

# Jonah & The Whale

Ore Popoola

March 2022

## 1 Introduction

This is dedicated to the Summer of 2021

“I have emerged from the abyss of myself by making my soul too hard to chew and breaking my teeth on it. I have found in that whale’s belly absolute endless nothing” - Ore

In order to understand my opinions on friendship, existential dread, my psychology of disassociation and Fixation, I must first explain my psychology of insecurity, whose solutions come from my philosophy of the self, which comes from my metaphysics of action and time and determinism.

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>On Memory</b>	<b>3</b>
2.1	Time, and its linguistic structure . . . . .	3
<b>3</b>	<b>Causality</b>	<b>3</b>
3.1	Cause & Effect . . . . .	3
<b>4</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>Identity &amp; Self</b>	<b>6</b>
5.1	The self is unchangeable . . . . .	7
5.2	Personality is unchangeable . . . . .	7
5.3	Contemporary Identity is inverted . . . . .	8
<b>6</b>	<b>On the Psychology of Insecurity</b>	<b>8</b>
6.1	Misconception 1: Insecurity can motivate . . . . .	8
6.2	Observation 1: The insecure are not motivated by insecurity . . .	9
6.3	Misconception 2: Insecurity lays the direction toward growth . .	9

6.4	Misconception 3: Insecurity is omnipresent and unavoidable . . .	9
6.5	Conception 1: Insecurity is illness . . . . .	10
6.6	Conception 2: Insecurity leads to Validation addiction . . . . .	10
6.7	Consequence 1: Friendships . . . . .	10
6.8	Consequence 2: Romance . . . . .	11
6.8.1	Manipulation, Obsession, Toxicity, and... Romanticism?	11
6.8.2	Insecurity makes relationships impossible . . . . .	12
6.9	Manipulation . . . . .	12
6.10	Consequence 3: Shortsightedness, Lack of Confidence, Self-Imprisonment	13
6.11	Idealization- The Gatsby Problem Part 2 . . . . .	13
6.12	The Origins of Insecurity . . . . .	14
<b>7</b>	<b>The Philosophy of Security</b>	<b>15</b>
7.1	Conception 1: Authenticity . . . . .	15
7.2	Misconception 1: Authenticity as manipulation . . . . .	16
7.3	Sight . . . . .	16
7.4	Wisdom & Forgiveness . . . . .	16
7.5	Relationships . . . . .	17
7.6	Misconception 2: We must love ourselves before we can love others	17
7.7	Misconception 3: There is no motivation for the Secure . . . . .	18
<b>8</b>	<b>“ As Above, So Below”, Fixation: Or Mind-Reading</b>	<b>18</b>
8.1	As Above So Below . . . . .	18
8.2	Fixation . . . . .	18
<b>9</b>	<b>Existential Dread: “ Or the Evaluation of One’s Life and the Many lives”</b>	<b>19</b>
9.1	Antidotes to Nihilism . . . . .	19
9.1.1	Antidotes to Nihilism: Death-Centered Ethics . . . . .	19
9.1.2	Antidotes to Nihilism: Life-Centered Ethics . . . . .	19
9.1.3	Antidotes to Nihilism: Responsibility -Centered Ethics . .	20
9.1.4	Antidotes to Nihilism: Inner -Centered Ethics . . . . .	20
9.1.5	Antidotes to Nihilism: Doubt-Centered Ethics . . . . .	20
9.1.6	Antidotes to Nihilism: Greatness Centered Ethics . . . . .	20
9.2	On the Evaluation of Lives . . . . .	21
9.2.1	The First Razor: Time . . . . .	21
9.2.2	1. The Achievement – Oriented Life . . . . .	21
9.2.3	2. The Experience – Oriented Life . . . . .	21
9.2.4	Who lives the greatest lives? . . . . .	21
9.3	Misconception 1: “It’s all Relative” . . . . .	22
9.4	Misconception 2: Achievement and Experience are Separable . .	22
9.5	Unity: The Achievement of Experience . . . . .	22
<b>10</b>	<b>Ethics, and their Psychological ramifications</b>	<b>22</b>
10.1	Truth . . . . .	23
10.1.1	Aggression . . . . .	23

<b>11 Dissasociation</b>	<b>23</b>
11.1 Pointless Dissasociation , Rumination, Oedipus & Hamlet . . . .	23
11.2 Godlike Disassociation . . . . .	24
<b>12 Demonic &amp; Angelic Thinking</b>	<b>25</b>
12.1 Authors Consulted . . . . .	25

## 2 On Memory

” At least in contemplation, actions in the past, are only pulled from the well of memories from input in the future. Sure, you say, reality moves in a straight line, all the while thinking. Yes, the reality of the events may have happened in a particular order, but an interpretation of those events, is completely undivorced from every single other point in time. The entries I share with you, the emotions I focus on, are completely unrelated with the reality in which and when they occurred. This doesn’t mean I’m unreliable, it means the idea of reliability is ridiculous. Without honest time travel, the artifacts of the past are in constant dialogue with the present and future, and we are fourth dimensional agents within.” -Ore

### 2.1 Time, and its linguistic structure

Memory is not experienced as a series of events  $T_1 - > T_2 - > T_3 - > T_4$ . It is better to see memory as a sentence filled with clauses. In each clause there can be nested another. For example, Inside our  $T_1$  there may be  $O_1 + F_1 + S_1$  as within a given time state there is always a multitude of feelings, sensations and observations. These feelings and observations and sensations do not follow a sequential structure, many may be felt at once, or only one. Their absence, or negation can be felt, as well contain observations and feelings within them respectively. However as time is recorded in our memory, there is left only a few dominant tags that compress the moment into a nonlinear sequential time state.

For example, I may be in a bakery with an infinite amount of sensations, thoughts, feelings, and observations I make at once, however, the moment is compressed within a smell, within an observation about the sweetness of icing.

Multiple memories may have the same tag, and so one trigger can cause a cascade of non sequential memories. For example a smell, connecting childhood to adolescence to old age.

