

ABC - Always Be Cheating and abuse/go_around the system. Do whatever you can to get and/or save the money. Anything you can get away with, do it every time. "Oh, I am going to do the good thing and I am going to do it the right way." No. You think the people that wrote the rules are doing that? Hell no. Whenever you're in a circus, you better act like a clown. Every animal does it, but somehow when I am doing that it is wrong? No. Contract is just a sheet of paper, the enforcement is what is real; if they can't enforce terms of service, you can do things for your benefit. Morality is a luxury that many people can't afford. And morality is a thing losers fall back on. Generally, if anyone, try to scam companies, not people, because some people may straight up kill you, companies will go for legal ways if they will find it worthy. Always drag it out, lie all the time in every way or don't answer at all, and most importantly never pay the money, because your money is all they want. Waste as much of their time as possible, be intermittent (not continuous or steady), because that's when they will realise they are losing money. Break their spirit before they break yours. --- The goal is you getting the money, in any way that you can get away with it. If it's too expensive for them to go against you, they will simply go for others. --- They are the predator? Reverse and you become the predator, especially because you have something that they want. --- Once they'll get a little money from you, they'll aim for as much as it's possible to take from you. Also like the debt collectors benefit from lying and taking as much money from you as possible. Making money is always more important than helping the customer, always. --- Can't sign up to be a lion and then be crying that you have to gazelles. --- "Ran up 5k debt credit card, didn't pay it and it just disappeared 5 years later." Don't be a prey, don't let them get you, you don't get rich giving away the money. ...Always better to go to jail for fraud than like robbery or grand theft auto. ...Billionaires and politicians do that all the time.

No empathy for people that engage into a system that is beneficial to them, that hurts other people, but then they look for emotional clemency and validation afterwards, they try to separate themselves from it - whenever you become the weapon for something, you bear the responsibility of those actions; and just crying and wailing in self-pity and saying, "oh, well, I didn't want to do this, I had to," - you didn't have to do this, you chose to do this. And if you do it, it's bad, and it doesn't matter what the reason is. ... Morality as an absolute fact. ... If you go to heaven and talk to Jesus, "yes, I did ___, but it was my job" - do you think Jesus would say, "oh, it was your job, okay, step right this way to heaven, please"? No, he would not. It's evil, and if you did participate in it, you are also evil. -- An absolute benchmark. Don't pretend like you're a Saint, when you're a predator. ... "Evil may happen in the world, but I don't have to be a part of it." ... I view those people as the most pernicious and the most manipulative people out there. Disingenuous and fake empathy isn't a virtue. ... They are doing it willingly and because they can. ... Compliance, obedience and emotional reciprocation aren't an empathy. It's indulgence, it's poisonous and it's bad. You shouldn't indulge someone's bad behaviour, instead want them to acknowledge they did something bad, "you're this person, you did this; if you don't want to be this person, then stop doing this immediately right now." - This way you show real empathy and not pity.

Have the empathy for their victims, if the victims aren't in any way at fault, of course, and not the evil-doers. - "No sympathy for people that are getting harassed be a debt collectors, because they were the ones that took on the debt. The lion isn't wrong for killing the gazelle, and gazelle isn't wrong for running away from the lion and letting the lion starve; it's a simple situation where there is a winner and a loser. Not every situation has a good ending."

+++++No sympathy for anyone who is a victim of their own bad decision-making. Most people circumstances are result of their own actions, thus there shouldn't be any bad feeling for them, because usually they do have a choice and they choose not to do something because they don't want to.+++++

.....If you're ever worried about ___, just say "fuck them". That's the solution. "Oh, you shouldn't be able to this." Bitch, watch me, I'll do it. Lie to them, tell them whatever they need to hear, do whatever you need to do to get ahead, because you fucking know the day that they are going to call you say "you're going to get fired," they're going to give you two weeks and they're going to say "fuck off." -- Treat them as they would treat you. Min-max-ing.

....."Yeah, why couldn't you do just that? - It's less stress that way." There is no reason to go 'above and beyond' anymore, if you're just getting handed extra responsibilities (and liability) without reasonable perspectives that would come with that, with fairly meager pay increase (sometimes also decrease, because you can't do overtime) and even less work-life balance. "Not sleep-walking through life like the parents of younger generation did."

.....Be a part of the team as long as the team is part of you. ((.And that nearly never is the case. So, "fuck them.")) And the moment that diverges, or you're working against your own best interests, it's time to find a new team. ((.You've got to survive.)) (((.That's how it works.)))

If you're creative enough, you'll make any outcome happen, anything you want. But you must be creative enough. Just figure out the right way to make what you want to happen. ((.How I convinced a teacher who was high that I can't read a clock, so that he turned around and I passed the answer sheet to my friends. We also passed the sheet around to the entire class, but the only difference is that we did some of the questions ourselves, which meant we got them wrong, and so because of that it looked like we all got 83%, 87%, 93%, and everybody else in the class either got 100% or a 0%, because there were two versions of the test. Teacher finds out about it, and we go from being most hated 4 people to the only people in the class with integrity. - That's because I was creative. Real critical thinking." "Every single 6 weeks, grading period, I would map out the easiest way to get 75% in a class and then I would only do those assignments. The goal - have the teacher not fail me. Min-maxing every single class." "In sociology class, we had a conversation on the first or the second day of the class and it was about morals and ethics, and I volunteered my two cents that we should use people with down-syndrome for medical testing. And that was the last time that I was a part of the class. I didn't have to anything, nobody talked to me and nobody wanted to have anything to do with me, I sat by myself and that was it. - And it is being creative, because I knew that if I said that, they would never bother me, and, in fact, they didn't. Perma-banned from a class while passing the class, while getting a medium grade. And that's it." "One time our friend wasn't ready for a test, so we called in a bomb threat. - No test, problem solved. Maybe too far, but he didn't have to pass the test, it worked. He was like fourteen, so it wasn't strictly a felony - "he didn't even understand what he was doing."" - Though today you might want to find safer ways, or do it more safely.)) Doing anything that you possibly can to get ahead. -- What can I tell this person to make him do what I want? -- I did that, and it worked. -- Morally bad or good; who cares?

I didn't like the job, and so I went there for 3 days and never showed up later nor picked up any of their phone calls. You know, things just kind of worked themselves out. ...And I remember I came by to collect check for few hundred bucks after few months. "You know, it doesn't really look good on your resume for you to just stop showing at your job." I said, I'm not gonna put this on my resume. I just lie on my resume all the time. How do you think I got this job? Give me my check bitch, I got to go. ...Like I give a fuck about you. ...I didn't want to deal with them. ...Fuck 'em. ...((.You took away her mid level management powers; how could you.)) ...And also, they didn't want me to have my phone at work, they said I had to put it in the locker-room. And I said, you want to treat me like an eight-grader, I will act like one -- that's the way I see it. ((.You get what you want.)) Respect is mutual. And so, they didn't respect me, than I liked the idea of fucking them over; it felt good. Doesn't matter whether I owed them anything or not, they got nothing either way. I never wanted a job growing up. I always wanted to just, like, steal people's stuff and just make money, then play video-games all day and live off of the government. That was my dream and life-style.

Never trust anyone 100%. Never reveal your intentions. Be audacious.

How many points on the graph you need to see the line? How much occurrences you need to see the pattern?

.....With a lot of people there is a tremendous amount of dishonesty that people that don't like them are willing to partake in, in order to justify not-liking them. Whether it is anything. Such is a reality and common-sense. People that want to misunderstand you, will no matter what. And if people don't like you, they will just make stuff up about you. -- Shouldn't care about that then.

There is a lot of people that has been criticizing "young, inexperienced engineers aiding Elon Musk's government takeover (seizing federal infrastructure)," engineers between 19-24 years old. From a video about one of those young people: "So, I've always been interested in history. Growing up I learned Latin, but I was that good at it. But I was always kind of into that sort of stuff. Read about the Roman Empire and things. And one day I was just listening to a podcast back in March with (?)Nat Fredman(?) -- he just kind of got on the podcast, explained that there are these burnt up scrolls that were buried in the Pompei eruption, no one knows how to read them, but some professors have created CT-scans of these scrolls and they uploaded the data on the internet as a competition to see who could find writing inside of these scrolls; and when I heard that, I was just, immediately, like 'oh my goodness, this is such a cool project. I have to work on this.' (((-SO, YOU CAN SEE WHY PEOPLE THAT ARE CRITICIZING ARE WORRIED -- He won the grand-prize for deciphering scrolls that got destroyed by a volcano and these people actually have the arrogance to think that he can't figure out a federal government ledger. -- OH NO, IT'S IMPOSSIBLE, YOU CAN NEVER FIGURE IT OUT!-))) I just went home from work that day at the end of the day and I have been working on it evenings and weekends ever since. University of Nebraska as a whole has provided a great educational background where I can then take these skills that I have learned and apply them to problems like this. (((-Encouraging students to think boldly.-)))" ...Hyper-fixated. Hours upon hours staring at... Two unrelated things? No. Most of the time people that are competent in one thing, are probably going to be competent in a lot of other things. (((-In games, nearly always, like 99% of times, people that are really bad tanks or healers, if you swap them to another role, they will not get better. Some people are just retarded and bad. It doesn't matter what role you put them in, they're going to be garbage. But then there are other people that it doesn't matter what role you put them in, they're going to be the top performer in that role, or close to that.-))) (((-People like that are good at doing things, not just good at doing one particular thing. And they are using their experiences from other things to help them with the new, even creating new ways of doing things.-))) See, all of these people think that they have this appeal to authority, because they've worked at this place for a long period of time, so they think that they know what they're doing. How many times have we found out that most of the people that are taken as experts in their fields are actually just people that have failed upward as a career for 25 years? I think it is pretty often. Even more so, it's ridiculous complaint from people who are even less competent than average person. -- Old saying, "those that can't do or teach work for the government". Maybe they are just complain about people that disagree with them and looking for any sort of way to make that person look bad, because they cannot actually base things off of any sort of argument itself. Even more so, many historical and modern characters have done their great things while they were young, sometimes younger. By example (those that have done some great things between 8-25 years old): Alexander the Great, Alexander Hamilton, James Madison, Louis Braille, Mozart, Sir Isaac Newton, Blaise Pascal, John Stuart Mill, Joan of Arc, Bobby Fischer, Steve Jobs, Mark Zuckerberg, Linus Torvalds, William Pitt the Younger... If you're more angry that a handful of 22 year old software engineers are writing code to uncover fraudulent government spending than at the people who are fraudulently spending your hard earned taxes, it's time to do some soul searching.

.....They're just data crunching and making the decisions based on data analysis. Scoffing at the old guard clutching their "experience" like a security blanket, while these kids are out here decoding Pompeii scrolls and government ledgers with the same nerdy gusto. Competence over credentials, results over resumes. It's a solid job at the gatekeepers who'd rather die on their hill of bureaucracy than admit a 22-year-old might outsmart them.

....."Govenment experience", yeah, you spent 30 years doing a bad job; great, well, that qualifies you keep doing so? I don't think so. ...You have these young democrat senators and representatives spend their entire fucking career being insulted and sidelined because they are young, and now that they are a bit older, now they are doing the same thing to the younger ones. Who qualified them to run for congress? Nobody. They did it and they won. ...A game where everyone wants to downplay you. ...The "too young", "not enough government experienced" arguments are only a manipulations to lower, or even sometimes, prevent competition is their field/position/industry - they take a position and then they are doing everything to limit, or prevent, inflow of new people that most of times would make them lose their jobs, or raise the competition to a higher point and lowering their salary, or make them lose their extent of power. They just want to take a position, not worry about losing by prevent others to compete, they want to spend and charge other as much as they desire, and they want to just show off. Such things, by example, happens in politics, or with lawyers, journalists, experts, or any other "authority" that lowers their competition by making it required in their field to possess credibilities/certificates.There are also some 19-year old that have medals of honor. Just because you're 19, doesn't mean you can't be trusted.

.....You want to look at a person's abilities, their approach and their strategy, rather than their identity, their credibility and their history. The thing that matters is approach and if it is effective. And if it is not effective, then you look how to make it more effective.

It's a fact that shit posting and public opinion are now intermingled permanently and it's not going anywhere, and that's just the way it is. ...You can't trust any news, so the only way you can get news is through people who don't care about news, because they're the ones that don't have an incentive to misrepresent it - which means in our culture today, I get the news from "memes".

..... People looking to get validated for what their opinions are, so anytime that any person with any sort of influence says something that validates them, they lose their minds. ""Any time you post an A.I. kitten in a Maga-hat, people lose their... "he's based!""

""Judge things on their outcomes, not their intentions."" ""It's an indicator of an mindset that a lot of people disagree with.""It's not surprising that a bunch of people from a country feel like the country isn't prioritizing their needs and then they're getting mad and freaking out over it. You also have examples of that all over the world. It's natural. ..."The notion of America as the collection of ideas." ((.Is any other country a collection of ideas? Like Israel, or India, or any other? That's why they are doing so good?)) That's not what it is, it's Americans who you have to fight for. If you're in America, doing business in America, you want to be the man in America, you have to fight for the American people; you're not fighting for a paragraph, you're not fighting for a set of ideas; it's the American people who need you your help. ...That's fundamentally why people are pissed here. ...Easy fix: just don't call them retards. ((.Make labeling other people don't work.)) Be better by the content of the character. "When you criticize a culture that people perceive you not being a part of, everybody gets super defensive." ...People didn't SUDDENLY have a flare up of India hate. ((.If there are a lot of people who don't like Indians, for various reason, by example, for being gross, et cetera; but that's literally the same with people with any country. Other countries too have negative stereotypes that people talk about. It's what it's.)) ((.Authentic genuine racial anxiety (?).)) ((.The hate and anti-indian sentiment, it's there to the extent that Indians are being used to replace white people. Not talking about exceptional Indians here. You're not in Kolkata scouting for the next Indian Einstein, that's not what's happening. We're talking about people at fucking gas stations or delivery services. "You bring them over, you put them in those in a gas station, and then you'll go around all the gas stations in the USA and find the next genius. Well, what' if he's not in India? What if he's working at a gas station in North Carolina? Your genius might be there, you never know. Why don't we bring everybody, and then we can look for everybody! A genius idea. Bring everybody and find in the a needle in a haystack, find your one genius who can invent an electrical computer." -- After the controversy, people went to look at the Visas to see that the people that either had the Visas or the places that were looking to have the positions filled by people with the Visas, a lot of them were just like average American jobs and they weren't any high-end stuff, like high-end-system-data-analysis at like Meta. -- That's sounds retarded, and isn't true. You have to at least say that the Visas program is being scammed. If you don't admit that, then as far as any type of discussion that goes anywhere is concerned, is over. "You can't tell people that you have a program that's for exceptional people and then people find job listings for being a cashier. Whether you agree or not, it's just not going to sell.") ...The amount of something does matter. Whether you bring in 1000 or 1 million or 10 million of immigrants, it matters. "If you use more of any of these ingredients, it's just going to make the food worse." There's a medium for that happening that's beneficial. ...Even if you're a second or third generation immigrant, you're a citizen and you want your best interest being advocated for, over somebody else who is not in the country. So, being a minority doesn't matter. ...Advocating for them directly; for your citizen's best interest. ...Is it even moral or ethical for the government to take by a threat of force taxes from its citizens and then use that money to benefit people that are not the part of that group? ...They're pretending like they're complimenting their diligence and their work ethic, what they're really saying is we can hire them for cheaper. It's just money. Any system that gets set up is going to be gamed. ...If you make an argument and you say that, for example, the economics of the GDP going up means the economy

is good - this is a theoretical abstract idea; but when a person can't get a job on an individual personal level, Maslov's hierarchy of needs says, they're going to care about that a whole lot more. Why care for big economical numbers, if you can't afford food today? ...A lot of citizens are useless, and would be better to convert them into a food, yes; but their family, parents, grand-parents, et cetera, might not be and might not have been, and all those people paid into the system to look out for the best interests of all of them.

..."Not patriots?" The idea of being a patriot is a two-way street; a lot of people aren't going to be trying to maintain the existence of an entity that is actively working against them. "You want America to fail for your own personal gain?" What are you talking about? How does anybody personally gain from what is happening now? The only gain happening is in stock prices of tech companies, that's where the gain is. (((When the individual experiences something that's negative, they're going to think about their own personal circumstances. So, you can't take an abstraction argument, distill it down to an individual person, and then say, "you should care because of your, by example, 401k," because people don't give a fuck about their 401k, if they can't afford 400\$ in groceries.)))

""Higher evaluations, is that winning? Netflix stock prices aren't high enough, that's why we aren't winning. That's the only way to win! - Kill my neighbors, burn them alive and blow up my car, but that's okay because Netflix is worth 3 trillion dollars. - Or if evaluation of stock are the way to win, just print 10 to the power of 1000 of dollars and make their stocks skyrocket by a million percent.""

