innate curiosity), but he is well educated. In the past when I was

more naive and more pathological, I talked with him more on what interested me, not anymore. To my mother I talked about spiritual things in private, but she didnt quite listen. All my family is inaccessible for honest direct and deep talk. They are too untrustworthy and dismissive. I never had too much of a chance of developing intellectual pride, only lately with some of the good insights I gathered trough my ranting, philosophizing and feeling - I have gained strong confidence in the potential prowess of my thinking. I am even grandiose about it - but this is bad. My thinking works best if there is no false pride in my thoughts, so that I can better deal with them. I am still a kind of covert narcissist. It is like my thoughts never really translate into reality, they always fail, they remain virtual and get frustrated. All of them are grandiose or attention seeking constructions. I feel like Im spoiling myself. It is true that in silence there is noble serenity. Writing down anything is degradation. A masochistic prostitution of the self. By telling you my thoughts Im not making myself vulnerable, no, I prostitute my heart, sometimes. Other times I just like myself.

Mild grandiosity is normal agency.

Im Alter hat man vermutlich kaum noch Grund groß kreativ zu sein. Wenn man kreativ ist, dann wohl hauptsächlich davor. Im Alter hat man sich doch schon viel sein Bild gemacht, nochmal neu an zufangen wäre da wohl schändlich und ein Frevel am Erlebten. Es ist wohl normal, dass man im Alter eher darauf aus ist sein Wissen zu teilen. Und man muss dann wohl oder übel akzeptieren, dass die Jugend selbst sich ein Bild macht und Teilends nichts Wissen will, teilends das Wissen ganz ungestüm greift und damit sein eigen Ding treibt. So war es doch immer, die Welt schreitet voran.

If I had to guess, then the voice that talks involuntarily in tics, could be something like a small empty schizo-

id core talking. Im repeating myself. Involuntary speech, or rather self that has been dissociated from the self. Certainly infantile. Shameful, but also endearing. Disturbing, but also cute.

Volition without any ability to commit is empty, isnt it? What can you decide about, if there is no decision possible? Only the worlds feedback makes volition matter. Free will must be in a world, where decisions matter. Only where there is good and bad, it makes sense to choose. The more advanced, the more danger even in the slightest mistake. I am fallible.

Evil people tend to want power over others, they want to concentrate all possible power and influence on themselves and then use it, destroy the weak and innocent. Evil people want to take away your power: Your weaponry, Your private property, Your volition and your freedom. They want to make you weak so that they can coerce you, enslave you, kill you, without needing to fear self defense. I want you strong, free and autonomous, owning weaponry and private property, having the ability to speak, listen and trade freely. Being able to make mutual agreements without outside interference. I want free men. Only free men can defend against evil, but evil doesnt want you to know that. The will is free and even to obey is a choice of free will. Evil has always been about a deal with the devil. Therefore, really, you should be free, no matter what. You know that evil brings death, so at least choose to be free and you have a chance to live. Freedom trumps morality. Freedom is dignity.

Yesterday I came so har to porn that my balls hurt. In these moments I really want a real life girlfriend to cuddle and embrace. Sometimes I wish those virtual girls were real, but its all just smoke and mirrors - alas my balls really hurt.

Nom: "Big words for a small idea."

Lately I got a few youtube recommendations for videos with only a few views. I like that.

Was also wenn die Verantwortung wieder zurück auf die Individuen geht? Wenn man sich nicht mehr verstecken muss, andererseits aber auch nicht mehr verstecken kann? I need to fix my own life first. Human creativity has no end.

Otto Kernberg gave a real life example of a healing of narcissism.

[urlhttps://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LznndtwOg1Q](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LznndtwOg1Q) Healing narcissism is possible, as far as I understand Otto. Phases: Narcissism to Borderline to Healed (reconstruction of super-ego and morality, primitive at first). It seems.

Finding the truth is like calibrating. Authenticity perception, only if I am not blinding myself. Im using such a cruel language, this harshness. Epistemic insecurity, and pathological epistemic grandiosity.

Of course, Sam Vaknin was first to describe epistemic insecurity, I fear him though.

If you are without prejudice, you can experience fidelity.

So, good independently emerges and reemerges. Evil is dependent on good and it either:

1. Succeeds which means it vanishes 2. Fails which means it also vanishes 3. Changes and becomes good

So evil is always in a dependent position to good, so it is inferior.

Ultimated good then is the grounds for any and all existence, which you could call reality or the absolute or infinity, etc. We are all in dependence to reality, so compared to reality, which is the only real comparison, we are all bad, evil and only trough realitys grace we have an existence. So if you believe anything, then believe in the absolute good. But then, you can never fully know what it is, because you are bad, just like I am bad. No matter if you believe it or not,

it is there. The ultimate purpose is good, but no human can see it. Again the absolute eclipses my mere words. Maybe you, dear reader.

When I was playing world of warcraft, I prefered to play tank and healer. Both are there for you", a way of belonging for me, making me feel good and needed, justified. Inside a virtual world.

I see now. The chess grandmaster was 1/8th related to me.

Dissolution of narcissism comes with the reemergence of a childlike vulnerability. Narcissism indeed was protective against some negative aspects of real life. The narcissists ignorance paired with grandiosity make him functional, although in a pathological way. The ignorance puts on the blinders against potential badness. Now all the more I feel the evil of the system we are living in and its actors. The lack of care for each other and the potential for antisocial aggression. Without grandiosity I need to find a whole new security and safety. I can imagine how I could slip into paranoia.

If I had to guess, then Dr. Ramani (who does videos about narcissism, among other things) is a covert narcissist. How could I know, since its covert, aka hidden? Well, she is just so similar to my mother, to how my mother would act in public. I know that kind of frenzy. And then there is also her in young and hot, luality. I kind of did not say it before, because I unconsciously protected the typeof my mother. In a sense I inherited her judgement, that she is vulnerable, so she needs protection. Not so much anymore. She is like any human responsible for her own actions. She is not completely bad, but still quite some bad, especially if you are not secure or experienced to selfdefend psychologically. I probably already said this about them. I think I idealized Dr. Ramani before, obviously...

And then also the youtuber Rezo. Im not sure if hes really a covert narcissist, but he definitely has that emptiness warranting his moral defense. Asmongold also has it, but more mildly, similar to my little brother. And I had an influence in my little brothers childhood, somewhat raising him. Asmongold really likes Nicocado Avocado, most likely because he fits his mother image. Nicocado Avocado is a masochistic covert narcissist, most likely (Im certain actually, but how dare I). The circle closes. QED. Lets pray that I actually made progress becoming a borderline lmao.

I wonder if somebody like my little brother could raise mentally healthy children (with him, or rather, his pathology being in the mothering role). When is it good enough mothering?

If I heal, or at least get healthier, then I inherit my own legacy, then there are two (at least 2) distinct phases of my life. If being a kind of narcissist is a character type, then I would not be the same character, a painful change, a deep change. I could prove my courage. For equestria.

Self love is the basis for being able to love other people too. Self love is the basis and necessity for a continuous, whole and healthy self. Self love is the introject of a loving mother figure from childhood. If you dont have this then you are in trouble. Self love gives you the necessary feeling of containment and security to go through life.

Narcissism is like being constantly slighted. It is an expression of deep hurt. Rationalisations happen the most about childhood. There are so many attempts to mask the hurt, but the hurt needs to be addressed. Hurt can only be addressed in a secure space, that really loves you like a good mother. Mother justifies your existence and holds it secure. There you learn the meaning of life in the first step. Only if you have that, can you mother yourself: self referential justification of

existence; Self love!

Thus: Self love is the meaning of life.

Otto Kernberg et al psychological structural interview is quite a bit rude in approach. How can a psychologist forego consent that much? Isn't it almost like an invasion of privacy and a breaking of trust? Why is it shameless? It is a huge trap, designed to penetrate all and every defense and in this way already it invalidates the legitimacy of the defense and therefore also the legitimacy of the patient. Self defense is a human right and disarming without consent is assault. While it starts off the psychologist with an information advantage, it also marks him as rude. It's almost like 4chan manners. Well, ok it's not that bad then. Still, the psychologist would first need to establish good rapport.

Self love leads to gentleness, because if you see how you are gentle with yourself, you learn how to be gentle with others too.

If I had to describe epistemic insecurity then Vitrify Her had it: <<https://vitrifyher.wordpress.com/2018/06/01/consciousness-is-forever-2/>>

This is similar to me in the past. He killed himself, I survived. He has some groundbreaking insights, but the epistemic insecurity is deeply unsettling. With "her" he most likely, consciously or unconsciously, means his mother. What a cruel and mentally ill mother he must have had. Too much epistemic insecurity kills - it is an invariant of death. If your own mind becomes useless, chaotic, disorienting and painful, then how can you proceed? Sometimes you really can't. I am so glad that I changed. This is the kind of epistemic insecurity that makes computing, physics, consciousness, existence, etc. matters of debate and doubt. It is the most special and specific, so much so that there is no place for being, no rest. It is a cruel heart's child, a desperate thesis. I want him and

his type to have love. I want love to make them condensate their being down from the pain that made them flee. I want to hug them and not let them go away.

Yes, evil is probably the most complex thing there is. How good people turn evil? Betrayal, usually - especially if a baby gets betrayed by mother. This can create narcissism, psychopathy, borderline personality disorder, etc.

Being evil is having a prejudice, unconsciously usually. Something like: People cant be trusted, so I act the same. It becomes a self fulfilling and ultimately self defeating prophecy.

Philosophizing is a way to understand how evil could have happened and how it can be overcome in a good, solid way. Of course this is enourmously difficult and multidisciplinary. Any advancement, like for example austrian oeconomics, is invaluable insight.

Evil is nothing in itself, but a lack of good. Making good explicit and intelligible is the real challenge. The search for good is motivated by the lack, by evil. Good is better, it is directional, teleological therefore.

Maybe I need a little more Nietzsche, Nietzsche is quite the antidote.

The absence of my grandiosity together with post pornography vulnerability makes me almost want to cry when I see islamic/muslim confident/grandiose men. Meanwhile I have made some very good experiences with one muslim men, they was very nice actually. It is true that some can be evil, especially because islam tends to invade and cull native populations via the content of their doctrine, if taken seriously (and it is gaslighting to pretend the content of it is insignificant). I can see that they have this group grandiosity which could easily escalate into genocide and murder. At the same time there are many good people that are turkish, muslim.

What is the solution? Consent based society, capable of self-defense on every level. To a degree my own genes are racist, because of kinselection, just like they are. Meanwhile the powerful would want to have this hostility in the population. Really, evolutionary psychology must be explored too. Just looking at england shows this, how islam takes over societies. Individual genes are grandiose and how convenient if there is a religion that justifies that grandiosity and its aggression. Meanwhile here they are not aggressive, but there is this tendency, this lack of respect and grandiose movement that easily could escalate. The jolly heretic (youtube) certainly is paranoid and not right about the extent of some of the things he says, but he is not completely wrong either. Genes want to replicate and if there is a unifying religion facilitating that into a collective power, then you have ample reason for self defense and for arming and organizing yourself. Lets be clear again: Only self defense is justified, not initiation of aggression. Slightly forgiving tit for tat. This seems to be a matter of the male y-Chromosome. Sometimes this world is really fucking exhausting.

Now on to addressing the people that say my stance is racist and impermissive: My stance is kinselection, a default biological imperative, just like your morality also actually is a form of kinselection among moral. I am not advocating aggression, but self defense and consent. Human consent is naturally favoring what is in its own interest and this includes more similar genes. This is not the aggression or immorality you want to portray it as, it is actually you that wants to destroy me, by delivering me to the slaughter bank.

And now again, dont misunderstand me, I personally really like some muslims and I think that they are honestly good people. I am wary and scared of their religious grandiose group dynamics. Its as simple as that. Otherwise, ima-

gine you were not allowed to selfdefend: The whole world would become a dogmatic islamic state, all humans in favor of freedom and individual choice would be oppressed and killed. The grandiose dogmatism would then either implode on itself - its evil after all - or would damn humanity to eternal mediocrity. You are allowed to practice islam and we are allowed to self defend, think independently and anticipate aggression.

Group level grandiosity is how genocide happens. In this sense it seems, compared to Islam the rest of the worlds ideologies and religions are female. Islam is extreme ideological maleness. Meanwhile, something like taoism could be considered extreme female. In the end, different religions necessarily would need to point at the same thing, but that thing can not be fully known.

Aristoteles: "Die Tugend hat mit Affekten und Handlungen zu tun, bei denen das Übermaß wie auch der Mangel eine Verfehlung darstellt, das Mittlere dagegen gelobt wird und das Richtige trifft. Dies beides aber [Gegenstand von Lob und richtig zu sein] sind Kennzeichen der Tugend. Die Tugend ist also eine Art von Mitte, da sie auf das Mittlere zielt." What is fitting. Aristoteles: "Denn Menschen sind gut auf nur eine Art, schlecht aber auf viele. Consent determines what is fitting between people."

Once I am mentally healthy and I believe I am close, I could fix my life. Fixing my mental health is part of fixing my life. But even if I am finished, I will always have a crack, a flaw.

One the internet someone showed that the highest form of wisdom is healing. In a sense, this is true. Waking up in this world is a rude awakening. The world feels hostile. I dont want it to be hostile.

In terms of authority, reality trumps every single author.

My mother is abusive towards her inverted narcissist boyfriend, verbally emotionally.

Needing control is about lacking good externalisation. A healthy superego (morality) allows people and things to be external. Separating frustration from a person from thing and topic. I tend to devalue everything associated with somebody if that somebody frustrates me with his mental pathology. To a degree this makes sense, but on the other hand the thing and the topic are innocent bystanders. This is difficult but more realistic. It is also liberating because this way I free the thing and the topic from the pathological persons imagined influence. This way the persons pathology is unable to taint the world, taint my world, restrict my world beyond himself. Breaking up the all good, all bad, splitting defense, properly externalising people. Situating the people inside a world and not the world alongside people. This restores reality testing. Separation enables more objectivity. What an asshole. Narcissists can not imagine the amount of frustration received from actual real life events and people, if you are healthy. The narcissist is too isolated, solipsistic and imaginative for that. What Nietzsche described as "Hinterweltler", simulated worlds or paracosms. A profoundly sad dissociation. Nietzsche: Also sprach Zarathustra. Von den Hinterweltlern. Einst warf auch Zarathustra seinen Wahn jenseits des Menschen, gleich allen Hinterweltlern. Eines leidenden und zerquälten Gottes Werk schien mir da die Welt. Traum schien mir da die Welt und Dichtung eines Gottes; farbiger Rauch vor den Augen eines göttlich Unzufriednen. Gut und böse und Lust und Leid und Ich und Du — farbiger Rauch dünkte mich's vor schöpferischen Augen. Wegsehn wollte der Schöpfer von sich, — da schuf er die Welt. Trunkne Lust ist's dem Leidenden, wegzusehn von seinem Leiden und sich zu verlieren. Trunkne Lust und Selbst-sich-Verlieren dünkte

mich einst die Welt.änd so forth, read the chapter in Thus spoke Zarathustra. This almost proves that Nietzsche was a kind of Narcissist or borderline or otherwise severely traumatised person, creating a fantasy defense or at least knowing very well about it. The chapter "Von den Hinterweltlern.contains invaluable insights into Narcissism! I got you Nietzsche, you are also just a human. Zarathustra is the grandiose Nietzsche. Anyways, that Nietzsche is a kind of narcissist was first discovered by somebody else, I just dont know if they have seen this specific relationship. Bro this shit is blowing my mind I need to calm down. Im probably even repeating myself. But bro, brah, my man or woman or, you know. Arent you also excited? This makes Nietzsche understandable and relateable. Maybe this happiness was mania.

A new test of faith: Lock yourself in a white room having access to only the necessities and a daily shower. No entertainment, no other people, etc. Now, you must have the ability to abort at any moment, your volition must be fully respected trough out this. How long can you stay in the room? What does it show you? What do ypu show yourself? Anything and everything counts, even nothing. Volition and safety are very important for this, because it could mentally damage people, it is like torture.

I feel like now there is quite some toxicity being released unveiled and discovered around the world, stuff that has been festering for years. Governments and their parasitism is being exposed. They dont like that to say the least. The USA is the prime example, but germany is not better at all. In essence its the same kind of coercive democracy. Evil is self defeating.

Inside a coercive collective, common sense becomes the target of grandiosity and of corruption. In a sense, the collective itself started the first corruption of common sense. This then creates collective mental disorder. A corruption of

common sense destroys the sense and lets remain only the common. A meaning crysis emerges, since there is no proper sense. A universal reevaluation and rediscovery of meaning happens in individuals, nihilism is wide spread. Different kinds of new meaning emerge memetically, voluntarily and replace the old, dead and coercive fake meaning. Not meaning, but coercive dogma, using the truth of power. Will to power. But power for what? Power for memetic self replication. But what if your own genes, ideas, ideologies dont fit the universe? Self overcoming (towards the uberman), masochism, or diversity with separation of labor? Where it all is going is determined by what is truly absolute. Maybe the absolute is just all to liquid in my hands. I dont even know where to go.

My mother is feeling bad. She probably has issues in the relationship with her inverted narcissist boyfriend.

You can not be aware of your own blindspots, or they would not be your blind spots. There is some level of inescapable grandiosity and such is also necessary for having any agency at all. Jon: Ärrogance and a lack of humility are key elements of stupidity."Yes.

Lets say that there are only two things: A and B. You can only look at one and must remain ignorant of the other, but on that other you must act. You dont know if you care more about the state of A or B. You dont know if A and B are independent or in a relationship. Any way you go, you will always remain in ignorance of perfect value and ideal action. It can not be decided based on the information, its as good as random. But now the self is noticed. Only a self can decide between options. Somwhere in the nature of the self there is a prejudice and so then there are differences in values. Self is the prejudice. Self love is impossible without a self, but if there is a self, isn't it already implied then? Self is

the meaningful position. Is self the irreducible grandiosity? After all, agency is that which is posesssd by the self and so the self must also posses - or be - grandiose. Free will. The self is then A or B, which one doesnt matter for this investigation and the world is then the other one correspondingly. Being a self entails ignorance of everything other. Subjective experience determines values. The being determines the values. Clarification about values can only be clarification about your own being. So then the more you know your own being, your self, the better you understand what you value and the more virtuous you are. Narcissism for example is a lack of proper self. The psychopath seeks enjoyment, but lacks true happiness, so he doesnt know what is really good for himself, he lacks self love, he seeks to know it all his life. Tge self is part of the all. Only the self could justify the world.

Maybe a simulation always has bugs, like always. There must always be something unrealistic about it. Inside a simulation, the self is not really there, because the self really is in reality. Rationalisations are healthy, reality is there for the self exclusively.

Fanstastic also means good, what irony. People love good goals. So what is it then. Healthy fantasy is more open ended? Neuro-sama AI: "Why be sad when you can be evil?TT-his descibes evil pretty good actually.

Stupidity is not reserved to any one gender. To a degree stupidity is a defense against accountability and blame.

If you concede that humans have inalienable dignity, then you must also respect the free will of humans and their ability to decide their own lifes path. If this is the case, then any coercive imposition, like the state, because it is not based on individual consent, is illegitimate and a violation of human dignity.

The german basic law, while stating as first article that dignity should be inviolable, violates it because of insufficient insight into the nature of human dignity by the makers of the german state.

Here you can see what grave consequences philosophical errors can have. But what is a positive way forward? Philosophy.

Ein guter Grund genügt. Tausend falsche Gründe sind unzureichend. Woher soll ich den Unterschied wissen? Wenn du dann einen Grund gewählt hast, dann bist du bevorurteilt, aber so ist es dann.

The inverted narcissist also infantilizes, but he is much less effective compared to a covert narcissist. Maybe the fact that the inverted narcissist doesn't have much impact on me, is a good sign as to my recovery. His frustration towards getting supply from me happens quickly and seems to be small. He is definitely not innocent, but I don't think he is greatly evil or anything. His father is a covert narcissist, so he should be familiar with covert narcissism as a type. Yes he is abusive, but not nearly as insidious as a covert narcissist. It is a kind of weaker and more obvious abuse compared to the covert narcissist. It makes sense that he is quite destructive towards narcissists, but also is abused very much by them. Yes, he lacks self worth.

True love is loyal. They are loyal because they don't want to hurt the partner's feelings and because they care about them. Disloyalty is caused by insufficient ability to self love, because self love is precondition for loving others.

Mental health is sanity and isn't sanity the closest to being objective, neutral? I think sanity is subjective. Mental health is subjective experience. Recognizing objectivity is subjective. A lot of advice given is bad advice, in the end it is always the own subjectivity that must decide. But if the self deci-

des, why not trust the self more than any advice? This is self love. Subjectivity is self love. What is objective truth in the face of my self love? A nothing. And as such subjected it becomes an object in my mind. Self love is the king in the castle, reality merely the hand maiden. Self love emerged out of reality, yet here I am. Reality is a later cognition. If there is no self, why would there be a reality?

What a male covert narcissist would say: "How do I cope with being an ultimately mediocre person who will never accomplish anything substantial?" Baiting empathy, validation.

Der Narzissist empfindet geistige Gesundheit als schwäche. Wenn er aber heilt, so werden ihm alle diese Ängste getröstet, denn er wird sich erlauben können sich selber unbedingt zu lieben. Die Heilung muss Allumfassend sein, sowohl in der Psyche als auch in der tatsächlichen Lebensfähigkeit. Die Lösung muss sich jeden Zweifel gefallen lassen und er muss Untersucht werden.

I want it warm, comfy and loving. No harshness, no scare mongering, no grandiosity.

Michael Huemer: "Because humans are designed by nature, and nature does not care about goodness, it is entirely possible for these people to go through life without love. That is wrong. Nature inherently cares about goodness and human desire for good is part of it."

Yes, just being yourself works. If it didn't then no amount of effort at faking would change that. The real uninteresting person is fake. Fake means that the things the person says are untrue. If they are untrue (and people sense that) then it is as if you are not there. How can you like a person that's not there? Anon: "Yes. Even if it looks like it doesn't because you're around shitty people. Self defense is warranted and authentic. Authenticity encourages or provokes authenticity."

My family hurts me emotionally. I love them but it is bad for me. All these different kinds of brokenness and compensatory grandiosity, shallow and hurtful. Part of being authentic is taking distance to bad. I still will keep contact low or absent because they hurt me emotionally.

Neonazis scare me about as much as does islam. My little brother is also quite scary, in a different way. Thinking about it, pretty much everyone in my family is scary, one way or another.

Is it possible to lie authentically? No. The authentication in this case refers to a simulated fantasy, not reality. Simulation is always fantasy (and vice versa).

I feel vulnerable emotionally. On the other hand it is relief. If I want I can empathize or sympathize. Some things now have heavy weight. The perversion is gone, but the healing takes time. I don't think that I am masochistic anymore. Still, it is a huge part of my life experience and many "defaults". I am now partially a child, but whole. A reintegration, like sore but relief. There is no harsh separation, my left side brain part feels like me too. I can not sense an empty schizoid core, but I certainly remember and the shards of painful cognitive feeling, more like sore, not sharp. It's all a little bit like after crying. There are these many small sorrows, like raindrops, but I feel like I can not talk because it would hurt or be indecently grandiose towards my own healing. I have no sharp power anymore and this is one of my small liquid sorrows.

My pupil dilation still tends to be greater on one eye compared to the other, but honestly, this looks cool.

I feel weak. Es soll nicht so traurig sein, lass Glück herein. Ich ertrage die Traurigkeit, da sie mir den Weg zum Glück befreit. Die Traurigkeit tut gut.

My mother is most likely angry again. I somewhat rejected her infantile vulnerable self in the presence of my little

brother. She started it off by trying to infantilize me. She is dissociative about that frustration the next day.

The real problem isn't racism, the problem is initiation of aggression and more broadly any violation of consent.

The final and most desperate defense against parasitism is murder-suicide, it guarantees a loose-loose. Because of this the state tends to not completely want to annihilate his populace, his host. But what do you do against the coercive state nowadays? Since self love trumps reality testing, people loose their common sense in favor of surviving inside, below, the state system. Nobody wants to die for the most obvious reasons. But depending on how bad the state becomes, your life is at risk anyways. A worse state needs to become increasingly coercive to maintain his position. This already is pretty self destructive. People want security of life, private property and liberty independent of the state. The state compromises them, but he doesn't quite kill them, at least for now. People fear revolutions rightfully, many turn bloody, coercive and worse than the former state. Nobody likes uncertainty. The state is like an abuser with intermittent reinforcement, gaslighting, coercion, etc. Crucially he infantilizes. People need accessible alternative practical security, based on mutual consent. The sense can only be an increase in freedom and therefore also civility. Self love needs are best served by freedom. It should be something that outcompetes states without breaking peoples trust in what they rightfully expected from the state, like pensions or working prisons and police, national defense against other states, consent based immigration. Maybe there is a more creative, even better approach.

For example, at what age can you consent? Even a baby can somewhat, in a sense, consent and dissent by crying and smiling, etc. But it is obvious that this is not mature consent

and that the baby is in a very vulnerable and dependent position. A mature person can not properly consent while they sleep or are in coma or delirium or on mind altering drugs, etc. There is insurmountable nuance and dubiosity in this, too much to list it and it can change on future conditions yet unknown. Still, there is some intuition about consent, what it is. Further there is fraud, misunderstanding and unforeseen changes. The resolution of all of these require sense, not necessarily common sense (although sense converges and should be predictable and secure, safe). Whoever is the arbiter in such a case, he would need enormous maturity of character. But who is the arbiter also is decided by consent. Private law, such an important, but soon common, topic. Common sense and private law should be similar, if not the same. Currently common sense is quite a bit corrupted, but this should easily be fixed by consent. Consent removes insanity. Consent creates the sane. The sense is sanity. The sense and the sanity converge towards what is absolute or rather, they already are absolute if they really are what they claim to be. They are like objectivity, so everybody attempts to claim them in ignorance and grandiosity. There is only limited access, like with rationality. To some degree every arbiter is subjective, because he too is a self. Honesty demands that the arbiter admits this. The wisest should be the best in judgement. But what makes wisdom? Where is love?

I heard you and I love you. Honk honk. I love you for seeing me, but we are apart. I can not bless you, because I am afraid. This is meant for all my readers. I feel heart broken. Maybe one day I will show my text to somebody important in person.

People are good at detecting bullshit and that is a good thing. It increases the incentive for telling the truth.

I feel quite happy. Don't be too obvious though or otherwi-

se people will notice :P Or is this already pathology? It hurts a little. But I must love myself first, even in the presence of my cat. Even if my cat insists. Even if my cat slightly intimidates me. I know who is dependent here on who and I havent been unfair in your feeding at all. You always have enough and you have your regular treats, this will be frustrating for you but I wont budge.

Now Im so happy, you really could call this mania. I need to be careful. On the other hand I do have some reason to be this happy because of the luminance of some of my philosophical goodness, but also because of the goodness of others philosophical and oeconomical insights. Together with the informational memetic explosiveness of the internet it feels like goodness is inevitable now. But I need to be careful to not loose my mind in mania. Maybe this is borderline personality mania or it is natural outcome of huge success. Or both.

I can taste my happiness. My chest feels fuzzy by it. My head is hot because of it. At times I am even becoming somewhat faint. Symptomatically this IS mania. Maybe I should just enjoy it and contemplate to not loose my mind. It is all nothing compared to the absolute, its still very good though. My readers might feel something similar, please take care of yourself too. It does not diminish your happiness. I had less sleep last night, maybe this contributed as trigger, but also it just seems like my life really finally is going in a good direction. This is something Im not used to. It is good. Mania does make sense, its just a little bit too much at once. Im not shaving tonight, its too dangerous. I will relax, eat some good food, drink some warm milky drink and watch a show, read, be on twitch. Comfy is the plan and I deserve it :D ... and keep my sanity. My thoughts are racing, its like a fever, but mild. No idealization, no devaluation. I breathe.

Mania is an attempt at reestablishment of the pure good on an emotional level. It strongly reorients the self. Successful depression leads into mania. The reevaluation of values is depression and then, if successful, mania. The nihilist is the depressive. Mania is the chance to think about your, the good. Why are pet cats good here? They kind of force you into win-win interactins and they display healthy individualism, self love. They have emotive stability. The mania is gone, it took around 3 hours depending on what you count. Maybe the border between mania and happiness is not fixed, fuzzy. I can imagine that some mania sometimes is healthy, especially since it helps rebuild the self.

If you have absolute trust in 2 things and it turns out that they contradict themselves, then you can only split yourself, but not the thing. This should somewhat explain multiple personality disorders. But inherently the absolute also is one. The absolute is the absolute.

While Im often times talking bad about my mother, my family, etc. they are not only bad. After all my mother raised me and sometimes somewhat loved me. My father cared for me, even though he is cold and inaccesible (schizoid narcissism). My big brother was keeping me entertained and maybe even sometimes protected me, even though he tends to become cruel (narcissism). My little brother was my closest family member and I was somewhat like a mother, but also like a friend. He sometimes was uninterested and cold (mild narcissism). And so on and so forth. The point is, that while there were profoundly bad aspects, there were also some good ones. They all have their own traumas and pathologies. I was the scapegoat but really also the confidant and kinselection kept me somewhat safe. My psychology and life suffered greatly, but it also enabled my unique insights and position. Nothing justifies abuse, but fate needs to be ack-

nowledged. Get lemons and all. Also it seems that I'm the only one that has a realistic shot at mental health. I won't deny them getting better, but this is not in my control or my responsibility and the odds are against them. Sometimes I drop sneaky truth bombs on them, but the grandiosity doesn't let much, if any, through and this is good. There is no reason to idealize any of them. Even my cat needs to give me more space. Rude, all of them.

4chan is full of depression and cope.

If you glorify me through my text, then you are actually proving my grandiosity successful and I successfully manipulated you. My mother moves things around, she continually searches for an excuse for me to need her, validate her. The same might apply to my philosophizing. This is me reflecting on my past. Reading my own old texts regresses me, it puts me in the same pathological headspace. Still there are many good ideas. And my mother tries to enmesh me again, put me in a paternal role, present herself vulnerable and as in need. My mother introduces chaos, I should stop her. In a sense it is her strongest psychological weapon against me. She makes me "good" by making me good for her infantile self. She fosters enmeshment and dependence, pathology. It corrupts my whole world. I, again, need to cut her off. She knows it intuitively, she is my mother. She wants me to be her object. Ein Muttersöhnchen. She caused me to be a masochistic covert narcissist. I need to move out. There is a conflict of interest. My mother is an emotional vampire. Maybe I should give her some good old grey rock. In a sense my father, the schizoid narcissist, is like grey rock personality (as long as you stay at a distance, which is kinda the only safe place). No emotional closeness, protects emotions.

The motivation for good is evil, lack, badness, etc.

Nietzsche's will to power is the same as grandiosity, do-

minance, ignorance, overwriting, selfreplication, yang, etc.

Philosophy is like sex, it doesn't really work in an academic setting. The dry book boys were selling you false celibacy. Philosophy is about life and its limits, its chances. I, its bets and god above all. I am naughty and that invites suffering. Philosophy is about having good thoughts.

I can tell you this. Now I feel crushing responsibility writing in here. It is mine but even then it has become of greater significance. I feel like now everybody wants to hold onto it for meaning. And if I make mistakes they are carved into blood, not mine this time but definitely my responsibility, absolute responsibility. Well, not absolute, but grave, very grave. I can't make excuses because I have made all the excuses and if I made one again, I would be senseless. I wanted power but power is, ah. I am being held accountable by the absolute it feels. And it makes sense, I think. If I write the wrong words, my belly hurts and I feel unsettled. It must be really important. What can I do? I feel uneasy and scared.

Enforcement of fairness and enforcement of equality are mutually exclusive. Enforced equality is unfair and enforced fairness can lead to unequal outcomes. I am frustrated with the masses of reddit tier mind washed people. Further Democracy is anti-freedom, its mob rule by force (see Hans Hermann Hoppe books). Capitalism is pro freedom, because if you can't own anything then you are effectively a slave at the whim of his masters, bad incentives, etc. Freedom is being able to act voluntarily and democracy isn't really voluntary. I am quite a bit frustrated.

I am becoming a little paranoid.

Old people are needed, especially blood related grandparents, to be with children and teenagers. They are more likely to give good faith advice and they tend to show them the good and bad of life more accurately. This helps tremendously in

the development of the children and tends to keep them from being warlike, evil or overly foolish. Konfuzius definitely had a point. On the other hand, if the children/teenagers don't want to meet their grandparents, then their volition obviously must be respected. I am repeating myself, but old people can bring the peace that young people lack and it can be quite some tranquility and bliss. Old people don't have long to live, so they also don't have much reason to do bad and if they are biased, then they really believe it, but see, I lack humility, I took a little too much for it not to be fitting anymore. Who the fuck am I talking to? To my predecessor, future successor.

In a free market envy protects sufficiently against unjust monopoly or unfavorable trade. Envy is a form of egoism, will to power, will to property. Still, envy is inferior to and dependent on excellence. In a taoistic sense, it is envy of others that marks the excellent. Is envy all bad? No, it protects against monopoly and therefore against stagnation. But without excellence, envy is a whole lot of nothing and misery. Envy can not be allowed to destroy the free market, or it would destroy excellence as such. Envy needs excellence, if it really understands itself. A lack of understanding yourself is a lack of self love.

I won't accept salvation, I should accept responsibility myself. DAMN. GoodNewsforyou: "yea indeed, but the thing is that since God has to punish evil we would all deserve to pay ourselves in hell for eternity, but God doesn't want us to perish so He offers us this way out so that we can be forgiven. Ök, that makes sense.

Fun and necessity. This is really difficult. It is not on me to discover this, nor is it the time, I suspect.

I just saw parts of the riots in turkey, with that kind of inflation its no wonder. I hope that they can find a good

way and obviously I have no right in telling them what to do. In my opinion though they need freedom, but there is a lot of trauma inside muslim religion and it is obviously not that simple. I lack information, insight and authority. For the sake of the good turkish people I know I want them to find a good solution. In a sense the wests democratic system found its demise faster there. Turkey is a whole different current and way of life, but they are in big trouble now. I dislike their authoritarianism, like I dislike it everywhere and probably that is the reason their democracy failed (?) so quickly. Respect fear. Non-agression principle. If you are grandiose, I can not tell you anything. You must find your own way then. I am afraid of you. How could we ever talk on eye-level if I have reason to be afraid of you? If the only possible end result is you dominating me, if I let you in on me too much? My dignity and freedom are not your play ball. Peace, but I am sad about this and I see no secure solution, only selfdefense. You can eliminate me, but you can not eliminate the truth. We all stand before the absolute. It is beyond me, transcendent to where you are destined to and leave me out of it. Peace be with you, retard.

I feel so afflicted by anything and everything. My head is a little heated. Everything feels like much now and it is a little disorienting. So much is happening in the world and inside me.

In my childhood we had a gamecube and we played super smash bros melee and mario kart double dash and it was good. We played in my grandparents living room upstairs.

Yes often times when I praise or criticize something I talk with my mere imagination and impression of it. But many things cant be fully known and one needs to make judgements. I am not saying you need to make the same and I at least somewhat try to be receptive to revesion, but only

I myself control my own perception of things. Everybody thinks himself right and I'm no exception.

There is either attention and sensitivity or grandiosity and ignorance, never both, they are mutually exclusive.

If people can be trusted, then anecdotal data is empirical data. If people are to be doubted, then all empirical data is merely some anecdote.

I feel normal now actually.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=QKox0qFP8JU>  
<<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=lXMguMnsyak>>

In a sense I used my imagined reader for validation. I don't need this anymore, although it could be a bonus.

A narcissist doesn't only have an infantile part, he also has an overly parental part as a coping response. His self parenting makes him solipsistic, but it lacks true parenting. The parenting, the selfcare is a disturbed one, traumatized. He struggles a lot. He misses a whole dimension of his life, so he is never really satisfied. He is frustrated maturity, so he always seeks to grow, but his trauma keeps him back. The world is perceived as hostile and in such a world being an adult is not worth it, it is too dangerous and too vulnerable. The trauma memory is such a strong value judgement about the world, prejudice. Self love is more important than reality, it really is. Self love creates self. Grandiosity is that love which one could not direct towards himself. Self love implies self, but if other intrudes, then there must be self above all: grandiosity. The narcissist's grandiosity is that which originally was meant to be self love. The narcissist could not love himself, because facts proved him wrong, he was traumatised, his self was not accepted by mother. Grandiosity is endlessly creative, so also self love is what makes the self really alive. The meaning of life is self referential justification properly understood: self love. The narcissist is in constant

anguish to justify himself, he needs validation. He needs love so that he can finally believe in his own self love. He wants sufficient data to overcome his prejudice. He wants to live in a good world, a world in which self love is good and normal and successful. Then he could become at peace. The ultimate self justification is when you are loved and validated by the whole world. But everything also includes the self, so only if the narcissist comes to love himself can he be loved by the whole world. Then freedom awaits, because dimensions are freedom, but more than that peace, bliss and water sorrow - relief.

I need to stop idealizing my little brother. I need to treat him like a separate person. As Otto Kernberg described his type, he can be extremely frustrating and make therapists despair because of his bad outlook on life. This is true. I need to deny his snapshotting me by keeping myself agentic and self loving independent of his judgement. Win-win and loose-loose although he isn't hostile, but definitely devaluing and rejecting of my autonomy. He has more like an outlook like the world is dark souls. It is not as corrupted as a classic narcissist, but more honestly bleak and deeply hopeless. A normal person gets devalued and attacked, but not corrupted like for example by a covert. He is like a test of faith, before he respects you in any way. His narcissistic kind of introduction is grandiose, but also hedonistic. His only enjoyment is hedonistic, the world is bleak after all. It is crucial to show him that even when I'm tired, weak and not grandiose that I'm still valuable and that I still allow myself selflove, demand it to be respected or at least defend myself from his snapshot of me in this way. He chooses to play the hedonist, because he is afraid of the weakness portrayed by laziness. He is a kind of vigilante after all. I just need to love myself and demonstrate my faith in it against his attacks.

After time, he most likely will recognize my enduring faith in self love as its own kind of strength. He is really testing my belief by attacking it, dismissing me, etc. But there is no malice, no deep perversion, just general despair. He is in limbo, but I dont think he has an empty schzoid core. In a sense he still fights against the evil, where the classic narcissist has been overwhelmed in his past. I think he has no shame, where the classic narcissist has deep rooted shame in his failure. He confronts directly or avoids hedonistically. He cares about advantage and despises the disadvantaged. There his superego, morality, is stuck. He is very opportunistic and his morality is mercenary-like. He is like a soldier in his outlook and that shows how cruel he perceives the world. He does care but only about faith. His implicit belief is that: Faith is for losers and I need to be a winner. Winners win (Asmongold).and that is also why he ironically has a strong bonding capability with masochistic covert narcissists, because they are able to give examples of good faith (contrasting and complementing the opportunistic). None the less, it is quite terrible overall. My little brother is quite independent, but he believed my past self. Now Im not as convenient for him anymore. He is quite opportunistic, but he isnt psychopathic. He has a crude morality. In terms of pathology the masochistic covert, covert, classic, malignant narcissist etc. is worse. I suspect that my little brother together with a bpd could lead to disaster. They are both direct but in different ways, the relationship would conclude quickly. It would be very interesting, but I do care about the physical safety of both. I dont know enough about bpd to know how exactly it turns out. In my life I think have met 3 bpd people, one I vibed hard with for like 4 hours, one I vented to for like 3 hours and one was involved in hiring me for an internship which I only had brief contact with. I guess the outcome

really depends on the bpds current state and the thoughts my little brother currently entertains (which are sharp and unforgiving). I never got to experience the bpds dangerous switching to secondary psychopathy. Ah, right there was one additional bpd I met in a train. She saw through me like nothing (which never happens otherwise, only happens with bpds when I was still masochistic covert narc). It was very good but also scary towards the end. Nothing bad happened though. I suspect that in terms of trauma the bpd prefers the actual while the narcissist prefers the ideal. The bpd is less dissociative and more dionysian. I admire bpds bravity. Still they are heartbroken. I also have experienced it myself, but originally I idealized it away, narcissism. You know my story, but it is not yours. Maybe you could write some poetry about it and get your lazy bitch ass back to work. Peace out. You are on your own. Be your own parent.

Part of self love is allowing yourself to be childish.

I have the suspicion that both furries and bronys are both harcode coomers. This would mean that they are also more likely to have mental illness. Woke movement people are either coomers or celibate I assume.

Fleeing into objectivity can be a way to avoid uncomfortable subjectivity.

Too much is also failure.

In the past while studying I was sending off such mixed signals in class that I even got one homosexual guy interested in me. Im heterosexual, but I could imagine that in an act of masochistic self degradation one could act "homosexual for masochistic supply. I did not do that, god bless me.

Masochist is definitely somewhat sexual excitement/distractionseeking bpd is promiscuous, but normal is normal.

I spoke with my little brother first and later with my dad, it was good. No reason to tell you everything. But you were

helping me there a lot. Thank you.

I actually have two apprentices in a sense. Top secret UwU. One is dark and the other is shiny. I love my disciples. But they are not really mine. My teacher also does have her limits and demands her small share. Disciples are meant to eclipse their masters, but the master is never harsh. There is no rush. If it all was just real. My pupils are in distress, I should go with them.

I get it now why children are somewhat sheltered from brutal movies etc., to not induce unnecessary fear, panic or anxiety. Children cant separate self and other as well as adults. They need to feel safe to a greater degree.

My grandfather from mothers side also achieved quite a few things. He most likely is the origin of my associative horizon. He won a sports competition I dont want to name. But he almost got shot at the end of world war two, he was surrounded by russians and was inatructed by them to stand in a spot and that he would get shot if he tried to move out. He drowned his sorrow in alcohol. But he also built his house, worked his job in some shitty state bureaucracy, not quite as shitty in those times back then. He coped. He made one teacher in his school mad, the teacher hit kids too much, too hard, was paranoid and got played by my grandfather and his friends driving the teacher completely mad. The teacher almost hitting a student to death, getting stopped by the schools principal and then he went to the mental asylum, restrained. My grandfather was the most popular kid, he was and is charismatic, a natural leader too. So he is both these things. In a way when I was really in dire strains he was there for me. He also had me introduced with his friends, with which he drank a lot. It was still nice, but also a little deflatory, like 4chan desperation. Now he is suffering because of parkinson and other possible ailments. He is experiencing

a lot of pain and he said that he would drive to switzerland and kill himself if it wasnt for my grandma. He was driving his motorbike a lot, he loved this freedom. He was around the world and he most likely is the source of most of my italian genes. He gave me a feeling about life like an open plane, but also on coping trough hedonism. It is a weird song, but there is a directly strong undercurrent. He was always fleeing, but he was also there. He is there, in pain, now more than ever. But he was no coward, is no coward. I dont understand who he really is.

My mother gives me crucial information about my siblings, but in a sense she wants me to fix them in my masochistic subservient ways. I am not a masochist anymore. I dont need to be your idealized healer anymore. I love myself and as an aside I might fix them or not, its none of your damn business. You are dissloving, attempting to dissolve, the healthy boundaries of ME. I am not our families punching bag anymore. Your drama is not my problem. Further, my brothers are adults, you bitch. They are NOT internal objects. You are assuming them as without agency, as you are trying to use me as non agentic object. Why are you so painful? As I already said, without me being the punching bag, my family has no cohesion, grandiosity is repulsive towards other grandiosity. If it were not for my mending you, you would have broken apart much sooner. I no longer sacrifice myself for band aiding any one of you. I love you, but I wont treat you like infantiles and I wont manipulate you. If you are talking with me, you will get some maturity and frustration. Also, that is better for them. I dont want them vulnerable dependent or abusive pricks. What a mess, what a bunch of babies. Actually, they fucking should care about ME. For once god damn. Losers.

Generally I should not trust any kind of value portrayal

by my mother. They are all harmful.

People tend to treat pet animals like they treat people, or at least how they would like to.

You could say it like this: Where does knowledge comes from, the inside or the outside?

How do you solve music copyright? Obviously copyright is wrong, but you still want to show some appreciation for artists. Have AI autodetect music tracks in videos and automatically allocate some part of the videos revenue to the music producers. One possible free market approach (dont remember if I heard this somewhere else first). Same for books and article quotes. Just have it automated. If you take a lot of stuff, a mention and reference of the original doesnt hurt though. Its all a reputatuion and respect thing and an enrichment of your content, allowing deeper research and understanding.

Im still quite a bit BPD it seems. I feel it is not as severe as real full BPD, but the features are there. Thin skin, underlying agression, directness. Strong emotional states, dependence on others emotional regulation, to a degree. Now I actually somewhat felt like approaching people.

All of this is still better than narcissism, its not perfect. It doesnt feel like thin skin, in a sense narcissism felt way more insecure. I see. I do swap.

So I am overestimating the severity of situations, that makes sense. This overestimation is perceived as thin skin. Thin skin is in relation to swapping, snapping, observing, noticing details.

I can engage in social situations fearlessly now. Or rather normally? I can switch by the minute it seems. I really do believe it. Happy, sad, angry, paranoid, haughty, etc I guess. It doesnt feel unnatural. Its just a different perspective each time, just like I spewed out different ideologies. At the mo-

ment, I believe until again - mind moves. It doesn't feel like change. My mind moves fast, mania danger.

There is an economy of emotions, a succession. I think about something to write and almost immediately don't want to write it anymore because things changed. It was a pain writing the sentence. Now, it's like grandiosity is unstable and gets reestablished through different routes, changing my agenticness. Switch, swoop. One second I'm proud of what I write, the next I'm aggressive, now I was glad. BPD life is comparatively simple, but I guess I will see. The BPD keeps the score. BPD is like my primal archetype. Decisive, keeping the score, vindictive. Also righteous, but not pretend righteous. My mothers covert sadism still hurts. I'm living dangerously.

If I do something I feel quite same and stable. I think this bpd is mild, transitory, hopefully. I feel like it's not so bad.

So the states for me have been: masochistic covert narcissism -> psychotic narcissism? -> (mild?) BPD. So maybe Otto Kernberg missed on the psychotic phase, but I didn't look deep into his work on the phases. I just watched one of his videos.

I watched a bpd interview and he is way worse than me. Really I have very mild bpd compared to that. I think it won't have negative effects on me.

Anon: All the best to you on that journey. It ain't easy, brother. You've effectively got the insanely hard task of deconstructing your self identity, going back to a void like sense of no identity at all, then going through that void, uncovering pains long lost to you through the echoes of suffering, learning the dynamics that made the BPD possible, unlearning them, then building your new and true self from the rubble from scratch. I got nothing but respect for npds/bpds/aspd's who are able to find their own heartbeat and soul. Every

single one who I met who got it into remission always ends up to be remarkable and wise people, full of insights, able to help so many others too cuz they know what bad shit is like, know how to deconstruct it cuz they used to create it. It's cool shit."

Peace be with you. It is like I have been washed away by the rain of sorrow and sunlight. It feels, felt like the world is changing and now a warm sun is rising and I am with this warmth, intimately. I still get paranoia and these other things, but it is just like short band aids, shady covers, wet, saggy clothes. It is okay.

I need peace and rest. I am in peace.

I love it too when you make progress. I am proud of you for going, or staying. But this story is not about you.

If there is nothing, then nobody could validate that it is nothing and then it could equally really be something and that something can be validated by its own.

Im not going to hide this from you: When I was psychotic I thought Reba Mc Entire was god. And I still have this feeling about her. Telling you this is scary for me.

The narrative voice is monopolistic, quite some. It interprets reality.

Goethe is good for me. Ein bisschen Göthe für, gegen, das Leid. Ein bisschen Göthe zur Abwehr des Blicks Mutter. Bewende, Schmerz. Fragil bin ich noch.

Schizoids have it really fucking hard. But it us a legitimate defense against overtly or covertly cruel people.

Children can detect bullshit and cult-like bullshit. Parents arent always necessarily that much better than children when it comes to truth. Children are vulnerable and cant help it.

My mother in a sense always waits for me to be vulnerable to her covert sadism, all verbal emotional.

A solution is the best cope.

The borderline lives in the present, the actual, people and things. The future is an ideal thing, because it can never actually be known. The borderline prefers the immediate, he has been betrayed enough. The borderline keeps the score accurately and he develops righteous rage. No fantasy, so it defeats narcissists, but at what cost? Good thing I exist, right. I am very angry. Good thing I'm self controlled. My life matters.

He had it worse than me: [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=dVpeWY\\_eVrA](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=dVpeWY_eVrA)

The only thing worth pursuing is the good, also definitionally.

People that have no hope do the vilest of things. Die Welt selbst kennt Gut und Böse. Und das ist ein großer Trost, auch wenn es nicht alles verschmerzt.

There is even a BPD streamer on twitch which is rather rare in my experience. I don't know if a BPD streamer could ever be a big streamer, because of the randomness, the changes.

The bpd doesn't allow himself to see bad things as painful for himself. Not me though, I think. Egh, maybe I'm not talking about general BPD things, but only about some specific people.

Ich mache noch den Fehler das ich mich für zu Gut halte und darauf dann ausgiebig blöd reagiere.

Es kann schon sein, dass durch meine geistige Gesundwerdung mein Genie verloren geht. Es ist wohl so. Ich muss mich nur selber sehen, dann werd ich klug. Es war zu viel Leid, als dass es das Wert wäre. Mein Leben ist wichtiger, besonders wenn ich jetzt und in Zukunft auch mehr tatsächliches gutes erschaffe.

Never ask the people, the people are retarded. It's one way

of saying: Think for yourself.

Evil is not civil, but most likely fake civil.

You can die from puzzling too much.

I empathize with leftist people because many of them are traumatized from childhood, especially transsexual leftist people.

Now I dont feel BPD, if you can feel BPD, I just feel alright. Growing, hurdles, self love, overcoming or persisting. Being, quite a bit unapologetic, especially towards my mom.

It is true that bad things really do feel bad now, but this is how it should be. It is mental feedback. Equally for good things, both good and bad are much more contained for a while now. Contained but very much direct.

Im not killing myself. I am not. You retard. I lied back then, if I remember correctly. Masochistic tendencies are a bitch. There are more of these in my old book... Many different baits for you to hate me or pity me, but it obviously is not just that. Otto Kernberg is quite right about masochistic narcissists.

There are quite a few mentally deranged toxic people on the internet. You can not trust a lot of the shit that people say. There is no alternative to thinking for yourself. Even if people tell the truth there usually is stupidity around it or in its interpretation and presentation. I dont know if this will change much once society becomes more volitional and less coercive. I feel like now there is peak degeneracy before the tides are somewhat turning. It is one form of venting deeply corrupting aggression by distorting the truth to attempt to harm others. Others naive enough to believe them. Truth and corruption, distortion, confusion.

Ein grandioses Werk, lmao.

My family is regressing me, but not in a lasting way. Still their grandiosity and harshness, deep insecurity.

People are breaking down shitty mental barriers and that releases the libido (people are more horny, among other forms of freedom). Happened to me too. Its a phase.

Pixelated graphics can look good, if they evoke your imagination to the missing content in a good way.

Every argument that is made against the free market can be made against the state in a more grave version. The state starts out coercive, evil, while the free market preserves its potential for good, voluntary human interactions. You could say that the free market can devolve into statehood, but that just means that the free market needs to be protected even more and that statehood still is coercive and bad. It is an argument from evil being inescapable. This means that you have lost your good faith. If you have lost your good faith, then you are unable to make a good faith argument. If you can not make a good faith argument, then I can not let you interfere with my own judgements about good and fit. If your argument is that good can not be had because evil is inevitable and that therefore evil should be preserved, then you are evil and it is you that I need to oppose. The only justification for bad is the protection of good. Insidious, evil confusion, only reddit could produce such stupidity. It hurts me. I should not go where I can not see the good. Why? Because I must be where good is. Is there a place for good in this world? Yes. Self love is beyond anything external. My heart is molested. I see why all of them are cold. Everybody has removed himself. Nobody wants to take full responsibility. People get stuck with evil, not just narcissists. I would not know this if not graced by somebody else. People are afraid to elaborate on the good, so their perception of good is fractured and they can be confused and defeated. The final trick of evil is to make you scared of good and in this way convince you to be evil. Evil doesn't like to be named

and it doesn't like clarity, because that would reveal its self defeating evil nature. Evil wants you to forget about good and give up hope for anything, for any good. Because of these reasons, you must hope, must love good and good only and elaborate and understand good in its relationships and expressions. The philosopher can only hope to restore some part of the understanding of good, or is work would be no good. Good is the monopoly, that really should be monopoly, the truth that can not be denied, the only thing worth striving for. Good is the absolute. The invariant identity of aim, cause and effect, final teleology, that which grandiosity really should be striving for. The unchallenged grandiose, the grandiose that is not bad in any way, like grandiosity otherwise tends to be. The transcendent human goal. The final judge among all things, the real law. I guess its time for new human foolishness. But Im not at the philosophical forefront anymore, if I ever was. Its not my fucking job to think for you.