## 3 Causality

### 3.1 Cause & Effect

There is none. Or rather, there is no compelling proof of Cause Effect and if we sit on the fence, we have reason to lean away from it. This is also a proof that humans will always have something that approximates free will, even if we live in a deterministic universe, even if and especially if our personalities are static—which they are<sup>1</sup>. Each moment we have an infinite choice ahead of us, and while our ability to realize it may not be constant, that does not negate its existence.

- Let us present World D and World F. World D is a predeterministic universe, in which every effect has a cause., and all ends are necessitated by the beginning. There are no exceptions to this. World F is one in which things, or at least humans, have free will. In World F, given all the information in the world prior to an event happening with a human agent, you cannot predict with 100 percent certainty what will follow. Perhaps some things are caused by one another, but others are not.
- Say you are chasing a rabbit that is moving in seemingly random directions. Could you tell if you were in World F as opposed to world D? Is it moving according to a deterministic plan? Or to its own whim. If we are truly in World D, what is the rabbit being determined by? Is it being determined by the movement of the wind, the time of day, the color of your jacket?
- A rich man offers a poor man a million dollars and the poor man takes it. The effect is the poor man becoming wealthy. But is the cause the man asking the poor guy if he wants to be wealthy beyond his wildest dreams? Is it the poor guy having put himself in the right position? Is it the “Gospel of Wealth” that the rich man read the night before. The Reason, or cause, comes after the event, or effect, has already occurred. The cause does not exist prior.
- Take the mythological gods of times past. In every action of god we now know to not exist there was a cause invented after a genuine effect.

---

<sup>1</sup>The OCEAN model of personality, which widely the most accepted assessment of personality, does admit changes over the course of a lifetime. Openness to new ideas decreases over the course of a life. Neuroticism also decreases on average. Life experiences can also change these fundamental personality characteristics. However this paper will largely assume they are static. Similar to how we still use Newtonian mechanics despite the realization time is relative, the conclusions we can come to with an immutable personality are still extremely powerful and accurate. Similarly, if our personality/Self/Temperament guides us from situation to situation, and these situations alter this personality slightly over the course of a life, then it can be argued ultimately the personality is still guiding its own growth, not unlike a seed with water. “self” limited as in it is the agent that is limiting their own action. It

- In a world without the predetermination of Cause and Effect, Cause & Effect would be invented. It is this tendency that should make us lean away from it on the fence.
- And so, it is revealed that we have Effect & Cause, where causes are invented after the effect.
- End.

## 4 Action

- Whenever a person reports doing an action. Implicitly or explicitly, they also report an intention. This intention matters. It is to the point that action is almost incomprehensible without intention. A man is digging. Is the man exercising? Preparing for Winter? Killing vermin? Context matters. It changes from situation to situation, and so many people say that if we have no control over our situation, we have no control over the contexts and therefore actions that move us from one situation to another, and therefore no control over anything that happens in our lives. These people believe we are determined by our situations, or more optimistically, that we are determined by our actions within situations out of our control. Therefore, we have no responsibility for our actions. This is the Basic Argument.
- While the aforementioned may be the case, my choice of intention for any given action I take is arbitrary. (see: Effect & Cause) Not only this, but my action itself is arbitrary. A man may be digging to either prepare for winter, or for exercise, but I believe the choice of intention and tradition is a free one. The man can be preparing for winter to appease the sun gods, or to feed his family, or make his farm look good for resellers.
- A doubter may respond that the reality of people's actions in day-to-day life is that we often see people choose the same set of actions for similar sets of intentions in similar settings. I don't think this means a person's action is determined by their setting, but that they choose from a "self"<sup>2</sup>-limited set of options constrained by their desires and interpretation of their situation. This will be elaborated on in the next chapter.
  - For example, a jokester continually cracks jokes at a lunchroom table not because of their tradition of humor, but because they desire to

---

<sup>2</sup> "self" limited as in it is the agent that is limiting their own action. It is important to distinguish the self from the self's interpretations of the world, as these interpretations are culturally constructed and transmitted. The self is something deeper, an inborn temperament akin to personality. I use self-limiting here somewhat incorrectly.

please those around them, and their interpretation of the lunchroom tells them that telling a joke is the best way to achieve that. Of course, they have much more options available to them than the limited set they choose from, but those options are not visible within their current interpretation.

- What this argument neglects is that agency we have stems from our interpretation of a situation. The actions available to us in any given situation are not static. They can change in response to new information, and without any new information. Sometimes just pure thinking or math or reflection can reveal new actions available in a situation. So within an interpretation we have free control over, we may/may not have free choice over the actions we end up taking. As our free interpretation leads to our unfree choice of actions, we will always have approximating free will.
- How can we reconcile the fact that we choose similar actions within similar interpretations, with free will? And when we change our minds, it is almost never because we have changed in our personality ( I will argue that this is never the case), it is because our interpretation has changed so as to make other actions within the situation more favorable to a somewhat immutable self/personality.
- Why do I assert the self as immutable, something that cannot be changed when this prior analysis leaves room for either a changeable self or unchangeable self? We will go into further detail in Chapters on security and insecurity.

## 5 Identity & Self

“Ultimately , the current concept of personality and self is useless, well useless in comparison to the preparation , creation , observation and consumption of opportunity. With the former, you will have control over yourself, with the latter, you will have control over luck itself. “ – Ore

“But Ore, The self is nothing but this!!” - Ore

A proper understanding of the self, of who we are, is something that will help us solve a lot of cultural problems relating to insecurity, relationships, existential dread, self-loathing and ethics. It’s really easy to get right, but getting it wrong can lead to a ton of wrong conclusions later down the road. The first aspect is going to seem a little contradictory, given the prior section. Before we can figure out what the self is, we must begin from certain axioms.

## 5.1 The self is unchangeable

- People often believe that accomplishments will change who they are. “If I do X, something a brave person would do, I will become brave”. If I adopt this position of a “wise person” I will become wise. The problem with this is at what point do you transition from brave to non brave. At which point do you change from unwise to wise in the course of committing to the action. However, on careful inspection this begins to make no sense. These are actions in desperation to bring about such an identity that is able to achieve them. With the goal that once the personality is proven, all future endeavors into other arenas will prove easy. If I can stand up to a lion, I can handle a high school bully. There is truth to this. Practicing a certain attribute will give you the attribute. Running will make you a runner. By definition. But it seems extremely wrong to make these things aspects of our identity. Are you a different person if you are braver in certain situations, are you a different person if you are braver in all situations. Something seems wrong here.
- We also have the question then, what is the proto-brave person that embarks on the journey to become brave. Doesn’t she have an equal if not greater braveness to seek a quality not already in her life?

