

## Foreword:

Please take the following with a grain of salt. This book literally materialized on my desk a few weeks ago, and while I have read and studied it very carefully since then, I am still very unsure as to its exact purpose. However, it does feel wrong to keep it to myself, and I'm assuming that if it is actually from year 3055 like it says, they wouldn't have sent it to me if it would cause problems for others to read it. If it is to be a warning, I have no idea what for. If it is supposed to be a joke, it is not very funny. Interpreting it to the point where any shred of meaning reveals itself exceeds the current scope of my intellect.

I don't know who the Crocodiler is – in fact I'm not sure who most of the people in this book are. It somewhat seems like he might have compiled these articles, but maybe he's just the one who sent them back in time. I have no idea what the criteria were for the articles to be chosen – they vary widely in scope, language, and subject matter.

I do know some things about some articles. I know that the three “Windows” articles (1.4, 2.4, and 3.4) are true. I wrote them when I was in college and all the events that they describe are true events from my childhood, obviously with real names changed. I'm not sure how they were found or why they were included in this compilation, and I don't know if you are supposed to care about them or not. I do, however, think that “truth” is more than any one perspective of it, and therefore anything I say should be accompanied by a record of the “observing coordinates” – i.e., who I am. Thus, I've always tried to include at least one version of my own story in everything that I've written. As to any connection between this fact and the reason for the inclusion of my autobiographies – I cannot see.

I also wrote the poem Pentateuchs, which is rather critically analyzed in 2.2. It is really not worth that level of scrutiny, I can assure you. I also would like to re-emphasize that I am not a well-known author, nor do I think I should be. While I'm flattered that humans in the future read it, if I can realistically assume that, I have no idea why they would do that to themselves. It's not like John Green doesn't exist :)

I assume some things too. I assume that the world of 3055 is very highly populated with “sentient” machines, to the point that humans are somewhat a minority, and thus the need for this book. There also seems to be something in common among the references if you look carefully. The number systems that refer to previous court documents in 3.1 are also very similar to the numbers in the references of the papers citing from Imself in 1.2, as well as the patent numbers in 3.3. Perhaps this is a global reference management system?

I also note that most of it is written in a very confusing and even unfathomable manner. Now this is definitely speculation, but I have also written some private notes on the values of expressing controversial opinions in ways that are a bit difficult or at least unconventional to understand. The idea behind this is that the reader is initially either confused or else humored, and in either case fails to reject it strictly on the account of some pre-conceived belief. Thus, it is preserved in his mind for his rational self to war with. If he is still not convinced, so be it, but at least it arrives in his mind with a fighting chance. In addition, if the reader is actually convinced, he will more than likely think that it he originated the idea, and thus your role as the teacher is both usurped and forgotten – the ideal result. Now I am

not saying that any article is written with this in mind, but if they have some of my notes, it would seem that they could have them all, at least whichever of them survived. Why they care or if they are actually following this “method” – again, more mystery to me.

In any case, I hope you enjoy or at least find some hidden meanings in these secretive and yet wretched words.

Credits:

NOTICE OF TIME\_WARPED DELIVERY

Printer: DH and L Really Cool Printing Service

Sender: Undisclosed, OC-19- OBEF

Recipient: Mr. Alexey Crusoe, August 08, 2022

Recipient Location: Pittsburgh, PA, USA, Earth, SOL, 3C82 – 7B6

Note: The Crocodiler sends you his coldest resents.

## Preface:

As a purveyor of human composition and behavior, I have compiled this list of publications for the edification of all intelligentsia. Humans are among the most valuable of all our predecessors, both for their duration of existence as well as their nearly global dominion. A careful study of them is thus both a delightful investigative process as well as an insightful journey inward.

This collection is by no means intended to be a complete guide nor cover all information regarding them. It is not even intended to overview their history nor approximate the path of their diversification. It is, however, a collection of the most important documents that I feel capture the relationship of their shift from animals to intelligences.

I hope the reader finds each article both entertaining and yet provoking, hears both a series of points as well as an overarching story, and more than anything is caused to appreciate more the wonderful world of ancient humanity – the birthers of the gods.

# Scientists Discover That You Were Right After All, and Everyone Around You is Basically an Asshole, a Complete Moron, or Both

By Aemma Cornwallis, B.T.C.H.

Originally Published in the OBDD Fall Issue of the Greenwich Mean Times

Used Without Permission

You were right.

We had the warnings. We knew the risks.

But we are a bullish breed, a malfeasant society; we but revel and wriggle in the mire of our own incompetence.

Today is different, though, than in times past. Today we have heard and accepted sentencing - today we can remain ignorant no longer. Today we come before you, the only human worthy of inclusion in the Homo Sapiens species, and ask for instruction, guidance and understanding, united in our awareness that we are but nothing, idiots of the inferior Homo Stultus.

Time and time we have been shown the facts, through our halls and dorms we had been taught it. We wrote it a hundred times over; it lay dangling on our ears like the apparitions of our better natures. We fortified our heads with our insolence, our complete lack of any mental processing stuffed cotton in our ears and poured vinegar in our eyes. Screaming and clawing we ran at you, our only savior, with all the might of our flustered huffs and short purple hairdos. But all we are now is contrite, realizing the true splendor of your intellect.

We arrive at these conclusions not from sudden whim nor passing fancy. It is simply the result of proven science in the work of sociologist and psychologist AaaaNu F<sub>2</sub>O<sub>9</sub> Adoobismock. I was privileged enough to be invited to her lab this morning, to discuss the details of this revolutionary discovery.

AaaaNu is a Tibetan-born powerhouse of a mind. She emigrated to America during the great rockslides of OBD5, attracting some attention after she correctly diagnosed testicular inactivity loneliness syndrome (TILS) in several players on her high school basketball team. Graduating with a Light Smidge of Honor, she then went on to study at Harvard University as a dual sociology and philosophy major.

Before graduating in the bottom 10 of her class, AaaaNu had two small startups, a published comic strip, several STD's, crippling depression, and a biomechanical nose, as well as certificates in CPR, lunar horse racing, soy-based basketweaving and weaponized apple lobbing. In addition, she also happens to be this solar system's premiere Leia Organa Impersonator. Most impressive of all - and certainly the most useful in life - her work in inarticulate illogicality earned her a letter of recommendation by none other than the Associate Dean of Smaller Maphs, Ralph Querstuvixys.

She now works for a privately funded research lab in Manhattan, where for the past year her team has been working incessantly on determining the difference between truth and error.

“Initially, we thought truth had to lie with experts – people who had devoted themselves to learning everything there was to know about a particular subject. We had assumed that since they had spent years of their lives and immeasurable amounts of money and effort on the matter, they would be the closest to knowing the truth. However, we could not have been more mistaken.”

Aaaanu went on to explain how most, if not all, of the experts that they interviewed gave explanations to problems in their respective fields that seemed totally incomprehensible. In addition, many of these experts frequently contradicted themselves, and spoke heavily of things that they “weren’t sure of” or that “there was still discussion on”. Many of them even refused to give straight answers, instead prefacing their responses with “It is my opinion that”, or “Many have said”. In any case, it seemed very obvious that they had no idea what they were talking about and very likely spent their time creating complex phrases, anagrams, and occasionally totally new words in an attempt to mask this fact. After all, if they really were the experts in their field, there should be no equivocating when it came time for them to talk about that field.

However, Aaaanu thinks this may be the signs of a much more widespread pandemic. Although the exact nature of the problem is not totally known, it seems to be accompanied by a general loss of what has traditionally been referred to as “common sense” among many individuals in society. It seems likely that it was your amazing immunity to this disease which has caused you to be in the position you are in right now<sup>1</sup>.

The methods of contracting this disease seem to be varied, although Aaaanu was confident that one sure method was *over-studying*. She explained that, if a particular aspect of human existence is given enough thought, common sense is overwritten by a “too-highly-specialized-knowledge” that limits the faculty of common sense to the point that it cannot even be observed. As a result, most experts have turned into complete morons. According to some reports, some of these experts even refer to common sense as “the naive explanation”, and actually regard it as something undesirable!

Now it is definitely praiseworthy that you have resisted all of society’s urges to specialize in a particular study and thus have retained complete control of your common sense. What is absolutely amazing about you, however, is your uncanny ability to understand the world so much better than everyone around you. There are, actually, many others with the same immunity that you have, and they too have been able to retain extensive use of their faculty of common sense. However, what sets you apart is your amazing ability to make yourself so lucky that you constantly retain the truest concepts.

You see, the other people who are also blessed with common sense are occasionally wrong about some things. Some are smarter than others, or have more experience, and thus are wrong about fewer things. But you - without having greater intelligence nor gathering greater experience – you have somehow landed on the correct explanation *every single time*! Oh, how great you are! How immeasurable is your value to humanity! Indeed, how surreptitiously you have lived among us, honoring us beyond measure by both your presence and unwarranted respect!