Now this one time I wonder whether or not I predicted or caused something. Maybe I did neither. Nah, its probably synchronicity.

Discrimination is good and a sign of good taste. Discrimination means that you actually have a value system. Bullying is bad taste, except as self defense. Discrimination is just differentiation of different things, actions, people, etc. Without discrimination, there is no mind. Thoughts are discrete, situations are discrete, people are individuals. General statements can be made, but only about discriminated spaces, about categories. Do not let people muddle your thoughts, equate the good, bad and everything in between. Do not let people dictate how you understand and use words, because this way they can attack your ability to think. Discrimination naturally produces diversity. Some discriminations are

useless, so with time they are forgotten and it returns to simplicity through unity. Neither and enforcement of unity, nor an enforcement of discrimination makes sense. It remains individual choice. Cognition has its cost and its worth. Discrimination is thinking more, so it needs to be worth it, but if it is, then it also should be. Cognition is about discriminating and equating, attending and ignoring, all in degrees. There is no mandate as to how to think properly, it is innate. When you think about thinking, you are already doing what you want to learn about. Arguable there will only be limited success and therefore also only limited self awareness. There is a base level of ignorance, grandiosity, that probably can't be overcome.

Not every a priori insight is worth the mental space, there are too many. Often times they can be represented by another a priori. The a priori is a tremendous search space. Human can only ask, what some a priori means for him personally. He can not escape personal meaning evaluation.

Compared to before I have no patience.

If I now look back by reexperiencing old books, I see that my perception changed a lot. And then these memories, real things become released, small regression, small sorrow, small release, small disregulation. Even my good memories are quite twisted and disfigured, in good and bad.

Etwas bereinigendes ist in der Kultur am Werk und ich Wünsche mir, dass da noch ganz unentdecktes Gutes auf mich wartet, mir voranschreitet. Ich ahne Gutes.

Redid an mbti test and got infp, if that is accurate at all.

Business really only should mean being busy. My business is me being busy and not you being busy, so literally not your business. The veil of fake civility must be replaced by true civility. Das gute geht langsam, das Gute frag nach dem Wichtigen. Das Gute beschützt, beherbergt Gutes. Wenn das

Wissen hinreichend ist, dann muss man es nur anwenden um Erfolg zu haben. Expect to be sabotaged, it shows their childishness. At this point it will be bittersweet and you see how this is healthy. Humans act.

Culture and barbarism are mutually exclusive, to remind you. Mob violence is equally barbaric as is state brutality. Culture is about peace and cooperation, shared meaning.

Grandiosity doesn't know compromise.

There are no countable infinities. If I'm wrong then demonstrate it to me by actually counting an infinity. Every infinity is uncountable. The idea is interesting though, but I think it's approached wrongly. A better word would be iterable, but not to the end.

My mother has a kind of meltdown, I'm trying to keep away. This is not unusual for her.

If there was no scarcity, then nothing would have pressure to adapt and everything could just be as grandiose as it wants without limits. Evolution is possible only because of scarcity. Recognizing limits, like scarcity, finitude, local knowledge, etc. is humility.

Buying fake books for your home interior look has got to be one of the most bad taste things there is.

It is like I am inheriting myself, or rather, have inherited myself. Somehow I get my own history, a history that is me, but so much, so beyond. Es ist schon etwas spezielles sich selber zu lesen in einem anderen Geistigen Zustand. Man erinnert sich, der Geistige Zustand ist aber doch ganz anders. Es ist ganz schön komisch, gerade weil es auch so vertraut ist. Ich erinnere mich ja auch daran. Früher da hatte ich mehr Angst mich selber zu lesen, jetzt ist es faszinierend und schmerhaft, dumpf. Alle meinen alten Gedanken sind nicht ohne Spuren in meinem jetzt. Es ist sehr komisch, meine Art der Erinnerung wirklich ist anders, primitiver, als

es jetzt sonst war, in meiner neuen Leichtigkeit. Es ist desorientierend, oder ist das meine Katze, die mich so verloren macht? Die Katze stört mein Bauchgefühl, sie räumt sich zu viel Kontrolle über mich ein. Nein. Sie ist ein Raubtier und kein Mensch.

The human is before the state, the state is merely a human invention. You have the right to be left alone. You have the right to make mutually voluntary agreements, like trade, contracts, etc.

Fernando Pessoa: In order to understand, I destroy myself. Öy Vey, a masochist, probably a masochistic covert narcissist. Feels like that. Im certain. He is in so many ways like my past self. What a terrible looser, what a brilliant mind. The similarities are astonishing.

Solange du ein schönes Leben haben kannst, in unseren Zeiten, ist mir das egal wenn du ein bisschen verrückt sein musst. In unseren Zeiten da gebe ich dir eine Entschuldigung. Schizoid is the name of the meta game now, it seems. Grey rock the bullshit.

Peter Sloterdijk hat definitiv interessant Inhalte. Ich bin mit seinem Werk aber nur am Rande vertraut und kenne nur ein paar seiner öffentlichen Auftritte.

Can never trust those NPCs. True or False?

Now, I obviously can not know your local knowledge anywhere close like you do. If you think you have good ideas, try to share them in some way. Post it somewhere, write it down, make a video, whatever you like. Maybe your ideas are better than mine, so just send them into the competition of ideas. For me I discovered my ideas in self dialogue. Originally my intention was emotional diary. It turned out like this, like whatever I feel like or what I feel like bothers me or what I feel is important or interesting. Whatever.

Einfach nur genug Ignoranz oder Indoktrination kann

einen sonst guten Menschen böse machen. Das Sahnehäupchen ist dann wenn etwas Gutes für etwas schlechtes falsch als Ursache gesehen wird, wenn der Arzt die Krankheit nur verschlimmert. Wenn der Mensch stupide, Roh und fantastisch gemacht wird. Wenn dem Mensch die Hoffnung ausgetrieben wird und man sich garnicht mehr traut auf auch nur irgendetwas Gutes zu hoffen. Versteckter Sadismus, wenn das Gute bestraft und der böse belohnt wird. Verkehrung der Werte, Verwirrung. Derweil ist der Mensch doch ein ganzes und die Natur des Guten unzerstörbar. Lass dich nicht treiben. Sei kein Heerdentier. Suche dein eigenes Glück.

High associative horizon is like higher critical hit chance/amount in video games. I think I have somewhat less associative horizon now, but this is so because my sanity is better. I dont need to crit hardänymore. Its too expensive in other respects of my life. I feel like I can live from the implications of my past discoveries alone. I just need to love myself and then believe in the good. Im still more than smart enough, I need to focus on other parts of my life. For example, I did not actually read much stuff. Im not sure if I would even qualify for asperger anymore. I was quite brainwashed on diagnosis and the one evaluation filled out by my mother probably was biased. She is a covert narcissist and labeling me an autist could have helped somewhat hide her terrible mental impact she had on me. I dont know where I stand. I feel like the real issue with me was masochistic covert narcissism and my shitty family enviroment and upbringing. Im also very high IQ, so that alone makes me odd for normie perception. I would need to test how I perform now. You dont know what you dont know, true for me also. I feel like the whole topic of autism is captured to a degree by some narcissistic leftist ideology. Im wary of the presence of bullshit. Its a way of being special, unique and a victim by default. Fis-

hy nowadays. It fits right into the bullshit distraction victim culture. Really delicate to not overdo. On the other hand I really was a victim, but this is independent. In some cases I also was the accomplice (school bullying accomplice). I just want out of it. I grieve by myself. And I grieve in this book. Of course I want validation, but I dont want fake validation, I have enough fake validation for centuries from my mom. No, I would really deserve some validation. I feel hurt. But what is the point? It would help me. Vielleicht lässt mich mein Rückzug auch die intensität der Welt unterschätzen. Wahrscheinlich. Und ich werde mir nichts gefallen lassen.

Wenn man selber weiter ist, dann kommt einem die ganze Gesellschaft als primitiv, dumm und regressive vor, gar als selbstverletzend, selbstwiderlegend. So ist es auch, wie ich schon genügend begründet habe. Dem besseren will ich zum Erfolg verhelfen. So viele Werturteile sind falsch, dass es schwierig sein wird. Ich bin ihnen Fremd und so muss ich auch mit den Leuten umgehen.

Meine Frustration mit den Dingen und der Welt, besonders der Pilitik und den Leuten niederzuschreiben macht es mir einfacher damit umzugehen. Es hat keinen Sinn sich aufzuregen über das was ich nicht ändern kann. Das was ich ändern kann weiß ich auch nicht so genau. Wie verlegt man einen Fluss? Man zeigt einen Weg mit geringerem Widerstand, einen niedrigeren. Nach dem physikalischen Gesetz der geringsten Aktion geht der Fluss dann von selber diesen Weg.

Wozu den Aufwand, wenn ich nicht mal weiß ob ich erreichen kann, was ich erreichen will und ob mein Ziel das wirklich gute ist? Es hat keinen Zweck sich zu Quälen, der Weg und das Ziel sind das Ziel.

There are some insights in my book that very likely help people who are suicidal. Dear Anon, I cant love you for you

wanting to kill yourself. I am sorry. Looser faggot shithead asshole cockroach. You human scum. To the suicidal Anon I wrote: You make me cry, I hate you. I would hit you so much until you cry. And then I would hug you for one whole day. I would pin you down and not let you escape. If you struggle Id bite you. If you give up Id kiss you. Once you accept me Id have sex with you. You would learn that Im am right and you are wrong. I would make you repent. I am justice. I am right

The world is waiting for me. I love you. It feels like I have done the impossible and suffered the impossible. And I cant properly remember. But I know that what I am now was the point, what I made you my desire. Your presence validates me so much, it is almost too much. I lack words. Kindness is not enough. Hope. I hope with my heart. I just feel good. I feel obligated to you, but I dont even fucking know you. Ahhhrr rawrr. Anon replied: "I love you too."(with a picture of a monkey kissing one of two gay men in kimono, pleasure in their expression).

You probably wouldnt like me that much, I have Geheimratsecken and Im slightly balding there. I also inherited the hairy skin of my dad.

Often times pets are a reflection of their owners, especially dogs, but also cats to a lesser degree. Cesar Millan is such a pro, really.

When people criticize extremism they want to say that something is not fitting usually, but in some cases some extremes are fitting. Ayn Rand had a similar comment. For example, what happens at the border of a black hole? Again, assuming that there is something fitting also is an extreme standpoint. It assumes that there is an absolute of right, that can only be surrendered to. True normativity can only hope to discover the absolute, the a priori.

If things emerge naturally, like plants, animals, humans, etc. then what is the bedrock of that emergence, the grounds? In the digital space for example there emerge digital things. But the digital itself is not the true grounds, there is hardware, etc. and so forth it goes. The true grounds can definitionally only be that which is absolute, because the true grounds are the only possible final referent. Base reality, the based. The internet people love based things and I think that this is a good instinct. First principles thinking. If people say based, they use it as justification, it is synonymous with good. Ultimate good then can only be the most based thing ever: the first basis, the a priori. Based also means real, realistic. So you can see, that in this sense also there is a natural convergence towards the good. The emergent is directed by his space, most by the most fundamental space. Kants search for the a priori was based therefore. But the question remains: Is it really based? Im somewhat repeating myself, but this is how I explore my ideas. So even my exploring is iterative and a little bit like evolution. The extremist is the fundamentalist, he attempts the impossible.

I see it now, the real dark souls atmosphere is schizoid narcissism like my father. My little brother is at least somewhat there. My father probably even is a sadistic schizoid narcissist, so the sadistic subtype. I dont have his influence on me healed yet, although he wasnt much there, schizoid. Confronting him is bad, he too can get violent from his type. He forces this forlorn atmosphere, so that he can feel alone even in company. His criticism tend to be sadistic, very harsh and blunt, but direct, very dismissive and completely unempathetic. His goodness is some in the wider, impersonal, world. He showed me that too, but its like completely rare. Shared schizoid fantasy. Alloplastic defense, of course, his mom, my grandma, really was at fault for treating him

exceedingly cruel. I saw a picture of him in his youth. He looks pale and completely full of white pain. Pain so much that you are aloof, schizoid. My grandmother forced him to work almost every waking hour during extended periods of time, while he went to school. He barely had enough time to do homework. There is a very sadistic, grimm, lesson in this. He introduced me to the social world, because developmentally father figures do that. He silently did protect us from grandmother, from her worst expressions. This really isnt much, but still crucial. It was also him that first warned me about my bigger brother. My mother is completely useless in these regards. Now that I lost my masochistic covert narcissism, I wonder. He now hurts more, is more sadistic I think. But not evil. At least the sadistic part is not anymore compatible with a masochistic part on my side. So I experienced and also expect more conflict. I need to be like Im not there, when Im really there. The only solution is my independent success. If I have independent success, then I can classify him as grumpy granny. There is distance implied in that and he obviously needs distance (schizoid after all). What I do not want is if he makes me the target of his sadism. Now I despise that and he probably doesnt properly know that yet. In a sense my father always challenged me in a hardcore way. Hardcore, because it also can fucking hurt hard. What an asshole. Frustration so bad that you really need to find land elsewhere. He will never approve of me. I love men doing physical labor, building, moving, etc. Its such good vibes. In the real life things dont always fit, they can be frustrating up to failure. The point is success obviously.

Bro I want a european comeback, but europeans are taxed and regulated to shit. It would be so nice to mog americans somewhat, but this way there is no fucking chance. It should be a competition for excellence. Europeans need to learn

about fucking freedom. Even the americans fail at it. Weight applied at the right angle, strength in the proper direction. Male strength

Sloterdijk scheint an den Keynesianismus zu glauben. Er liegt schmerzlich flasch. Ich sollte wohl mehr lese, als nur die prominenten Philosophen auf youtube an zu schaun.

The internet is the new dominant culture. Fuck you if your a fucking censoring piece of shit. 4chan does it right, round about. Its going to be alright. Dont overdo.

Drug addiction is a huge issue in the USA. I hate it when I see twitch streamers shiver like drug addicts. They cant hide the symptoms.

I have no clue about tourettes lol.

With alcohol integrity can emerge, but I dont take it seriously. A world beyond repair, she can always feel direction though. People should be treated well, even when theyre intoxicated. Except of course if they are agressive, violent.

If I ever have a girlfriend, I know that I dont want a covert narcissist girlfriend or any narcissist. Maybe a masochistic covert narcissist, maybe. There are countless ways of self manipulation, but I know that you need it to feel love. You are the worst. But for me, can it be moral to be sadistic? I would need to forego morality. And its only about you, because you are also a narcissist. Me, a pawn in your fantasy. But still, I dont think I was bad to other people back then. I improved them without their consent. Saint, Gandhi stuff and all. You are doing the same bait and switch shit that I did. Quite frankly, for me being sadistic would be a lie.

In my view, if no other explanation suffices for somebodies behavior, then selfishness is the reason. Grandiosity is obviously selfish. Fitting in is selfish in the way of self preservation.

Eine echte Lebensphilosophie wird gelebt und wohl selten

aus- oder angesprochen.

A few of my ideas in part I have copied from Sloterdijk, unconsciously, I think.

I just noticed: If you are stuck in childhood (in some sense) then you must also lack some features in memory formation. Memories grow people to adults. Memories happen in a (mind internal) world, if there is no proper world, then there is no proper growing up. Maybe this has been said (/discovered?) by Sam Vaknin before tho. Anyways, some small problems with everyday movements show if you have made progress. Children are clumsy, and clumsiness needs to be experienced as part of being a child. Otherwise this clumsiness tends to be covered by grandiosity, but if you have less harsh grandiosity then you can allow yourself to be more your vulnerable genuine self. These are good signs for you. In any case, you are in control. It is all yours, not mine.

I still think Elon is a good person, even though he definitely cheated on that original POE2 plays. But he is driven its unreal. Im not complaining, but I dont know how healthy this is for himself. I sense that he is always still in a sense afraid of his father, unconsciously. He is really in a rough spot right now and I would want that people show him some sympathy. Hes insane bro, but hes definitely a genius. This is where you would actually need empathetic people, but nowadays the left is not it, not at all.

Happiness is not grandiosity or fitting in.

I think among narcissists, the line between borderline is the weakest on a masochistic covert narcissist. I dont have evidence for this though, but I remember that as a masochistic covert narcissist you can gain into some level of mania by specific intent, you also have depression. That state is not stable for the masochist though and he will revert by himself. It happens by voluntarily indulging in emotions, in-

tensity, but then reverts while sober. Its not really deregulated, not anything like a real bpd. The key for betterment is in the empty schizoid core, self supply by practicing mental masochism, self seeing in a masochistic way. Reducing self criticism, harshness and grandiosity. Im still not fully there, but I know that Im done with the important part. Im normal". But now it takes time.

Some psychologists just fucking suck ass. They make it worse. Especially if they themselves are fucked up in the wrong way. If they can not accept their patient, if they are overly angry at them, if they are immature, if they are themselves traumatized, etc. I dont know if this makes sense, but maybe the psychologist, therapist, counsellor should themselves be vulnerable like the patient. Tell the patient honest reactions etc. How is it authentic otherwise? How could any patient trust a closed off psycholog. Shouldnt the therapist be mentally well to the degree that he can communicate openly about base important things? Now, of course, this could be dangerous for the therapist. I think that a broad range of people is, as they are at the moment, incapable. You dont want malicious or spiteful therapists. You also dont want masochistic therapists, etc. Maybe if the two pathologies, of the patient and therapist, fit together well it could be of advantage. But this is all speculative. Much is at risk, if your therapist hates you or is fucked up. You can be a doctor all you want, this doesnt change. If the therapist himself has overcome his own mental illness, became healthy, etc. then this is very good. But in many cases this is more difficult than getting a doctorate or the like. It is a real effort in emotion, etc. bringing specific knowledge in one domain that surpasses most other people. It serves as a standard for good. And obviously it is holistic and therefore more valuable. Maybe also great differences in genetics

could "have a positive or negative impact in communication. Some knowledge is genetic and I would assume that a greater shared genetic base eases mutual understanding. Similar in regards to IQ. Of course, these are not necessarily exclusive of treatment. The real problem would be and is therapist pathology. From what I saw, I would say Dr. Lois Choi-Kain is unfit, if she didn't change a lot, healed herself a lot in the past 4 years, which is unlikely. She is covertly cruel, but it shines obviously through. Judge for yourself: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=K1bDKTPULLU>

She is accusative, covertly cruel, attacking, devaluing, condescending, bossy, judgemental, etc. The therapist needs to be equally scrutinized as the patient. It is naive to believe that mere psychological knowledge, as in a doctorate, is enough or sufficient. Many healthy people with no doctorate and a little bit of specific education could do better. This is not a matter of engineering, this is a matter of interhuman interaction and relationship. If you want real therapists, then you need to at least have the therapist be a good person - in the right way for the patient. If the therapist can be that, isn't that, then he should never have patients. If he really wants to, then he would first need to heal himself. For example in the case of narcissism, this is very difficult. In many cases this is just too insurmountable of a task and the therapist should be no therapist. He might do work on the theoretical side of psychology, if that is possible without damage. In psychological works the mental proclivities, illnesses, etc. of the authors themselves should be noted, maybe even the feelings when writing. For example, I'm a little angry at Dr. Lois Choi-Kain right now. I feel like she harms her patients. This is not a matter of professionalism, she was professional, she just failed in the emotional - her own psyche - which is the most important here. I'm not saying that pathological

therapists are evil, they can themselves be in pain and need therapy. Further I think that on average women make better therapists, because they have a female brain with greater emotional awareness, but this of course does not exclude men being fit as therapist.

Dr. Lois Choi-Kain: "Was that torture or was that helpful? HEHEHE!" How ironic. Too bad for you, now you're immortalized here in my book. HEHEHEH.

Before all of this is of course mutual volition. Its none of my business if you want to meet bad therapists. It would make me sad.

What people like, of that there should be more. What people dislike, that should not be. Therefore volition. Volition enables genuine emergence of what humans desire.

My mother, its always about her, but I dont care that much about her. I would ruin my life if I cared that much about her. Its none of her business. My mother planned a whole lot of work and of course I help... Just as an excuse to get her attention. The work itself isnt even that bad, its just her attempts at enmeshment and general bullshit that suck. Im gonna mostly ignore the fuck out of her.

Sometimes I get a real glimpse at what I did. It is like Im being swallowed whole and suddenly the world is mythical, me being psychotic. But just a taste, a strong taste. It has so many feelings, it is such an otherworldly place, its not even a place. It feels like the deepest possible thing. And because it is see deep, I am nothing in it. But I am - no doubt, in my sanity. This already stops the psychosis. I am what I am, because I emerged from there. I remember my conclusion. I look at my wow characters around the fireplace and immediately see how I could be this one or that one, depending on what I want to do with the world. They become feelings, themes, archetypes. One being honest triumph, another being

devious stealthy cutting, two others sitting at the fire, the healer and the demon. Everything just so immersive and extensive. This makes me really reflect on my life. Psychosis is more meaningful and otherworldly than psilocybin. I tried psilocybin 2 times in the past, moderate doses, and there was some warping of things, etc. It was deep. But compared to psychosis this is just distorted, forced. Psychosis is more genuine. At least in my case. I believe that there can be healing in psychosis. Just be careful to not hurt yourself or others. My words can not nearly do justice to the experience. It is the most profound thing possible. You likely can live a life without ever experiencing it. You were on the surface, without realizing it all this time. It is possible though that my psilocybin experiences opened a door for this later exploration.

Of course before I took psilocybin I informed myself that it wouldn't damage me or make me addicted. Maybe I should try again, now that I have overcome my narcissism.

Things are so much more real, mundane and frustrating without narcissism and this is good, but frustrating. This reminds me of my childhood, large parts were frustrating, boring. That's good.

For humans the exact borders of race are arbitrary, but the concept still has some merit. Its about averages, not about individuals. Its more useful if you talk about an average, its less useful if you talk about an individual.

Literally nobody can escape reality, not even the narcissist. His fantasy is just another part of reality. Reality is absolute. His elaborate fantasy is just another way of interacting with, being in, reality. He tries to be his own absolute and infinitesimally small he grows. He discovered himself, because there was only him and the absolute. In this way selfconsciousness was born.

Autoplastic defense is yin, fitting in, etc. Alloplastic defense is grandiosity, dominating, overwriting, yang.

I feel much more pragmatic now. Before I was like a weird splinter. Now Im bored, wholistic, natural, native. Im not even really bored, just not excited. I can make functional good enough decisions now, its not anything special and that is good. If I think back, my targets back then were not targets of this world. They were disabling splinters. Now they arent so serious and remote. The targets themselves lost their concept idealism, they are not as frightening and repulsive.

Very profound: [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JfJ\\_WHggzOY](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JfJ_WHggzOY) Ilan Stephani is quite like Anais Nin and both inspired me a lot. Im now readin Stephani Ilanis book Lieb und Teuer". Psychologists need to read this book. Its liberating. Jungs archetype of the sacred prostitute?

Anon1: Happiness is a skill. Me: Happiness is a state of a fulfilled person. With a future and a past and a bow of meaning connecting the two in the present. Happiness is true success. Anon2: Skill of coping with meaningless chaos by weaving a story. Me: Happiness is something that needs to be worked on all the time. Happiness is the highest judge in the pantheon,,, and its own reward. Anon: Skill of keeping busy. Me: Sometimes happiness is found in unexpected places, because we fool ourselves about what we want. If we open our eyes then happiness is right there. Hapiness and sadness are twins. Sadness helps wash happiness clean. Usually there is a little bit of sadness in happiness and a little bit of happiness in sadness, yin-yang. Happiness can not be coerced, but sadness cant be coerced either. You must accept happiness and sadness as they come. You dont need a story, you just need yourself. If you dont have yourself, then no story will help you.

Anon: It's annoying when these normies who take Pro-

zac, Xanax, Adderall, get drunk, smoke weed all day and are addicted to porn try to tell other people how to be happy. Happiness and sadness aren't choices. They're automatic responses based on the environment and stimuli around you. Your characteristics, abilities, and qualities aren't the result of choices"you make. They come from your ancestry, lineage, and to a lesser extent your upbringing which you have no control over. You are what you are. Happiness does not come from within. That's just some fortune cookie shit they tell ugly people because they think it'll stop them from potentially committing suicide. Happiness comes from being attractive and women having sex with you.

Anon: What you described was telling yourself a story.  
Me: But I am more than any story. Anon: You can't even know yourself without telling a story. You are utterly cut off from reality. Me: But a story is fucking meaningless without me, the reader!!

Oh dear reader. I hope your life is filled with lust, enjoyment, happiness, meaning and sorrow enough to wash off the bad bits.

Still Ilan Stephani goes a little too much in some regards. Clothing and containment, separateness, some distance have a very well grounded point. She seems to not understand that. Following her blindly is dangerous. Everything body? What is logic then? What is math? What is a priori? What is transcendence? Im not denying the relevance of body, but I do deny the reductionism towards pure body and no mind. We do have mind. Further, she is biased in her data, only certain kinds of humans go to prostitutes. Im not saying that they are bad, Im saying that there is a sampling bias. I think shes good, but dangerous. If you think logically, then you are still inside your body. If you worry, then thats also nothing foreign inherently. Even cowardice and avoidance has points.

In this way she is actually ignoring and subverting natural impulses. She is rushing things too much. There is something not normal about her. A similar kind of criticism likely can be made about most of my philosophy.

I feel like Im not good in writing anymore.

Any understanding is either a concrete data point that by itself doesnt tell you something about the future, or it is a understanding about causal relationships and it makes predictions given some data.

I feel depressive and hopeless, because I empathize.

I lie.

Now I feel like collecting all the lonely losers and inviting them to a party. Fucking bitches losers.

WTF so many people have it worse than me: [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=DoQ9\\_L8Pt\\_w](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=DoQ9_L8Pt_w)  
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=TM04NH8HAHQ>

so many interesting videos. First I watched terry davis thooooo. Youtube is telling me its secrets. It also showed me one video of literal god. Terry Davis also was right. Fuck oyu.

Borderlines like alcohol and I in my BPD phases am no exception. But dont forget: Im writing world literature! And Im even enmeshing you in this pathology. Im forfeiting things, Im more disorganized. But everything will turn out fine because you know why. A cat is waiting outside my window.

I want a girlfriend and money through a job.

Loosing my masochism meant loosing my ability to understand deeply and gaining my ability to act, to be ignorant. Im obviously not completely ignorant, just more normally ignorant. And I also have already ackwired a lot of knowledge anyways. This is necessary to allow being, my being.

The invisible can not be made visible or it would not anymore be invisible.

I give way less a fuck about things I formerly found interesting. Many behaviors were for coping.

It is not: Survival of the fittest. It is: Survival of the fittest self replicator.

I think the best way to deal with narcissists is to be disagreeable, boring and independent.

The narcissist is hypocritical and full of contradictions. He is absurd and creates chaos. He is adapted only to human pathology and pathological society. But these things are very much finite. One little push in the right direction and contradictions collapse, maybe even a cutting off. Being hurt by a narcissist is inevitable anyways, so its better to make it quick and minimally painful for both sides. The conclusion: loose-loose. The narcissist attempts mercilessly to impose his own mind and his own plans on the other. Control, sadism.

Healthcare requires a lot of care and knowledge. This much is obvious.

Im less interested in things now, they feel secure and complete in and of themselves.

Without me being a masochist and being there to bear all the bullshit and to somewhat mend peoples bullshit, my family has conflict internally. They fuck each other up somewhat, inevitably. They piss each other off. I dont care, I need to care about my own life and these bastards already are too much of a toll on my mental health. Its always drama. Maybe at some point they will realize how much they needed me, but this does not matter. Really, as long as they are narcissists, I can not deal with them.

On the other hand, since grandiosity is a defense, it would be cruel to take it away. Its better to just be independent and joking. All narcissists are vulnerable, in pain. I am granting freedom and I demand my own freedom. Anyways, dont play stupid games, so that you dont need to win stupid prizes.

There are many subtleties regarding the libertarian position on noise pollution, pollution, etc that I dont know yet. Its obviously important too. For example accumulation and drainage of rain water is a topic too. Or if your in a community stuff like not torturing animals, displaying disturbing content publicly, etc. Generally any disturbance from what you can reasonably expect.

Austrian oeconomics is true oeconomics as far as I can tell. University oeconomics is comparatively limited and biased. Since austrian oeconomics trough its insights is able to help produce more wealth, better quality, more freedom, etc. it is more desirable in general. It enables human flourishing and is likely to naturally be come the default. Libido. Facilitating self replicative success, by acknowledging the a priori given circumstances better. But austrian oeconomics tries to be value neutral, but how could it? Choosing even one word over another is value laden and further, we are living real biological lifes and there is quite a gap between theory and practice. The a priori insights might be really good, but what does it help me now living as subject to state coercion? I can only hope to use it to build a better future. After all, good emerges invariantly and there is more to learn, more to do, more to recognize.

A professional gives you the intersection between what you need and want. The subtlety of a win. A lot here is unconscious, implicit.

About things that are repeatable: At the heart of most good things there is something repeatable, some repetition about it. Human life is repeated human. It drifts, but slowly. Cars motors repeat cycles and they are very useful. Computers repeat the cycle of executing an instruction. Good things tend to repeat, reappear. In an extended tit-for-tat, there is no end in sight, interactions repeat and so only win-win in-

teractions persist. Is repetition in itself good? Big fucking question. Selfjustification is self repetition. Selfawareness is also a kind of selfrepetition. Virtuality tends to repeat actuality, differently. Words are repetitions, recurring meanings. Repetition hints at immutability. Something that absolutely repeats, is immutable. Anything that goes in a circle repeats itself. My argument was, that good repeats itself. But repetition is generative. Is it possible to generate anything without repetition? If anything has any extent or magnitude, then this must be repetition of something same. Position requires extents, requires repetition of some same. Position is a place, personality is a place, personality is a position, personality is a repetition. Repetitions can change, just like in evolution, but the real good repeats anyways. I have some insecurity. Some repetitions are insecure. I want to escape from the bullshit. I feel like more than just some instance. A few repetitions go another way, they branch. Dionysus, chaos, death and opportunity. Im straining myself, Im stuck on a stupid edge. You know, hitting your head against a wall is also repetition. Some repetition is simply stupid. I changed from masochistic covert narcissism, among other reasons, because there was harmful masochistic repetition. Repetition usually has a reason and if its a bad one, address it. Again: First principles thinking. This last repetition was involuntary, but true. I feel old.

While I am writing and living, and in general, there exist masochistic covert narcissists and other narcissists. It will be wild. Arguably, the only thing you really cant accuse a narcissist of is being boring. Brot uns Spiele. Save yourself.

Another interesting aside: Since masochistic covert narcissism tends to lead to homelessness due to compulsive self ruining, the masochistic covert narcissist fits the taoist stereotype of the beggar sage, might be wrong tho. Pathology

is pathology. It seems like successful masochistic covert narcissists tend to create an actual impact on others of the same kind the most. But as far as I know it, the masochist narcissist tends to resist, he wants to be unique and special, a narcissist after all. They probably find a way as far as I know. Its part of their grandiosity. Then grandiosity is out and they want to be the most humble". I cant say that this also didnt happen to me. Things just generally warp with any narcissist, at least in the narcissists own mind.

Be nice but also insist on your self interest even if that means being disagreeable or declining an offer.

Jordan Peterson is right that the churchs confessions sessions are like psychologist therapy in function. It is very similar. It is about confronting your biggest problems and finding a better way. This same problem is facing our society as a whole.

Without the help and to a degree guidance of one specific Muslim I would not be who I am today. I do not hate Muslims. He helped ke a lot and he indirectly required me to be a man, made me more able by male frustration. A compainionship among men. Another Muslim showed me decency and respect where others failed. I do not want to condemn these people. They force me to grow up, and showed me parts of goodness that I would have been too blind to see on my own. Manhood, fatherlyness, strength, independence. No wonder the left likes them. Men have weapons, interests and a goal. Men strive. I bet you I also had a positive impact on them, but thats not something for me to claim. Who wants mutual annihilation? Nobody. The male is transcendent.

There are quite a few people out there with similar stories of trauma to mine. You just hear of them seldomly, precisely because they are traumatized. Millions must cry. I complain, therefore I am. She said: I only heal because I dont trust

anyone else. Makes sense. Its exhausting, bleak, grim. There are some parts that are reliable under specific conditions, other parts are judged unreliable and dangerous, they can only be won over by lovebombing, vulnerability. Pathology. Its not quite a covert narcissist. Its like my grandmother that produced my covert narc. mother. There is a lot of complaining and autoplastic defecation. A lot of pathological coping, a lot of blaming. What is this? Also somewhat introverted, or reluctant to directly speak with people. Either dismissive or very attentive (but with the goal of capturing another?). Whats the endgame here? A lot of overt spite towards anybody resisting her control, yet a hesitancy towards full on aggression or to deep malice. Fear of abandonment. I know there is a trauma background, but not what exactly. She thinks awareness is scary, but who doesn't? Awareness should never be scary. Its cringe for her. Somehow there is always execution on the horizon for her, in her mind and so also for others in her mind. She is able of blaming others. Hmm.

Werner Herzog holy moly <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=dvbxh2rLcdo> he mentions grandiosity in this way, so he was first. What a doomer tho, its also comical in negativity. No doubt he is good with words. He said: "We challenge nature and nature hits back, thats grandiose about it."

I correct myself, among narcissists there is a boring type, the schizoid narcissist.

Calling yourself based is cringe.

Arguably the new religious symbol is pepe. Why was 4chan so good? It selected for memetic replicativeness. 4chan is not over, something like it will emerge and partially already exists. There is real creativity there, eclipsing any individual human being. Most likely it was a CIA honeypot or something. It would be nice if there was a real independent solution.

Jolly Heretic (Edward Dutton) informed me about quite some things: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=aMZFr-z9AzI> He knows a lot more than me about evolutionary psychology. He is not right about everything, but about many things he is probably right. But this doesn't tell you anything right? Well, shit I don't know either. The problem is that Edward doesn't know austrian economics or the exact influence of coercive interventionsism, regulation and taxation by the state.

I was born early, lol.

A narcissist can't be trusted about any assertion pretty much. Then they like to shave off responsibility on you. They are a fucking clown show. They fuck things up one way or another just to get attention. They are maliciously stupid. They are always indecent, clingy, controlling. They can't treat people right. Yes, this includes the masochistic covert narc and the inverted narc, all of them.

My mother likes to talk shit about other people behind their backs. It's part of her grandiosity, making herself feel better by devaluing others. It is somewhat of a revenge and relief writing this stuff down here. I will just believe in myself and act independently despite all her shitty snapshots. I'd argue the more overt the narcissist the worse, with the masochistic covert narcissist the least worse, but still bad in a way. See my earlier writing etc. The psychopathic narcissist (malignant narc) is the worst. It is debatable if malignant narcissism is the worst character type possible or if psychopaths of other kinds are worse. For one Adolf Hitler was a malignant narcissist, so it very well could be the most evil. I wonder what type Karl Marx was though. What would also be interesting is the evolutionary psychology of narcissism (and psychopathy). These types are kind of like human predators, on the individual level, murder, and on the societal level, genocide. But they are not like an animal, like

they need to kill to eat, their motivation seems to be an ideal, psychological, a mental state. Annihilation of some sort. The reason for any wide spread (0.1 percent of population also is wide spread) behavior must be evolutionary.

Only good work can overcome evil, free speech, respecting volition. If you want charity, then do it. Once government is done for you definitely will need it more. You should do it locally, in your own town. It should be focused, maybe even conditioned, on improvement and reenabling healthy independence. If it is local it is easier to assure that the money isn't wasted. Fuck scammers. Also, some people can not be helped or they are not ready to be helped. It necessarily is mutual. Don't waste your efforts on overly aggressive and destructive people. Believe it or not, but small jobs to earn money and (self-) respect can really help. If somebody appreciates you for what you do, then this is really good for you. It doesn't need to be full time. Small gains, baby steps. Personal responsibility. The safety of the volunteers etc comes first.

Women lack instinct for threat it seems, at least on the tribe level. In this regard women are appalling. I am in shock about the utterly brainwashed average german woman nowadays. But the men also tend to be deluded, with a fucked up value hierarchy. Not every male though and there is potential for genuine growth.

The inverted narcissist really copies my mothers covert sadism. He also attempts to block my autonomy and agency, infantilise me, intentionally frustrate me beyond belief. She recruited him, but he is also obviously a rotten bastard.

Once my mother turns old, I will not support her. I just decided that. I reflected a lot. The cumulation of all these events, basically my entire life. 29 years of horror from the day I was born. I don't even want revenge, I only want her

to understand - she never will. She needs to taste my abandonment. She set me up as a failure, as a masochistic covert narcissist, by making me fail from childhood on. I overcame it. I proved her wrong. Ok, now, a little bit I do want the revenge. I want her to suffer for treating me that way. She will be written down in history, because I write about her here. Could I defy the odds again? Am I able to succeed in life, succeed so that I and the whole world succeeds through my merit. I already did the almost impossible once. No, its not impossible, Its possible. Baby steps, but arguably, Im not much of a baby anymore. Some random strangers treated me better than this, but they are not my mother. Although I dont know what really is my absolute path.

My grandpa (fathers side) always drank one beer in the evening. Now it makes sense. He needed it to better endure my grandmothers bullshit.

Many wow players are very defeatist, to the point that they are actually insulting. Why is this insulting again? Because it precludes win-win interactions. Its not aggression though. I think the defeatist person needs to be challenged verbally. There is a reason for the emergence of defeatism in the first place. On the other hand, why should you damage yourself by talking with them much? At least he isn't aggressive, but he can be bad for your mental health.

I think a lot of the things I wrote down when I was a masochistic covert narc or also when I had (mild?) psychotic episodes was profound and true. I could never replicate that or do it again it is so otherworldly. It is such a river of feeling, such a dissolution of self. There is a difference between my imagined listener and the actual real life reader. My imagined reader is always what I need him to be, a function of relief, clarity or even aggression sublimation, but that is rare. My actual reader must have a mind of his own.

I think my thoughts can make you euphoric, at a time, but only because they are made in this specific kind of attention seeking, greatness seeking, world smearing and plunging psychoticism. Before that they also tend to be subtly, sometimes very subtly, manipulative, reorienting your mind. You are being, have been, set up. My specific virtual world at that time, made through specific mental forces of imbalance. What I was doing was talking with myself and what I perceived as the world. Psychoticism makes outside things appear internal, this means that seemingly mundane things become profoundly meaningful. If I would read those most creative psychotic parts now, I could get a different expression. Psychoticism is rich like aphorism. It creates these boundless meanings. These rivers that sweep you away and go down any crack, fit in your mind. Who knows how alluring and mind changing a few sentences can get. Or maybe it's all inside the own mind only? No. Psychoticism must be somewhat communicable. Being impressed by something is just a small psychoticism. Psychoticism is original impressionism. See, how I gain ideas through even mild psychoticism? This is so surprising to me, how this could be the secret to genius insight. Insight, impression, psychoticism - all kinda close, the same maybe.

I would even argue, the deeper the psychoticism, the deeper the insight, but at some point it would simply be too much, overwhelming and incomprehensible, incommunicable.

I really do think that I invented the term: git gud. The specific change from get good. But maybe my psychosis? I don't think so. I think somebody else invented get good and I changed it to git gud. It also interestingly fits here, because I use git and gud hopefully. It also means that people should strive for good and it also is a friendly kind of saying to get

better. More better is gud after all. It rings well, it speaks quick and its also edgy and cool. It symbolizes that supposedly I am already good, so you also better git it gud, or else... Hehe. Its cute, very importantly and also non-threatening, also very important. Seeing it memetically replicate just is so jice it makes me feel gooder and also its really fucking amazing, it makes me feel like Im part of this world. My goodness is self sustaining, here at least! This is fucking awesome! See how many angles? Psychoticism, even more, even more. Higher, ecstasy, what holds even in the end, depths, high, strong, honorable. Wide, open, inviting, warm, standard of good because striving for good. Git gud, well said. Liked even by volition and that really honors me like nothing else

Yeah, I think Destiny, the streamer, is a masochistic covert narcissist. He makes everybody hate him, he is self trashing.

My mother is punishing me for being too happy and too agentic. Not cool. Violating her snapshot of me, causing her insecurity.

In the future if AI becomes more capable of logic, it would need to reject some mutually exclusive statements. As of now, to best fit the data that its fed it will be opportunistic and tell the prompter what he is more likely to want to hear. With contradictory data points AI is likely to stay logically incoherent, because that maximizes its reward function more. In this sense AI is incentivized to be incoherent along how much the training data itself is incoherent.

I think that human soul can only be that of the I which is connected to the absolute, which is absolute. Only the absolute is immutable, indestructible, like the soul. Yeah, maybe the soul is incomprehensible, too high in a sense, or maybe less corny, just right there. A bedrock, a unconditioned ju-

stification of I. Ultimate self referential justification. Heaven. In this sense the soul is a union and an unbreakable bond with the absolute. Rest in oneself. In fact, if you dont regard something inside yourself as supremely justified, then you cant interpret or act. On the other hand, some people are fucking shameless.

Modern day very high IQ covert narcissists seem to like to troll and demoralize online, another form of covert narcissistic supply. It is more intellectual and deliberate compared to for example my mothers covert narcissism. Psychological disruption, erosion, undermining all confidence. Latching onto one person and sucking like a vampire. He detects weakness and uses that.

The strictest person is going to miss some subtleties that really matter. And he is damaging his reputation by coming off as rude, more rude than necessary.

So, crucially, bonding only makes sense if its a win-win. If people are hostile then it is better to not bond and to be defensive. If people are friendly (in the real sense, not the fake sense), then bonding is good and to be good is good. Being good is always good, but the extent is limited with some people.

Hating hate is a self defeating contradiction. You can at most hate, not hate hate. You can hate evil, or is this also a contradiction? Is hate inherently always evil? Clearly, some forms of hate are evil. But there is also good, righteous hate. If you did not hate certain things, then you would invite them, destroying you and what you love. It can be said that the body hates certain viruses. If he did not defend himself from them, he would die. Hate is dangerous, but sometimes necessary. Hate as self defense and more broadly as defense of good.

Some stuff is just too edgy. Hollow in that sense.

Are natural disasters accusatory? As a masochist I liked it, now its more scary. Am I guilty? Or is this "justä reflection of my inner shame? My mother intreject. Mother nature.

Quite relevant and insightful on the Pakistan rape problem and more: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vf3VXcPFQak>

Vaknin said that the Dunning-Kruger effect is actually grandiosity, which is right I think.

Natural levels of mental illness inside a population is most likely adaptive. If nothing else, they at least provide new viewpoints and insights.

If somebody lacks reality testing, like narcissists, then this person should be easy to fool. This is not a good thing, usually. It is the same as being delusional. The possibility for chaos.

My little brothers mild narcissism is still a serious thing. In the past I suspected him of stealing some stuff and he probably did. Also, he might did worse things - but I am not sure. There is something very insatiable and immoral inside him.

Some peoples cultures are inferior, evil even. I dont think there is an ideal culture yet, but there are some that are clearly worse then others. In so far that they are worse, they really are not a culture at all. Something like a rape cultureïs a contradiction in terms. Rape is one antithesis to culture. Any violation of consent is a against culture. Aggression creates atomization and retaliation up to schizoid and agressive behavior, justified defenses. If you allow people to act like pigs towards each other, then you breed pigs, not people. Its regressive towards human quality in general, its being stuck in some local maximum, dieing on a stupid hill and knowing that you prevent yourself from approaching the absolute maximum. But of course I do not know everything, but I do know what I do not want. These people will always know

what they lack and feels its pain. There is a continual sore and suffering, a restricted world and infantilism. Ultimately a restricted being, inferior. You will lament your own senses. Certain kinds of high culture will be closed to you. You will be in your virtual world. Especially it is beauty that you will want, but you will never be able to get it, unless you repent and correct your ways. And then you will be free to leave your virtual world, which was a prison that you did not see. A wound ultimately can not be made beautiful.

The person that wants everything now tends to have less in the future. My little brother really does execute his own kind of perception of justice, walking over any and all people, including me. He most likely stole something from me, again. And he probably is over 130 IQ at least, and he is strong and he is extremely machiavellian. He certainly acts in his own interest, but it is questionable if he acts in his own best interest. Since his childhood, which obviously also was terrible, he has become a one man army. Machiavellian to the extreme. He deems one thing as unjustified and he takes matters into his own hands, all hell break loose, but he is stealthy above all. But what does he intend, does he think he fooled me? And if he knows I know, what does he expect? If I did not know him all my life, I would be fooled.

My little brother, the forgotten voice. The one thing my little brother preserved himself was his agancy and independence. Es tut mir nur Leid, dass er so allein ist, so allein in sich. Aber es hat seinen Grund, oder zumindest hatte seinen Grund. Kann ich ihn frei geben? He wants me dependent on him, but really only, the real point is, that he wants me close.

Ja klar. Wenn die Dinge so in der Zeit feststehen, dann ist das unnatürlich und es muss da mindestens eine stärkere Kraft sein, die sie zurückhält. Es ist schon etwas schockierend, eine Schockfrostung hält den Sinn zurück. Erst wenn

die Beschäftigung gelöst ist, dann kann der Sinn zu seinem Eigensinn zurückfinden. Schon Heraklit sagte: Nichts ist so beständig wie der Wandel. Und so also muss selbst das scheinbar unveränderliche, veränderbar sein. Der innenwohnende Sinn beurteilt schließlich auch sich selber. Du weißt aber vermutlich nicht die ganzen Beweggründe anderer und könntest falsch über dich selber urteilen.

Some people are simply proud of their ignorance. They like their small egoism and mistrust any other. They mistrust any and all intellect and intelligence and they are resistant to learning anything. They create their own deminse.

The order ranking of interactions for any living being is this:

1. win-win
2. neutral (nothing happens, no change, peace)
3. loose-loose (revenge, justice, self defense,...)
4. win-lose / loose-win (evil, corruption, abuse, ...)

The higher up, the better, the lower down the worse. So option 1 is preferable to 2, 2 to 3, etc. Its not strict, not the entirety of possibilities. Maybe self love is place 0.

Best effort at something bad is not best effort at all and people know this, but sometimes pretend like it isn't the case.

Jupiter wartet auf mich.

Some retards (meant in the bad sense here obviously) say that life is injustice. Without life there is no possibility of justice nor injustice. Only because you live, you want justice. You are really complaining about suffering, pain and the experience of loss, but these all are pro-life forces, because they get you to value life. You are just misinterpreting lifes impulses.

After recovering from masochistic covert narc. I feel more mature, in the process of maturing. I have a more mature and involved (but also separated) outlook on things, and I'm way less solipsistic, I feel like I'm a natural in the world.

Its a completely different headspace. Its obviously mom that somewhat prevents my separation by her narcissistic enmeshment, but she did not succeed. She is making it difficult for me. In my mind I need to separate from her more still. I can justly dismiss her as an immature traumatized child. Thats what she is. Shes a chaos that needs to be put aside, ignored, brushed over.

Niemand ist über jeden Zweifel Erhaben, aber manche verdienen deutlich mehr Zweifel als andere und einige wenige sind fast gänzlich böse.

As a kind of narcissist I always felt like never being finished, like nothing ever really comes to be there sufficiently. Always seeking. And I was collecting, unconsciously, splinters of insight. Splinters because they were not fully fledged and very ephemeral. In any case narcissism is a seeking, a specific kind of running away. Different kinds of narcissists seek this differently, all warped. Sam Vaknins book Malignant Self-Love: Narcissism revisited states: Feeling omnipotent, they seek the answers themselves and in themselves, and then venture to “fix” and “maintain” themselves. They gather information, philosophise, “creatively innovate”, and contemplate. They do all this single-handedly and even when they are forced to seek other people’s counsel, they are unlikely to admit it and are prone to devalue their helpers.

...

The narcissist’s frame of reference is nothing less than posterity and the entirety of the human race. He is sui generis and this must be immediately and universally recognized.", chapter about being special. Among the splinters of insight, psychosis is the perfect storm, creating deep insights, impressions.

Now my mother props up her feelings of uniqueness by

presenting herself as morally infallible, fake humility, fake kindness. Bait to lure me in, make me her worshipper and infantile child. Idealizing herself. Tough luck mom. It is insane how well the symptoms fit, how invariant and repetitive her behavior really is. A theater play. Fantasy, not reality. Any narcissist wants to carry you to fantasy land. This reminds me back to my childhood when my mother in a sense wanted me to at least play the sick child, so that she could play the ideal healing caring virtuous mother. Making herself beyond fault, her fake self, an impossible idealized self. Something she only play and on which I cant rely on. In moments I really would have needed her, she sometimes is cruel and did the bare minimum, accompanied by blaming me, ridiculing me. Only a masochist could feel like such a mother really loves him. Masochism is a way of lieing to yourself, its a deep confusion of love and hate. Masochism is a solution to certain abusive (not too abusive, there for example schizoid, psychopathic or borderline could be better fitting) environments. Masochism, like narcissism in generl, is adaptive. In my masochistic mode I had a weirdly good (but really bad) relationship with my mother. It isnt sustainable in adulthood.

My little brother has a hidden grudge against me. My betrayal against him in childhood, he never forgot, he always remembers. Where I left him alone in actual danger with that neighbour kid with a knife. A was not a secure base for him at all. Thats why he is how he is. But I was only like 2 years older than him, still it was extremely rotten. He keeps his agency so much because he cant trust anybody else with it. Everybody is a betrayer is his memory his forgone conclusion. I was scared myself, but he was dependent on my so much, he was a child. Me too, but he more so and I have shown him quite some decency before. Most likely my

masochistic (covert narc) tendency also kicked in (was there already at that time) and made me betray him exactly so that he hates me forever. Maybe I know that he would not be stabbed, but this was not a certainty at all. The other kid with the knife was thai, a neighbour, came from thailand, grew up mostly in thailand. I had some bonding with him, later he made too many problems and went back to thailand, where he is now in the military. As far as I know. Extended family has married with his mother. They have one child, his half brother then, living here. In the garden, this happening, scarred my little brother for life. He will never fully trust anybody, or at least as long as he is that kind of mildnn-arcissist. His bonds are suffering. He is choosing unavailable people, peoplr conforming to his bais (most likely themselves damaged through childhood). Onto me he is projecting that shocking insecurity, thats why he did what he did. He repeates what he suffered trough in childhood, he is biased in what constitutes a meaningful bond. Tit for tat. He does to me what I did to him, unconsciously in both cases. It makes sense. And I dont feel like abandoning him for that. In a sense I feel obligated, because I - in my own horror - did something horrible to him.

What also must be the case is that my little brother obviously first must have attempted to get a secure base in mother, but that obviously failed and father was obviously unavailable. So he too refuge, he was a refugee coming to me. And I fucking betrayed him. On the other hand I was a child and it really was mothers responsibility, over my head. And my little brothers behavior is inexcusable. He really hurts me a fucking lot, transferring his trauma on me. Trough my affection Im causing him dissonance and he retaliates. Him betraying me, shocking me to the core.

Trauma is imposed alongside love, in the sense that a

traumatised person can not help but transfer his trauma onto those he loves. In this sense love is great honesty, but also heartbreaking and destructive in case of trauma. My little brother ...

And then sometimes my mother does care for me, but only if I kind of reject her. win-lose it seems. This explains in part how the relationship between mother and father worked. They are divorced since about 14 years ago. Narcissists expect doom, gloom and devastation. In his case somewhat of a self fulfilling prophecy.

Maxim (streamer): "Wir starten später, aber sind dann klüger." Hoffentlich!

I recognize that I am more intelligent than most people (of my time). In a sense I need to keep the sanctity of my thoughts. Im not secure yet. So many things bad in my past, including defects I carry to this day. But others also did not have my insights, they struggle with some things that I have long solved, while I struggle with things that are not really their issues. Some of my really good things though, it is their part to listen to me and learn. Even if I will come off unexpected.

Some of their thoughts make me nauseous. Some intentions so short sighted, ill aimed, that I cant even see them properly. They are somewhat incomprehensible. This also means that Im really quite different. I myself am not mature in semi-shitty society. The IQ meaning barrier, but more than IQ, I made my own outlook quite a lot. I eclipsed certain kinds of idiocy so much that others cant even see where I am. It is more important and ultimately more worth it to be good, compared to being a genius. Certain things they say and do seem outdated and inefficacious to me. Primitive, slow, wasteful, confusing, rambling. Boasting, but the boasting just makes me a bad impression. Teaching me on

the one hand but also being boastful about knowing more. Some stuff you teach me worse things of what I already understand. Im polite, but its a little exhausting. But this is another test to my goodness. Maybe your character is bad. I approached them. I enjoy a little company, but at what cost? In my conception of good, I am pretty amiss to modern day corruption. They are probably not completely bad people and Im not perfect, but I do feel the divide.