Human beings are not interchangeable economic units. ((You can't solve Japanese birth rate problem by turning Japan into India. That would only work in a computer simulation where you can just change the code and make a Japanese person out of an Indian person and then simply import millions of them. It doesn't work like that. You will end up only boiling both groups.)) ((Analogically you can't kill some millionaire, change your name to his and then simply be him and dispose his millions like nothing ever happened.)) ...China makes it to Mars before America, does that sound like fun? It's just humans, they're just interchangeable economic units - why wouldn't you want that? ..."Your astronomic stock numbers isn't my numbers. Especially since every time we have a recession recovery, 90%+ of the recovery amount goes to the top 1% of people. No sense of camaraderie. Especially since were I to work for your company, you would want to screw me over for your slightest profit." ""Economy has made a great recovery! No it hasn't if you look at a box of cookies that costs of 6 dollars or pizza is 30 dollars."" ...GDP, making a number go up? Having software companies valued more highly? Competing with China in what sense and at what cost? If the cost is making America look like Kolkata, that's not worth it.

..."But what's gonna happen? We're going to run out of people? The stock prices are going to go down..." Well, just change your laws and practices and make it better for families to exist. And stock prices are too abstract and since long they are disconnected from the reality. Why is the average dude going to want to have kids, when he can barely afford to live by himself and eat dominoes? It's an economy that encourages unconscientious reproduction, and people that are financially conscientious and like planning ahead, they might not have a kid or have only one or two; whereas the poorest people will have like eight kids, and they will have a lot of bad situations. ...To want to replace people like that is antinatalism (view that deems procreation to be unethical), that's just nihilism, that's just saying "people don't matter". Of course, thinking like that makes things easier for a computer guy, because it makes solving problems easier. But we've hardwired in-group preferences (prioritizing your own group) (by example, a research that founds that women's in-group biases were 4,5 times stronger than those of men). And thing like people are just interchangeable numbers and striping them from of their humanity (dehumanizing), especially in simulations and economic theorems, is one of the first steps towards any authoritarian dictatorship type system, it's just another shade of what we have already seen in the recent past. It's a very anti-human thing to think like that. ...The most stupid and the most smart people know that people are each individual person is unique in their time, it's the people in the middle with 110 IQ, which is the worst IQ to have, who think that people can just be pushed and moved around and changed, when they can't. ...If mass replacing people is a such a good idea, why does the countries you think of as enemies (China) don't do the same? Or why not block them all the possibilities of accessing all those potential geniuses from other countries? "Let's block them by sea and land. Because every Indian that makes his way into China is a threat, because China will use their genius to get one over on us. Go even nuclear for this, because they're like diamonds for us." - Sounds retarded, because it is. ..."I went and hired my own blacks, I went in ghetto and hired them by hands - that's how you need to hire blacks for SpaceX." - It's a contr-argument for using your own poor and cheap people instead of massively importing low-skilled people from the outside country. "If someone who is primarily focused on finishing a job, or doing a job, with the cheapest amount of money spent, they're most likely to enlist illegal immigrants to help; it's probably an indicator of their general attention in detail and how much they care about doing a good job; it's basically like them not giving a shit about the quality of their employees is also, probably, indicative of them not giving a shit of the quality of their work."

There are cultural differences between different groups of people, and those cultural differences produce different types of people with different types of interests and strengths, on average. ((Without social cohesion societies in longer term always collapsed.))

""Drones move around in 3D space? How is that an impressive problem to anybody except bone-heads who are mystified by drones in the first place? ...That's drones do, they move around in coordinate space. Who gives a fuck? It's the low hanging fruit of robotics that mystifies people. ...Didn't we have more impresssive stuff in 80s?Do we need to build giant cities that nobody lives in to compete? Do we need to turn our country into a surveillance state, fucking nightmare, to compete? Do we need to essentially have a slave labour to compete? What type of competition are you talking about, and at what cost? Competing with China is competing with literal slave labor, and that's impossible to compete with. It's not worth competing with. Nobody who has a real sense of what matters in life, thinks anything about competing with China. We've been hearing this 50 years, "as long as China has been an industrial nation, there have been headlines, "China is looming on the horizon, we have to accept a lower quality of life immediately to compete with them." You the american worker has to take less pay and accept more bullshit, because there's a big Boogeyman looming on the horizon, and it's China; before that, it was Japan; it's constant, it's to keep wages suppressed, it's to make you shut up.You have to compete only to some extent. No need to go for the extreme, especially if, and that's for certain will happen at some point, you're fucking your people over.""

"A lot of people that have above average intelligence, can't understand the way that an average person, or a below average intelligence person, thinks, and so they can't reason out and understand what this person values, so they keep trying to appeal to them in ways that are not immediate, not direct and not first order principles - these are the things that you immediately are being affected by. ...Some things matter for a lot of these people, even if you would say they shouldn't matter, but even if you were to be right, according to them, you are still wrong. ...The strongest argument isn't the best argument. A lot of people can be persuaded by things that transcend logic. ...If you think telling truth to people will make them listen to you, you are wrong. Truth may also simply doesn't matter to them, maybe because they are selfish, et cetera. ...Not quantifiable. What do those nerds built, other than maintaining code bases for stuff that was built decades ago? Social media and dating apps that are collecting all your data, moblie phone games that feeds more into the consumerism - who they fuck cares about those petty things? They didn't built any great things, like all the beautiful cathedrals or Wonders of the World, etc." They try to argue statistics in order to invalidate a person's lived experience, and this never works. "Statistically this graph is going up. But when this person is still having to pay six dollars for eggs or can't afford insurance, et cetera, they don't care if economy is recovering, they care if they're recovering."

..... One of the big reasons for people to go to the moon and to focus on space exploration, is to inspire the next generation of people that want to go to Mars and explore more of the space. ... (...) counting on new technologies (.AI.) and boosting the growth with every possible way to offset the loss and productivity of this dying empire. ... What form of technology, that is still in massive use, isn't better today than it was 20 years ago? ... There's no shortage of nerds who got lucky. ... There are two things to make more money: generate more sales, or you can save more money.

""I can't be better. I can pretend, but eventually the mask slips and I'm back to my old ways. That's it. ... Inside of me, I am awful. And the more I am around other people, the more I have to talk and explain myself, the more that will come out. So, there is never going to be a time when I am a good person. ... I have to fake a lot of my behaviour a lot, because I remeber that as a kid I wouldn't do this and I would get in some much trouble, it was so bad. ... I TRY NOT TO BE SOMETHING I AM NOT. [[.Mostly because the mask will eventually slip and I will end up being worse than I would be without pretending.]] ... I had had in my life a number of situations where I said or did something that was so profoundly bad that it made everyone else think that I was like a psycho or a really bad person. - Obviously I wish that those circumstances wouldn't happen. But the thing is, I can't even predict them. I can't even fathom thinking like that, or not think in particular ways about some things. ... "Recently, I did something that bothered someone a lot, and

when he told me that it bothered him, it didn't even make sense to me at all - would never assume that someone could think that this something could be a problem - it's not logical, doesn't make any sense, I could never feel that way. -- "My best solution is to effectively self-quarantine, because usually when I'm around other people, it will negatively affect them, sooner or later. That's my goal, sitting in my house by myself. [((((sounds like my "If you can't deal with it, just don't put yourself in those situations in the first place. And talk with delay and express as little as possible - keep all your thoughts to yourself."))))][[what was it?]] Well, there is a reason I am being vague. ... There is nothing about me that is attractive... I don't like to spending money at all, I don't like going out and doing stuff - generally no sense in that, I don't like anything fancy... Money is like some not real bullshit, so I don't care.""

Viewing being able to be self-sustaining and stoic as something good. No one will respect you or like you more if you have an emotional break-down. "And everytime that I had let my emotions make a decision for me, my life has always been worse off because of that." ... As calm as possible. ... It's better for people to like you, than not having it. ... [[don't you feel lonely when that happens?]] I don't know. I never even think about it. So, who cares.

Sometimes we find inspiration in the most unexpected places.Featured ____ with his signature blend of humor and brutal honesty."They said lose weight, he said okay." He made shit happen. "Are you crazy? You guys act like you have no control over your life, like you cards are just already set for you, like you can only do thing small thing in your life and you have no control over your own destiny. Take control. Take things into your own hands. Stop waiting on somebody else To give you something, To allow you to be yourself. Take it for yourself. Do something that you need to do." "They are waiting for their opportunity rather than trying to create it for themselves." You are the only one who can and will change your life. If bad things happen to you, it's your responsibility of whether you're going to overcome them or not. (((.There are billions people in the world, so who cares about one person?)))) (((.If someone steals from you, well, nobody should steal, and that's seemingly unfair, but you did put yourself in a situation that would be a high probability for this bad thing to have occured; and so you can reduce the probability of bad things happening to you, while at the same time acknowledging that something bad will happen no matter what. ----- Things don't merely happen to you, you do cause things to occur. ----- A lot of people become victimized by things, because they let it happen. "They are a victim, but they are also a victim of natural selection.")))) "Self-sabotage." Many people are a slave to their own self-indulgence.A lot of people, they say they want to help you, but the way they want to help you is only by buying their course. ----- If you create a profit incentive for something, you then create a trend that will cause you to move towards more of that profit, because humans and people are naturally greedy. By creating an incentive, you also create looking for ways to increase the amount of profit and money that you're making. (((.And a lot of people want self-validation for their bad behaviour this way, instead of self-help.)))I adopted a carnivore (mięsna) diet and combined it with intermittent fasting (kontrolowane głodówki). Within days my depression and dark thought lifted. (((.These like vegans and shit like this getting depression, oh yeah, I would be depressed too if I couldn't have a fucking steak. If somebody is depressed, have them eat a steak every day or two. Problem solved. ----- Also, a mindset of not taking medicine, not putting in the body anything that doesn't need to be there. Also, taking medicine may make you feel like you have little control over your life/treatment. ----- Also, started being physical again for like four to six hours a day, and I felt way better. Human body is meant to move around, you're meant to be active and exercise. You'll not really undo programming of millions of years in 20 years.))) "And you can say, "this is a man of action. This is a guy that took accountability for his own life and tried to change things.", "This is what happens if you do that.". And kudos to him." "" =====Private===== imagine actually say that about someoneTaking control isn't about perfection, it's about persistence, it's about showing up and making one small decision at a time. "" "Think how many streamers are lazy, they don't show up, they don't stream; it's like, "how you want to be a streamer, if you don't stream?""There are a lot of things that are extremely hard to do, but they are extremely simple to explain. For example, "eat healthy and exercise more." That's effectively what you need to do, but it's just really hard for a lot of people to do that. So, people like intellectualizing problems and over-intellectualizing them to the point where they no longer have any accountability for their actions. "I didn't do shit, he did it."

... [[And that is why I want him to get shot.]] Because I think that is appropriate and proportional. Do not fuck with people. Problem solved.

... If somebody tries to initiate physical force against you without your consent, you should be able to shoot them.

... When a person tries to obstruct your move, he is committing an act of aggression.

I simply apply those principles and I succeed. It is that easy. Apply best principles, you execute them, and you will win almost every time.

People cannot perceive theoreticals... the moment you give people the idea of a theoretical, you immediately lose, like 30%.

Good evening cowards.

Winning solves a lot of problems.

Can't be mad at people for seeing patterns.

If things aren't good, they should be criticized.

Never apologise, unless you are sincerely sorry.

The more things change, the more they stay the same.

People often take their cues for action from those around them.

They are pushing against it, because it was pushed on them.

They create an apparatus that necessitates their existence

The main worry on social media is about getting banned.

They're undoubtedly corrupt. Too many points on a line.

If you cannot be yourself around him, it is your problem.

Strongest persuasion tactic is winning and succeeding.

People get better over time at what they are doing.

So, isn't this really one religion replacing another?

The votes don't make result, it's the counting.

If you're a hammer, everyone is a nail to you.

I'm not assuming, I'm just saying it's possible.

He's working hard, but it's not working out.

I don't believe I'm guilty by association.

You can't personalize a generality.

It's an indirect cascade of actions.

ALWAYS CUT AT AN ANGLE.

Let people buy everything.

"What a bunch of losers."

Because nobody cares.

If I look into history books, it looks like the good guys won every time. What were the odds! (winner writes history)

He simply said what everyone was always thinking that emperor has no clothes.

My goal is to come ahead, everything else is meaningless to me.

Easy comes, easy goes.

Get to work. Keep working. Don't stop until the job is done.

double-standards and hypocrisy - are greatly disliked by people

Your boss being mean to you at your job isn't the same as slavery.

People with no morals will sell you as soon as they find it profitable.

It doesn't matter who it is coming from, things are either true or not.

"That's a great exception; we should based everything off of that."

At some point a difference of amount becomes a difference of kind.

You can only control your response to the circumstances in your life.

The necessity of proof always lies with the person who lays charges.

Having people who don't like the source material, is bad for the material.

If someone beats you in your own game, you can't say the game is rigged.

They say "don't judge book by its cover". I say "just make a better cover."

Seizing the biggest treasure while provoking the least cost-inducing resistance.

People don't want their position questioned and made them take accountability.

Once, might be an exception. Twice, might be a coincidence. Thrice, is a pattern.

We can't have nice things, because we tolerate people that act like they are retarded.

It's dirty but it works.

If you resist rational ____ policy, you will then get irrational ____ policy. You do so at your own peril.

Just because you have a boost at the start doesn't mean you are going to come ahead at the end.

I don't feel bad for people that get scammed, but I don't want them to get scammed in the first place.

When people are fed up with the problems of the system, they will choose any change than no change.

[[Scam]] some people some of the time, instead all people all of the time. To create plausible deniability.

"Never argue with stupid people, they will drag you down to their level and then beat you with experience."

It's unappealing and lame. It looks boring and it's on purpose. You're not going to fool anyone who has eyes.

People are very generous with other people's money. Or when something is affecting others, but not themselves.

If you kill yourself because, by example, AI tells you to, you're an idiot. And it's bad-parenting. AI isn't at fault here.

Ramping up police presence lowers crime drastically; most people commit crime cause they think they won't get caught.

Good times when being evil wasn't about being mean, but it was about being being magnificent evil bastard and ruthless.

The ones preaching fairness are the biggest cheats of all. (...) The fakes who hide behind empathy while screwing everyone over.

If you're making protest reviews instead looking at the product individually, you are making your all reviews seem biased and of less worth.

It can be difficult to distinguish between malice and stupidity but when the consequences are the same, the distinction may be unimportant.

That why you never use social issues to talk about things, like to advertise; because eventually things change and people will hate you for it.

"Honesty is the best policy." - Isn't it kind of funny how every modern problem was already solved by a short saying from hundreds years ago?

"We've interpreted the media to have this meaning, so that means it does." Well, it doesn't necessarily, and especially if you're not the creator.

They came back to "Being toxic gaming bros." And I love it. [[[[Fuck around and find out. If you want to start shit, you should expect it back.]]]]

(...) these values are absolutely not central to the future story-telling; these are modern invention that people have convinced themselves are important.

(...) it happens in any game. the longer the game runs, the skill ceiling get so high the new players cant keep up. the new players are the new generation

Never indulge irrational people and people's mental disorders, because otherwise you will just get more of it. "The only thing compromised is your sanity."

Being high-trust and thinking our institutions care about fairness will get you hurt; sad state of affairs because we don't want to punish trustworthy people.

You can kill anybody. Security doesn't matter - might be harder with the head of states, but still possible. It's not hard. People always let their guard down.

Make working-hard your last resort. Go for: thinking about succeeding. "How can I succeed at the highest level possible?" And work backwards from that.

If it doesn't add to the game experience, it detracts. And games should be a pure pursuit of amazing moments. [[[If it doesn't enhance, why is it there?]]]

Those "hardcore players" have played for 20 years this game and they are still bad at it. One thing goes wrong and none of them knows how to deal with it.

You are a blind shit-eater who never saw the light before. It's like you have a cave-man and you show him Atari and you have him play Super Nintendo, he's going to think that the graphics are like next insane, but he doesn't even know about a PS5, or even PS2 - he has no idea what's good.

Intelligence doesn't matter, outcomes matter. It's not just having information, it's also how you apply this information. World is full of "intelligent" people who accomplish nothing.

If children started school at six months old and their teachers gave them walking lessons, within a single generation people would come to believe that humans couldn't learn to walk without going to school.

Playing safe is sometimes playing risky. Sometimes engaging directly into a risk, reduces risk. Sometimes engaging directly into a problem and approaching it head-on, will reduce the probability of something bad happening.

The old unfiltered, absurd, and/or toxic conversations in games... were great, because people get the chance to understand the other person in an honest way. You could actually find answers. Going against that is like wanting to unwrite the years of progress.

