

I. Section Why?

What is best in life?

To care for one another, and to have adventures.

Technology can help us do both of these things, building societies where all physical needs are taken care of as well as which preserve the adventure that makes life worth living. However, as technology has advanced it has increasingly served its own needs. It has such a powerful overall positive effect on the human condition that we have let the rules of technical progress dictate the rest of our society. As I discuss in the next section of this chapter, I have some theories I will present here about the nature of this technical progress structure and how it's falling apart.

This section outlines the goals of the overall work, the overall ideas, and how the work here will be structured. It is an introduction which focuses on the purpose of the whole thing.

elaborate on adventure, counter example of star trek

elaborate on caring for one another and include caring for ourselves

II. What is Capitalism?

What is Capitalism?

What is capitalism? This is something that critics of it weirdly avoid a lot of the time. If you look up various definitions, it generally goes something like this: "Capitalism is the economic system in which the means of production are privately owned." I hate this definition.

What this definition implies is that the opposite of capitalism is someone other than "the private owners" or "the capitalists" owning the "means of production", and "economics" being based on something other than private capital. I put all these things in scare quotes because I see them all as subtle weapons to inject hidden ideology into peoples minds by the very wording of the definition. First of all, the anarchist rejection of capitalism rejects ownership of minerals, land, and machines. So any definition that talks about "who owns what" should already be rejected by the anarchist, and we have already ceded a major point by allowing this definition to stand at all unexamined. Capitalism is a system in which some people, called "owners", claim to have power over certain things which they claim the right to carry out by force if needed. Capitalism is a system in which a military state exists which both feeds of the system of privately owned extraction and enforces the power structure that governs it.

The "means of production" is also a problematic phrase. While it is a bit ambiguous, I see this phrase as at least potentially implying that this the "means" is some sort of fixed infrastructure. The implication is that "the means

of production” is a thing that exists outside of economic systems, which can be controlled by any of various types of government or state. This is total bullshit. The very structure of “production” in today’s society is what I would call capitalism. The Soviet system, the various Fascist systems, “democracies”, dictatorships, monarchies, I would say every single one of them is capitalist. They all have this basic structure of military power creating a monopoly of force that protects a vast system to extract mineral wealth and destroy it as fast as possible by constant threat of violence. To me calls to “seize the means of production” sound like calls against a king to go seize the palace and tell the king what to do but to keep the palace and king in place. It’s the same system, with slight changes. So to let the capitalists define these ideas gives them a victory before a debate even begins: it allows that the existing “means of production” should continue to exist. A true challenge to capitalism is one in which the very concept of production is reinvented. It means building industrial technology from the ground up around different values.

Another problem with the notion of “economic system”. I would argue that economics is again a part of the intellectual descendent of the basic idea of the One God of monotheists. There is a Universal Hierarchy that exists, which allows numbers to be used to assign value to things. Human value becomes a number, always either less than or greater than or equal to any other numerical human value. Part of rejecting the basic ideas of capitalism is to reject this hierarchy cast down from God. But to even use the phrase “economic system” again lets capitalism be defined in a universe in which nothing other than capitalism exists.

Indeed in some of the definitions I’ve found online they even add phrases like “as opposed to State ownership of the means of production”. In other words the supposed definition of capitalism used by most people is not a definition of capitalism at all, but a clever propaganda piece that creates a world in which the alternative to capitalism is another type of capitalism which is re-cast as the Socialist Enemy. Since I consider all the Soviet style “communist” countries to be capitalist in their philosophical worldview, I find it not surprising that they hold the same warped view of this false dichotomy. The communists can point to “capitalism” as their enemy, where “the ruling class” “own” the “means of production”, rather than “the dictatorship of the proletariat”. When this goes to shit like it always does and destroys the environment even worse than “capitalism”, people on the right say “I told you so” and people on the left say “it will be different next time! it’s all Stalin’s fault!”.

So if we really want to move beyond capitalism, criticisms of it need to start trying to really see it for what it is, and see just how far the viral ideas about God that underly it have wormed their ways into the very language we use to describe it.

I will give capitalism the following simple definition:

Capitalism is a system of belief in which numbers are used to denote

all value.

That, I believe, is the heart of the matter. And it points to why experiments like the USSR have ended up having problems so similar to those in the western capitalist world. In a word, money. Money is not just metal or paper or faith in a government, it is the idea that a number, specifically an integer number (money can usually be subdivided but only up to a point) can be used to denote all human values. This is why I believe the concept is so slippery, and so hard to break out of. You can replace dollars with time dollars bit coin, gold, silver, bags of salt or gold backed e-dinar and it's really all the same thing: numbers. Integer numbers. As long as there is an exchange rate between a system of value and an existing currency you have not really broken free of the current system.