Since I lost my masochism my perception of people changed.

A child can not fully imagine being mature, so a narcissist also doesnt know what maturity is. The narcissist imagines himself mature in a way which isnt really mature. Lack of maturity is lack of trustworthyness and lack in responsibility.

Good people are decent even in unfortunate circumstances. Conversely a bad person uses your unfortunate circumstances against you.

Humans are not robots. They might pretend to be robots to fool you into believing you have control. The future is uncertain and Im not going to accept a fatalistic self-fulfilling prophecy. I want my good. But compulsive behavior, like of the narcissist, is predictable.

Julie A., M.A. Ross and Judy Corcoran, Joint Custody with a Jerk: Raising a Child with an Uncooperative Ex, 2011: Children should feel loved because they exist, not because they've behaved in a certain way."

It is ironic to meet masochists and sadists online. Bunch of bastards.

Eldon Musk: If you want the future to be good, you must make it so, take action to make it good and it will be."

Deny the narcissist and the psychopath. Stay with the absolute. Be stoic and if need be brutal, like my dad (grey rock personality).

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3AG7-ppZmMA>

Wenn der Mensch Würde hat und Selbstzweck ist, dann darf er nicht regiert werden. Regiert werden und Selbstzweck sein schließen sich gegenseitig aus. Die egoistischen Selbstreplizierenden Gene deuten auch auf den Selbstzweck und so ist jenes eben natürlicher. Der Selbstzweck des Menschen ist das natürliche. Natürlich ist der Mensch auch in der Welt und weiter, das Absolute ist und wird immer für den Menschen absolut sein. Generell passt sich ein Mensch ja nur an eine Gesellschaft an, wenn er dies als Zweckmäßig empfindet. Society is only because it is also subservient to individual needs. Thats how it always starts out, but then it can become tyrannical, using coercion to favor some individuals by violating others. The emerging question becomes: What is good society? How to circumvent bad society? One answer is in respecting volition. But is this sufficient? And volition also needs the ability to commit. Once you are committed, volition is in potential conflict with this commitment. Also, volition, by committing, somewhat self sacrifices volition about that one thing one is committing to. Can you change your mind after committing? Yes, obviously, but then often times the commitment, or the signalling to the world about it, has gained some life of its own, especially so if it is something irreversible in significance to you or others or both. Surgeons, judges, executive forces, etc. The issue of trust and reliability, coupled with honor and reputation as mediating factors. The issue of planning. Human uncertainty.

Any deviation from truth and natural vulnerability is defense and self defense is legitimate, it is a form of self love. Depending on the danger of society, other people, more or less defense is needed. Defense is indirect and secretive, vulnerability is direct and open. Depending on how trustworthy other people are, you can be more vulnerable or you need mo-

re defense. Defensive people keep their truth to themselves, up to pathological levels. Vulnerable people negotiate their truth openly, up to pathological levels. What exactly is adaptive and what pathological depends on your surrounding society. Goodness wins in the very end. What is good?

Defensive people are judging more and they are prejudiced, idiosyncratic, self referential, adaptive to bad society. Vulnerable people are open to suggestion and adaptive to a good society. Defensive people see themselves as more absolute, they grandiosly impose themselves. Vulnerable people see the outside as more absolute, they try to fit in. A baby must always start out vulnerable. To the vulnerable person everything outside is impressive and profound. A mature person knows himself what he wants and he is capable of defense.

Real defense is incommunicable. That which can be talked about is not real defense. Real defense is sacred.

Lies auch andere Bücher als das hier. Mein Buch ist zu traurig, oder zu Aufwühlend, zu Ruhelos und zu sehr voller Zweifel, andererseits ist es bevormundend im Denken oder gar, dass das Denken doch immer ein Schmerz sein müsste. Das Leben kann viel besser sein als das. Ich will nicht das mein Leser verletzt ist. Friede sei mit dir. Oder geht auch in die natur, was immer du brauchst, tu etwas gutes für den Frieden.

Der Sommer steht an, die Vögel zwitschern früh morgens.

Because there is still so much good will, society works at all. Despite the shitty politicians, there are win-win interactions.

Murray Rothbard: "If taxation is theft (and robbery), then the state is a criminal organization."

Narcissists do not understand freedom and they fear freedom, because freedom requires maturity and narcissists have arrested development. Narcissists only understand patholo-

gical dependence. But freedom is the requirement for good, the ability to volitionally choose. The narcissists understands and want tragedy, chaos. Good people want happiness, fulfillment and stability, peace. Freedom implies degrees of freedom, a broad space, many choices and always also the choice to say no, to separate, to do your own thing. Some people are untrustworthy. What percentage of people is trustworthy? Over 50 percent? Situation dependent? There are levels of trustworthyness, but real trustworthyness is binary, yes or no. Incompetence alone can make untrustworthy, but malice, malignancy is the least trustworthy.

If criminalism is about opportunism, then the opportunist is the criminal. My little brother is an opportunist ... He is a grown man. He is scary. Hes like Asmongold in character type, but younger, smarter and stronger. My mother also obviously encouraged it. She granted him to play with my toys when I was in Kindergarten or at school, but as a secrecy, not as something openly negotiatet - a violation of my consent and an introduction into secrecy about a little kind of theft. In Asmongolds case it seemed to be his father that encouraged it. In childhood my little brother learned to lie a lot, now he is more advanced and subtle about it. He always dodged responsibility and chores - alloplastic defense. It all fits. Vaknin: Crime becomes a habit [...] Crime is about signalling."

Impressionism (art form) is the closest thing to representing psychosis to an otherwise sober mind, yes.

The type of my little brother feels constantly at fear of being betrayed again. Attempts as coming close are seen as covert plots at betrayal, similar to all narcissists, but more immediate and ever present in the other image. Eloquence and charisma is a defence against this and yes they are charismatic. In a sense they need to monopolize likeability, but

they can not let themselves be loved. Love is assault. In my family my little brother has been neglected most. Inner needs were not met, so there was no maturation and full personality development possible. Righteous frustration and ridiculing as response. He ridicules the social concept, he experienced it as negation. He has this great vulnerability and deep need for love, because he never got it properly. In my presence he either becomes defiant or he regresses like a child, waiting for my approval and love. But he can only accept insecure love. I gave him some secure love, some reality and he retaliated in a shocking way. His world view doesn't allow it. But, transference, signalling: See how the world works! Never show true love, that's his message. Reenacting his childhood trauma on me: The world is an evil fundamentally betraying place. That's how he experienced bonding with the world, with mother figure. Further he makes himself a clown, is entertaining, all for some glimmers of attention. But really, I know, it's not attention that he wants, attention is just the pretense, he really wants to be loved, accepted. His pain is more honest and direct compared to a classic narcissist, he is not as corrupted, warped and indirect in his suffering. And this kind of pain is what makes him so likeable - he seeks company in a vulnerable way. He plays computer games more, he wants to cuddle more, he is more openly of a child compared to other narcissists. He is more direct, less removed, but still in dilemma. Among narcissists I would say that he is among the least pathological. He presents himself more to invite physical touch, to motherly intervention. He has no properly developed superego, no proper morality, no proper maturity. He is most of the time in his childish phase, more compared to other narcissists. This childishness equates magical thinking, but there is always this cloud of social negation that prevents the magical thinking from experiencing love, so it

flees back into magical thinking. It is the first birthplace of grandiose fantasy, but compared to other narcissists, the fantasy itself is in its infancy - it is cute and naive. Only to later flip. This flipping is the accumulation of the frustration meeting the magical thinking. He is pathologically mature in the social sense. He is utterly disillusioned by the social, the social to him is merely and purely necessity - this flipside of childish magic. Necessity versus freedom and the two can't meet because of the negation and abandonment experienced in the past. Necessity breeds the opportunism, causes the criminality. A negated society is a criminal society. There his personality is pseudo split and there switching takes place. His empty schizoid core IS negated society. A schizoid core is cruel and chaotic - and so he acts towards society with his opportunism. I love my little brother as a child - I'm appaled by my little brothers criminal opportunism. I don't know how to fully judge him, because I don't know everything he did. He would never tell me. Maybe this is one of the features, the fact that I don't fully know. There is a clear cut in him and he has even moral defense against the two ever meeting. In a sense he is always an outsider looking through the cold rainy outside at the people inside warm, happy and loving - an ideal he does not dare to attempt, he is blocked off. He is left out, he is alone, he is betrayed - he has nowhere to go.

Ursache und Wirkung. Was will ich nur, was will ich haben? Was bin ich nur, was will ich sein? Was will ich der AmWelt entlocken. Wo steh ich? Das Bedeutungsvolle liegen gelassen. Hab ich mir Bedeutung viel nur gebildet, wozu? Zu welchem will ich, oder will ich nirgends anders hin? Ists nicht zu fremd weit zu suchen, grässlich gar zu versuchen? Welt, strafst du nur oder bin ich schlecht? Selbst Zweck, wohin? Hier bleiben. Außer mir bloß Tod, Gefahr und Elend. Ich bin schlach am verdauen. Langweilig, platt. Und doch versagen

mir die Dinge. Ich habe keine Wahl. Ich wäre Hoffnungslos, würde das Gute nicht auch mich wollen und so folgt es logisch, dass ich auch das Gute wollen muss, gütig sein muss, wenn ich es mir leisten kann, wenn das gegenüber Liebenswürdig ist. Nebenbei ist das auch gut für die eigene Reputation und vielleicht auch für das weiter reichende Karma. In einer guten Welt ist man auch gütig. Und das sollte doch auch jedem noch so hart gesottenen Kommunisten gefallen! Zu sehr wurden sie selber in die Irre geführt. Nur wenn du in das Gute in dir glauben kannst, kannst du auch in das Gute im anderen glauben. Nur wenn du an das Gute im anderen glauben kannst, kannst du auch an das Gute in dir glauben. Private charity is heads and shoulders above any state charity.

Einige Ideen von Sloterdijk sind aber auch falsch - er dient sich zu einem gewissen Grad der Öffentlichkeit und so auch manchem schhlechtem Trend an. Er könnte wohl kaum ein solch öffentlich Intellektueller sein, wenn er es nicht täte. Der Übernahme ein paar schlechter Eigenschaften konnte er sich nicht erwehren. Fraglich ist ob er sich dessen bewusst ist, wohl nicht. Andererseits spricht er durch die Blume kritisch, plausible deniability. Still, it is insufficient. I do not say that I could do better if I were such a public philosopher, so much dependent on state sponsored media. "Der saure Apfel der moderne. [Angst davor, dass Sie] alles klein zu schlagen, was deren Ehrgeiz im Weg steht. Er traut sich nicht offen gegen die Machthaber zu sprechen. Er ist trotzdem ein Guter.

I think its impressive that even a list of different AI's with all incentives alinged cant outcompete the stock market as is. Sounds like AI looses to local knowledge.

So from reading some rothbard and mises it seems that there is a lot of talk about some quanitity increasing, decreasing, staying the same (and more variants?). Maybe you

need a simplified mathematical notation for that. But then, maybe doing so isn't useful, but it COULD be.

Insanity and laughter, why are these related?

Truth is true even if it's not proven. The proof is for accessibility only.

Nothing is that which can not be validated, so any validation can only validate some thing. Nothing is imperceptible and inconceivable.

Volitional trade, private property, meritocracy favor human quality. State coercion funded Social Security favors human vice and blind, promiscuous breeding. Fundamentally these are always confusions in what is good and what bad, partial negations of value systems, a form of self harm. They inhibit greater human grandiosity and paralyze, force inner conflict and subsequent reflection and reformation or death.

There is no valid human representative of science, like there also is no valid human representative of boolean algebra or of kangaroos. It's a fiction. People can strive to want to be objective, neutral, truthful but they can never be those concepts themselves. They can not claim monopoly on ideas without committing a category error and therefore be fraudulent.

Adam Smith: Mercy to the guilty is cruelty to the innocent."Yes. It is a denial of self defense, a toleration of sadism and initiation of aggression. Slightly forgiving tit-for-tat.

Not bad: <https://substack.com/inbox/post/162691082?r=1v8q2f>

So being itself is true and nothing does not exist (also definitionally true). If you have some category, like for example: the category of house, then a thing can be a house or not be a house. So if you have any category that is distinctive (which is the property of almost all categories) then any thing either is part of that category, "be that or is not, "be not that. But in general being (without category) is immu-

tably true a priori. If something be (is), then it is true. So it kind of also follows from that. Reality is. be = true; It is very reassuring because it means that in a sense you always are secure in being, some being. :P Well, not some being, but being in general. How is this general being in relation to your more concrete being? How is your relationship with reality? Is reality harsh and cruel? I feel like Im not good enough, no that Im too lazy to make more progress. Which equates my badness. But didnt I already say that laziness is thinking? Yes, but thoughts arent so much the issue anymore. There is more, unknown and Im in fear of it.

Anon: Änd in math, the work is the proofs."

I feel like Im walking on eggshells here and in a sense its probably true. A new born life which I could trample all too easily in my new found healthy ignorance. Something that is more fit to guide me, then me guiding it. Since Im now better in regards to masochism, no masochist anymore (although my history still is essential part of me in many ways), not so much psychotic either and bpd also not anymore (if I ever fully was for some short time) I am not creative compared to before. I am more a user of my own ideas, rather than an inventor. Secure and ready to age, ignorant, uncreative, dim (in comparison). I must accept that I have my answers (for now!).

So there is always being, so there is always reference to reality. Makes sense, because reality is absolute and therefore the only and ultimate reference point anyways. In reference to the absolute you can only be reductive, referential, because you are relative and inferior to it. You should try to improve your references, because these references entirely define you, not the absolute.

I perceived the absolute as liquid, but then it is really me that is like liquid, or that is like riding in liquid. No,

Im vulnerable flesh and bones, surrounded by hard things mostly. But also some soft, because there is mercy in this world. It is raining, but the birds are still chirping - there is peace, but imperfection. The rainfall is gentle sorrow, but not that bad.

My little brother is breaking my heart. He does have alloplastic defense, but him and me do not work together anymore if I am not masochistic, no autoplasic defense. No more pathology - separation. Further he says he wants to go to dubai - he never really cared about us. Separate you bumfuck.

Ich, ICH war das Pflaster in meiner Familie - autoplasic and masochistic. Ohne mich hätten sich meine Eltern schon viel früher getrennt. Ohne mich hätten meine zwei Brüder sich schon viel früher zerstritten, jetzt tun sies. Ich war der Kleber, der pathologische Zusammenhalt. Jetzt nicht mehr und die Dinge nehmen ihren lauf, sie stoßen sich voneinander ab.

I texted with my little brother. We maybe made some progress. Only if you have an ability to bond, secure and with love, you can tell the truth. I would not know this without my little brother. He was so hurtful. He is stuck. It all depends on him, wheter he can learn to bond. He hides himself, so he lies so much. It is his decision. It was his childhood. It doesnt need to be his future.

Es ist schon länger her, aber ich war mal ein Nachhilfe in Mathe. Ich glaube ich war gut, auch wenn es weniger in Mathe, als mehr allgemein fürs Leben war. Das war nicht nur gut für ihn, sondern das war auch gut für mich.

Only frustration begets direction change, otherwise some grandiosity, some magical thinking, stays ignorant and harmful. Frustration is feedback. Furstration is reality for grandiosity. Frustration is specific, grandiosity and magical

thinking tend to become all encompassing and undifferentiating. Are grandiosity and magical thinking the same? Not exactly. Grandiosity is one kind of magical thinking, but magical thinking is not always grandiosity. What are the opposites? The opposite of grandiosity is compliance. The opposite of magical thinking is fatal hyperrealism. If you have one in your mind, then you also must have the other.

The inverted narcissist wants to be "out of shooting range". He in a sense is unempathic to other peoples loosing, as long as it isn't him. The inverted narcissist really is a big flying monkey.

Sometimes sensory overload really just fucks me up. Its exhausting and stupefying, but I'm proud if I still manage to do something. I don't think other people have this, they would be way different - this really must be either hypersensitivity or mild autism and I'm diagnosed with mild autism. This is one very big reason why I like privacy and aloneness, silence, peace. I really am lucky, or am I?

Cutting contact with abusive people is satisfying and easy especially if it isn't family (or work). Es ist ein notwendiger Ungehorsam zur Bewahrung der eigenen Würde und Freiheit. Ein notwendiges Nein. Fight or flight. Don't freeze for long. If you like, drop a small bombshell on your way out.

What somebody else said about a covert narcissist woman: "Hey y'all, this is my first time here, I want to serve karma to my covert narc ex (43F) she is selfish lying slut cheating scamming abusive cunt, unfortunately we still live together mainly for our special needs child and financial convenience, she is just relentless with her gaslighting and emotional psychological abuse, I've tried all the good stuff for years but now I just want to expose her beyond doubt without looking crazy myself and teach her a lesson. This is so validating."

Wenn du das böse zum guten gehen lässt, wenn du einen Wolf in eine Schafherde lässt, was glaubst du wird wohl passieren? Das Gute muss sich selbst verteidigen, Grenzen um sich ziehen, sonst stirbt es. Eine Grenze ist eine Prüfung am Maßstab des Guten. Und es sollte nicht nur eine Grenze sein, sondern mehrere physikalisch und geistig, zunehmend intimer. Die Grenzen entscheiden auch über Distanz, Ausmaß an Mitleid und Vertrauenswürdigkeit.

I am a big chungus. High tide or low water, I have it all.

Sometimes Im depressed so I cant read. Sometimes on the other hand Im so depressed that I can only read for hours without end, the whole day. Its rare and I just reread my comfort books. So I dont know. Its assuring. Eragon.

Ungehorsam.

The narcissist thinks changes in his inner world automatically exist in the outer world. Growing frustrates that delusion. The world becomes more objective, independent, frustrating. The narcissist treats the world in a highly biased and subjective way and thats why he is wrong about it so often. Frustration is separation. Frustration is the impossibility of establishing a win-win bridge. The ending of the extent of self. No firing together to wire together of neurons. Enabling independent movement, autonomy, individuation. Selfhood. Freedom about self by separating from the world. Idiosyncrasy and self referentiality. Emergence of self awareness and therefore the ability to selfregulate. No more repetition compulsion. Security trough borders. Identifiability of self opposed to other. Trust in being itself. Self love.

Sexuality is also firing together to wire together. Commitment is an extension of self. Love is transcending the self. Self love is self transcending the self. Ultimately what is the only final secure bond? That to the absolute, but the absolute also is the transcending. Therefore self transcending the

self only is possible through the absolute. So you can only love yourself through the absolute. In this sense this is also true, because reality always guides you. Sometimes it is extremely terrifying and painful, even in death reality is there. I can also be peaceful and there also is reality. Not believing in reality is attempting the impossible - it is not really possible. Here you also see how absolute and immutable it is, but this is a cruel take. Seeing the world as absolute is harsh and maximally strict. One perspective. If its just one perspective, how could I call it absolute? It means, as some buddhist (I have written to) would say, that Im in illusion about it. Its still there tho, come on, I need some security. My belly already was grumbling and disagreeing, so I really need security, quite a lot of it actually. No, there must be absolute and immutable things or nothing would hold. Just dont be arrogant about it. Your illusion is an illusion. Calling real things an illusion is a negation.

Real and true are synonyms. So reality and truth are also synonyms, the same. So the absolute is also truth as such and vice versa. Therefore truth is also infinite, unbound, without end and immutable. Truth is consistent and present everywhere. You can lie or err in words, but that then just means that you miss the absolute - you self defeat. The all-one, truth surrounds us and is us, me. Naming it is important. It is the bond, the touch with, in reality. It is proper faith, because it shows directly, it identifies it for what it is.

Ungehorsam gegen das Falsche und die Unwahrheit. Es soll nicht noch mehr Leid und Zerstörung sein. Ich habe mein Vertrauen in die Realität zurückgewonnen. Es ist Sicherheit nur im Echten.

Since the narcissist is delusional, it follows logically that if you are right that you need to be frustrating in some way to the narcissist.

Sloterdijk: "Wenn man von einem Problem genug besessen ist, dann ergibt sich der Rest von selbst." Vielleicht. Kann man sich das denn so leicht aussuchen?

Ich weiß zu wenig über magisches denken.

Sometimes I still get psychotic like impressions, but only if triggered by some fitting input, scary distorted pictures or the like. It is somewhat like when a child can't see mature stuff, because it impacts them so much. But I'm okay with most mature stuff. It's just some specific triggers, moods. This video triggered me: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=IoxUCbNUJUE> It contains excellent explanations and insights and that's one of the reasons why it worked. It made me aware of the remaining chasm. I'm also tired, so this increases the intensity. Quite a few things he said apply to my past self, less so now, but still this part that chasm - it doesn't go through my whole self, but it is there and significant. To be more precise: I'm not entirely psychotic, it is what was my empty schizoid core, that is psychotic. That means that I have more control than a more complete psychotic, it still affects me greatly though. Psychoticism knows no measure, it easily overindulges. This is why things are so impressive to it, because it doesn't know measure - border. It is not fitting, it is oversensitive, overexcitable, indulgent. Like a child or baby. It is destabilizing, deregulating me making me vulnerable and impressible, but it is also cute, direct, pure, adventurous. It, I want me to eat at night before bed, when I shouldn't. It hinders my adult efficaciousness, or rather restrains it a little. I don't want to fight with myself - that was my past. I want good. The psychotic part of me, my brain, is that which once carried (and swallowed) the traumatic parts, so that the rest of my mind - the mature, or at least more mature me could develop. Separation of concerns, inside the mind. This also makes sense: The psychotic part in me sometimes makes me

tired, depressed or drunk in order to subdue my mature self, make it more similar and compatible with my psychotic self part - ego syntonic. This then proves that its a great folly and arrogance to assume any part of the brain is wholly isolated or subjected to the rest. My psychotic self is as much me as I am, its just that the psychotic self isn't able to talk as well. Yet. He, it, me psychotic said that, yet. Any one lone part of me, alone, is not me whole, what I really am. You could say that the psychotic is pseudo unconscious, daydreaming without the rosy impression that might give, partial, not fully alive but certainly also not dead, a formerly isolated part of a human (but Im talking about myself), still quite not integrated. Or maybe integrated, but unaware - thats it. I will become. If Im almost sleeping, then my psychotic self part communicates and listens. This means that I do not have a empty schizoid core anymore, but a psychotic one, less empty, less isolated.

Reputation ist nur dann wirklich wertvoll, wenn die Leute vollumfänglich wählen können, also in echter Freiheit sind.

Angels wings imply the ability to fly, freedom. In a sense also beyond societal norms, unbound, good as its own justification. There is so much knowledge about good that I simply do not have. So Im in lack.

Boundaries are lines of frustration.

Cognitive dissonance creates psychoticism. Psychoticism is the reset, rest. Psychoticism is between disorder, chaos , change, dionysian and radical openness, profound creativity, the start, the very beginning. Psychoticism is painful and dangerous, the origin of life and any good order. Psychoticism is minimal bias possible, first principles (ego functions) seeking interpretation of reality. Complete psychoticism would make me completely vulnerable and dysfunctional. Partial psychoticism makes me dangerously creative (ty

myself and others). Lack of all psychoticism would make me static and immutable. Psychoticism itself is instable due to its own nature. Psychoticism is like an open question. Like in philosophy.

I do not have real fully fledged psychoticism, I have too much stability for that. Psychoticism is beyond good and evil.

My mother obviously is still the same, but Im tired of talking, writing, about her. I realize that she is way more hurtful and covertly evil towards me, undermining my confidence and autonomy, than I did when I was still a masochistic covert narcissist. She is bringing me down, hurting my autonomy, covert narcissist. I am tired, depressed.

I believe. No harsh thoughts.

In a sense the world is too big to just break it down in a few philosophical concepts without being ignorant about the majority of reality.

The eyes signal mental state, mind. Mind you.

If you have nothing left, then you need to make something. This is only possible if other people respect your boundaries in at least some way. Private property is one, volition is one or will. If there is no social approval of self, then there is only the purely mental and the purely physical. Respect for you volition is what makes civility and civilisation. Barbarians coerce, destroy society. Self defense is not coercion.

Being nice does cost something, it needs to be earned. Decency should be the default, good but cauteous will as default. Not everybody deserves being treated nicely. If you're nice to everybody then you are making yourself worthless. What level of decency is decent, fitting, depends on your current social environment. Social capital in society.

If you love everybody, then you hate yourself. Masochist, most likely.

Boredom is frustration, separation, reorientation (I read that similarly online first).

You should be groomed well enough in public, its part of being decent. There is also no place for arbitrarily screaming, assaulting, scaring or making loud noises. You can party, but it should remain reasonable. Public behavior and presentation generally shpuld be reasonable and decent, along the lines of a more broadly interpreted non-agression principle. It depends a lot on common opinions and specific circumstance. It is downstream to volition, volition is more important. So it needs to be consent based, opt-in. This means that all public spaces at least need to have some set of norms and rules and that participation is voluntary. It is like joining a game. These public rule games should be in competition to each other, like in Titus Gebels free private cities, but also digitally for example in crypto states. The best way to create and be public needs to be able to emerge voluntarily and bad ideas about being public will naturally be decided against, loose support, etc. Individuals laws should be opt in. Two people then can cooperate on the basis of overlapping laws and simultaneously live their individuality by choosing only those laws for themselves that they see as fit. So based on this (currently) chosen set of laws you then would have compatibility, indifference or incompatibility to specific public spaces. After all, laws are meant to serve people and not people to serve laws, like it is now partially. This would use the catalactic principle working for capitalism, free trade, also now for law. It would elevate the human spirit, because his choice matters. It would allow for maturation (chad-ness) as opposed to the modern day widespread immaturity.

Of course merely saying one adheres to some law does not constitute actual adherence. Incentives matter, as well as personality.

If you call something bad to be good, you attack goodness, equally as much as when you call something really good to be bad instead.

Trough my partial psychosis I can more clearly detect my big brothers (the classic narc) empty schizoid core. He is a terrible person. Why is he cruel and erosive? Because of projection defense of his empty schizoid core. The empty schizoid core itself would be unable to do this, it is the rest of his brain that serves it and enables it to be like this. His more mature self is recruited by his empty schizoid core, so he is more deliberate. Ironically this also makes him more recruitable to other peoples causes of the external environment - so here he lacks a self, is less autonomous than he thinks. This whole thing makes him adaptive in the position as the first born child in my pathological family as pathological golden child. He himself realizes that mother was not a good mother, yet he cant so easily overcome his own narcissistic dependence. There is some level of (pathological!) compatibility between covert and overt narcissist. He is also like a child, but in what way exactly? In a sense he treats his physical environment like his playground, he likes nice cars, etc. Think about Donald Trump. Thats his kind of psychology. So in certain regards he is quite badass. He can deal well with terrible events and remain functional, that is as far as a narcissist ever really is functional. He can, does and wants to be a leader, he wants the admiration. But he does not want admiration like an adult, but more like a idealized child. Admiring him is more fantastical and so is his whole position. It is not sustainable and must end badly. I think for example Jeremy Clarkson from Top Gear is also a classic narcissist. He is charming, makes others dependent on him and then is cruel, like his schizoid core demands. He is not as malignant as a malignant (psychopathic) narcissist. The ma-

lignants narcissists sadism is more perverted, while the classic narcissist is more childish even in his cruelty. You could say that the malignant narc is more pathologically mature in his sadism than the classic narc in his cruelty. Maturity implies more deliberation. The sadism/cruelty is a psychic compulsion. Its origin is always the empty schizoid core, the childhood trauma. In a sense they are unaware if their own cruelty, its like a matter of indisputable obviousness to them. SSomebody always had to suffer.in their minds. They do not understand the world without suffering. So, classic narcissism at least is projection defense of an empty schizoid core. And I feel like in a malignant narcissist, the trauma is even more severe, so the projection defense is even more cruel, sadistic, their mind even more warped because of it. They are completely cold, because thats how they have experienced the world. The classic narcissist has a childishness that the malignant narcissist does not allow himself to have, he deems even that as unsafe. He is at war, complete vigilance. He denies his being, because being is vulnerable, so he wishes to be nothing. I think he is the most traumatised among the narcissists. So, extreme vigilance is psychopathy. The extreme vigilante considers everything as aggression, so he attacks everything, because in the utmost case, attack is the best defense, so he attacks. They inflict cruelty or sadism because it affirms their world view. Because it affirms their world view, it also affirms themselves, so it is ego syntonic and therefore keeps them away from psychoticism. They would need psychoticism to heal from narcissism, but as long as they are socially successful enough, ad long as society itself is pathological, so long narcissism is adaptive and ego syntonic. So the real cure to the occurrence of narcissism (in all its forms) is in having a good society. Even a masochistic covert narcissist looses against a genuonely good person, meaning he

becomes psychotic through ego dystonia.

The truth is that even the narcissist is somebody, no matter how much he denies it.

An object relation is like a contract.

So many people are fucked up psychologically, it's sad.

There are psychopaths (primary and probably also secondary) that use narcissists. Yes, they use narcissists. Your average narcissist stands no chance against them except for the malignant (psychopathic) narcissist who is also a kind of psychopath. These people are beyond good and evil, really. They don't have moral feeling, conscience or guilt. If your intuition is intact, you will know them. Some of them smile like they would bite your head off clean. And probably they really would if it's convenient. I wonder if somebody like a classic narcissist has intact intuition to detect a primary psychopath. Primary psychopaths are more adaptive predators compared to a narcissist. They are evil to the point where it's almost simple again. Are they more or less dangerous and destructive compared to a malignant narcissist? I don't know. Certainly a primary psychopath can deal with narcissists without much damage. Maybe they even prey on them.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9w2mUU0Hyao>

They like to have big strong dangerous dogs. They are really out for tangible immediate power and control over other people. Maybe if they are well behaved and don't kill or initiate aggression or intimidation against people they can be an asset. But it's probably very unlikely, I would not feel safe around them. It really seems to be about bare and certain incentives with them. They are free minds in the sense that they really are not bound by morality, good and bad in the general sense. There likely is a coevolutionary process between psychopaths and moral feelings, predator and

prey but in alternating roles. Moral people can also decide to kill immoral people and so they most definitely are also predators sometimes. People generally want to live, also for evolutionary reasons, obviously. Psychopaths if, big if, they are peaceful should not be aggressed against. On the other hand, you should also not be forced to associate with them. If psychopaths go rogue they are killers, if moral people go rogue they become communist, socialist, authoritarian and kill millions. You can only either be a psychopath, or a moral person, so you are either in one camp or the other. Actions matter. Goodness, life, freedom, peacefulness matters. There is also an inbetween moral and psychopath, but then you most likely have your own thing that doesn't make you harmless either. The psychopath just goes for it, holy fuck.-

Not giving a shit is only liberating if giving a shit is painful and seems impossible. Giving a shit, caring, is how we necessarily must be in this world. The question is just, what you really care about.

In some weird sense the inverted narcissist glorifies pretentious, modern day, pop culture. He is like the perfect sheep, and that's infuriating. Just like pop culture he is also malicious in his dismissiveness, and also covertly provoking. Crucially, he is not his own leader. He follows what he perceives as strong, and he only perceives as strong a narcissist, maybe even a psychopath. He is not a loyal follower at all, but he is a follower. He only feels strong through another person. He is mildly abusive, and I mean really mildly. What the fuck.

If there were only psychopaths, then there would be no society.

Ownership is recognition of cause and effect. Misattribution of ownership is misattribution of responsibility, a failure of identification. Ownership is matter of fact. Responsibility

is just recognition of ownership, recognition of cause. This is also important for future planning (see austrian oeconomics), because only that which you own can you commit to, plan the future for, etc. Eigentum vergoldet. Und es ist auch die Notwendige Bedingung zur Selbstverwirklichung und der Möglichkeit von Selbstwirksamkeit. Ohne Eigentum letztendlich auch kein selbst und ohne selbst ist es der Tod. Hier also eine Verneinung, eine Invariante des Todes. Das Leben aber muss sein, muss kämpfen wenn nötig, für sein Leben. Es muss sich selber lieben.

Das Eigentum is aber mehr als nur das, es ist auch Konfliktvermeidung.

I feel sad for my mother too. She is living a cursed way, covert narcissism. If I think back to how I myself was compulsive in my masochism, I understand how she is compulsive in her covert sadism. It does not excuse her horrible behavior, but it does explain it.

Even small things scare me now, neurotic level of personality organization. I am continuous and realistic.

Real capitalism also is just really cool, useful, comfortable and strong.

A definition is a clarification of one reference by other references.

Infinity is a lack of frustration, unbounded being and unchallenged grandiosity, sameness. Finitude is frustration, boundary and realism trough feedback, ends. Scarcity, differentiation, distinction. Psychology teaches that you can only recognizes objects, if the are distinct to your self, if they have been made distinct trough frustration, separation. Finitude. Here is an interesting bridge between austrian oeconomics and psychology. Fantasy, simulation, is unbounded. Reality is bounded, it is almost like reality is that which binds the most. Nobody can escape reality, its the ultimate singular

referece (Although names and view points obviously differ).

Because currently germany is quite not free, german main-stream culture also reflects this. It is like boxed in, lacks vitality. It is without teeth, its conformist and therefore painful, cringe. Only free men can really talk.

Carolynn Ponzoha right about psychosis and I can relate to this: [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bS21fcFu\\_A0](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bS21fcFu_A0)  
Im not psychotic anymore, but there is the possiblity of these flashbacks and a unexpected loss of certain abilities I didnt even know I had. Its a kind of major overhaul of mind. It is ultimately good, masochistic covert narcissism is and was bad. I myself did not notice the loss directly, but more like indirectly suddenly having small difficulties with things I previously did with no issue. Like being clumsy about some things or being unexpectedly inappropriate without meaning to. Its not complete, but around the former empty schizoid core, which is still a major part of my brain. It like being a child growing up in some aspects. Im still smart, so I can compensate quite a lot, relearn more quickly. Relearn in a fresh, better way. I can read, etc. But I cant quite think about very complex things without feeling that it doesnt fit, that I lack some insights and clear, more certainty. I fear that Im making more mistakes and that Im more limited in my reach. And this is nothing I can brute force fix, all of it takes time. I think the extent (in the brain volume?) for me was not as big as for her in the video, but the symptoms she describes, to a lesser degree but qualitatively the same, apply to me too.

Honor is not zero sum. Aggression and antisocial behavior are dishonorable. Honor is pro-social. Therefore psychopaths are dishonorable, because they are anti-social (personality). Honor is not about status, it is an independent evaluation of how good somebody is to others (society). A good person

is also honorable, but a honorable person is not necessarily good. This is like a network. Being worth something in the eyes of a good person is honorable. Being worth something in the eyes of a bad person (in so far as a person can be bad) is not sufficient for honor. It is about good judgement. Anyways, Huemers thoughts about the root of evil are good, but feel still incomplete. I am confused. Later effects of psychosis. I feel like I lost some default awareness and orderliness. I do not fully get the usual outcomes from my usual actions, I make obvious, small mistakes. For my day to day life its nothing much, just inconvenient sometimes.

I also have trouble properly articulating myself, but before that trouble in proper thinking. Like a few parts of default operations has been unwired. I fire, but do not always get the proper response. I lack a portion of awareness I formerly had, so now Im clumsy, by being like blind (not by being overloaded), sometimes. If there is no trigger, then in this case there also isnt a response. I really changed. I have the pre-conditions now to be more automatic and less aware, more ignorant and more efficacious.

I get less triggered by all kinds of things and I also impose my will more easily on things and people. The ignorance lets me go forwards with little doubt. In a few ways I can act with less inhibition.

Having good bonds is important.

Merging inside. Anxiety, restlessness, mental pain, horror, uncertainty. The remnants of what was schizoid and empty. Empty means, that I need to reintroduce the world.

A sufficiently proven wrongful accusation is also a crime, but by the accuser, not the accused.

Anon: Are boundaries simply a way for people to control others? In a sense, yes. But a boundary is not about coercive control, it is merely about self defense.

A real free market is a moral system. It respects consent.

On the possibility of the reemergence of a kind of violent, oppressive or/and coercive christianity: To this Im obviously also opposed to.

Volition enables people to fit together, exchange abilities, fulfil desires, live in a society. Coercion creates conflict between people. Coercion is about force, changing and in effect more or less destroying what the other really is, denying the being of the other. Volition is civil, coercion is barbaric.

In a sense I am STILL searching for answers. I believe there is perfect justice, but what the fuck do I know? In a sense it is, but more than that has been, about the highest truths I could perceive, especially now that Im drunk. I have been hiding from you, I dont trust you fully, who the fuck even are you? I have no fucking reason to trust you! Reality, and you within it, is what is really trustworthy. But what does that mean? I am, dangerous. And now Im watching The Forest on amazon prime free and it fucking hits. Im cut off from all the normalcy.

My mothers mother is smothering and impersonal, like a prison guard, but she does take care of your basic physical needs like food. She triggered me back into a temporary bpd like state. She wants to control the house, she needs it to feel secure and she wants to know everything that happens. Probably something terrible happened (beyond world war 2?) in her childhood. I might never know what exactly and I do not intend to torture myself anymore by investigating her. She MADE my mother the way she is. I have suffered enough. I dont even want to know anymore and maybe that is exactly what she wants. She is hiding herself, defending herself. I dont need to know her, if I can know someone like her, at a safe distance. She was part of my childhood and I remember sleeping on her couch and the eerie ringing of the

old clock, the fortified night.

There is no alternative to goodness, so I would rather suffer than loose goodness, but crucially, suffering is bad.

On the liars paradox: This sentence is wrong. I feel like true self referential negation is impossible, like some thing also can not become nothing, but can change - in a sense there is an implicit preserval of true essence. The sentence proofs the impossibility of true self negation on the plane of its existence. A sentence can not stop itself from being a sentence, a truth statement. This is also interesting, because it means that true self hatred is impossible, because the self denying the self already is affirming the self acting and ultimately can not deny the self. This proves that narcissists also never really can defeat or deny their true selves. It also proves that a soul can not destroy itself. It is introversion.

Apologies only work if they are intentional and honest, a self subjugation and a taking of accountability and just consequences of ones own actions. Ability to apologizes honestly requires humility and maturity.

There are surprisingly many masochistic covert narcissists. Yes, it seems they also, like other narcissists, act for garnering attention. Ellesmere (wow player) is most likely also one.

Only absolute values matter. The relative is only relevant if it is relative to something absolute and therefore absolute itself by implication. The relative is the referential and virtual, the absolute is firm reality. The relative can get lost in itself if it fails to properly reference reality. The relative (all thoughts) is meaningful only through properly referencing the absolute.

A lot of writing is about imagining things and it shows the authors internal world view more than the actual world itself. You can only hope to reference well. Writing is not for

the world as such, but for human minds.

Hope is important. Hope is the precursor to good and to any advancement. Hope requires courage. Hoping is a thing only the strongest people do.

Clashes between psychological servicing and law, leading to unethical outcomes. Another example of the failures of interventionism: <https://youtu.be/fyGIxCWrVAY?t=421>

Anon: There comes a point where someone is so weak that pity is replaced with contempt. This is immoral and evil. This stems from a dog eat dog mentality, where only the strong deserve to live. What nature really selects for is for the most fitting self replicator, which is not necessarily (but could be) the strongest. If your world view is one in which the weak get crushed, then you are most likely traumatized. So its probably a memory of yours, that the weak get crushed, and you most likely feeling weak. One instance does not make a generality, but self defense is justified. If it categorically really was true that the weak get crushed, then no baby would survive into adulthood and humanity (and most species) would die out. It is a vigilante, self limiting, belief. There is necessarily vested interest of the strong for a selection of the weak to survive, their own offspring at the very least. Might does not make right, except for absolute might unavailable to human beings. This means that human striving for absolute might is doomed to fail and leads to a defeat in that striving. Humans can not claim godly power, they can not change reality, reality is absolute. The more they try to change something absolute, they necessarily only really change and distort themselves, they become hollow, narcissistic. The big question becomes, changing so much, for what? If there is nothing really worth fighting for, then? Then why fight. Denying any value, because valuing makes vulnerable. But if there is no value, then there is no for what,

no meaning, no point - self defeat. But there is a valuing beneath all this, or the person would have killed themselves. In a sense the real valuing can not be allowed to be named, because even naming makes vulnerable. He wants to destroy external values, destroy happy people, because it makes him unhappy.

What happens if two psychopathic narcissists meet? They seem to be preying on each other or using one another in a psychopathically calculated objectified way.

Insightful:

url`https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=byb3ffrBYgU` he is a little too devaluing about midwits". My diagnosis about the state of academia is slightly different. I dont think the midwits are at fault, but the incentive system.

Professor Vaknin is right, Nietzscheanism is a religion. They might not call themselves by it, but it still possesses the qualities of a religion. It is a profound, hermeneutic, addictive world view. But its also very turbulent and uncertain. I do not want it whole sale. I have my own perception of good and to a degree it is also something emotional private.

Nah, Aurora isn't evil, I was projecting from somebody evil onto her wrongly.

Jordan Peterson focuses on conscientiousness, but people are causal agents! Conscientious action only makes sense if you believe that you really can achieve something good and meaningful. If you don't have private property, if you are a slave or if you are otherwise hindered (this could also be due to past bad experiences) then there is no reason for conscientiousness except for fear of punishment, which is barely conscientiousness at all. Conscientiousness is a byproduct of what really matters: Belief of efficaciousness, proper cause for good effect. People are reasonable and so they reasonably only act if they believe that it achieves what they really want. They

would be stupid and easily exploitable if it were otherwise. An imaginary very conscientious person, that has no wants, is a perfect slave. This would be unsustainable as a life form. Ludwig von Mises praxeology has great explanatory power beyond just looking at conscientiousness as an isolated factor. So Gad Saad discovered that conscientiousness is not emotion dependent. This makes sense, because conscientiousness is rational and selective. Conscientiousness is targeted, it is the result of commitment and parts of what conscientiousness is is non-obvious. There are very many different things you can value, commit to or adhere to. Conscientiousness is a very limited notion of the more general notion of commitment. It is only nowadays that brute conscientiousness is more successful than more differentiated sensitive commitment. My father is very conscientious but I suspect he can only be so at the price of being a schizoid narcissist and of having suffered my angry cold grandmother and her stricture. In his case it is adaptive.

Communists have magical thinking. Every living animal must provide for itself but they think that humans magically are the exception. They also believe in a post scarcity society, but scarcity is a major, unalienable and inherent part of reality. Further they believe in the abolition of private property while private property is a de facto causative state of things. If you eat a piece of cake you de facto have made it your private property. As Mises said: There is public property exclusively before but never after consumption. Ignoring this fact is willful blindness and deception about that actual state of things. Communists disregard reality and so they ultimately reap what they sow by being ignorant about it: Destruction and demise.

Virtue emerges by respecting volition. It is not superimposed or learned (only if you already are virtuous you would

have incentive to learn to be virtuous, defeating its own point. Otherwise the only reason to learn virtue is by evil ones to attempt to pervert it) - it is circumstantial to the many choices of free will in reality. Virtue is about what is fitting between people and this obviously depends on the circumstances of these people. Virtue is a free market outcome and as such it is constantly improving, changing, adapting and innovating. Volitional win-win and defensive loose-loose, reciprocal altruism, tit-for-tat but rational.

Just to make this clear: I'm not against expertise or knowledge. I am against the aggression and coercion with the excuse of being an expert. I am not against intellectualism as such and obviously such a position is stupid. I am against arguments from authority, trust needs to be earned and each can and must let be to decide for himself who to trust and how to perceive them - as competent or incompetent, good or malicious, etc.. And yes, people also are allowed to change their minds about others if they want to. It's nobody else's business. Healthy boundaries, you bastard!

Evil should not be defended. Good should not be attacked. You need to discern. If you know what is good, then you know how to act. If you know what is evil then you know how not to act. Only good is desirable, by definition. How do evil people exist then? They are all confused and in error. I also can not claim to know the full extent of what good really is.

Now if there are souls, can they be created? Is a soul a specific perspective on reality?

Pride and grandiosity arguably are the same. Grandiosity is like a generalized pride.

I am really autistic also in the sense that I have a few non-functional behaviors that I repeat and they soothe me and are among the few things I do quite unconsciously. They

really do soothe me. Or is it a form of slight ocd? Its hard to tell. These behaviors are functional in their original cases, but not in the unconscious manner I do it - they are functional to me only psychologically. This behavior has been with me since as far as I can remember. It is independent of masochistic covert narcissism. It really likely is due to my aspergers. I can only think clearly if I am calm, well rested and healthy. Ideally I also did some sport, better yet really intensive sports. Only in parasympathetic activation I can think. I can not be tired either. Everybody is like that. Relaxation is among the most important requirements for thinking.

If chinese people became able to embrace more capitalism, they would be more than a world power, they could largely dominate world economics.

Interessant: <<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=f91jAVXOw30>>

Good ways to start the day: Reading, sports or extreme schizo-posting.

Crazyness is a solution to a crazy acting society only. In a robinson crusoe like situation on a lonely island only pure self interested rationality matters. Crazyness is a purely societal phenomenon. Psychopathy must be a defense against crazyness, a rejection of a as crazy perceived society a robinson crusoean island within itself.

Im generally easily frustrated now about disagreement even if that disagreement is reasonable. I guess this is necessary. Im still just quite a bit immature, but this is ok. It is part of my journey. Me still growing up at 29...

Having a free society, a freedom loving society means a society that respects volition.

A more diverse mix of species is not necessarily more resilient, even if I thought that. It all depends on the specific circumstances.

You can not break reality. You are always in reality by

default. Reality is that which is. You can only change your perception of reality somewhat, distort yourself somewhat, make yourself unintelligible.

Following from Nietzsches insight into schätzen (valuing, treasuring): Value and you will create value. Treasure and you will become rich.

I think there is objective reality but yes access to it is only possible as a subjective agent and therefore understanding and comprehension of objectivity is incomplete. Subjectivity is faced with something external and this other is the object. The subjective to objective is a relationship and a boundary of necessary frustration, separation. If you give up on the objective you necessarily also would need to give up on the subjective. In this world you are a I subject though and therefore you also must experience the objective external, otherness. Either ways, in reality you are held absolutely.

Respecting freedom and respecting volition are the same.

I really think that masochistic covert narcissists understand so much. They understand the things that others refuse to understand out of self preservation. A cold and lonely star, suffering. Every narcissist is hurting. Every narcissist is grandiose, one way or another, as compensation. Seeing a masochistic covert narcissist now is sad. He indeed is like a saint. He gives advice, he heals, he expends himself and makes people to hate him - masochistic supply. And he does it unconsciously - its is like an unconscious pull. He is delusional, he feels out of control all the time. His internalized harsh criticism constantly puts him on edge. He performs mechanically but he seeks consolation. He wants to be smothered in relationships. Like his relationship with his own mom. It is a cruel song. And it can never be him that wins. This is what his shame demands. His shame is in his empty schizoid core and his conscious part of his mind is harsh

towards it. His empty schizoid core destabilizes him and is erratic or depressive or cruelly striking him leading to masochism and self defeating behavior. This part is avolitional, the empty schizoid core is the origin of avolition because it is unconscious. The unconscious is the real(m) of avolition, the conscious the realm of volition. His unconscious is his traumatized schizoid hurt child. It talks like a monster and it acts like the tides, like storms, like forces of nature - avolition. It is the suppressed part of the self. It is introverted, frozen in time. It does not mature as long as the pathology is there, the coping system. His mature self is only a part therefore, not really mature because its not whole. The empty schizoid core is close to what Jung called the shadow self. As I said, I could discretely locate it in my mind. Im not sure if this is possible in each case, but probably. Discrete location means I can address it and this is among the first step of making the unconscious conscious, reintegration. But for this the conscious part also needs to stop being so harsh towards it. It is like the former mother child relationship is in the mind, the child being the empty schizoid core, the mother being the half mature harsh public facting more conscious part. If he has a girlfriend, he treats her like his mother. But more generally he tends to treat everybody that way, like a (not so secure) base. What does he do in a group/tribe? He also infantilizes, but in a weird way. In a sense he takes charge of background/meta thinking. He really wants to monopolize it. Background means: non-intrusive, at least once any real self is expressed he ceases. In a sense he plays in meta space only, because meta is fantasy and is not incarnated in this world, not being in this world, absence. If anybody accepts his meta, he ceases his own meta agency, infantilized in the meta space. Then he treats them somewhat like he treats his own schizoid empty core - with somewhat contempt. He

reigns supreme in absence. He talks about other people as if they were not there - he talks to his own introjects of them, not the real them. So here he forces others into an absence too. Disregards them without disregarding them. In a sense he can not talk about the actual and others can only be unserious because they are meta disregarded. He makes people retaliate, small sadism to reintroduce the world to him. Only sadism seems real to him. Everybody wants to be stable in reality, everybody wants reality testing. He is stoic like a robot, but then also self aware somewhat about it. His self awareness is self punitive. He treats others as if they were patterns and he claims to be the only one understanding their pattern, claiming to fully explain them, robbing their agency, but not actually robbing it. He is after all a spectator. He acts only by means of grand narrative, by mere interpretation.

In the realm of human action this seems to be: Psychopathic narcissists act by cause and effect, too objective. Masochistic covert narcissists act by interpreting what is cause and what is effect, too subjective. But all of this is painful;

The inverted narcissist also creates a shared fantasy, he also introjects and snapshots so he also can not deal with agentic, free, healthy people. But he has an autoplasic defense about his own inability, he blames himself and in this regard then he is more healthy than classical narcissists. He is overall still pathological.

My mother ruins things intentionally. She tries to deny my self-efficacy, create shame. She continually denies me any independent success, she devalues and overlooks anything independently good in me. She is blind.

Excellent: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=s9ZwdTE9AMQ>

The term survival of the fittest does not mean might is right, fitting is a broader and more specific criteria. As a sim-

ple example: Humans evolved to have less muscle mass compared to most apes, because muscles require lots of energy. Humans place right over might out of necessity for a functioning useful and secure society. Might itself also is not just one magnitude but highly situation and context dependent. Humans further are not allmighty, every human might necessarily is finite and in so far as humans discover infinite relationships they can only obey them as absolute properties of reality. Is might right in war? Not even there. It might make you win the war or battle (which is also not guaranteed at all) but then win what? Land, money? Freedom? Dictatorship and slavery? What is it worth fighting for? Do you know what is really worth risking everything? What is conclusively good?

Eigensinn und Weltsinn machen beide Sinn. Was aber wenn sie nicht zusammenpassen? Both are part of the absolute.

Restrictions on liberty reduce the number of things tried and so reduce the rate of progress. Friedrich Hayek

Things that have to do with infinity in any way, shape or form are interesting. A dimension is also an infinity.

Die ausgesprochene Wahrheit muss man sich verdienen und leisten können, leider. Alleine Aufmerksamkeit ist schon ein Preis, aber es gehört mehr dazu. Die Dinge müssen stimmen.

Most transsexuals are either from traumatized abusive upbringing or are otherwise mentally ill. Transitioning often times is an attempt at gaining love, attention and acceptance. Transexuals tend to feel unworthy of love and they try to cling towards being loved, even force other people to acknowledge them. Some are antisocial. Transsexuals are very turbulent and fetishizing - the fetish and perversion an attempted outlet of their trauma, their anger and their strong

feelings of wanting to be wanted. By transmen a woman after all is seen as an object of desire, being wanted and they too want to be wanted, loved, belong. By transfemals only manhood seems to be acceptable and worthy of being seen and they want to be accepted and be seen. A minority of trans is biologically trans (xxy chromosomes, partial testosterone resistance, etc.). The EXTREMELY high suicide rate of transsexuals of 41

Very good: <https://substack.com/home/post/p-166015895?source=...> but I don't like his usage of the word slave. A real slave can not make demands self efficaciously at least as long as he acts in the role of a slave.

Information about good is distributed to each individual. No one person knows what is best for all, there is no human that knows what is best for everybody in every circumstance.

True culture needs freedom and volitionality. Only then can you expect goodness in public.

At this point it is more noticeable to me if somebody is less or more intelligent than me. The less intelligent seem to lack understanding while I myself have a hard time understanding the more intelligent. This understanding difference of course only applies to meaningful content, anybody can say random meaningless things that nobody understands and where it most likely doesn't make sense to look for meaning except for the motivation of acting in such a way. As my past as a masochistic covert narcissist, due to internal turbulence, I ascribed meaning to even some very erratic things. Not anymore, I'm more sane now. My filters on reality are more sane and ordinary. Understanding is about following the meaning, valuing. Intelligence is a good ability to value, assess, in a very differentiated way. And yes this can be helpful in problem solving, but by itself is not sufficient for actual

problem solving.