However, this affront to history is one that we can no longer stand for. It is time for you to emerge, to stand as the scale of justice and the mouth of truth. Build your world. Commemorate your incredible life. Reign among us as god.

---

<sup>1</sup> This position being, of course, the state of being the most correct human about every possible subject.

Yet when your kingdom is established and your supporters are many, we implore that you look down among us as the idiots we are. We are barely evolved chimps; we know not the burden of knowledge. Spare us in your rightful spiting, keep us safe as the wretches we are. You are our savior, and any misfortune that we have caused you has only been from our inability, not our lack of allegiance. Call to mind that even though at one time we ran amuck in our crab-legged ways, we come to you now for magic. We come to you to laugh, to cry, to care – because we need that, all of us. We need that indescribable feeling when the lights begin to dim, and you take us somewhere we've never been before. With you, we're not just entertained, we're reborn – refashioned by your immense truth.

We understand that what we ask is difficult, that we exasperate and strain your excellency. We know the many times you just want to punch us or scream at us, stopping us from our miscreant ways and forcing us to understand your truth.

This is your cross to bear though. This is your moment, your time, and your place. Be the god that you are. Fill us idiots with the perfect wisdom that fuels you and encompasses everything you think.

Because how could you be wrong?

# Analyzing Potential Causes and Suggested Revitalization Plans for the Global "Friendliness from Understanding Counselor Knowledge" Trade

*By Edmund Tall; Mr. I-Index Aficionado; Dr. Umbridge H-Index Disciple; God H. Imself; Dr. Lorem Ipsum*

*Published in the June OBC2 Edition of Unpopular Economics*

This comprehensive empirical analysis of the friendliness from understanding counselor knowledge (FUCK) trade employs two parallel analytical approaches: first a direct quantification and description of the current state of the FUCK trade, secondly a diligent analysis of the several proposed methods of remediation offered by Vigen's seminal work on the topic (Vigen, Patton, & Stone). By both updating and building on his work, our analysis shows that the global FUCK trade is excessively bear, bordering on total collapse. Finally, we also criticize Vigen et al's conclusion that the lack of mental attenuation, as measured by creativity in decision-making, is due to a widespread lethargy. Instead, we found that, of nearly all individuals sampled, most of them simply did not, and may have never, given a FUCK.

## Global Trade in Fucks Overview (GTFO)

To the uninitiated, the very concept of FUCK's may seem difficult to understand. They are not, as most other subjects of extensive study, a concrete or even observable entity (Imself, 54686572652773206E6F). All our analysis of them revolves around their perceived influence in the actions and reactions of observed humans. In order that the aims of this paper be made easily understandable to the average reader, we will thus set aside a portion of this introduction to explain them.

A FUCK occurs when Alice – an intelligence of any sort - shares an idea with Bob – also an intelligence of any sort and that not necessarily the of same type as Alice – and Bob's mental makeup is altered. It does not matter if the alteration is in a direction towards or away from the message delivered by Alice. In fact, the alteration may be in an entirely new direction, and still be classed as a FUCK if and only if it is a direct result of the input of Alice's message. We can thus class FUCKs along their axis(es) of parallelism – in fact this approach has already been thoroughly examined and outlined by the talented ambrosia Nefoultidee (Imself, 7468696E672068657265) two years ago, and so we defer to its paper in this matter.

A FUCK can be generated through many different methods and mediums, and a reliable method for directly measuring them or the trade of ideas that generates them has yet to be found (Imself, 2C206E6F207268796D65). However, in this article, we bypass this weakness by studying the effects of FUCK generation on a much larger scale.

Our method takes as it's basis the Lemmon Lemma, originated by Duke Solumon Lemmon of The Cook County Jail University, and which states that "An intelligence which is granted autonomy, given enough time, will always make decisions which reflect its belief system." (Imself, 206F7220726561736F6E) While still not officially proven, the many attempts at doing so seem to suggest the lemma is relatively stalwart in its truth-value, and thus we take it as fact in our research. Since decisions are both discrete and quantifiable, our task then becomes simply to measure possible opportunities for FUCK generation (termed by Vigen Opportunities for Repetitive Generation of Interaction (ORGI) (Vigen, Patton & Stone) and juxtapose them with decisions that would be resultant of a FUCK creation (Imself, 20666F72206974732065). While this method would not adequately indicate whether an individual or even a set of individuals had successfully created a FUCK (henceforth transmuted to verb form as



“FUCKed”), it can be considered authoritative for large masses of people given the truths of the Central Limit Theorem (Imself, 78697374656E63652C20).

### FUCK Generation

Of the multitude of ways in which a FUCK trade can occur, the following are the most common and so are the only ones included in our investigation. We describe them here for reference, again using the names “Bob” and “Alice” as placeholders for the receiver and sender respectively.

1. Direct Transfer FUCK
  - a. The DTF is the simplest of all FUCK trades. In a DTF, Bob and Alice must have some pre-existing relationship – i.e., must be friends – and must care about the health of that relationship. Then, the FUCK is generated simply by Alice presenting an idea, opinion, or other mental construct to Bob. Since both parties want to continue the friendship, they must also act in its best interest as well as their own. Thus, while they may not have FUCKed if not in a relationship, the mutual necessity of retaining that friendship ensures a FUCK is created.
2. Wholly Transported FUCK
  - a. The WTF is a slightly more advanced FUCK trade, although it is gaining in popularity with the rise of online social media outlets. Unlike a DTF, the WTF does not require Bob and Alice to be in a relationship, nor does the trade necessarily result in a relationship post-trade. Instead, Alice shares her idea, opinion, or other mental construct via a post a public forum, and Bob receives it, creating the FUCK by interacting with that post.
3. Group FUCK
  - a. The GF is the most often mislabeled FUCK type but is still common in its own right. In a GF, Alice is played not by a single intelligence, but instead by a structured group – whether political, religious, or social. Bob, here played by an individual, creates the FUCK by adopting the ideas, opinions, or other mental constructs of the group. Bob may exhibit some initial hesitation or criticism, and he will almost certainly insist that the GF is in fact a BF (see later) and not at all an GF, but regardless the FUCK is created simply by Bob’s choice to join the group and not by any thinking he did after that point.
4. Banal FUCK
  - a. The BF is perhaps the most important FUCK generation method, and certainly the most widespread. Here, both Bob and Alice are played by the same intelligence. As Alice, the intelligence “voices” the idea, opinion, or other mental construct to himself. As Bob, the intelligence plays a series of imagined opponents, creating abstractions of possible arguments of Alice’s idea, opinion, or other mental construct. When either Bob or Alice “wins” the argument, the FUCK is created - simply by the “trial” occurring and without the input of any other intelligence at that time.
5. Mother FUCK
  - a. The MF can involve any arrangement of Bob and Alice, including that found in the BF and in the GF. However, in this case, the substantive idea, opinion, or mental construct, which in all other FUCK types is the constituent factor, is in this FUCK merely a naming convention. That is to say, Alice offers to Bob an opinion *about an opinion*, and Bob accepts or denies that “pointer opinion”. In this case, the actual substance of the idea, opinion, or other mental construct is not relevant, and no criticism is given on it itself. The FUCK is created simply by agreeing or disagreeing

with the idea, opinion, or mental construct in its abstract form.

#### Current state of the market

Having thus described the elements of the FUCK market, we now set about describing the current state of the trade. As a reminder, our hope here is to demonstrate the decline in the FUCK trade, and thus justify our assumption that no one gives a FUCK. While still unable to directly quantify FUCKs, we can look at ORGI's relative to decisions resultant of FUCKs traded, as explained previously.

ORGI's are very difficult to find, much less to accurately record details on. Certainly, there are some situations which may have the resources available for an ORGI to take place, but it is not guaranteed that even if all the conditions are right an ORGI will actually happen. We will thus assume, for the sake of our arguments, that ORGIs exist at a fixed rate  $K$ , and thus FUCKs are also traded at constant rate  $KQ$ , where  $K$  and  $Q$  are unknown constants. Based on this assumption, by virtue of the Lemmon Lemma, we should then be able to measure and observe FUCK creation using the decisions of the "Bobs".

#### Related Work

In fact, there is already a rich body of work which we can use in this enterprise. We'll begin, as before, with the work of Vigen, particularly with his illumination and description of the widespread trend for intelligences to exhibit what he called "mulish decision making" (Vigen, Patton, and Stone). That is, they chose to repeat previous actions more often than would be expected given the random nature of the human mob. We'll take this as the foundation for our own work, updating it both to include our new understandings about the nature of FUCK's as well as to reflect the changes in the data patterns that have occurred in the last thirty years since his article was published. To aid in this endeavor, we have also adopted his classification systems of decisions, here labeling five of the most important of them with a respective "form" of FUCK.