And what is money? The purity of numbers has proven to be incredibly powerful. Users of the number based values have literally moved mountains with the power they have been able to deploy using money. In particular money based values have been excellent at several things, some of which are good but most of which are bad. In a nutshell the main mind viruses that are along for the ride on capitalism are, in no particular order:

- mining
- militarism
- hierarchy
- misery
- property (all private property is laundered misery, including money)
- intellectual "property" is pure evil

The Nature of Capitalist Money

Our currency is based on two things:

1. suffering
2. and minerals

Turning minerals and human misery into numbers is capitalism in a nutshell.

Capitalism is an industrial system in which all value is based on human misery and minerals. By creating misery, some people use threats of violence to control land. They use more minerals, fire, and misery to create minerals ordered with a precision based on their belief in violence and control through military order. The threat of inflicting misery using military technology (not only is our technology military, our concept of military is based on our technology as well, and both are based on the One God beliefs) is how some people known as capitalists claim "ownership". Ownership is a complex network of violent threats which allow threats of future misery and benefits paid from past misery to be added

up numerically, building a ladder of power down which the physical benefits of mineral wealth slowly trickel, with the most landing at the top.

Any proposal to reform capitalism that maintains concept of numerical adding up of suffering and minerals is just capitalism with a new mask on. True reform means finding a set of moral values that informs technological figures of merit which are based on human joy, adventure, hilariousness, beauty, or other things that actually have positive value for everyone, and then re-builds our whole concept of what it means to have a technology up from scratch.

To repeat: to attempt to reform capitalism while continuing to use any of our current technology at all is a lost cause. The ideas of capitalism are built into the position of every atom in a modern technical artifact. If you want a world without capitalism you must re order every atom, completely re design how atoms go together from the bottom up. And it only makes sense to have this system acknowledge that this does not exist in a vacuum: 300-400 years of capitalism gave us the gift of minerals, which we can now live on forever.

Every atom. Every atom changes in how it relates to the whole. Same physics, same atoms, but new ordering principles, breaking out of the military design concepts. No more are the ideal shapes always planes, circles, and perfect grid arrays of objects. No more are tech artifacts locked into a centrally controlling clock that tells them when to work and what to do. No more is there a wall between engineer and customer, where some things are known and some are secret: all information on construction is physically encoded in the artifact, and updated as more edits are made, even if the user does not document(data stream into the dataverse).

Capitalism as Religion

Beliefs of Capitalism:

1. Private property is sacred
2. All value can be added up using numbers
3. All value must be extracted from the Earth or from human misery
4. Human society is described by something called an “economy”, which is a system for laundering mine products and human misery into numerical media of exchange
5. Hard work is an intrinsic good
6. Our world can all be described by a giant heierarchy, people, animals, objects, gods, ideas, all are always ranked and this ranking is ordained by the highest authority, whatever that is

Expand on this, loop it back to what is best in life(which capitalism does not bother to address at all)

IV. Why now?

Both the positive and negative sides: danger to humanity is imminent, but also opportunity is greater than ever before because of the vast mineral wealth that is everywhere and a critical mass of processing and communication technology. Marx was about 100 years early, and didn't have access to the information or materials we do today. Globalization and Capitalism really have literally sewn the seeds of their own destruction, by creating seeds for millions of new societies by spreading mineral wealth everywhere around the globe.

V. Layout of this Book

outline, goals, trash wizardry, summary of philosophy

Also be sure to add a note here on novelty: it is not my goal. I believe that the obsession with novelty in applied science is a toxin of capitalism and that by ignoring where ideas come from and using them as needed, with no expectation of novelty that much faster and better progress can be made.

Against professionalism, against specialization. Specialization is fine up to about 100 people then it is a luxury for special projects. If you need someone who makes up less than 1% of the population to do something your technology needs a reset and it sucks. Our goal is total freedom for 100 people.

Also a major point to make sure is in here is about ownership, and how the concept of ownership is not just IP but novelty and getting stuff named after you and all that. We need to change how we think of achievement and eliminate the concept of ownership if we are to get the full benefit of ideas. I aim to prove in these pages that capitalism in addition to a moral failure is a technical failure, that the underlying philosophical ideals of capitalism have prevented technical progress in all of our lives. Ownership is always wrong. All property is immoral and holds back progress.

The Trash Wizard Alternative: Adventure!

An essential part of any manufacturing operation is "supply chains". For reasons that are not clear to me military people use the term "supply line" at least historically. I shall now ramble about both in the context of things I've been reading recently. First of all, I just finished a book about US involvement in Asia from the turn of the last century through the end of WWII, which was fascinating, called Empires on the Pacific. Also, unrelated, I saw a news story about the owner of a plumbing shop in Texas who's suing a car dealer because he saw his logo on a truck used by ISIS on the TV. Apparently the truck somehow made it from Texas to the middle east and was acquired by ISIS.