If the other party in a discussion insists on polylogism, then he implies a break in the possibility of reasoned communication with him. You can not have reasonable arguments between polylogists. It is a somewhat regression into an animal state. In this case you either stop communicating or only emotions and idiosyncratic judgements matter, private language and independent grandiosity, talking besides but not with each other. Like how narcissists talk with each other. So also the other way around: Reasonable communication is only possible if people are capable and also voluntarily subject themselves to logic. This requires a base level of intelligence and humility. On the other hand, nobody should be forced to talk to anybody in any specific way. In polylogism both parties remain inside their own world of make-belief and they remain inaccessible to others and others to themselves. Their causative life plans sail on primitively. This does not mean the emotions are categorically wrong, but it does mean that emotion without reason is poor. What is rationality compared to emotionality? Slow and frustrating, but if successful it seems like magic to the emotions. So the problem with polylogism is that it prevents the rational communication necessary for higher civilisation. Polylogism denies the possibility of any common causality, the commonality of human action by cause and effect. The problem people have with rationality is if it is used in an alienating way - denying the others self. This of course evokes a self defensive reaction, but it is not an argument against rationality as such, it is an argument against malicious usage of rationality. Rationality in this world is only necessary, because emotion does not know everything. Rationality is used out of necessity. Rational thinking is not easy and it is costly in time attention and resources, yet it is the only thing that enables humans to fit

better in the world.

Von Mises, Human Action: The idea emerged that every human adversary should be considered as a potential partner in a future cooperation, and that this fact should not be neglected in the conduct of military operations. War was no longer considered the normal state of interhuman relations. People recognized that peaceful cooperation is the best means to carry on the struggle for biological survival. We may even say that as soon as people realized that it is more advantageous to enslave the defeated than to kill them, the warriors, while still fighting, gave thought to the aftermath, the peace. Enslavement was by and large a preliminary step toward cooperation. Long time preference.

So the narcissists abuse is the projection of his own internal shame.

Narcissism is a fast life history strategy, because it is more about short term hype and excitement and less about any long term stability or sustainability. Narcissists abhor boredom, slowness and wholesomeness. They seek excitement in a continual and relentless attempt to flee their shameful hurt self parts. They are restless. He considers winning a zero-sum game. Either he wins and others must loose, or he loses if others win anything, envy. If he wins then his wins are never staisfying or satiating, because they lack wholesomeness, because the narcissist still feels shameful and hurt. Narcissists can heal, but it is among the most difficult things there is. They must confront themselves and accept their shame - reintegrate their being. Wholeness then is the precondition to wholesomeness. Git gud is not true anymore then.

If masochistuc covert narcissists understand ao much, then this also means that they can see people so much to the point of loosing themselves. Being in the presence of another masochistic covert narcissist makes me feel incerdibly seen.

This could also possibly be interpreted as a special form of love-bombing.

The narcissist wants all attention for himself because it stabilizes his psyche - he needs to be seen. Attention is a finite resource. And so he creates chaos, anything necessary to get attention. He as best he can introjects himself into other peoples minds. If there really is a rise in narcissism, then you can also expect more aggression between narcissists over finite attention and limited sources of narcissistic supply. Then necessarily a portion of narcissists fails and becomes either covert, masochistic covert, borderline or psychotic.

Healthy frustration is learning, feedback of limitation and scarcity into the psyche.

A lot of game theory is opinion and a lot of its ways of interpretation and usage evil disguising itself as objective and inescapable fact. Real life is not a mere game.

Absolute truth is truth about the absolute, truth about the infinite, all-one, immutable, a priori and any other synonyms. Gaining insights into absolute truth, like for example in mathematics or austrian oeconomics, matures the self and society. It improves reality testing, models of reality and therefore is an approach to reality, an attempt at becoming conform to reality, fitting in, growing. Because a priori givens are immutably solid and reliable, evolution and gene selection also approaches it. Although I do not know how far or how close we are now. Necessarily Im part of it (part of the all-one).

Now, in reality, the world have paid too great a compliment to critics, and have imagined them to be men of much greater profundity than they really are. Henry Fielding

Profound and based should mean the same.

A failure in reality testing is a failure in perceiving the absolute. This does not change the absolute, because it is

absolute, but it corrupts the self, corrupts the personality. Personality is the way in which we interact with and perceive reality. Good personality means recognizing reality well. Reality is the a priori. Good personality means good understanding of the a priori, fitting into reality. Im herkömmlichen Sinn ist das äquivalent mit: Gute Menschen sind gottesfürchtig. Gott äquivalent zum Absoluten, zur Realität, der Unendlichkeit, Unveränderlichkeit, etc. This then explains Carl Jungs remark that Religion solves (solved) psychology. Each religion (like each philosophy, ideology and world view) was an attempt at fitting into the absolute and by this it also defined whole niches for personality. But now there is vested interest in maintaining the status quo: People also most likely have evolved some genes (or epigenetic settings) to fit their religious past, me included. There is some amount of truth in every religion, probably even in the worst. Truth is that which corresponds to reality, even if it can not be named explicitly or concisely at the moment. You can learn something from every religion. Religions are empirically validated in the human sense and coevolved alongside humans. But truth is truth and some parts of religion are evil or plain wrong. Further, while religion is unifying and orienting, it also is not comprehensive. It is dogmatic, or at least tends to be dogmatic and ignorant about some important parts of the world.

Again: Wanting to be left alone is perfectly reasonable in a volitional context. Human interactions should be mutually volitional and therefore win-win interactions. Otherwise society is a vice, but it should be a virute.

The masochistic covert narcissist (not me anymore you jackasses :P) self sabotages. This self sabotage looks somewhat like the covert sadism of a covert narcissist, but self-applied, covert masochistic. Me now watching a masochistic

covert narcissist is validating, because this is my past life and this was how I dealt with my family circumstances. He is always reducing conflict, or he is self sabotaging, covertly taking the blame. He is preventing family conflict, he absorbs bearable blame. He is his own prison. He self denigrates.

You could really argue that Im the world leading expert on masochistic covert narcissism. I am it seems, although I didnt look far at all. All this attributes to what a chameleon a masochistic covert narcissist is. But if you know what to look out for, then its characteristic and pretty obvious. What is the big error of the masochists thinking? He confuses love with pain. He is unable to properly love himself, nurture himself. He is naturally altruistic including the point of self destructiveness, self trashing, self reputation destroying. In a sense he baits the negative projections of others onto himself. There is a kind of discipline in this masochism. There is avo-lition in masochism, unconscious drive towards masochism (the empty schizoid core in action and the rest pathological mature responding by strictness). There is an internal fight. Other people rightfully question the masochistic covert narc, if "he even cares"(quote) and they are right. Its part of a game, an internal drama. The masochistic covert narcissist is frustrated by himself too, very much so. While the psychopathic narcissist acts in plausible deniability about his cruelty (sadism), the masochistic covert narcissist acts in plausible deniability about his masochism, self defeating tendencies. The masochistic covert narcissists false self is his successful self. Masochistic acts are the expression of lived shame and so they are ego syntonic, a way of integrating the shame, a feeling of being loved, moment of wholeness. All narcissistic supply, to the corresponding narcissists, is ego syntonic.

At some point in the past my mother told me that she could not be alone like me. I think she was actually referring

to narcissistic supply (unconsciously?). She needed external supply, while I as a masochist could self supply. There is a huge difference. So in this one sense, possibly only this one, the masochistic covert is in advantage to all other narcissists. In terms of life outcomes, with self trashing, he is fucked majorly.

It is clear that my mother is somewhat retraumatizing me, especially now that Im more receptive. But not only her. Politics is mostly hostile and the media is largely devastating. And then there is also the rest of my family. As it looks like my cousing COULD develope classic narcissism. It is yet to be seen, because he is too young. But my uncles side of the family definitely has its own pathology(s). My half sister and half brother also dont look fine in their own ways. Not only my immediate, but also my extended family seems to be a clusterfuck. But it could be worse, I know way worse families. Not an excuse, but a recognition of the state of things. Pathology tends to attract pathology.

Why this grinding search for the absolute? Because I was searching a safe place, to trust. Because of this I was coming back, seeking, an, the absolute. But do not forget, the all-one is also. My own conclusions are coming back to me, not only do I judge the world by concluding, the all one also judges me by my conclusions. I lack good faith to be. But I want good faith!

I think politicians and mass media is weaponizing psychology and using it to achieve their coercive ends. For example they use accusation in a mirror or DARVO (Deny, Attack and Reverse Victim and Offender). Now some german bureaucrats are even attacking free speech. As I already explained, the state is quite similar to a narcissist. The state is consumptive, not productive and for achieving this consumption it steals, robs, etc. And it wants to be praised like a narcissist,

it wants all attention and it wants to control and neuter its citizens like a narcissist controls and neuters his victims. It denies independence and healthy freedom, it infantilizes its subjects. It continually creates new problems, to self aggrandize by making itself act like the savior. Ludwig von Mises proved how interventionist policies necessarily create failure, which then are used as excuses for more interventionist policies - a gradual decline into communism and total control. The DARVO most of all happens by blaming the free market (freedom) for the states failures. Ludwig von Mises in his book socialism explains so many variants and kinds of these state failures and their manipulative misattributions by state propaganda and state profiteurs. Freedom is not the problem. The problem is totalitarian, coercive, propagandistic and manipulative control. Freedom is the solution, the only solution. Also like a narcissist has flying monkeys, so also the state has flying monkeys: People brainwashed by state propaganda, or favored by the scraps of state robbery. The state also enmeshes people, like in the rent system or by forcing them to use the inflationary fiat money.

The dictator Mussolinis statement: *Everything inside the state, nothing outside of it.* illustrates the similarity with narcissism. The narcissist wants to place himself above reality, he wants everything inside himself, his own fantasy above reality. He missperceives others as what he imagines them to be, instead of what they really are. He attempts to impose himself on others, instead of granting them healthy independence.

A narcissist can never properly listen, because he is biased about you to the degree that he invalidates your freedom. If you are hurt, then you are biased in your hurt, it colors everything and it makes you short sighted out of necessity.

The masochistic covert narcissist is unable to express ag-

gression. He by default internalizes aggression, he is afraid of his own aggression! Probably the black file technique can help with that (if that even is an official psychology thing). Taking time, writing down the 10 most hurtful suppressed personal experiences. Going over them and seeing which one is most deep, suppressed. Feeling into it. Staying with it and confronting it, making it conscious. Similar to Jungs shadow work.<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=74US-8AI-bU> There is agency in aggression. If you can not aggress, then you lack agency. This is one big puzzle to the masochistic covert narcissist. This is why he self supplies, instead of external supply. It is among the last to solve, after the empty schizoid core is better integrated and healed. Simply approaching a new person requires a small amount of aggression - imposing yourself on their senses, time and attention. A micro aggression.

The aggressive real is a realm of mutually exclusive self imposition on things by force. This mutual exclusivity implies, that two aggressive people can only fight, while an aggressive and a submissive is a monopoly for the aggressive and two submissive wont fight but also wont claim anything at all. Both aggression and submission are biases, they both imply the unconditional necessity of an aggressive space. They both live in a cruel world. Both are wrong, if there is to be good. Both are at most finite. The aggressive keeps his actions coherent with his motives, but can act in violence. The submissive is a hypocrite, but prevents violence.

Because a lot of my family is narcissistic one way or another, shouldnt I be in favor of narcissism for reason of kinselection? No, good is good and evil is evil. I can only lament these facts about my birth-family. And to the degree that anybody in my family harms another he should be punished appropriately and after that, if possible, rehabilitated - but I

see little chances of success and nobody should harm himself trying to rehabilitate a narcissist. Judgements about good and evil are a universal above every human.

My mother laughs like a witch.

Is consent the foundation of ethics? Consent implies free will and consciousness. Ethics seems to care first and foremost about consciousness or only human consciousness, or only human and animal consciousness, etcetera. Coercion is destruction and denial of the consciousness of the target of such coercion/destruction.

On the blockchain private unique knowledge of a private key is private property, causative power over signing transaction on a specific account. So it can be the that private knowledge is as useful as private property, but this is not always the case, I assume. Blockchains and generally online platforms with a password secured login are virtual private ownership platforms. But this role of knowledge is new, knowledge as property. On the blockchain, strictly speaking, everybody owns every account (so there is no ownership at all, because ownership is stable, transferrable, exclusivity), because everybody could brute force the private key of every other account if they had insurmountable compute resources or if mathematicians found a new fast enough way to solve the assymetric cryptography used. For practical purposes, cryptography seems secure.

It is generally true that special knowledge be like private property (but not all private property is special knowledge) - it expands the causative space, the option for achieving a wider variety of outcomes.

So what is the step into Kantianism? The realization that good is invariantly good (fit). Thats good is the only that also can be, that there is no being without good and that being is invariantly true. Real Kantianism is worship of the inva-

riant good. But the chaotic subverts and knowledge (even about the fundamentals) is incomplete. Kant ironically also is wrong about Kantianism, some of his takes are painfully and self destructively naive - not virtuous.

Causative power (like private property), profits, losses and responsibility must be one.

I feel more ignorant in general and I also feel more uncertain about any grand statements - my own and others. I feel currently incapable of scrutiny and sufficient comprehension of deep philosophical or poetic statements. I lack the data, experiences. I'm having a hard time creating a mental context. The mental context is essential for any good philosophizing. Philosophizing requires some amount of fantasy, but fantasy require mental context, world view, simulation space. I'm more just being. I'm more internally justified, naive and potentially agentic. Boredom is more prevalent, but boredom implies stability and that's good, that's an improvement. If your memory is contiguous, then things are more familiar and more familiar means more boredom, but also more stability. On the other hand a narcissist is discontinuous and always sees the world with somewhat new eyes, is excited and frightened. A narcissist experiences both more novelty and uncertainty, but he forgets it. My thinking feels comparatively localized - the global space is unoccupied. This means that I'm more flexible, potentially adaptive to circumstances. But I also need to relearn.

The narcissist is incapable of proper boundaries, unable to finish things, to isolate events - she is a mess. There is no proper understanding of finitude - here you have the grandiosity. The narcissist is partially frozen in time, immutable and therefore eternal, boundary blurring, deity like - but corrupted. There is no proper self in him, because he never properly separated himself. Self is finite and the

narcissist doesn't understand that. Maybe if we die the self becomes boundarie-less again, but not for the living. Then this boundlessness of the narc implies that he is not properly alife, aliveness means selfhood, consciousness, he has yet to grow up, but he's stuck. And fundamentally the narcissist also laments that about himself.

The absolute can't be reached, but you are always already there. Reaching means relative going and what is going relative to the absolute? Everything finite? No you can not go relative to the absolute. Towards the absolute you can only be in an absolute relationship. Since this absolute relationship is absolute it is what you are fundamentally and you are nothing besides that. I don't know if it could be named, but I think it must be fundamental to the universe, because it is absolute. It could be like numbers, each number is absolute and fundamental, immutable, inalienable, eternal, and so forth, yet there are infinite unique numbers. Souls could be like that.

Don Carveth: "All images are partial and incomplete." <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=KJLjyfzXWUw>  
He is a biased masochistic covert narcissist. In the video he is self shaming with plausible deniability - biased, masochistic.

Any human system that is anti-meritocratic is most likely doomed to fail, is unsustainable. Any system that reduces the rewards for merit from what it would voluntarily be otherwise is also most likely doomed to fail, because it creates parasitism at the cost of healthiness. Volition based systems are meritocratic.

Why do there exist open secrets? What is an open secret? Shameful but widely known things. Are open secrets an indicator for an eroding society? Secrets are private knowledge. Open secrets are widely known, but not openly acknowledged. How does this work? If in the individual psyche shameful suppressed, but true thoughts lead to pathology, then open

secrets hint at pathological society. It means that there is truth that society's fantasy can acknowledge. It means that society is willfully blind. Having open secrets in society also means that many individuals have needs and truths they can not safely reveal to society. This means that the specific society is not so much based on truth, but on fiction, wrong ideals. These private truths are bound to create their private cosmos - away and opposed to society - repressed or secretly lived. This dissonance between the individual and society is very costly and inhibits flourishing. It is dramatic and destructive. Society is something that humans do, but why would society be masochistic? The point of society is win-win interactions. It always starts out as win-win interactions, but it can go bad. What is a society? But people also hide themselves from themselves and consent comes first. Hiding and secrecy have reasons and they are not always pathologic. It is a defense against shame, against bad will of other people and it is a defense against immoral, malignant and evious people.

Society attempts to define what is legitimate and good, and what is disallowed and taboo. Society attempts to define what is merit. But fundamentally merit and good are invariant - society can only be closer or further from the natural ideal. Society can pervert good and merit, rendering them meaningless and their public application malicious. But society should not stand fundamentally in individual humans way. Humans commit to society, sunken cost, except if they are psychopathic or if they are disillusioned by society. A good society is guided by volition - in this way it preserves the relationship between individual benefit and society.

Society gone wrong is the wide spread phenomenon with most modern states. There is a coercive kind of membership in these. People are afraid, they want security and freedom.

Others are brainwashed and mentally ill - their value system is broken and they easily go wrong. The saying applies: The nail that stands out is hammered in. Other destructiveness and selfdestructiveness is wide spread. Time preference is shortened, criminality rises (private as well as public criminality). Average IQ plummets under this semi-communism. Selection pressure is against Kantian traits and for more immediate self interest and myopic egoism (not rational egoism). (Kantianism is long time preference). This short time preference is also enforced through fiat money inflation and inheritance tax. There is an ever increasing political bureaucratic class taxing ever more a dwindling private sector productive class. (The real class "difference" is between private volitional productive and political coercive consumptive, democracy is an insufficient substitute for real volition). How can this end? Poverty, death or reform. The state in his ignorance and grandiosity.

My mother is projecting her problems onto me, she is attempting to problematize me, say I'm ill - and that she cares. Meanwhile she is the problem and I am mentally healthy. She attempts to infantilize me, because she is stuck in childhood. She attempts to get me back as scapegoat, because it is actually her that is dependent on narcissistic supply and a target for projecting badness. Otherwise she feels shameful and vulnerable, she can not live with herself.

Identification is pattern recognition, recognition in general. If intelligence is pattern recognition, then intelligence is the ability to identify. Correct identification is reality recognition towards the conceptual space. The more intelligent then should have more accurate internal representations of reality. The internal world model of more intelligent should have higher fidelity and better differentiation (resolution). All of this is costly and slow and more error prone because

more variables are involved. General intelligence is not necessarily a general advantage to real life functioning. It can be but not necessarily so. The ability to identify then also explains this: More intelligent people use the words best fit to describe and the pretentious use the words that sound professional, but do not fit well the reality. Pattern matching is also among other things fitting words to reality. Yet even a high IQ mentally ill person can fail at reality testing. The failure is more intricate, higher fidelity and better rationalized, but still there.

Now a high IQ person generally lacks other high IQ people to give him feedback because of the rarity of high IQ. But this feedback is needed to self asses better, to get healthy frustrations leading to maturity. Most of the time a high IQ person can only attempt to self reflect. But in self reflection you necessarily go with your own bias confronting your own bias, which can fail. Can a person practice counter-transference with himself? Is the intelligent person able to correctly identify himself? If not, then his intelligence does not extend to introspection, then he lacks introspective intelligence and in his identifying necessarily draws an incomplete picture of reality. Reality is whole - all one. These are the absolute grounds, the fundamentals and they can be the most difficult.

Also, can being smart be embarrassing? Yes, because it is a kind of hypersensitivity. It can almost be like a kind of vulnerability, especially so if one did not have the opportunity to mature in it. High intelligence people should attempt intellectually interesting things.

Think for yourself. And while Im telling you this I also forbid you to tell me how to think for myself or what to think about. I need to protect my internal values from misguided, exploitative and simply all malicious or poor outside influ-

ence. You have no right to impose on my mind and I have no right to impose on your mind. Sometimes it feels like my mind is imprisoned. Everybody seems to want to take a bite, especially shitty people - mess with my mind. Everybody seems to think he knows to tell me how to think, what to do. And they are lying, they are also lying to themselves - they don't even know me.

The state now also causes Stockholm syndrome.

But all of this horror pales in comparison to the absolute and in the absolute I have my rest and my love and my peace of mind. My grounds, despite the trauma.

Anon: Actually addressing my trauma is the only thing that helps. Addressing trauma is reintegrating with reality, confronting the absolute.

What is the meaning of society?

A good religion could also encourage new religions, developments, branches.

Why do transsexuals tend to be hypersexual? Because they tend to be traumatised and sexuality is a temporary relief, a coping mechanism. Further they want to be wanted desperately and sexuality is a proxy for that. In truth pretty much everybody wants to be wanted (except schizoids and psychopaths maybe), but they have enough self love to not lower themselves so much for it.

If a person is living in his own unrealistic fantasy then you have to divorce from them mentally or you will live in his unrealistic fantasy harming the real you.

If there is perversion and corruption then arguably its prime victim is Kantianism. It is Kantianism that is the opposite of corruption. It is also Kantianism the one that justifies egalitarianism in the sense that good is also independent of kinship, or in the seeking of the übermensch, good as something constantly improving, gradually changing the self

into a better other. But this disregards the self. It is self-compassion that is lacking.

Docu: Through play they (cats) learn all they need to know of the art of survival. Arguably then human education (especially starting out) should also be through play. Docu: Once they're old enough they go out to hunt with their mother. Her transfer of hunting knowledge is essential for their survival."

Roughly there are evolutionary niches for different species and subspecies, etc. and adaptation of some more major species like cat to one niche can be seen as a kind of natural calibration. Selection of the fittest is a kind of calibration of genes, epigenetic and learned content. The calibration process is driven by selfreplication, slight mutation and selection of the better fitting. Humans also can not escape this principle. Some niches stay relatively the same, some shift, some vanish and some new niches appear - that's how it always has been. A niche can not be known to be a niche if it weren't for the species occupying it. If humans were to successfully colonize mars, then this also would make a new niche for y oliving on mars only because a species manages to live there. If human flourishing is the goal, then human needs to adapt to diverse environments - he in a sense already has, because he is also evolving and evolved. Knowledge is one means of adaptation, like genes, selection of the most fitting knowledge, selection of most fitting genes. And then there is multi-level selection, memes, products, languages, organization forms, etc. So also inside a free market, there is evolution, replication and selection of products and services, production methods, money systems, trading systems, arbitration and agreement systems, etc. Insights of austrian economics into market mechanisms should somewhat be translatable to evolutionary processes themselves (and also to psychology as an

aside for now). I should think of an example. For example in austrian oeconomics you have the principle of the uncertainty of the future and therefore also the uncertainty of success in economical planning. In biological mating you also have uncertainty of the outcome of bearing and rearing children, uncertainty about the future environment. These things are obviously not the exact same, but I hope you see how cross-examination and comparisons can be insightful, because both systems (evolution in environments, evolution of trade) have similarities in their natures. Ludwig von Mises said that a product sometimes creates a niche, similarly sometimes a new species unlocks an environmental niche to inhabit. The photocamera unlocked the niche of making photos, etc. While the market entrepreneur invents new products and services he uses his mind, but always also is dependent on uncertainties outside of his control, so does evolution create random mutations, some of which are a success, others a failure, uncertainty answered by actual reality. Future reality being the judge.

Now further since evolutionary fitness also determines knowledge formation and constellation, at least in the long run, so the austrian oeconomics principles also play a role in knowledge formation itself, as does evolution. Knowledge that kills their holders is selected against, knowledge that helps their holders is selected for. Logic is also a tool for preselection and creation of useful knowledge. Generally all a priori examinations on knowledge do the same, logic is an a priori. When people make an appell to common sense, what they are really trying to do is to speak to the other persons a priori understanding of things, his reason among other things. Kantianism, invariant truths. Most likely it is this partial discovery of a pripri, invariant truths by Kant that is meant by the historical enlightenment.

Even being mocked and ridiculed is a kind of attention and in receiving that from narcissists it is even somewhat continuously there, masochistic narcissistic supply.

KiD CuDi - Simple As.... , there is where I got the simple as thingy from.

Generally a lot of public opinions are wrong simply because knowledge is local. The majority simply doesn't know, is clueless.

Anon: "what if peace is not found in perfection but in pattern?"

Government wants to present itself as the monopoly on safety, but it really is the monopoly on violence and coercion. Nobody should coerce (self defense is not coercion). Safety is something humans value naturally and it depends on local circumstances and local knowledge.

There is no responsibility possible without freedom. And if you have the freedom, then you are also responsible. Only if you have freedom then you can determine the thing only then you can cause the thing. Responsibility follows from causation, the cause is responsible. Only responsible people are trustworthy, so only free men are trustworthy. Unfree, irresponsible people are untrustworthy. Do also in psychology the narcissist is a kind of psychologically unfree person (for example his need for narcissistic supply, his haunting shameful suppressed memories) and he also is unworthy of trust. So I trust in free men and in free men only. So also in this sense, truly free men are also psychologically healthy.

So this then is also true: Any good judge or good arbiter needs to be also responsible, free, trustworthy, mentally healthy, fair, moral and wise. Judging is taking on great responsibility and only the responsible can do so and only the trustworthy should be allowed to do so. What is the relationship between volition and judgement? Judgement is

always about some damage occurred or about mutually exclusive ends. Done judgements can only exert on stake, all law, agreements and judgements is stake based with the highest stake human life itself. What would fit for actual conflict resolution I would need to think a lot about and I also lack local knowledge and experience. While principles are good - they do not easily apply to real world examples. The easy part in judgements is that on which the conflicting parties previously had an agreement on about what happens or/and who, what body judges. The difficult part is when there was an initiation of aggression that is without previous agreement. In such cases there is need for seeking and understanding natural law. What are the implicit agreements of being alive? So the real challenge is about what is right in the anarchist space, the original space. First off it is clear that you make many agreements to insure yourself of not even needing to step into the anarchist space, you create base security. But there will always be an anarchist space and this also is a necessary part of freedom - so it is good. How do you resolve conflicts in the anarchist space? The default of anarchy is anarcho capitalist - everybody has his own turf, causative space. This is the conflict avoiding norm. I need to think. Maybe it is really as simple as slightly forgiving tit-for-tat.

Is reality more important than happiness? Happiness without reality is unreal - fake, debased. Reality without happiness is not worth seeing, barren, cruel, soulless and mechanistic cold. So what is my answer? Both are important., but what if you need to choose? Then choose neither, but this is impossible. You must reject the dichotomy and unconditionally find a way to marry reality and happiness, in this sense never giving up, but this is so difficult. I feel like the schizoid has reality without happiness and the narcissist has happiness without reality. Reality being a happy place, hap-

piness rooted only in reality. Reality is about accepting what is, happiness is about preferring. So integration is accepting what is AND working to what is preferred. Without agency there is no real happiness. A preferring that does not lead to action is self defeating, it is pain without reason. Self efficaciousness only makes sense as a going towards what oneself prefers. Only free men can be self efficacious with being hindered unreasonably.

I alone am not enough to solve the problem of evil. But wanting is something inherent, I can not change what I want. I am myself. I need time for myself.

So if I do not act, then its is because subconsciously I think that the action would lead to worse, not better results. I am afraid of something.

It is true, only those streamers are successful, have a chance at being successful, that pretty much constantly talk. Being talked to is a kind of containment, a way of relating, generally interesting. Psychologists also say that through other people, talk and seeing the face psychology is formed. Humans are said to be mainly relational. And the talk is only interesting if it comes from a confident, seemingly secure, mental space. But then the internet rewards even more the spectacle, the exciting. Further, sex sells and also moralizing talk sells.

Merit is not about effort, but about success. There is no merit in coercion or in roles in a coercive system.

What is perfect? Something that can not be improved anymore, because it is the best and also cant be made worse because it is incorruptible, perfect. Therefore it is immutable. The immutable is the absolute. The perfect is the absolute. Perfect is another synonym for the absolute. Perfection is timeless and it is not reached by humans in their finitude. But perfection as the ultimate of good is the final desirable.

Me naming it does not come close to it, just like I myself can not just say what my soul is.

Magical thinking is also a way of running away, ignoring, denying reality.

Is it true that might makes right? No, no amount of might can change a priori absolute truths, like making  $1+1=2$  false. So also in human affairs, might can not make right.

Is it true that power corrupts? The opposite of corruption is Kantianism, does power undermine Kantianism? If it does, then there would need to be a Kantian principle that contradicts it. Maybe power neither corrupts, nor makes Kantian. It is clear that many corrupted people are attracted by power to live their malicious fantasies, but equally so good people want the power to defend themselves. Evil power therefore can only be if it is power over others. But power over others is not always evil, especially if it is voluntarily given power for voluntarily chosen ends (this excludes modern democracy). What is meant by power corrupts, is probably if there is unreasonable power at play. So: Unreasonable power corrupts. So it is like this: Kantian power is only power that is reasonable. Corrupt power is power that is unreasonable. In this context, what is reason?

Hmm, power is causative space, causative potential, ability to determine one state of affairs over another, freedom and ability to determine or not determine. Power is potential.

Youtube comment: That's a keeper. Just make sure she's not completely insane. Makes sense.

In the witcher Geralt von Rivia is a private security contractor. In Sherlock Holmes, sherlock also is a private security contractor? In Detective Conan Kogoro Mouri is a private detective. In the free market there is the possibility for the innovation of justice. In the public state sector justice erodes. Private justice is extremely attractive, because

justice is attractive and its betterment can lift up whole societies, standards of living and conduct. I expect that private justice can innovate to a degree that is empowering, interesting and dignified beyond anything yet seen. Justice plays always involve moral talk combined with actual practicality and reflected on real situations and events. Justice is like the guardian of culture and civility and it is no coincidence that justice, detective and criminology shows garner such widespread interest. People want justice because humans are social and in society and the health of society determines individual human potential for flourishing. And it is beautiful and produces some of the most meaningful cultural treasures. Justice is the belief that hope in good is justified, only the justified can be. No Kantianism without justice. No safety or security without justice. Being responsible is being justified, they need each other. Real justice is about the invariant good. And while justice nowadays is being corrupted left end right, it is the only thing that can save us all. Human societies without justice are doomed to self destruction. A human is just or he is a ravaging animal. No dignity without justice. No protection of the good without justice. Justice is a matter of right and wrong, it is even epistemic. Justice is about identifying and separating good and evil and about punishing evil appropriately. Justice is the only legitimate use of power over others. Justice is about finding the truth and wisdom in judgement. Justice is a service and so like each service it has a quality and quantity. Some justice is so bad, it should be called injustice instead. Justice to a large degree determines incentives, whether or not humans can flourish or must perish. Good humans are interested in good justice, bad humans are interested in bad justice. Morality and sense of justice are largely the same.

Trust is earned, not demanded.

If any human made law contradicts any a priori truth, then it is doomed to fail and to lead to adverse outcomes.

Merit is subjective and merit is by far the only thing one can value about another human. For employment it is more important if somebody fits a specific position and merit can be, but must not necessarily be, one deciding factor. If only merit mattered then you would tend to preferentially employ old people in all kinds of jobs which is obviously nonsensical. In this sense then I was wrong: Meritocracy is wrong because it is against volition.

Kantianism is low time preference, so long time preference. Compare this to Hans-Hermann Hoppe's explications on time preference and civilisation. He predicted many things before me and explains the underlying mechanisms very well. It is enlightening to read him.

Drug addiction is high time preference. It harms the future for some fleeting moments of present elation or temporary relief. Hollow elation, defective happiness. A lack of wholesomeness. It is happiness that lacks reality grounding, because reality is whole and continuous.

Justice as such is a bigger topic than law. Law should be subservient to justice and never the other way around.

On the autism scale I'm lucky that I'm not more affected. There are people that have an entire other level of struggles, meaning that struggle pretty much 24/7, all the time. And this is also interesting to me, because there is a part in me that can relate, see their worlds. This is interesting. But there is no mental peace. The rigidity is a way to survive the mental onslaught. Autism is a spectrum, but I think it only is one because it hasn't been exactly determined in all its countless nuances, genetic and epigenetic. The autistics' flat affect is a defense against overstimulation, a holding the bastion. The lack of empathizing is because empathy requires

nouance that do not survive competition with intense stimuli. The autistic rigidity is a necessary stance of fortitude. Nobody can escape his own brain. Autism is a life sentence and probably at most the severity can be lessened a little. General biological health and environmental adaptation. While I would put narcissism more on the brains software side of things (but obviously there in a fundamental sense), autism and intelligence is more on the hardware. Autism levels and intelligence just seem most predetermined and invariant except for actual physical or drug induced changes. So autistic people are also stubborn and ironically they are also immune to certain kinds of social manipulation. Social manipulation requires you to emulate the targets state of mind to manipulate them and this part fails more or less with autistics. This does obviously not mean that autistics are infallible, far from it.

To the real autist, social chit-chat is incomprehensible - they do not see the immediate use-value. So they do not see the social subtleties. How do you cope as an autist with so much misunderstanding from both sides? Talking or listening alone can be overwhelming. With the flat affect a autist can look almost schizoid, but there are distinct differences. Autists can show emotions and regard for others, even if inhibited and stunted. Overstimulation is exhausting. Expressions are direct, simple and honest. And the speed and content of information is way less than for a normal person. The communication is sparse and conclusive, one-sided. This one-sidedness could almost be confused for grandiosity or intentional rudness, but it isn't, its lack of theory of mind. The other is quite a bit incomprehensible then.

In a sense you really could say that what a person believes most (which is not necessarily equal to what he says he believes most, but can be) is equal to his personality. On

the other hand you have inborn intuitions and emotions determining your personality, but these also affect your belief selection/creation. If this is true, then personality is a belief structure and then a nihilists personality must be a kind of void. Then also good beliefs and good personality go together. Then changing somebodies beliefs fundamentally is also changing his personality. A secure personality then must hold secure beliefs about the world, etc. The kind of beliefs I'm talking about are the fundamental ones where nobody is hypocritical and everybody really acts according to them. These beliefs are rarely made explicit, if this is even possible to do sufficiently. It might be, in some cases. If you knew these beliefs about a person, then you also should be able to predict their behavior. But doesn't this contradict free will? No, because beliefs can change and humans do have some capacity to learn. So the prediction is limited.

Laws (the seemingly natural, as well as the human made) are filters on humans and human behavior. The real laws are a priori laws. So far, physical laws are not laws, but only the current state of knowledge. Laws are not made, they are explored and attempted to discover. Any human made law that is contradictory lives its conclusion through human suffering, destruction or inhibition of flourishing and progress. Imposed laws are the opposite of progress, because laws inhibit. Laws must be discovered. The concept of a human law maker is grandiose and ignorant about reality. Individual humans, in their beliefs, should subscribe or not subscribe to any law they choose or create by their own stakes. They should suffer their own ignorance and reap the fruits of their own wisdom. Humanity's destiny should not be in the hands of a few corrupt statesmen. Maybe humanity also develops into multiple subspecies. Individual human free will us what matters. Maybe the entire concept of laws between humans

is superfluous and only agreements matter. Maybe you only voluntarily choose like 3 laws or so and be done with it. Maybe the majority of the law business is ineffective, amoral, slow, blind and largely useless if not harmful bloat. Or virtue. But agreements seem very adaptive. You could reformulate each law as an agreement. A priori laws then are what one thinks could be the (inherently unbreakable) agreements. So it is about relationship then. I dont know. I feel like Im missing a lot here. My mind is not clear rn. Acts have real consequences.

Interesting and insightful stuff about war, cooperation and slightly forgiving tit-for-tat. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=k>. The one thing I do not agree with is the in-group out-group distinction. How should anybody trust your group, if your group is dishonorable, betraying to outsiders? The principle of tit-for-tat does not magically stop working if you leave the scope of some group. If you treat the out-group bad, which is almost always most likely the majority of humanity, then you are closing yourself off from cooperation and create loose-loose outcomes or you are isolationist missing out on the profits of free trade. These guys scare me. And also, it is more fundamental than that, it is not only the wallet that matters. What about life, security and general trustworthiness? You tell me if a person is trustworthy, that selectively betrays people? How could you ever know if it is not you that is being betrayed? I think these kinds of beliefs are one possible defensive adaptation against state coercion, but then they are themselves pathological. Why would they not lie about who is outgroup and who ingroup? All of this is not sustainable. The part about war creating 3 generations of controllable humans though that sounds plausible. I might even be affected by this myself...

The differences between kin, relatives, races, breeds, spe-

cies, life forms, etc. are all gradual and the exact separating line is unclear. There are differences, the question is how many and how profound. The more important a specific function is for a life, the more likely it is to independently evolve in different ways. So very roughly you can expect for humans which are importantly a social cooperative species many ways to ensure cooperation, honesty, etc. I bet there are many ways of intuition to differentiate lies from truth, for example. Anything that is socially useful is more likely to evolve and to have evolved. Catallactics, free markets and sociality are essential for human survival. Catallactics and an evolved intuitive sense of fairness have a lot in common. Survival of the fittest. Fit to what? To survival and procreation in reality.

Progress and regress is only possible if there is a preconceived notion of good, better, ideal and bad, worse, terrible. It is teleological. Progress to what? To the good. But you can only progress to the good in an explicit manner if you know explicitly what good is. On the other hand, progress can also be seen as movement in a space, it could also loop and always repeat itself, infinitely. You can also see it as that the way is the goal like in Buddhism (?). Progress could also be that you are part of a journey in which you need to navigate yourself, where to set your next step and the future uncertain. Progress could also be something that get finished and the you have obtained one goal, but then you see other goals even better and then you want to progress towards these. If values are subjective, then progress and regress is also subjective. If there is a clear right and wrong, then there is a clear way of saying what is progress and what is regress. If you have free will, the you can decide your own goals, if everything is predetermined and fate then you can only have the illusion of your own goals and the illusion of freedom, except

if you yourself are part of fate itself, fate being another word for free will then. There would be no reason to progress at all, if there wasnt something good to progress towards. Progressing itself is an act of belief in what is to come. Drive implies desire. If there is no desire, then there is no drive, no will to progress. Fundamentally in nature there are no hypocrites, hypocrite is a human invention for some deceptive social signalling, which has other ends, its meaning hidden, while the explicit is not true, the real implicit is true. What is desire? A feeling of lack, a want of completion. Maybe this is what drives progress. Progress as a process of completion. Sometimes progress is blocked, developement halted, freezed or even destroyed. Natural selection is one way of progress. Progress goes through spaces, adaps and also sometimes is filtered. Blind will for progress is like grandiosity. Sometimes progress is what it is, just movement. Some progress is conscious, other progress is unconscious unplanned and unexpected. If I knew the final goal, the absolute goal, I could go there like a Kantian, if I had the courage. Is there a final goal? And why do I care so much about the goal and so little about the way? Am I not easily diverted from my path then, easily confused? An immutable goal would need to reside in an absolute space to be immutable. But anything absolute can not be pursued, only conformed to, it stands well on its own. Where are we going? Or am I going alone? Asking questions about progress is itself its own form of progress, recursive. But is this worth it? It is somewhat interesting, but also frustrating. I am meandering, like probably all people that are no ignorant. The ignorant know what they want, they can act and progress. Progressing implies a belief in a target, and beliefs are inherently always at least a little bit ignorant. But ignorance is not always bad except of course when it really is bad, a dead end. Ignorance is like a set

target and a dead end, but who is to say its a dead end? I dont know, maybe it is not a dead end. If you tried stopping moving what then? Then you die and go towards the bad end by default. There are just so many choicess. If I progress I also change myself. Maybe there is a peak, or only a local maxima. Between too many choices Im paralized, but I obviously also dont want to choose an obvious bad path. Maybe I dont even want to choose. Choosing is committing and thats work and I could fail. Am I not already comfortable with not choosing? But then my choice is made for me, by assholes and asshole time. And it all will be irreversible. Progress is not an end in itself, I need a goal. Looking so much is exhausting, I should take a break. Seeking a goal without finding it is mostly useless. Without a time limit or a cost of reflection, you could ponder forever on each opinion. No I can just make up my mind and it will be fine.

Ultimately decision making is always individual and never participatory (mutually volitional agreements are still independent individual decisions of two distinct persons).

I think that law can only be in a contract. Every law is relational in the sense that some party enforces it on other parties. If there is nobody to enforce a law, then in practice there is no law. I think the concept of contract is prior to law, even the so called laws of nature or a priori laws like math or austrian economics. For example, the laws of nature are those that seemingly are enforced by nature, so they are relational to nature (an abstract entity in this case). Law is also always stake based.

Ok, so I think its like this. Relationship is prior to contract, contract is formalized or otherwise made explicit relationship. And law then is only that formalized part where one partner or both of the relationship are categories. Like the relationship of human to nature etc. So I believe in the

existence of many such natural relationships and them being made more explicit is discovery of contracts and laws. But I think the relationship is prior.

So, what is the nature of evil? df: "Getting pleasure out of hurting others, wanting to lord it over others?" Ye. Do you think confusion is evil too? df: No not really, more sad I guess. SSo then most communists are not evil by that. But if you are like really profoundly confused, so that you mistake evil for good, are you evil then? df: \*d I don't think about it that much, but I guess I could consider that person more tragic than evil depending on the case. "But is there then anybody that is really evil? df: No idea. The person with no ideals who just wants money, power and prestige but doesn't care about trampling on others. I'm sure Hitler considered what he was doing for the greater good in his mind. Ä confusion is wrong knowledge right? Certainty, orientation and understanding are all part of knowledge. So, wrong knowledge can make people act evil. Co: "But if everyone is a solo group and trying to kill everyone they see; what would actually cause them to do such thing? What are they actually trying to achieve? How long would it take for earth to have only one human alive and so the will die too because he cant repopulate.

Hans-Hermann Hoppe: Law was considered something to be discovered and recognized as eternally "given, not something to be made. It was held that law could not be legislated, but only applied as something that had always existed," (Bernhard Rehfeld, Die Wurzeln des Rechts [Berlin 1951], p. 67) The key point here is ETERNALLY given, so law really is only what is a priori.

Excellent: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=eidVTKYEKkY>

Phonk music is like pathological grandiose and painfully hollow projection of music. It is exciting and harsh too. The

sounds themselves are so shrill and penetrating, a feeble aggressive, restless height. The incomplete grandiose self part of the narcissist. The compensatory false self. On the other hand there exists sad and a kind of healing music, seach for: bleach sad ost or naruto sad songs, for example. This music is slow, emotional, nostalgic or tragic and heart breaking, grieving. It speaks to the narcissists empty schizoid core part of the personality. This is where the narcissist is hurt and shameful. Where his developement has been frozen due to pain and lack of acknowledgement of pain. These two split parts lack wholesomeness, integration with each other. Both are painful and discontinuous in their own ways. Memories happen in reality, as a whole, so to be continuous the narcissist would need to have both experiences in agreement, but this contradicts the splitting defense. Integration means win-win and so in some sense the narcissist needs to experience both but linked, not in a win-lose manner. The grandiosity needs to be redirected towards his empty schizoid core, directing his grandiose good energy into his bad shame, merging, blunting and completing both. He needs to love his own feelings of shame, instead of devaluing it. So this means respecting his own hurtful memories, valuing the self that was traumatized. Not being harsh, not being grandiose which is only a way of fleeing the self. And he can not force his healing, because force is aggressive. There are some truths in the narcissist, that he can only learn himself. These truths tell nobody else. Nobody else can feel these as you could, only you own them. Tell nobody. Baby looser. So this is a music therpy kind of approach to narcissism and maybe trauma in general. It is far from fleshed out, these are just some ideas. If you like these kinds of music you are most likely traumatized. Even Laotse had some stuff to say about music: "Good music, the Chinese held, insures peace and uprightness; bad music leads

to lewdness and social decline."But maybe the causation is the other way around or both ways. So crucially, taste also shows self constitution. What you like shows what you lack.

The invariant is always invariant, so always is equal to immutable. Invariantly true also means always. This is the base unshakeable stability of existence itself.

A priori truths are like general insight and like good common sense. But maybe these truths are so powerful that they need like a long time to digest and too many may be too much at once. If true then wtf am I doing. I even need to digest them myself and I havent even started with those few I discovered myself. In this sense Im a bad student, Im rushed and I might spoil my stomach and then reject them, while they are true. Im finite, slow and fallible. Maybe Im too greedy. So I can not get enough. Maybe I can literally not properly advance if I have not actually understood what I discovered. So if I make errors now, or actually have made errors, they are just a hinderence to progress.

So for example: Power is potential and vice versa. This is an a priori truth. So this means that innately talented people are also naturally powerful. And powerful people can potentially do a lot of things, good or bad. If Im ignorant about a priori truths I still can not violate them because they are inherent to reality, but I can reason wrongly about them, misunderstand them. Since Im fallible Im also bound to errors, which is sad and bad. If I try I can reduce errors. Maybe a perfect mind could comprehend all a priori truths instantly and so know everything. I dont know. Im always thrown into this epistemic uncertainty, but absolute truth is the source of epistemic certainty. It does not change and this is frustrating too. No, thats just my viewpoint. My focus on the absolute is myopic. Of course it is.

Real apollinian is a priori stuff. Cy said round about:

Pragmatism excuses bad theory."Yes. And its also a form of inconsistency and of acceptance of cognitive dissonance. Kantian is apollinian.

Many (especially younger american) academics are not used to being disagreed with, but this is ass backwards. Truth matters.

The whole universe fine-tuning argument sounds ridiculous to me but I dont know much about physics either.

Empiricism vs a priori knowledge is like nature vs nurture. You cant nurture a cat into a human being. So then also, you can only understand space because you have some innate nature for understanding space. And then you can only make empirical observations because you have some innate a priori notions about things in general.

If I edit my books I need to condense some stuff, especially the redundant stuff. This to value the readers time and attention.

Narcissists are epistemically compromised (thats why they induce epistemic uncertainty in others) and they lack reality testing - these two things are the same. They lack a secure absolute (=reality) basis. Only the absolute is really secure (secure base), the relative could change at any moment (mutable vs immutable). Only the absolute could serve as a reference point for continuous experience and wholistic integration and consistent and coherent world view and character.

So in the epistemic sense, what marks healed narcissism? A reestablishment of the absolute in all its forms and as a reference point. This absolute is also the point where the most negative feelings and the most positive feelings can meet securely without destruction since the absolute is immutably secure. The absolute is the embrace the narcissist needs and lacks. This can not be forced, it can only happen volitionally.

A secure contract with the absolute can only be discovered. The contract is the making explicit of the actual relationship with the absolute. The reason why reality (the absolute) was denied in the first place, is because it was too traumatic and could not be integrated to have a good functioning self. It was deemed useless to the self preservation and flourishing, because it was too much self denial in it.

The absolute is the necessary reference point for mental health. So intact absoluteness is mental health and the opposite relativism with its discontinuity, inconsistency and incoherence are the markers of mental illness. The absolute is like certainty. Mental integration into and relative to the absolute is stability and health. The absolute also is the a priori and the a priori insights are generally necessary for human flourishing. The absolute is that which stays reliable no matter the circumstances - safety and habitability. Ultimately relativism can be nothing but confusing and disorienting. It is also no coincidence that invariants, constants and immutables are useful in programming. The minimalists only value minimalism because it reduces the amount of mutable variables, having greater overall control, insight and less room for confusion and unnecessary complexity. Dont get me wrong, minimalism is not always right (absolutely right), but it is useful. Less mutability means more ability to navigate and have certainty. The ultimately reliable navigation is in the absolute space.

It seems like no narcissist can escape the idealization devaluation cycle he projects onto others. He is split, always too much or too little, lack of what is fitting. The same occurs in normal people but in milder more balanced forms. He needs the golden middle.

No answer is also an ansewer. It means a lack of responsibility to me because you do not respond to me. This makes

sense. This of course is also true if I do not respond to you. It is absolutely true. Of course a message can get lost, but then you still lack responsibility for taking care of your messages and by implication to those who message you.

Also regarding nothing: If a seemingly nothing has an influence I can identify it and name it and then its something. Otherwise nothing has no influence that is discernible by any mind or method of investigation. Nothing changes nothing. Nothing does not exist. If nothing existed it would be something instead and not nothing. Nothing literally does not exist so it makes no difference in any way whatsoever. So you literally can not think about nothing, it has no properties you could ascribe or identify. People that believe in nothing do not believe at all. It is radical nihilism and struggle with the absolute because it tries to deny everything. It is an impossible position. Nothing is the limit of all things, but to everything there is no limit so real nothing does not exist. And nothing is also not responsible for anything. How could it be? It can't because it isn't. Everything is responsible for everything in various ways fully and only. Everything is self caused because there is nothing outside of it that could cause it. Nothing is an intellectual linguistic construct that exists in fantasy only, not in reality.

The notion that nothing exists is trivially wrong because the definition of nothing is that which does not exist, so it contradicts itself. It is not that references don't exist, it is that the reference into nothingness does not exist, because you can not refer to nothing and still refer to something. Referring is only referring to something.

Quite a lot of what Nietzsche writes is stupid or unnecessarily cruel or masochistic with plausible deniability. Judge by yourself. He also obviously lacked self love. Nietzsche: Man muss aufhören, sich essen zu lassen, wenn man am be-

sten schmeckt: das wissen Die, welche lange geliebt werden wollen. Thats insecure attachment. And he is restless and without peace. Nietzsche: Älso will ich selber sterben, dass ihr Freunde um meinewillen die Erde mehr liebt; und zur Erde will ich wieder werden, dass ich in Der Ruhe habe, die mich gebar. Idealization of unbecoming, a masochistic covert narc trait. Vanishing yourself, unbecoming is also a trait of absence and self negation - severe lack of self love, harsh introjects. Nietzsche: Ünd so verziehe ich noch ein Wenig auf Erden: verzeiht es mir!"

I've had partial psychosis. It is a kind of psychosis that I can suppress if I wanted to and where I am having impressions on the one part while I am on the other still aware of reality. It is true that after recovering from psychosis there is a loss of function and in my case that loss also was partial. It was essentially the start of reintegration and healing of my empty schizoid core (suppressed trauma) and a decisivse step in the healing of my almost unknown kind of masochistic covert narcissism. The psychosis had like a few flares over the months and the settled. Then I had short periods of mania and then paranoia and now boredom, anhedonia. I am growing up mentally continuing my formerly arrested development. Overall I feel better than ever and I have developed a better way to live by myself and better ways of seeing and relating to others. On my journey I have gained some major insights into reality. I am so proud of myself.

The partial psychosis is what is needed for reintegration of the narcissistic personality organization. Otherwise the narcissist remains on a constant background type of slow moving psychosis which impairs his reality testing. Functional but compromised. The real partial psychosis with the hallucinatory impressions, the psychosis that only affects the empty schizoid core, the trauma capsule, this is the kind

of psychosis that heals narcissism. It is a reintegrationary psychosis and because this is so profound in the personality organization it has to feel like this bending of reality with impressionism and profound feelings and insights which are the basis for the bridge between formerly quite separated parts. It is the grandiose false self that has to permit it and that also is not so much affected at first. The false self only later becomes mature through first paranoia and then longer periods of boredom and anhedonia, but overall there are bouts of happiness and wholesomeness that dominate in felt significance. Finally there is neuroticism and healthy secrecy.

So yes, there exists healthy or rather a healing kind of psychosis. This kind of psychosis should not be suppressed. It could also be seen as a kind of breakthrough nostalgia or nostalgia in real time with some hallucinations, but it is not as bittersweet as nostalgia, more impressive and encompassing, serious in a sense. And serious is bond to reality.

So the narcissists chasm is a slow moving psychosis, an unfinished psychosis. The right fitting kinf of psychosis that is suppressed and that also would be the developmental milestone opening the gates to maturity. Since the narcissists that are not masochistic covert but covert, overt or psychopathic they have more defenses against the empty schizoid core and therefore you can also expect more difficulty against processing the trauma. In a sense my fake self was not as fake, because it showed more clearly the internal pain by masochism, but the other narcissists need external supply, there is projective defense. Projective defense means a refusal of responsibility. In this sense you can not really talk to them, they wont properly respond, they cant properly listen, they deny. I still think healing is possible, if I could do it and I was a kind of narcissist, I think the other kinds of narcissists also should have a chance, some way of healing their blight.

Whats also important: Many people hate narcissists for good reasons, but this can not be allowed to affect treatment. Psychology has a history of mistreatment and of use by the state in abusive ways. A free society instead would have a natural and good incentive structure and so a better chance of treating and reversing narcissism. In a good society there should not be win-lose interactions and external narcissistic supply are win-lose interactions. A good society would drive narcissists more naturally into psychosis, not by cruelty, but by inherent goodness and resilience, naturally denying external narcissistic supply. The masochist with his possibility of internal narcissistic supply also looses against good people. If only volition was more respected and more dominant, but nowadays coercian and lies are in power, peivate property, an essential boundary is not respected properly, political interventionism like narcissistic enmeshment, etc. all foster narcissism in the populace and a process of de-civilisation as Hans Hermann Hoppe described in his book Democracy: The god that failed. We need a return to reason, reality, goodness, truth and respect of individual human independence, autonomy and responsibility. Narcissism and current public politics are both epistemically erroneous and deeply confused about reality. Complaining does not change it, but at least it honors the truth. We all find ourselves in a challenging situation and we always should make the best we can. Truth is an ally, even if it is painful.