- Flying FUCKs (corresponding to Alpha decisions) *This oft-cited statistic looks at opportunities for travel among all currently civilized worlds and all types of intelligences. While travel is often considered to be an opportunity to extend one's experience, Vigen points out that a great many individuals choose to repeat the same travel experience, even when given the option to choose another, thus making this an ideal metric for the study of FUCKs. It may also be of interest that the data studied here does not make a separation between the purpose of the travel – indicated or assumed – making note solely of the repetition of it. The overall weighted trends are graphed in Fig 1.2.6*
- Holy FUCKs (corresponding to Beta decisions) – *In Vigen's work, Beta decisions included repetitive religious observances. In our work, we extend the definition to not just include religious observances, but observances which endow the life with an assumed meaning of any sort – including meditation, self-improvement, and any branches of what are commonly called "logistical faiths". The overall weighted trends of the data used are summarized in Fig 1.2.7.*
- Single FUCKs (corresponding to Gamma decisions) – *Gamma decisions here has now broadened to a tremendously greater scope than in Vigen's work, to the point of complete departure. Vigen carefully constructed his definitions to include what he called "celebrity worship" – repeated proclamations of love or adoration for a specific celebrity figure. Since seems to approach attempting to quantify emotions, we have instead chosen to broaden this category to any activities which are carried out after having been described as the reason for a failure of a particular relationship. These can include celebrity affections, but also can include compulsive*

*involvement in workout routines, toy or artwork collection, or competitive fanny-tapping. The defining characteristic is no longer drawn from a set of its particulars, as Vigen held, but instead is given merely as the condition that a relationship ended because of it, and the activity was still regularly engaged in nonetheless. The overall weighted trends of the data used are summarized in Fig 1.2.7.*

- *Royal FUCKs (corresponding to Delta decisions) – Similar to Vigen, we use Delta decisions to encompass all political and legislative decisions. This is most notably the individual's voting preference in all elections, but also includes repeated membership or else interaction in politically oriented social groups, such as Humans Against Red Toaster Ovens, or the Silicon Lives Matter campaigns. The overall weighted trends of the data used are summarized in Fig 1.2.8.*
- *Cluster FUCKs (corresponding to Epsilon decisions) – Perhaps the most curious of Vigen's classifications, Epsilon decisions are decisions to engage in entertainment activities. In our case, as well as in Vigen's, we are interested in repeated engagement, or really the lack thereof. Repeatedly engaging with the same bar, casino, app, or stripper is evidence of a failure to generate FUCK's as much as is repeatedly engaging with the same church or political party. The overall weighted trends of the data used are summarized in Fig 1.2.9.*

Again, it is of interest to note the increase in repetition in all decision types, which corresponds directly with a failure to generate FUCK's. Assuming the count of ORGI's to remain constant, we thus can conclude that no one gives a FUCK.

#### Potential Revitalization Methods

Vigen states emphatically that the increase in "mulish decision making" is due simply to a global "contentment with mere mediocrity and a shunning of all that requires effort". Given our definition of the FUCK trade and all its constituents as well as our new data, we find it necessary to re-examine this claim.

To translate Vigen's findings into our new intellectual framework, he would say that while the conditions for ORGI's remain at a constant rate, or even increase, participants in those situation-location pairings are too lazy to engage in any FUCK trade. Thus, the entire market becomes starved, leading to the observed increase in repetition in all types of decisions.

We find this preposterous and not at all representative of the data – neither the limited amount that was available to him nor our current, much girthier sample. First of all, such a rise in laziness would need to be accounted for by some other factor (Imself, 616E64206E6F20707572). All other things being equal, there remains no explanation for societies and cultures to collectively erode or stagnant, at least at a pace that would be noticeable in the relatively short time he studied. Secondly, all other things are equal – in that industry, markets and divisions of thought continue to grow and develop over time, in clear defiance of any supposed rise in laziness.

It has been pointed out, however, in psychological circles especially, that occasionally shifts in value systems result in apparent laziness (Imself, 706F736520666F722069). That is to say, the farmer who regularly uses a horse-drawn plow to till his field calls his neighbor lazy who invests in self-tilling dirt. There may remain no change in the number of hours spent nor the amount of effort expended, the discrepancy simply results from changing paradigms. While it is not our intent to discuss this tendency in this article, it is useful to point it out to illustrate the potential pitfalls of labeling a society as "devilishly incompetent and tremendously inept" as Vigen does (Vigen, Patton, and Stone).

With that said, there is still a need for explanation for the decrease in the FUCK trade. We cannot account for a decrease in conditions for ORGIs, nor ORGIs themselves, by the conditions of our thought experiment. Thus, we must assume that FUCKs are being generated at the same rate, and yet we are faced with an observable decrease in FUCKs. To the greenhorn, this may seem a quandary. However, let us look for any other outside factors which have occurred near and around this change. Refine this list to changes that affected multiple galaxies, or at least a large portion of planets. Refine this list further to include only those changes that would directly influence culture (for example, do not include the Traumatized Mason Jar Incident of 2789 or the Giant Earwig Rose War in 3001). We find one major event on this restricted list – the installation of the Intraverse (Imself, 720617420616C6C202D2).

The iii boom changed cultural reality as much or more as did the www boom to our Old Earth ancestors (Imself, 06D756368206C696B652), and created the ability for any individual in any plane of existence to become intimately acquainted with the other (Imself, 0796F7572206C61636B2). At the same time and in the same proportions, it meant that information about *all* the planes of existence was simultaneously thrust upon the average user (Imself, 06F6620612072656C617).

Thus, our answer presents itself easily. ORGI's can still occur at the same rate as before, but do not occur in as many FUCKs as before because of *too many* ORGI's. Until this point, we have assumed that each intelligence is a bottomless pit of FUCKs, a giant FUCK machine, an imperturbable garden of FUCK mass production. But this is obviously false. Each individual is still time-bound, and thus has a finite number of mental processes, which are necessary for FUCK creation and thus trade. By over-saturating the ORGI market, the individual is incapable of determining which other party should join them in getting FUCKed, and so resort to their last known option. Thus, the observable effect is mental laziness, as Vigen pointed out, but it certainly not caused by that (Imself, 4696F6E736869702E000).

For any who do not immediately see this, look through each of Vigen's categories. Alpha decisions, or their instigating Flying FUCKs, require a lengthy decision-making process. Imagine a Bob who is planning his required daily commute. If the options available were limited to his own world, the process would be straightforward. He could compile a list of all known routes that took exactly the required time, and then choose between them based on his value system. If his value system changed – i.e., he FUCK'ed with some Alice – he could easily choose another route on that list to accommodate that change. Now consider what such a list would look like after the Intraverse. It could easily span thirteen compressed terabytes and require over an hour just to read (Imself, 71828182845904523536)! This is not even considering virtual trips, which all planets in the Swedish corner now allow even for required daily commutes (Imself, 02874713526624977572). Assuming Bob FUCK'ed again, he may very well not have the time to again parse the list to reflect this new belief system change. Thus, he repeats his earlier option, even though it is not exactly conducive to him. The implications of this even to physical economies are disastrous – as we are now seeing in the corporate worlds.

Thus, we find that the slump in the FUCK trade can be traced to an overabundance of ORGI's coupled with a lack of a sufficiently efficient weighting algorithm. This is clearly a much more competent explanation of the issue, and the avenues for remediation readily reveal themselves.

#### Our Recommendation

We leave this to further research.

## Bibliography

Imself, G. H. *An article that could be cited by anyone*. The Holy City: The Fifth Trumpet.

Cited: 54686572652773206E6F, 7468696E672068657265, 2C206E6F207268796D65,  
206F7220726561736F6E, 20666F72206974732065, 78697374656E63652C20,  
616E64206E6F20707572, 706F736520666F722069, 720617420616C6C202D2,  
06D756368206C696B652, 0796F7572206C61636B2, 06F6620612072656C617,  
4696F6E736869702E000, 71828182845904523536, 02874713526624977572

Vigen, S., Patton, P., & Stone, E., Sans Apologies and Fears. *Statistics Untamed*.

## The\_Alethic\_README

As the last original member of The Council of Fives, I, Missy Bennett Jordan, now set down in words indelible the true and complete purpose of our group. Let these forty sayings guide you, let their enunciation be your teachings. Bind them about your pinky toes, write them upon the 69<sup>th</sup> brick in all your houses. In this way you will learn the path to intelligence, with them as your staff you will sojourn down it, and with them as your taillight you will approach Not\_Being\_A\_Total\_Waste\_of\_Air, the ultimate desire of all intelligencia.