“ Obviously this isn’t true. The problem is, this isn’t only an undeniably ignorant expression of insecurity, it’s an irrepressibly selfish indicator of insanity!” - Ore

- And even if you accomplish all of these things, practically is your life better? If you are nicer, if you are braver? If you are wiser? The acquisition of abstract traits will not change reality around you.

”You solipsistic bastard, do you honestly think bullets bend around the wise , attention accumulates among the ascendant?”

- It seems these things only change how the self is expressed, not what it is.
- I claim that this unnamed mysterious self that comes before all the qualities it acquires is the true self we are looking for. I also claim that all of these “qualities” we acquire like braveness or boldness are mere changes in our interpretations of reality as discussed in the prior chapter. These changes in interpretation guide but do not consist the self.

## 5.2 Personality is unchangeable

”Believe me, I’ve tried” - Ore

- Personality is the self. The personality is not the situations we find ourselves in, but a marker of qualities we prefer in the situations we do put ourselves in. This is locked in an unchangeable temperament formed at birth.

- Contemporary Psychology backs this take. The OCEAN model, the most commonly used model of personality in the psychological community, is pretty unchangeable and static. While we may interpret situations differently, what we want out of them comes from our personality and will never change.

### 5.3 Contemporary Identity is inverted

"In every tree, in every frown, and every flower, there I was" -  
Ore

- Our current cultural understanding of Identity is as something that is within the body. From a first-person view, the self is viewed as something that moves our arms, that is within our chest that is between our ears and under our hair, built through actions and experience.
- In actuality, the self is something that strangles our phenomenal experience (Phenomenal experience = raw perception). The self also contains every thought, thought pattern, it is every comment we have on our perception, it is our focus within our perceptions, it is the shade of green, of red, it is the map of meaning we use to interact with the world. Not only is every opportunity we observe part of our identity, the tools we use to accomplish each opportunity is the same from start to finish.

## 6 On the Psychology of Insecurity

It can be difficult to talk about insecurity. Not only is it widespread, it is accepted as natural and in certain occasions, helpful or necessary. This is not the position the Author of this text takes. Insecurity is nothing short of a demon. It is an illness that results from fundamental misconceptions about the world and the relation between identity, perception, and action. It is not rational. It is not helpful, and it is a poison that will cause you to destroy everything you hold dear. These conceptions are very hard to get rid of from the perspective of someone already mired in insecurity, as it occurs from misunderstandings at almost every level of understanding reality. With our established metaphysics of cause-effect, of action, identity and personality, correcting these understandings can move this from a Homeric task to an achievable one.

### 6.1 Misconception 1: Insecurity can motivate

This claim is that insecurity is a force that pushes us toward growth. If you are skinny, it pushes you to gain weight. If you are awkward, become more social, if you are weak, insecurity will make you desire strength. Imagine the world without insecurity. A terrible vision where sorry sorts would be content as they are!



The Sanguine sickness of obesity would run rampant as fat people would become comfortable with their bodies destroying them! Kids brutally picked on would continue to take the punches without altering their situation. In this way, insecurity is the backbone behind the mechanics of change! No one would improve without recognition of fault! But this is ridiculous. We can just make the simple observation:

## **6.2 Observation 1: The insecure are not motivated by insecurity**

Are fat people the most motivated to lose weight? Are skinny people the most motivated to gain weight? Are bullied people the most motivated to gain strength? No. Most people deal with these pains, and cope with it in unhealthy ways. If insecurity is behind growth, then why is it that it is the most insecure who acquire weight, and the most confident, and the most internally invulnerable who manage to overcome these problems?

## **6.3 Misconception 2: Insecurity lays the direction toward growth**

But perhaps insecurity lays the seed and confidence/security is the fertilizer, the sun. Perhaps insecurity lays the path, it reveals the injustice of your environment, while security, an utter faith in your ability allows you to traverse down it. Losing Weight? Getting Stronger? Becoming Braver? More girls? Guys? More friends? More money? Are these truly the areas that will improve our lives for the better. Will the acquisition of these things makes us into better versions of ourselves? Are these things really the points of existence? We argued in chapter 2, that this self is unchangeable. If this is the case, these things will not make us greater human beings.

## **6.4 Misconception 3: Insecurity is omnipresent and unavoidable**

This is ridiculous. Are you still insecure about being unable to read? About being able to stand? Is Michealangelo insecure about being able to sculpt, or Micheal Phelps about being able to swim. In fact, if you were able to go back to middle school now, would you be insecure about anything anyone said to you? If you were a Navy Seal spending years going through a series of near death experiences and you were to return to your hometown, there is likely absolutely nothing that could seriously upset you. Every moment would be filled with a orgiastic happiness in being alive. Absolutely nothing could faze you because you had seen the depths of the terror that insecurity tries to invent and made peace with it. Once we understand that one insecurity can be destroyed, we can abstract this process and destroy them all.

## 6.5 Conception 1: Insecurity is illness

The truth of the matter is that insecurity degrades one's interpretation of one's environment into only the most inefficient avenues. Insecurity demands that one change oneself to fit one's environment. It turns an environment into fate, into providence, into measure of one's existence. A thin person surrounded by muscular people is nearly as insecure as a fat person surrounded by thin people. There is nothing objective, nothing rational here. One's sense of insecurity is not an accurate, god-given guide to anything.

## 6.6 Conception 2: Insecurity leads to Validation addiction

Insecurity demands your addiction to it. Everything, friendships, family, hobbies, all become sources to get crumbs of this irresistible ambrosia. The affirmation, the intimate knowledge that nothing is wrong with you, and that you are in fact satisfactory. Of course, ultimately insecurity demands that you reject these facts by one way or another, because the moment you accept the fact that you really are as charming, as kind, and as interesting as your insecurity would lead you to disbelieve, insecurity fails to exist and melts into security.