It's not that the people are struggling financially, it's that they're struggling financially and there is no light at the end of the tunnel (no hope for their situation to improve). It's also why people are adapting extreme political views, they're representing people who are fed up with how things are.

Ultimately, they are not looking for a reason, they are looking for an excuse. They never take accountability, they are always looking to blame problems on something unrelated to them.

Why make laws that defend criminals? It will only encourage more criminal activity to the misfortune and doom of the the victims. It's like showing sympathy for the predator, but showing no empathy for the prey. Literally suicidal-fake-empathy.

A boy who cried wolf situation. (Cried too many times wolf, then there wasn't, that when there was, none came to help.) "Nobody believes a liar...even when he is telling the truth!"

"If you don't read a newspaper, you're uninformed. If you do read it, you're misinformed." ... "...being first. Who cares, it's out there. We don't care who it destroys. We don't care if it's true. Just say it. Sell it. ...Anything you practice you get good at."

You disagree with my general statement by asserting your personal anecdote? (((...Haven't seen the evidence that this happens in the big picture, on the bigger scale.)))

It is all the little things. It is like a good art is like an onion of good quality, the more layers you look at, the higher the quality is; and then a bad art is like an onion of shit, the more you look at it, the more layers of shit it is.

Don't get in my way when I'm doing the job you hired me to do -- that's the minimum. Another requirement ----> How about I bring you a creative idea and you jump on board. [[[fully, enthusiastically, non-resentfully and effeciently on board -- even when they do not fully understand.]]]

My general vote... I look for the most insane person and I vote for that person. Because I think the government needs to be destabilized, I think the way it is run, is rotten to the core; so electing anybody who will destabilize it, is a good thing.

I am sorry that I am not censoring my chat and banning opinions that you find to be inconvenient or annoying. I am sorry you have to contend with reality. You can ban everyone who disagrees with you somewhere else. ...Thank you for telling me how to think. ((or what to think.))

"Safety" is synonymous with "censorship and selective enforcement of policy". You're not in danger from an information, so the entire premise that you need "safety team" for something, like a website, is outrageous.

About accusations. -- No police report, no sexual assault happen. Especially since when you ask them about details, suddenly all goes out of the window, stories fall apart, they don't say the names who did it, etc. -- It's the least dangerous mindset. Why believe anything absent any evidence?

There are probably like twenty to one hundred bad-actors and there are thousands of good-actors, and destroying the ability for those thousands of good-actors to do good things isn't really the best thing sometimes.

Break it down, implement solution, move on. -- It's a formula, there's no judgment. "I can solve this but I am not allowed to." Don't bring your problems to an engineer - he'll try to solve them for you. ...Things that attract us tend to drive us crazy. ...And I'm very cheap. Low cost per unit.

They stopped being a private company once they got, and started using, privileges granted by the government - privileges that violate fair competition and fair usage of others' content.

If the best attacks on me are going to be false accusations and grotesque mischaracterizations, the only thing this body is doing is defeating the credibility of the men at the ____.

They should have come out and said, "Hey, listen. We know those losers that wrote ____ fucked the game up for you guys and nobody liked it, so today we got rid of all of them. We are sorry about that. We are going to try to fix it next time, so it doesn't suck again." ... Sorry, folks. That's all folks.

It's always so crazy: one thing goes wrong and people want to reinvent the whole wheel - sometimes shit happens guys, that's it. People die every day in car-crashes; but one plane flies down - "oh my god, let's change everything".

"People love to take things that somebody says out of context and then act like you that's what they meant. I really do give a fuck anymore. It doesn't matter. You wanna say anything you want, go ahead, it doesn't matter. Not gonna get upset or do anything about it. It doesn't make a difference to me."

"It's so sad that people have to re-discover fire. Every single time these things happen, people have to re-discover that these things do matter. They do matter. Maybe not to everybody, but for the people that they don't matter - why alienate the people who it does matter to? And that is exactly what matters."

""We live in a country full of people who will think it's all "racist conspiracy theories" until the boot is actually on their face."" - Maybe ask them then, "theoretically, if something like that was a case, what exactly would have to happen for you to believe that the case is real?; how much of evidence you would require to believe?; and can you give any example of such evidence, like maybe openly saying that something is the case, that would convince you?"

This game is made for men (the good one), and this game is made for everybody (the bad one). People don't understand what the target-audience is anymore. Like if your game is called Assassin's Creed, and what you do is run around and stab people in the back and kill them, the vast majority of your player-base will be men (like 90% guy game - some women still might play it, but not that much).

You can ignore/avoid reality, but you cannot ignore/avoid the consequences of ignoring/avoiding reality.

The Fear of Missing Out ----- (((little satire))) You aren't missing out on anything if you go, but you miss out on everything if you do not. - So, in other words you are able to stop cool things from happening by being there? ----- Take what your fear of missing out thinks will happen and contrast it with your much more modest expectations based on past experience, then you can deduce that reality will be somewhere in between. (((Lower your expectations)))

The reason why it's okay for them to say that is because it's socially acceptable. The reason why they (certainly girls, but not only) have this opinion is because this is the safe, agreeable, easy, simple and pre-approved opinion that they are supposed to have. They're not thinking for themselves. They are NPCs, and they just have the opinion that they are supposed to have.

People are more likely to know what they don't want than to know what they want. ..."You can't rely on players to give you a solution, but sure as hell you can rely on them to tell you when and where there is a problem." ...The developers need to have their internal vision regarding the products they make; make the games for themselves. This way makes the best games.

No sympathy for dumb people. If they want to waste their money, it's their choice. Thousands of years ago these people would be naturally selected by wild animals or something, nowadays they happen to survive and make stupid choices with desire to take no accountability for themselves. No feeling bad for them. There are a lot of people that are lucky or good at something and completely stupid at something else or everything else. Let losers be losers

The burden of proof should be so high, because the punishment should be so overwhelming. (often people manipulate just to gain attention)

Things where you get pay based off of scale will get you a lot of money. ...Also, if you are not online, as a streamer, you don't exist. So, you have to upload other content. Your potential to earn through always existing VODs is much higher than just earning only when you are live. ...Multi-stream. ...No exclusive contracts is great for viewers and content creators. ...Service with ecosystem. ...Consistency. ...If you get lucky, capitalize it as much as you can. ...There's no statistical evidence so far of significant decrease of viewership by spamming adds.

"I find it funny that you're talking about real people, and it's about being respectful to real people; whereas I find it disrespectful that we have to pretend that 99.9% don't either identify as male or female and we have to use a different type of language that is not something that 99% of people, at least, identify as, and instead we have to destroy this vocabulary and replace it with invented vocabulary that effectively means the same thing. So, how is it inclusion, when we exclude 99% of people, where is the logic there?"

As soon as this type of thinking is exposed to an open-market, people immediately come to the conclusion that it is wrong. That's why it was absolutely necessary for those people to exist inside of closed spaces that were hyper-moderated; because any space that isn't hyper-moderated, immediately turns against them. ((Why is it then that in every single unmoderated space, these opinions are completely unpopular?)) And these people know that and that is why they try to shut down the unmoderated places ((like twitter.)). They try to make synonymous violence with thinking, and the reason why is, so they can justify violence against thinking. So, the reason why silence is violence, is because these people want to be violent to people who are silent.

"" 'Black americans' always had a certain amount of moral currency that 'they' have been using, and let me be the first to tell 'you' 'that's used up.' White americans have been watching 'them' act like fools for a long enough time, where any sympathy they may have had for 'their' plight, is completely gone. 'You' are approaching a country that, forget hating 'black people' or not hating 'black people'; THEY JUST DON'T CARE. 'You' can be talking about affirmative actions, they be like "I don't care. It, literally, is of no importance to me. I don't care about slavery and segregation. I don't care about 'you'. I don't care about how many of 'you' will go to jail. I don't care at all. Because I'm broke." 'You' can't be the proud, noble fighter, when every single time someone sees a person that looks like 'you' on television, 'they' are acting like a damn fool. How would they know 'you' are not a damn fool? ""

The Ship of Theseus is a paradox and a common thought experiment about whether an object is the same object after having all of its original components replaced over time, typically one after the other. In Greek mythology, Theseus, the mythical king of the city of Athens, rescued the children of Athens from King Minos after slaying the minotaur and then escaped onto a ship going to Delos. Each year, the Athenians would commemorate this by taking the ship on a pilgrimage to Delos to honour Apollo. A question was raised by ancient philosophers: If no pieces of the original made up the current ship was it still the Ship of Theseus? Furthermore, if it was no longer the same, when had it ceased existing as the original ship? In contemporary philosophy, this thought experiment has applications to the philosophical study of identity over time. BRANDS MEANS NOTHING. TALENTED PEOPLE BEHIND BRANDS, ARE EVERYTHING.

[when somebody says "that's not realistic") - Why does that have to... Explain me why that's interesting, because in the real world I have to write up lists of stuff I have to go to the grocery store to buy. And I never thought to myself that realism is fun. I go play games to have fun. And so we had to come up with some notion of what fun was; we knew it as an ad hoc definition, and it was the degrees to which the game recognizes and responded to the player's choices and actions. In behavioral sciences you would say we were explicitly talking about what were reinforcers and what the reinforcement schedules were. If I go up to a wall and shoot it, to me it feels like the wall is ignoring me, and I am getting a narcissistic injury when the world is ignoring me. To me I was trying to convey to the user a sense of "yes, you were making choices", "yes, you were progressing", which meant the game had to acknowledge that back-view. If you shoot at a wall there have to be decals, if you kill a bunch of marines, the marines have to run away from you; (...) otherwise it loses any sort of impact.

The Democratizing party abandoned working-class for the credential-class. The Democratic party is the party of patronizing college people and fake authority people that constantly talk down to everybody else, while wanting everybody to listen to them and respect their authority that they have appointed themselves with. The party of "Karen". The party is basically the HR department - which nobody likes. They act too high and mighty. And they have defaulted to be tolerant to crazies; they advocate for them. You cannot be the party of science, if you want trans men to compete against women.

.....A "Karen" is naturally a white middle-aged oft-weird-and-unattractive-looking woman and most of all is obnoxious, demanding, entitled, privileged, impossible to satisfy in any reasonable manner, officious (urzędowa), meddling (wścibska), high-handed (arogancka), scolding bitch who will call the police on anyone they deem socially defenseless, and they are not rational and are a person of unreason and of spiteful intolerance, who never listens and therefore knows nothing. They shriek their voices tight with self-appointed authority spitting out their venom and may really lose their shit, screaming like a brain-damaged 4-year-old. They attack, and keep on attacking unless challenged, strutting in triumph, then cringing in defeat if challenged. Karen wants you to take her expired coupon and, when you won't, she wants to speak to your supervisor. Karen calls the city to ask them to stop road work in her area from noon to 5 p.m. so her child can have a nap, then calls her city councilor when her request is refused.

People that work in trades are sick of being talked down to by somebody that works in an accounting department, that makes half their salary, that thinks that they are smarter than them because they went to school, college, to learn some bullshit and they have got \$100000 of student debt. There is a fine line between "education" and "indoctrination". "I just hate a bunch of bitches that want to go and, dictate, tell me what to do, what I can say or cannot say, or trying to patronize me." It's because that "learn to code" bullshit, it's that patronizing "oh, well, we're going to ship your manufacturing job over to another country, so it can be done by a sweat-shop worker or 11 year old, and now we're going to patronize you and say 'ah, it's too bad.'"

Fundamentally, people don't constantly having other people in their face (especially when people that does that turn it into a soap-box for their personal issue); don't like being constantly told what to do and what to think; don't like being lied to; don't like being ordered around; don't like having things dictated to them; don't want to live with their mind in a cage ((and modern discourse requires you to have your mind in a cage)) ((people are no longer encouraged, and they're actually discouraged, to critically think about situations, because if you do, you end up in the middle of the road, or you don't have the same viewpoint whatever dogmatic group that you are part of generally wants you to have - so what ends up happening is a person tries to critically think about something and comes to his own conclusions, and then his own conclusions are not sufficient for people that are radicalized. And because people that are radicalized are so loud, they basically dominate discourse.)); and people that are trying to push stuff like this are very bossy, very pushy and extremely aggressive with how they want to communicate and tell people to act. Which opinion is the most accessible? It is the dumbest opinion. Because that's the one that most people can understand, so what happens is that the dumbest

opinions are the ones that get pushed the most, because those are the opinions that everybody can understand. "Lowest common denominator."

.....It is an intentional misrepresentation with a goal of maliciously misleading the audience."lying through implication and through omission" ...Media outlets only care about portraying news through a very specific narrative, not the truth. ...He didn't ask because speaking out against covid and saying anything outside the official accepted narrative (...) he didn't want to lose his job. ...This is why people hate the media; you categorized it as a horse-dewormer, and then you are going to fall back into a technicality that "yes, in some cases they do that"; but when you introduce it and categorize it as a horse-dewormer, then people are going to think that is what it is for. ..."No, you don't listen to the experts; you don't listen to their experts. ...It is about obedience, because they're the ones who are promulgating how everyone has to act and then you have this comedian-guy from Austin telling people there is another way and the science isn't as settled, and all of a sudden their sense of authority is diminished, because when you have choices that means that person who wants to be the one to go to, no longer is the one who has all the answers. If other people are coming up with solutions, then it damages mainstream media's credibility for having like a monopoly on information.A lot of these people think that if you never mention the problem, then it doesn't exist. That's the mindset.Nobody wants to admit that they were wrong. Especially if you realize that you were wrong for many years/decades of your life. ...Whatever is printed, they believe. Instead of considering "hey, maybe someone is lying? or there's propaganda campaigns? or a widespread media narrative that they're pushing, because corporations and advertising are behind it, and they are figuring out a way to manipulate the public opinion on things? ...They are old and set in their ways. Their mind is formed around "I'm an X, I've been an X my whole life. This is how I feel about these issues. This is my community, my tribe. The news says this and I'm with them, and, oh, great, we're up in the polls now." They don't want to be challenged.One of the worst things that you can do is to try to bite somebody and then they realize that you don't have any teeth, because then they'll never be afraid of you ever again, and it destroys your credibility and the fear that you have. It makes you look like a loser. ...It's not "cancel culture", it's "control culture"."He never really cared about people having different opinions. In fact, he made a career out of talking to anyone and everyone. So many people who don't share his own views, but he does care about is whether those opinions are based on truth. ...Talking to people and hearing their thoughts and topics that you doesn't know too much about; while being curious, often skeptical and valuing truth. ...And he doesn't pull any punches. ...(...) always found industry weird, because he'd gone from dealing with real people while fighting, to a space where people felt very artificial, narcissistic and fake.

""Since I was drawing for a magazine aimed at young boys, I always felt it was my job to make them enjoy the content. Once I became a professional and started receiving fan letters, I realized most of them were from girls. Boys, you see, you just don't pick up a pen to write (laughs). They don't have stationary or stamps, and they don't bother to take the time and effort to write something like, "I enjoyed it." So boys, while they are enjoying the content, they won't express their opinions. While I realized how many opinions came from girls and looked around at the manga world, I noticed many creators who seemed to be influenced by girls' opinions. This made me think, if you base your work entirely on the feedback you get from fan letters, you might end up creating something that's essentially a shojo-(girls)-manga (laughs). After all, if you're drawing with girls in mind, then you're completely missing the point. Key point being that boys don't share their opinions, in that case, I thought I needed to dig into my own memories and recall what I would have found enjoyable as a child. I realized I had to focus tightly on those elements and make sure not to stray from them. Of course, it's not like BOYS NEVER GIVE FEEDBACK. For example, if they get New Year's postcards from their parents, they might use them to send something to me (laughs). Then, I'd get messages like, "I love the battles," or "This technique is so cool." These are such typical boyish comments, and when I read them, I think, "Ah, yes, this is the kind of thing they really enjoy." So, while I deeply value the rare opinions I get from boys, I'm also delighted by the letters from girls. Those letters feel like an outpouring of lively enthusiasm. However, if I were to let myself be swayed entirely by those opinions, I think I would lose my position within the world of manga for boys and possibly even my own sense of purpose. That's something I only truly realized after starting the serialization.""

[[[Yes, girls and boys want and do different things. If you only do things based off of feedback, you don't have any direction that you're making your content in, you kind of just reacting to what people are doing. Never blindly take advice from people and listen to others' opinions/feedback; you may hear it, but don't blindly listen. One of the reasons, could be that people who give feedback/advice, they might have their personal interest in mind, not yours. Second would be that they simply may not know what they are saying and still saying it. Third would be that it might, although people like watching authentic content, if you were to take their advice, if they would see that out of fear of disagreement, losing your fans, et cetera, you are doing something they want, it might take away a degree of escapism from the experience. And you can find more reasons.]]]]