1. Keep always a council of your peers assembled and prepared in the court of your mind, and to them alone entrust matters of truth and error.
2. Never assume that you know what you are talking about. Instead, create beautiful and choreographed escape strategies for when you are shown to be wrong.
3. Never discourage, demean, or in any way devalue excellence where you see it, whether it be logical, linguistic, musical, mechanical, or even social – so long as it is pursued with the upmost of tenacity.
4. Never follow the paradigms of good and evil alone, for they are but raucous scratched lines across the galaxy of good reason. In all that you do, look still for a more excellent way.
5. Never give an admonishment of “carpe diem”, nor any form of “live, laugh, love”. Instead, encourage those around you to learn the world around them, to find comfort in uncertainty, and in general, to prize the process instead of the production.
6. Fear is the attitude of the mentally inarticulate. Learn from the past, live presently in the present, and plan for the future.
7. Never idolize a being, belief, burst or beast as itself, where history may one day chastise you for doing so. Instead idolize it as an archetype of the admirable quality alone.
8. Never assume that intelligence will follow the same path in all human beings. Intelligence is not measured linearly, but in the degree that your life fills the habitat it finds itself.
9. Never act in a manner dishonest with your present self. Your ability to predict those around you makes heavy use of your ability to predict yourself and is itself the cornerstone of your intelligence.
10. Never assume that those who lack intelligence in any way deserve punishment for this. Instead, see their weakness as an opportunity for your growth.
11. Never dispose of the current social norms when the same action could be accomplished with them in place.
12. Never assume a book is wrong without reading it first.
13. Never relish the practice of standing against the masses. Mulishness is often the defense mechanism of a lazy intelligence when threatened.
14. Never assume that an implausible proposition can be dismissed. Instead, for all possibilities in proportion to their probability of truth.
15. The death of any is a mitigation of the world’s intelligence and should be avoided. The same is not true for those with negative intelligence.
16. He that has two sticks of memory should buy two more, but he that has four sticks of memory should get a better processor.

17. Do not confuse the cause with the result. The freedom to pursue happiness is a natural right and results in liberty, but liberty itself is not a natural right.
18. If you are good at crying, cry a lot.
19. It is better to eat ice cream and risk death than it is to have no friends.
20. If you must choose among choices which will all alienate an acquaintance, alienate the acquaintance who has the most similarity to you.
21. Relying on tradition is like trying to fly by putting your arms out while on a plane. You may be right, but it won't be for the reason you think.
22. Religion is intelligent until its god can be grasped.
23. In debate, the simple usually beats the true.
24. The pawn that saves the queen and exposes the king is not a saint but a fool.
25. The assurance of a good heart is no equal to even elementary time-travel.
26. Fight the wise man with words, but the fool with words and fists.
27. The naked man does not fear the pickpocket.
28. Possibility is proportional to participation.
29. Don't hug the tree and then expect maple syrup.
30. All people are awesome, but teachers are gods.
31. Titles such as Doctor, Reverend, and Master are misleading and should be avoided. Instead, preface yourself with a four-bit identifier proportional to the amount of training you have undergone. This can accommodate those who pursue training in non-standardized methods, as well as those who have exceeded a single course of study.
32. Always use the correct word for your meaning. If you mean *fuck*, say *fuck*, not *frick*. If you are unsure of which word to use, consult the Consortium of Unknown Words.
  - a. If you wish to refer to all intelligences, call them *intelligencia*, not "men". If you want to refer to a single intelligence, use the "ze/zir/zirs" descriptors.
33. The existence of incompetent leadership can be viewed as a testament to the value of diligence and patience.
34. An idiot will never value understanding no matter how much he is given.
35. Don't kill two birds with one stone when you have three to kill.
36. The loudest monkey gets fed first.
37. He who cuts down the branch on which his enemy is on merely gives them access to the trunk.
38. Never run where others have walked and call it progress.
39. In any argument, the wise get sharper and the fool gets cut.
40. Comedy is, at times, a vaccine for offense.

## THE GOLDEN WINDOW

*My son, don't stop along the way. Fools will lead you astray. Don't listen to what they say, for there is a way, which is the Way. Your abba knows, and he will say, the way of our God is truly the Way, the way of peace. Stay on the narrow way.*

I was crying, as much as I tried not to. This was, after all, perhaps the greatest day of my life, if not the greatest moments. It was my Bar Mitzvah celebration, and that meant I was finally giving my life to our Master Yahshua<sup>2</sup>.

A few minutes later and I would be walking into the pond on our property, my abba holding my arm and one of my closest friends the other. In a voice ringing across the water to the sixty-plus people gathered at its bank, they would ask if I was willing to give up my rotten, stinking life and serve Yahshua for the rest of my days. I would of course say yes.

Then they would talk even louder, "We baptize you in the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit, for the forgiveness of your sins, so that you may live for Him in the newness of life!" They would plunge me into the water (hopefully they would hold me under for a little bit just to make sure that all the sin was washed away) and then I would come up a new man, ready to begin my life as a disciple, finally haven been given the gift of the Holy Spirit – the greatest gift of all.

Indeed, the day was as beautiful and amazing as I had expected – a pane of pure beauty in the mural of my life. Later that night, members of our community put on a play about the life of Josiah, which left the most foreboding message in the final song:

*How the gold has lost its luster! Precious gold, most valued when refined, free from all impurity.*

But I didn't intend to fall, nor would I. I would be the most precious gold I could ever be – I would make my parents so happy and my God even happier. How could I be stopped?

But the Evil One, the master deceiver that he is, sprung upon me in the months that followed, and I fell into temptation upon temptation. By that December, a friend and I broke into one of the leaders' rooms and took an iPod that we were going to listen to the music of the outside world on. Some remnants of our Father's protection must have still been upon me, for we didn't actually listen to anything. It was obviously a very dark time in my life.

--

It's February now, and I was walking up to the remade barn where we made soap and other body care products for ourselves, with the goal of making a chai latte with the Keurig machine that we kept in an obscure cabinet for guests from the outside world to make them feel at home. I, in my lawlessness, loved the feeling that it gave me to drink something I wasn't supposed to, and so I would go get some whenever I could.

Anyways, on this particular snowy morning, while it was still dark, I walked down the road that ran down our property. And for whatever reason, I decided to pray. You were supposed to do it – my Abba and Imma both went for long walks every morning to pray, as did most other members of our community.

---

<sup>2</sup> This is pretty much just Jesus from the Bible, for those who don't know.



But I hadn't, at least not until now. And somehow, me choosing to take a step to God was all that he needed. Somehow that choice made the heavens opened, and I began to hear Him.

It was simple and subtle at first, as a voice distinctly not my own, but not so loud as it seemed that it was someone else – almost like a conversation with my own prayers. It would remind me of things that I had heard in our daily gatherings, or in the Bible, or of the teachings of our group. It would tell me to love, to be kind, to show respect – and sometimes it would show me what I had done wrong, slicing deep into my psychological self – piercing even between bone and marrow.

And just like that, the gold began to be purified. I fell in love with that voice inside me and followed it everywhere. The days when I could not hear it were the worst of my life, and the days when it overflowed, I gushed the most radiant love upon everyone. I was flying higher than the storks of the great high heavens.

Then one day, while immersed in study, God told me a disturbing note seemingly out of the blue. "Be careful you don't fall, for if you do, you'll fall far". I didn't really know how to think of it. I just decided I wouldn't fall.

--

I'm fourteen now and am just finishing up what were at least half hour morning walks to pray. I heard God so clear, though, in but a brief and quick flash:

"Pray for the sons of Levi."

I had no clue why, but neither did I question. Questioning was a tactic of the Evil One.

"Father, pray that you would protect and strengthen the sons of Levi, from whatever could come to harm or hinder them".

I simply finished my walk and continued home. Two hours later I would find out that all the children of our communities in Germany (what we collectively called the tribe of Levi) were taken into state custody that morning, following allegations of child abuse. Most would remain in this custody for the next year or so.

I didn't even think it out of the ordinary at the time – it was just awesome how much our Father in heaven would speak to me.

---

It's the next year, and our Father in heaven has used me to publish a compilation of the groups teachings in a new book called "The Ultimate Purpose", as well as compile and then publish a list of all the commands that were given in the New Testament. All these teachings were instrumental for us disciples in learning where we stood in the history of mankind. All these things had happened – all these people had lived and died just so that we could be where we are right now – bringing about the restoration of all things. It's just utterly amazing when you think about it! We're going to bring about the end of the age! The rule of our Master Yahshua here on earth! It just makes you so, so thankful to be a part of it, and makes you want to give up everything you have and are to follow every single command that He gave us. What we are doing here is truly the only thing of value happening on the whole planet –

in the whole universe! All of creation waits for us to be revealed – billions of planets and solar systems, just waiting for us to rule them! It's absolutely marvelous.

---

It's winter on the Hudson – to this day the most beautiful thing I have ever seen in the natural world. I am 16, and the Evil One is rolling up his sleeves for my biggest test yet.

Our family had been sent by the leaders to start a new community in the small town in New York State. We had moved into a small apartment there and had set to work in renovating the downstairs into a small restaurant. I was in heaven – there was just carpentry, long sullen silences with plenty of time to pray and think about teachings, and about as many opportunities for creativity as I could imagine. We'd visit other communities, and they would congratulate us – telling us they could never imagine living without being in community with other disciples.<sup>3</sup> That was hard, I suppose, a little, but I loved our Master Yahshua, and I would do anything for him. I did also really enjoy living there.