## 6.7 Consequence 1: Friendships

Insecurity turns people into securities:

“By seeing people instrumentally, you use them for some form of fulfillment. Whether its one person for their money, or another for their connections and their parties, or another for the future they can give you, you see people as ultimately disposable, depreciating or appreciating assets. They are commodities.” Make no mistake, you genuinely like these people, the feelings you feel aren't fake, they are merely conditional. Because as long as you see someone as an asset class, you are no longer human but a miser, a hawk, an accountant, bent on exacting as much value as possible from your property according to its comparative advantage. Again, make no mistake, you are not evil, you genuinely care. If you didn't these relationships wouldn't last, and you would fail to continue to extract value. From this insecure perspective you are genuinely concerned with the wellbeing of your products. The issue is it is impossible to found a genuine relationship on this insecurity.” - Ore

People are seen merely as benefit exchanges. People are prioritized according to transactional relationships. And you want to know how this makes you feel? Alone. Because this relation toward others is necessarily symmetric. Because from an insecure perspective people only love you according to your value. Something that can always change, in an environment that necessarily can't change, and consumes external validation in order to sustain itself. Sad.

## 6.8 Consequence 2: Romance

### 6.8.1 Manipulation, Obsession, Toxicity, and... Romanticism?

Any secure relationship, whether it be friendship or romantic, requires authenticity.

We define authenticity as expressions of that unchanging character. This will be elaborated further on in the section “The Philosophy of Security”. “The Gatsby Problem pt. 1”

All insecure relationships are predicated on the fact that there is no such thing as authenticity. Because there is no authenticity, an individual can become anything. Therefore, if an individual is treated poorly in a relationship, there must be some amount of time in the gym, some amount of pounds lost, some perfect words and hairstyle that makes it so this other person person has no choice but not to abandon the insecure person. Insecurity sustains itself on a fear of abandonment, that is temporarily nulled by validation. Similar to Gatsby’s character, there must be some set of items a person can acquire to be loved. As shown in the book, this isn’t true. People fall in love with the self that acquires the traits, not the traits themselves. And so, a person who hates themselves to the point where they would not only repress their own identity, but hide it under items to appease others, is a repellent individual.

“There must be some amount of money in the bank account, some elite status or way of speaking that will make people love me. Because there is no static identity, there must be some collection of traits that make it so you will love me, and if there are, I can acquire them!” – Ore

The sad truth is that even if you acquire people by gaining these traits, these skills and gifts, you must rest in the fact your entire relationship is not about or with you, but of these and in these external traits.

“I had people I could depend on, more than ever before. I had people who were more pretty and wealthy, and courageous and intelligent and more like me, and seemed to like me than ever before. People who had gone to greater ends for me. Who I had gone to almost unfathomably greater ends for. But sliding and subdividing each moment there were these ripples. I felt I couldn’t really express who I was to these people. And they didn’t express themselves to me. I still commodified them, traded my time between them as investments to see where I could eke an advantage, who would be a good fit for a party or trip, or adventure. In a sense I was a talent scout. I didn’t see a problem with this until it was applied to me. And they weren’t not deep, we talked about really technical and cool topics and shared pieces from our vastly different lives. We were great setpieces. What was I supposed to do? Act cooler? What is this, High School? And the people who stay with me, is it because they

can't find anyone else? Or because... I didn't know. I mean I had some great actors and we had some great parties. But we were all living and staging our own little fantasies, but I didn't know. A dark part of me wanted to throw myself off a cliff and see who caught me. And it's not like the people I met were psychopathic. We did things for each other, we shared notes, we ate lunch together, and we cared about one another. But how can someone care about you if they don't even know who you are? Sure the instincts are being employed, but without full knowledge... How can they know. How are they loving our hanging out with anything but an abstraction, an image of me conjured in their minds. We are all in our own little movies." -Ore, on freshman year

### 6.8.2 Insecurity makes relationships impossible

"But nothing, nothing big and world changing and death defying has been given to someone because their internal self deserved it. The problem with the (insecure conception of the)self is that it blinds and absorbs. The countless hours spent improving are only a self induced slavery to an environment and people therein. And so we must destroy our selves, and if we cannot kill them, we must forget them, if only to seize what cannot yet can be seized" – Ore

Very few people are able to erase all traces of their identity, or "kill oneself". And so their true personality comes out even if they are insecure. This is not a bad thing, as it means genuine connections can be formed with an insecure person as the true person underneath is visible. The issue is, insecure people are unable to recognize the genuine connections as they are, because they assign this affection to external traits rather than a static soul. The reality of Insecurity means that even if people genuinely love you for who you are, you are unable to recognize it. You can't recognize it, as it would destroy your understanding of the world Insecurity has corrupted.

### 6.9 Manipulation

Manipulation is treating someone as if they are an object to game. It is speaking, and acting in certain ways to get someone to act a certain way. It often involves a misrepresentation of reality. It is inevitable for the insecure person to manipulate because they believe they lack internal value outside of their attributes. The issue with manipulation is that it that even if it succeeds, especially if the manipulator is under the impression that it succeeded, the relationship is irreparably damaged, because now the intimacy of the relationship is assigned a person's actions.

"You only like me because I treat you in a way that makes you afraid to lose me."

“No! I love you for you!”

“How can you love me for me when I am just a collection of traits”

“How can I not love a sunset despite it being a collection of color?  
How can I not adore a constellation despite it being a collection of  
dots?”

### **6.10 Consequence 3: Shortsightedness, Lack of Confidence, Self-Imprisonment**

An insecure person must constantly validate themselves against their environment in order to get an accurate understanding of their own value. They must seek this from other people, and events in their life. This destroys any ability to peer into one’s future as they are countlessly grounded in the present. These ideas will be further explored in the chapters on existential angst. If there is always some defect in the self to be improved, than true self-confidence is impossible. How can one walk a building with a half-constructed scaffolding?

“How can Van Gogh create works of art only valued after he is dead,  
if he is constantly concerned about his present?”

“Van Gogh also cut off his fucking ear”

### **6.11 Idealization- The Gatsby Problem Part 2**

“She’s perfect. She completes me. She is the world to me. She understands me like no other. She has everything I want in a person.”