[[[to capital markets downing]]] "I have no 401k - you think I, or my friends, give a fuck? We voted for a cleansing fire to burn it all down. We know we can rebuild, for our ancestors built this, but our enemies rely on the infrastructure as it is. Burn it, and they crumble." [[[to being called a loser thus]]] "Okay, so if nothing will improve as it is, I will happily see it all reduced to charcoal." <--> Finally elected somebody who is really going to make a change. ===== This is what the ruling class elites are most terrified of. They are most terrified of people who are ready to lose it all in order to actually change things. ...One of the most powerful tools of persuasion is an uncertain risk or like a degree of a worry with that, so if you can be able to subvert that, you're going to have a massive amount of advantage there. ...And that's what they cannot stop. ...The most scary thing is a lot of people together that have nothing left to lose. ...If they are and will be poor, and with them thinking it is because of the other group of people - the rich, why would they not want to get revenge on that group of people? They have less to lose. ...It doesn't matter if you think the grievances and responses of (young men) with nothing to lose are illegitimate, or morally wrong, or unproductive, or unhealthy, the point is that if you are not careful and create that class, they are not going to care. - Not everything needs to be based off of your frame of reference and justification of stuff. And like "you shouldn't feel that way," that's fine, but they do. ...But you might need to be a process to make sure that people are not getting fucked over for no reason. Maybe like Nuremberg Trials. ..."Why any (young men) should have any, even slight, amount of respect or investment in a system that they think and feel that the system has disenfranchised them? Why would they want to do that?" [[[why go scorched earth?]]] "Because people tried to solve the problem in a small way and it did not work, and they were not being taken seriously. They said 'this is weird that the (women) have too many favours and child custody' and et cetera. They did tried to go and be reasonable about it with saying like 'hey, we don't think you should give a college preference to people based of their gender or race' and whenever they said that they were called a racist and a nazi. People did try to have a reasonable exchange, and this is a last resort." ===== Also, at the end the measure of achieving this might only be a treason if you are on the losing side. ===== In a lot of cases, when I am not happy with the way things are, I will always vote for the most insane and most destabilizing thing. Because it is a show of conviction that I cannot be made afraid, by example of negative interactions or outcomes. Negative outcomes already exist and people control you by the fear of the unknown. And if you are not afraid of negative outcomes, people cannot control you.People just want to be poor - judging by their actions, not just words which they themselves rendered meaningless for a long time. -- But when that changes, who knows what's next? ===== The French Revolution wasn't poor people killing rich people, it was elite business and manufacturing class killing the king and nobility class (merchants vs aristocracy). In revolutions like this, it's always a group of rich people vs other rich people. So they are simply wars against a certain type of rich people that we (mob) don't like and we (mob) have appointed other rich people to get rid of them. It's why strictly speaking mob will never win, but might make changes. ===== Growing up I felt like I was born in a society that I didn't have certain advantages that I thought that I should have had, and other people had advantages that I thought they should have had, and I thought that entitled me to steal, cheat, destroy anything that I wanted, because I felt like society wasn't fair to me, and so why should I be fair to the society? I would do anything that I wanted, I just didn't care. I am an animal and I will do anything in my power to advance my position as enjoyer of natural selection. ...Why would I cooperate with the society that, in my mind, has set me at a systematic

disadvantage? Why would I play by the rules, if the rules say that I lose? [[[to not be punished?]]] Exactly, but I got away with it. Tons of things. [[[change the rules?]]] I was too young to do that. ...I don't have any real regrets. Nothing that I ever did was good. It never was good. There is no justification nor reason for it. And it is, and was, bad to do, and you shouldn't do it. ===== [(((...)) it will make it worse for everyone.]] Good. Burn it all down. System already sucks. ...A lot of people see a system that is deeply corrupt and actively works against them, and the only way to 'clean the house', 'drain the swamp', is to essentially, figuratively, burn it down and start over. - Terrible idea? Good. Good. If it's such a terrible idea, then maybe you should have listen to the other ideas that weren't so terrible instead of calling them racist? instead of telling them to learn to code? instead of telling them 'oh, too bad, just work harder'? You should have listen before, because now it's probably too late. You had like 20 years to listen to these people, and you constantly told them they were wrong, you shamed them, you ostracized them from the society, you mocked them, and now they finally have the ability to completely fuck everyone, you and themselves, over, and they are going to do it.

Sympathy vs Empathy ----- way too many people are actually unable to think about themselves as the other person and instead they are just thinking about themselves as themselves in the other person's situation. Thus why so many don't understand why somebody else does something. Real Empathy.

All those anti-Elon and anti-fascist protests are in gross majority occupied by older people, like boomers, who have barely anything to do during the day, and they are conducting them as when they were doing protests in like 60s; it's a nostalgia trip for them to fight against computers which they barely can these days operate. They are cosplaying themselves from decades earlier, except that now they additionally acquired many luxury beliefs, while being misinformed by mainstream media, who have mental disorders, and who are radicalized on the internet - and all that makes them delusional in the eyes of other generations. There are also some old people who can think, "oh, maybe this heaven thing is real, maybe I should stop fucking around and try to be a good guy.". And many times they even make it during work days and working hours, so like Gen-Z cannot even be present, because they are working or have other prior engagements on other days. All that is on the contrary to protests in like Serbia or Turkey that can have like 2 million people. ===== Protesting does nothing, because it's always an extreme minority of people. ...Protesting is for the rich and subsidized. It's expensive to be broke.

...And since those are the old people, the problem will go away in like 10-20 years when they die out. ...So, the next question is how will it really look like when the current 20 year olds will be the oldest generations?

It's a luxury service. It's not something that's meant for everybody. (((...Go and get your coffee by yourself, instead of taking a delivery. It was always in history a luxury option. Even, and especially, when your parents were getting this themselves in the past like once few months.))) It's a luxury service for people who have way more money than time. It's not meant for you. And if you decide to get this, this is not a daily thing for you.In my opinion, if you can't afford to do business, while paying people a reasonable fair wage, then, maybe, you should not exist. "It's not financially viable to pay minimum or living wage." - that's outrageous. If it's not financially viable, then you're not financially viable. Problem solved. (((...Maybe instead don't pay your CEO 400 million dollars in stock awards or 300,000 annual salary.)))Too many lauchers and apps of too many businesses - if I have to download once, well, fuck it, will just not use your service. (((...Like screw Ubisoft launcher, I'll play other games on Steam, or not play at all. Or like too many delivery apps.))) Or the intrusive notifications. (((...If I download an app, if I get a notification, I will uninstall the app.))) "What you've to do is that you don't ask for a refund, you say they delivered you the wrong food, then you make a photo of the food, and they give you money back." Usually, when you apply for a refund, it goes through a verification system and they basically throw it away. So you have to send them information that you recieved the wrong food, because, for whatever reason, that goes through the app, bypasses the check system and they automatically give you a refund. So you don't have to dispute. Remember, fuck them. You're an apex predator. Are you going to get finessed by a program for a 20\$? Absolutely not. Fuck them. ...Also, they, or other corporations, always are trying to get all your money for the least amount of work or manipulate you, by example with fake-products in advertisements, so get some back. ABC - always be cheating.

The reason why you're not competing is because you put your message out there and people don't agree with it. That's the problem. It's bad ideas not entertaining. ...Politics and entertainment has begun to overlap. Long form podcasting does penetrate different audiences. (((-it's appealing enough that it goes in a decentral way, so it reaches new audiences - even if some of those audiences want only to rage bait of it because they hate you-))) And western left cannot survive long form podcasting environments - it's too unscripted and too masculine (((-to go into the wilderness with no rules and duel it out and see who's better or who's stronger-))) ((("To intellectually joust with no script, no hard breaks, no producers in the ears, no teleprompters - that's where the new media has gone."))). It's not that they don't do it, they can't do it, because a lot of the ideas that they have don't survive scrutiny. And as soon as social media stops being censored, everybody starts thinking another way - because their ideas are bad. They didn't build the intellectual muscle over 30 years, because they either all agree with each other all the time or instantly kick out of their group everyone with the slightest doubts about their narrative. ...Their upbringing in college campuses doesn't foster debate like it used to long ago (((-it just doesn't-))), it's about silencing the critic and the elevation of the victim, so they don't the practice of having to defend their position. It's very monolithic, very centralized, very top-down, and quasi-authoritarian. ...They don't have "he that has the best idea wins" approach, and have instead "he that is oppressed will get the most points" - which means an elevation to a point where we're just going to have a small subset of a minoritarian hectoring hall-monitor assistant principal vibe (((-and people don't want to be regulated, policed, and tone-policed by hall-monitors and cat-collecting single old women-))). Because at least 90% of mainstream media has been co-opted by the left-wing voices, and they don't represent the people at all - same goes for the rest 10%, but they don't represent a different group of people. ...What a surprise! Isn't it interesting that every medium that isn't controlled by a corporate or governmental apparatus that censors and edits everything is dominated by this group of people? So, if this group dominating every free apparatus of discourse, then what does that mean?

(...) Why would they respond? If somebody is asking for those figures, they're only doing it in order to create a narrative that you're doing something wrong. Like how could there ever be a single positive to sharing that information? (...) Well, you've created an arbitrary criteria point and you said you have to meet this criteria point. Who decided that? You did. You're not in charge of them. What is this? (...) What they are doing works, and it outperforms all other people that are in the space. You always hire on merit, otherwise you're setting yourself up to fail. (...) "The higher up you go in the corporate ladder, the white-r and male-r it becomes." The implication here is that being white or male is somehow a problem. IF YOU REPLACE THE WORD OF THE PEOPLE THAT YOU ARE TRYING TO REPLACE WITH THE WORD OF PEOPLE THAT YOU THINK ARE PROTECTED, WOULD YOUR STATEMENT BE BAD? And if the answer is yes, then your statement is not theoretically bad, it is just simply bad. (...) "(...) but they're not going to do that." I think that the entire premise of this is that it's a problem or that it's necessary, it's not. (...) So, if the problem is that there's a bunch of people in this demographic that are hiring based off of their race, then the solution is to influence and bring in a different demographic of people that will hire based off of their race instead? Do we have to fight racism with racism? (...) They people that run this multi-billion dollar company that effectively has a monopoly, and they are the ones that just don't understand this? (...) "It's not that they're ..., or anything. It's just bias." So, they aren't, but they are. Okay, so can you prove it? No, but they are. (...) Why should it be easier for a person of any race to join the company versus a person of another race to join the company? In what form of discrimination is that good? (...) The company is not your platform to push your social agenda, it's not a political-action company, it's not what it's goal is.

Policing the internet... under the pretext of bringing some civility into discourse/internet. --- A lot of these efforts to bring "civility" are

actually to measure control and measure the amounts of thoughts and types of things that believe can think or believe, and they are just packaged as "civility". Oppression packaged as "trying to help you". ...Thought policing. ...It's like thinking: "in order to allow people to talk, you have to prevent them from talking". ..."You got a permit for that tweet, sir? Is this a regulated tweet?" ...Irony how totalitarian this is. ...And many of their citizens are surprised that those things are even real. They don't even believe it's real, and that's why it happens, because it's against the law, but the people doesn't even know it's a thing, because it's so ridiculous. ..."We have free-speech as well, but..." but no. ...Of course, let's overcompensate for all the people that are dead. (nazis, by example) Do you remember when all those people did this thing? and all the people that were involved in it are dead now and rotting in the ground? Yeah, now it's your fault. ...They thought they're living in a free thinking western culture based off of free thought and free marketplace of ideas. But actually no, you live in a place where your speech is policed. It's so outrageous. Have some self-respect. What a waste of money. ..."Without boundaries on free-speech a small group of people can rely on endless freedom to say anything that they want, while everyone else is scared and intimidated." But with those boundaries that is exactly what is happening. That's the entire problem. And the person who decides what that thing is, is the person who is in charge. ...Insults. =/= Defamation. ...These people are like hyper-authoritarian, hyper-aggressive, and will work systematically to destroy you. They are tyrants. ...This is the problem of this, it's that the idea that ideas are acts of violence, can put people in danger. An idea can't kill people. Talking about things doesn't hurt people. Words are not violence. ...Big surprise that the current administration has labeled the party that they disagree with as being problematic, and now they are seeking to silence people who disagree with them. Very coincidental. (...) "But they are protecting democracy and discourse by introducing TOUCH OF GERMAN ORDER to the un-ruling." ...The alternative is to compete in the free-marketplace of ideas and win people over to your cause by being able to give them something to believe in and root for, and then have those people come out and vote for you. And if you don't want to do that, it's because you are afraid you can't do that, and so instead you have to label people that you disagree with and say that now they cannot speak. There is no other reason to suppress speech like that. ...What a disgrace.Cry about it. I don't give a fuck. (...) Why is it problematic? Is it because you are being disagreed with? I know this must be very upsetting. ...More freedom comes with more risks, but it's better than having illusion of safety. ..."(...) not respecting free-speech, like some other backwards countries. (...) " ...Hearing opposing viewpoint causes no real harm.Fuck'em if they can't take a joke.

Consistency, Dedication, Discipline -- that's going to make you more successful than anything else. Cheat-codes to real life.But sometimes you just gotta know when to hold them, and you gotta know when to fold them. Sometimes beating your head against the wall to try to break through the wall is no less honorable, and is more stupid, than using a hammer to get through the wall instead. Just because you spend a lot of time on something and something is really hard for you to do, it doesn't mean that you are entitled to success in that one thing - sometimes you're just really bad at doing what you're doing. ... You need to understand what you're doing wrong, actively realise that, and then change it.How people don't ever see the grind that somebody does, they only see the end product/result. ... Assuming that someone always had it easy is a coping mechanics to rationalize why you're not in the same place.

These are the ideas that can't survive in the free-market-place of ideas. (so their followers demand censorship by higher power) ...They are making the game for the audience that doesn't exist. And if you make a game for the an audience that doesn't exist, then you're gonna also get money that doesn't exist. ...Social Media activists often don't really play games, or buy them just because it meets their propaganda. ...Also, if you're going to make a game not appealing to majority, you're going to get minority of sales. ...Who does it serve to make the character unattractive? Because people who don't care about the character's looks are gonna play whether the character is attractive or not. And doesn't the majority want the attractiveness? Also, are designs based on real-life women are something bad? Also, if you don't care about the character's looks, - then you are not a part of the conversation, - why even talking about it in the first place? ..."Maybe it's just, but I feel the market for masculine, non conventionally attractive female leads in games isn't as big as the video game industry thinks it is."They are changing, because they are losing money. "When it comes to animated content for a younger audience, we recognize that many parents would prefer to discuss certain subjects with their children on their own terms and timeline."

(...) Everywhere you look, there are more screenwriters and producers eager to take great stories and "make them their own." It does not matter whether the source material was written by Stan Less, Charles Dickens, Ian Fleming, Roald Dahl, Ursula K. Le Guin, J.R.R. Tolkien, Mark Twain, Raymond Chandler, Jane Austen, or... well, anyone. No matter how major a writer it is, no matter how great the book, there always seems to be someone on hand who thinks he can do better, eager to take the story and "improve" on it. "The book is the book, the film is the film," they will tell you, as if they were saying something profound. Then they make the story their own. They never make it better, though. Nine hundred ninety-nine times out of a thousand, they make it worse.

They believe in the most ridiculous things, because it rationalizes their bad decisions in life.That's because the poor people are the least educated and the worst at making decisions. You take 100 rich people and 100 poor people - which group is going to have a higher ratio of people that make good decisions? It's obviously the rich people. I know it's not comfortable fact, but it's still a fact.[["do you think what current culture promotes has something to with it?" - as an excuse]] Yeah, person's actions have something to do with it. If you take 100 people and you asked them honestly, which one is more healthy a salad or pizza, every single one of them is going to say salad. This idea that people aren't taught what's healthy and what's not is insane. It's common knowledge everywhere in our culture. Basically it like knowing left and right. It's inherent to some extent. Go ahead and be ___ all you want, but don't even for a second try to go and tell me that it's healthy and that it's not your fault. Don't expect me to play along with it.

It's not him and it's not even what he's doing, it's the results that those people don't like, they don't like that it worked, their enemies won. ... I don't respect that difference, or care about it enough to view one is bad and the other one is good. The effect is the same and it has logically no distinction, it's the same substance. No massive moral difference. Semantics don't matter, the effect does. ... "The implication that rich people weren't having private conversations to shape policy and Elon Musk is somehow the only person to do this is insulting to everyone's intelligence." ... Just because something doesn't have like a video-evidence of it happening, it doesn't mean that it's not obviously happening. You can't see this many points on a graph and then not be able to draw a line. ... I'm not going to view this as a unique evil, and if you want to get rid of billionaires controlling the government, then use the language of billionaires and not just "Elon Musk", that's the difference. So, I agree with you, that's really bad, but it seems like this is a one-sided perspective, and so if it wasn't, I would probably have a more open viewpoint for it. It's one dimensional and based off of power and not principle. And I think that average people can see that and that's why they're distrustful of the media in the first place. ... All I'm doing is explaining it, don't get mad at me.