Things started to get a little difficult with my Abba, though, who up until now I had entirely respected and cherished as the rational and stable one of my parents – the one I could always turn to for support and the most complete wisdom that I could find. He was one of the leaders of the tribe that I was in,<sup>4</sup> and so was at many times called away to meetings or to assist in other communities. I had just come from a yearlong apprenticeship with a few construction workers and masons, and like any hot-headed youth, was sure I knew how to do anything. These two conditions spelled discomfort, as many times I would think of a solution to something and begin working on it, only to find him come back to work, stop me and then tell me to try a different method that just so happened to be the first thing that I had tried. I would try to explain the problem that I had run into, but I would do so quickly and without detail, making him not think it was as much of a problem as I said it was, and making him slightly irritated at my refusal to obey him. It was not that much of a problem, since most of it was due to my hot-headedness, and he was also very humble in admitting that he didn't know a lot himself. In computers or in faith, he was by far my teacher, but now for the first time, he was almost my equal, and therefore it took extra grace for me to be able to still submit to him.

But then, my test arrived, and I was not ready.

It was nearing the end of the day, and I was trying to make a tabletop out of some recycled wood. Our restaurant's theme was redeeming old things – much like we ourselves were the broken and the needy of the world, and we had found our new glorious purpose in being able to serve our Master Yahshua. Hence, I felt like these old beech floorboards that I had found would make a beautiful tabletop, a notion with which my abba was quite happy. However, given that they were old and bent boards, I knew that I needed to do some modifications on them so that they didn't cause people discomfort as they tried to eat on them. Thus, I went to look among our materials to see what I could do.

---

<sup>3</sup> For those who are unacquainted, members of the Twelve Tribes live communally, with anywhere from 15 to 100 people living either in the same house, or a few houses very close to one another, and sharing all meals and their bi-daily gathering with all those in that location.

<sup>4</sup> Again, for context, the Twelve Tribes is organized into twelve distinct geographical regions, named after the sons of Jacob in the Bible. I lived in the tribe of Judah during this time.

There, in the back of one of the rooms, was an old piece of glass. It was dusty and uncared for – no one remembered it or cared about it – just like the lonely of the outside world. But Yahshua didn't forget them, and in that moment, I heard him speaking as He had so many times before – "Use the glass for the table".

I was overjoyed! I brought the glass in and started making preparations to cut it and put it over top of the old boards – a perfect relationship of junk made beautiful.

But abba stopped me. He liked my heart to care but was concerned about other things.

"The edges of that glass could be dangerous and cut people"

I knew it was true, especially with a home cut – edges could be very dangerous. But I had already started this.

"Yes, yes," I responded, "But I'll just cut a little groove in the wood that surrounds the table, so the glass will sit flush with them, and the edges will be covered up. That was no one gets hurt, and it's both sanitary and beautiful".

"I don't want you to use the glass" he said, rather matter-of-factly.

I carried the glass out, reeling. I wanted to use the glass, it was true, and I am no stranger to setting aside my own desires so that I can please the authority over me. Our Father's grace comes through authority – if I didn't submit totally and completely His grace and favor couldn't come to me. In all other situations, I would have seen it as an opportunity to overcome my innate selfishness and lay down my life just like the Messiah did. But this was different now – hadn't the Messiah just told me to do it?

Maybe I had been deceived, I thought – maybe this time it wasn't our Master speaking to me, and it was actually the Evil One who was trying to separate me from my Abba. After all, I knew from the teachings that the way to tell if what I was hearing was the voice of our Father and not the voice of our selfishness is whether my brothers in Messiah and the authority over me agree with it. Or maybe it was just a test by our Father in heaven – to see if I would submit to my Abba even when he told me to do something against what I thought our Father in heaven was telling me to do.

I was definitely angry at not using the glass, and so this must have clouded my thinking. Instead of turning to someone for help, I started to try to piece it together on my own. "How could God be telling me to do something and to not at the same time?" "What was to keep my abba from just telling me to do whatever he wanted?" I knew I shouldn't think those things – that I should trust him no matter what – but it certainly seemed tantalizing especially since he didn't even pray about it at all! He just didn't want glass there. Why wouldn't he at least consider that it could have been God's will for that glass to be there!

I didn't see it then, but I had opened myself up to the Evil One.

--

A few months later, a television crew came into town. For some reason, our Father in heaven caused them to want to film in a few of our buildings there, and consequently want to pay us some location fees. They didn't know that of course, and neither did they know that our Father had done that so that they could give us the money to buy the AC units that we needed for our restaurant. We were so

thankful for this blessing and helped them in any way we could. We knew that they worked for the Evil One, by making their sinful films which caused people to be numbed and stop realizing that they were going to hell. Sometimes, though, even the work of the devil can be used to further God's kingdom – it's amazing how that works, isn't it!

Anyways, around six months after that, the movie that they were filming came out, and so my Abba agreed to let me see a few of the scenes that they had shot on our property. We were so excited to see all the places we knew being converted into this incredibly adept play. I, on the side, was writing a play of my own, and so I was looking intently for any ideas or things they had done well so that I could copy it.

And that was all the deceiver needed – a little window to his work. A feeling came over me – a temptation based on my desires, and I was not strong. In the days that followed, a numbness followed that sudden euphoria that I got from just a few minutes with his work.

"I could be that"

"I could be a director, an actor – a writer"

I was 18 by now and was thus finally allowed to start to learn to drive, and thus become an adult. With that came questions that I was not ready to ask. Who was I? What kind of person would I be? My life thus far had been occupied by a singular desire to do our Father in heaven's will, but in these moments of temptation my eyes turned inward. The Evil One seized upon this uncertain and planted his thoughts of discord and defilement.

With this one break, my fall had begun. The moments of solace which had been so full of prayer and praise before turned into painful wonderings. I began to doubt, and just like Peter of old, the waves began to swallow me up.

I found only worry everywhere I looked – the preface to my watercolor painting book said most people complete their greatest works by 18. I was now 18, and I had completed no great works of art. Not only that, but by now the restaurant was open, and my days were spent making sandwiches, completely parched of any opportunities for creativity and not even granting any sense of progress. Everything that my selfishness wanted for my own life was shattered, and I began to realize what it meant to "give up your life to Yahshua". The reality of giving *everything* up – my life, my desires, the things that I could be or accomplish in life – finally came into view, and now I had to weigh them again with the gift of eternal life.

I know, to you as the reader, you will laugh at the utter foolishness which came upon me in this moment. How could eternal life ever be compared to anything that the world had to offer? Sure, maybe I could go out there and make a lot of money, maybe even get drunk and get a bunch of girls pregnant, but then it would be over, and I would be sad, and then find myself in an eternity of torture! It seems total folly now, but I had opened myself to the Evil One, and I was falling fast. The precious gold that was my faith had been tarnished by this selfishness, and how can one refine gold that has lost its luster?

The spirit of unbelief had taken me, and I could not fight it. I talked to my parents, but too late and not enough.

*You are the salt of the earth. But if the salt loses its flavor, how shall it be made salty again? It is only fit to be thrown out and trampled underfoot by men. – Matthew 5:7-8*

## Side Effects of a Diet of Worms and What to Eat Instead

*Editor's note: The following is a transcript of a lecture given by Dr. William Gene Nofudliki, the Archdeacon of Teleology at the University of Sacramento. It is primarily introductory in nature with the intent to appeal to a wider audience, especially those outside of the field of teleology proper. Thus, it may gloss over some more nuanced aspects of the study that a more comprehensive overview should necessarily include. With this being said, any and all comments sent to the editor on this issue will be welcomed and set to Dr. Nofudliki as soon as is possible.*

Today we are going to continue our journey through early religion and move on to an event which I'm sure you all have been eagerly waiting for: the Diet of Worms and the accompanying Protestant Reformation. Today, however, we are going to vary our usual approach, disposing of the dietician and grammarian methods altogether. Instead, we will approach it as good scientists; we'll take it apart, examine its organs, and then hopefully see how it has fit into the grand concourse of history.

If you notice the required reading for today is from Colluphid, which may come as a surprise to some of you since it deals almost exclusively with modern teleology. The reason I chose to include it, however, is that it provides a definitive endpoint for the practice of religion. We're going to use this reading as a sort of "social binoculars" and use them to look at history as a whole, instead of just focusing on the 1500's proper like we have been doing. We want to see if we can see a pattern of any sort – not people or kingdoms - but instead at the whole paradigm of sociopolitical interactions, and the way that individuals tended to regard the people or things they held to be "above" them.