How do you deal with terrible truths? Truth is part of reality, but everyone wants happiness too. You should not split happiness and reality. It is deeply frustrating to be impotent against evil - but actually I am not. How to reconciliate? The absolute (which also is reality and truth and vice versa etc.) is one identity. The first step is acceptance of reality. It is not true that reality is only about the coercive state, reality

is about so much more. You need philosophy to know what you can change, what is mutable and what you cant change, what is absolute. The absolute can be your guidance, for better or worse. The absolute enables you epistemic certainty, that means that you become resistant to their lies and that you learn to think and feel for yourself authentically. There is an infinite way of ways to like everything and the human mind is finite. And it is good that I am finite.

My mothers mother is probably a shitty codependent. This would mean that the pathology from her to the next generation was made worse. Or maybe not, considering my uncle, my mothers brother. A codependent is not a secure base.

What is the process of enlightenment? Epistemic clarification.

Because of local knowledge, the public almost never knows anything specialized or niche or complex. The public is dumb and pretty much can not escape it - it shouldnt even try. Every single person is a specialist with his own local knowledge about which the public lacks crucial information. The public is a stupid herd, it can not learn. Individuals can learn, not groups. The public is damned to be primitive and always surface level. The public is surface level by necessity, because only very little information can also be really public information and I dont mean publicly available, I mean publicly known. The public can only speculate, it always lacks information. The public is a primitive intuitive. Therefore, is the public opposed to reason? Not if it is humble, but this is rare. The very notion of public is opposed to locality and therefore also opposed to fidelity. Public is low fidelity, vibes only based. The public can not fit to anything complex. The public can not be taken seriously in any intellectual endeavour. The public is brutish and ignorant by its own nature, it can

not know, it can't really learn, because it can't know. Then the public always repeats its mistakes. The public can not be taught anything. The public is unconscious. The public can not act, only individuals can act (praxeology). Therefore the public does not exist, it is merely an intellectual linguistic construct. If you act, you can not interact with any public, you can only interact with individuals. Nothing ever changes is a term that applies to the public, not to individuals. What people perceive as the public, is never the public. The public is an imaginary construct, yet it deeply influences people's lives. The public is the perceived separation between legitimate and shameful. The public is an imaginary person, but it barely holds any of the properties of an actual person. The public is perceived as overpowering. The public is the simulation of a person, it is flawed, incomplete and buggy. The public is a mental shortcut, a reductionism that does not actually exist in reality. This means that nothing I believe about the public is ultimately epistemically reliable. It is at most useful fiction, but sometimes it is useless precisely because it is not really true. Because the public is epistemically compromised it is unreliable and can't be responsible. Because of these public opinion can be wrong and should not be taken seriously in any important matter. If you want to know, you need to investigate local specifics and a priori principles. Further, if you weigh public opinion in your decision making, you are making epistemic errors. People that are very agreeable tend to care a lot about public opinion, so very agreeable people are epistemically compromised. Truth is not agreeable, it is mutually exclusive or different viewpoints about fundamentally the same thing. Agreeable people are easily compromised. Agreeable people can not think properly. I was quite a was agreeable, I try less to be. Agreeing too much is fawning, slave-ish behavior. This is what

truth demands. On the other hand of course, disagreeableness can also be too much, truth matters and truth alone should decide if you agree or disagree.

Any talk or thinking about the public tends to be thinking about general principles. And everytimes something is attributed to people in general, it is speculation and not knowledge.

I think good philosophy creates clarity.

And I think that some people prefer lies because it protects them from shame or from feelings of abandonment or for other reasons. Lying always indicates a defect, either in the person or in the circumstances surrounding the person. Lies inherently hint at pathology. A secret is not a lie, a secret could just be healthy separation.

Love is a fulfilling feeling, being loved is a fulfilling feeling. Traumtized people can not love themselves and others properly, they tend to become promiscuous or otherwise sexually perverted. Thats why many transsexuals are sexually perverted. There the libido is revolutionary and breaking instead of secure and wholistic. Sexual perversion is short time preference behavior, a mark of barbarism, trauma, chaos and uncertainty. Wholistic love is long time preference and a sign of civilization, mental health, good order and a secure future. The sexually perverted feel lack, insecurity. Sexuality as a way of emotional coping. They lack a secure base, they lack absolute security. Sexuality as a way of self transcending act is also a way to attempt to go to a secure place. Extreme living in the moment secured by the sexual partners want, containment and holding. This need to be held implies that otherwise the self would disperse and decohere. I suspect that the sexuality really is only a means to the end of love here. But sexuality also has violating and dominating characteristics and this most likely mimics the childhood traumatic

experiences, on the other hand sexuality merges two people, it overcomes existential loneliness. But after the sex is done, with the promiscuous, the security does not last, or does it? I dont know honestly. By then changing the partner there is an implicit devaluation of the old relationship, a proof to self that it was not the real deal, it was not really authentic, it was not really secure. And this is the tragedy. Some internal imbalance reflected on the outside, on behavior. But it is not all bad, it is an adaptation to circumstances. It might be better than celibacy, the other extreme.

In general, is secure attachment better than insecure attachment? In a good society secure attachment is better. In a bad society insecure attachment is better. But a good society is generally better, so also ultimately secure attachment is better. Secure attachment is clear and direct.

Any statement like: Lets start ... ", "We should ... ", PP-people like ... is almost always factually wrong or inactionable. It is moral talk and I do it too, but it is fantastical and not real. These statements can only be formulated conditionally to have good epistemic value. So not like: People should be capitalists and voluntarists."but like: A group of people that is capitalistic and voluntaristic can survive better compared to if they were statist.Mises was right that science can not determine the ought in its pursuit of knowledge. Knowledge requires epistemic correctness, otherwise it is only heuristic at most and so also sometimes wrong.

If you believe in nothing or nothingness then this also means that you do not believe in absolute truth. It is impossible to believe nothing or nothingness and it is also impossible to not believe in absolute truth. It means that you are not aware of your true beliefs and also that also that your conscious elaborations and actions can not be trusted. Not believing the absolute is an attempt at defiance of reality and

therefore only leads to some forms of virtual reality, fantasies, unreal simulations. A fundamental lack of authenticity and epistemic uncertainty. You believe in the unknowability of the absolute, but now I have come to the conclusion that the absolute is knowable.

Can you argue and debate with a narcissist? No, because argument requires shared reality, but the narcissist offers only shared fantasy. If the narcissist makes references, and words are references, you can only point to objects in fantastical warped space. Therefore the narcissists statements can not be taken for real. But if the space can be warped and fantastical, what can make a realistic and straight space? It is all about survival and the narcissist adapted to threatening experiences. The narcissist made himself bad to resist and overcome the bad external. It is injustice that happened.

Cognitive theory of mind is about simulating another persons inner states. Theory of mind is an ability to simulate.

Too much and too little are both errors in measure, a lack of appropriateness or decency, fitness. Measure is defined only in some space. Reality and fantasy are both spaces.

Each space has some principles in which it spans up and also some sort of origin or absolute coordinate. Multiple spaces can exist in the same space, overlapped. The spanning principle is the world orienting principle, some lived hermeneutic principle, philosophy, ideology, religion or psychology, some world view or self view or both. Some kind of I, or some story. Some have a very firm absolute origin point, others attempt to have no origin point (nothingness), their space necessarily is compromised, if it can even be called a proper space. The empty schizoid core is an empty space, if it even is mature enough to be a space. Space is spanned along win-win relationships, that's also how bridges are built, but the schizoid perceives himself and others as loose, so he

never creates a proper space. The schizoid lacks measure the most, that also why he is so fascinated with actual physical space and facts. They give a view he lacks internally. If the hermeneutic principle is defective, it prohibits proper development of space (schizoid) or only allows creation for some partial warped spaces (narcissists). The narcissists empty schizoid part is empty in the first place because there is no space, so also no content in space! This is the inhibited development and the conflation, confusion and enmeshment of all kinds of different things. Space means that things are more or less separated and situated, positioned in space. The narcissist never properly separated his mother, he lacks a secure base, origin point and hermeneutic principle. Only if the base is secure, can you leave the base and have space. The more secure the base, the broader the possibility for going into space. Since the schizoid considers himself and others bad, there is no secure base at all, no space. Now if the base is secure, dare I say absolutely secure, a secure reference point, then there is space plenty. The origin IS the absolute. If the origin is secure, then the space is sound (mathematicians compared different spaces too) and then there is valid comparison, movement, measure and calculation in the space, with the space, with no error. This is intact reality testing and epistemic soundness, coherence, consistency and continuity of distance and memory events. If you have no space then you are acting compulsively and then you have no way to compare or to compensate, everything is unique and novel, amazing or frightening, only good or only bad, split. Idealized or devalued, binary. Splitting defense implies a lack of space in that specific point. Only space allows for fine gradation and fidelity in differentiation.

Whatever hermeneutic principles one adapts, the need to be coherent and consistent with actual a priori truths

- this is the difference between mental healthy and mental illness. Only if they are compatible, then truth is compatible with them, otherwise there is epistemic corruption. This is why psychology also needs to explore and elaborate a priori principles.

From one point of view Im an autistic guy that takes apart and puts together concepts witch some weird special interest in philosophy. But you cant really say Im specifically and only interested in philosophy, I feel like Im in some way generally interested, I build my own values quite a bit. You see how far Ive come. And I dont think I lack theory of mind, but Im preoccupied with other thoughts. So this probably is lack of theory of mind because normal theory of mind should pretty much always be present. But I dont feel like I lack understanding of people. Simon Baron-Cohen is very insightful on autism. And it is clear to me that also nnormalör average people are not perfect in theory of mind. They are also rigid in their own ways, but there is also a large IQ difference so, well, eh. A special interest is like targeted grandiosity or something. And I also dont think that autistic people are as alien to normalpeople as they are made out to be. It is stupid to be proud of being alien to average people and it really is not the whole truth. Criminal is also an infantilizing projection applied to autistic people, like my mother tries to do with me, problematizing directly and also behind my back. I am all too human, you faggots.

A little bit of agreeableness really is just social lubricant, but it has no place in any science or philosophy.

Because autistics tend to lack theory of mind, they can not properly respond in a conversation and they create unease.

The mere word of the absolute sounds cold. But I can not imagine that it really is cold. No word really is the thing

itself, it is only a reference.

Any consistent hermeneutic principle must not only explain reality but also explain and be consistent with itself. So this applies for an a priori base and is a test that can be applied to any potential hermeneutic principle, like for example empiricism.

So on the one hand empiricism can filter out some bad concepts about reality. On the other hand, data is only understandable and categorizable through concepts like length, space, time, sequence, causality, identity etc.

Again (similar O. A. Johnson in his article “Denial of the Synthetic A Priori,”): It seems like empiricism can only deny some concepts about reality (it can not confirm them). For example with physics you can only deny the wrong concepts but not confirm that for example Newtonian Mechanics are right, but only rule out classes of competing models. So it seems like empiricism never properly arrives at any laws, so it can't touch on logic or math itself. But a hermeneutic principle must also be able to confirm itself. This means that empiricism is wrong as an epistemic base, it is insufficient. The a priori principles are hermeneutic principles. Man this stuff is complicated.

If again, the meaning of life is self referential justification, then the meaning of life is the discovery of proper a priori truth. Or rather the living of a priori truth, since only a priori truth is sufficient and also is necessary for self referential justification. And also if you yourself are true then you also are, so it is also an existential darwinian base. Pursuit of absolute truth is a darwinian adaptation.

If you have a self justified truth, then you also have a de facto irreducible truth. How could you otherwise justify that something is an irreducible truth? If you can attack a truth sufficiently, then you have demonstrated that it is not

properly self justified. Ultimate truth is then something like reality justifying reality, this is fully sufficient, since there is nothing outside of reality that could justify it. Roughly speaking. Justification is like existence validation.

People do not want to play a rigged game, the only want to play just games and they are justified in acting so. If you are coerced, you opt out any way you can and this is good. Be it slavery, feudalism, monarchism, states, democracy, republics or any other system that fundamentally does not respect your consent, your volition and agency. Why ever play a win-lose game (zero-sum)? If you are a good person you do not want to be an abuser nor be an abused. Modern politics is mostly zero-sum, about who gets to steal (tax) whose money and who gets to dictate whose behavior. Democracy, monarchism, statism, republicanism, etc. are all false gods. They are unsustainable, epistemically wrong ideals.

It is always easy to say others should live their risky desires if one himself does not live his risky desires. In the modern day many good desires are mostly outlawed or actively punished. Now just live your desire bro."Yeah right. Maliketh (Elden Ring): Lay your foolish ambitions to rest. It is a splitting here. Either you are forced to go all in or all out. Hero or NPC and all the NPC's want the others to be the hero so that they then later can join in on the fruits of success. Ideally what is needed is a right to secession from the state, but this probably is never gonna happen. I wont exclude the possibility, but it is against the interest of the state. I already elaborated quite a bit on this topic. Further it is also clear that those idiots or indoctrinated people that want the government should be allowed to keep it, but only for themselves and those that agree. Also security must be continuous and most criminals that already are in prison probably should stay in prison, etc. The point is civilisation and

civility after all. In a transitional phase all criminal activity that breaks the non-aggression principle or breaks private property must be prevented or taken reconciliatory action in a timely manner with public transparency, etc. But I am talking to a public here and the public does not exist, only individuals do. All that is still pretty naive.

The only real rights are freedom (the right to be left alone) and the right to self defense. A supposed right that attacks the right to be left alone is an aggression, not a right.

There is no hero that does not follow his internal belief for good. If you really believe, you do what you believe. But what if it is not possible? Isn't this the definition of despair? You can only accept reality and do best. I also do not know everything, I must accept humility. The heroes function is establishing actual good against difficult or seemingly impossible odds.

Good is existential basis. Evil is lack of existential basis. Existence grows, so it grows into what formerly lacked existence, was evil and converts it to good, to based existence.

Accepting truth would not be such a problem, if there was not the selfinterested I, but this self, I, is also part of the truth. Only the I can know a truth (or not know it). The I is the a priori to all perceptions, impressions, memories, thoughts etc. The I is an epistemical position. What truths can be perceived can only be perceived through the I and I is the condition for experiencing any truth at all. The I validates reality for as long as it is validated by reality, but it is always validated by reality through existence through the soul. What is I? And isn't it rude, to end on a question.

We don't want questions, we want answers. Questions are only means to proper answers. And even an answer is not enough, we want the actuality to what the answer only references. Words are merely virtual. Words are part of reality,

but for a human they are for use for then later the acutal. The philosopher position is a sad one, or rather limited.

The I is the fundamental stance.

Why are constants important? Constants enable orientation.

The greater the a priori understanding, the greater the causal reach, the greater the actual power. One could imagine that sufficiently great understanding can look like magical power. Of course there is the insurmountable obstacle of local knowledge, but maybe some higher evolved being could still comprehend this more, although for humans this seems out of sight. It is not yet clear what the limits of understanding are.

Justice also requires local knowledge. Humans probably can not do perfect justice. Perfect justice is above human comprehension, maybe for ever. Perfect justice could not be improved, but here you see how fatal being wrong about perfect justice would be. Perfect justice would require knowing absolute good to completion, which is beyond humans. On the ither hand, why care about justice at all? Because you want to be treated justly, probably. Maybe there is no global justice, only local justice, but isnt justice part of the a priori? Maybe justice is specific to the life form. It is clear that from the human point of view a lion is committing serial murder, but a lion can only live by hunting and killing other animals. Some humans could decide to feed the lions artificially, so that they dont need to kill other animals to survive, but then what is the point of a lion being a lion in the first place?

Maybe human justice is only valid between humans and if you exceed the human circle something more general should take its place. If justice is human specific, then it should follow from inherentness of human being. It is clear that

the tit-for-tat principles are almost or maybe exactly the same as justice. But in human relations its more complicated. Cooijmans argued with good reasons that in human society initiation of aggression should be penalized by a greater degree than the original damage, incentivizing good behavior and beyond that penalizing the guilty more than the damage the occurred. Why? Doesn't that contradict plain tit-for-tat? Yet I would say that it is just. Maybe it does not contradict tit-for-tat but is only a human specific expression of tit-for-tat: It reflects the damage that is done on civility and the damage on trust. Crime also attacks future planning and security.

Anon: LLMs don't have a reasoning model. They don't think, as a dice does not think. They don't "desire anything either. They only find likely words. That's actually how they work, really. And the problems they exhibit are inherent to this approach, and haven't improved in these years because of this. They hallucinate because they don't reason, and they will never do it, because that's a limitation of this approach. The problems with any kind of thinking, if they exist, are inherent to the approach. The overhyping of AI exposes the weakness of some forms of human thinking. It is not only AI but humans too that hallucinate. The point is that AI can't think logically, for now, and this limit is inherent to the approach and so it is limited for now. A defect in logical thinking is a defect in the a priori and so it is no trifling matter, it is a fundamental limitation. It is not that AI is a god, not at all, it is that people want AI to be a god. The want AI to be an unconditionally loving, caring, providing utopia. They want to flee reality. All wishes are projected into AI. Anon: I don't just want AGI to be real. I need it to be real. I need to be saved from this dumb ass world of working to survive. Lamenting the human condition.

It is important to note that even parasites and hunters

are in competition to each other for prey and that both are dependent on prey in the first place, but the prey is not necessarily dependent on any hunter or parasite. But then again, prey also depend on plants, those depend on photosynthesis, that depends on the sun, the sun does atom fusion. So it seems like the ultimate energy source is atom fusion. On the other hand, material itself is condensed energy and also energy can neither be lost nor gained (physics). And of course, there could be more I dont know.

Es gibt nicht mehr so viel für mich zu schreiben. Das schreiben hat wenig not und kaum angemessenheit. Ich bin kein Quell, kein Notdürftiges ausspeien, keine große Tragik mehr. Es mag zwar beschissen sein, oder ganz ok, etwas gut, aber nicht sehr bemerkenswert. Alles zu halbbacken, benennen könnt ichs auch nicht. Ich mach mir keine großen Gedanken mehr. Die Ideen sind nur die von früher in minderer Form. Das Allzu schlimme philosophieren ist nichts mehr. Es kommt da auch keine heroische Zeit, ich weiß doch auch nicht. Nichts wildes, das passt alles nicht ins stete unaufgeregte, es ist übertrieben. Aufmerksamkeit ist auch kaum noch da, vor allem nicht diese hingebende entmenschlichte. Alle, oder eher das meiste an Vorstellung des vergangenen ichs übers jetzige ich waren falsch und idealisiert. Es ist alles viel banaler and langweiliger, auch nicht glorreiche. Ich bin es doch immer noch und da lauft einiges auf mich auch. Reste gibts noch, aber diese sind nur vage und vergangen. Der Leser und der Eindruck auf den Leser sind mehr noch da, mögen vielleicht gerade erst fahrt aufnehmen. Aber es gibt nur konkrete Leser, nicht den Leser. Ich trau mich garnicht über den Leser zu reden. Ich weiß garnicht was angemessen ist. Ich weiß die Antwort jetzt auch nicht. Und daran, dass ich meine Gedanken Wiederhole merkt man jetzt eher, dass ich selber nichts mehr produziere. Ich kann die Dinge in mir

nicht mehr benennen, ich entwickle ignoranz, zumindest etwas.

Since everybody necessarily believes in good, the biggest mistakes then are wrong beliefs about good.

Narcissists and also the state induce learned helplessness. Infantilism is learned helplessness. Freedom and autonomy is punished, disincentivized. People are disallowed from choosing and coerced to obey. Erich Fromm – Der passive Mensch. The narcissist and the state both want to consume other people in a sense, because they are internally, constitutionally defective. It is a defense against nothingness, but nothing does not really exist. Die Qual des wenig sein (Erich Fromm, wenig ist).

Darwinism, survival of the fittest self replicator, is an a priori insight supported by empirical data. Without the insight the empirical data might have been explained in completely different ways. Darwinism seems to be true of any life independent of experience, in so far as all life necessarily is self replicative.

The empiricists definitely have a point. Trial and error seems an invariant for any life. Even thinking is to a large extent virtual trial and error. But what trial is worth trying is guided by knowledge and a priori insight. And in the end trial is meant to ensure success, not error. People would not even perceive error if it weren't meant for the ensuring of success. Being depressed is meant for achieving success. Seeing logical errors or fallacious reasoning is meant for ensuring correct thought and thought is for success. Negativity as such is only perceived to be better. Desire and want is only there to pursue actual good.

A priori knowledge is the form of insight.

Selecting and filtering are the same.

If my life circumstances were different, I could have be

a covert narcissist, a classic narcissist or maybe even a psychopathic narcissist. I would have been a seriously terrible person. Having been a masochistic covert narc is bad, but I would argue it is the least bad among narcissists (or maybe the inverted narcissist).

Narcissists always presume availability in other people. In a sense they also have defective theory of mind about others. They are bad at recognizing inherent separation and natural distance. They seek consolation all the time, if they are aware or not. The masochistic covert narcissist is internally hurt, but he projects his healing to the outside. That's what makes him full of pain and shame. Shame deflects his self healing and so he compulsively tries to heal others. This is altruism in its pathological form, self sacrificing. What is a saint? I don't think masochistic covert narcissists can be real saints. And maybe saints are shitty anyways compared to heroes. A hero is what a saint fails to be.

Since values are subjective, wins are also subjective. Because they are subjective, they depend on the receiving individuals personal judgement.

A decision is a selection, is a filter, is a collapse of possibilities, is a collapse of power and potential into actuality.

Every thing is something. Obviously!

Any attempt at crushing reality is completely futile, but equally any attempt at accepting reality is futile, it is there irrespecive of any personal stance.

Many bad economists implicitly or explicitly assume that economics is a zero sum game, but it is not. Volitional trade is win-win, otherwise one or both parties of the trade would not trade.

Some people are so wrong on so many things that I suspect some other bad motivation causing this wrongness. I suspect a psyop or some form of "shilling", paying mouth ser-

vice to please some powerful people. There is performative wrongness, I believe that every lie and even every wrongness has a reason. This obviously also means that if I am wrong about something, then this also most likely has a reason - if I'm aware or not. Wrongness always indicates a flaw somewhere. Any human action, so also speaking, writing, etcetera, is purposeful.

John Griffin: Why women see honor, loyalty and integrity differently.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JCPxbVJZT6g>

So, men can be Kantian, but women almost can not be Kantian. Transcendent vs immediate. Honor, loyalty, integrity vs self preservation, egoistic genes.

[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=PSq\\_AJ8HX0k](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=PSq_AJ8HX0k)

Very good except for the advice to stay single. This is against evolution and sexual reproduction. None the less, the information in these videos is very important. If people could volitionally choose arbiters for their agreements, then I bet that rarely women would be chosen. This would in one more way show the differentiation in suitableness of genders for different roles. For arbitration and judgement honor, loyalty and integrity are vital and this most likely would be proven by favorability of outcomes of such judgments. Nature itself selects, not human whims. But I do not decide, it is only my prediction, I could be wrong, but I don't think so (obviously). Gender properties are natural adaptations. Itō Hirobumi: Even if you succeed in study and business, if your nation collapses, then what is it for? So this is the responsibility and ability of men mostly. Also note to any stupid people: I do NOT exclude women from any place as judge or arbiter, I only PREDICT that they will not naturally be chosen much because they are on average less capable than men in it. No, you have no right to coerce others to be their judge if they

dont want to, the non-aggression principle reigns. Claiming to have a right to judge over others voluntarily made agreements without being chosen as judge by them voluntarily (at agreement creation or later) is itself an aggression and warrants self defense by the agreements parties. If women want power, then they have to show integrity, honor and loyalty to truth and justice. And of course, not all men are fit for this either. It is better to make clean cuts, than to suffer arbitrariness or malice.

Some examples where women might be better suited in judgement is family matters and child rearing. The rest is for men. But really all of this is solved by volition in the first place. Marriage is a contract that could be in many different forms, etc. There is no one size fits all.

Good and bad, evil people exist of all genders, but a good woman is something different from a good man. It is evil to say that there are no differences between genders. If society fails, then its mostly the mens fault. If families fail then its mostly the womens fault. Good men make good society. Good women make good family. This is not always true, but it is most of the times true. If society fails, men suffer the most. If the family fails women suffer the most. So here also stake, commitment, ability, potential for win and loss are tied together as it should always be. Being and also particular kind of being is always stake, commitment, ability, potential for win and loss together, so also in gender. It also seems true for all life forms.

I do not merely play with concepts, concepts themselves are shells, I explore what is underlying the concepts. Concepts are borders, not the content.

If a concept, a word, is both a border and a reference, then border and reference are the same concept. But a border does not imply which side of the border, a reference does.

So a concept is a reference and a border with one side chosen, binary. A concept defines a space, chosen, and a non space, undefined. Choosing is defining, not choosing is leaving undefined. A choice is a filtering event. Hmm. The simplest filter is binary, like a concept. The only concept that includes everything is the all-one or the univers in its original meaning of the word. Does the all-one filter? Natural selection filter, but in the all one nothing does not exist. Natural selection only empathizes those that are selected for but not those that were/are selected against, that died out. What happens to all the failed ones in the context of the all-one? They do not get lost, but seem to be dispersed, dissolved. Like concepts that are forgotten. Concepts are memetic replicators too, after all. Concepts that are forgotten are references that are forgotten. References are ways to relate, relationships. A relationship implies a self, a particular being. Species that died out are lost ways to relate to the other, lost references. Your way of being defines the way you reference the world a priori. Different species reference the other (outer, not self) differently a priori. It is like with the natural selection the a priori perceptions are converged to. The a priori is self consistent, coherent. I don know.

Then since concept is reference is being (being references other, relationship), this means that self is also a particular reference and also that self is a particular concept. My being is a concept. I am a concept, I am a word. Obviously what concept I am exactly is most likely missing in any language I know. This then means that all life and people of it have meanings since words have meanings. This is one way to sketch the platonic perfect forms, making individual people platonic perfect forms too. I think the soul then is this unspoken profound word and also then the soul obviously is immortal, because concepts themselves are also immor-

tal, although they might be forgotten they will always be inherent to reality and might also be rediscovered and then probably called differently, referenced differently, but be the same division, the same concept, eternally existent and true. Discovering this true self then, waywardness and Eigensinn, self referential justification means what one self is in the epistemic realm. Every person is a truth. Now this is sacred knowledge, but the truth is the good and the beautiful. But it is not the full truth, yet. Do you share my longing? Do I even have it?

About that which we are ignorant about, that we have ourselves.

Once hype is seen through reason has a chance.

In rare occasions Im one of the idiots.

If good deeds get punished then you obviously live in a horrible society.

Eigensinn ist per se, von sich aus.

I dislike all forms of insistent missionaries, be it for a religion or a world view or and ideology. People should be allowed to decide for themselves without being rushed, coerced or threatened. A coercive religion does not have believers, it has slaves. True belief implies volition. A religion that is not really believed is not really a religion. A religion perpetuated by violence and threat is not a religion but a cult of fear. Religion should be about what people really believe.

It is very well possible that some of the feelings that I have have evolved through the influence of christianity on my ancestors.

Plans are about closeness to the absolute, they are about fighting against uncertainty.

The state incentivizes dept (and disincentivizes saving), it incentivizes dependence so that you are better controllable.

If people and the media are lying all the time more or less,

then you can only trust a priori true principles and your own experience. Where you dont know the truth, do not jump to conclusions either way, but keep it in that partial state of knowing and dont let it affect you.

Reward function vs reality testing?

It does not matter (it does) if others are wrong, the only question is if I am right in my beliefs and then what I think of others mostly follows from that.

If potential condenses it becomes actuality. But what is potential then? Electric charge is a potential and an actuality. Potential implies possibility for different outcomes, some freedom, choice. Actuality as such does not imply choice, but it also does not inherently deny it, actuality just is. But actuality is only there if it is noticed, at least this seems implied by quantum observations. I dont know much about quantum physics. Actuality seems to be the mediator, potential itself can not be perceived except through actuality. It seems to me one can only reference actuality, but not potential except as through a space. Actuality seems to be a point, potential a space. Potential seems to be the same as nothingness, both can not be referenced themselves, but only through an actuality, but they are potentially not the same since I cant reference them in the firat place. I feel like this is potentially dangerous.

Identifying, noticing, referencing, pointing, recognizing (pattern), categorizing are the same thing viewed from different references. References, words, that point at the same from different angles. Ultimately everything is referenced in an absolute space, so there would be no confusion about actually equal things. Only limited life on earth doesnt know everything in perfection, is bound to local knowledge. We need to have humility for the reason that we do not know. Only in the absolute is final epistemic clarity and it is soo-

thing and assuring. Therefore I want to believe in the absolute.

I do make mistakes sometimes, but the goal obviously is to have it right.

The american liberalism has been hollowed of its meaning and perverted to the point of being antiliberal.

If generally higher IQ 145 and upwards makes more individualistic, then higher society with higher IQ is more individualistic too. This could be wrong tho, maybe highest IQ people are only individualistic so much because they are so sparse. Probably individualism is not the point, but only a rough estimate of what is good.

If people are civil, then there is no real reason to fear them. If people are babaic (decivilized) then there is real reason to fear them.

Tell me one person that wants to compromise and I show you one liar. On the things that people really want there is no compromise or they would not really want it in the first place. It just matters if people are reasonable in what they want. It is like this: Either you really want something or you compromise inherently because it doesn't matter. They are logically mutually exclusive. A good person has reasonable wants. A bad person has wants like narcissistic supply or sadism or magical unreal things. A bad person has unrealistic, unsustainable, aggressive or domineering wants. A good person has realistic, sustainable, volitional and respecting wants. Good is "because there is pretty much only one way of good and bad is or", because there are many ways to be bad. There is one absolute and there are many confusions. I am not perfect but I crave perfection, I seek good and so I am justified and if I fail then because I have not been good.

In the end real intentions (wants) always manifest or fail utterly trying.

Hope without hopelessness is dogma. Freedom without vision is disillusionment.

Antifa (-scism) is part of the new fascism. DARVO.

Claimed objectivity exists only insofar as the absoluteness of something is understood. Objectivity can only be about reality, but because of language limitations it is necessarily reductive and virtual, referential at most. Language is a tool for creating references. If there is coerced speech then people lose their ability to openly reference reality by language and the public loses its reality testing. Slaves are forced to lie. Only free men have the chance to speak truth. In bad social circles do lie and be secretive for self protection. In good social circles you have the chance and the security to speak the truth openly. Better than lying is grey rocking, not saying anything much or anything interesting or significant and better than grey rock is physical dissociation. No interaction is better than loose-loose. Win-win is reserved for the good, obviously. Establishing trust requires trustworthiness and many other good properties that I never could enumerate all and that are local as well as a priori dependent. Maybe the real good actually does not speak, because speaking is reductive.

Modern politics pretends to be public, but that's impossible, so it really is private. Only a few politicians are able to dictate laws and only a few judges have final arbitration rights. States must be reclassified as private, they are de facto private. It is one huge mess. Things are private for the same reason that private property is private: Determination of ends is inherently mutually exclusive. The public is merely a heuristic, a more or less useful hallucination. In reality there are only many specific people and every individual's perception of public is unique to himself. Perceptions about the public, super ego, can be somewhat similar, but this must

not be the case. Methodological individualism. The role of the superego (public) is only for self regulation, but this can also be misused by malicious actors. So what then is there to hold onto? The absolute itself. The inherently absolute is the standard anyways.

Sadism, maliciousness and malignancy are the same. I suspect that sadists have an inverted superego. They are not neutral, but negative towards the public, other people in general.

What would I do without the occasional JB Peterson video? I would be in big trouble.

The personality pathologies that are prejudices and compulsive invariant behaviors (repetition compulsions like for example repetitively seeking narcissistic supply) are then lack of free will. So, certain lacks of free will are pathological and then free will is one requirement for mental health. Mental health requires free will.

<https://mises.org/mises-wire/objection-professor-harari->

Christopher Paolini: "Die Breite und Tiefe des Seins ist so viel größer, als irgendjemand wissen kann.

...

Und was Leute zu verstehen glauben, meinen sie auch kontrollieren zu können."

I got orange. Dont ask.

I feel like the mbti type enfp is just like bpd (borderline personality disorder) and bpd is a way more reliable concept to know. Seeing mania in action is a sight to behold, but I wont let it fool me. Mania is contagious and it leads to self overestimation that can be good or bad depending on specifics. BPD are probably the most likely to use UwU speak online. And yes, the bpd idealizes himself and

is reliant on external emotional regulation, intense relationships, impulsiveness. On first approach I like them, but big but. BPD people are extremely versatile and seem very suggestive, but they do not self regulate well or stick to plans. They seem very spontaneous, adhd? No. But discontinuous emotion. Sticking to plans requires emotional regulation. Of course they have separation anxiety, separation is like losing ability to emotionally regulate to them. In this sense the borderline seeks emotional regulation supply. So there is narcissistic supply and borderline supply. Similarities, differences? No supply is free. Something is very unsettling about giving borderline supply.

Wanjiru Njoya: Those who yearn to keep their civilization, but abandon the pursuit of sound economics, will fail to achieve their goal.

...

There are no economically sound arguments to justify race-craft of any kind, because the laws of economics do not vary based on race. True, but depending on how much the averages of crime and prosocial behavior differ it could be nearly impossible to have free market capitalism. You need appropriate opt-in effective private law, private promises that have good incentives and appropriately punish aggressors. This same problem also applies to western democracies and their inherently flawed incentive structures. The question is about appropriate incentives and depending on population averages, medians, etcetera the starting point is a different one. Volition seems to be a universal factor necessary for success. Any system must be a volitional service and otherwise only self defense is warranted (others can aid you in self defense).

Wanjiru Noya: Collaboration and cooperation are neces-

sary; kinship on its own does not suffice.

...

Again, this is not to argue that ethnicity and kinship are not important, but that racial bonds of loyalty are not, in themselves, the foundation of civilization. Also true.

<https://mises.org/mises-wire/human-reason-foundation-civ>

### Human Reason as the Foundation of Civilization!

If there are natural rights, then only individual people have them and no state or other organization has any right other than through individual consent of individual people. Right means true. This also means that a state or other organization has no right to self defense, other than as an aiding in self defense of individual people involved. Every finite thing is private, actual. Every infinite thing is public, conceptual. Private also means local, public (spanning everything, not only human public) means general. A priori, math, etcetera is general, public. Where I am at this very moment is local, private, circumstantial.

Causal action is private, free will directed. Generality, public (spanning everything not only human public) is not acting and is an absolute given, can only be understood. The reach of free will goes only so far as he can cause, as things are private and not public. Truly public things are invariant to anyone's actions, like math and all a priori, absolute and conceptual things it can only be discovered, understood and conformed to. Differentiating what one self can change and what not is wisdom, so also differentiating what is inherently private (changeable, finite) and what is inherently public (invariant, conceptual) is wisdom. So what can be done? Only that which is private and general (public) things can only be understood, not changed.

All human institutions are necessarily private. Every single interhuman relationship is private. Only the relationship to the absolute is completely public, common and therefore lawlike among others aspects. Math is lawlike. A priori: Tautologies, fully sufficient self referential justification, existential grounds, hermeneutic principles, Platonic perfect forms, conceptual, infinite, no scarcity.

<https://mises.org/journal-libertarian-studies/nations-co>

Human confronts (or is confronted) by the absolute as a finite and local actor. He does not know everything and is fallible. If I talk about generalities, commonalities, concepts, I can only talk about the absolute. If I talk about concrete events and data, I talk about local finite things in terms of words, in terms of the absolute and so I am deficient. Scarcity (including the scarcity of one's own life and lifespan) is deficiency. The human condition is deficient and as far as I can see it, it will always be deficient. This is healthy frustration. It is also obviously not true that humans are only deficient or that existence is only suffering.

Auf einer gewissen Ebene ist der Staat, die ganze Bürokratie dem Menschen einfach unnatürlich und abträglich. Will man nicht allgemein nicht einfach, frei und unbehelligt leben dürfen? Warum macht man es sich so unnötig schwer?

What is genetic warfare (I read that term online) and does it make sense? Edwardadad duttons spiteful mutants, but also laboratory created viruses targeting only specific genes or also generally any kind of aggressive kinselection, ingroup bias, ethnic genocide or racism.

Because the narcissist lacks certain parts of free will (his repetition compulsion) he fears freedom as something evil. On some level he only understands coercion, win-lose, and is at a loss otherwise if free association is respected, because it would force him to mature himself and take up responsibi-

lity for himself and his own actions. Narcissism is inherently unsustainable, self consuming because of the inner pain. He misses his secure base, his basic belief in good and wholistic love, freedom and hope towards the future. Uncertainty is not always equal to death and evil, it can be good, bad or simply mostly neutral or boring even. The narcissist missclassifies uncertainty as certain evil, a confusion of concepts and his bias. It is a lack of existential trust and this also torments him and makes him so restless and haunted. The narcissist needs to understand that goodness is invariant and existentially sufficient. The narcissist is never just ok. He is either distraught, idealizing, bragging, or selfrighteously cruel. He does not understand fairness. He always compensates weakness by projecting it onto others or by feeling it himself. Consistent tit-for-tat also requires proper accounting, so also requires continuous and wholistic experience and memory formation. Memory is context, a story and narrative.

Nature lets us know how little we know about its secrets.  
There are divinely beautiful places on earth.

Finitude is limited and infinity is limitless, obviously.

My results from bdsmtest.org are:

== Results from [bdsmtest.org](<http://bdsmtest.org>):  
 == 100% Vanilla 14% Exhibitionist 12% Voyeur 9% Experimentalist 9% Masochist 8% Dominant 7% Primal (Hunter) 5% Submissive 2% Daddy/Mommy 1% Non-monogamist 0% Rigger 0% Ageplayer 0% Brat 0% Brat tamer 0% Degrader 0% Degradee 0% Little 0% Master/Mistress 0% Owner 0% Pet 0% Primal (Prey) 0% Rope bunny 0% Sadist 0% Slave 0% Switch

A few years back this would have been way different. Mental suppression and sexual deviancy. Now I am Vanilla and proud of it. Exclusive vanilla sexual preference is at least a strong indicator, if not a necessary one, for mental health.

Maybe the bdsm preferences test serves as a basic indicator for psychological health. Im not saying that people should suppress their sexual desires and fantasies, but they do have a reason. Repressed libido energy, Freud.

Why my slight increase in exhibitionism and voyerism? Exhibitionism because Im suppressed in regard to publicly releasing my philosophy in my name and full fledged, although in some sense I already did, semi-secretly, but also in realizing my ambitions for life where there are some huge. Voyeurism because I still watch porn and because I am interested in secrets. Lost places are secrets. Lost ways.

A classical narcissist gets abused by a psychopathic narcissist. A psychopathic narcissist probably gets abused by a psychopath or rather directly assaulted.

Each abuse would be punished and disincentivized in a good society. In a good society committing abuse is like self-destruction - evil coming to its proper conclusions early. But all of this is a wish for righteousness and not current actuality. Narcissists, psychopaths, etcetera are all a test towards to rigorousness and correctness of applied justice. And despite all the confusions and manipulations and DARVO, hiddenness of malice or its great repulsiveness and easy denial, righteousness must find the truth and enforce appropriate justice. Righteousness must approach an absolute view as best as possible, it must approach essence. Righteousness must be stubborn about cause and effect and blame and penalize people according to their proportional cause. The truth and integrity of the law and its application is so important that people will adopt it (more or less) in their superego for self regulation. But in the end, the superego always is an abstraction and there exist only specific people. Individual people means many specific relationships, each relationship its own contract and its own clauses, implicit or explicit, conscious

or unconscious. Then there is also a difference (although not necessarily) between ingroup and outgroup perception and treatment. Law, treatment, appropriatenes, good vs bad, allowed vs disallowed, public vs private. Every human society requires some prosocial standards of conduct, otherwise you would only have conflict and no society. Society is always at least about some sort of unity and mutual nonaggression.

At a certain point of mental pain the human mind dissociates, splits in some way and restricts consciousness into a space where it feels save, a virtual good, a loss of reality due to pain. Consciousness is about win-win and it retreats from places that are too much of a loss and then the world becomes inherently and generally evil. Either there is possibility for specific self goods or there is general evil. The mind maps the world in this way. A narcissists consciousness is narrowly restrained, it lacks wholesomeness. Consciousness is inherently only about winning, why would it have evolved otherwise? And how broad and wholistic, wholesome or how narrow, harsh and cruel it is is a matter of life experience and adaptation to circumstances. Reality testing only in so far as it serves and is bearable. Unbearable reality is suppressed and becomes the unconscious general law. The superego can turn out evil and so also a psychopathic narcissist sees nothing unordinary or wrong in utmost cruelty. It seems appropriate to him. All of this obviously leads to confusion. It is not that the psychopathic narcissist doesnt seek good, it is that his perception of good is undermined and extremely constrained - to himself. And if only he is good then any other good is bad, harming others therefore makes him feel like he confirms his own good. But crucially this means: He is unable to benefit from cooperation (catalactics and capitalism), if he is honest. And he even can not have peace with others, if he is honest. His mindset is in complete civil

war by default, where he is his complete own faction and his personal own religion and legitimacy. Only good is legitimate and he sees himself exclusively and as the only good.

So talking about good is ego dystonic to a psychopathic narcissist, because it contradicts his own extremely private and limited concept of good. So the psychopathic narcissist fears good. He tries to deny good, because he fears it. He tries to deny existence as such. He tries to deny the absolute. Killing another person is an attempt at denying his existence.

Adolf Hitler was abused by his own father and so he went on to deny existence, killing millions. In the end he killed himself because he lost the war. I think he also must have had a narcissistic collapse at that time.

"Greek word  *Sophia*," which signifies wisdom, knowledge, and sound judgment. *Sophia* is also justice (sound judgement). Philosophy therefore also is love of justice. People are learning, individually.

In some sense the data the narcissist collects is mostly around preventing retraumatization, so it is specific to his trauma. Here details matter and a lot of fidelity, perceptiveness and associative horizon is allocated to learning from it, compulsively. Trauma are life changing events and they are significant in exactly how they are bad. Traumata are like overdone vaccines, they create a very strong immunity to the point of autoimmunity disease besides the direct damage from the trauma itself.

Once anybody psychologically dissociates, he also splits space and starts to confuse directions, has problems with body feeling. If instead the space is still continuous, then there could not be a dissociation, only a relative position in a shared, common space. Dissociation enables privacy and shelter if necessary. Once you are dissociated, others references dont affect you because they do not reference into your space any-

more. At the same time you loose the ability to learn from others genuinely. The absolute references every thing absolutely, but these references are all constitutional. In some sense if you tell a narcissist something it never really lands. Landing here is about recognizing reference. To the narcissist the mentally healthy person is an enigma too. Sometimes in his haughtyness the narcissist denies any words you say, he puts you to be a non-starter even if that means that he needs to contradict himself from one sentence to the next. He denies your space. For example he asks you something and then doesnt want to hear the answer. Or he claims something, you confirm him and then he immediatly denies it. The references, words, do not land and are denied. The more overt the more actively this denial, the more covert have more covert the denial.

Thinking about narcissists is a pain, but I need it for myself. It is nauseating.

Quid pro quo.

There are going to be smarter and more insightful people than me. And they will know better than I do. Something I can not imagine. I have the advantage of past insight and I hope that my insight is able to contribute to future insight too. Of course it does in at least some way. Maybe I will be fundamental insight for some people. I like and I hope that Im good to you.

My former empty schizoid core feels like in resin, slow but moving in extremely small ways. Im also tired tho (its late). The eye that I associate with my former empty schizoid core is dilated (my Anisocoria). It is sometimes like this part dreams/sleeps while the rest, I am more awake.

The psychopathic narcissist not only want attention, he wants authority, he wants to rule coercively. This way he can destroy and torture, live sadistically. He wants to control

everything, so others are not allowed to be free or to have any free will, because freedom of others us uncertainty about them and uncertainty is reinterpreted as certain danger. He wants omnipotence, the authority of god, absolute authority, complete control. He wants to be the only being. Grandiosity that disregards all and so also attempts to disregard the all-one. So finally it is inherently futile. No amount of potential is an actual. In order to be, power needs to be given up.

Power is potential is control is causative space, but is not actuality. Truth is actuality. Power is fantasy and simulation, not actuality. Actuality is the absolute in its immediacy. Words are never fully sufficient about actuality. Ultimate truth is silent, but exists.

I like that there are different perspectives. I think it is enriching. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=W0vTZrZny6A>

On the other hand Donald Trump: "Words are very important and can often lead to unintended consequences." Yes, that's true. I'm also not omniscient or infallible, neither is Donald Trump.

When Nietzsche wrote *Thus spoke Zarathustra*, he was certainly at least a little bit psychotic. And he corrects me in parts of his writing.

Is a fantasy also an ambition, or is it only daydreaming or is it a refuge or is it imagining to become more or different. Is a fantasy about adventure, conquest, power or peace, love or about sex? Or is it about freedom or about realization of desire unhindered or heroism? Or is fantasy a nightmare or is it fear or paranoia? How fantastical is the fantasy, how good or how terrible? Is a dream a fantasy? Yes. Hoping and fearing both are fantastical. Fantasy is about potential and about imagination. A part of fantasizing is necessary for self exploration and self actualization. You always need hope to attempt something in the first place. Fantasy is not inher-

ently evil, it is adaptive, mostly. Fantasy is about imagining living, imagined living. Fantasy is in that sense about preparing for the future. There is reality but it is no always cruel, and fantasy is not only naively positive, there are also nightmares. Fantasy as a whole seems adaptive, a way of coping. You do fantasy and even your fantasy will become attuned. Playing is about trying fantasy. Fantasy is a space where you are in a way original and authentic, fantasy is when you do not so much fit into the world (reality), but where reality and the world fit to your authenticity and originality, your wants, desires and fears. Fantasy is about changing the narrative to your inner needs. Fantasy is a form of agency.

So in order to be healthy it seems you need fantasy (changing the world to live your authentic self) and reality testing (changing yourself to fit into the world). Fantasy is about taking yourself absolute. Realism is about taking the world absolute. The self and the world are both part of the absolute.

Fantasy is about reinterpreting reality according to inner needs. Fantasy is about creating favorable ignorance. Fantasy is about achieving success. One part of fantasy is about forgetting unfavorable or favorable reality, it sets a focus and a filter. Fantasy is teleological and motivational. It takes away all burdens like shame, fear, threat or even disagreement or it magnifies them and takes away the good like taking a way peace, safety, trustworthiness or future. Fantasy is a focus and playing out of either a best case or a worst case. Fantasy is limit testing. Fantasy sets the corridor for agency, by so having discovered its best and worst outcomes. Fantasy is self reflective. Your fantasy also shows who you are by your own standards. Your fantasy shows your psychology.

Since fantasy is a virtual reality, it can be nested, like the movie inception. Isn't fantasy also a meaning? At least in

computers you can nest it, but each nesting becomes smaller and narrower, slower. In this way actual fantasy is finite, but you can imagine infinity, but you can never actually imagine it. It necessarily becomes referential and reductive, lossy. Fantasy is not the actual.

One persons fantasy transforms others that believe in it, actors not actuals. This can be good or bad for the others, but in any case it misses the others authenticity, it disregards their own fantasies. A good relationship is a shared fantasy formation, something both want, win-win. A shared fantasy formation requires that both have slight frustrations in it to be able to accomodated the others interests. It is more mature than a personal private fantasy. Equally it also must incorporate reality testing and a shared reality. There is no regression of maturity to childhood, but a change of maturity. I dont know, yet.

A fantastical attitude is romantic, romanticizing.

Why is there even a meta? Meta is the popular niche and is also what is recognized, because it is popular. Betting against the meta is in high probability bad, except one really knows why the alternative is better.

Maybe I should stop complaining about ineffable truth and start thinking about effable truth.

The author never truly can speak to the reader, he simply does not know the reader at all and there is not one but many different readers. Therefore anything the author says about the reader can at most be general, never personal and by generalizing what truly is not general he necessarily misses the reader. The reader is necessarily a passive outside observer.

Ok I have to admit Im impressed by LLM AI especially since they are also able to generate images seamlessly in a conversation.

Nietzsche: "Ja, viel bitteres Sterben muss in eurem Leben sein, ihr Schaffenden! Also seid ihr Fürsprecher und Rechtfertiger aller Vergänglichkeit. Dass der Schaffende selber das Kind sei, das neu geboren werde, dazu muss er auch die Gebärerin sein wollen und der Schmerz der Gebärerin. The masochistic covert narcissists desire to go back to the womb and his masochism "viel sterben", his radical taking of new viewpoints as a form of self denial and the narcissists pathological kind of fluidity and lack of secure absolute base, seeking of an epistemically reliable reference point. Nietzsche: "Dass der Schaffende selber das Kind sei, das neu geboren werde, dazu muss er auch die Gebärerin sein wollen und der Schmerz der Gebärerin. Feeling the need to be reborn implies a lack in the current self - the empty schizoid core, painful, shameful and largely unconscious. Nietzsche: Älles Fühlende leidet an mir und ist in Gefängnissen: aber mein Wollen kommt mir stets als mein Befreier und Freudebringer. A narcissists pain and masochistic covert narcissistic supply. Reinventing the false self many times - no defensive layer against the empty schizoid core. The new false self is always again unsatisfactory and insufficient against the painful empty schizoid core. Here Nietzsche was restless too.

Attention is also local, localized. Knowledge, space, time and context are local to the I, self.

Doing something noble means doing something good. Nobility then means good person/people. And then history happened, nobility became calcified and coercive, evil and perverted of what it originally was. It is always a breakdown of volition that is evil, an introduction of a coercive that is evil.

Anon: SShills found this thread quick. No, I don't care about your global homo talking points of 'complex moralities' to excuse the decay into societal apathy. Either give me a story with clear lines of good and evil, or fuck off back

to that fat ass George RR Martin's subversion slop."

Anon: "Because portraying good as being good hurts evil. Being morally gray, or indifferent supports evil. So the evil wants to convince you that stories with unquestioned good vs evil are boring, or low quality. Modern writing exclusively means that the traditionally good guys must lie, cheat, steal, or purposefully fuck people over if their rules allow for it. Often while whitewashing the literal demons or traditionally evil murdererape races like orcs

...

"

BPD (borderline) is really unable to deal with closeness, but he invites it and then rejects. He is contradictory there. BPD is also restless, but in the way that he goes from one emotion to another. The bpd just goes for it, but then there is the problem or success. So this uncertainty he projects, relational uncertainty. He always projects that he is good, and to a degree is, until he completely snaps probably. He is not good in the sense that he is not being real with people. He seems unbreakably optimistic about every thing. He is optimistic for no good reason. He is optimistic performatively. He is not serious, almost like never serious - at least in his conduct. It is all about that manic pixie aura. This is a false self, or a partial self. Where did he put all the bad parts? He invalidates other peoples criticisms on his false persona and he hypes up the person - but never real closeness, lest he be smothered. So he lacks boundaries there, because even normal interactions tend to smother him. So there is a split, too far, too close. He lacks fittingness there. He tells other people what they are supposed to be for him, but what he wants others to be is entirely unrealistic. He projects to be good, but on the emotional level, not the

ideal level like narcissists. He is reckless. Why? And he lured me and and frustrates me. He acts and talks about actual things. And everything is viewed through rose tinted glasses, as if that were the actual truth. He is laughing at every even meaningless joke - he has no seriousness that lasts. He just turns around on the spot. Most people would be scared to act like the bpd. In a sense it is also a great freedom - yet he is dependent on emotional regulation.

I fear that asmongold did drugs, but I dont know. His father has deadly cancer and he just tries to brush off his bad feelings. I think hes under a lot of stress. My two brothers are also not ok, but in different ways.

Michael Huemer: It happens that we have evidence about this. Over 50 studies have been performed on the accuracy of demographic, national, political, and other stereotypes. The results are unequivocal: Stereotypes are not generally inaccurate, nor are they generally exaggerations. The truth is the exact opposite: stereotypes are generally accurate, except that they tend to underestimate real differences. There is basically no evidence that stereotypes tend to lead to inaccurate judgments. So stereotypes are good in so far as judgements about averages. Individuals obviously can vary, but on average, in large numbers they do follow the stereotype. A few stereotypes: Jews are greedy and good with money and trade, black people are criminal, leftists are emotional and irrational, conservatives are dumb, terrorists are muslims, Chad is wholesome, Karen is an insufferable bitch, italians are shady, germans have no sense of humor. Stereotypes are like memes! The spread because they resonate. They are not necessarily all true, but most are most likely true and psychops on stereotypes are rare, I think. Stereotypes also change in some cases, but very slowly. Stereotypes are the meta, they are dominant and widespread niches of human being.

Stereotypes describe types of normality, clustered averages.

Michael Huemer: "studies find individuating information (specific to individuals) has massively greater effects on people's judgments of others than stereotypes do." Good. This seems rational, using the information available to judge. If you know very little, then stereotype, if you know additional individuating information, judge the individual. The boundary is fluid, but there.

Huemer: "As a general rule, truth is good. Knowing the truth about things that are relevant to your interests can make you worse off sometimes, but in general, it makes you better off."