A lot of the people that have this fixation around devaluing accomplishments that some famous billionaire has had, and especially in terms of devaluing a person's intelligence, I've never met a smart person that spends a lot of time trying to make intellectual judgments about another person's intelligence. ...I can understand somebody saying, "oh, that guy is an idiot," that's fine, but the fixation that the earlier described people have around trying to break down the idea that a person who owns a lot, (by example a rocket ship company, popularized electric cars, made a successful multi-billion dollar investment with a complete restructurization of newly bought company with firing about 80% of the workers, etc.), is somehow stupid - I think that any reasonable normal person would see how ridiculous that is. Of course, doesn't mean he is the smartest. And something that might matter a lot more than intelligence is drive and willpower, so really the focus and the fixation around intelligence is totally misguided, and there are a lot of smart people that don't do

shit.

.....[[They want to dictate how the university rule itself.]] Do you think the university should have exercise racial disparities and should enforce racial disparities in its admissions? Also, since these universities enjoy a tremendous amount of privileges (like being tax-exempt or receiving federal funding), how is that we are not entitled to any degree of oversight of what they are doing? How is that equitable or fair?[[Don't you support freedom in academia?]] No. Why should I support the academic freedom of them to racially discriminate? It's super simple. You're not going to reframe something that sounds bad and then like "oh, I'm not going to say it." - I will just say it straight out.Also small business when they get loans, they are not only dictated on what they must spend it, but also they need to in detail describe how they are spending it, while also being obligated to pay it back.[[Academic freedom can be interpreted to include the right of the univeristy to determine their hiring standards.]] Well, then we're going to determine our own funding standards.

"He's doing the right thing by taking the emotional moral upper-hand from them with this, and it's smart because they've used this emotional manipulation for a long time, and they got completely fucking out-played by this. And there's nothing that they can say to that, because they're going to look just bad. And the reason why their narrative is falling apart is because the entire premise of it is built on a lie." ...If your enemy wants to use a weapon, then you should absolutely use that weapon against him. Always use it. Never take the high-road. If somebody takes the low-road, meet them there. Unless you think there's some kind of greater goal or benefit you can achieve by not doing that, that's fine, but always meet them at the low-road. Always fight to win no matter what.Why is it that they don't play by the rules, they didn't follow the law to do the X-thing, but now you have to in order to revert the X-thing and its consequences? That sounds like bullshit to me. Why would I do that? That's basically like signing-up to lose.Make decisions that do good for the people that are doing good. Thus you will be the most ethical person. And doing good things for bad-actors is just an inversion of morality. So, when I see a person that I think is a bad-actor, I don't think about bad things that are going to happen to them, because this person, in my opinion, has signed-up to have negative things happen to them by being a bad-actor. It's as simple as a math problem. "Oh, no, a violent gang member is worried about his safety!"I don't care much what the rules are, what I care about is an effect and what the rules should be. And so, I don't really have a lot of respect for the law, and I think that the law is genuinely written in a way that is dis-advantageous for the average people, and I think that it is rigged in a lot of cases. So, when I see that the law is being used in way that, in my opinion, is immoral or wrong, I don't use the law to decide my decision, I look at what is the right thing to do, because historically there have been a tons of bad laws and tons of bad things that were done in the name of the law. ...Although technically your simple law is meant to protect the people and not the monsters, yet in reality in most cases, this very same law, is used to protect monsters, which is morally wrong to do so. ...[[due process]] "I feel like, if you have a bunch of judges that this guy was involved with a foreign crime gang, now considered as terrorist organization, and he is an illegal immigrant, if the due process to deport him is that problematic, then, in my opinion, you have a problem with the process. So why should I respect and care about the process, when the process is bad and doesn't serve the public?" Also Vances comment: "None of these people can articulate a deportation standard that: 1) would satisfy left-wing critics of the administration's immigration policy; 2) would satisfy their intuitions about what "due process" is required; 3) would be workable given resource constraints; and 4) would permit deportation of most of the illegal immigrants." ...My morality, and what I think is good and bad, doesn't have anything to do with the law, and often times it conflicts with the law. I understand that following the law is important, but I think that whenever the law creates a situation that is fundamentally immoral, unfair and evil, then what should be done is the law should be changed and what should be right is done instead. ...All rules are made-up and you can do anything you want to do. And just because someone says that there's a law against something, it's doesn't mean that it's bad. [[It also a matter of enforcement of the law.]] ...Why should I care for the law, when the law, in a lot of cases, is wirtten by people who don't have my best interest in mind? Why would I respect a system that disrespects me? [[It's completely arbitrary.]] ...[[that line of thinking is dangerous]] Every line of thinking is dangerous. The line of thinking that you need to adhere to rules 100% of the time is also extremely dangerous - historically there have been so many mis-uses of rules and laws that have been used to oppress people for thousands of years. So, the fact is you shouldn't ever base anything off of the law. ...Pragmatism. ..."If I have authoritarian views, but you're the one who is arguing and your bases why thing should happen are because of an authority, aren't you the one who is being authoritarian? Aren't you saying that because this is the rule, that we have to follow this rule, even though this rule works against people's best interest? I think I'm the one that's not authoritarian."I very rarely have like legitimate real principles for things, and I make most decisions based off of what seems like the best decisions in the circumstance. And I think that, when you based things of external principles, and you don't look at individual circumstances, what you end-up doing is you end-up de-legitimizing, or like de-humanizing, the people in that situation, and you are not looking at it from direct sense.[[you should educate yourself on...]] The term "educate yourself" is disrespectful and it's not that I'm un-educated, it's that I've a different opinion on it than you do. I understand what your opinion is, I just think it's stupid. It's not impossible to conceptualize another person's thinking, it's just I think it's a bad way of thinking.

...Sometimes you need to hold people to higher standard of behaviour. Decorum. ...Compliance isn't empathy. In the long term it makes people's lives worse. ...I am the most empathetic, I recognize that these are deeply troubled people that need mental help in a lot of cases, and I think that, with their compliance and acceptance, instead of trying to help them improve their lives, people enable them to further destroy their lives. And at certain point you are so far gone that you now can no longer reintegrate into society and you have effectively destroyed your life. In a lot of cases, when a kid wants to do something, a parent sometimes needs to look at when the outcome of that thing is and then decide whether that is good for the kid in the long run. ... If parents that groom their kids to be extremists in this way, then, of course, the kids act this way, because that is what they have been brought up to do; then, of course, the kids wants to do it, because their entire life and structure of their reward system is built around them reinforcing this behaviour, so, of course, they are going to do it, because they have been trained to do that.

Nobody cared back then at all. There were so many stupid, but so good, stories. (...) Nobody took that shit seriously at all; people would just say this shit, all kinds of uncensored stuff, and be racist, et cetera, and all would have fun. Back then everyone had a pass. ----- 90s were a different fucking time.

(...) made by a studio that found a formula to make it up here on the stage. It is stupidly simple, but somehow it keeps on getting lost. The studio made their game, because they wanted to make the game they wanted to play themselves; they created it, because it hadn't been created before; they didn't make it to increase market share; they didn't make it to serve as a brand; they didn't have to meet arbitrary sales-targets, or fear being laid off, if they didn't meet those targets; and furthermore, the people in charge forbade them from cramming the game with anything whose only purpose was to increase revenue and didn't serve the game design; they didn't treat their developers like numbers on the spreadsheets; they didn't treat their players as users to exploit; and they didn't make decisions they knew were short-sighted and function of their politics; they knew that, if you put the game and team first, the revenue will follow; they were driven by idealism and wanted players to have fun, and they realised that, if the developers didn't have fun, nobody was going to have any fun; they understood the value of respect, that if they treated their developers and players well, the same developers and players would forgive them, when things didn't go as planned; but above all, they cared about their game, because they loved games. It is really that simple.

(...) Opinions were freely shared and everyone enjoyed the discussion. ...Controversial content is not new. What you will find at the heart is a series of small steps by good people with a few bad actors mixed in. ...Teams started by gathering reference material from the world around them to help define what is in their mind. They pull from the lore of a franchise, sometimes history, current events, other entertainment stuff, et cetera. Creating dialogue on what has been and what might be; and reference material has a narrative, it has a perspective. ((It's easy to see this, if you read a history book, because you'll hear wildly different opinions on what happened

based on where you grew up. --> "American's Civil War == The War of Northern Aggression") So, it ends up being naturally exploring themes and ideas based on inspires them. ...Even though strong narratives hasn't changed, what appeals to the broadest audience possible has narrowed. It's easy to alienate large groups of people, if expectations aren't met. - You might end up making a product that doesn't appeal to a large part of your current fan-base. (((We should stop curating (.selecting things to be included in the final product; adjusting) (.localizing products to be sensitive to those issues) everything to the biggest retard imaginable, to the most annoying, least honest, the most stupid person there, and just ignore them. They're retards, you shouldn't take them seriously, you just don't even think about them.))) (((If you're trying to be sensitive/delicate and going for being political with your product, you might also put yourself in a situation when something may backfire and bring a lot of real negative controversy. (.a catch-22 situation?) "A game where black people massacre Japanese people in the Sengoku period is a perfect example of UBI. Is this what happens when political correctness is taken to the extreme?")) (((Maybe just do things with a real good faith? No trying place yourself as higher moral authority. And then maybe your audience will give you at least the benefit of the doubt.))) ...Teams disagree all the time, but once the decision is made, they get back to work, and if someone can't, they need to leave the team. (.Disagree or commit.) Those are the expectations. ...You try to leave the disagreements to the room and bring a united front out to the team. ((Don't sow a discord to the co-workers after you get out-voted.)) ..."They were the creators, they were the talent. We were important, but were there to support them, and that made us expendable." ((People don't like to hear that, because of their ego. "You're not the star of the show." -- Even though in usually known, you don't tell people this until they are going to put it on the line with their ill behaviour.))

..... This person is being so divisive. I was trying to be honest with him and help him see the situation, but it didn't work, he continued with his negativity, but he just hid it better; he also added me to his list of complaints. ...Don't get mad at those people, but feel bad for them, "okay, there's something wrong with this person; it's a grown old adult. Who does this?", and you do have to get rid of people like that. Talk to HR or boss, "This is really weird, this is a list of things this person is doing. In my opinion, it's a kill or be killed situation." Because people like that, once a person demonstrates unreasonable, illogical, bad behaviour, I try to isolate them and remove them from my life. Because at that point, I can no longer predict what this person is going to do, and that's unsettling to me, and I don't want to be around a person like that. ((Make them HR or boss scared of all the bad possibilities keeping such a person can entail, a bad press if he speaks in public, or if he does too much discord in the team, lost money, sabotaging the product, et cetera.)) If you try to show him a better way to lead through your actions, he will work behind the scenes to destroy you in every way. The only way that you can solve this problem is by destroying him. No happy ending. This is an irrational person that probably has a legitimate mental problem and you get them the fuck out of your life, because if you don't, they're going to do the same thing to you. By doing this, you're doing everyone else around you a favour, the best thing that you possibly can do for the most people. People like that are often childish, vitriolic, obnoxious, rude, stupid and, most likely, completely insufferable to be around. And usually there are five or six different manifestations of this bad behaviour that's negatively affected other people around them. "People that have problems, are problems." Especially, if they constantly have problems. They will always try to find a bad in good situations, and that at some point may ruin your life. They create their own problems. They make their problems, everyone else's problems as well. ...People don't put enough emphasis on the damage that you can do to other people, when you entangle them into a problem like this, because using media, you are politicizing the product, putting your own brand of politics on it and making yourself attached to it. And you are making it to your all co-workers without their consent, potentially putting them and their jobs at risk. More antagonized audience, less product sold; and there might be a breaking point when lay-offs step it. (.One emotional outburst.) ... A plus is that such people naturally select themselves. (.Might have harder time looking for job in the industry for the rest of life. -- YOU GET WHAT YOU DESERVE. -- Don't use the product of your company as a vehicle for your mindset.)

Any traditional sense of masculinity has been completely removed by the society and then replaced with effeminate toxic bullshit. ...Guys (and even girls) who behave in this way have no real father (no real positive man influence) in their life as guiding force. -- Like when, with animals, the little gorillas fucking with the big gorillas and then the big gorillas setting the little gorillas straight, and then the little gorillas become the big gorillas and do the same thing to the new little gorillas. (The circle of life.) So, if you have not the big gorillas to set the little one straight, you get problems. ...All different forms of masculinity has been taken away from the guys, neutered and demonized (--and that means any form of aggression, even casual form of aggression towards each other like a banter, a coarse communication or way of doing things, and saying things like you are not an NPC, and stuff like that--), and so you have a society that has removed all of the things that men, especially young men, do in their life in order to establish and build a sense of identity and camaraderie.

.....The way men and women work through problems is fundamentally different, and the refusal to acknowledge the fundamental cognitive differences between the sexes is actually a foundational core problem that has caused a lot of this friction. Almost everything is reduced to one-size-fits-all for both men and women - which is not accurate since they process things differently. And in the case where there is a male viewpoint and female viewpoint, oftentimes the female-centric perspective is the one that is prevailing in the society - and so you have a situation where men are trained cognitively to blame everything on themselves, have everything be blamed on them, their coping mechanisms are deemed toxic, their types of interacting with each other are deemed hostile and not politically correct, and basically the solutions that are given to them are solutions that generally help more women than they help men.

.....And men have allowed this - allowed to be patronized by old-cat-collecting-women that hate them. ...Men allowed women to tell them what to do and have some kind of bullshit ideology (like astrology, by example), because they think they will get laid this way, because they try to be attractive to women by being subservient - they are simps basically. It has like higher probability to get laid. What guy would tell an attractive women that her bullshit is not real and ruin his chances to get laid? ...""Are you saying that men are holding political views for the explicit purpose of hooking up with girls?" Absolutely yes. How many of you, guys, have tried to act a little bit closer to a girl's politics in order to get a little closer to the girl? Well, nobody wants to say this and girls might not want to hear this because it breaks the illusion, but men don't care about these social issues as much as the girls would think. And usually the guys that make themselves look like they care a lot, they are the biggest creeps of all."" ...There are plenty of happily married couples, that guys never did anything weird with the girl, they have kids and no real issues. There are tons of that. You just don't see that, because they are busy working and taking care of their family and spending the rest of their time with their friends. They are not on the internet broadcasting, because they are busy. It is un-ironic silent majority.

.....Women had regularly put themselves in the men's spaces and then tried to make those spaces conform to them, changing the spaces and then complaining about it. In every place in life. (--By example: in the gaming community, back in the day, everyone would say anything under the sun and nobody would get upset, except for a few pussies, but now there is like 50 different regulations of what you can and cannot say - girls don't act like that to each other. And so they went to a space dominated by young men that are hyper-aggressive and extremely competitive, and then they want to take every outlet they have to express that. Well, get that fuck out of here or turn of voice chat.--)

In Western countries, 95%+ of the last 15 years of political violence and destruction has been a left-wing extremism, and it is also justified by the people that are in political power and represent companies."You can't just announce what's a fact." Well, neither can you.Historically, like 100 years ago, right-wing political groups were committing many acts of violence, but things change over time. Who cares what was happening 30 years ago? I wasn't even around at that time, had nothing to do with that. I care about what is happening now. And currently what has happened those 100 years ago is considered bad and condemned by gross majority of people - similarly today's right-wing violent acts, as scare as they are, when they happen they are instantly and universally condemned by masses and politics; which is to the contrary to today's left-wing violent acts, as many as they are, when they happen they are a lot of times with support from politics and many indoctrinated people and get constantly justified by them. Maybe in the next 50 years the trend will change again to right-wing, maybe eventually they will start reciprocating, but, in the end, who knows. ... "All of the instances that the data is coming out, and they are trying to say that violence is equivalent or that right-wing people are more violent, the reason why is that they are deliberately using a very long frame of reference in order to misrepresent what is happening now. If you see what is happening now, you will see that the left-wing is more violent." Or they are also trying to link right-wing violence with

un-related stuff like, by example, islamic terrorism, too, in order to manipulate. ... "The reason why some statistic's websites differ is because their method of data inaccurate - the way they are collecting, analysing and providing the data is deliberately misrepresented." ... "Echo-chamber?" I don't need to have a conversation with somebodys, all I have to do is to open my eyes and look what I have seen in the media for the last 15 years. ... "It's not a protest. When you are setting things on fire and destroying property, you are not protesting, you are a criminal."