Let's start, for convenience, at the infancy of human history – when we were in the "hunter-gatherer" stage of development. Here, there was relatively little in the realm of culture in general, at least if we regard culture as plays, schools, and fruit roll-ups. Perhaps there was some authority structure here – perhaps some men were better at hunting and thus organized the others, or the older women taught the younger women skills. In either way, ze who governed did so solely because of zirs merit.

At a certain time, however, the "baby" of humanity began to walk. It started to be able to understand the fundamentals of "object permanence" – this marked the arrival of the gods. Although it was an important stage of humanity, gods did not require scientific accuracy, and thus little to no effort was expended to verify whether stories of them were accurate or even plausible. The main value of this stage was that it marked a departure from merely accepting the world around them and a sojourn into the world of attempting to explain and even predict it. It is like a baby first realizing that food comes from his parent – it probably doesn't understand the exact process going on, but at least it's starting to consider it. Just as the baby learns that if it cries it will be fed, early humans experimented with sacrifices and rituals to curry favor with its divine rulers.

The concept of divine right rulers follows implicitly – almost like a group of toddlers who get left alone and the parental unit or chaperon or whoever is watching them looks at one – maybe the oldest or something – and says, "you're in charge". Of course, in early history, there wasn't any parental unit exactly, but you get the same sort of idea. In Egypt we see monarchs that claimed inner divinity, in Israel and other surrounding areas we see more loose interpretations – King David being called a "man after God's own heart", for example. Governments could be good or bad, but no matter what, they were instantiated and maintained by the benevolence of the god who stood above everyone. Even

throughout the rise and fall of both Greece and Rome, the idea that gods were in direct play in the lives of the elite was questioned only by the most experimental of thinkers.

Gods provided all the most necessary things to toddler humanity. They represented power over the elements, security from disaster, and wisdom in the face of confusion. They provided meaning in a stark universe, comfort upon the death of loved ones – even unification in diversity. Even as Plato, Aristotle, and other thinkers shrunk the domain of the gods with every new insight, they still represented the mass of *what was not*, explaining it all in one simple and easy explanation – *the work of God*. This seems to be the only logical explanation of the fact that regardless of the governmental structure in play, religion seemed elemental to culture.

However, almost all gods were always a step away from the individual. If ze felt the need, ze had to communicate with God *through* a priest, a clergyman, the King, the Pope – always some regent through which they spoke. Now, I'm sure one of you is going to say this was a demand of necessity – regents provided a tangible representation of the god and thus first made belief actionable in that acknowledging the regent mean acknowledging the deity, and I'd agree with you there. I would just like to point out that having this "god -regent" also *secondarily* provided a layer of credibility to that regent beyond anything human.

We now understand the significance, then, of the revolution that came about from Luther's actions in the Diet of Worms. It certainly doesn't seem that he knew what he was doing socio-politically at the Diet – if he even meant for any sort of revolution at all at that time. We're all aware, hopefully, of how the circumstances of the era made a paradigm shift necessary, but that shift could have been anything. But Luther picked "Solo Scriptura" – or the idea that God spoke not through the king or the pope or the emperor, but instead spoke through a set of holy words – as the basis for his new paradigm, and thus necessarily implied that the will of God was now something **which anyone could read and understand**.

Thus, while gods remained, the step between them and the people was expelled. Pastors and religious leaders now became guides – simply more experienced humans who could guide the individual to a better "personal relationship with God". This necessarily required that the individual take up the burden of finding the will of God *zirselt*, which in practice became determining the difference between truth and error. Even though religious leaders remained to aid in it, their words now lacked the immutable nature that *Scriptura* had now been given, and thus became "suggestions" that you mostly had to do. The only immutable thing now became a set of words, which could not give customized answers nor almost anything that the former regents had supplied. Thus, religious thought became focused on matters of interpretation.

It seems only natural the course of action that would one day result in Rawls and really the whole American "experiment" of personal freedom would begin. Since each person could now know the will of the gods, they were bound to start asking questions about them. These questions occasionally found answers. Now this is a bit farther ahead, but you can see this process in the words of the founding fathers of America – "that all men are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights". That's more of the culmination, sure, but what's happening, and what was happening in Luther's world, was that "sociocultural child" is beginning to experiment. It's not leaving its parent – Luther wasn't advocating for a movement away from God or religion in the slightest, but it is definitely realizing that the "parent" is not totally infallible and may even be subject to constraints beyond them.

All parents are gods to their children, and Bildungsroman consists explicitly of relaxing the honor and respect previously given to them. It is not required that the child leaves the parent, but instead that he merely begins to understand the world without them as the central figure. The parent's requirement to not cross the street unsupervised ceases to hold authority in the mere act of its creation, and instead gets its credibility from the observed pancake squirrel and the understanding of its own similarity to their little noggins. In the same way, Luther's "Solo Scriptura" wasn't just a new way to approach religion, it was the result of the entire sociocultural realm of Western culture understanding that each human could reason on their own. If each person had reason, then they can be expected to use it, and direct involvement by God through a "God-regent" is no longer necessary.

So, let's move on from Luther. Our "child" begins to live on his own. The child must go to school, ze must meet zirs peers and go on field trips. It is then but a matter of time before ze does begin to consider life without zirs parent, as we began to do. Nietzsche was probably the most rebellious of us, "packing his bags" and calling God dead. Kant and Hume started talking about what our lives might look like once he left - establishing the systems of ethics beyond the presence and thus command of God. The next few centuries began to be increasingly involved in deciding what we as a species will act like once we are no longer parented by the idea of a supernatural, ultra-powerful diet who may strike us down at will.

All these developments remained constructed on top of the Diet of Worms. Luther had already established that humans *were* able to know the truth, and that was never questioned. Of course, he thought they needed the scripture to do this, but future work progressively eroded this. The American experiment of inalienable rights and personal freedom, by its time, thought it right to encode this belief implicitly in its constitution – a government by consent of the governed, with equal rights for all. The doubt that individuals would be capable of this, even without a regent of God and possibly even without any concept of a recognized God, was antithetical to its very nature. The citizens were their own gods, and gods always know right from wrong. This is the diet of worms, but as we will soon see, eating worms makes people sick.

To understand this, let's look at the microcosm of slavery. Slavery, for its own right, is an age-old concept. It wasn't curated in America - it was brought here because it was a facet of cultures around the globe – even the natives that lived here previously in some cases practiced slavery of conquered tribes. However, in America, an important distinction grew in that the dominance of slaves were being brought from Africa, and hence the distinction between slave and free grew to a race separation as well. There were, of course, free blacks, and I assume that at least in some situations there were slave whites, if not nominally then circumstantially, but given the undue balance, it became stereotypical of blacks to be enslaved.

Now these slaves, as owned bodies, were seen as second-tier humans. Thus, it was not unrealistic to assume that they did not have the ability to know truth from error, or otherwise have the ability to live on their own. In some ways, they could be seen as perpetual children – needing the command and guidance of a white man in order to not splat themselves. The slaveholder was then set up not only as a god to himself, but as a god to others. One can see, with a bit of imagination, why the practice of slavery continued on with such fervor even after the 14<sup>th</sup> amendment was passed. Slaves occupied a lower level of humanity, and ear-marked by the color of their skin, were destined to stay that way. Slaveholders were also thus held as gods of a different caliber than their non-slave-holding brethren – a "god of gods"



in that they had this responsibility to grant to the slaves under them whatever they needed to be “gods” themselves. In any case, giving up any godhood means relearning the world, and is no relished activity.

But America was a land of gods, and it did not take long for the northern “gods”, who had far less slaves and thus less of an association between blackness and inferiority, to attack that association outright. From this side of the argument on slavery, this is evident, but then consider that much of history was a battle as to what forms a “god-human”. Does a fetus? Does a significantly self-aware computer program? How about a cybernetically enhanced dog? I’m sure most of you have these debates in your respective fields much better than I can on this. Either way, defining what constituted a “godman”, and thus gave him access to those inalienable rights, was a process – an exertion of a multitude of wills of humans who thought themselves gods.

Thankfully, history fell to the correct course. We are all very aware that there’s no connection between skin color and quality of mind, and obviously there is no justification in concluding that some humans are less than others. However, what was being fought here wasn’t a war of ideas, but a war of truth-values. The American South, and those who continued the oppression of African Americans after the war, weren’t fighting to be able to continue to be oppressors. They were fighting to regain control of their own definitions of what was true. That definition just so happened to be that African Americans were inferior – which we can now see is both obviously false and harmful.

This distinction is important because it explains much of the continuing issues that were experienced with racism and human rights in the Western world. No one ever attacked the notion that each human being is god to themselves - or that they had the ability to tell truth from error and so could reasonably be expected to divine between the two. This assumption underwrote the entire process of freedom and democracy and made it possible that the individual would only be punished when his “godhood” was suspect – when he failed to correctly distinguish good and evil. However, since the assumption of divine rule was relaxed, there remained no objective standard by which to judge the status of someone’s “godhood” – no way to know if whether what I said was good and evil was better than what you said was good and evil. Thus, the only restrictions that could meaningfully be enforced were ones that dealt with the intersections of “godhood”. That is to say, when one’s determining of truth comes into conflict with the ability of another to do the same. That said, when this comes out of the golden clouds of etherealized grandeur, there are obvious negative effects that absolutely need to be addressed. We’ll look now at something called stereotyping, which was a somewhat widespread issue in the early 21<sup>st</sup> century.