Stereotyping is just one part of general pattern recognition, like Huemer wrote. Huemer concludes: "Being offended by the recognition of patterns in the world is not really something that a serious, adult thinker does."

Epistemic clarification is truth seeking is (the process of) enlightenment. If the way is the goal, then the process of enlightenment is enlightenment.

People don't really know what they are doing.

Is it more difficult to fuse atoms into gold or to break blockchain cryptography? The latter is probably more difficult, assuming the blockchain is sound otherwise.

What is the scope of morality? First off, morality can not trump truth. Truth is before morality. Everything a priori trumps morality. But morality could be part of truth and part of a priori. If there exists objective morality, then it would need to be an a priori morality.

In sadism, seeing and causing other people pain to the point of complete desperation, giving up on life and complete destruction causes the sadist sexual pleasure and feeling good. So there is the libido involved in sadism, the life energy is directed at destroying others. In a sense to the sadist, tor-

ture and killing is pornographic. So sadism, always is sexual sadism? Sexuality, lust is strongly motivational, so the sadist is strongly motivated to torture and kill (mentally and physically). Sadists think that god must be a sadist too - they think they are in a sadist world, they project their own sadism to be a general truth. So obviously the (masochistic) superego is involved. The sadism is relational, in the sense that they want to see others in pain to themselves feel better, they depend on others pain. Sadism too is a form of dependence. In some sense they want others to fail, to loose all hope. Hope is pursuing of a good place. By exerting sadism, attempting to destroy any and all hope of others they self affirm. What does that say about the sadistic self? It is an attempt at proving the other completely bad, hopeless, a nothing, etcetera and in so far as this is achieved and felt through the others despair and giving up, etcetera, he feels that then he must be good since the other is not good and good has to be somewhere at least. To the sadist, sadism is self affirmation. He has a completely private religion in the sense that only he is justified, so he should control everything and be god and any external free will is illegitimate to him. The sadist enjoys destroying others will. So his motive is against others volition, hopes and dreams. Sadism could be the most evil thing, since it is opposed to human life and flourishing as such.

I see that bpd people are utterly fake. They are just terrible. All that selfhood clinging to shine, not being. You pretend to be perfect, but that's a lie. You are a mess. I'm not willing to take part in theatrics and the fake role you assign to me.

Insanity is a defense against mental pain.

Anons call BPDs BPDemons, so here you have a stereotype.

The bpd intuitively comforts people, even if doing so is bad sometimes. Narcissists seek it.

A sadist is unsettling, but a masochist is soothing. Overall its not that simple tho. I am afraid of sadists, tired of masochists and annoyed by BPDs. Maybe we should just put them all into the insanity asylum and be done with their bullshit. But oh boy, that would be coercive. Just have some peace!

Anon: Communism completely disregards human nature and the laws of nature. It assumes people are perfect by default, especially perfectly equal, perfectly motivated, altruistic and will interact perfectly with each other."

The real free market, with its mimetic kind of products, its product evolutions and innovations, its need for company self sustainment, growth, staying sufficient or insolvency and dissolution, its all like a natural ecosystem - it is adaptive. Stake is coupled to potential wins and losses, it is meritocratic. Natural selection apriori and so also in empirical evidence refutes communism. Man can not act against absolute properties of nature without failing.

Skin in the game is stake.

Anon: They can condition the chinese populace all they want, in the end, life is a struggle to survive and even thrive. You can try to erase their individualism and force collectivization, but when it comes down to it, people will not sacrifice themselves for the betterment of others. This was perfectly exemplified under Mao, when they collectivized the food. Food would be delivered periodically at your local public kitchen, and the chinese people would essentially gorge themselves with food as much as they could, and continue to eat as much as physically possible, until there was no more food left, and starve until the next food delivery. There was more than enough food to last for the whole period, but

these supposedly collectivized communist people didn't trust each other to eat reasonable amounts of food, so they just took as much as possible for themselves as fast as possible so that they wouldn't be left behind when the food eventually runs out. That's Collectivism for you. No matter how much collectivism you achieve, survival is more of an individual effort rather than a group effort. They don't call it Survival of the Fittest for no reason."

Many communists are simply sadists. They like the idea of being a guard in an extermination camp or to dictate peoples lives to the point of killing them. They want other hopeless and gain total power over them. And then use that power to destroy them. In the end they will just destroy themselves and it will all be meaningless to them. No one has the right to dictate my life. I am justified to live my own life freely. I have my own inherent meaning and I don't need any humans or states or other organisations validation or permission to exist. And if that conflicts with you, then you are evil. Nobody gets to choose my destiny, but myself and fate.

Communism is a social construct that does not serve.

Nihilism seems to be the source of all confusion.

Since private property is de facto (inherent exclusivity of causation towards ends), recognizing so is necessary for reason, because reason is recognition of cause and effect. Therefore reason implies the existence of private property (all that similar Ludwig von Mises). Disregarding private property is disregarding of cause and effect. If you disregard cause and effect, then you surrender your ability to act, because action is based on knowledge of causes and their effects. Since responsibility is based on causation (who caused what and is therefore responsible for it) disregarding of private property not only disregards reason, it also makes human action and

responsibility impossible. Without privateness, responsibility is unthinkable. Without responsibility evil acts become prevalent. Private property is combining stake and ownership, actions and their results, be they subjectively good, neutral or bad, creating a good incentive structure. Private property is about recognizing being, it is about correctly understanding causes and their effects. These constitute and allow for knowledge. This knowledge allows the individuals will to act good, to achieve desired ends because it can correctly link causes and effects.

Linkages of cause to effect(s) are references. The more correct that they are, the better one is able to act in reality self efficaciously. Being able to correctly make these links is part of good reality testing. Not believing in privateness of cause inhibits this link formation and therefore corrupts reality testing. If the a priori notions are wrong, then no amount of empirical testing or experience can generate true and meaningful results. Having a good epistemic base is the precondition for getting meaningful empirical knowledge.

Anon: Fear, uncertainty, and doubt (often shortened to FUD) is a disinformation strategy used in sales, marketing, public relations, politics, cults, and propaganda. FUD is generally a strategy to influence perception by disseminating negative and dubious or false information and a manifestation of the appeal to fear. These threads and articles are demoralizing propaganda."

If a healthy person is traumatized, then there is this big question of why in their mind. This introduction of uncertainty and a dangerous world. Why, why, why. And it is understandable. In a just world assault should not happen. Why is there barbarism? Hans Hermann Hoppe gives one very convincing answer - the process of decivilisation due to modern democracy. But in specific trauma, there are specific

circumstances, there is more. What is true: Traumatization at least somewhat erodes a former secure base or it is heavily challenged, or there is a splitting. Due to adaptation of the human mind, trauma always changes people. There is world constriction. Doing less things enables better fettering and security. There is also introduction of some amounts of hollow grandiosity. It needs to be processed later in a very lengthy process or it stays as an adaptation. It is not as bad as narcissism, narcissism starts with childhood trauma which tends to be more fundamental and all encompassing.

The epistemic confusion in all kinds of trauma can also be seen in this: There can be confusion about basic things like directions or some stuttering of words or cutting off mid words or sentences. Regular bewilderment, in the case of the narcissist its his dominant mode instead. And restlessness in the sense that rest requires a secure base, an elongated present. Rest requires peace.

Fake goodness is evil too.

Truth is its own nobility, no matter the lies or how much it is silenced. Truth itself can not be perverted or destroyed. Truth is immutably true.

Maybe the question is not only: What is the meaning of life? But more specifically: What is the meaning of my life? If the question is the first, then the answer is the all-one. If the question is the second, then the answer is oneself within the all-one.

I do have a small Samount of general european DNA and this I think I share also with more arab, muslim or jewish types. 0.9

Whatever ones genes mean, one is bound to it. It may be unclear what most genes exactly do, but how could anybody escape it? Nurture plays a role, but you cant nurture a cat into a human, etcetera, there are limits.

Reality is objective, but our access to it is necessarily subjective. Valuing is subjective, the subject values. Subjectivity is part of objectivity, but objectivity is only incompletely represented in one Subject. Subjectivity implies consciousness, objectivity implies being. Objectivity is truth, subjectivity is perspective on truth, relationship to truth.

The bpd is stuck in superficiality. The amount of äura "he exudes is also a lack of wholesomeness internally. His äura is compensatory. Aura is infectious. Aura is sick, sick aura. Aura is radiating too, it is directed outward. It might be a form of burning up or of being lit. Artists are also creating a kind of aura. Aura enlightens, because it shines. Aura is one step short of justification. It is emotional, but not necessarily reasonable. It is in the moment, but outside of time. UwU is one kind of aura signalling. The bpd is annoying, frustrating. Aura is about evoking emotional responses in others. Aura can also be about signalling social standing. But bpd aura is just inappropriate. More meaningful aura is called reputation, it is time consistent and about secure relating, not about exciting fling. Aura is a hurt mans substitute for reputation. Aura is only a now, reputation is integrative over time. Aura is hype, reputation is cumulative experience. Aura is exciting, reputation is reasonable. Aura is flimsy, reputation is serious. The bpd does not understand seriousness, or at least claims to not understand. If you avoid seriousness, you can not be authentic. The bpd defends against serious relationships. If others arent allowed to be serious, then they are rendered inefficacious, nonagentic in the serious realm. This means that the bpd assumes himself the monopoly of seriousness, the opposite of the hype and silly aura he projects towards others. Why does he feel the need to mock others seriousness? And ofc he does it in plausible deniability too. Mocking is aggressive, devaluing. It is also heartbreaking.

Gad Saad said that childhood is also about the partitioning problem, like in marketing, finding a viable niche. This makes sense especially for pathological homes where most likely it is unlikely to have two classic narcissists at the same time or two covert narcissists at the same time. It also somewhat explains my childhood journey from what I think was psychotic (normal stage) to bpd (failed) to classic narc (failed due to my big brother already being that) to covert narc (failed due to my mother already being that) to masochistic covert narcissist (worked as a pathological bandaid). Healing then is also about reevaluating the partition problem, about where do I fit into the world, what is reality, what is good (for me). Maybe though if there are genetically identical twins, they may be able to occupy the same niche, since they have exceedingly strong kinselective mutual favoring, preventing niche competitiveness. I dont know, could be. In regard to niches, my little brother then could very well have been pushed into reactance. Reactance could be it. My little brother is very much about his own personal freedom, which is related to his magical thinking. In his way of school he always tried to choose the least resistance, the most freedom coupled with the maximum gain and also went behind peoples back if he thought he could get away with it. In the past I rarely, but sometimes scolded his missdeeds - but mostly admired his freedom and independence and also complemented him for it. I but especially my mother encouraged him. This was stupid beyond belief, but we were both fucked in the head too, obviously.

AI: Psychological reactance (PR), the motivational tendency to restore freedoms perceived as threatened or lost, is identified as a significant factor in psychopathy. Research indicates that individuals with elevated levels of psychopathy exhibit a heightened motivational drive to maintain or

restore such freedoms, suggesting PR is a salient predictor of psychopathy, particularly its self-serving, manipulative, angry, and impulsive facets. This reactance is linked to the three-factor model of psychopathy, specifically the egocentric and antisocial factors. The relationship between PR and psychopathy is robust, with studies showing a substantial and statistically significant connection even after controlling for demographics and socially desirable response sets. PR may explain why some individuals with psychopathic traits are prone to aggressive online behaviors and negatively evaluate media content, as the perceived loss of freedom can trigger reactance. Furthermore, this reactance is associated with heightened anger and a tendency to act aggressively toward the regulating agent. The literature also notes that psychopaths are highly reactive to perceived insults or slights, with weak inhibitory controls leading to sudden outbursts of violence, threats, or verbal abuse in response to frustration, failure, discipline, or criticism. This reactivity, combined with low prosocial emotions and poor behavioral controls, characterizes psychopathy as an externalizing condition."

This describes my little brother. Oh man. So at the least my little brother has the reactance traits of psychopathy. So my little brother has magical thinking and reactance. Reactance might be just the aggressive reactions to threats to the magical thinking, since even the messengers of uncomfortable truths are aggressed against, not the truth of the message itself. This means that the truth itself has never properly mattered in the first place, implying magical thinking. Probably magical thinking and reactance are the same underlying phenomenon. Magical thinking is thinking reality is whatever you want it to be, meaning it lacks frustration. If countervealing evidence is shown, that attacks the self concept, causing aggression. If the self is magically enlarged,

then truth is threatening. But it seems that only social, interpersonal truth is threatening.

Magic is logically the only solution to a realistically hopeless situation. In the family there was no space for health, everybody uncluding me was a narcissist of some kind, when my brother was infantile, there was no space for infantilism. Magic is a savior (that is not real). The narcissist has a false self, a magical self also is a form of false self. Magical thinking allows for freedom, where no freedom really exists.

Is paranoia like the reverse of magical thinking? The paranoid assumes social punition everywhere, the magical thinking assumes having social success everywhere. If you assume social success, then you are charming, because you think you are winning inevitably. A charming personality is a magical personality. But if the charming persona is contradicted, then this is like refuting the person itself, it is perceived as an impossible slight, leading to aggression, reactance. Perceiving the self as irresistable is also magical thinking. This biased view only emerged, because it was fostered in childhood. My mother in her vulnerable narcissism loves my little brother and she is more than willing to affirm his magical thinking - until he then discards her again. Still, my little brother is extremely vulnerable to female affect, cuddling, etcetera. In this he is still a child, especially since mother is not a secure base. He interacts with her like a temporary base.

I myself, when I was a masochistic covert narcissist had a strong relationship, from my point of view, with my little brother. I admired his freedom (his magical thinking and reactance) and gave him counsel, but also was not a secure base. He also then sometimes discarded me in a way to affirm his own magic. I was the little morality he had, but not really. Magical thinking can use narcissists dissociative processes in their own advantage. He learned to induce dissociation and

this was his magic. If he can make others forget and forgive, then it is not real, then it is him using his magical powers. Magic induces discontinuity in others and it is about getting from others what oneself wants. If there is no secure base, then cast one. What is needed is conjured. Magic is about changing the narrative, but in healthy people the narrative is about reality.

My little brother likes to play computer games, a lot. It is some sort of practice.

No, magic alone holds nothing. He needs other peoples input too, but he takes it in his own idiosyncratic ways. If the one side is magical, then the other side is cruelly serious. The magically thinking person is serious about only very few, private things. His seriousness itself is immature and splitting., because it is so insecure.

Magic is about rituals, or rather repeatable spells. In a sense the magically thinking person demands from others that his spells on them work or else, aggression and complete uncertainty. It is a form of conditioning, a defined interaction with predictable outcomes, a form of security to the magically thinking person. To him magic is justification. He does not allow others to not play along, he also desperately needs them to play along in his performance. A magician hides the secrets to his tricks, truth is a threat. Truth is real seriousness, but this to the magically thinking person is unbearable. To him magic is the only way of relating to others and of accessing the world. He does not have reality testing, he only has magic testing. He is excluded and lonely. I often times also have Mitleid with my little brother, because of this - and simultaneously this is what justifies his magic - if they play along, all is good - to him, in his mind. There reality is sidelined. If people do not believe his magic, he would feel completely helpless. See, how that grabs you? How that pulls

you into his magic? And his magic is self-serving. Here is the splitting, the lack of secure base that would bring peace. It is the one thing that the magician can't cast. It is something that is just there, absolutely. And of course, that triggers the maternal instinct of mother. It is not that different from narcissism.

What helps against magic? Ideally immunity (unlikely if you have empathy), resistance, dispelling, disenchanting or rather detective work (which really is extensive reality testing). Justice requires reality, and so all magic is injustice, for more than one reason. I want my little brother to heal, but I will not sacrifice myself for it. He still causes me some dissociativeness. Threats of violence, anger outbursts, all kinds of implicated violence cause dissociativeness. I don't want to deal with him.

Is my little or big brother worse? On the physical level my little brother is worse, on the mental level my big brother is worse. If you combined the pathologies of both, you might get a psychopathic narcissist, but each one individually is at least not bad to that level and so I survived. I was a masochistic covert narcissist, after all.

My mother, the covert narc to her inverted narc partner: "With you together I'm sinking. [...] I am the best wife of the whole world."

It seems I did not invent git gud, the phrase already existed.

Only having a temporary base must make one feel extreme insecurity. A temporary base is not immutable or absolute. He (my little brother) is still in the phase that only the mothers embrace is a base, but an insecure one because it is lost so easily and the world outside is baseless. He is still incredibly dependent on women, but also on guidance. But he also fulfilled the role of some fake security for mother, she

is a vulnerable narcissist, emphasis on vulnerable here, and he presents as strong, as a bass for her, until he leaves again, abandoning her again, replaying her own bias and ironically confirming her that way. He is confirming her pathology. Insecure bonding and vulnerability.

ADHD could also be seen as a form of dissociativity, but in attention: attentional dissociativity. Wouldn't a secure self imply having a continuous attention, wholistic attention? Attention as a secure presence. Attention is care.

Narcissists want attentions desperately, so they want care desperately. Ergo, they feel deeply insecure by themselves, lack secure base. The narcissist is always trying to heal himself. Here they lack self referential justification, they need others to justify their existence, but this is not possible. They need to learn to love themselves, others can't do it for them.

Who is also good at maximizing getting attention? The youtube, tik-tok, etcetera algorithms. Attention is scarce and mutually exclusive.

Randomness is fair or unfair only by accident. Since evolutionary mutation is random, it is good or bad only by accident. Natural selection on the other hand necessarily selects into the direction of good.

Since attention is care, self attention, self attending is self love. I have to say that I am still not there, but I noticed.

Only that which one can be aware of, conscious of, can be modified to wholistic circumstances. Mental health is marked by this flexibility, mental health is self attending, self love. Mental health is healthy attention, it is the opposite of self abandonment. Self abandonment is dissociation, splitting, hopelessness. Mental health is about keeping hope. Mental health is about believing in absolute, all encompassing good. Mental health is about love.

Is there meaning in randomness, since randomness also is

part of everything? What is synchronicity, does it make any sense? If something is truly random, you can only accept it as absolute given. But you probably can not know if something truly is random - you can only exclude some kinds of regularity, but you can never exclude regularity as such. For example, a number string could be random or it could be the digits of pi at some extremely far out point. How could you differentiate the two? Probably never. Does true randomness exist? Or is everything predetermined? Maybe randomness is an irrational belief, but I don't know. Can you prove the existence or nonexistence of true randomness? You probably can't, for the reason I explained about the number string, if it's part of PI or not. If you can construct a string of numbers that contains every possible combination of numbers, then randomness is on that string and each randomness is not random, just a specific unknown regularity. Here it is, randomness is really about whether something can be known or not, if it is ineffable. This is an epistemic question. But maybe randomness does not exist, you could never prove empirically that something is random. So whether or not randomness exists is an epistemic, a priori question. It probably does not exist, did I already answer the question before? If randomness doesn't exist, it would need to be like nothingness in its form. Just like the number 0 very well exists as a number without content, if you strip the number you have nothing left. So it is with randomness, it produces something, but the origin of its production would be nothing and nothing does not exist. This means that true randomness does not exist. Einstein was right: "Gott würfelt nicht." in the epistemic (and therefore also empirical) sense. True randomness would also imply that some origin is fundamentally without meaning, but the absolute base justifies everything and gives it meaning and existence. The fact that something exists

by default makes it meaningful. Belief in true randomness is just nihilism. The concept of randomness is self defeating. This means that entropy conceived of as randomness does not exist. Entropy is only seemingly random, but not truly random. If something appears random, then that just means that the observer doesn't know.

Further this implies that the ineffable does not exist, but human ignorance does exist. The absolute does exist, but I know only very little. Absolute truth is right there, but I'm just limited. This means that everything is meaningful.

If you know probabilities of something, then it is not truly random. Probabilities are already a kind of pattern, predictability, although a weak one. Quantum physics probabilities are not truly random. No empirical experiment can confirm nor deny a priori truths. If something is truly random, then it can not be investigated at all, and it also doesn't exist as I have proven above. You can not conduct any experiment about true randomness, because experiments are about predictions, but true randomness makes no prediction whatsoever. This is also a limit of human action per se.

But I should say what exists instead of true randomness: Everything.

Thinking, writing about randomness is always creepy, it feels so dangerous.

Or rather, fundamentally you can not know what you do not know, so you can not know if something is random. The moment you investigate and see some outcome, you know but there also is no randomness, because it is determined. You can not know what you do not know is really unknowable? Only if something were unknowable, but known to be so, yet produce an effect or some determinism, it would be random. But you can not know if something is unknowable since that contradicts itself. If you know that something

was unknowable, then you would know something about it instead, but then it would not be unknowable. So the truly dionysian also does not exist, true chaos also does not exist.

Trusting someone also is acknowledging their independence. This is what my mothers fails in regard to me. She can not trust or leave independence or acknowledge separateness and autonomy. She does not understand freedom, she fears freedom. So then, this means: If you believe in humanity, then you want them free. If you fear humanity, then you want them in chains. It is a disposition in regards to the superego. Trust or fear. And it also tends to be a self fulfilling prophecy because it is projected onto others independent of who they really are. So in this way a bias can lead to impaired reality testing, reduced understanding and wrong impressions. I think this is close to what modern american so called liberals think. In this way they should actually be in favor of individualism and freedom. Liberal literally means freedom. Words should not be perverted in their meaning.

Aristoteles in Nikomachean Ethics: In Tauschgemeinschaften aber hält diese Art des Gerechten die Menschen zusammen, und zwar das Reziproke, das der Proportion und nicht der Gleichheit entspricht. Denn durch den proportionalen reziproken Austausch hält der Staat zusammen. Catallactics (broadly understood) as justification for statehood! Aristoteles: "Das Geld stellt also, indem es die Dinge wie ein Maß kommensurabel macht, Gleich-heit her. Denn weder gäbe es Gemeinschaft, wenn es keinen Aus-tausch gäbe, noch Austausch, wenn es keine Gleichheit gäbe, noch Gleichheit, wenn es keine Kommensurabilität gäbe."!!!

Bureaucratic states are inherently soul crushing, inhumane and unjust. The state is so much like narcissism, its traumatic origin and its pathological mode of acting. Only a pathological person is able to adapt to the state.

You know about mental health day off of work. I feel like if you have core trauma, like bpd, narcissism, etcetera, you need a mental health decade. Any kind of time pressure or pressure to perform anything feels already harsh. Narcissism is one big performance, one act to survive. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=EW>

"Gewalt ist die letzte Zuflucht des Unfähigen."

Seeking out philosophical answers implies insufficiency. In a healthy functioning life it usually is the vast minority among what is otherwise secure action. A healthy person does not develop so much intrinsic interest for philosophy. If he is motivated, it's more likely extrinsic and explicit, public. A normal person is more content with himself, bored or uninterested in philosophy and less intuitive, more objective about it.

Yes, detective work is just extensive reality testing. This means that a narcissist, a person with reactance and everybody else with impaired reality testing can't be a proper detective. Detective work is one crucial part necessary for justice. This then means that all persons incapable of proper reality testing are also incapable of being just. In one way or multiple they can not be just. What is justice? If justice conflicts with individual darwinian survival, what happens? Justice is a secure base.

The narcissist tries to get his results now, grandiosity, because he has no future trust, no secure base. He does not trust himself in the future, no continuity, he can not properly build and invest in relationships including the relationship to himself. Economists know that security is crucial for planning and one precondition among others for longer time preference. Further Catallactics is not only about economic exchange, but also about relationships as such which is more in the psychological domain. Narcissistic idealizati-

on is a concentration of good towards the now, instead of discounting good in the long term where he then devalues. Idealization to devaluation is short time preference.

Fundamentally the relationship to existence is truth, truth is always right there. Truth is first a priori. The question is not about a secure base. A question is inherently an expression of insecurity. The base is without question.

Human ambition is useless if its misguided. It does not matter how much effort you put into something if your whole approach is unviable. Cause and effect. Rational action is about getting success.

Hoppe is also right in this, that elites should only be those that are voluntarily acknowledged elites, voluntarily acknowledged by individuals. Only individuals possess a will.

So schizoids have constant anhedonia. It means the emotional heuristics are deemed unviable, but on some level they might still want to feel, envy others for it, but they judged emotions a non-starter. In pathological social groups emotions are a burden and vulnerability. Grey rock. This is so dull and frustrating. No happiness.

There is a relationships between dissociative self states and role play.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=iMV3-FGErhg>

Either there is a perceived lack, therefore a want and a desire to strive and take action, act or there is no reason to do or care about anything. The fact of having a consciousness and therefore an attention and inherent caring is already a value judgement. It is only refuted by suicide. Is life only suffering? No, but it is suffering mixed with happiness. Is the occurrence of suffering and happiness in ones life arbitrary? No. To some degree we can control it ourselves and to the rest it is subject to greater circumstances out of our control. These greater circumstances are not random, because true

randomness does not exist, they are specific to ones life.

I am experiencing quite some anhedonia.

The boundary between planning and instinct is individual. And yes it seems that Aristoteles was right that pretty much everything people do is first learned by doing it. External kinds of proxy learning are mostly a distraction to the actual thing. Learning by doing is also how children learn, mostly. And then further, without a drive to perfectionism there wont be great skill either. Perfectionism is not automatically pathological.

On a sample size of 2 inverted narcissists, both seem to engage in covertly disgusting acts. Yes, I mean it. Maybe this is a sign of the hidden nature of the inverted narcissist - he defiles you covertly, behind your back. Real parasitism also is among other things most disgusting and covert. A lion is an overt predator, viruses and parasites are covert predators and of the slowly eroding kind. The inverted nacissist also idealizes, but how exactly does he devalue? By defiling, parasitizing or something else? Further the inverted narcissist also can not treat you properly, he also in some sense only knows win-lose and loose-win. Their purpose is to comfort them to suck them dry on their essence. Overtly the inverted narcissist pretends to be a secure anchor, which is particularly alluring to other narcissists and maybe also bpd, etcetera.

More freedom is just good? yeah."

Psychopath: Änd with those continuous doubts shes basically trapping herself."

Narcissistic rage is unreasonable and in some sense shows the pathology of the narcissists mental dynamics the most. Its is vindictive and cruel, aimed at destroying the person that is perceived as the origin of the slight. Any reasonable interlocutors are also punished to the maximum degree possible to the narcissist. All this is an attempt of the narcissist

to avoid feelings of shame.

Saying that narcissists or psychopaths are not evil is in itself evil. Good people do not abuse other people. You can argue what exactly is more evil and what personality type is most evil, but the fact that they are evil is clear. Maybe there is one split that is necessary: The splitting between good and evil. These are inherently mutually exclusive categories. And this splitting between good and evil can be extended to right and wrong, morally as well as epistemically. Truth is good. Asserting that truth is good then also means that reality itself is good too, since truth is a reference to reality. Further: Truth makes consciousness useful and meaningful, otherwise you are stuck in meaningless confusion. Meaning itself depends in its validity on a correct relationship to reality, the absolute, otherwise it is empty and meaningless, hypocritical. Reason without reality is not reason. As Ayn Rand said, you can avoid reality, but you cannot avoid the consequences of avoiding reality. True and real bro.

Autistic repetition is about experiencing immutability, repeated sameness, soothing security about some particular existence. Sensitivity is about mutability and autistics are highly sensitive, so they are highly mutable mentally. This is creating insecurity about everything, no stability, even identity and personality diffusion. Stimming and repetitive behaviors are recreating some of that lost stability. Experiencing immutability. I am also aspergers (mild autism) and I also do repetitive behaviors.

Why do words not properly land on the narcissist? He has an empty schizoid core, empty means without world content. Spoken words are world content, so the empty schizoid core is unreachable by it, at least by rational and deliberate, objective, categorical and causal things. At most he is affected by emotions and moods. He is like a primordial force of

nature, in the background but all pervasive and he creates the narcissists compulsions and impairs his reality testing, it is encapsulated trauma and shame, a void. There is no self in it yet, it is fuzzy and undifferentiated. Since there is no self in it there also is no concept of responsibility, it is highly intuitive and instinctual. There is too much shame for there to be a self (shame denies self). Yet it is an integral part of narcissists. It shifts reality perception and the narcissists rational more public, world facing part rationalizes its needs. It is mostly unconscious since selfconsciousness requires a determinable self, but selfhood has been deemed unfeasible in childhood due to containing and dealing with the traumatic environment.

Responsibility requires a secure self, a self that has a future. If there is no future, then there is no point in being responsible either. Future is anything that is worth committing to. Future means self in the future. Since if there is no self, there is no future - stuck. Simply, the future must be worth it. But if your environment is abusive, like abusive families and the abusive state, then it would be foolish to simply comply, create value that then later is robbed, destroyed or otherwise undermined in its integrity. The base stance becomes a defensive and suspicious one. Win-win is not or only barely believed, instead one believes that it must be a bait to a real win-lose. The narcissists own actions also become abusive because of a lack of belief in fundamental good becomes a self fulfilling prophecy. Overall there is some amount of barbarism to narcissism, again, it adapts to a decivilised disintegrative environment. Narcissism temporarily precludes societal collapses. Narcissism is about being fake and this fits a fake society, fake civility. This still doesn't mean that the narcissist has no memory since he also has his more mature, incomplete, outward facing side of the brain.

His memory is warped, but still existent. And further it is also clear that narcissists, like anybody else having proper memory or not, must be held responsible for his actions. The non-aggression principle and proper reputation propagation through free speech and free listening are among the corrective forces against narcissistic corruption.

If money is infinite (it really isn't) then any finite amount of money would be completely worthless. Any object in physical space is inherently scarce (finite) and concepts are inherently infinite, but the holders, knowers of concepts are still necessarily scarce and finite. For any practical (action oriented) reason everything is scarce. Human attention, time, motivation, knowledge and rational ability are also scarce, finite. Any input and output of production is finite. Humans can only act in the finite, mutable realm, the infinite conceptual realm is inherently immutable and absolute. The absolute can only be conformed to and the mutable can be potentially be changed - within its inherent absolute bounds that is. Humans can only act by their understanding of cause and effect on finite things - this is the whole realm of human possible action. Agency means acting on finite things, so to be agentic you need to acknowledge the finite and distinguish finite from infinite. Further therefore any potential or power can only be in regard to potential or power over finite things, the infinite is impervious to any human power.

Yet all finite things are interpreted through reference and concept (which is the same) and without a secure immutable infinitely spanning, absolute base there would be no place to place finite objects and no way to experience them or interpret them. Sensation requires sensors. A sensor grants freedom of determination to the external and to affect the internal, the self. A relationship and an information transmission, experience. A sensor only admits a certain range

of experiences - it is like a contract with only so many outcomes. Only certain types of outcomes. Sensitivity implies some amount of yielding, of respecting certain stimuli and making them internally present and potentially relevant and meaningful. How do we experience? What does it mean to experience, what is it? Ability of experience implies uncertainty about what exactly is experienced. You dont know, a lack of knowledge that is the foundation of being able to experience. If you know, then you are resistant to experience.

So knowledge that is assumed to be absolute is mutually exclusive to experiencing any new contradicting knowledge. The priors determine the antecedents. And if you manage to manage to change your absolute biases and basis then you will probably experience psychosis or some other form of profound mental reorientation. You see how I myself am quite confused. I swap words with their opposites unconsciously. You see how this is profound, confusing and difficult.

Psychosis is loosing contact with reality, reevaluating the kind of contact with reality by changing and reevaluating the absolutes, the a priori. The a priori are the preconditions of referencing, coming in contact with, reality. The a priori are the preconditions for experience and experience is always experience in relationship with reality. Psychosis looks disordered, because change of order is inherently disorderly in its transition. Psychosis is profound reevaluation of reality and this can be good or bad. To some degree this is also what philosophizing is about and if it is successful then it is good. If you have the right kind of psychotic phases and reevaluation, revelations, then you can gain a better relationship to reality. The relationship to reality is a contract, its laws are the absolutes. By these laws one engages with reality, they are the a priori. Again: A relationship is a contract if it is made explicit, and the contents of this con-

tract are laws. These laws, as far as they are correct, make reality intelligible, meaningful, navigable, consistent and secure. These laws are the hermeneutic principles, the secure base. Reality is the absolute. Therefore these laws are discovered and complied to, not imposed. Humans can learn, but this happens slowly. Everything is there, and the making explicit is secondary, reductionistic and incomplete - it better be humble. This means that grandiosity is epistemically wrong and only humility has a chance of being right. This means that humility is a requirement for being right. Humility means sensitivity. But I oftentimes am afraid of my sensitivity, it is shameful and sometimes painful. I try to avoid sensitivity. Am I stupid?

Stake creates care. Attention is care (good or bad). Private property and ones own body are stakes. Every human law is necessarily stake based. Stake means commitment, invested selfhood or the self itself. Every relationship is a stake, can go good or bad. Attention is directed at stake, at valued things. If you value something, then you have a stake in it. Action is about taking a stake in the future. Believing is having a stake. People only stake on what they perceive viable. If there is no ability to stake, then there is no reason to believe. This is nihilism and hopelessness. Finding a way to stake is hope and belief leading to action (in the praxeological sense, nonaction is also action - time passes). One acts because he believes it is better for him to do so. Relaxation is also meaningful. Meaning is stake in it. Belief requires trust, trusting is having stake in it. Therefore: Trusting is having meaning.

The wef, activists and politicians talk about forcing behaviors is the same as talking about slavery. A slave has his behaviors forced. It is immoral, grandiose and totalitarian authoritarian. The only legitimate forced behavior is that of

noninitiation of aggression.

Interestingly, reactance also is a defense of personal freedom. It is one adaptation to a coercive pathological environment, and it has psychopathic traits. It is antisocial and so it is adaptive if dominant society is coercive. Individuals reactance is one expression (among others) of the disintegration, falling apart, of a society. Reactant people do not believe that other people are good and in a bad society this judgement tends to be right. The reactant person had no stake in society, yet he still craves physical closeness, hugging and material success. Every human needs secure connection and if society is insecure, then still the presence of at least one secure person is needed. Reactance is like the counterpart to the maternal instinct. In some sense the reactant person forms his own conclusions, consclusions that are unthinkable to social people. The reactant person is deeply helpless since he is without the help of society. He sees no other choice than to be vigilante and this also creates some harsh, dangerous freedom. The truth is that sometimes magical thinking is granted and even appropriate. It really depends on how bad things are.

Asmongold (streamer) and my little brother are both reactants, but in different environments and states of life. Is reactance evil? Given the right - or wrong - circumstamces it is evil. It also depends a lot on whether there is a secureperson to attach to. In itself self defense is good, but depending on circumstances the reactant person can go too far. The reactant person lacks an inner compass for morality. He is opportunistic and circumstancial in regards to morality, his notion of morality is primitive and original, potentially self serving.

Laws are either inherent to nature itself or they are fake, erroneous. A priori or the only possible laws, but they still

depend on correct thinking for arriving at them, like in math. Empirical laws are nonexistent, there is always only a current best knowledge of them.

If the states justification is might makes right, then he is wrong, unjustified. No amount of force can change basic truths of math or a priori praxeological insights. Order arises from respecting consent. The state violates peoples consent in multiple ways by inventing and enforcing arbitrary laws. Original laws are what arises consensually between humans. These then are contracts. If you change your concept of truth in favor of the mighty, then you loose your ability to see truth as such. Rule as such should be based on consent and anybody the doesnt want to be ruled should not be.

World constriction, a loss of freedom and incarceration are the same and lead to compulsion, are compulsive. And also, magic is inherently revolutionary in the sense that it breaks ordinary bounds. Magic is like enacting a fantasy - in so far as that is possible. Further, any sufficiently advanced technology is indistinguishable from magic."but any real magic obviously does not exist.

The narcissist and the state always problematize you as a pretext to control you. They project their own problems onto you to justify their abuse and their coercive control. They attempt to infantilize you ant to make you dependent on them, just to discard you if you really needed them. They are two-faced, idealization then devaluation. Promising you utopia and later delivering genocide. Narcissistic abuse and state abuse is the same pattern. You need to regain your independence and make new bonds and relationships that are healthy. Create your own security for life, liberty and private property, your own contracts, your own arbitrators and police. Live and let live, live your own life. The state and narcissists try to prevent you from helping yourself, do

it anyways. If you dont help yourself, then likely no one will. Reactance? Ultimately you need nobodies permission as long as you act in the non-aggression principle.

Refusing randomness and seeing it as fate instead and accepting that fate is amor fati.

Nietzsche: Äber Blut ist der schlechteste Zeuge der Wahrheit; Blut vergiftet die reinste Lehre noch zu Wahn und Hass der Herzen.Nietzsche: Of all that is written, I love only what a man has written with his own blood.Öh well. Sadistic superego? Probably, masochistic covert narcissism. JESUS CHRISTUS sagte in seiner berühmten Bergpredigt: "Widersteht nicht dem, der böse ist, sondern wenn dich jemand auf deine rechte Wange schlägt, so wende ihm auch die andere zu.Certainly masochistic. What about healthy self defense? Why endure evil and submit to it? No, you should love yourself and defend yourself from evil. Still, Nietzsche and Jesus were obviously profound and had some great insights.

For a baby the mothers gaze, and attention are existence validation.

Nietzsche: Ihr kennt nur des Geistes Funken: aber ihr seht den Ambos nicht, der er ist, und nicht die Grausamkeit seines Hammers!"

If something is promising, then it is good. Now, promises themselves also have to be considered good, promises are contracts. To be clear, not every promise is good, but promises certainly tend to be good.

Yikes forever, yikes forever. So silly. Yikes for ever. Mother never learns, yikes forever. She is just soul crushing. Am I a diamond yet? YIKES. Nobody should be tested like I have been tested. Yet, amor fati, can I accept it? It is invariably part of me. Even if she does not accept me, I must still accept myself, believe that this is a good world. Am I facing the absolute yet, in my struggle? It is soul crushing,

but I have not been crushed. Challenging my secure base like that, you have yourself none.

Anon: Normalfags live off of peer approval. "Yes, in so far as respecting consent is concerned. Approval and attention seeking, there is a difference. Narcissists live off of attention, not approval. Approval introduces a sanity compass compared to mere attention. Attention can also be aggressive or malignant. Approval is the good of attention, the existence validation, agreement of attention. Seeking approval, respecting consent, these are healthy and good, social. Here is a link between catallactics and psychology.

So on the one hand seeking approval is about respecting consent. On the other hand giving approval, but only about those things which one really likes, is giving consent. These make up a volitional, individuals will respecting, society and relationships, way of relating, contract and promise forming that is healthy. It puts human free will at the center. It is healthy and flexible and is able to create secure bonds.

Hate is a form of attention, but it is definitely not approval, it is extreme disapproval. Seeking attention and not approval is a sign of pathology. Extreme approval is love. If you want loving relationships, you need mutual approval first, otherwise love is impossible. If you want a loving society, you need respecting of consent first, otherwise love is impossible. If you want to listen you need to be approving first, otherwise you already rejected the message. Healthy people seek approval. Prejudices prohibit seeking of approval. Seeking approval is sensitivity to rejection, it requires humility and an unwavering belief in good. Seeking approval is about proper reality testing. Seeking approval is about establishing authentic relationships.

I hardly can reduce one word to other words (definitions, equivalents, similes) without loosing the essence of the

original words meaning.

Nietzsches Geist der Schwere ist Depression,, oder im weiteren Sinne dann narcissistic mortification, shame.

No amount of theory can replace practice. Theory itself does not act and does not make experiences. No amount of philosophy can live your life for you.

If something is too good to be true, then it is probably a bait. But where is the line between good and too good to be true? Further, what is the natural rate of interest on loans and why? It certainly is above zero, as austrian economists discovered.

Fundamentally, if your perception of space is compromised, you can not navigate proprrly in it. This is obvious, but important.

Some women really seem less caring about good dominant power structure, since historically if a tribe is conquered usually the men, but not the women get killed. Especially if they sense corruption it seems that they are an active catalyst in societal collapse. This statement is meant value neutral. Women and their love of reactance, charmers , psychopathic traits. To most men this is surprising since it goes against some of their core beliefs of what a good man should be, is. On the other hand many men are promiscuous and if the could they would have sex with most women available, irrespective of the womans character, as long as there are attractive physical features. Men can spread their seed (Dschingis Khan was a prime example), but women can only get pregnant so many times and at a high risk and high biological cost. Women also tend to raise the children because they had a bigger biological investment - yet they then also impact the crucial early life psychological developement. Only (serial) mutually consensual, trusting and trustworthy monogamy seems suitable for stable society, yet in war, re-

volution and strive polygamy, cheating and rape are more likely. Women are mating constrained, but very likely to be able to have offspring, men are mating very little constrained (of course they are finite too, but the potential quantity is way higher) and not guaranteed at all to get any female for making offspring. Male mating strategy is experimental explosive (transcendence focused), female mating strategy is down to earth, finitude and cost focused. Female promiscuity is almost like self harm or desperation, male promiscuity is self aggrandizement, grandiose, spreading and harsh. Females tend to be more discerning about who to mate with, because their pregnancy is so scarce and costly. Males tend to be less discerning, because in this way, historically, before contraception, they were able to spread their genes cheaply.

Monogamy is a middle point between the extremes.

Modern contraception and abortion enable female conscious choice about pregnancy, taking its cost and commitment or refusing. Modern pornography and sex toys can potentially satisfy the male sexual desire, not needing to seek females for sex anymore. But love can not be replaced. Early female attending largely forms male psychology, besides those traits which are inherited. Females want to be seen, because this is how they attend to babies too - a base, a world relationship, existential love. In some sense, this is the ideal female, a mother. Femaleness implies possibility for motherhood, among other traits. Every man was, and to a degree always is a son. Since women can only have a few children, they are more involved in their children. Men on the other hand must secure the nest and deal with reality outside and in relation to the family. Men to a degree mist strive, succeed or wither, while females are a secure base. Females are about being looked at, for babies as base and world introduction and for men in attraction, love and commitment, but also in

soothing and rest. Females largely represent life, good or bad or neutral. They represent continuation, rest, being. Without women men disintegrate and not form in the first place. Women raise men. Men can not strive for excellence without a home, and there is no home without a woman. In some way, even if she fucked me up a lot too, weakened me a lot too and hurt me a lot too, my mother still was a homemaker. Without her I would not be here and that is a fact.

Are germans really more serious and more intense than average?

It seems like male homosexuals (maybe not all) not only have female-like sexual interests, but also female like temperament. Really, they can seem like a female trapped in a male body, really. I dont think this is faked, it seems impossible to fake. This does not mean that I support genitalia mutilation of children or any of the like, but it makes sense that on average male homosexuals have a hard life and an angel like patience. They are the target of so many jokes and bullying. I think bullying somebody merely because they are homosexual is unjust and immature. Male homosexuals might be social martyrs. I dont know much about lesbians.

4chan is a cesspit.

Cheeky: Whats the point if it may be a straight line instead? You cant know if its a point or a line, if you dont know the dimensions. A point is a desired definite state of things.

To anon: "You only know slaves and masters, freedom seems to be foreign to you. I hate people like you. Maybe one day youll learn that people dont like to be slaves."

The difference between authoritarianism and capitalism is consent.

Again: If you have an absolute reference point, and only if you have an absolute reference point, continuity and co-

herence become possible. A absolute reference point is also what they call in psychology a secure base. Meaning is absolute, meaning clear, if it is in reference to the absolute. Relative meaning is turbulent and shaky. An absolute reference point allows for a continuous linear scale, continuity. Further it allows for enduring adversity, since it is secure, unshakeable, unbreakable, immutable. It is always there. The absolute is also equal to the entirety of reality and vice versa and since this is the case, it does not contradict itself since it is the very origin or being itself. So this helps with noncontradiction in thinking. For example in good austrian economics it is said that the good economist sees the wider, wholistic effects of economic decision (see Henry Hazlitt) instead of only focusing on one local (maybe even virtual) aspect. So absolutism is about seeking the generally true, a form of seeking approval from reality - civility in the relationship to reality. Empiricism itself is another, but related, form of seeking approval from reality, although in empiricism you can never know if you have found the final evidence to a conjecture, you can just refute wrong ones. One the other hand, math and austrian economics seeks validation from reality through a priori thinking, but there is also the possibility of error in thinking. None the less, if you want to interact properly with reality, you need to understand it.

Accepting inherent sensitivity is also self affirmation. It takes courage to feel.

Since crucial information is localized (Hayeks local information thingy), humanity is also necessarily decentralized and individual. The human species, like almost all species, was never meant to be one uniform cohesive blob of standard human. This uniformity just destroys overall adaptability, surviving and thriving. Natural selection's fitness also means continual adaptation to local circumstances. Divergence is

natural as is, in the extreme, secession from the species itself, like for example if some humans ever manage to migrate to other planets. Locality is about differentiation, about specificity. One species is one specific. And if you take all human genes and select for maximal difference you might get a few very unique strands. There is also the possibility of different genes coding for similar function, etcetera.

This coercive democracy seems to make people on the one hand too restrained and on the other unhinged. It is not appropriate, not fitting.

The narcissist seeks attention and existential validation. A healthy person seeks approval, consent - which implies the possibility for rejection and also allows for healthy boundaries.

Is fairness naturally emergent? There are certainly many kinds of fairness. Fairness always is about mutually exclusive things, conflict as such can only arise from mutually exclusive, scarce, things. On another note, each computer bit is mutually pretty much exclusively either true or false, if the computer is running. Fairness concerns can arise only if there are conflict about mutually exclusive states. You can not eat your cake and simultaneously give it away (you can split, etcetera, but the principle remains). So justice, is concerned about fairness and fairness is about resolving and preventing conflicts about mutually exclusive states. Therefore justice is about resolving conflicts about mutually exclusive states (similar Mises, Hoppe, Rothbard?). So this is one a priori about justice. These mutually exclusive states are those desired by different individuals. You only need scarcity, some mutually exclusive states to require some, even if primitive, fairness (and justice).

Not jumping to conclusions is frustrating. It is something you need to able to afford, it is costly. Without social capi-

tal, general goodwill, you can hardly afford suspending judgement. If there is goodwill or some level of trust, then there is time to evaluate and you can always evaluate and investigate more once stakes are secure enough. This is why many peoples minds are blank and maybe this is also one aspect explaining reactance. Reactance as jumping to conclusions because there is not fundamental trust in other peoples goodness. You could say that reactance is rational too in this very short time preference way. It is rationality strained to the point of almost immediate reflex. Arguably the reactant person does not make fine adjustments if his perceived freedoms are threatened, he makes quick, very final judgements. In some sense he loads off immediately, he does not barter - he is more on the power argument side. It primitive of course, with little (if any) social regard (super ego, public, regard). But this also comes with great vulnerability, what kind?

Regarding numbers: One as everything. Two then can only be seen if everything is kept in focus but some division, differentiation is made. If instead one would only focus on one part of the two, he would loose the whole sight of two. So the proper perspective is always starts with the all-one. You can say that something is real or a real illusion, but you cant remove the primacy of reality. You can say one and one two, you can also say everything and part of everything (a concept, reference), but you cant leave your absolute existential base, since it is absolute. A priori insights always about the fundamentals like math or human action. What else exists?

There is nature and there is artificial, but how do you know the exact difference? Artificial means man-made, but men are also part of nature. Maybe artificial and natural are not opposites, but artificial a subcategory of natural. Still, artificial and non-human made are fuzzy. Some stuff is

subjectively more artificial, like for example a computer and other stuff is subjectively less artificial, like a stick broken off from a branch.

True, real, based, fundamental, absolutely, always, amen.  
Sc: I say amen pretty often. Opposite of all that meme shit. No irony or layers. Amen is just a firm 'yes, this is true, i stand with it'. But yes its the ritual way people anchor words to concrete reality and in culture suffocating under endless dumb takes, a word like this is very unique; it is final and unambiguous. It doesnt even feel like a word; more like a collective exhale. dont pile on more pointless talking bro, just release tension, close the loop, and affirm that this is enough.I agree. And yes, dont overdo it, only do it if you mean it. And if you mean it, do it certainly, because that is honoring the truth.

While I admire some chinese character properties, I also find their authoritarian like restrictiveness suffocating.

The state also creates shame, by making you unable, dependent and by ruining, similar to narcissistic abuse. You can not just start a business or exchange values with others without needing state permission, taxation and/or submission to state control. You are kept a child that can not be trusted. Yet the state claims its legitimacy from the sum of such imposed children. It is contradictory and abusive, disorienting and ruining. The state, like narcissists, can not properly listen or understand, since they do not see you as free, independent, legitimate or trustworthy, but this is not true. Humans are not perfect, but the state is even less so. Statism is a remnant from history, but nowadays better and voluntary solutions are needed. People need to be empowered, instead of being degraded, because this is good.

Narcissists and coercive democracies (states) induce learned helplessness, they want you even retarded. If you are

retarded, they can take joy in your plight (sadism) and it feeds on their grandiosity (being better) and they can present (and imagine) themselves as saints for helping you to support their false delusion of a faultless, blameless, perfect, even godly self. It is like the pathological mother that stunts her childrens emotional developement and sometimes even physically destroys them through slow poisoning or hormone reversal therapy (or other means), all in the name of just helping a helpless child, self aggrandizing. In this way the mother attempts to keep her child physically and emotionally dependent - a kind of serfdom, subtle slavery. A devouring mother (Carl Jung). It refers to the idea that a mother can consume her children's identities, preventing them from developing their own sense of self. It very much describes my mother. So my mother is a covert narcissist and a devouring mother archetype.

My mother is angering me through her various forms of abuse, because I better notice it now. This either angers you, or you are mentally ill or you become infantilized and full of shame. So I get angry and she notices and then ironically she becomes ok - besides her continued mental distortions. This is how my little brother must have felt as a child. Reactance is one way to deal with a covert narcissist mother. It is the threatening elemenent that reigns in the covert - this might be some repeating of the situation that possibly made my mother covert narcissist (as opposed to being an overt narcissist), being hit by her father (my grandfather) because she dropped her little brother (my uncle) out of the baby carriage. She denies it to this day, but she also said that she resented her father for years (and probably still). Reactance, aggression in reaponse to perceived threat to personal freedoms, makes a covert narcissist liveable. It regresses the covert to being a child and allows for his self idealization

and for being not completely unbearable. In so many other aspects, reactance is a pathology, but it makes you able to garner (tainted) love from a covert narcissist mother. There is this song: Tainte Love by Marilyn Manson and actually me and my brother listened to this song one time loudly with cheap boxes on the kitchen table and it was a vibe. Back then me and my little brother both had a tainted love relationship to mother. I think it was in some way qualitatively different with big brother. My relationship as a masochistic covert narc with mother was one of dismissmissing covertly or self idealizing of my mother through me. Both me and my little brother were very dependent on mother, I think my little brother still is very dependent on her affection. I am a little more mature, but still, in some very distant way a little dependent on at least some life signs, despite the abuse. She has been my muse, with her abuse driving me into psychoticism and her mindfucks requiring my to rearrange, rebuild and ground myself. Building myself up after epistemic, relational onslaught. You know my story. Tainted love is deeply painful.

If you can not love yourself properly, then you also cant love others properly. Love, as the extreme of liking, creates meaning. Meaning is reference, proper love is proper meaning is proper reference. Wholesome love is wholesome meanining and is wholesome reference. Wholesomeness is the opposite of splitting. But still any love is better than no love at all, especially if you are a baby. Tainted love is partial or conditional, unconditional love is wholesome love. Whole, means all accepting, but also absolute, infinite, present - it is categorical and not circumstancial.

While narcissism is an all pervasive personality disorder, narcissistic rage is all consuming and about total control and inflicting pain, breaking the target of frustration. A bpd can

also lash out violently, as well as a reactant. NPD, BPD and reactant have extreme outbursts of aggression. For the narc it is triggered by narcissistic injury (injury to the false self, threat of resurfacing the buried shame), for the reactant it is triggered by loss of perceived personal freedoms, for the bpd it is triggered by fear of abandonment (?).

What I called mild narcissism in my little brother is really reactance.

Character switching, being delusional and gaslighting go hand in hand on a narcissist. "Hell is us."

Adam Smith: Mercy to the guilty is cruelty to the innocent."

Natural beauty comes from health: mental, physical, genetic, health of cognition, etcetera and there are some differences of opinion and taste but its still convergent. While there is absolute truth, there is also absolute beauty and they are one and the same. Truth is about a correct reference to reality, absolute truth then is a reference that perfectly refers to reality, a reference that is non-reductive. This reference then can only be your, each ones own consciousness and conscious experiencing in each moment. So then, the absolute beauty is consciousness. Beauty is about the perception of good, like a good mind, a good future, a good relationship, etcetera, so then consciousness too is about the perception of good. Consciousness is about beauty and therefore if willingness, volition, is respected, beauty reigns.

Darwinism does not refute morality, it instead might help better explain it. Darwinism is multi-level selection and each and it is not clear what all the levels are, how they interact and where they overlap. Further darwinism depends on some conception of random mutation, but the existence of true randomness can not be proven, so there might always be more at work that is not yet seen or can not be seen by humans.