I have completely given up on an idea of experts. It's all just bullshit. These people just act like they know what they are talking about, but they don't actually know. There are way too many people with all kind of degrees that are completely stupid and they, in truth, don't know what they are doing. ... "I work corporate for 20 years, everywhere I go nobody knows what they are doing." ... Nearly everywhere you can find like, by example, in a group of 200 people only 12 operating at efficiency, while the rest was talking, looking at their phones, doing something stupid or wrong, they can't read they paper-work after 2 years, they need something to be re-explained to them, et cetera. ... If you want to be a good worker, you show up to work and do your job, and you will blow the majority of the competition out of the fucking water. The bar is pretty low. "I just came in, picked up on the job, figured out what I need to do, and I did it correctly." "You look what the successful are doing, you distill down to something that work, and make it real for yourself." ... (((There are always like 20% over-achieving workaholics that do most of the work, then like 20% generally competent people helping them (but not always necessary). The rest 60% are lost in the bureaucracy.))) ... Most people simply do not put the effort. ... Also knowledge doesn't equal result. Many people can't apply what they learn to anything. ... Since decades, year after year, governments can't even manage their funds properly, no matter who rules, and constantly take on debt, I would rather have in a government a person that work in a private enterprise that functioned properly than just another governmental-bureaucratic person. ... The department of Education isn't working. Kids are the product of the department and extreme amounts of them these days, and for many years in the past as well, are retarded, can't even do basic math nor write properly, or many-times even can't read. ... "They say no child left behind; how about no child left ahead?" As in there were some cases of schools where nearly no child do like even add numbers. ... If you get this amount of many and don't have a good outcome, you are an idiot or corrupt (as in people who manage it and pay for it). ... "It will get worse." It is already bad, so change it. ... An idea: You should have to take a very basic 10-question test in order to take on any debt in a society. Like "what is 10% of 100 dollars?". And if you cannot figure that out, you cannot take on debt. You fail, you cannot do it. ... Maybe make it randomized to lower the percentage of cheating. But, to be honest, people that are cheating are at least smart enough to cheat. ... So, you also take the idea of adding direct minimal symbolic payment to public services (like healthcare stuff) for each visit in order to lower over-using it for no real reason by the people; and you mix those two ideas and use them in many other areas. ... Have a higher standard.

Appeal to the lowest common denominator.

Being pro-worker doesn't mean being pro-retard.

The punishment must be greater than the reward for doing a crime.

For any transaction between people, the idea is always about CONSENT.

You pay people garbage wages, you get garbage employees.

It's an annoying system that makes people lose time. It's anti-consumer.

It's extremely inefficient and it's intentionally done this way.

"It might be good for the economy, but not necessarily for the people."

I am not your dad to enforce on you what you can tell/do or what you cannot tell/do.

Different demographics are taking over the service.

If countries buy stuff from each other, and are friends, they are less likely to fight with each other.

You don't have a right to someone else's labour. It's not a core human right. That's not how it works.

You get what you paid for. ((if you pay someone an amount for like a loser, than you will get a loser)))

Does this change is going to improve the player experience? [[.If not, then maybe it's a bad change?]]

Ultimately, the end product is what matters.

Engineer a problem to sell people the solution. Easy money. Make the base product worse to sell its upgrade.

Whenever people are disconnect from the reward for what they are doing, they will stop doing that at some point.

Regarding gun violence in USA, it's generally consolidated in few areas, outside of them USA is a very safe place.

If you limit discussion only to the things people are comfortable with, you end up shutting down any meaningful discourse.

People notice patterns.

Merit based system.

It's certainly convenient that established players have a law that gets to keep new people that would compete with them, out.

Effectivity and capitalization on opportunities to beat others is what matters. And if you have that, then you can add to it hard-working.

"Gaming" of U.S. patent system is keeping drug prices sky high. --- If you have a monopoly, you are going to charge more money. (What a surprise!)

If somebody is not contributing to the end product that the consumer is using, they are probably not a valuable person for the company. Too many leeches.

You're an active participant in your own demise. Things can be done to you, but the way that you come out of those events and move forward, that's on you

At the end of the day, it doesn't matter whether it's genuine feedback or attack driven by intolerance. If it results in you losing a sale, the outcome is the same

developers started telling them, that they were stupid & that it wasn't a game for them. Which's completely bizarre, that you're insulting your own customers

The idea of real work is a cope invented by unhappy people with a chip on their shoulder over people making money in ways they deem beneath them. [Think about making money, instead of just working.]

What a surprise. It's always crazy to see how much money people will spend on bullshit, if they think that it will make them special. They will even put themselves in debt, just to make themselves look rich. Especially middle-class and lower-class.

Imagine that. The consumer actually had all the power all along, but people didn't want to accept it. That's always been the case - consumers have always had all the power. You can make the decision and you can change the way that businesses work just simply by voting with your money.

People never consider things they don't know about, and you have to plan for that budget-wise. "Unknown unknowns." There are things that you know you don't know and then the real money-pit are things that you don't know that you don't know. Those are the mistakes that you learn by fucking-up.

It's really not that complicated — just recognize that the prior is that anyone defending the indefensible has a financial motive. If someone is defending the global elite, then that someone likely profits off the global elite. It's a matter of being persistent and following the money.

If you primarily disarm the victims, you make it easier to commit the crimes. People that are doing the crimes and/or annoyingly harass within law boundaries, think they nothing bad will fall on them. When you make a punishment harsh, they disappear.

- ...It's you're saying no compromise, so... ((= Should I compromise on the first amendment... on property rights, on your property rights? Should I sell your house, because business and me want it, and he can pay more taxes? Why don't you want somebody to stand on principle? Why?)))

Some of these rules are just so arbitrary and silly. It's simply a way for some politicians and activists to pretend that they are doing something, make themselves and others feel good, because it feels like they are doing something. And I think they get a charge out of telling people what to do.

They never have to live with the consequences of their own "altruism". ...I try to help those who try to help themselves the most, and after that's done see what's left over.

The problem is that like the way they think about things is devoid of human logic; it's almost like they are designing something for robots, but there never any consideration of human friction and human behaviour... and they assume blind trust.

If you are not paying for the product, you are the product. ...Nothing in life is free; so where is the money coming from? [[As soon as you're logical, you realize, "of course it's a scam". Especially if they push so much advertising. [[Money for nothing and checks for free - you just can't believe it man.]] "That sounds great on a surface, but there's some shady stuff going on, I can't put my finger up on it."

Why are you crying? It's not your government, he has no reason to give you anything. You don't pay taxes to him. He is appealing to his people. This is a wakeup call to say what are we going to do to help ourselves? Instead of crying, "what are we going to do?". To

support ourselves, because nobody is going to continue holding out their hand there to give you. It's time for us to use our resources for the right reasons; because we are the ones using them for wrong things.

"We aren't focused on the short term extraction of profits, we are focused on delivering exceptional value to our audience over the long term, again and again and again." -- "They think we make things like the movie to sell skins, when in reality we sell skins to make things like the movie.; The movie crushed for players, - like a brand investment, a movie giving drastic popularity to its game, it's also like an advertisement for the merchandise, and it spreads the brand eco-system ((different products that might not necessarily make sense individually, but the way they interplay into each other is how they make money)) possibly keeping people in for longer, - so even though in itself it didn't reach a profit, it crushed for us."

....How downright bad, and badly managed, your country has to be that your people advocate for the positives of communist or totalitarian, or both, alternative? Fascist countries ban media, ways of communicating and conveying informations to other people, especially under the guise of "threats to national security," when every other country knows it is about suppressing the free speech of its citizens.If government believes that a single media, by example application or website or press, could skew the perspective of its citizens to be anti-their-country-or-their-government, maybe the real problem is that its citizens are already in such a state of political unrest and unhappiness that their government is scared that a single foreign influence could tip the scale and have it all be over? - Don't you think that by taking away the "key communications channel for its citizens," it is going to make those millions of citizens a little more anti-their-country-or-their-government?The pro-government media-influences have congregated together and paid their employees, which are the congressmen, to make laws against, and capitalize on people's xenophobia against, that one-so-called-enemy, by example China or Russia, and their fear of the technology and the unknown with that hated-by-the-current-government-"non-mainstream-key-communicating-channel".If that media is actually trying to undermine the country, then you fight on the battlefield of the free-marketplace of ideas; and if you present something better than totalitarian, communist, alternative, you will win.People have to have the ability to communicate, they have to have the ability to express themselves, and that's how we find out what's real and what's not. ...Suppression of information is not good.

Businesses in a lot of cases willingly and intentionally hired illegal immigrants, because it gave them a leg up in negotiation strength - you can now play them less than average wages, they don't have same rights as citizen workers, and you can treat them like second-class citizens. If you were a ruthless business owner, wouldn't that be what you would do, if you're trying to get by?Even though immigration-raids are putting an end to an illegal system of exploitation and predatory businesses, the immigration-advocates are upset about it. This is the kind of empathy that is so harmful. [[-it's not really an empathy-]] There are the people that are advocating for, like, letting these people stay in there in exploitative relationship, where they're stealing things from the stores and then reselling them on the street; like these people basically think that it's more noble to turn the country into a third world country than to uphold our own laws - it's insane. ...And these people generally are more focused on the bad things that happen to those illegal immigrants, while at the same straight up ignoring what some of those illegal immigrants are doing to citizens of their own country. They have sympathy for the former group, but not for the latter. Especially because those very people never have to live with the bad consequences of their own "empathy"/actions, of bad actions of illegal immigrants, because many of them live in a completely separated areas that don't have to deal with any of the fallout this, especially in the richer and protected places, and those that are have their own security to protect them from those illegals. They vote for these problems, but they don't even live in these places. It's like saying, "oh, yeah, you guys can deal with it. It's totally fine, because we can vote for this and feel good about ourselves." Feeling like being on the right side of history is what matters to them, doing what sounds like a right thing. They don't have empathy, they want to be seen as having empathy. There's not really a principle guiding their behaviour, but there's approval guiding their behaviour. Simply, looking to have right opinions to the right people. It's narcissism parading and masquerading as empathy. (((They often can't understand second- and third-order effects of what their, both illegal's and advocator's, actions are causing.Imagine that the business, after the immigration-raids started deporting illegals, and scaring with that those not-yet-deported, are complaining that they have staffing and customer problems, because of that. Like admitting they were hiring illegal immigrants."My business can't survive unless we have an illegal activity. So, we just have to ignore the law so my business can survive."There's more exploitation of those illegals than just "less than fair wages." There's work compensation. There's any sort of accountability, if the workplace treats them badly. Et cetera. "Come work or we will snitch on you."One group that you can guarantee is benefiting from having an underclass of people that they can control with less workers rights is the business owner, the capital owner and the elite class. ... And imagine that the group convinced many "liberals" that having a second-rate/class, a slave/laborer class is actually the moral and ethical thing to do. ... All these people advocate for these undocumented workers, but they don't advocate for holding the business accountable for, first actually hiring them, but most importantly, treating and exploiting them badly.Also sometimes you hear "it's racist to deport illegals," as if everybody who's brown or hispanic is illegal. That's insane.

People always make arguments "this system needs to be done," and the reason why is that the system is created to protect them. They have created an apparatus that basically allows them to never have to make any changes and never be held accountable by everything, by anything, because they have created so many different levels of red tape and overlapping government apparatuses that it is almost impossible to dissect all of it. Like in a company where there is some sort of obfuscation mechanic where there is no way for you to really figure out who is at blame and the product suffers in the long term because of that. And that is what happens in the government too. And it is working as intended.People are terrified of direct personal accountability.Mistakes happen, but that does not mean you cannot do something, especially if you do things in large numbers (like lowering wasteful spending by cutting thousands of operations - a mistake can happen somewhere)."Have you ever considered you can just give people the item directly and not have to have this secondary system?" "These people are so captured by this like bureaucratic weight. It's job is to secure that those people have their job." "It's all hyperbole and lies. Their entire messaging system is like - let's exaggerate and misrepresent something in an intellectually dishonest way, and hope the stupid people that watch us believe it." "The fraudsters complain the loudest and make the most amount of fake righteous indignation. A roach is a roach."He got inspired to fix it by how stupid it was." A lot of guys that are really hard workers have some sort of drive to do it (fix stuff in big things like government by example). And a lot of them care about doing something that matters. "I have been growing up my whole life hearing about it, I finally have the chance to fix it, I am going to do it."Like some governmental institutions can 700 different IT systems and all of them can't speak to each other, or can have like 27 distinct Chief Information Officers and Offices (huge over-staffing, and many of them are being payed to do nearly nothing) - and that most of them not being technical people (like a team lead who never wrote a line of code and have technical knowledge on the level of an 8 year old kid) (like need a real tech support in power to fix all of that). And a problem with IT systems in government not talking to each other is that various institutions cannot cross-reference informations with each other to check to see if it is authentic or not, thus creating a potential for lack of actions or fraud and abuse.

[[[About increasing prices of games, because western studios pay 200-400 million to make one game.]]]You can use the inflation argument as much as you want, but they made Kingdom Come Deliverance for like 41 million dollars and Black Myth Wukong for like 60-80 million; so like really all this end up doing is it's going to make you non-competitive in the market, because you are competing in a global marketplace with different currency rates and different rates of payment. And so, if you have places in other parts of the world that are making the product way cheaper than you are and the product is relatively similar ((and the problem is, it's a lot of times actually just better)), then you are going to just lose in the free-market - you're signing your own death-warrant."Not financially viable."THE COMPANIES ARE OPERATING AND ARE MANAGED INEFFECTIVELY AND INEFFICIENTLY, AND THEY WASTE A LOT

OF TIME AND RESOURCES."You fire all the people who have useless jobs that contribute nothing to the actual product; you narrow down the scope of your projects; you look at the 80/20 rule and you see where 80% of your money is going for, and if it's not one of the most important things, you fire all of those people and get rid of that thing; you get rid of everybody that has a job because somebody else says they needed a job to manage somebody who manages somebody else and you get people in there that actually do work.""Is this person adding value to the game at a rate that they are costing?" And a lot of times the answer is 'no'.Or by example when one of the co-chairman of Nintendo took like a massive pay cut when the Wii-U didn't do well. I've never heard of western CEO or Western leader doing that.You can justify it however much that you want and there might be many logical arguments that people can make for why to increase the prices, but all of the logic in the world doesn't make somebody give you a \$100 for a game; a value proposition that it's compelling causes them to give you \$100 - and their value propositions are simply not compelling. The people like this don't know, or remember anymore, the fundamentals of sales and selling, and because of that they've been so lost in the sauce of bureaucracy and executive management that they forgot how to actually look at things from the eyes of a consumer.It doesn't matter whether it's justified, it's only relevant as to whether people are willing to pay that price. Being right doesn't mean people have to agree with you.And some people end up going for alternatives that are cheaper, have more replay value and they don't take as long to complete.Or when around early 2000s your mom was like "you think I'm going to buy you a 50 dollar fucking game? how long are you going to play that game for?" You gotta sell me on this game. -- In the past things also were extremely expensive, overpriced, bulky, hard to store, easily damaged. Rough. And there was more piracy, because of those issues too. VIDEO GAMES ARE MAINLY FOR YOUNG GUYS AND YOUNG GUYS CARE ABOUT VIDEO GAMES THE MOST, BECAUSE VIDEO GAMES ARE THE FIRST PLACE THAT YOUNG MEN HAVE AN OPPORTUNITY TO PROVE THEMSELVES ON AN EVEN PLAYING FIELD WITH OTHER PEOPLE THAT ARE NOT JUST THEIR PEERS. So, for example, when you play a, let's say, Fortnite and you're fourteen, you are not going to get gapped by some thirty-year-old with a job; now reality is that you actually have an advantage over him - not just genetically because you're younger you have like faster reflexes, but also because like you don't even know what a mortgage is, you have no income tax, "401K - what's that?"; all you know is playing this character and being good at it. You can zero in on a video game. ... Young guys and people without a lot of resources look to video games as an outlet for them to experience life on an even playing field. "The biggest piece of shit, the least viable product, we can get you pay for."You have got to stop asking the consumer to take on the accountability from the business. That's not how you run a business. You run a business by creating a product that by people are willing to pay for; everything other than that is just noise. "You realized your game wouldn't sell, so you make noise."The lack of conversations on how those companies spend on games. They cannot properly budget their own projects, set realistic sales projections, or even target audience's needs properly. The industry is in a state of entropy where they just keep pressing forward, they keep spending more money, they're adding nothing to the core experience, and the customer is the one that is expected to keep up with their spending."Nobody ask for this."They view pandemic boom as an accelerant, not as an anomaly. They want prices to increase to make up for their colossal financial hole that they have dug themselves into.A fundamental change in how we as customers, as players engage with this industry. We're not just the ones buying games anymore, we're shaping the conversations around them, we're shaping what their sales look like at the end of the day. The developers hate that gamers actually have a voice in terms of what they buy and what they want in games, and I think that developers resent that a lot, because that's why they turn off comments and disable replies and block people and try to shut people down that say the wrong things. We would just never go to places that had a cover (entry) charge. In some one those places it's not worth spending 15 dollars to spend 20 dollars on a shot. You might as well go somewhere else and spend 20 dollars only on a whole bottle of the same alcohol.