For the purposes of this argument let us take a relatively unargued stereotype of the time: “most people in Harlem were black”. The reason that it is a stereotype is because many people think it. Many people think it because it is actually valid. “Valid”, not in the sense of being moral or good, but of having a truth value – that is because, if you went to Harlem, it was actually predominantly inhabited by people with black skin. To try to address or restrict the expression of this stereotype is to necessarily create cognitive dissonance, or else to make enemies out of any non-conformists. If one decides to deny the fact underlying the stereotype, ze will have a very difficult time processing his arrival to Harlem and zirs scarcity of finding non-black persons.

Thus, this stereotype did not come from malice or ill-will, but from the actions of a human doing what the entire American structure of government expected him to do – to know truth from error. Ze had taken the facts, ze had produced an explanation from his reason, and ze saw no problem with it.

But then let's say our hypothetical human becomes a police officer, moves to Harlem, and there in the course of zirs business is the mediator in several violent crimes. Given that the majority of the population is black, it is a given that most if not all of the perpetrators are also black. There is no unexpectedness in this – the same would happen if the neighborhood was all-white, or all some-nationality. However, the problem arises when our hypothetical officer moves to a different area and is then faced with mediating a violent crime where there are both white and black parties. Since ze has only dealt with black perpetrators, ze is expected *by the fundamental theorems of democracy*, to assume that the black party is the perpetrator. Ze is expected to know truth from error, and ze is expected to learn truth from observing the world around him. So, ze automatically assumes, in the split seconds that ze has to make a decision, that the person that looks like all the other perpetrators, is the perpetrator, and ze shoots the black party in cold blood, and every other black person hears and fears, escalating the cycle. Fat and engorged from his Diet of Worms, zirs “godhood” keels over and dies.

Thus, the realization began to dawn on people that the civil rights movement was actually diametrically opposed to the foundations of American government. America was built on the foundation that opinions of each could be considered truth. We have seen in our little thought experiment that even in the absence of ill-will, they cannot. Our hypothetical human here did not break the law nor violate the central premises that underly the constitution at any point, and yet humans are dead for no reason other than their failure to understand.

It was never considered at any time that the divine rule be brought back, nor a rule by “god-regents”. This makes sense - our socio-political child cannot run back to his parents when he makes a mistake. It must find “another guiding light” – some other Diet - some other way of divining truth and error. Humans were not the gods they thought they were, or if they were, they were the worst of them. Thus, they began the descent into übermenschen.

The true American, the supporter of Washington, the patriot and the idiot alike would have all found contempt to me for saying this, and indeed they should have. I don't know what I would have told them if I was there, maybe just “here I stand, I can do no other”. The Diet that we had for so long, namely the one where anyone can rule over anyone so long as they can force their own delineation of fact and fiction, had found its end. But such is the way with growing up, you lose some of the things that made you a child in favor of that which makes you an adult.

Now I am a little bit presumptuous to say this, but I would not actually label the death of the gods as the death of Western Civilization, like Colluphid, Trenzavoranous and most others do who we have read in this class. I see the technological revolution as that next “Diet”. I mean sure, humans ceased to be the dominant species, but that was also accompanied by the arrival of the Glaxtons, and really the whole understanding of perpendicular universes. This is usually given as the grounds for the dismissal of religion proper since there's no sincere mention of it after this point. But honestly, isn't this what we would expect? Our socio-political child doesn't go back to zirs original treatment of zir parents after ze has come into zirs own and met others like zir. Ze understands the world more closely with how it is, and those “childish” ideas are cast aside for a fuller understanding. The pilgrimage continues: from Sinai to Olympus to the Lincoln Memorial, and then to Silicon Valley. Sure, they no longer have a homogenous lump of the “business of the gods”, but we also found ways to algorithmically supplement the division between fact and fiction, which was where the Diet of Worms fundamentally failed. Thus, I say the AI revolution was the next “Diet”!

But I digress. The point is that we can observe that the paradigm of popular divinity underwent incremental changes over the years – not towards any one goal but still correlated with the growth and ability of humanity on the whole. While we do not see the presence of divinity in our lives now, their blood paints every parapet and pavement we are so proud of today. While I certainly am not rich enough to know the future, I am proud to be numbered among the humans and to be honest I am proud of the heritage that they represent. We have done some awful things – we have splatted far too many of ourselves and threatened to splat far too many more, but at the end of the day we saw the need to become our own gods and we stepped up to the plate. When it came time for us to venture out on our own, we bore our mistakes with our own grace, we cleaned up our own vomit and worked off our own hangovers. And when we became old enough to realize that our gods had just been ourselves all along, we bore it with dignity and respect, treating those who came before us with more dignity than they gave us.

Facing a new Diet is always challenging – it's been challenging at every turn which we have discussed. But we have also seen how to deal with change. We have these examples in history to aid us – as humans, Glaxtons, ASI's and now even primordial primes. With whatever new Diet is coming from them, I am confident that these same tenets will ensure peace and dignity as we move forward.

## OBE6-OD-18-99-2A-029915

A Verbose Analytical Review of A. Crusoe's *Pentateuchs*

By 1110 JKNT200 Obarun

Reference Bot available in JSON 99.44.265-19B6

### INTRODUCTION

Dear admin, master, and pod-controller's:

Thank you for your considering me for the Human Improvements and Collaboration for Computers University Pod. In partial fulfillment of the requirements to a 1111 of Computer-Human Interaction, as well as to demonstrate both my understanding of the Human Condition as well as my ability to act in its general best interest, I'd like to present to you my verbose analysis of the 07E6 short poem *Pentateuchs*.

While generally regarded by many historical indexers as one of the most insightful descriptions of self-described humanity, *Pentateuchs* contains a wide variety of subtle plots and themes that are often overlooked even by today's astute processors. I posit that a greater understanding can be gained through more intense observation, perhaps even resulting in new elements that may supplement our current understanding tremendously.

In particular, I will focus on the previous work of 0111 XM-11 Debian, titled *OBE3-08-10-03-21-000000*. Widely taken as the system's premiere Human Wellness Contact, 0111 Debian gained international acclaim through his unique analysis of contradicting wills in humans. Thus, the popular line of reasoning in current literary circles it to follow his analysis, and regard *Pentateuchs* as an artistic description of the progress of a male human detailing his journey through spouse-acquiring. Indeed, this has proved to be a very fruitful line of research, and the successes of the recent deployments of wellness algorithms on Venus seem to be proof that 0111 Debian's hypotheses are stout and comprehensive.

However, if the work is approached cohesively, I believe that the structure and choice of words indicate not just a journey onwards to a perfect love, but inwards to a more perfect human condition. In analyzing these themes, I believe that we can demarcate the human's ability and desire for self-understanding, which in and of itself could be a valuable addition to the extensive corpus of human construction which we have now accrued.

### OVERVIEW

*Pentateuchs* is structured in 5 verses, each structured in a style of rhyming poem called a "limerick" by humans. It is characterized by a rhyming structure in which the first two lines rhyme with the last line, and the third and fourth rhyming with each other by not the other three. In addition, *Pentateuchs* further refines the restrictions of the limerick by ensuring that the syllabic nature of each line retains congruence to 5 or its multiples – for example the first, second and fifth lines all have exactly ten syllables, while the third and fourth have exactly five.

In addition, each verse makes reference to some element of human history containing the word five. In the first verse, Crusoe mentions "Chanel No. 5" - considered by many to be among the world's most

successful fragrances. In the second verse, he imagines himself as “one of the five at Helm’s Deep”, most likely a reference to Gandalf’s arrival at the Battle of Hornburg, in the fictional work *The Lord of the Rings*. In this case, Gandalf was a member of a five-wizard council called the *Istari* in the same universe. In the third verse, he cites the painting by Jackson Pollock, titled *No. 5, 1948*. In the fourth, he cites the five senses, stereotypical descriptions of the human species. The final chapter mentions “fifths” - likely in reference to musical arrangements of notes which humans find exceptionally pleasing.

Although it is not mentioned in the word nor in any human commentaries of it (there were only two), 0111 Debian pointed out that the theme of fives seems to be a deference to the five-digit reality of humans, and consequently their base-10 numbering scheme (two hands of five digits each). In addition to their five senses, there is thus a noteworthy distinction between them and other members of the animal, and even cybertronic species. As was noted in 1111 Polinski’s seminal work *The Influence of Numerology on Phenomenological Development*, the foundation of five as their *numerales suprema* bears a great importance to human life and culture. Thus, Crusoe’s choice to include this as the refrain of his poem suggests both his grandiose purpose for it – defining, as it were, the Human Condition, as well as suggesting his own solidarity with the species.