Insecurity necessitates a distortion in one’s relation of the self to itself. It demands one believe themselves above or below themselves. Self-Hatred, low-self-worth, and too-high self worth or narcissism have the prerequisite of a distorted sense of self and being. Insecurity demands that there is something uniquely wrong about you that must be fixed.

Therefore, All relationships involving insecurity require idealization. If you believe you are incredible, or that something is uniquely wrong with you, and someone falls in love with you, this must mean that this person is unique. They have some special quality, they just “get it” in some way no one else does, that makes them deserving of intimacy with you. If there is none, you must invent one. If they hate you they must be villainous beyond compare, if they are good they must be a saint. As people are flawed, how does the insecure person reconcile this gap between their distorted necessity and reality?

To be put simply, the insecure person constructs a second person, an idealized person on top of the real one which the insecure person interacts with instead. The gaps between the two are filled from pieces of the insecure person’s self. Aspects of the self are stolen and used to patch up the idealized figure. “She” isn’t just like you. She literally is you, and all of her best qualities are ones that

are already within you. Of course this dream guy/girl completes you. Of course you need her and can't live without her, for how could a person live without themselves.

Over time, the narcissist begins to interact more with the idealized figure as opposed to the real one, constructing a narrative in which to explain every action the real one takes. This is to protect the narcissist. Idealization, while natural to an extent in healthy relationships, is something that prevents authentic connection and breeds codependency.

## 6.12 The Origins of Insecurity

Warning: What I am trying to accomplish with this section is somewhat non-obvious and will confuse the rest of your reading. It may take two or more reads. Feel free to ignore it if you wish.

"I was a smart kid. And people disliked the aristocratic, pretentious way I spoke using words they didn't believe I understood from books who were my dear companions. Yet these books were my dear companions because they were the only ones I could express myself to, the only ones who tried to understand my feelings. Goethe is my dear friend, as is Dostoevsky, as they express themselves with that unique accuracy I am starved for in daily life. I find these peculiar interests absorb me entirely, partially precisely because they substitute relationships I could have with others. This means that as I speak to others, I can only share those odd interests no one seems to share, or share at least to my degree. By this way, my very isolation isolates me. When I do interact with others, I am fearful to share my lonesomeness as I don't want people to fake being my friend out of pity, or for them to cure their own isolation. Yet I believed that the only ones I could truly connect with, were those who shared these interests with me, who were inevitably those same lonesome souls I would despise faking to be my friend. I didn't want to make friends to cure my loneliness, and I didn't want friends who would be mine because they were lonely."

And just like that, solitude was absolute, certain and eternal.

This meant I wished to be accepted, except my only requirement be that I be accepted by people who necessarily must not accept me. Therefore, my mission was simple, to not be myself."

"I had to be cruel to prove to myself that these people only wanted to be with me for what I could give them, as I hated myself. And when they inevitably left, my loneliness was validated, and my world

was at peace. What scared me the most was not that they would leave me, it was that they would stay for me, as this meant they could see me for me. If I saw me and disliked me, what would happen if they saw me for me?” - Ore

The origin of all insecurity is fundamentally carnal, primal, existential loneliness. The lonesome person finds an immutable, intrinsic flaw to excuse their isolation. Whether it be their nose or their interest in books. They not only believe this flaw makes them incapable of connecting to others, but makes them doubt those connections they do make.

It was at this point I realized that to be insecure was in reality an act of infinite hope bound with infinite despair. For as long as this flaw exists there is hope! There is possibility of acceptance. As long as someone can destroy this intrinsic aspect to themselves or mask it, necessarily killing their conception of them self, they can live! Fundamentally, The true reason I loved and identified with Gatsby was because of this precisely great hope and utter acceptance of his unfathomable lonesomeness. Acceptance was there, just a little bit beyond that green light.

So, What is the answer to this despair whose despair leads only to more despair?

## 7 The Philosophy of Security

“ I am what I am, and what I am is enough” Does Caesar get self-help from the world? Or does the world get help when they see Caesar?

Security is defined as the opposite of insecurity. There is no acting different for different people. There is no choice of personalities a person can choose from. There is only accepting one’s personality through authenticity, or there is suppressing or obscuring it through the action of manipulation. To the question of “To what extent does our environment determine us?” It answers. “Fuck it. Let’s change our environment”.

### 7.1 Conception 1: Authenticity

The most important thing in the secure perspective is Authenticity. Authenticity as through self-expression. Authenticity is truth in speech in self-representation, and action. Speaking how you think, saying what you believe, and expressing how you feel are all example of security. It is choosing one’s own life and existence at any given moment.

## 7.2 Misconception 1: Authenticity as manipulation

There is a misconception that sharing one's trauma or personal secrets with another person is a measure of authenticity, and is a key part of healthy relationships. Trauma-dumping is annoying, not only in of itself as it is draining, but because it is manipulative. The Trauma-dumper wants to achieve deeper connection with the dumpee by reciprocation of shared secrets. There really is no authenticity here, it is merely the whoring out of one's personal memories for intimacy. Are you your trauma? Are you everything bad that has happened to you? Or is there more to you? True authenticity doesn't encourage the other person to do anything, except maybe reject someone if they have fundamental differences. True authenticity, means that people only like you for you, and you only like them for them.

## 7.3 Sight

Sight is the recognition that our perception of others, outside of the immediate moment, is based on the egotistical representations of the self. So at any given moment we are surrounded by shades of ourselves. Likewise, all we can be to others are begotten shades of themselves, representations of baser or higher impulses. This ties back to the earlier commentary on the inverted sense of self.

This again, makes the idea that insecurity will lead to objective growth laughable. You are merely improving yourself along an axis that comes from what you think others think.

“It was then I broke down. I cried and screamed at the Bucks County Sky! Ore! You are a slave to people who may or may not actually even exist.” – Ore, after his freshman year.

It is also the ability to see beyond one's own environment, towards further methods of self-expression. It is not being bound by one's environment, and the ability to see flaws in one's environment. To the fat person surrounded by thin people, security is not being complacent with one's weight, it is pursuing whatever the fat person desires, whether that be writing, snowboarding, or weightlifting. If weight gets in the way of those goals, then it is the desire to lose weight so as to achieve those modes of self-expression.