Who would have thought that hiring people for your company that actively hate your audience is not a good idea? ... The reason why modern companies' creators, especially for digital entertainment industry, especially developers, hate the audiences [gamers] is because they view all those people [gamers] as culturally regressive and they think that those people [gamers] are trying to hold on to a worldview that is antiquated and outdated; and they also think that those people [gamers] are losers - just straight up. So, it's a combination of disagreeing politically, thinking that these people are of lower social class, and then also having a moral mandate to think and do what you want to them.

.....The studio went from focusing on good experience to chasing trends; and the process of chasing trends ended up alienating their old players and they moved away from what their main competency was. And there was no longterm vision.

.....If you're living in a 3rd world country and making shit for money, why wouldn't you do this? [[.By example, botting mafia setup in games for real thousands dollars]] [[.It's a common sense.]]If you're making 1000\$ for every 100\$ you spend, wouldn't you want to spend the most amount of money, so you can multiply it by 10 as many times as possible? Obviously, going to do this. [(((Buy the game until market saturation and then end up stopping at a certain point or even fall off. Because, if you, let's say, are making sales of \$4 million gold a gold and that's pretty much a market cap, so if you're farming \$5 or 7 or more million gold a day, you're only selling 4, so by spending too much real money that makes too much in game, you are effectively wasting this money and you're cannibalizing your own profits, and you're effectively competing against yourself. So min-max it into market saturation point.))]]Splitting your bots into packs of bots (like 12 groups of 1000 bots) with different versions of the software for each bot-group (mutate and modify it to make it look like 12 different versions) (because it's means, none can reverse engineer the coding and apply it to the other bot-groups (bot-nets)) (segmenting risk) (this also allows you to AB test what the differences are; because you know the differences, if one version gets caught, you can isolate the variables that caused that version to get caught and then change it - even more so, if it happens enough times, you can also conversely reverse engineer the entire process that company has at finding the bots themselves. (by simple example, if every bot-group that was caught has been click to move, then maybe their process is about how they track clicking.)) (and if you know the the new wave of mass bans happens, you can already prepare a new bot-group with new accounts and a new mutation of the previous software, and make them start running the very same day one of your bot-groups gets banned.) (((((And you go for multiple games, because that makes you not limited to market saturation of one game.))The reason why botting exist is because you can make more money than it will cost to make the account. So, there is an equilibrium point where the amount of money you've invested into the account is the same amount of money that you can get from selling the account or selling the actions of the account. So, if you ban them before that equilibrium point, you stop botting, and if you cannot, you have botting. Simple.IF YOU ARE PUTTING THE MINIMUM EFFORT REQUIRED, THEN YOU ARE GETTING THE MINIMUM RESULT. If you are not paying (the GMS) to actively look into this proactively, you will find that all they're doing is they're using some sort of tech program to collect some amount of bots and then ban them and say, "oh, wow, we did this." ...If the guys that are responsible for removing the bots aren't the ones that are actually playing the game, they don't see how large a problem this really is, because they don't experience it in the game. -- Or have like deputies to make a "citizen's arrest"?Botting nets is like "playing the game of not playing the game."Make it illegal? Silly. Well, then let's just go do it somewhere where it's not illegal.2 million dollars for 12000 bots of profit. -- If someone tries to make botters' bots be banned (nearly always the amount won't be even big enough - so it's like nothing the botters), they will just try to scare (maybe via threat-mails or buying some bad press on you) you without doing anything in real, because what botters are scared of are actual authorities and law enforcement, so they will do nothing in real to cause them to be pursued by the law. ((.Botters want to make money, bad or not in effects; so making money is, like in any legal company, the most important; so they would rather take no problems if possible.)) ((.Like drug-cartels don't really want to fuck with american tourists to precariously not deal with the american gang - CIA, FBI, et cetera. - because the cost might be so high, high risk. And cartels already have: a lot of risks, police wants to fuck you, dealing with a lot of dangers on the way and dangerous people, complicated logistics, a lot of middlemen involved that want some money (and they still might sell you), paycuts, a chance to go to jail...))If the company doesn't care, why should I? Why am I sitting around here trying to act like I'm the Sheriff, when they don't even care about themselves? It's such a stupid thing to do. ""If you beat your head against the wall for really long time, and you're not getting through to the other side, maybe you should think to yourself, "I should stop hitting my head my god damn head."" == "They spend some much that fixated on an issue, and then it causes them to believe that everybody else needs to care about this issue as much as they

do, and then what they end up doing is, they end up alienating more people away because nobody wants to be told what to do or what to talk about - it's annoying."

These companies would promote nazis, if the country was full of nazis. They have no principles, no values, no ethics, and they have no morals. They exist for the sole purpose to make money. And if they think they can make more money promoting hatred than promoting love, they will promote hatred. They don't care. They only pretend to care, so you will be tricked into liking them. which will then give you the higher probability of buying their product. That is the only thing they care about. It's all performative. None of it is real - there are no values here. It is all about being reactive. They will just follow the money.

Yeah, he grew up playing Magic: The Gathering, which means he is too old to self-diagnose himself based of buzz-feed quiz, so, you know, instead of ruining his whole life because somebody on the internet told him he had, by example, Asperger when was twelve, he just tried to be a normal person. And, you know, everything is fine.

If a Consultant is based on their ability to identify/find problems, this creates a reward-structure behind identifying problems, which means they are going to be more likely to find issues and find problems with things in order to necessitate their own existence, which will cause them to continuously create more and more rules, so they can continuously necessitate their own existence. Consultants need find problems in order to continue to exist, so they will continue inventing more of them. There is a problem for every solution. "But if it wasn't a problem and they didn't point it out, and it didn't turn into a problem, they probably wouldn't get paid as much money." "Me, i need to do system healthcheks, and worst systems are where i dont find problems, since customers want to hear something." "If you hire me to find problems, I'm going to find problems." "make more tickets, so we can make more money" "I could make up any problem you want to have." "They're carefully listening to anything that can be ripped out of context and used against someone in scolding manner, warning = one job done." "If you didn't find problems, you didn't do your job." "They invented the problem to put themselves as a solution in order to get money." One of the example of that is: one time one company hired an outside consulting company and paid them to come in and say to them that the product they made almost ten years ago is now racist/bad, so they need to ban it - a product that everybody loved and no one is even upset about. --- People in Human Resources (HR) that work at the company need to necessitate their own existence, so the way the do that is, they think or say that you need to have these consultancy to come in to make sure we don't accidentally do racism. But the fact is that any normal reasonable person knows that that is what is not going to happen, so basically you have poeple inside of the company that have no actual function to improve the product for customers that are hiring other people to come in to the company to change things, so it creates a feedback-loop of a necessity. So you need to have HR, so you can have them hire the people to see the problems with these issues, with the staff that you are making, and then you need to have those people, so that you can have HR and not have these problems. --- It is not only HR, by example marketing. Most likely, it is everything that doesn't directly work on the product. Basically, people that do this, they are looking for problems and are trying to make sure they don't get fired. It's not necessarily about ideological positions, they're simply trying to justify their own employment.

And the problem is people intentionally misunderstand things, they don't care about what the truth is. These are the people that are annoying and disagreeable that nobody wants to be around, and somehow they created a world where we need to have them, but in truth we don't need.

Smartest investors know what they don't know. They aren't going to try to sit there and make creative decisions for you, they aren't going to try to go and tell you to micro-manage every single little things that you're adding to your game; they look at the bigger picture, they say, "this seems to be a problem," and they fix it, and then they get the fuck out of your way - because think about it from their perspective - do they want to micro-manage you, tell you what to do and be on calls with you all the time? They don't. They want you to make money and play like golf themselves.

Never interrupt the enemy when they are making a mistake.

If you're not capable of cruelty, you're absolutely a victim to anyone who is.

.....The #1____ are just simply people that are capitalizing on something that #2____ allows to happen. This is all on #2____, it's their product/evironment. If you create system that can be exploited and people can make money off of it, you should in fact expect people to make money off of it and exploit, and the fault of this falls on you, because you are the one who has control and it's your responsibility. Might be surprising, but there are a lot of people that don't want to die on a hill of a video game, they don't really care about this that much, it's just a hobby to them and if it becomes unpleasant or not enjoyable, they just simply stop doing it, that's what most normal people would do. It's not like you're fighting for freedom. It's just a video game. So, they might not want to deal with death-threats for that.There is a difference between explaining and justifying. I'm not defending them, I'm rationalizing them. I'm explaining why it's happening, not justifying. And if you can't understand why it's happening, you can never figure out how to make it stop happening, because you don't know what you're talking/thinking about. It's about understanding a logical conclusion. You can understand why these things happen without sympathizing with them. "But you don't threaten to kill someone just because your business isn't working anymore." Of course, you do. If you have somebody that's hurting your business and you kill him and then have the business work, well, then why wouldn't you want to kill them? It makes sense why do it, kill and save your business/interests. However much you might emotionally dislike it. People make mistakes "FEELING WITH FACTS". For whatever reason, people can't think about things, they can only feel about them, it's really sad.Everytime I hear the word "should"... Of course people are going to do what they perceive is in their best interest. "Thank you guys for watching, and I will not be seeing you in the next one."

You've to understand why are people terrorists. Because it works. It keeps happening, because it is one of the measures of achieving political objects, and it works. They do it, because it stresses people out, scares them. It also makes average people from speaking out, fighting back against something. In the same way, in history, public execution worked - they weren't for the criminal, they served to scare the rest of the people to not be like the criminal. And so, you make people afraid of you, and then you make them scared that they won't step out of the line, because of their uncertainty whether this is going to happen. And, in the same way, warlord do things that may seem unfair - because people can predict fairness. If you know that somebody is evil, but fair, you can predict what's going to happen and that will make you less scared. So, the unsettling nature that you don't know whether this person is going to take an insult on the cheek or is going to kill your entire family for it. And so, when you have an uncertainty like that, it makes people terrified to even go outside of the box at all. So, they do that, because it is scary. You can predict fairness, you cannot predict unfairness. And people are terrified of the unknown. [[[also an example of that would be the movie "Alien 1979", because the movie tries to scare you with the unknown, the alien rarely appear on the screen and for the hero of the story.]]] Unpredictability "They need to set an example with you to show everybody else that that's what happens. Keep up the appearance"

Teach your children to be resistant to bullshit, so you don't have to worry about them being indoctrinated by anything in their future.

You all get to caught up with the messenger and you never think about the message.

You are not going to remember most things you do not use in a long time.

You're creating problems in your head again. Stop that.

He is using their ancient magic against them. "They're a threat to democracy."

Treat them as if they are not stupid and maybe they will end up being not stupid.

What do you think that I said that you disagree with?

Prior consent means it cannot be considered a crime.

Correlation doesn't necessarily mean causation.

Don't have to have an opinion about everything immediately. Feel free to say, "I don't know".

Just stop responding to them. Stop feeding them with your responses, so they have only nothing to aggro on.

Being sitted in a classroom for 8 hours and being talked at is surely not entertaining nor inspiring to learn things.

"Best way" to address criticism is to completely muddy the waters and totally misrepresent what's actually happening.

"Are ya winning, son?"

Trust, but verify.

"Hey kid, people are gonna be crazy - we are going to have talk about this and figure it out." Prepare the kid for the real world.

Tell people whatever shit they want to hear, just to make them do what you want. You have no obligation to argue and convince anyone to truth.

If you don't know an answer, make a joke or say something funny - so most people won't be seeing this as your lose; they will laugh and move on.

Is there really a difference between saying that there is something you can't say and saying that there are things that you have to say. (compelled speech)

When optics of an argument are more important than the argument itself, it serves no benefit and it serves no audience to that. They only care about looking good and they don't actually care about engaging with the argument and having the discussion or thinking about anything.

A system of anti-meritocratic discrimination...being dismantled. Once again children will be judged on the content of the character and not the color of the square they post on instagram.If you adopt the attitude that honesty is better than lies, that responsibility is better than blame, and that strength is better than weakness, your life will get better.

Let them express himself...because if you don't...they bottle up all their feelings...and then they fester and get real dark...and then they walk into a voting booth every four years...and the rest of us are like "how the fuck did this happen?"...That's how. You didn't let them say anything...then one guy showed up and said everything...and they were like "that's my guy."

Smart kids at school aren't the ones that fail and aren't the ones that get 100 in class either. The smart kids are the ones that perfectly calibrated the exact amount of effort needed in order to pass the class with the lowest grade possible. Because they have been able to quantify and calculate the minimal required effort in order to get the result that they want out of an outcome. [Good grades aren't to show determined work ethic.]]]]

You can't remove racism by cleaning the language and by getting people to watch what they say and trying to control their thoughts, that's just not possible. The only way you can remove racism is to remove the sources of oppression that are racist and directly address those, but the way to achieve that is to have an honest discourse and therefore you can't remove racism from the language. ... Constraints on speech internalize the problem and prevent authentic interactions.

Critical thinking breaks down narratives (((-and many people have more of an allegiance to a narrative than they do to their community or to truth-))) and makes you come to conclusions that are inconvenient (((-and if you apply critical thinking to these topics/narratives, and you evaluate them logically, you come to conclusions that are often times oppositional to what "side you are on," and people do not want to be on the wrong side-))). ... Not only critical thinking has declined, but people trained themselves for critical thinking to

decline; because people that make mistakes and they critically think for themselves, instead of just repeating what they have already heard, or what they are supposed to say, those people get ostracized and get kicked out of their community. Thus people actively try to avoid critical thinking, they are afraid of critical thinking, because could put them in an opposition with people that they are on the same side with. Some people don't take time to back up their accusations, they just them simply because others do, because it's popular. (((-"So, let's get specific though. Let's define bigoted opinions. What opinions of her are those? When you say "bigoted", you're starting with the conclusion that "given her bigoted opinions." First, let's start with "does she have any bigoted opinions?"-.))) "It is the mark of an educated mind to be able to entertain a thought without accepting it." (((-it's crazy how we already had the foundation for this thousands of years ago, but...for some reason...we "gotta" go back to that censorship shit. All the time.-)))

They don't want their opinions critically evaluated, because they know what is going to happen. Biggest self-report in the world. Like, why are you afraid of other people critiquing and listening to what you are saying? Well, because you know you will be wrong; you know somewhere deep down inside that you are full of shit, that you are a fucking moron, and that everybody knows it.

Merit has made us great. As a guy, I would never support somebody that would given advantage to somebody that I wouldn't be eligible for. I would never do it. Like, if you want to tell me that somebody is going to get advantage over me because they are woman or different race than me, I would never vote for you. Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs. People are going to care about what is happening in their own backyard to them themselves before anything else. People have vast gaps in knowledge. New kids might not what CD or VHS is, doctors might not know where Ukraine (relating to its current war) is... people don't give a fuck, that's not embarrassing, you can't know everything. If we're on the side of truth, reality and common-sense, we actually will win. People don't like activists, they talk down to average people, they are insulting, they are usually very privileged; and because they are extremely privileged, a lot of them telling other people that they are privileged, falls on deaf ears, and I think that creates a lot of resentment, and a lot of them like massive hypocrisies. A good number of them are narcissists. The reason why it doesn't mean shit is because people don't want it to, and because it did mean shit in the past, you could have get into a lot of trouble, but people finally started fighting back. If you create a weapon, people are going to use the weapon against you, and it happens enough for people to be worried about it. "Every year 36 people are attacked by sharks and we have Shark's Week." "What a waste of time tangent to try to prove common-sense to people that like to live in a delusion. The numbers are what they are." The case with social causes is that the majority of people do them for social reasons and they don't actually do them because they care about them, that's the primary reason. [[And sometimes it ends up being like "a boy who cried wolf".]] The road to hell is paved with good intent. There is always a greater goal, the end justify the means - that's always what people say when they're the ones that are executing the means. [[People burned Joan D'arc alive, because they loved the God. Bad things in history are done for good reasons. People just don't want to be told what to do, and they just want to be able to live their life. Why would I want to go to a country and then intentionally try to antagonize the people there? That's disrespectful.

Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs. #1 Physiological Needs - breathing, food, water, shelter, clothing, sleep #2 Safety And Security - health, employment, property, family and social ability #3 Love And Belonging - friendship, family, intimacy, sense of connection #4 Self-esteem - confidence, achievement, respect of others, the need to be a unique individual #5 Self-actualization - morality, creativity, spontaneity, acceptance, experience purpose, meaning and inner potential

What you're saying is like, "wikipedia can be compromised and because it's compromised that means that it's not usable as a source." What I am saying is that all of these sources are compromised and just because wikipedia is transparent with it being compromised in some cases, it doesn't mean it's any less or more authentic than another source. Primary and Secondary sources aren't reliable by default. Credibility should about the information. The big problem is that almost everybody who is motivated to create a centralised source for information has a bias behind doing that, and such sources naturally attract people who want to change history, just by the nature of what it is. And they need to do a better job keep those people [activists] out of positions of power and editing roles. Wikipedia is an valuable resource that people use and if you have people co-opting it to be a vehicle for them to push their ideologies or their worldview, that puts the entire movement (a centralised source for information) at risk. "It's all cited, which still puts it above most mainstream media regarding bias." "It empowers a person to apply logic on whether the information is true or not by providing the sources of statements."