What struck me about this story is that reading about the conflict of various imperial powers during WWII, supply lines were always one of the biggest issues for all parties involved. The Americans, British, Germans, Russians and Japanese were all competing for very specific raw materials like rubber, oil, and various metals. These are very specific demands. The war machine of each major power individually needed a supply line of rubber from the plantation to the jeep factory if they wanted rubber tires on their jeeps.

Not so now. Anyone with money can get anything now, almost immediately. Does ISIS have some supply chain of rubber, steel, copper, silver, and gold to make trucks? No. Just oil. With oil they can get money and with money they can get anything. From anywhere. And it's not that they wanted a truck from Texas, they just didn't care and neither did the global market. Was the truck American and made in Mexico or Japanese and made in Georgia? Were the parts made in China or Eastern Europe? Who knows? Who cares?

The world of the modern supply chain is almost unbelievably different now than it was half a century ago. I believe that this is a fundamental shift that government and corporate structures have not yet caught up with. If rubber, steel, plastic, copper, silver, gold, aluminum, glass, etc. are all everywhere and moving around the world all the time, the assumptions that industrial empires have been based on in the past fall apart. Corporate and state structure have a lot to do with economies of scale. In the age of industrial empires nations the size of the USSR or USA and companies the size of IBM or Dow win over their smaller rivals due in large part to economies of scale. I claim that those economies of scale are worth way less in today's world than they were.

I realize this is nothing new and has been said better many times and with more facts to back it up. But it's relevant for my project because it relates to how I want to recast the supply chain problem. I believe that if we are to have a brighter future or in fact any future at all it will be by abandoning the economies of scale of past empires and building with what is on hand, which was extracted and refined by the old system. Humanity used to have to make do with what was available, which often meant not getting what we needed. There is no reason that this would be true in a post industrial future, however, since the last 300 years have already extracted enough to live on forever. That is the goal.

On the other hand, it's a bit horrifying to think how unstable this could all end up. If industrial empires really are obsolete, what replaces them can be very very good in some cases, but very very bad in others. The way for the good to triumph is to build a system that easily absorbs more people rather than rejecting them as our current systems do. Everyone in major industrial empires agrees adding population due to refugees will create economic hardships because it will mean more people competing for available jobs. But this is totally irrational. Surely we need a lot of work done, just look around at all the important stuff we supposedly don't have resources for. The system that wins will be the one that moves beyond the industrial empires and can absorb the refugees from the decentralized evils like ISIS in such a way as to smoothly grow.

No one wants to live under ISIS or work a shitty minimum wage job in capitalist America. People do both because they have no choice. If supply chains were short enough that you only need to get 50 people together to build a functioning industrial society, most people would go that route given the choice. We just need to show the way and people will follow.

I'm against the machine. That's what this is all about. I hate industrialized society, and I resent that the good products of it are used to hold us all hostage to the totality of The Machine. The military machine, the capitalist machine, the consumerist machine, the extraction of raw materials machine, the political machine, all of it. We're told that if we it's all or nothing. Don't like nuclear bombs? No vaccines for you. Sick of the Internet giants controlling your life? Well, I hope you like writing letters by hand, asshole, you must be a Luddite. That's the message over and over from the mainstream of society.

I challenge all that. I say that the course of the last 300 years of industrial development has not been just fixed by some immutable laws of nature but has in fact been the product of decisions made which could very well have been made differently while still learning how the world works and how to make useful technology to better navigate that world.

I am against professionalism in all forms. I'm against engineering and design as professions. While specialization can be useful, I believe our society has created a soul-less techno-priest class which is evil enough in its very nature that technology needs to be re-built from the ground up outside that system. If your technology needs the techno priests to function, it means your technology sucks and needs to be replaced. If it needs extraction of raw materials from the earth or any control over large tracts of land in a centralized way to function it is bad technology and needs to be replaced. If it requires secrecy or proprietary control of information and use it is bad technology. If it can't function without capitalism it is bad technology and needs to be replaced. We need to start over from scratch and build a technology without the existing techno priests which can be built and maintained by anyone with the desire to do so, using waste streams of the old system. This has to happen in thousands of parallel tracks in many different fields of applied science and technology. My goal here is to start a couple of those tracks which fall in my area of expertise: namely electromechanical devices for practical consumer products and some electronic devices.

At the center of this is The Motor, or The Philosophy Engine, or whatever it ends up getting called. But I also want to build up a way of studying and deploying new electronic materials that breaks the chains of the old system. This means cheaper and simpler experiments, all done on available waste materials.