## 7.4 Wisdom & Forgiveness

Wisdom, as defined by the secure perspective can be summarized as “picking ones battles”. There is not enough time in life to spend it fighting others' battles. If someone insults you, wisdom is the realization that the person's action is more representative of the person's perception of you in relation to their life, than it is of you as a totality. And refusing to fixate on such a statement. One's abstract “value” is not measured the number of arguments won, and what a pathetic life it would be if this were the case. So, we must forgive. The ideal life can be found in further chapters on existential angst.



## 7.5 Relationships

The authentic relationship built through authenticity is the only healthy relationship. It is the relationship where I like you for you and you like me for me. It is built through honest, authentic self-expression with as great an opportunity for rejection as possible. It has nothing to do with the intrinsic value of the person. It has everything to do with the kind of person we are allowed and allow ourself to be in their presence.

“Friends are not some asset we invest time and money into and hope to benefit us in the future. They are not some tree we water in hopes they bear fruit. Friends are those we have that infinite prejudice in their favor, those we like not because of their qualities and in spite of betrayal and heartbreak. We love our friends because their good is our good! Because our good is their good! Because we are allies, on the side of the angels, of Micheal, Metatron, and Gabriel. Together, with our friends, whether they are stupid smart, fat, dumb bossy. We are friends not just because our interests are aligned, but because their interests are our interests because they are interested in it. That’s what friends are. Not slaves or saints. But allied angels.” - Ore

” We were a rock band! And together we expressed ourselves with maximum accuraccy! Maximum veracity! We danced! Brother, we danced!- Ore

It is the authentic person who is able to see authenticity in others, and fall in love with it. And so the authentic individual finds himself falling in love with all of his friends and those around him as he acts as himself, and finds himself accepted as he is. And when he is rejected, he knows it, that it is for the better, for who would want to be friends with someone who fundamentally hates/dislikes you for you.

## 7.6 Misconception 2: We must love ourselves before we can love others

Insecurity is not an issue with a capacity for love. Insecurity is a mental illness, a contagious thought virus, that corrodes the fabric of one’s reality. There isn’t really a self to love in the first place. The insecure person is desperate and starved for love. Self-love is somewhat of misnomer. As we have already discussed, the self is one’s immutable temperament which guides the situations one puts themselves into and choices they choose from an interpretation. This not something that can be loved, or actively perceived except over a long period of time. Although, It can be and should be accepted. When we are self-conscious, this “self” we choose to love or not love is an anxious expression of egotistical disassociation. From this, it is no wonder “self-love” leads to narcissism. True self-love is ignorance of this disassociated, false “self” or ego . With that said,

a person should be comfortable on one's own. They should be comfortable and present in the beauty of their own reality. Most of this can be done by eradicating insecurity. The rest of it can be done by changing dissociative thought patterns, which will be discussed in its respective Chapter.

### **7.7 Misconception 3: There is no motivation for the Secure**

How do you choose actions from a secure perspective. To be put simply, the secure person does what they want, authentically. This almost always take place in some sort of exploration or self-expression. Authentic expression can only attract more experiences and people that are good for the person as they are. The secure person is just not motivated to do things they do not want to do. To the insecure, this can appear as complacency. Can a person be motivated to greatness without insecurity? I would argue that one is not able to fathom greatness without looking past their insecurities. With that said, there should always exist some doubt in the ability of full self-expression over the course of one's life, which should push a person towards further self-expression. This, is an entirely different phenomenon from insecurity's existential terror at the low-value of oneself.

## **8 “As Above, So Below”, Fixation: Or Mind-Reading**

This chapter will be a short interlude before the next larger section on Existential Angst. It will cover some basic psychological axioms that the next chapters will precede from as the content gets increasingly psychological.

### **8.1 As Above So Below**

This concept is that one's relation to others is a symmetric reflection of their relation to themselves. Similarly, one's relation to the world is a reflection of one's self-relation. This means that how we perceive and treat others has a direct correlation to how we treat ourselves. Socrates argued something similar in “The Republic”.

### **8.2 Fixation**

It is easy to tell what a person is thinking by what concepts they fixate on over the course of a conversation. Similarly, what concepts we fixate on over the course of a day, are no accident, and are often the iceberg of certain psychological structures. For example, an enduring obsession with an ex-lover, can be a psychological structure designed to substitute relationships with others, and relationships with the outside world. We must be careful in self-reflection, to not allow rumination to substitute our engagement with reality.

## 9 Existential Dread: “ Or the Evaluation of One’s Life and the Many lives”

We enter life in a dark room. There are monsters, and the crowd merely wants to manipulate us into doing what is best for them. How do we rely on our own logic to orient ourselves. What shall be our compass? Our north star?

How should we live our lives? How we should we evaluate the past? What to do, when we can do anything?

Let’s begin with the obvious. Before we optimize for the great life, we must understand what gives life meaning, by examining arguments against the premise there is none. So we will be proceed by evaluating many answers to nihilism, or the feeling that nothing matters, lets find a reason to do something.

### 9.1 Antidotes to Nihilism

#### 9.1.1 Antidotes to Nihilism: Death-Centered Ethics

The recognition that nothing in life truly matters is a chilling one. But one way to generate meaning is from the idea that there are limitations on what a life is. And so pushing against them is meaningful. One day we will die, so we might as well live as hard as we can while we can.

“When Rabbit comes to the realization that life is finite, there is no god, the immediate attempt to reconcile his existential horror with the boredom of everyday life is to dive into immediate gratification, into pleasure. Rabbit realizes the limitations of life, of seizing what we will not always be able to seize. There is something death-celebrating for Rabbit in the recognition that You Only Live Once”.  
- Ore“

#### 9.1.2 Antidotes to Nihilism: Life-Centered Ethics

But why rush after things in a rush to grab them before one dies. Why not make this life as pleasurable as possible. Let’s chase after extreme health, extreme pleasure, and collect as many experiences as possible. Let’s do things that are pleasurable in themselves, but lead to future pleasure!