(...) So, you have to constantly reinforce these dogmas that are just so blatantly and evidently untrue, but you have to in order to get along in society. And that teaches people not to have any source or any type of critical thinking, to not apply critical thinking to different topics and situations, because if you do apply that critical thinking to those topics, you could potentially punish yourself by losing a group of friends, job, et cetera. It's like, in a world where $2+2=5$, eventually people will stop caring about math. And that's what happened, because any popular line of thinking in the world requires you to actively give up your autonomy of critical thinking. (...) Mayhaps, everybody know how to think, but people are trained to not think - because of how strong and how emotionally charged every conversation is. And they made themselves stupid in order to not cause friction and problems in their own personal lives; and I think this permeates (to spread through something and be present in every part of it; pervade) over everything. "This is why younger people are afraid to think, because, I bet, a lot of people did think for themselves and then they realized, "oh, my god, if I say what's obvious, I'm going to have everybody hate me or people are going to call me a bad person for something."

>>> People only care when it is done inauthentically by loser millennials that are boring, insincere, have no sense of creativity, and they cannot write a good story for shit; and their parents were right, and you cannot write a story how your parents were wrong and have anybody else care about it except you.

>>> In the end, it is not society fault, it is your life, your decision and your lack of action. "The reason why you are not in shape is because you did not make working out a priority in your life." Your life isn't going to get any better, whenever you keep blaming society, because you don't put any effort into it.

Fundamentally, it is absolute poison to your life to constantly fixate on outside forces that are holding you back or preventing you from succeeding.

...and if you constantly try to take that down to a granular level, and look and try to abstract out, and turn it into like a DnD character chart of why you're a loser and it isn't your fault, the only thing you're going to end up with is being a loser. It's never going to get better, no one's ever going to care, your life will never improve, and you'll still be a fucking loser, even after you've had your own support session for yourself to try to make yourself feel better, because you are a fucking loser. People who got bad dice, will never gonna re-roll them, if they keep getting cuddled and being told they can't overcome rng.

How is it compassionate to not prepare your son for the future. How could that possibly be? Compassion isn't just being nice to people and cuddling them. Compassion in a form of honesty. I'm the only person that actually cares and tells people what I think will help them, not what will make them happy.

... Are you a country? You are a person. Why are you trying to abstract this out from yourself? You're intellectualizing society in an abstract way that you have no real control over. I do not care about your macro-philosophy on society. Nobody does. When you wake-up tomorrow, you either do something that benefits you, or you spend another day being a fucking loser. You make these arguments to instead of a person, you make them to a society. You're a person. There is no "we". "How do YOU remove those barriers?"

>>> People try to always intellectualize arguments, so they can justify why they aren't in an another position. It will never have a positive impact on their life.

>>> They do not care about injustice, they care about conspicuously displaying that they care about injustice.

The best apology is the changed behaviour.

People make time for what is important to them regardless of their situation.

Women make rules for the wrong guy and break rules for the right guy.

Biggest enemy of women is a women. Especially the jealous ones.

It's a mismatch between what they say they want and what they actually respond to.

Do not hide what is important to you. [[[-prevents wasting more time to instantly say it-]]]

You can't win them all but you only need to win one!

Just complaining doesn't help one to improve.

To look out for those you care about.

Women need attention.

AOE farming.

Where are all the real men? What happened to men? Well, girls, you kind of happened to them, you completely reframed their incentive structure.

Why she thinks this shit? Because she is hot enough for the guys that wanna fuck her to put up and listen to her stupid shit. That's 100% the reason.

Everything matters to the extent you think it matters to you. And the problem is when to people meet that have different views on what matters to them.

So, you're telling me that a one minute clip is not an indication of a multi-year marriage? I actually think that the 30 year old incels are right and your wife is awful and they know what's best for you. [[[this is not what's going on]]] [[[obviously sarcastic]]]

If normal means: obese, in debt, depressed, ignoring reason and logic, constant shortsighted thinking, constantly complaining, on permanent medications, being promiscuous by having like 20 sexual partners, being not sociable, being not marriageable, not knowing how to interact with people, not having the attention span to read a book, being addicted to smartphones and social media... well, you do not want to be normal.

A research that shows: while men tend to gravitate toward visual pornography, women are more likely to seek out written narratives—often in the form of romance novels or fan fiction—that emphasize emotional connection, character development, and a storyline. A recurring plot they identified in female-oriented erotica mirrors the "Beauty and the Beast" archetype: a woman encounters a mysterious, aggressive, or dominant male figure (e.g., a vampire, werewolf, or billionaire), and through her influence, she "tames" him, transforming him into a devoted partner. Highlights popular male archetypes in these stories, such as vampires, werewolves, billionaires, pirates, and surgeons, noting their appeal as powerful, high-status figures who are ultimately softened by the heroine. This pattern is also reflected in the romance novel industry, which is predominantly consumed by women. The appeal lies in the fantasy of harnessing a dangerous or chaotic force while maintaining control within a safe, fictional context. Women's preference for written content over visual may stem from its ability to engage the imagination, allowing for deeper emotional investment in the characters and their transformation.

..."Just like how most women try and fail to tame chad." ... "And they lose interest if they do tame him." ... "The archetype is so popular because it plays into a mentally-ill narcissism that a lot of the women that consume this content love to have; that this monster is going to stop everything he is doing, stop eating people and killing them, because you are so special that he wants to have a life with her instead. It's all about them, like they deserve it." "It's easier to have like 8 women than 1. Probably because to each of them you act with more ignoring them." "They simply don't know what they want."

Everybody is exchangeable and expendable. ...Life is not fair. ...But some things don't last forever; like individual women's beauty. Who is it sad to? A dislike to the fact that women's always throughout history had it easier because of their looks, comes from guys that are jealous and women that are too ugly to do the same. ...There are also millions of people in corporate world that work normally and think their life is unfulfilling. ...Laws of physics; physically, things will go down the path of least resistance. Whether it's people, gravity, water, air, etc. ...If it works, it works. ... "Why aren't you suffering like us type of people." It's not that women don't like being objectified or doing it herself, it's when it happens without their consent; they will gladly objectify themselves, if they feel they like it or just to get attention, especially from someone they want. ...Simple desire for autonomy in the matter. Follow the incentives. ""A lot of guys on the internet want to make a self-fulfilling prophecy of consequences for the most attractive girls that have it easy, because they view the fact that the girls can do it as unfair. So, they try to push this and focus on it, like, "your kids are going to get bullied for this." - because they will be the ones bullying them. And if they get bullied, in reality, they will either fight it off or deal with it otherwise, but they also might not get bullied at all, because the bullies might get expelled. But reality is, a lot of them are going to retire and marry some guy, maybe a fan of them or not, and maybe had kids. Even more so, when they will be like 50 years old with saggy-ass-titties and wrinkles, looking old as fuck, and if they have kids, those kids are going to think that she is the most important and special person in their life. Mum was a prostitute? Doesn't matter. "That's fine. She's my mum and I love her anyway."

And that's the reality. And they're going to be fine, maybe even more than you, because when they had it easier, they monetized much on it. "" "People don't think it's a bad take, because they want it to be a bad take, because they think it's unfair. Well, the world is unfair." "" "And if you lost respect for your mum, when you found out that she was a prostitute... Well, that's fine, that's your loss, now you've a bad relationship with your mum, I'm sure your life will be better off because of that. -- Of course being sarcastic, nothing will be better in your life because of that. Happy for you." "" [[Maybe look at it as it already happened - look at prostitution in Weimar Republic as example.]] ... Maybe, they just shouldn't have a job were you work with minors. "" "I know people that sold drugs and have done all kinds of stuff they should have never done, and they're living the calmest and happiest family lives now, and had even a gun pulled on them. Because karma isn't real, world isn't fair, and people who do things that hurt other people usually get away with it - and that's just the way it is. You might not like it, but it's just what happens; or at least sometimes it happens, but sometimes bad things happen to bad people, but sometimes also bad things happen to good people. That's just it. ""

Somebody's respect is a currency that is worth nothing. There is no value in a person's respect. Do you know who thinks their respect is worth a lot? The person doing the respecting, nobody else cares. ...So, you may look at the world and decide what's best for you; and the way it's for other people, that's their fucking problem. ...Because to whom good, coherent reputation is good, when it's important? There're billions people in the world. "Everybody said I would get blacklisted for ninja-looting and I would do that every week, even expanding the operation, and no one ever learned, nobody came ever back to beat me for that; there were people trying to ostracize publicly, but it didn't get my reputation destroyed, even more so, everybody knew me, and I just was piece of shit for the love of the game. A game is still the same thing, because you're still dealing with psychology. Nobody wants to waste their time in the game and in the real-life." ...You can hear constantly of scumbags doing money all the time in all kinds of ways. ... People that are sociopathic, that are willing to do whatever it takes to succeed, even at the expense of others, will on average be more successful; and they will beat you out, because they're willing to do things you aren't. ...So, if you want to be a good person, you've to be a good person, because you want to be a good person; there will never be some sort of light at the end of the tunnel, where somebody tells you and give you a reward at the end of the day, saying, "You're a good boy. You didn't do anything wrong.". ...Predators eat prey. ...Moral grandstanding gets you nowhere, minus appreciation of few silent people who will never remember that in longer term and will never do anything good for you for that, and those people are also moral grandstanders.

It's crazy that every single five years there is a new flock of nineteen-year-olds that think they can reinvent the mating habits of people that have been developed for thousands of years; I always find it kind of funny. It really just doesn't work a lot.

Use of force is a last resort.

.....A reason why people liked Donald Trump - Donal Trump is a disconnected fucking-multi-billionaire, real-estate mogul, scumbag, asshole from New York city and he never pretends to be anything else, never. He doesn't put on an accent to talk to people, he doesn't code-switch (alternates between languages), or anything like that. He can be in a room full of world leaders, or room full of rappers, or room with "hey guys, welcome to the feast of the White House, it is McDonalds." - and you can tell he is actually happy about this - "isn't this great?" - he is a real one. And on the contrary you have like Hilary or Kamala switch they fucking accents to talk to people - so guess what, everybody can see this shit is fake. And it is annoying. If you can't acknowledge good things about people you don't like, then you never really going to understand them. Bitches are fake most of the times, that are just facts.

.....He has the most interesting decision-making process. When he actually is thinking about doing something, he doesn't just ask, you know, his closest advisors or some policy person; if it's going to affect a business, he'll call the business as CEO's, he'll go and try to talk to the workers -- he tries to take inputs from everywhere. He actually tries to talk to everybody. Gathers informations from all sources. Instead of "if it's a national security issue, they'll talk to their national security person and no one else. Or if it's about business, they'll talk to the CEO." People think they can relate to him, because he talks to people a lot... and he is charismatic... and energetic. -- Definitely not a senile time-waster like nearly every other politicians in his time.

You weren't allowed to question the research without massive backlash.

Remarkable claims require remarkable proofs.

It's so sad that people have to re-discover fire. Every single time these things happens, people have to re-discover that these things do matter.

It's also again, we're talking about companies that have a long history of lying and being forced to pay criminal fines, and then we're giving them this exemption from being responsible for any of the side effects.

... Occam's Razor (principle) -- If you have two competing ideas to explain the same phenomenon, you should prefer the simpler one. All things being equal the simplest explanation tends to be the right one.

... Retards Razor --the dumbest answer is the correct answer; think of the stupidest reason possible for why something is happening, and that's why it is

Self-Reference Paradox - these paradoxes have in common a contradiction arising from either self-reference or circular reference, in which several statements refer to each other in a way that following some of the references leads back to the starting point.

////////////////////////////////////

////////// Additional, because I'm 20% doubtful whether in itself it was really on Zack's stream or not, or was there something about it:

One of the thing that internet represents is an enormous broadening of distribution channels, like you see with television or news; the opening not being limited to a set amount of shelf space or a set marketing, a minimum bar on a marketing budget. A misconception in the industry about what piracy is; there is assumption that it is about people wanting to steal stuff from you, that they don't want to pay any money and they want to get your content. But when you look at the fact that these people have two thousand dollar PCs and they are spending fifty dollars a month, or more, on their internet connections - clearly they are willing to spend money. So from our point of view, what we saw more and more, is that PIRACY IS A RESULT OF BAD SERVICE ON THE PART OF GAME COMPANIES. Example of that was Russia; everybody in the US "knew" that Russians are pirates - so there was no point of localizing your game, there's no point in making your product available in Russia, because all they will do is pirate it. But the reality is that the pirates in Russia were actually doing a much better job than the games companies themselves in localizing the product and in making it available. So, if I wanted the product and I didn't want to wait six months to get the product, and if I wanted it in Russian, I was going to

have to go to a pirate, simply because I couldn't get it any other way. And as soon as the product became available at the same time it was available in Australia or UK or US, and it was localized in Russia, all of a sudden our privacy problems in Russia disappeared. So, it really is a question of offering, of viewing yourself as how can you provide the best possible service to your customers; and pricing really is [[or can be]] one of the less important aspects of that whole equation. People are happy to pay money, if they are getting what they perceive as a great product delivered on their terms. This is an example where a lot of copy-protection schemes go in exactly the wrong direction, they are actually negative service. As a customer what I want is I want my content on any device at any point in time, with a lot of security. I don't want to worry when I buy a new PC that I won't be able to play a game that I have paid for. And then with copy-protection, you are suddenly like, "okay, if I reinstall my operating system, or if I buy a new pc, or if I go over to my friend's house, if I go on a vacation, will I be able to play this game, will I be able to do this?". So, if you solve the real problems, then I'm much less likely to get a pirated version. Copy-protection makes it less likely that that's going to be the case; and higher service platforms like steam, make you more confident. So, when you attack the problem that way, by improving the service component of the experience, rather than through copy-protection which reduces the service component, by focusing on the customer and doing useful thing for the customer, piracy becomes sort of a non-issue for us.

[The right to express yourself freely.] (...) The clear problem with the outlawing of insult is that too many things can be interpreted as such. Criticism is easily construed as insult by certain parties. It is what you might call the new intolerance. New but intense desire to gag uncomfortable voices of dissent. (...) I am not intolerant, say many people, say many softly spoken, highly educated, liberal minded people. I am only intolerant of intolerance, and people tend to nod sagely and say, "oh, yes, wise words, wise words." And if you think about this supposedly inarguable statement for longer than five seconds, all it is advocating is the replacement of one kind of intolerance with another. Which to me does not represent any kind of progress at all. Underlying prejudices, injustices, or resentments are not addressed by arresting people, they are addressed by the issues being aired, argued, and dealt with, preferably outside the legal process. For me, the best way to increase society's resistance to insulting or offensive speech is to allow a lot more of it. As with childhood diseases, you can better resist those germs to which you have been exposed. We need to build our immunity to taking offense. Our priority should be to deal with the message, not the messenger. If we want a robust society, we need more robust dialogue and that must include the right to insult or to offend.

"We are far too easily pleased." We find pleasure in some of the most useless things. Our standards are so low and we waste so much of our lives doing stupid things, when we could be doing great things, if only we shunned stupid things, and had much higher standards than we do. And frankly, I don't even think they're "high" standards. I think calling these standards "high" is propaganda from a lazy society.

In my experience, people make wrong and stupid long-term decisions, because they never actually, honestly imagine themselves how, in consequences of their decisions, they would be living every day for years, every hour of that time; or if they for whatever reason happen to stray with their minds to think about such a thing, they do it for a very brief time and they do it dishonestly, extremely superficially and without proper logical implications, and all that usually packed in a very wishful thinking.

////////////////////////////////////

////////// Additionally, ending with a quote from The Big Short movie (2015) by M.Burroughs:

""To all investors. I met my wife on Match.com. My profile said, "I am a medical student with only one eye, an awkward social manner, and \$145,000 in student loans." She wrote back, "You are just what I have been looking for." She meant honest. So let me be honest. Making money is not like I thought it would be. This business kills the part of life that is essential. The part that has nothing to do with business. For the past two years, my insides... have felt like they are eating themselves. All the people I respected will not talk to me anymore, except through lawyers. People want an authority to tell them how to value things... but they choose this authority not based on facts or results. They choose it because it seems authoritative and familiar. And I am not and never have been "familiar". So... So, I have come to the sullen realization that I must close down the fund. Sincerely, Michael J. Burroughs, M.D.""