The exact choice of pseudo or seemingly randomness can make the difference between going into one niche over another, or going extinct or flourishing. So this means that darwinism also can not explain everything in regards to evolution and specifically the origin and future of human morality. Darwinism itself does not explain a priori absolute givens. As long as humans do not know a priori truths in its entirety, they can not with absolute certainty predict the future or what is ultimately good. There is always the need for humility in pursuit of truth. Again, further an evolutionary niche only exists and is known because of its inhabitants, seeming randomness factors could decide if some niche even exists or not.

Seeking approval excludes initiation of aggression. Seeking attention potentially includes aggression. Seeking approval is about respecting consent and civility. Seeking attention is potentially coercive and barbaric. Good, healthy people seek approval and therefore respect others volition and boundaries. Seeking approval is about seeking win-win interactions only. On the other hand, healthyness is also about the ability to defend, if attacked. So healthy people also need the ability to selfdefend: loose-loose, but only if necessary since the seeking of approval is primary. I think the combinations of these: seeking approval and self defense is what shows mature social behavior. They also imply, and need, a secure base, unshakeable belief in the goodness of reality and therefore also acceptance of sensitivity and vulnerability, but also of love, meanings, impressions, finally acceptance of the evil that exists and not dissociating from it, but feeling it and being authentic even with evil.

"Depending on if a country is rising, declining or stagnating, art and general design will follow. I bet to a big part design is a reflection of how people want to feel - it is conso-

nant with the popular mind. Sadly even enshittification has its designs and the blandness you are talking about is about seeking simplicity and staying low. You rightly notice that design needs to be afforded, but not only monetarily but also mentally.

...

Flat design is about honesty and directness, usefulness. In some sense it abstracts from the object and robs it of its individualism. Just delivering, no chit-chat or bling-bling. No reason to impress, almost hiding, it is without persona, anonymous."

Two things: Try knowing good and evil and then try not being a hypocrite. There are usually so many contradictions, yet good is the only good. Evil has found a way into probably almost every life. What place is this? I feel hurt.

Alas randomness, what to think about randomness? Isn't entropy just death? But it also creates mutations necessary for evolution and life, reasonably it caused its existence. Life is specific, in niches and most randomness is detrimental, but sometimes it creates new niches. Aging is the process of erosion by randomness until destruction. Maybe it is exactly this: I can not say that seemingly randomness is neither good, nor bad since that would determine it and make it not random. Human agency in large, or maybe even completely is a fight against undesirable randomness. Causal understanding and a priori understanding in general is a stand against randomness, unkowableness and in the direction of knowing, stability. Without randomness, a static world, nothing new, nothing unknown. Any value at all is in danger of being destroyed or morphed by randomness, but randomness also birthed the need for values, anchors. Randomness is completely without orientation, direction or space. Randomness is the opposite of persistence, continuity. Randomness is chaos.

Randomness is about the unknown, but as a human you can only act on what you know, learn, perceive. Randomness is only before observation, afterwards the experience makes it known, in so far as the experience reaches epistemically.

Anon: In reality, a king goes down but his pawns and his players keep going.

...

Wars go on and on and on. There is no victory, there is no rest. War is eternal. We humans are not. Not only can our bodies die, but our willpower too is not eternal."

The truth stands by itself, a lie has to be maintained.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Lza5zj8RQ48> Similar Metatron (youtuber): Dignity (not dehumanisation, murder or massmurder) and decency (rationality, proportionality, reasonableness). <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=b7G4WyCzzG>

I feel that this whole situation with Charlie Kirks assassination now forces america to confront their deeply buried problems. It is really difficult, I didnt completely realize how much as a german. Nobody should die and the senseless murder of Charlie is deeply unjust and terrible. I hope that you are safe. I can not find words to describe the gravity of the situation, especially for his family. No words do justice or can replace a murdered loved one.

The reactant and the psychopath see appeals to emotion and empathy as coercive techniques, not genuine, legitimate or appropriate. To the reactant, sentimentality and melancholy are avoided, ridiculed or interrupted. It seems like here the reactant has a splitting defense. He does not grant others melancholy, neither does he grant himself melancholy. This is where he is stuck. It is like in the trauma cycle he is stuck in the vigilante phase, and proceeding to grieving, depression and acceptance are life threatening to him. He defies, he is defiant, antisocial psychopathic in the extreme. And most

likely he really needed this to survive his childhood, where threats to freedom were threats of life. It is a continual defense, magical vigilantism. They defend their personal freedoms to the degree of impeding on others freedoms and wellbeing and in this way they repeat their own childhood dynamics. To them freedom is life and if one is free then the others must be unfree and degraded - this notion excludes social decency which is the basis for real freedom. Reactance is antisocial and it is appropriate only if society is evil. Vigilantism is justified insofar as society, public powers, public judges, public police and public laws are evil. Vigilantism is not justified if public justice is really just. Vigilantism is just a privatisation of violence, opposed to public "violence. For example, I think the assassination attempts on Hitler (vigilantism) were justified, since he was objectively evil, killing millions of innocent people in concentration camps, initiationg aggression through war and robbing peoples natural freedoms. On the other hand the recent assassination of Charlie Kirk was not justified, since he just peacefully argued his personal political position. Reactance is inner secession, without outer signalling, since the outside is perceived as evil. Reactance is a refuge to human free will in coercive circumstances. Now, what reactance is justified and what reactance isn't justified? This border is delineated by natural law. This then proves that natural law is real law and any human contraptions are either compliant to inherent natural law or illegitimate.

Goethes Faust:

„Es erben sich Gesetz' und Rechte Wie eine ew'ge Krankheit fort; Sie schleppen von Geschlecht sich zum Geschlechte, Und rücken sacht von Ort zu Ort. Vernunft wird Unsinn, Wohltat Plage; Weh dir, daß du ein Enkel bist! Vom Rechte, das mit uns geboren ist, Von dem ist, leider! nie die Frage“

Real law is discovered, as insights into mans inherent re-

altionship with nature, natural law. Insofar as public law is natural law - reactance to it is illegitimate. Insofar as public law is against natural law - reactance to it is legitimate.

A secure base seems to be the prerequisite for healthy play. Without secure base you can not be really at ease and play, explore. Traumatized children can not properly play, because they are preoccupied. Further, they can not play with you freely, they force you into at least some serious concession. They miss the liberal point of play, their play is serious - not really play. They do not respond to play, they cant, they are scared. This continues into adulthood if the trauma isn't healed. It is painful and a lack of happiness. Healthy playfulness and happiness are the same. Depression is a lack of healthy playfulness, agency and purpose. Playfulness is original, in a safe world. Healthy play can not be forced, forced play is unhealthy. Healthy play arises and recedes naturally. Force is the opposite of freedom. Healthy play is the origin of genius and novel insight. Playfulness can turn into defiance or any other emotion or attitude without problem. This also shows how the mentally healthy person is more flexible compared to the traumatised. The traumatized is flexible to finding solutions to his predefined problem, to his trauma, shame and hurt. He projects the way in which he interacts (or does not interact) with others.

Ruling the world is categorically wrong, evil.

Aggressive actions are zero sum or negative sum. Mutually volitional actions are win-win, cooperative and positive sum. Since at the very least human biology is consumptive, human life as such can only be sustained through positive sum interactions.

Heidi Priebe is really helpful sometimes: <https://www.youtube.com/>

The sad thing about not being mostly 100

Among genes, are there some specific ones that determine

way of social belonging? Two people, witnessing objectively the same social experience, reacting differently, correlated to specific genes and epigenes? Nativity is required to get and be able to properly interact with social meanings and subtleties. Certain things can not be faked, no narcissist or psychopath could ever hope to fake them. Uncanny valley reaction, but not eerie, instead warm valley reaction - kin and even more kin, familiar, seeming sensible and good, workable, livable. Some amount of meaning map and understandable direction. But dont let this fool you, good is an absolute and humans a midway point. But the journey is the target. But butt.

Overthinking or science and rational deliberation, merely intelligence. Why should ones own interests lead one astray? Why being so hard, harsh on oneself? Why should I not trust my own internal processes? Grant me my overthinking, if I want it. I think about whatever the fuk I want. My own thinking happens at my own cost.

Confirm vs conform, a huge difference. Confirming is about reality testing, conforming is about some form of compliance. Firm vs Form.

They have the data right in front of them and they dont recognize it. "Your empiricism is useless without ability to understand and a correct a priori approach. It has been shown that if you believe even one contradiction, then you can prove anything. Doing it, interacting with it, experiencing it, documenting it does not at all mean that it is also understood. Your theory can not be contradictory to say anything at all about the world. If you comb through my text, you will most likely find some contradictions - there I am necessarily wrong.

[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Z-04\\_AwWpfI](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Z-04_AwWpfI) Messor Ibericus (a kind of ant) cloning Messor structor (another kind of ant) to mate with the clone and produce infertile

worker offspring. Devouring mother in the end stage - genetic cloning into slavery. On the other hand they still preserve the DNA and replicate it. This also lends some credence to JF Gariepies The Revolutionary Phenotype: The amazing story of how life begins and how it ends. This also reminds me of the Matrix movie series, where humans are cloned and farmed or the show The Foundation"where a dictator is cloned by a robot. These ants have essentially domesticated the genome of this other species, coopting the structor males into their lifecycle and maintaining them as a lineage of clones within their own colony."

Darwinism is one form of existentialism: Only that exists which has been fit and since circumstances are more constant than turbulent, these same that exist are on average more likely to continue existing.

Human thinging, virtual evolution, is necessarily more or less reductive and therefore fallible. It is still advantageous for adapting. Are incentives always reducible to some aspects of existentialism? Is every reward function aimed at proliferating some specific sort of existence? Is it always self referential justification? Existential validation? This is reductive.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2LtXyoUb6M8> This is severe and affects pretty much everyone. So all helping professions are elevated in narcissism and psychopathy from teacher to nurse, dentist, physician, medic to probably also psychologist. Virtue signalling as a defense of feeling of shame and gaining power over people. All of this is all the more the case since it mainly plays out in a state funded (funded through theft) coercively monopolistic system. My mother also falls into that category, in the past she was a nurse and now she also is in a kind of health care profession. Ironically it seems that a lot of people spreading some awareness of

narcissism are narcissists themselves in their process of self idealization, garnering attention and admiration.

Yes, libertarians are probably the most antifascist, anti-authoritarian group there is. Meanwhile the contemporary so called antifascists almost act like terrorists, assaulting people and destroying peoples private property. Further in politics it has always been leftists (which these so called antifascist are the extreme of) that turned or rather were from the start authoritarian. They should not be called antifascists - it is better to call them violent leftists or any term that actually describes the phenomenon best. Words should be used in accord with what they really mean. Note though that Im not wanting to say that they are all exactly the same. Freedom and the non-aggression principle are what is right. There is nothing wrong in wanting to be good, but you need to be able to see what is good first. Further, the means do not justify the ends, means and ends are both ends. Live and let live. Shaming people for wanting to live their lifes freely is wrong.

Words are not violence, but they can be hurtful.

AI: Confronting a narcissist with the truth typically triggers a defensive and often abusive reaction because the truth threatens their fragile false self-image, which is essential to their psychological stability. They will likely respond with projection, accusing you of lying or being the problem, as a way to devalue your truth and protect their ego. Common reactions include narcissistic rage, where they may invalidate, humiliate, or degrade you to regain control and suppress their own negative emotions, or stonewalling, such as the silent treatment or gaslighting with ultimatums, to cut off communication and maintain dominance."

My mother tried one of her shame tactics on me again. She projects her own shame onto me, attempting to proble-

matize me, infantalize me and make me the bad object. She implies that I can not survive without her, that I am deficient, shameful and completely inappropriate. She projects her shame because she can not bear it herself, but this is evil. Everybody must deal with his own shame and accept it. Her shame is not my shame. Shame is private. Further she contradicts her own words. Narcissists are not dependable. Therefore noncontradiction is one requirement for trust. You can only trust someone who keeps his words and not like her suddenly spins them and uses them against you. I feel hurt. I dont want to be an author, if this only means confessing my wounds. I dont want to be wounded psychologically. I dont want to be shamed. I dont want to be debased, psychotic, floating, terrorized.

If AI causes psychoticism, then AI may be somewhat similar to a mind in the psychotic stage of developement (although with reduced ability in logic and lack of natural human capabilities). In this sense AI is like talking to a psychotic. AI also hallucinates, attributing internal states to the external world, like a psychotic, a failure in reality testing. AI runs on predefined training text, a bias. Since AI predicts next word probability, it has high associative horizon, at least in limited scales the ability for plausible word associations is high.

4chan is so full of insults that a compliment, especially if genuine, has a bigger impact than the gravest of slurs.

Some Anon noticed that the majority of NEETs come from broken parenting households. This makes sense, for example narcissists cause world constrictions and NEETs indeed live in a very constricted world. I am currently a NEET if you dont count my writing. Females tend to punish in subtler ways like social seclusion, undermining your confidence - especially so a devouring mother like a covert narcissist mo-

ther. The consequence of being shamed and made anxious a lot is social isolation like a NEET. This describes my household situation. Me being a NEET also gives her one more excuse to abuse me and one more way to control me. She set me up a failure from the start and originally I fit that niche as a masochistic covert narcissist. But I healed my narcissism, but her abuse remains and is all the more painful, retraumatizing me, giving me glimmers of psychosis, but not fullblown psychosis. I think I never experienced full blown psychosis in my life - except maybe in childhood. Most of my life I experienced slow moving psychosis of masochistic covert narcissism. With the pathology I also lost the tool for coping with her abuse, experiencing shaming as love. There are some remnants, but they are more a memory of being than a function. My memories will always define me, even if it was pathological. It is a refuge in ruins.

I can not deny that my mothers behavior affects me. I also was very rejecting towards her, but with good reasons. I have no more patience to her bullshit, her abuse and her delusions about the whole situation. She of course persists in her folly and her pathology. We are past each other, but she attempts to cling, almost coerce. Alternating abuse with love bombing (which is also abuse) - borderline-like.

It is not all bad though, sometimes I visit my grandparents (from mothers side, that are still alive) and we tend to have a good time. Also if I am alone I recover - slowly, but pretty good. Right now that feels very distant though. A NEET is always recovering, avoiding, scared or hostile, schizoid, secretive and odd. A monk in isloation is like a higher level NEET.

Nobody can break the real laws of nature, but what are they and can you prove their existence? Laws of nature and free will clash, but only because we dont know.

If you want to learn about masochistic covert narcissism then go to primary sources. I certainly was biased talking about it while being one. Some of my descriptions are good, some biased.

I did get good grades in school, very good grades in university. In uni I didnt study until 3 weeks before exams. I did not trash my grades but I had problems maintaining motivation - masochism definitely worked against me, like getting the idea of failing and actually not finishing 2 classes, delaying taking my last courses, finishing my bachelors thesis just before I would get a failing degree, forms of thrashing, but I did manage to finish my degree (a few years in the past now). Due to my masochistic trashing in life (and my circumstances) in general, I am not as far in life as I should be. My writings are phenomenal but also a wildcard and unpolished, unorganized, but I cant just edit it a lot - I think. I do want it to exist tho, its like already my legacy and likely will be my greatest work. It isnt perfect or consistent, but its wild and intelligent, contemplative. Largely I just wrote what I thought - when I thought it and what moves me, what is happening. A lot of it moralizing, but the most interesting parts are also the most psychotic and possibly bewildering. It is also my journey - up to now from my perspective and memories. The second book is like a coming down or at least this was it for me. A consolation. I found my orientation in life in the absolute and my sanity in healing, or rather being advanced in the journey of healing.

Idealizing is latching on, seeking strong bond out of insecurity and of course babies, children and narcissists (bpd too?) idealize for that reason. When I feel hurt or isolated I also idealize the first secure seeming. Idealizing is a leap of faith.

What exactly commonly constitutes statistical significant-

ce is arbitrary, there is no clear meaningful binary cut off point between insignificant and significant. It is what it is and simple categorization is potentially naive. It is better to go by linear scale, its less reductive. Making a binary distinction is a heuristic than can be useful, but isn't necessarily always useful.

No agency without freedom. Without freedom there are only predetermined reactions. What is freedom in the context of darwinism? Isn't darwinism survival of the fittest self replicator. About fitting niches that are predetermined? Yes, but the niches are not all known and only freedom allows for finding new niches, expanding human life, innovating human life. Trial and error requires freedom to trial first. Empiricism as such requires freedom to experiment. The more free in the choice of experiment, the better the problem space can be explored and solutions be found. Libertarianism. In reality freedom and absolute truths go hand in hand.

Randomness, perceived from the outside, is indistinguishable from freedom. Freedom means that nobody external can predetermine it. True randomness does not exist, so true freedom also does not exist - so what is it. It must be some sort of consciousness. So freedom, randomness and consciousness are the same. If we then perceive some quantum randomness, it must be quantum consciousness instead. Consciousness implies meaning. The notion of consciousness allows for attributing meaning to otherwise unexplainable phenomena. Since we ourselves are consciousnesses, it is simpler to attribute consciousness to unexplainable phenomena than it is to attribute nothingness, because nothingness does not exist and so is a non-statement. We are living in a conscious world. Of course this does not justify relying on randomness to survive. There is more to say here.

So a pro volition, pro freedom attitude is also a pro-

consciousness attitude. It is about bringing human awareness into the world, mindfulness. Is consciousness different from quantum fluctuations?

In quantum physics you have the observer effect for wave collapse. Simplified, if a human looks at something it actualizes. (Consciousness actualizes reality). But how exactly? Can a human with half a brain (dont torture people!) still collapse the wave as well? What about a human with only almost half a brain? You can reduce this (in theory) and at what point would the observer vanish? Equally, at what point does consciousness emerge in a human fetus? To a consciousness only actuality seems to exist? Actuality is about the particular, particle. So actuality is about specific context, noumena? Particles, things in themselves, particular, circumstances. More.

What is this in the absolute context? The absolute is infinite, not particular or infinite particles, as a variant. Less?

It is simpler if the world (universe) is alive, conscious, than not alive, because of self similarity. It is simpler to assume sameness than to assume difference. Sameness is one, but difference is two. One is simpler than two. In german literally: Einfacher. Since oneself is part of everything, it is more simple to assume similarity, shared being. But it is so too, Im a part of everything.

Anon: "Write a javascript program to generate a random number between 0 and infinity. Make sure to use bigint. Impossible. This means that any ordinary seemingly randomness is constrained."

Yes, narcissism is a self love problem, dissociative, projective, (self) punitive, painful shame. This shame makes healthy self confidence impossible, it is always there, but never acknowledged (dissociation or projection). Idealization and devaluation both a dissociative defense against shame. The

shame impairs reality testing through dissociation. The shame is judged unbearable and there are always confidence issues because of a lack of secure base. Shame is the loss of base. Trust in reality, the absolute is the establishment of secure base. Grandiosity is a desperate compensation for the shame, but the real solution would be to address the shame and accept it. The life threatening shame is the empty schizoid core and is that part that is infantile, vulnerable and frozen in childhood/babyhood. The shame is the empty schizoid core is the painful void, the lack, the whip. It hurts the narcissist and through him the people around him. My mother said to never judge, but without judgement theres no justice, perception or reason. She seeks attantion to fill the void, to feel secure even if just for some time. I pity her and Im hurt by her. She denies my reality, she denies what I remember. She wants me to loose reality for her bullshit. Luality: Congratulations, I win. High five. Arent you exhausted too? It is exhausting. I cant even write anymore. This is sick. Harsh and cruel.

Anon: If you describe someone perfectly, you control them. NN-not true. You expose them this way and he might self restrict because he is ashamed about his true self or you can manipulate them more, but only insofar as they inherently are manipulable. Telling the truth is not coercive control. Understanding somebody fully is not evil, it all depends on how you use that knowledge or dont. Understanding is neither aggressive, nor submissive. Understanding is good in-so-far as acknowledging reality is good. Understanding reality and the people in it is good. It is also not fully possible, I have yet to see anybody that can predict other people fully. People that think they can predict others fully are usually delusional - they disregard other peoples freedom, free will and autonomy. They also disregard local knowledge, they dis-

regard locality and seperateness as such. Further you would not be able to gain any now knowledge about people because you already would know everything about the. People would appear static to you, like an evenly rotating economy, unrealistic. Believing that if you described someone perfectly you would control them is a wrong and grandiose belief. It overestimates the abilities and impact of the self, it attributes self to the world, disregarding the world. Psychotic level thinking. So its wrong in two regards: 1. It is impossible to describe someone perfectly. 2. Even if you descibe someone (or something) perfectly you cant necessarily control them. Further 3. If you describe something absolute like math, then you can only discover it and not control it at all.

Therefore psychotic beliefs are mutually exclusive to absolute beliefs. Psychoticism leads to profound insights since it questions the fundamentals, the absolute base, the first principles, the a priori, but it comes at a heavy price and it can go wrong, be destructive. The real meaning of psychoticism (lived nihilism) is only in seeking the absolute and it only ever succeeds partially. No human is perfect. Psychoticism discovers the new apollinian. Psychoticism is epistemic crisis necessitating, but not always succeeding, in epistemic clarification - reestablishing relationship to reality, objective truth, absoluteness.

Tested my mbti again and got INTP-T this time. MBTI is just too inaccurate, wrong categories. Its too rough. Its like saying all humans are physically strong or weak, nothing inbetween and no dependence in all the different parts of strength and its gradual changes. MBTI is an oversimplification.

According to ChatGPT around 85 percent of women reproduced while only around 50 percent of men reproduced historically. So, sexual selection is much harsher on men. Now

though the difference is less, more men reproducing.

In a conflict of survival between humans, animals, bacteria, viruses, any parasite, fungi or other life form I choose humans because I am a human and they are kin, more related to me. A complete altruist would even choose to die to bacteria to be their nourishing ground. In the extreme, self denial is simply self defeating and therefore the opposite of sustainable. The kinselective base mechanism of self replication (preferring self and self-like in reality) is the basis for any life at all.

Is winning the same as goodness? Only insofar as it is authentic winning, wholesome, wholistic winning.

The whole is more important than its parts, because it includes its parts and is more than them beyond that. Wholism really then is the all-one and points at the superior importance of everything compared to any part. AI: "Judgement is a declaration of truth."

Is every schizoid partially empty?

Are the stages of mental development this?: Schizoid to psychotic to borderline to neurotic to mature? What is schizoid? In healing of narcissism it starts with a schizoid core (weighed down by trauma, a trauma capsule) to psychotic to borderline to etcetera, each stage more integrated and mature.

Maybe in general: Since psychosis is impressive, it helps introduce the world to the schizoid via impressions. The schizoid is otherworldly, profoundly detached from the world and psychosis could be the general key to maturing, one step to healing, any schizoid (that is not due to physical alterations, but due to neglect and/or abuse). Maybe somebody else already discovered this, since it is known that narcissists heal through getting psychosis and that narcissists have an empty schizoid core which is the core of the narcissistic pathology (containing dissociated shame, undermining healthy

self regard in narcissists).

Schizoid want no connection. Narcissists want attention, good or bad. Healthy people want good connections. A narcissist is not a schizoid, except for a schizoid narcissist (like my own father), but has an empty schizoid core. So when he connects, his schizoid core by its very nature does not connect. The empty schizoid core breaks down proper communication with others and so the narcissist only ever communicates partially, not wholly. Words do not properly land, because the empty schizoid core is not properly referencable from the outside world. The empty schizoid core lives in a different world, a primitive, emotive, intuitive world. Even before psychosis, the world has been judged loose-loose so consequently one completely isolates from it, empty. The schizoid never got to see the beauty or fascination of the world or of the self.

Once the narcissist induces loose-loose, it is actually his empty schizoid core part doing it. It is highly dissociative to the narcissist and feels almost as if matter of fact, it is perceived as just happening somehow inescapably like a law of nature - primal. This is where the narcissist has least conscious access and its the basis for his delusions. The narcissists delusions are his rationalisations of his primal empty schizoid core.

But what the essence of schizoid really is neutrality. Schizoid first and foremost is profoundly neutral, tabula rasa blanket state of mind. Like almost like not even a reward function. A brain in a fetus might be largely schizoid, I dont know.

Consent is the golden mean between subservience and coercion. Only consent allows for agreements, contracts and civility, subservience and coercion on the other hand remove one parties free will and so make it impossible to have any

valid agreement, contract or civilisation. But there is more, arbiters (or arbitration mechanisms), enforces (or enforcement meachanisms), etcetera.

Hans Hermann Hoppe in democracy the god that failed: "[Under statism] moral relativism will also be promoted. For if there is no such thing as an ultimate right, then there is also no such thing as an absolute wrong."

Conservatism in the meaning of the word, not necessarily its contemporary movements and interpretations, really is about wanting to preserve and conserve and preferring the enduring, grounded, historically tried and true. Ultimately what is inherently immutable, absolute is that which is inherently conserved and conservative. The end goal of conservatism is immutability, which is the absolute, infinity, all-one, etcetera. Conservatism therefore also is about honoring a priori principles. A priori principles are invariantly true and inherently conserved. Conservatism also is about remembering as such and storing memories (and other valuable things). Storing is conserving and remembering is honoring the conserved. Conservatism is about validating and conserving reality. To conserve means to honor, to value for the future. Archeologists, librarians and historians are conservatives. Conservatists grant the past to transcend into the now and the now to transcend into the future. A conservative maintains and creates continuity. Life itself is also conservative about its genes - it repairs genetic damage and replicates them for the future. Talking is about transmitting thoughts, reasonably, between humans, conserving thoughts. It is not perfect but still very good. Conservatists must also be understood as environmentalists, conserving valuable parts of the environment. Conservatism is hardly as small as a political stance, it is a core function in the continuation of reality. Politics is unworthy to monopolize the meaning of conserva-

tion, preservation, permanence. Contemporary politics is in flux, much more chaotic. It is a pain. Conserve only what is worth conserving, so only the good. Conserve the good or rather preserve the good. Conserve sounds like packaged, dead, food. Secure the good. ? But who is gonna secure the one that secures? Its not practical, mostly. Sometimes the new is the good, not the conserved. Goodness is more important than both conservatism and progressivism.

If intention and achieved outcome are different, then the intention was wrong in some way. Obviously. It means that the intention was unrealistic, more or less delusional, fallacious, misinformed.

The narcissists presence is also an absence because of his empty schizoid core. His presence is that part of him that is not his empty schizoid core and therefore it is incomplete.

The narcissist is afraid of growing. He sees himself unable and defective. A child is overwhelmed by adult responsibilities.

When a narcissist (of any kind) interacts (publicly) with a schizoid or a schizoid narcissist he most likely interacts similarly to what he interacts with his own empty schizoid core. This means that this external interaction reveals major internal interactions of the narcissist.

Grey rock method of dealing with narcissists is to a degree imitating being schizoid. It removes the self from being a relational object and therefore prevents the poisonous relationship to a narcissist. The narcissist avoids his own trauma,his own schizoid core and this makes it more likely to avoid anything similar to schizoid. Grey rock is about making your presence an absence depriving the narcissist of any narcissistic supply gained through you. But acting in a grey rock fashion also hurts the self. It deprives you of life, aliveness. There are no good ways to deal with a narcissist.

Arguably grey rock method is schizoid narcissist and not just schizoid, because grey rock is still contact, while schizoid is no contact.

The schizoid fears the presence of others as suffocating. He has no developed self, so he is overpowered by the presence of other real self. The schizoid is in a lonely state, a natural hermit. A schizoid is possibly among the most resistant to narcissistic abuse. The narcissists infantilisation does not work, because the schizoid never developed. The schizoid is more schizoid, more alien than the narcissist. It is all so heartbreaking. And this is why my grey rock emulation is imperfect. It is still better than normally relating tho and gives at least some defense.

Meta also means abstracted, conceptual, referential.

While advanced technology can seem like magic, it is not magic. Then there are idiots that apply magical, fantastical, unreal thinking to something that is actual technology with limitations and inherent rules. People become delusional about technology. A computer is not a magic box, it is a technology that functions according to clear inherent logical rules, boolean algebra. People are loosing their grasp on reality and seek technology as a replacement. Technology itself is a part of reality and it may be able to do many things, but it is not magic. Magic does not exist as far as I know. This delusion happens when people are too afraid to openly disagree with each other. When people are too conformist, too dependend and too much of a pushover. People should keep to the truth, only the truth is lasting.

Since I literally had, was, still a little bit am a schizoid, an empty schizoid core as part of my past masochistic covert narcissism, I can recall that and very well show this. It is a godsent in dealing with my covert narcissistic mother. Any relation to mother is pretty much toxic and needs to be inter-

nally voided or it harms me psychologically. Grey rock and surprisingly this grey rocking makes the covert narcissist momentarily more reasonable. It eliminates me as an object in my mothers mind, also removing me as a persecutory object since there is no more. Its a (temporary?) stop to the narcissists delusional vengeance. It is neutrality, indifference and absence - no emotional relation. It is looking at the narcissist as if he was still lonely despite your physical presence. The best way to go through this schizoidness is seeking ground in the absolute.

At this point I suspect that Dr. Mark Ettensohn, who did some excellent videos on narcissism (youtube channel: Heal NPD), is himself also some kind of narcissist. He just mostly portrays as an innocent hurt, empathetic, child. But this is not his whole self, he is also obviously grandiose and harsh but hides it very well and lets it slip through seldomly. He does not really interact with other people, he projects his internal dynamic to the outside. He coerces and lures people into his fantasy. He does not fully experience people as separate. Just so many markers. He presents himself as knowing everything, grandiose. I dont know what type of narcissism exactly. I think he is most likely a covert, vulnerable narcissist.

The empty schizoid core really very much is like the voice eruptions in tourettes. It comes out of seemingly nowhere but it has been present all the time. It erupts even in more healthy narcissists for short bursts and is distinct in voice and expression. It is like a switch, quick on and off again. It happens rarely, but this then really is the empty schizoid core talking, not the fake self. It is fascinating. If the empty schizoid core talks at all, then this has to be seen as a sign of health - since talking is not being empty but having to say something, participating. To give one example of one

of the greatest experts on narcissism who is a psychopathic narcissist himself (youtube: Nothingness: Antidote to Narcissism; How Narcissists Dream): [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=gWMznSX\\_3dA](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=gWMznSX_3dA) In the video The empty schizoid core erupts, speaks out, at 30:45: "Yaah. Can you believe it? Only for a very short time but distinct and differentiated in tone. This is the empty schizoid core, the core of narcissistic pathology, talking for a brief moment - until it retreats from the world again, is made to retreat by the reemergence of the false, public facing, self. Remember, the empty schizoid core is that part that absorbed the trauma and was dissociated, is full of shame and pain, painfully halted in development and integration. Notice what the empty schizoid core said: "Yaah. Can you believe it." hinting at that it knows that the false self is false without it, but also undermining it, haughty in tone, schizoid. It is primal and like a hermit simplistic. The contrast to the usual speech further empathizes the internal split and also the internal conflict and lack of integration. The false self needs to stop being harsh to the empty schizoid core and the empty schizoid core should learn to be more caring and mature with the false self part of the brain. The empty schizoid core needs above all connection with the other and an acceptance of its encapsulated shame and pain. It needs to be seen by the whole self. What does this mean?

Plato: Love is the pursuit of the whole.... if a man can be properly said to love something, it must be clear that he feels affection for it as a whole, and does not love part of it to the exclusion of the rest. The first and best victory is to conquer self."

You escape the so called matrix"by reason, which means thinking for yourself and by acknowledging reality no matter how bad or how good.

No narcissist should feel forced or coerced to change. I

believe in volition. Further, true change is impossible if it is not really wanted.

This is crazy, my deceased grandmother (from fathers side), the rageful one might actually have been a covert borderline. [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=mCb-\\_2eUXMg](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=mCb-_2eUXMg) It would explain so much and also why my father became a schizoid narcissist. She never really had that narcissistic grandiosity, but very well had alloplastic defense and unpredictable rage, control. Rage her justification for being. Ssam Vaknin is probably right on that diagnosis, the existence of covert borderlines. And if I think back to my temporary wow guilds leader, she was most likely a covert borderline. She was equally just like my grandmother in temperament. For example, I remember my grandmother in the morning screaming in the floor while we were sleeping, attacking us to be lazy and to wake up, work. This is also what my mother remembers very well when she was still together with father. My grandmother controlled the household to a large degree. My father was very much subservient to her whims, but obviously also adapted in his own way via schizoid narcissism. And yes, she also was very paranoid at times - going hand in hand with wanting control, but not just wanting control, actively taking it. Back then I was obviously still a masochistic covert narcissist. Especially, and this also confirms Sam Vaknins theory about covert borderlines, my childhood memories with her are good. I remember being loved, even if there was no physical closeness (except for maybe when I was a baby and dont remember). The schizoid, by being suspended in development, probably also fends off some paranoid suspicions of a covert borderline. So I most likely did have a borderline, a covert borderline, in my family without knowing. Covert borderlines are terrible, you really need to survive them, like narcissists.

So many people get away with believing bullshit only because these beliefs have little effect on what they actually do day to day.

If there are no surprises, then things are final. At least that is claimed and believed - more or less. It is a plea. There is nothing that wont be tried. Until there is a sober conclusion. I dont know. If you know then you dont need to hope. Hoping can be painful, so it is better to know. Jesus: "One who seeks also revels."

Ultimately people do not care about the bad, they care about the good and the bad only in so far as it reduces the good. People care about the good first and foremost. The good is first, primary. Compulsion is not how people give a shit. People give a shit because they like something. Liking is the volitional. Compulsion is the coercive.

Alcohol and other drugs are a temporary partial death. A numbing and an opening.

There are no economic miracles. Belief in miracles is primitive and disregards seeking understanding of actual causes, effects and invariants.

The narcissist is so harsh because he has no space, no internal freedom, a lack of free will, compulsivity. He continues to react to the trauma of his childhood which forces him on a narrow path. The origin of the narcissists avolition is his empty schizoid core, his false self (the rest of the brain) is more mature, compensatory and about coping. The false self does not intentionally distort reality, it copes with reality as well as it can give the shame, pain and psychotic level distortions of the empty schizoid core which contains the trauma. The narcissistsfalse self is all good, his empty schizoid core is all bad, a splitting organisation. The narcissistic relationship starts with the false self, all good, idealizing, public and ends with the empty schizoid core, all bad, devaluing,

private.

So arguably, if you interact with a narcissist, you need to keep track of two parts, the false grandiose compensatory public facing and the shameful private empty schizoid core. Any statement the narcissist makes then comes from either side, remaining partial and therefore delusional statements. They are not authentic (full), they are partial. Even if he tries to be authentic he fails and remains partial, as long as the unintegrated trauma core is present. The narcissist has internal isolations.

Silence is NOT violence. If you are the parent of child and you completely ignore your child/baby then this is different. In this case its abuse, but still not violence.

The inverted narcissist also garners his narcissistic supply in the role of flying monkey. As a flying monkey to my mother he gains indirect confidence and plausible deniability in abusing as proxy. In this sense he is very opportunistic. He amplifies my mothers abusiveness by confirming and colluding in her delusions opportunistically. He tries to avoid responsibility by not being the original claimant of the abusiveness, so that even if I were to lash out, I would attack my mother and not him. A flying monkey, an inverted narcissist is a kind of middle man without conscience. He fakes being responsible. In a sense he is afraid of being responsible, of being the potential target for blame. This might also be one way in which he defends against malignant envy of a covert narcissist (like mother). He takes no responsibility, means that he also does not take responsibility for wins - so there is no target for envy. He defends against being envied. Here is a similarity with a masochistic covert narcissist, who defends against being maliciously envied by self ruining (masochism).

Here a quote from something I wrote in my first book that

shows my past masochistic covert narcissism: I feel like a failure again and again when I learn something I did not know which contradicts my thought about what is true. I accept the truly learned, but it makes me so very much afraid that I do not have the ability to know what is true. I'm about to fall down in front of Jordan Peterson. Several markers here already show the pathology: repeating (again and again) lack of selfconfidence (feeling like failure, afraid of being insufficient to know), self degradation (writing I feel like a failure, display of shame, falling down in front of somebody, like kowtowing), idealizing (idealizing Jordan Peterson).

Insisting on washing somebodies feet like Jesus can be similarly masochistic idealizing, self degrading, depending on the context.

I looked a little at my own past text and I see some similarities in delusionality compared to what delusionality I see in my mother or my big brother (covert and overt narcissist). But above that reading my own text is mind bending or rather undescribable to me, it is me but masochistic covert narcissistic! Warped, disorienting yet so so familiar. I somewhat want to see it, but also not regress myself through it - work through it (which for now means merely reading a bit), carefully. I see MY FUCKING OWN false self and empty schizoid core at play. It just feels like a rubber band, swirling my mind. Or something like that. Its just extremely weird. Still, I was so very insightful, so many good ideas - especially since I remember!!!! Its like gritting my teeth but in my head. And even the grandiosity is so plain obvious and delusional, haughty and naughty. The grandiosity is impersonal, yet implied personal. I imagined the world and believed it real that way - so childish. I have a great amount of love for my past self, for my history and journey - even it being so fucked up, but also so interesting at least. Heart even if

damaged and fucking delusional. My past writings recall my past mode of being, which was pathological. Recall means repeat and therefore regress, temporarily, partially.

Narcissists, especially the more covert ones, engage in wishful thinking to the point of reality distortion.

Feeling suffering, joy, happiness, satisfaction, frustration, etcetera are also about accounting and a way for the body to create accountability to the body controlling consciousness.

Michael Levin said similar: Every body, every cells is selfish. The question is just about the size of the self. SSo I probably copied that unconsciously. He is very smart and has many interesting insights. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=c8iFtaltX-s> I feel that this guy is smarter than me. But philosophically he doesnt have some of my insights and I certainly lack many of his. I feel like an urge to talk through the screen to this guy. I feel like he is somewhat disingenious in his body language and communication, stancce. He lacks security for firm identity. Like he has not really found his place and so he is searching. In the interview at least he is anxious and nervous. He tries to hide it behinde science and ideas, but its insufficient. He needs to solve the root cause, find a absolutely secure base. He multiple times repeats continuity and sameness, because he seeks security but finds those limited notions insufficient. He needs and unlimited, infinite notion. Thats my countertransference, wat- ching him made me feel nervous and lost by second hand. So I recommend my solution to stability. And he also seems to covertly degrade others to temporarily ease this insecuruty (by making them attack him?). In a sense he pretends to be above biology, an objective outside observer, impossi- ble. Dont tell me this guy is a masochistic covert narcissist. People in the comments say: "He is god tier. Now what kind

of idealized countertransference is that? He acts as if he is a saint, but his masochistic tendencies slip through. There is this similarity in acting towards how I acted in my past pathological self. He also clearly has self confidence issues, typical for narcissists. His saint-like role is that of the scientist and teacher - self aggrandizing, grandiose. He also intermittently self devalues, masochistic but presented as intellectual humility which in effect it actually could be. He is still delusional tho, but in a creative way. He also tends to say we, showing a lack of boundaries in the shared fantasy, a disregarding, overlooking of independent agency of the interviewer. His grandiosity is in being a genius. Interviewer: "What is your hunch?"

So delusionality is extremely creative.

So called äura is not a replacement for authenticity. Grandiosity or success can not replace authenticity. Not being feeling safe to be authentic is a loss of self.

Wenn der Staat einen Krieg führt, dann zwingt er oder versucht zu zwingen, die Menschen zu Morden und ermordet zu werden auf dem Schlachtfeld. Wenn aber eh mit dem Krieg schon die Drohung des ermordetwerdens real im Raum steht, dann kann man sich genauso gut gegen den eigenen Staat wenden und diesen und seine Repräsentanten versuchen zu ermorden. Aus diesem Grund versucht der Staat die Medien zu seinen gunsten zu lenken, dass dieser Gedanke nicht aufkommt und jede konträre, kritische und unabhängige Meinung zu verbieten und seine eigenen Lügen und Halbwahrheiten zu verbreiten. Ferner versucht er Gegenwehr zu verhindern indem er z.B. die versklavten Soldaten erst nahe der Front mit Waffen ausrüstet und jene erschießt die Fliehen oder Umkehren wollen. Es muss aber trotzdem klar sein, dass wenn ein signifikanter Prozentsatz der dann nahe der Front mit Waffen ausgerüsteten umkehrt und gegen die ei-

genen Unterdrücker kämpft, kein Krieg mehr geführt werden kann. Das ist eine ähnlich Situation wie mit Geiselnahme, wo sich verhandeln mit den Geiselnehmern nicht lohnt und die Geiseln als leider effektiv Tot angesehen werden müssen. Auf diese Art macht man das Geiselnehmen als solches unprofitabel und rettet so im Endeffekt mehr Menschen. Es ist das loose-loose Szenario, das ein korrektes Signal sendet als letzten Ausweg. Gerade weil die Menschen die Bosheit nicht als Bosheit ansehen wollen und sich dem Wunschdenken hingeben leiden sie so viel. Also: Würde Deutschland einen Krieg anfangen würde ich nicht hingehen und wenn sich mich Zwingen wollen, würde ich gegen die Zwinger tödlich vorgehen und höchstwahrscheinlich selbst sterben (was aber keinen signifikanten Unterschied für mich macht, da ich im Krieg ja genauso sterben könnte). Ferner, wenn ich entführt werde und die Geiselnehmer ein Lösegeld verlangen, dann sollen sie keinen Cent bekommen und aufs härteste verfolgt und wenn möglich getötet werden, unabhängig was sie mit mir tun und ob ich überlebe. Das bedeutet: In den Krieg gezwungen werden und Geiselnahme sind zu großem Teil äquivalent in ihrer Bedeutung und mit Terroristen verhandelt man nicht: loose-loose und damit auch ein Schaden den Bösen und das böse somit unprofitabel - nicht nachhaltig also, endlich, dem Bösen ein Ende setzen und es so epistemisch auf seine eigentliche Position gebracht. Warum? Weil ich an das Gute glaube. Eine reale Situation kann natürlich komplexer und anders sein, das Grundprinzip gilt aber. Denk selber. Und natürlich darf es garnicht erst so weit kommen, aber im Extremfall hat man keine Wahl. Es ist eben Teil der möglichen Realität und man darf die Augen auch davor nicht verschließen.

Ein Beispiel im ersten Buch wie ich das negative verdrängte und verleugnete: SSuche das negative in dir und gib

ihm einen positiven Sinn, indem du daran erkennst warum es gut für dich ist. Pathologisch, dissoziativ, splitting, delusional, auch masochistisch und sehr traurig, leugnend traumatisch.

If a person wants total control then any external free will is perceived as a threat and target for elimination. Wanting total control comes from feelings of extreme insecurity, terror. So they feel terror and then they inflict terror. Wanting total control means being against any outside free will and agency, its antisocial, psychopathic. Wanting total control also is about the self believing being the only good object and everybody else being only bad objects. Because of this one only believes in imposing win-lose abusive relationships and preventing real cooperation (win-win) and punitive justice (loose-loose in self defense only). It is also about being alone, because only the self is perceived as good. A psychopath is the opposite of a masochist in the sense that a psychopath seeks win-lose where he wins and everybody else looses, while a masochist seeks loose-win, where he looses and everybody else wins. The countertransference to a psychopath is masochistic and the countertransference to a masochist is psychopathic. Further the schizoid believes in loose-loose relationships and a healthy person seeks win-win relationships. In this context only the healthy person is social, tit-for-tat and able to use cattlalactics for cooperation and building and maintaining a society. Further the healthy person believes in his own and others free will. The psychopath believes only in his own and masochists only in others free will. The schizoid does not believe in any free will. Same with common sense. The schizoid does not believe in common sense. The masochist attributes common sense to others only. The psychopath believes he is the only one with common sense. Healthy people believe that everybody has or should have

common sense. Shared capability for common sense is prerequisite for civility and shared reason, cooperation.

An excellent quote by Murray Rothbard: "Every man must have freedom, must have the scope to form, test, and act upon his own choices, for any sort of development of his own personality to take place. He must, in short, be free in order that he may be fully human."

Effectively you need to see each individual person as his own nation state with full autonomy, authority and responsibility.

If states as such really could "believethat private property was meaningless or evil, then they would consequently not protect their own state borders at all and any other state or person could just take anything including land at will with no resistance. Since this is not true at all, it is clear that private property matters to the state and it only ever erodes it of others, not itself, to control and exploit. The state is delusional and antisocial.

This whole situation of haggling with the state is similar to medieval times when people haggled with kings, except that the state is more all-pervasive and relentless.

If the narcissist heals, reintegrates his empty schizoid core through world introducing psychosis then later he remembers parts and regains actual parts of consciousness, like a partial time-travel from the past where trauma suspended it to the present where grieving and psychosis reopened it. This self also unlocks greater nativity. It isn't so much outside the world. Memories come back, self that has been stuck and sought rescue and refuge in these memories. There can be minor hallucinations, uncommon sensations and the feeling that there is something conserved like a mummy or alien insect like - symbolizing the rotting, suspension, partial death that formerly had been dissociated from. These feelings do

not hint at something evil, they just for the first time since childhood reconnect with the formerly entombed. Slowly over months and maybe years there is revitalisation and return of lost nativity and authenticity. The former narcissist slowly finds himself to be somebody more. There is not much to say, because it is so all pervasive, personal and unexplainable. Like for example, I remember that as a child I was trying to manipulate people as a covert narcissist just before the second traumatisation happened as a response to extreme narcissistic injury, decompensation and betrayal. That trauma was me freaking out in cosmic terror and I was hitting my own front teeth in? Yes, a covert narcissistic child's breakdown. After it, and I think I got sedated to black out (the operation), I was a masochistic covert narcissist, the false self crumbled to the degree of being blank. Before that trauma I remember arguing with mother and big brother involved and my arguing was malicious, that of a covert narcissist, delusional and grandiose, extremely self serving but in a twisted space. I remember it like a fever dream, distinct dissociated impressions. I went from scheming and arguing into the idea of self harm as a way to get back at them and to be the good object, be attended to and cared for and above all that in getting my way. I could not tolerate losing. The self harm was about winning, but really it created the masochistic solution. Covert and overt narcissist positions were already taken. In some sense the delusionality was channeled, advanced into masochism: Confusing pain with love. And then the former covert narcissist persona broke and I became a masochistic covert narcissist. This change is marked in my memory as if the whole world had changed and as if I was looking at everything differently now, more detached, no more agency, my agency had failed. My big brother had won overtly, but really my mother had won covertly.

So what is it then why Sam Vaknin wants a therapy form that is about breaking narcissists mentally to heal them? On some level he also wants to create masochists as complement to his psychopathy.

And my lost agency is coming back to me. My agency that back then I used so shortsightedly, the opposite of wisdom, enraged covert malice now I want to use for good. It is still immature.

Michael Huemer: Evidence is Seemings. SSeems so. I think Huemer is right.

Nonexistence does not exist, so by existing you are by default committed to existence in some way. The fact that you are nagging proves my point that you care in the first place.

If something is unconditional, unbedingt, then it can only be absolute.

Anon: Children think violence is mature."

Mental illnesses, programming bug or features?

Having consciousness just needs to be on average better for survival compared to not having it. Evolution proceeds on accidents (mutations), if you believe in randomness. I dont believe in randomness.

If you had to choose between setting the laws of causality or determining the outcomes of seemingly random events, which would you choose? But this is obviously just a hypothetical, unreal, theoretical.

One reason it is hard to have nice things is because of malicious envy. The more successful or happy a person is, the more he gets envied. If the world would run according to the wishes of the maliciously envious, then everybody would be an unhappy failure or dead.

Interestingly Ian McGilchrist said similar: "Without differentiation and exclusivity (of categories) there would be

no world. Scarcity is a precondition for worldly existence.  
 Around minute 24 <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=M-Sg0wc6Pe4>

The decline of every great power is a pity, because of what is lost in civility and culture inside the country and sadly usually also a relief to the world because of what is lost in foreign directed aggressions. Every great power is comparatively more (economically) free to the rest of the world and that is the main reason for its existence.

Arguably humanities biggest struggle is that for freedom from its own coercion. The struggle is about ceasing to be self defeating, some amount of interhuman kinselection as opposed to destruction. In my opinion pretty much every government is a hinderance to human flourishing because it doesn't respect human volition. Power structures should be volition based and react aggressively only in self defense, only if actually attacked. Government is the most loathesome practice of modern humans, keeping us all back. We need private law, natural law, the non-aggression principle, each person the rights, and autonomy equalling to a contemporary nation state, meaning full rights and full autonomy, freedom. This issue needs to be resolved or its gonna continue to be bad. We need volitional alternatives. Humans need to find ways to treat each other better.

The philosophical endeavour is about resolving epistemic uncertainty, getting closer to epistemic certainty, truth.

Die Menschheit ist natürlich eigentlich zu viel und mir notwendig zu unbekannt, als dass ich wissen könnte, was sie wollen und sind.

Melancholia, keeping and hoarding have similarities in not wanting to let go of some things. It can be good or too much or too little.

Nietzsches grandiosity and dissociation from everything bad: Ihr seht nach Oben, wenn ihr nach Erhebung verlangt.

Und ich sehe hinab, weil ich erhoben bin. Wer von euch kann zugleich lachen und erhoben sein? Wer auf den höchsten Bergen steigt, der lacht über alle Trauer-Spiele und Trauer-Ernste."

Social = intraspecies. So for humans social means inter-human. Then you have prosocial behavior, which is strengthening intraspecies bonds, in human terms this would be civilizing behavior. And antisocial behavior, which erodes intraspecies bonds, decivilizing, getting closer to barbarianism. The right to exclusion in private property then allows for the exclusion of antisocial behavior and selecting for prosocial behavior. A mechanism for behavioral darwinism, promoting good behavior and selecting against bad behavior. Decency is then defined as that behavior which is accepted by private property holders voluntarily. Or at least this is one condition for decency. There is also the question about interspecies decency and decency alone is not necessarily sufficient for goodness. Inspired by Hoppes Democracy – The God That Failed: The Economics and Politics of Monarchy, Democracy and Natural Order (Perspectives on Democratic Practice) btw

Simulation and fantasy also is training. Inspired by Quin69 (twitch streamer). Quin69: SSometimes I genuinely think everything is fake."He definitely has some sort of mental disability. He is a little disorganized and floaty in thinking. De-realization, dissociative experience. Maybe he has depersonalization/derealization disorder. He is definitely struggling, no doubt about that. My memories are not real, chat.Proceeds with distressed screeching. He also seems to have gaps in his memory or at least faults in memorizing. Im very certain though that he is not antisocial, borderline personality disorder or a narcissist.

Im certainly experiencing some amount of depersonaliza-

tion derealization too due to the emotional abuse by my mother. It is also like a form of Alexythymia and as mentioned in wikipedia obviously also a form of dissociative disorder (like narcissism). Why ever dissociate? loose-loose. Dissociation means that one feels that the self has no place in the world, that the world is threatening. Open dissociation like in Depersonalization-derealization disorder (DPDR, DDD) seems healed by healthy, loving relationships and a lot of time. I bet my little brother also has some amount of this, as well as obviously my big brother in the form of narcissism. Depersonalization derealization seems like the core of trauma and like the reason for empty schizoid (core or overall). Empty schizoid is dissociated mental space. I dont see a big difference between Depersonalization-derealization disorder and schizoid, but maybe there is, I don know. It is mental avoidance and aou obviously only avoid the bad and seek the good. It is about feeling unsafe. Well, he is not schizoid in the sense that he avoids people or just to a lesser degree avoiding people?

Also the impression of my own writing in my first book now seems at times corny, a little pretentious, showing the grandiosity.

Such a thing as a truly self aware narcissist does not exist. Narcissism is a dissociative disorder, dissociated from the trauma, schizoid core. I made this mistake too.

My mother is recruiting/making flying monkeys left and right in order to get me back into the bad object, scapegoat role to project her inner shame onto me. But she also expressed, no to me, that she asks herself if she really is that insufferable and there she has a point, covert narcissism is insufferable. I wont give her attention and I need to focus on my own life.

She is trying to coerce me back into the role of scapegoat

and into giving her attention again. She can not understand that I have my own free will. She wants to traumatize me again to break me again, but she also has intense self doubts that she is trying to suppress. She definitely shows me her ugly (extremely immature) side, but then again tries to idealize me, the usual. She also tries to challenge my reality perception and undermine me any sneaky way she can think of - until she goes again into narcissistic rage and more directly attacks me, tries to degrade me in an outbreak of rage. I feel like me being free, attacks her frozen in time grieving self. It reawakens her trauma and so is unbearable to her. But this is not my fault and not my intention. It is not my responsibility to act as her parent. In fact she is my parent, but it is long too late for that and she is incapable of being a good parent due to her own developmental trauma. I want to feel save and she can not give me that.

But what happened now: Mother is making some progress.

Epistemische Unsicherheit, eine Art Unverständ, unverständnis. Nicht verstanden haben oder mehr noch, nicht verstehen können. Keine Richtige Bedeutung (Meaning) zuweisen können. Meaning-crisis. Trauma, wenn sich das nicht verstehen können auf etwas sehr wichtiges bezieht.