“But on reflection, an opposite yet not superior perspective is asked by Kangaroo, in the consideration that, life is good, and not a problem. Walking among trees is not the maximal pleasure, yet it is a pleasure that, for the Kangaroo, not only cannot be consumed but whose sunshine saturates and increases all moments before, after, and within. In this sense existence mirrors exercise. An act which seems to chemically justify itself, but also justifies the future. It provides benefits, while being intrinsically beautiful “-Ore

But this doesn’t the answer the problem of taking long term action?

### **9.1.3 Antidotes to Nihilism: Responsibility -Centered Ethics**

One way to find meaning is to take responsibility for as many things as possible. To take responsibility for all the things that brought you into being and also all the things you will bring into being.

“Why take long-term action, they ask, in a way that both acknowledges both life and death? Beaver answers, saying it is to take responsibility. To reach an overabundance of satisfaction with life, that one can take responsibility for both ones yet-to-exist children and fans, ones already existent family, tutors and ancestors. “

### **9.1.4 Antidotes to Nihilism: Inner -Centered Ethics**

One approach to life is to cultivate an inner happiness. But, responds the Tortoise, why do this when we recognize that we are enough as we are? We don't need external things to be happy. Whether or not these abstractions are satisfied, we are satisfied, both freed and bound by an illusion of enlightenment.

### **9.1.5 Antidotes to Nihilism: Doubt-Centered Ethics**

Another approach to life is achieve true knowledge of things by experiencing them. To achieve first-hand experience of as many things so as to leave life with as complete a picture.

Opposite not superior, is the confounding butterfly, who confirms the question. Can you honestly make a judgement not having seen all sides? Are you exalting inferiority, she questions.

### **9.1.6 Antidotes to Nihilism: Greatness Centered Ethics**

Another approach to life is to selectively choose things which have the most impact as possible and more than justify their opportunity cost. Things that leave an immortal legacy, but are also a pleasure to experience.

“Yet the truth of the matter comes from the owl, who proceeds as follows. Our desires are not created equally. And there are desires whose accomplishment can both justify past, present, and future, enable other desires we consider above or below our character and which alter the axes the gradations from which we judge life. Yet, the Owl acknowledges, these desires are constrained by relationships material wealth, knowledge, location, experience, which all break down to time as a delta defined by speed. Owl pauses before coming to his conclusion: we accomplish long term goals not only because it is pleasurable and virtuous to do so, but because accomplishing some of them, just once, accomplishes all of them for all time. And these smaller, gratifying activities, are most sweet when never tasted at all. “

## **9.2 On the Evaluation of Lives**

If we know what the greatest life is, we can model ours after it in order to reach it. For our investigation of the Greatest Life we can use a couple of helpful Razors

### **9.2.1 The First Razor: Time**

Imagine a life in which you only had a week to live. Then imagine a life in which you had an eternity to live. Are there any things in common with both lives? I will jump to conclusions for this one and leave the proof to the reader. The short life would be one obsessed with obtaining meaningful and interesting experiences. The immortal life would be one obsessed with gaining as many , or as great achievements as possible. From this we gain two looks at life.

### **9.2.2 1. The Achievement – Oriented Life**

This is the life narrowly focused on breaking records. It is the life focused on building legacies. It is the life built around growth and legacy, and the struggle to be great. It is also the life of consuming as much knowledge and viewing as much art as possible. The great scientists, the great mathematicians, all of these consist the great life.

### **9.2.3 2. The Experience – Oriented Life**

The world is made for us, so let us have all of it! The experience-oriented life is the one that is focused on getting the mileage out of every breath as possible. Every continent, explored. Every ocean, dived. Every chasm, crossed. Every dangerous alley, explored. Every word said! Living life for the sake of it! Racing faster and harder each oncoming moment! Let us take every drug, let us love deep and hard and hear every story and suck faster from the current then its flow.

### **9.2.4 Who lives the greatest lives?**

Are the poets the greatest? Are the conquerors, the scientists? The explorers? Is the Einstein that broke time greater than the Bismarck that created his country? If the fact we are born is owed to Norman Borlaug, founder of the Green Revolution that saved 1 billion lives from malnutrition, is he somewhat responsible for everything we do? Does it all come down to Julius Caesar, does it all come down to the men and women who crossed the Bering Strait? This is easily refuted by the knowledge that there is no cause & effect, these lives must be evaluated on their own, and what they directly caused, not inadvertently enabled years later. Still, we have a problem. But like all problems, they are based on misconceptions.

### 9.3 Misconception 1: “It’s all Relative”

Make no mistake, some lives are better than others. We know this when we feel awe and wonder at envy at another’s life. There are some aspects in the person whose life we wish to emulate that are not in our own. However, envy should not be our guide either, as that only leads us to compare against people in our current area or time. The truly great life must be one that will not change with changing cultural attitudes. The great life must be one that is recognized as great whenever it is heard. If we are to have a compass to the great life, it must not be altered by the magnetic field of changing whims and culture. Echoing the chapters on Insecurity, the great life must demonstrate security. Therefore, the great life must necessarily be one of self-expression.

### 9.4 Misconception 2: Achievement and Experience are Separable

There is an image of the achievement oriented life as one spent grinding, and tirelessly studying for an eventual Nobel Prize or accolade when it is all finished. This life seems to lack the experiential goodness of a life spent climbing mountains , learning languages, and diving into oceans. One life leaves objective immortal achievements, while the other is a life filled with unforgettable memories. However grinding for the Nobel Prize may be filled with unforgettable memories just as learning languages might lead to objective achievements. Nonetheless, How do we unite these two lives?

### 9.5 Unity: The Achievement of Experience

Perhaps we could see a life whose immortal achievement is its lived experience? These are the lives of adventures and odysseys whose myriad of encounters shake us to their very core. The lives where we feel inspired to hear about, whose lives we’d commit suicide to be reborn as. Ex: Goethe, Marco Polo, Hemingway

Or perhaps a life whose experience is its variety of achievements.

These are the lives whose sheer volume of accomplishments astound us

Ex: Goethe, Newton, Gauss

So the greatest life is that which, through self -expression, and experience, is not only an achievement but a series of achievements of experience.

## 10 Ethics, and their Psychological ramifications

“ The greatest good for the people is that which is good for the greatest amount of people” – Some utilitarian.

Everyone knows what utilitarianism is. Fuck you if you don’t. It’s just correct, but it’s not what we’re asking.

The question we are asking for the purpose of this document is: what are the psychological ethics that are built into our mind. What are the things we should

do if we are to promote psychological health.  
This is not dissimilar from the path Kant takes.

## **10.1 Truth**

Truth is an objective moral value. We know this because within every lie there is an implication of truth. Without truth in communication there would be no communication. All irony, satire, etc are methods of telling different types of truths about the world while playing with a person's default understanding. We psychologically feel when we tell the truth and when we lie. Striving to tell the absolute truth in every communication, and not withhold any of what you mean, is true authenticity. This also excludes saying "technically" the truth, to obscure what you mean. It's always saying what you mean and dealing with the consequences. At least in One's relation with oneself.

### **10.1.1 Aggression**

"I am what I am"- Someone much before Ore

Aggression is the recognition that you are what you are, and that is not going to change. It is the orientation that it is the world's problem to deal with you rather, than your problem to deal with the world. These are our only ethics, let them be our guide!

## **11 Dissasociation**

### **11.1 Pointless Dissasociation , Rumination, Oedipus & Hamlet**

"To puzzle out a preferable path in life seems to be against the point. There is something fundamentally depressing in the contemplation of existence, something so bitter, that to look at a situation from a third -person view eliminates the saccharine beauty of existence!"  
-Ore

Disassociation stems from the-will-to-not-be-oneself. It is a defense mechanism to deal with a painful existence. It is a thought pattern that isolates a mind from the outside world. It begins a spiral of self-reflection that destroys one's connection to reality. First, one begins to consider oneself as an object in the world. A person begins to think of themselves and their actions in the past, as if some contemplation of past problems will save one's present, one's future. If one examines enough mistakes, enough broken relationships, enough trials and tribulations, then one will gain control over the present, then the future. In this sense the past becomes a riddle of the sphinx, we, like Oedipus, must answer. And like Hamlet with a dagger next to his father's killers throat, even if we know what to do we are trapped in an infinite regress of what will happen

next, what will follow, and are equally paralyzed.

“The girl is forced to grow old with pain not only in the past, the present, but approaching in all points perceivable. No wonder she is grasped at once by despair and endless existential dread. For she breaks life into its component parts and forgets the gorgeous entropy, the gambling and risk which brings imperfection to perfection.” -Ore

We are so engrossed in our own biography and studying how to live our life without realizing that we are already dead! Our relationships die! Our desire to eat and to breath ceases. And what if we have the answer! What if we know exactly what we will do next because of some ancient trauma, some horrible prophecy, do you know the damage that would do to yourself?

Why live at all when we have seen it all. We at once have that desire to tear our eyes from our face and lie across traintracks! At this point our life turns to a “have to” rather than a “want to” or “get to”. But as we have shown in Chapter 1, there is no Cause and Effect! There is no Sphinx, there is no sacred cause at the abyss of yourself, there is only the reality you are ignoring to mentally pleasure yourself to this disassociated fantasy.

“And the saddest part, is that this Feeble chain of Cause and Effect, this sickening slumber it indemnifies, is not even accurate!” - Ore

This type of self-reflection is useless, damaging, and at best, masturbation. So the world is not enough for you, so seek it one’s own mind? No! The fact is, the harsh, brutal lows of life are not bugs, but features. And we must clench the thorns of the rose along with it!

“Let us see life not as brutal chain of cause and effect, but as a orgiastic festival of vitality and energy! Let us see it as captured lightning, for this image captures the transitory disgust and awe of the pestilence, vigor, shit, courage, gluttony, boldness, lust, love, empathy, misery, and suffering of humanity” – Ore.

And even if you consider every piece of life as it breaks apart, even if you examine feather of the bird with infinite accuracy, you will never understand the gestalt, the beauty of the structure in its entirety if you do not examine the sum of the parts.

## 11.2 Godlike Disassociation

“Art! It is the limited palette, the too-short alphabet of expressions and colons and spaces which unites the constituent parts which are not an insult to the whole but merely a marker of its transcendence.” - Ore



Godlike disassociation is the meditative state in which one becomes enmeshed in one's reality. In which one becomes one with the patterns of the in the leaves, the way zippers knit together, the sound that one girl's voice whispering in your ear over the phone, or the way light dapples on leaves. It is the intense observation of what is, not what isn't that leads to optics, and science, and beauty. It is this meditative disassociation that makes one realize that the limitations of life make existence all the more enticing! It is not the man at the end of his life reflecting on his rights and wrongs, it is holding a shell to your ear and listening and straining for the ocean.

"In this way life in its multiplicity is not a cause for mere optimism nor pessimism, existence itself is a call for existence! It was then I realized I love all of it. I love being alive! I love existence! For how could the florist beget the thorns which raised and surrounded the rose.

I loved living! It made me cry with a hunger that gave me the solemn realization that I must consume it with a rapacity that matched the slow end of my life. Yet it was life's slow yet steady and absolute end that added an idealistic fervor that with its absence would mean an end to the essential,sufficient, and necessary pregnancy which exuded from its pores." – Ore

## 12 Demonic & Angelic Thinking

"Your thoughts are not your own" – Ore

"It is the human impulse to confuse description with prescription, or most importantly observation with opinion. It is through this that thought becomes the primary vector of not just our mood, but our perception of reality. It is only once we cast off the chains of a perverted rationality founded in falsity, when we destroy this impulsive thought we believe is us, in its entirety,thereby killing "ourselves", that we can truly live ." – Ore, going through a rough moment.

### 12.1 Authors Consulted

The ideas from this text stem from several authors I've read. Here are some you may like if you enjoyed this.

- Heidigger
- Arendt
- Emerson
- Sue Johnson

- Thoreau
- Nietzsche
- Jung
- Plato
- Aristotle
- Homer
- Salinger
- Rimer & Dunlop
- Pollock
- Hume

Thanks also to the people i had millions of annoying conversations with to straighten these ideas out.

The end

Hope you enjoyed reading this!

Special thanks to my first reader, Hagey, who I would not have shared this without his enthusiastic response.