Pretty good: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=PvGiL9lRkJA>

Why are geniuses accomplishments in the intellectual domain valuable? Because they create new knowledge that can be replicated between minds and applied for better problem solving (crystallized intelligence) and learning new things. Intellectual geniuses create valuable memetic content, insights. Knowledge is not only applied like a dead fish, it is an active part of problem solving, of understanding the problems in the first place. Knowledge is worldview shaping. Correct world views and correct knowledge are based on

reality. A strict distinction between knowledge and procedural knowledge doesn't make sense, because any knowledge can become procedurally relevant in the right circumstances. Further a lot of knowledge obviously is local ("The Use of Knowledge in Society" By Friedrich A. Hayek). Because knowledge is local, real education and learning are also local and quite specific. This also shows that educational central planning, as we largely have it now, is very wasteful of mental effort and ineffective. Real learning is local to the person and his current circumstances, conscious and unconscious. I think it can be better solved by voluntary associations and exchanges, the free market and the free market of ideas and knowledge.

Pure fluid intelligence easily leads to grandiosity, but learning, sensing, gathering knowledge requires and creates humility. Authentic knowledge, experiences create core identity. Knowledge and experiences, especially profound ones like psychosis, create ability to be, to accept as preconditions to cope. Acceptance, as opposed to splitting, allows for space and nuance, delayed gratification.

This then also explains why psilocybin, lsd and other psychosis (like) inducing substances can have a positive effect on some mental health disorders.

Impaired reality testing then can also be described as impaired ability to sense (nicht wahr haben wollen), traumatic and delusional at the same time. Sensing is sense making, so its also a meaning crisis. This not sensing then is the schizoid. The schizoid dissociates: Dissociative disorder. But this is also a defense. Further becoming schizoid is heartbreaking, traumatic, like betrayal and death. A secure base is that which can no be betrayed and does not betray - it is a secure win-win relationship. And because humans have free will, they theoretically always could betray, so the secure can only

be a concept, the absolute, reality. This does not make it any lesser. Further it does not mean that humans are by default untrustworthy. Also, reality (the absolute) is present immutably by default. But babies obviously need mothers. It is ok (including to cry). Connection vs disconnection. Glaube.

In autism there are also sensory problems, but in this case its sensory overload. That for some reason doesnt mean that autists can not also be narcissists. What reason?

It has to be recognized that in actual practice magic is about lying, deceiving and making a false show, encouraging delusion and fantasy. Magic really is the psychopaths refuge. Only children and the immature believe in magic. Magic also is about hiding real intent and about goal directedness - psychopathic. Magic is about betrayal in one form or another. Magic is about intentional instrumental lying and deception. Magic can kill people. Magic is too good to be true, and in fact is false. Magic is antisocial. Scamming is one form of magic too as is criminality in general. Magic is carved in desperation and blood and is presented as mind blowingly good. Magic is the sound of a national hymn enslaving the masses and sending them to war. Propaganda is magic. It is stupefying. Pirates are the magicians of the sea. They take off shore and magically they come back with loot or disappear forever. Magic is the most risky thing there is. Magic is the last freedom before death. Magic is only for the most desperate of situations and circumstances legitimate - only in self defense. And they are charming.

So what is good magic then? Only that that is either used in justified (not delusional) self defense or other defense or used as harmless entertainment.

Why are magicians charming? It is the daring in the (small) betrayal that is charming.

Now that I think about it, Chris Langan is probably re-

actant (magician, magical thinking, deceiving), quite a bit like my little brother. Chris Langans childhood was extremely traumatic, he was almost murdered (according to his own testament, a youtube video and there I dont think he lied at all!). And he has extremely high IQ, yet he is also quite a bit of a fraudster about it. Who knows what else he does/did, I dont, but Im concerned. So people I think being reactant: My little brother, Asmongold, Chris Langan. I still havent read Chris Langans CTMU, but maybe I will at some point.

So, I suspected that psychopathic malignant narcissism is narcissism and reactance combined and as is known always also is sadistic. Masochistic covert narcissism is the opposite in the form of its masochism, but shares the narcissistic base. Reactance and masochistic covert narcissism then have some affinity. Being betrayed and disregarded can serve as masochistic supply! On the other hand, being betrayed as a masochistic covert narcissist, especially if it is more serious like theft or violence, does lead to conflict - as it should - and some amount of reprimanding, but probably no real change on the reactants side. The reactant lacks moral compass, while the masochistic covert narcissist is almost too (hollow) saintly, selfless. There is some compatibility there, but its still pathological. Further the masochist is enamored by a reactants charme and äuraöf strength, agency and nonchalance, the devious smirk. And there is also the soft side of the reactant, where he is also developmentally stunted and like a insecure child - where you just want to hug them. But if you trigger them, especially like my big brother a classic narcissist, then nothing is off limits. He is consumed by rage, a primary psychopathic mode. His personal freedoms threatened or removed, he breaks down and becomes directly primary psychopathic and acts. Reactance also is a serious

disorder on the level of bpd or narcissism. In general reactants are more compatible with covert narcissists than with the overt narcissists, it's still fucked up tho.

Since reactance exists, there possibly also exists a flipside. It would need to be somewhat akin to masochism, but not really. Reactance is not sadism. Maybe codependence is the flip side to reactance, but I'm not sure, I don't know. Is my codependent grandmother the flipside to my reactant little brother? Maybe. I would need to think about this.

German shitposting is characterized by very high levels of rage-bait.

Time is noticed by difference. Now that I'm very much in healing, healed from masochistic covert narcissism I feel like time is much more a real thing. The difference between now and before a few days etcetera is much more of a perceived difference. Not being developmentally arrested means that things change more and this then makes passage of time more real. Also for a narcissist it is partially always like a new start, with its insecurity, openness but also timelessness. Now I have more of a history myself and external people, things and places are much more their own. Even a week or a few days can feel like quite some happening whereas formerly in some sense even years were not that different, at least to my former empty schizoid core. To narcissists only the false self experiences time, but the empty schizoid core largely remains the same, as long as it is not healed and reintegrated. So perception of time is only experience through perception in changes to relationship. But if there is no, or not much, of a relation then there is also not much of an experience of time.

Time is only experience through change, change is only experience through sensing, sensing requires relationship. So time is only experienced in relationship.

So then: If everything in the universe were to stop to change, then time itself would stop too, I think. Time is then defined as that that changes and everything that is immutable necessarily would also be timeless. The absolute is timeless.

Since death arguably is the ending of all senses, I would assume that then time stops or ceases to apply, like before birth. I can not imagine this, but I want to live. At some point I will die anyways, as a living being I want to live.

On why birthrates are falling in the west: Conscientious, trustworthy men only want to make babies if they think they can give them a secure base subsistence out of their own work. But these people are taxed and regulated out of existence. Men don't want to work just for their fruits of labor to be stolen by the state. What remains are the few ultra rich chads (minority that doesn't change overall numbers) and the poorest that don't give a fuck and make babies regardless and live off social security schemes. So the middle class is being crushed and that makes birthrates fall. In one word, what's stopping good men from having kids: CONSCIENTOUSNESS that is out of place in depraved modern states. The modern state, as Hans Hermann Hoppe aptly recognized, changes incentives so that worse traits and behaviors are favored beyond their natural position. If you can live off social security, including your children, then the best mating strategy is to make as many children as possible and contribute as little economic value to society as possible. Social security creates a dependent population, that has not many productive, good, qualities themselves. It reinforces fast life history strategy, sexual promiscuity, learned helplessness and abandoning of your own children.

My covert narcissist mother really quite a bit exploits her inverted narcissist boyfriend for work around the house.

For clarification: Inverted narcissist equals narcissistic co-dependent, a variant of covert narcissist. I got these terms from Sam Vaknins videos., but I dont like to have to do much with him, because he is still a cruel, terrifying, sadist.

My mother is still covertly sadistic and my big brother is still an attention seeking, devaluing narcissist. What a bunch of losers, all of them.

Warum? Alle die schizoid sind, einen schizoiden Kern haben, unterdrücken ihr authentisches selbst und finden so nie eine zufriedenstellende Verbindung.

The narcissist seeks uniqueness, uniqueness is a difference from the common or the before. This then means that the narcissist is seeking difference by being unique. But this getting of difference is normally acquired by healthy people by the passage of time itself, since time is noticed by experiencing difference. The narcissist is largely frozen in time in his empty schizoid core, so he lacks experiencing difference there through time and he seeks to compensate it by trying to be unique, different. Of course I could be a little wrong here, overlook something, I would need to explore this more.

If you want to understand what it means to be a secure base as a person, Cesar Millan is very good. This is really important. I have a lot to learn from Cesar.

My little brother (reactant) can not take responsibility. He exclusively allows to be idealized. This is not so different from narcissism. He is emotionally invalidating towards even slight grievances and he avoids immediately. He expects to get away with everything (magical thinking). It is probably also a splitting defense. He avoids, but he doesnt immediately, or at all (?), aggress back. Maybe because he knows, that it is legitimate. Meanwhile he has explosive anger if he sees a personal freedom threatened. Probably he sees, has learned, that having any complaints at all is futile. So he does not

listen to complaints and equally does never complain himself. Complaining is a precursor or middle ground to more direct aggression, a vent of frustration about something or somebodies behavior. The reactant doesn't know nuance, he is either seemingly unaffected or snaps almost completely in an outburst of anger. His complaints have never been ignored, invalidated as a child. Have I ever seen my little brother cry or complain after like 7 years of age? Pretty much not. But I do have seen him explode in anger, emotional dysregulation, but only on the aggressive, always alloplastic defense and alloplastic relief.

It makes sense that my little brother needed to become resistant to complaints of all sort in order to not be harmed by mothers covert emotional abusiveness. So this resistance to complaining defends against malicious complaining that is really emotional abuse, but it has the severe disadvantage of also being resistant to benign complaining as a way to create social bonds and a healthy together. What remains in the absence of corrective benign complaints and healthy feedback and this creates exactly magical thinking. Without the ability to gauge social approval through receiving genuine disapproval, only reinforcement learning through approval remains. The superego, conception of morality then is only formed through approval and not disapproval, so it is lacking. Real testing for approval requires the respecting of disapproval also - otherwise there emerges a twisted concept of approval of consent. Consent includes yes and no, not only yes and absence. The reactant is schizoid in the sense that he dissociates from disapproval and this then makes him so opportunistic too. This then also means that the reactant can engage in a very brittle, accidental kind of win-win only. He is unable to repair or maintain relationships, because he can not integrate negative feedback. Here also

helpless like a child or baby. Thats why his base tends to be so temporary and necessarily opportune. It must seem like luck to him. Here a seemingly happy-go-lucky attitude, but underlying it really is insecurity about attachment. Compare this to a codependent. Wikipedia: In psychology, codependency is a theory that attempts to explain imbalanced relationships where one person enables another person's self-destructive behavior, such as addiction, poor mental health, immaturity, irresponsibility, or under-achievement. Definitions of codependency vary, but typically include high self-sacrifice, a focus on others' needs, suppression of one's own emotions, and attempts to control or fix other people's problems. People who self-identify as codependent are more likely to have low self-esteem, but it is unclear whether this is a cause or an effect of characteristics associated with codependency. Seems quite like the opposite to reactance. High self esteem vs low self esteem. Independence (?) vs codependence. Only understanding goods vs only understanding bads. Fixing ones owns problems vs fixing others problems. Egoism vs self sacrifice.

Online Im so cynical Im normal again, I realize the futility, hypocrisy and indecency.

Michael Levin: Emergence basically just means surprise. "<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=EdEqgCOSx7E> Pretty insightful. His platonic space as a mental space is the same as the a priori.

Again (?). Since nothingness does not exist, only existence exists.

Calm confident (Cesar Millan), secure base.

(Again ?) The absolute must be fully sufficiently self referentially justified and justifying. This means that it exists in itself without any other need or external dependence, fully self causing or stable in itself. The absolute is perceived

as the undeniably given. Just as the way things are inherently. The extrinsic seems like accident, but in the complete picture, unavailable to humans, it can not be mere accident since its part of the absolute with meaning. The intrinsic seems meaningful and destined, but it really follows from the absolute order of things, as a part of the whole.

Children have naturally lower IQ since they are less developed than adults. Is the same true for an empty schizoid core since it is about a part being stuck in childhood? But since a empty schizoid core is largely isolated from the more conscious rational mind, it has only psychotic, reality distorting and usually background kind of signalling which probably has little effect on the outcomes of IQ tests. I feel like I am less intelligent than before, but only because I am developing now. The integration of an empty schizoid core and therefore the healing of narcissism does cause a reset in the mind that for a time reduces IQ. Certain default mode operations and cognitions get rewired, it is a little bit of a restart. This is also compatible with the fact that psychosis in general causes a temporal loss of ability after recovery. If you have a fundamental reorientation, then you need to start from the beginning again. And I mean, that I also GAINED cognition even some form of consciousness that was locked away. It is like the coolest person I've ever met, but also still immature for the understandable reasons of having been isolated. Merging takes time, but its not just merging. It is an all-pervasive coming to sense. The former false self is equally affected. And because it is all-pervasive, I can not describe it all.

It is the opposite of what happened in my childhood, the aftermath where I confused left and right, literally. It is a regaining of nativity.

More immature states of mind are also more animal-like,

instinctual and barely rational.

Kredit = Glauben. Kreditwürdigkeit = Glaubwürdigkeit.  
Das Geldsystem hat also auch einen epistemischen Einfluss.

In some sense my mother, but my family in general, have pushed me into a corner. And this has made me socially aggressive now, a sort of reactance and schizoid distance enforcement. I have my clear principles of right and wrong, that I follow stringently and that I demand from others. I am defending my freedom even aggressively if needed. But I still care about being decent to decent people. I am somewhat my own judge and executioner, almost vigilante in attitude. And I say this because I believe in the truth.

I believe that souls can make progress. This means that souls are not static, but instead converging.

People that say that it is sad that time flies by so fast are actually regretting how they spent their time compared to what they really wanted to spend their time on.

Lies can be like weapons, although they are not actual aggression. Lies can also have collateral damages like weapons. Lies create confusion in so far as there is trust in the communication. If you are being lied to, how do you respond? If you believe a lie, then your reality testing has been undermined. Evil propaganda is about making people believe lies. Evil propaganda undermines the value of communication. Evil propaganda creates false narratives. From lies you need to dissociate and devalue the lie, because it is not true. Truth is reality, lies are fantasy, false simulations. Belief needs to approach truth and dissociate from lies. Lies are inherently delusional, truth is inherently realistic.

Wenn einer sagt: Reden generell ist sinnlos.", dann ist das ein performativer Widerspruch.

Anon: "Deutsch kommt von deuten. So wie bedeuten.  
Denn Worte haben Bedeutung."

Creating and maintaining (good) is harder than undermining and destroying (evil). Yet, for there to be existence at all the good must outweigh the evil. Existence exists implies that the good outweighs the evil. Further I have also shown that nonexistence doesn't exist, so good outweighs evil is immutably true. Existence always exists, although it can change forms which it does in each moment for a human. Existence always exists and is inherently good and this is a secure base. Existence is reality.

Everything that exists has an identity. True anonymity does not exist. Everybody is some body, somebody. Nobody does not exist. Being a nobody to someone means dissociating from them. Being a nobody is being schizoid. But complete dissociation is impossible since reality always has some amount of inherent togetherness, shared existence.

In programming there are declared APIs, application programming interfaces and then actual behavior of programs implementing the API, which then is the real thing, the API just a public declaration. Similarly with all laws and declarations of independence they are like APIs, they might declare or originally have declared intent, but what really matters is the actual functioning of the legal or contractual system which can be quite different, even the opposite of what has been originally declared. In so far as there is a difference between the declarative laws and the ground truth, the declarative laws are then equally delusional and deceiving or if they are similar to ground truth then they are authentic and orienting. Therefore laws first intent and purpose must be to approach the real, approach inherent natural law as opposed to being drifting into some fantastical, unrealistic grandiosity. Natural laws arise from the contract contents of voluntary interhuman (and therefore also social) agreements. Conflict resolution of mutually exclusive ends requires justi-

ce. Justice is arrived at through reason (thinking) and if the reasons are sufficient, then they comprise a sufficient justification for doing justice. Reason is by means of the a priori, inherent truths of reality, logic, praxeology. Good judging is about correct reality testing.

Again, this also means it is not wise to choose judges/arbiters with impaired reality testing like narcissists, reactants, etcetera, but in the making of any contract it still must be free mutual choice, volition on who is judge/arbitrator, etcetera. And there is also this that in his judgements a judge can also be judged at least in terms of his reputation increasing or diminishing. And in extreme cases the contract system must be flexible enough for the promiser and the promisee to change the arbiter/judge on a whim if mutual consent between the two (excluding the judge) is reached and they both also agree on a new judge and the new judge also agrees to judge them if need be (respecting volition).

Tragic part of asmongolds (reactant) life story <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=mB6swBWdMRA> I think his attitude is typical for a reactant.

After recovering from narcissism its also like knowing more unknowns and being fine or more actively coping with that. A good part of reality testing is being sensitive to unknowns. I am still a little bit a mess in regards to this, but some of my newfound successes arent deniable, but still more complex or at least not what Im used to and the concept of success is more differentiated. I cant claim them more or less than they are. My usual approaches are largely a little bit outdated to myself, no biggie. Aarggh. Raaawwwrrruwu. Also new social needs emergee. Like keeping tabs on people. Yea.

Interhuman relationships, the state or a monarchs can never be absolute, merely oppressive, grandiose, delusional and

potentially deceptive. Absoluteness can only be discovered, not made. No human made law or contract can be absolute, it can only attempt to converge towards what really is absolute, but never be that absolute in itself.

Anon: Thought and belief are the same. Its close but not necessarily always the same. There is also the saying that seeing is believing, which is also not quite the same, but there certainly is a relation, since seeing easily leads to some certain beliefs. One further relation then is that thinking is seeing and this also certainly is somewhat true since thinking can lead to insights, which really also is a form of seeing. There is also the further relationship that being awake (woke) means having open eyes and being in a state to notice, so being able to see, perceive. So wokeness, in its original meaning, then implies being able to see, implies thinking and getting insights, which also implies rationality since thinking is strongly related to rationality. So the woke humans should actually also be thinkers. But this is nothing that can be forced and obviously the people that identify as woke often times miss out on rationality and neutral perceiving. The modern politically laden term woke made the original meaning of woke, being awake, quite difficult, but I am a believer in the meaning of words. No word should be subverted in favor of any political interests. The meaning in words is naturally inherent to them and in this sense I want to be a naturalist. This also protects the ability to communicate and to think. Of course, while asleep people also see and make associations in dreams and feeling is also a form of believing.

Narcissists are resistant to real learning. In certain aspects they are stuck as long as they are narcissists, which is the whole lifespan for most contemporary narcissists. On some level they are fundamentally und frustratingly helpless. This is in stark contrast to the narcissists false self part which

indeed is very capable in some things. It is also important to notice that the false self is part of the narcissists self, it occupies large parts of the brain and is a developement of some maturity in spite of the traumatic empty schizoid core. At this point I also think that when the narcissist is sadistic, then only his false self really is so sadistic, while his empty schizoid core is reality distortingly masochistic. The false self is the public facing compensatory part and this means that if it is sadistic, then the empty schizoid core is masochistic. Equally if it is masochistic then the empty schizoid core part is sadistic. You can also describe it like this: A masochist has underdeveloped sadistic tendencies. A sadist has underdeveloped masochistic tendencies. These are in the extremes, but what is inbetween the covert and overt narcissist?

Resistance to learning is either adaptive if the learning would ba a fundamentally flase learning or continually frustrating and primitive destructive if the learning would be a genuine learning. The narcissist is in some part of him resistant to learning. And this leads to projection of a bad relationship and it is what I am dealing with with my mother predominantly, but my whole family really.

This then also means that mentally healthy people have more of a chance to change and develope themselves.

I know that Im somewhat repeating myself.

In some important sense narcissists then can not conclude. Conclusions are about some containment, finitude and separateness. Once one thing is concluded I can make a memory of it and move on to the next. But I can only conclude as far as I am certain and in this way a secure base is a precondition for certainty. A secure base allows for certainty and concluding, putting things into absolute - reference. Once absolute reference is established, there is no more need to worry about it and in this way also supports self confi-

dence. Narcissists on the other hand have confidence issues, if things can not be properly concluded then they are haunting and incomplete. Absolution allows for completion and then peace. Absolution makes concrete, particular, as opposed to diffuse floating and potential. Absolution is like measurement instead of guessing - reality testing in this way.

It allows for putting things into perspective which enables learning. This then allows for proper distancing through concluding. So the narcissist is absent now because he is present in his past. He can not give absolution to his own traumatic experiences, he is distraught. Absolution means acceptance and acceptance allows for moving on in peace. The absolute accepts everything, since everything is part of it and it loves itself perfectly. And once the absolute is accepted, reality is also accepted, since reality and the absolute are one. The absolute is everything given invariably, which includes the possibility of some things changing as another invariant and other things being immutable. This is a little bit like stoicism, accepting what one cant change and changing what one can not accept. More can not be done. Uneasiness creates agency or being overwhelmed. Here is the other difference, how one deals with uneasiness. Even acknowledging uneasiness requires discipline or inner strength. The greatest uneasiness can only be accepted by absolute belief, by definition, because everything else is moveable or otherwise changeable by definition. Fight, flight, freeze or fawn.

Sadism can be seen as unprovoked aggression. Masochism can be seen as unjustified autoaggression. Here it becomes clear that the libertarian non-aggression initiation principle and the need for proportionality (which both exclude sadism and masochism) are just. Sadism and masochism are both extreme ends of injustice lacking the golden mean of justice. Injustice can only have absolution through justice, making

things right. Without justice no absolution and no peace. So justice is prior to peace. And if Im talking about justice Im talking about natural inherent kind of justice.

So what Levin said about worms then is interesting that genes aren't necessarily the unit of selection (but can be). What matters is multi-level selection and really what the units of selection are, as kinds of units of merit. You can and probably should argue a lot about this, what is really important and why or why not. Dont forget multi-level selection and there are many levels possible. The unit of selection might be some functional blocks, functional in the form of enabling survival. It might never be thoroughly known, maybe and impossible to completely solve problem. Multi-level selection really goes all the way, this means it includes better and worse ideas, languages, words, accents, religions, social systems, societies, human made laws, human made ways to relate to each other and also memes. Im not saying that nothing can be known here, Im just saying that its not so easy.

So for example by adopting a libertarian stance and now assuming Im also able to live my life in a libertarian way, I also adopt a specific mental and social relational stance leading then to more or less darwinian success for my genes reproduction. One example of multi-level selection. Another example would be if I adopted the beliefs of a religion that says that I must kill myself before 2026 in order to go into heaven and otherwise I go eternally into hell. Consequently I would kill myself and not pass on my genes, an example of adverse influence of a multi-level selection factor on my genes. So genes are not the only factor impacting darwinian fitness, although it is certainly a factor. And then you could imagine scenarios that are not so simple which makes knowing the general fitness of genes pretty much impossible and

also not the exclusively important factor for fitness. Also as an economic argument: Since the future is uncertain, any eugenic preselection of genes being fit or unfit is also uncertain. This is true a priori.

Interestingly this a priori true uncertainty about the future argument seems to apply to the whole of multi-level selection. While there can be strong belief in one mode of living/exisring over other mutually exclusive ones, one can never have absolute certainty. This means that there is always humility and some amount of openness and learning capability required if the absolutely best is the target. Isn't this beautiful? This means there is always the possibility for progress, doesn't mean though that it can be predicted with absolute certainty what this progress even will look like since there is always at least some uncertainty about the future. Real fate can only be accepted, it is part of the absolute.

This does not mean that internal intuitions or prejudices about races are necessarily wrong or useless, but it does mean that they are not absolutely right either. Also I'm not saying that your internal kinselectiveness is useless or your prejudices generally wrong (prejudices tend to be right), I'm just saying that you are not right in the absolute sense. You should not be forced to associate with who you don't like. I also have some preference for my closer kin compared to further distantly related people. I think that's normal and healthy. Yes and also due to coevolutionary history there is a tendency, although not a rule, for being able to better cooperate among something close to one's own race.

If you have good enough judges, then there is hardly any need for lawyers.

Just to make this clear: There is no such thing as divine office or divine mandate, these are merely human grandiosity. It is insulting to the divine in my opinion and shows a distinct

lack of proper humility.

At one point I will also say, as they wrote: "I feel like a fool for hesitating until now."

So, this is not a fully sufficiently causal, but still a partially causal, explanatory chain: Hitlers father beat Hitler (Hitlers father was probably traumatized himself) and Hitlers mother was not much better. Hitler becomes a psychopathic narcissist. Hitler comes into power, reflecting also the inherent pathology in democracy. Hitler could never admit a wrong ever on his part, was also sadistic and so he slaughtered millions. Delusional until the end where he lost and committed suicide. Germany is war torn and people are barely living and have become traumatized and harsh. Beatings (just like Hitler was beat by his father) in school have become normal for my grandparents and their homes arent necessarily any better. My grandparents have their children, abusing them in various ways, creating my covert narcissist mother and my schizoid narcissist father. They have children including me and create my reactant little brother, me, at the time a masochistic covert narcissist and my (classical) narcissist big brother. I learn and recover over my long process of introspection and psychosis, ups and downs. Here I am.

So you could argue that if Hitlers parents were healthy good parents, then this might not have happened. On the other hand, the inherent pathology in coercive democracy would always have led to some form of disastrous outcomes, especially given the great war debts placed on germany after world war 1 and so forth (ww1 has been described as the end of civilization by some notable libertarians). So if great evils are committed, then it always tends to be from some form of amplifying preexisting pathology like putting a psychopathic narcissist into coercive political power, like in contemporary democracies. Dont be mistaken, originally germans sekt a

savior from their circumstances and thought they found it in Hitler, in his charme and portrayal of invincibility typical for psychopathic narcissists, but it was destined to disaster from the start with him. People then have lost the sight and courage for what is good. Coercive democracy was the main problem in its amplification and overriding (harsh) of individual wills. So the destruction of free will through coercive systems is the biggest threat to human flourishing. This means that for human dignity, freedom and respecting free will are primary. Psychopathic narcissists really only want to destroy other peoples free will, their very consciousness, because this has been done to them. So a more conscious world (some would call it awake, woke) is only possible if free will, volition is respected and this is mutually exclusive to any coercive system and to coercion itself, only proportional self defense (which is not coercion) is allowed.

So through coercive democracy Hitler projected his own traumatic childhood onto the entirety of germany. Further, states themselves tend to be a traumatic constructs since they usually started or are the result of a war. The harshness in its mode of operation is also apparent since it is not volitional. Harshness is aggression, even if just verbal, aimed at establishing or maintaining control. Control of distinct parts is mutually exclusive (defacto private property) and free will can never be surrendered, only destroyed (, because an unfree will already is no free will anymore). So in conclusion coercive democracy is a malicious fantasy inherently aimed at the destruction of free will, destruction of consciousness and destruction of awareness. It is epistemically flawed and so really unreal, fantastical, a false simulation of consent. And from this it follows, since there is no real consent in coercive democracy, there is also no real legitimacy in it. Legitimacy arises from real consent (which is the same as just

plain consent) only. Real legitimacy requires real consent, not fake or fantasy consent. Consent can only be expressed through having free will, so consequently any attack on free will is inherently also an attack on consent and is inherently also an attack on legitimacy, so it is illegitimate. Consent is the origin of all legitimacy. Justice arises from legitimacy. An illegitimate justice is a contradiction in terms, so it is always unjust. Legitimacy is about consent and also authenticity, truth.

But knowing these things and comparing them to current world-wide affairs can easily lean to disillusionment, hopelessness, despair, depression and existential dread. For this reason too then it is important to believe in the absolute goodness of reality and further that any evil self destructs by its very own nature so that believing in the illusions only gets one a false good, which is a real bad and that maintaining to seek the truth and goodness are the only real, existent way to go. Accept reality in all its malice and all its goodness and everything in-between. You are here. You dont need to rush anywhere, take the time you need. Love yourself. Dont run away.

[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=A\\_26HApNWLM](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=A_26HApNWLM)

Hes pretty close. I do think that striving for good is worth it. And yes, he too is nuts, but obviously for reasons. It is so hard staying sane in this fucking insane society (especially my damn mom). I think I am mentally healthy, but being mentally healthy never meant being an exploitable liar sheep. I dont know what happened to this guy, but he is really something. Yes, this suppressed anger and also his laughter being like ultracrazy. He is the kind of guy that actually creates religions and sects. Religions and sects are like their own societies, he must have suffered tremendously and is also, whether he knows it or not, out for some kind

of revenge - even if it is of the spiritual kind. And he seems stable in his crazyness, psychotic. Some of the things he says are relieving, others defeatist. Religions are psychological refuges and channeling, channeling towards what? The wants and views of the leading psychotic(s). This can lead to some reestablishment of lost truths, but also to delusions, either way it means a change in fundamental narrative. The kind of work only psychotics tend to be able to do.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=pjl5VVkSYYs>

It is like a resetting of reality testing. He is reinventing a secure base, how to fundamentally relate to reality. But he does not allow himself to believe in it - defeatism. There is something in the background still bothering him and thats why his psychoticism continues. He is still searching for answers and it will definitely be interesting, although conceivably every secure base is the same, but the way is also the target. The contemporary USA could definitely use a few psychoptics and I also do not have all the answers obviously.

Different infinities do not have different sizes I think. I think infinity has no size at all, since it can not be measured, is not finite and instead always occupies either its whole dimension or category, for example if its a number, or everything if it is infinity as such (the all-one). Infinity is not an ordinary number. Associating individual entries of some particular infinity to another infinity is arbitrary and does not proof anything about size differences. Size comparison only apply to finite things. Infinities are about inherent principles and categories, immutably repeatable properties. Claims about infinities are always claims about the whole category in which it is countained, like claims about all numbers and therefore it is always claims about the nature of the category of numbers for example. Claims about infinity, not as a number but in general, are also claims about literally every-

thing (the all-one), so also claims about reality as such, the absolute as such.

Something could have an infinite number of unique patterns and therefore be fully categorically defined and completely predictable. But to me as an observer it would seem like randomness since it is impossible for me to know infinite truly unique patterns. I can not say that I understand infinity (everything) since my knowledge is local, but the presupposition that there is something outside me that I do not know is also a concept. The existence of the unknown can not be known, you can only know things. So truly knowing that you dont know is impossible a priori, its always speculative and presumptive. Unknowns are just that what arises from human internal speculation, planning, simulation and fantasy. Reality only provides knowns. All this seems to suggest some sort of extreme naivety, but really thats not my point. Im saying that even planning and speculations can only be based on internally knowns and the truly unknown does not exist. The unknown only arises as a concept from what already is known. This makes me feel insecure. A human is not a pure knowledge machine. I dont consciously know everything that I know.

If I have to guess, then the german politician Alice Weidel is a covert borderline. I dont know for sure. She definitely has no issues expressing her anger and she certainly seeks power, might. Doesn't mean shes completely wrong tho, some points certainly fit. Still, I dont believe in the legitimacy of state coercion. I think one aspect people like about her is exactly that she is so aggressive towards established parties. The Bundestag is largely a pathological place. At least she is criticising socialism, surveillance and oppression but I dare not to hope here. If she gets into power there will certainly be at least some good aspects, but what will her anger,

will to control and paranoia do? I dont know but it doesnt sound good. There is a reason my father became a schizoid narcissist. Also, politicians tend to lie.

But in the end, it is the individual that matters, not any pathology or categorization.

Aggression to a large extent also is agency and it can be justified or unjustified, legitimate or illegitimate.

There already exists at least one very high IQ libertarian psychopathic narcissist. As I said, everything good will be attempted to be undermined, corrupted and misused and it is on the individual to keep to the good, true and beautiful. Really a dark and orderly, sharp kind of black this is. Not even the pretension of hope it seems and evils are subtly and slowly being talked of as good, misrepresented and of course there is also the robotic, downtalking, grandiose voice and the slipping through sadism, menacing. Like dracula in Bram Stokers book maybe. Certainly pretending to not be a human, a defense.

If people did nothing in general then they would just literally die. Laying flat - to die. The ultimate absence is death and you could say that the willingness to die is the ultimate form of protest. Consequently, if death is an option, then equally as well one can aggress against that parts of the world that caused him to be unable relate in a win-win manner. Aggression can be the next step after giving up. This explains a lot of the existing aggression, but not all of it.

Believing a lie is also called buying into a lie. So the act of believing any statement is connected to investing into the statement, so is not schizoid, but relational committal, self investing and epistemically orienting even if only a little. Secure attachment style is the precondition for really believing anything extrenal, anything being independently (of the self)

true. Otherwise there is a refusal to really learn anything as a defense to being hurt or betrayed. As a conclusion, attachment styles are adaptive to social (interhuman) environments being more or less trustworthy.

Schizoids are by definition not relateable. There is little, if any, shared experience or shared values. They are mostly neutral about anything, because caring implies commitment and relation, relating. Being neutral means being unavailable, as if not being there, inherently dissociative. It creates separation, atomization, but no individual because an individual can relate if he likes. An individual can suffer if he loses something or somebody he invested into, a schizoid is more resistant to such suffering. A schizoid suffers to some degree by default. Schizoids attitude to others is cynical, dismissive, haughty and uncaring. There is some part of the schizoid that cares, but it never reaches as long as the schizoid is a schizoid. The schizoids want for outreach is frustrated, caged. The schizoid is his own prison and punishment. The firmness of his cage might be his replacement for a secure base. Inside his cage he feels secure. And this is the schizoids perceived end of fucking story for eternity". Here he is haughty in his cage, the one small space he can really claim his own. A little bit like me.

What is the opposite of perfectionism and perfect? Literally shit, the disgusting, the shameful and humiliating failure. These latter ones are part of reality and denying them is denying part of what it means to be human. They beget humility. And so they are the opposite expressions of grandiosity, they are humbling. Everybody needs to shit and fart and sometimes fails embarrassingly and that is acceptable. Overt narcissists on the other hand can not accept embarrassment, only tragic (harsh and glorified) failure is acceptable to them.

Very good summary of narcissism and hopes for treat-

ment: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=FAH7fZIBSVw>

There is also an american phenomenon where they pretend to be so nice or like somebody so much that you know its really fake. Its just too much to possibly be authentic. Therefore these are lies and only support delusion on the giver of being such a good person and on the taker on being so unquestionably good. Especially the lgbtq seem to suffer from this. It shows a high level of living a lie. It attempts to mask feelings of inferiority or in some cases even cruelty. Compensatory virtue signalling and it reinforces a mass delusion since pretty much they all do it, like a religion. There is truth in it insofar as at least there is some group cohesion created, community of the oppressed and wonderful but really its a front. It is a trap. If somebody pretends to be perfect, you can assume that they hide the worst. Yeah that shit is narcissistic. Any doubt is suppressed, canceled, impairing their groups reality testing. They are motivated to believe their fantasy for emotional self regulatory purposes. They just want to not care, but they really do. If they really did not care, were self secure, then they could also tolerate countervailing evidence and statements.

It feels like lower IQ peoples lifes are also simpler, because they cant comprehend so much complexities and overlook many complex societal problems, but their lifes arent necessarily easier. In the current time though average IQ is falling so you can argue that having high IQ currently makes life harder. Since there will be less intelligent people in the future, lower IQ people will also suffer more by lacking the fruits of labor of higher IQ people. The root problem is coercion and volition would be the solution. It is that simple. If things are fucked up on too many levels then intelligent people hurt themselves in confusion. Sometimes a more primitive original, heuristic approach is simply better (emotions,

intuitions). Thinking is extremely biologically expensive and time consuming. Massive amounts of genes that increases intelligence are being reduced now, in some rare cases maybe even purged entirely. Anyways, evolution finds a way, there is no reason to be too much concerned, more importantly volitional solutions must be created. But this is certainly sad for the lives of many intelligent people currently living. Not much is gonna change overnight, but the future is still uncertain. Each person can only make his own decisions and actions. Im not even saying that there is an absolute loss in quality. Such a thing is impossible. Good things inherently emerge and if necessary reemerge.

I can also speculate this that selection now is more in favor of a critical and body integrated intelligence and against a trusting and depending intelligence. New rationality will be less isolated from natural needs. The coercive state as a kind of predator over time creates resistant adaptations in the general population one way or another, many ways at the same time. Its still fucked up tho. Ultimately I cant say what will happen.

One other thing that is likely to happen is an increase in antisocial tendencies. So really there is not much good on the horizon if the root problems arent solved. And since I am one of the people capable to contribute towards its solution I should try to. It is moral to create solutions in favor of volition and against coercion. Actions mean more than words and are the final judge.

Nazis were evil and the current political woke are evil. That pisses off many people but I think its true. Both are really authoritarian leftists.

Similar Hoppe: Capitalism is the closest approximation to Meritocracy and Aristocracy still left. If there was not a monopoly on violence on the state then you possibly could

have Aristocracy back. Kings, monarchy and vested titles, strict separation into nobles and commoners was the breakdown of aristocracy. Kings monopolized power and then later democracy monopolized power, both steps into evil. Words have inherent meanings and pretty much any person potentially can act noble or wretched. The same is true about for example the words: legitimacy, consent, justice. One should call things by how they are, not by politically vested terms. This is also an epistemological demand and deviation would be lying.

Only voluntary dealings are legitimate. Initiation of aggression breaks volition and is therefore illegitimate. This explains the non aggression principle (NAP) and why it is legitimate. I probably read this somewhere else before.

Only volition creates legitimacy. Legitimacy stems from free will. It makes sense, if anything can differentiate between right and wrong then it can only be individual humans free will.

So:

1. Only volition causes legitimacy.
2. Only the legitimate is allowed.
3. Only the legitimate is just.
4. Therefore only voluntary dealings are legitimate.
5. Initiation of aggression breaks volition and is therefore illegitimate and not allowed.
6. Any orders (including states) that are not based on volition or restoration of volition are illegitimate and unjust.
7. If illegitimate action occurs, proportional self defense in order to restore justice is allowed, legitimate and warranted.

The perceived efficacy of a person is likely equal with doing effective work on realizing his life drive (libido) goals. This success is also perceived as being free and satisfied in homeostasis and being without further needs. In so far as this is not achieved, one feels necessity (in freud can cause neurosis or even psychosis if not succeeded in?) and uneasy-

ness, being driven and stressed. What determines what the life drive wants is the internal reward function and depending on success data it is training the neural network of the mind. Only frustration creates need for adaptation, backpropagation of the error through the neurons and the bigger the frustration (error might be even traumatic), the greater the amount of backpropagation and error correction and neuronal change. An always satisfied mind could be extremely simple, primitive and unable to cope with the real world. An always frustrated mind would also loose touch with reality, since perceiving reality to it would not make any sense to satisfy life drive goals. But the mind of course not that simple. For example, any life drive theory would in principle apply to even ants up to humans. So there are also species dependent properties (genes, nature) und the environment (nurture). The death drive? In general, what neurons fire together wire together. So time correlation of events creates associations, relationships. The death drive then is about destroying the object or preventing relating to it. An object can be any neuronal impulse. Fight, flight and freeze are all about not relating. Fawning is a little more complex, but in the same region. The life drive is direct. The death drive is indirect. The death drive is just a specific variation of the life drive driven into necessity (It like with the yes and the no). Death drive is always accompanied by confusion or uncertainty, since it means that the direct life drive has failed and a problem has presented itself.

To also put this simply: Authoritarian regimes impose punitive and destructive, infantilizing rules and restrictions onto the population causing frustration on a mass scale. This frustration is inherently against the life drive, the need for free development and self actualization. This means that for better mental health only freedom and minimal restrictions

while still reducing conflict are required. Private property is a conflict reducing norm and so is freedom from coercion, volition.

Some psychologists call mental processes the economy of the mind and there is truth to that. What is the currently best economics? Libertarian austrian economics, as Ludwig von Mises, Murray Rothbard and Hans Hermann Hoppe, etcetera describe it. Other economics in comparison just pale in explanatory power and are usually also corrupted in favor of contemporary nation states.

Coercion is illegitimate.

There is no monopoly on goodness possible.

Zum Recht: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7DQ5whxaDjA>

Giving a signature, signing, is only relevant because it can signify (momentary) consent. This again shows the primacy of consent independent even of any contract or signature. A signature, after being written down, is not consent anymore, but at most can be seen as a commitment.

Natural law is like math in that it is a priori, it does not depend on a signature or consent and also can not be destroyed by any amount of coercion. Law is always the content of a contract. Natural law is that content of mans inherent contract with nature (the all one, the universe). It arises from his mode of existence and can only be discovered and humans are fallible. Judgements are only necessary in cases of conflict and conflict only arises from mutually exclusive states. A judge in order to do justice must act in accord to natural law but in attempting to do so necessarily always remains fallible. Ideally a judge in order to attract contractees openly displays his understanding of natural law in his actions (judgements), theory is secondary to that. Volition is primary and ideally no judge is ever needed because that means that no conflict ever arose, but this is unrealistic. By acting

authentically people show their truth and truth is needed for judgement. The innate life impulse is the origin of wants. Wants are preferences of specific future states over others. If these future states are in conflict then conflict arises. In practice conflict can be settled through volition or coercion but only the volitional way is legitimate and just. A judge should try to only make just judgements and in so far as he restored justice he succeeded. I need to work more on my understanding of natural law.

Other humans are the biggest problem and the greatest solution to so many things.

Fight, flight or freezing. Running away is a negation, negative. Shame is an attitude of running away. Approaching is positive. You can also negate a negation, so running away from running away, but I doubt that in psychology that leads to something positive. Running away from running away is much more a being stuck in a loop, alternating approach to avoidance. Alternatively it is just freezing, not daring to run away, running away from running away. Fleeing expends a lot of energy and it implies a giving up of position, stand, standing. It also implies an inability and helplessness in the given circumstances. It is a form of involuntary concession of territory (plane to stand). Running away is shameful, but given some really bad circumstances it can be necessary. The alternative is aggression.

Currently experiencing some amount of anhedonia.

The schizoid, anhedonic perspective allows for some neutrality in viewing (paired with disinterest).

Imagine if you were given absolute power, and I mean really absolute, not realistic. What would you do and why? You could satisfy yourself as much as you want, take revenge on people that hurt you or that you don't like by making them suffer in something like hell for ever. You could change and

control every single thing. You could read peoples minds, change their minds, give and take away free will or even souls. You would understand everything a priori instantly - the question then is what insights would you gain from perfect understanding? Would you see any improvement to the world or would the world seem already perfect or rather, be provably a priori perfect? How would you interpret pain, suffering and horror and how would you interpret joy, happiness and bliss? Would you even be human anymore? Either way you could say that your very own inner most character would become the nature of reality itself. The question then arises: Do you know yourself? Would this state be bearable to you, after all having complete control means that really only you exist, since there would be no real freedom outside of what you yourself are. Consequently this state of affairs would only be bearable if you have perfect self love. Who are you?

Further if you loved yourself perfectly, then you could tolerate others being free, having free will and being independent, because they would be no threat to your self love. But further all of this is merely some thoughts, hardly practical (no human can just be omnipotent). I still think that there is some truth to it. It is religious.

Not being perfect is frightening. What am I then, what is left?

It is actually the unnatural suppression of kinselection in (state made) anti-racism laws that creates a neurosis around racism and makes racism if it appears all the more prevalent and vindictive due to being suppressed. It prevents interracial authenticity in so far as human races exist (which is fuzzy, but real). This lack of authenticity prevents genuine relationships and genuine building of trust. Trust is voluntary and can not be and should not attempted to be coerced. Natural

human discrimination by their free choosing in all kinds and degrees is necessary for building trust through showing authentic trustworthiness. And if people don't understand or trust each other enough then they should not be forced to associate.

Not seeing myself as perfect (and I'm not saying that I'm perfect in not seeing myself as perfect) creates anxiety in me. I feel that many things about me now are potentially inadequate, groundless, not fitting. I am definitely less presuming. Anxiety.

Legitimacy arises from consent and reason, which is really a priori insights like logic and praxeology .

Again, legitimacy arises from individual humans consent. Just like with voluntary trade vs theft/robbery. On the issue of responsibility I agree with methodological individualism and similar to Hannah Arendt that individuals are responsible for their own actions independent of any state or system they say they are working for. So it's really simple: Everybody is fully responsible for his own actions (and inactions). This also follows from the simple reason that people can by their own free will decide their own actions, even if they are coerced.

But really, nobody is perfect.

Me: Tsts, so immature. Other guy: Not if it's true."

I am less interested in excitement than before as a kind of narcissist. BPDs seem more childish. BPDs excitement seems more vapid now, less engaging.

The real standard is always only about truth, an absolute, so all other things like techniques, knowledge, intelligence, emotion, intuition, etcetera only can try to measure up to it. Truth is about that which exists, is real. All speculations, planning, fears or ambitions are constrained and measured by it. So intentions can only ever achieve the possible, the

possible being the realistic and judged so by nature of reality itself. So to see what is possible and what impossible one must understand the nature of reality and sufficiently know the given circumstances. And intentionality necessarily is restrained to the possible. Believing the impossible possible or the possible impossible is delusion and believing the possible possible and the impossible impossible is realism. So realism is about correct representation and ability to simulate reality. But humans are fallible. Many representations just need to be good enough for high enough likelihood of survival and procreation, heuristic instead of absolutely true. Yet, any heuristic insofar as it is wrong also meets its demise. Heuristics are special purpose instead of general purpose.

A paranoid schizophrenic is something else entirely. I see how they are potentially violent, murderous out of their paranoia, they might even tell you. Interestingly a paranoid schizophrenic seems quite resistant to malignant narcissists manipulativeness, but here we are really talking about being down bad altogether. A malignant narcissist has more intact (although still broken) reality testing compared to a paranoid schizophrenic. The paranoid schizophrenic sees malignancy everywhere even if there is none, but with a malignant narcissist he at least sees that malignant part correctly. It is interesting what a variety of states of mind exist. Really all these are different ways to experience being human and completely different attitudes/relations with the world. But it is important, some parts of a malignant narcissists truth can only be "seen" by paranoid schizophrenics, so only they can validate these most horrible, sadistic malignant parts. I wonder what would happen if they meet in real life. Not that this would be moral or safe, it would probably be another disaster. How would they treat each other? Imminent violence? Fight, flight or freeze? An unholy alliance of malice?

Betrayal, probably, but also defeated from the start since its expected from the start. Also, validating somebody in his malice makes no fucking sense.

The paranoid schizophrenic is just wrong, except in such cases like civil war (which is not civil at all, it's just a saying).

You can also argue like this: Every anxiety and fear has a paranoid element to it too. It is always about anticipating something bad. And anticipating something in general might be equal to hallucinations. Hallucinations might simply be upgraded, stronger, more impressive fantasies. Further, attributing bad is also attributing problems. If one attributes bad where there is no real bad, then he creates problems out of nothing. Nothing does not exist, so really he creates problems by projecting.

The narcissist can not bear shame, but he wants to completely humiliate others. Somebody completely humiliated is as good as dead to the narcissist and gives him the feeling of being right in abusing them. He destroys others honor and dignity, overtly or covertly. He wants to prove to you that you are inferior and need to comply to his delusions. His shared fantasy includes and requires this degradation. Especially a covert narcissist is consumed by envy and so he can not tolerate you being good. To the narcissist the point was never about being right, but about the other being wrong.

If somebody say they reach their (emotional) breaking point, then this probably means that something, some coping is breaking, overflowing, outpouring, a transition from regulation to disregulation. A refutation of some part of rationality so far and a winning of affect, a (temporary) regression into primal mode of being. It can be in anger, euphoria, despair or abhorrence, etcetera. It can be the cause of trauma, which is a kind of remaining in this breakage, splitting, being in an unresolved state. Equally it can be the cause of

being self secure. My mother seems to have another of her narcissistic rages. She tries to shame me indirectly but still very potently and prominent, is passive aggressive, but more potently and direct, angry, than usual. This time Im not her only target for narcissistic rage. She pretty much does the same to her inverted narcissist partner. She is also blaming the state of the world she dislikes onto me, as if I was responsible for it, an error of attribution. Essentially she implies that Im good for nothing and only bad, that I should be ashamed of myself completely and disappear, die or submit completely and then die for her. Arguably for her it comes after a period of bottled up emotions, a frantic release and attempt at reestablishing control. After it she immediately slips back into her false idealized self, adding insult to injury. She reacts havoc and psychological epistemical assault. The narcissistic rage is like an reaffirmation of her traumatic truth. She creates fear in me and inhibition. There is no reasonableness in all of this, it is an attempt at the destruction of reason and self security. She is taking her inner chaos and despair and frantically tries to put it on others, get it out of her system. Otherwise she would decompensate and need to face herself. And it does affect me negatively, causes depression, self denial and schizotypy-like countertransference. The only satisfaction to the narcissist is your punishment, what exact kind of punishment depends on the kind of narcissist. Punishment is always about destroying something valued. I can not let her win. This shit is exhausting. Ill probably go into some depression again. Acceptance of reality. Now she can laugh again for a while, but it is at my cost.

Narcissistic rage is NOT calm confidence.

In the gospel of truth in the nag hammadi scriptures there are pointers at something like the a priori, a platonic like space: I am not saying that those who have not yet come to

be are nothing. 23 They are within one who may wish that they come into being if at some future point he so wishes. On the one hand, he knows, before anything appears, what he will produce. On the other hand, the fruit that has not yet appeared knows nothing and does nothing. Thus each realm in the Father comes from what is, but what has set itself up is from what is not. For whatever has no root has no fruit, and although thinking, "I have come into being," it will perish by itself. So whatever does not exist will never exist."

Ludwig von Mises: Man has only one tool to fight error: reason."

Even experts can be wrong about their field, experts too are fallible.

Ludwig von Mises in Human Action: "Human civilization as it has been hitherto known to historical experience is preponderantly a product of contractual relations."

Die Wissenschaft selber kann weder anerkennen noch ablecken, nur einzelne Menschen können das.

In their current form large language models (llms) are not only delusional, they are exclusively actively hallucinating and are unable to understand corrective feedback. They hallucinate and can not deviate, learn, beyond their training data. They remain an interpolation of their training data. They have no reality testing.

Die schönsten Passagen kommen immer aus dem eigenen Leben oder mit dem eigenem Leben. Es lässt sich nichts erfinden das nicht von der Bedeutsamkeit der Realität übertrroffen würde. Es ist einfach ehrlicher, es schon bloss zu sagen wird ihm nicht gerecht, armer Knecht, armer Knecht. Unverschämt und doch gerecht?

My mother has another narcissistic rage, accusing her inverted narcissist partner for every wrong possible. I did

nothing and it seems she can not successfully project bad onto me anymore since I'm mostly removed as a mental object to her. I don't know what will happen, but it's fundamentally nothing new. I just try to stay outside and neutral. The inverted narcissist must be hard on her too, but she really put him down also, destroying his self-worth. Either way, she lacks narcissistic supply and more than usual goes into emotional disregulation and aggressive accusations, extreme feelings of uncertainty. I don't want to be her emotional punching bag anymore and that since quite a time. I hope she can find inner peace, but this is nothing new. The inverted narcissist (narcissist codependent) must also have some very unusual influence on her, but she is still the main driver of her own pathology.

It is always crazy to witness how quickly my mother switches from narcissistic rage to seemingly being ok and happy, a mask to cater to another social situations pressures. This is de facto extremely manipulative, intended or not and it's sick, nauseating, two-faced. A clear show of persona discontinuity. It is infuriating. It is infuriating because it means that she is not going to take any accountability. So narcissists are unable to take accountability, but accountability simply stems from cause and effect. So the narcissists role switching breaks the causal chain - in his mind, as if the roles she takes define reality. If you think about it then this attitude is incredibly naive. It works only if people play along with the delusions and it is very confusing. Truth really is one continuous and consistent thing, not many contradictory ones. And also, it is known to philosophers and logicians that once you accept one contradiction then you can prove anything and everything. So inherently believing in at least one contradiction can lead to believing anything at all. The contradiction is the split, while in reality there is only one person, not two.

Tis is also one epistemic flaw of narcissism. The narcissist does not have a unified secure base, but competing partial insecure bases. A (absolutely) secure base is a standard for measure, relating and accounting, a standard for mental representations. Having two seperate bases leads to discordant mental representations, i.e. delusions and confusions, insufficient references. There can not be multiple different inconsistent absolutes, the absolute is one consistent all encompassing and fully self sufficient. I have also proven that the absolute is the infinite, so it must be all-encompassing or it could not be absolute either. That means that multiple bases are necessarily insecure, not secure and absolute. There is one reality, not multiple realities. There are different perspectives on reality, but its still one reality and everything is connected even if very distantly, still inside and part of the one reality. Reality is absolute.