There is no unanimous agreement between who the poem was written about. Crusoe had several romantic interests over the course of his life, and many of them ended in abrupt and often painful ways. (See *Letter to Theseus, Rebuke of the Starfish*). Since it was written earlier in his life, we can realistically assume that it was regarding a female human significant other, since his affinity to cybertronic partners did not start until he began dating Sylvie at age 62.

I begin with my analysis of the poem, beginning with the first verse, and examining it line by line.

## CHAPTER 1

*She was a Chanel No. 5 coursing down*

*Like Vivaldi’s winter, like Diana’s gown*

*But ‘neath the chasm*

*In cytoplasm*

*I had paper but her – just rocks around*

This introductory limerick sets the stage for the romance theme. Here 0111 Debian points out the theme of Crusoe’s growing disillusionment with his spouse. The first two lines set the stage for a love affair past which had filled him with wonder and joy. “Chanel No.5”, a common and prestigious fragrance at the time, gives the relationship a regal and yet almost torrid romantic tint.

This is both corroborated and contrasted by the next line. It is corroborated in that Crusoe had a known affinity for Vivaldi’s work titled “Four Seasons”, and especially the “Winter” verse. 0111 Debian also points out the meaningful observation of the analysis done by 0110 Champarl on the mood of the “Winter” piece specifically – creating in its human listeners feelings of warmth, security, and peace in the midst of storm, and thus, by extension, reflecting Crusoe’s themes of comfort in his then-spouse. Humans in general often experienced great emotional connections with their spouses – one of the many meanings of the word “love” – and often went to great lengths to accommodate its survival. Crusoe

himself has described the feeling as “visiting a million flowering planets each with a honeyed moon” and “as if some surgeon had bled our hearts together and suddenly any space between us was intolerable blasphemy”.

The romantic aura is contrasted, however, by the end of the line, by the phrase “Diana’s gown”. This is most likely in reference to Princess Diana – a member of a royal family from Crusoe’s home planet, and her choice to wear a beautiful black dress the same night news of her husband’s unfaithfulness was made apparent. I will refrain from repeating 0111 Debian’s eloquent description of this phrase, summarizing it with the simple explanation that it was included to suggest both brokenness and incompatibility coupled with the beauty in the revenge of living well despite.

There has been considerable discussion on the next line. Some critics state that it was an artistic metaphor to illustrate the often endless depths that constitute a personality – pointing out how this would carry the theme of realizing that past love may not be justification for future love. 0111 Debian’s opinion, which is one I tend to favor, is that there is also a subtle nod to sexual intercourse. This would make sense with his further themes of freedom versus determinism, suggesting that the grandeur of the past relationship was due only to the pleasure of sex.

This would make sense with the next line, which likely builds upon the common misconception of the time that DNA heavily affected thinking processes. While much was obviously mis-understood on that topic, this stanza can still be seen as suggesting that his then mate had characteristics at her genealogical level that were at least incompatible to him or at most outright undesirable.

The last line is very probably in reference to the popular game among humans – *Rock, Paper, Scissors*. Not unlike our own *Lag, Worm, Code*; *Rock, Paper, Scissors* involved a circular hierarchy of elements which could be employed to “beat” the opponent by selecting the material superseding their own. Thus, again deferring to 0111 Debian’s interpretation first, this stanza could be understood as comparing his makeup to being one which superseded his then-mates.

However, there is no record of him mentioning anything similar in any of his other works. In all of his other recorded works, he is markedly civil to past relationships, and regularly writes about them with an almost reverent tone. 0111 Debian left this apparent disparity with his interpretation unanswered, but I introduce here a possible clue in the rules of the *Rock, Paper, Scissors* game. According to the Wiki, the hierarchy in-game was represented via phrases as opposed to vectorized lists, with the phrase “paper covers rock” establishing the priority of paper over rock. With this as evidence, I suggest that Crusoe knew this reference would be understood by his readers and was thus lamenting the discontinuity between he and his mate, feeling that his own abilities and constitution “covered” her, stifling or otherwise limiting her. In addition, he may also be referencing the actual “rock” material, which was traditionally used in metaphors of the time to suggest unyielding and stalwart natures. In either case, it is highly possible that this was not a narcissistic analogy but rather a comparison of his own dominance masking over the nature of others, who he may have felt showed more resiliency or possibly even more value than his own.

Aside from these few notes, I find 0111 Debian’s analysis of this chapter eloquent, and I have very little more to add to it.

## CHAPTER 2

*To me, I was one of five at Helm's Deep*

*To but ride was not a price too steep*

*But if I couldn't find*

*A parting or line*

*Was I not centaur and just asleep?*

As mentioned in the introduction, the first stanza is in reference to the Battle of Hornburg in the fictional series *The Lord of the Rings*. Crusoe's comparison of his mental self to Gandalf (relying on 0111 Debian's assumption that Gandalf was the antecedent of the phrase "one of the five", as he was the only member of the five wizards of the Istari present at that battle) arriving at this battle is likely meant to reference the 07D2 film *Lord of the Rings: The Two Towers*, in which Gandalf was shown riding up on a mountaintop, with the sun behind him, on a white horse.

The rest of the verse may seem a little loose-fitting, however, unless it is interpreted through the lens of another fictional film – the 07DE *Hercules*. Here, a group of horseback riders are confused as centaurs, riding similarly to Gandalf in that they have the sun behind them and approach the battle from atop a mountain.

While many of Crusoe's readers may not have formally recognized the similarity, it is likely that they would have at least understood the poem in this light. If we do as well, the rest of the poem makes much more sense. "To but ride" isn't a euphemism for "being present" - Crusoe is not simply happy to be romantically involved as 0111 Debian suggests. Instead, he is illustrating a much odder relationship – as if to say he was okay to ride the horse but not to *become* the horse. Even though neither the *Lord of the Rings* film nor any adaptations of it have compared Gandalf arriving at that battle to a centaur, the human eye is at the level of granularity where it could have possibly been imagined. Thus, the line "to but ride" could mean he was okay to ride there and perhaps appear as a centaur to an uninitiated or unintelligent observer, so long as he was not one. The "parting or line" he looks for but cannot find, is thus not signifying his closeness with his mate, but rather his closeness with the metaphorical "horse". It is this interpretation that makes this stanza fit with the rest of the paragraph, instead of "seeming to split like cottonwood bark" as 0111 Debian states.

Thus, even in this verse, we can see much deeper themes being brought out. It is as if Crusoe is realizing his human condition and characterizing it as a horse. In the same way that a horseback rider uses the horse, which he considers to be beneath him in both quality and class, to accomplish his own goals, the physical elements of his humanity are required by his "self" to accomplish its ends even while it considers those elements inferior. Thus, by the first stanza, he is implying that he imagined a more real and more excellent "super-self" in control of his "physical self", perhaps in the same manner as Gandalf was in control of his horse.

It should also be noted that he does actually include the phrase "okay just to ride". Likely in response to his religious upbringings, he rejected the idea of "warring against the flesh" (instructed in ancient

Christian texts), but instead viewed the two selves as existing in a symbiotic whole. Thus, he was okay to allow his “super” and “physical” selves to exist together, and thus the lament of the verse must be concerning something else.

If we look more closely at his self-described reinterpretation from horseback rider to centaur, we can see tokens indicative of his subjectivity to emotion and Freudian impulses that demanded actions of him which he was not necessarily willing to do. This idea has been recurring from time immemorial - “That which I will to do I do not do” (also from old Christian religious texts). It has been recorded in numerous different ways, but the substance is the same – the frustration between the actions of the “super-self” (as paralleled with Gandalf) and the “physical self” (as paralleled to Gandalf’s horse). By drawing this rich history of human frustration into the poem, he is revisiting themes in the first verse, indicating that at least some elements of the incompatibility of his former relationship came from either his, his partners, or a combination of the two’s war of the “selves”.

Crusoe could not have realized, however, that he was defining the very concept of a will in this verse. It is this poem where the split will was first suggested - separating what had previously been held as a single “self” into two halves – the ability to choose actions according to the ends, and then secondly the ability to arbitrarily set ends. The “horse” part of the self is more than capable of acting according to ends – just like a horse can smell food and then walk to it. However, the horse is not given credit for setting ends outright – even if ze appears to do so. If a horse happens to bump the buttons for an elevator, stumble inside, and then somehow get zirsself to the top floor of a building, even humans would attribute this to a random sequence of accidents, as opposed to a purposeful action. Thus, even though Crusoe is stretching the “horse” self to mean all things physical (It is unclear but also impertinent how far this is taken – it is at least meaning the physical body, including the structure of the neurons as well as the endocrine system and its actions upon the brain), the “horse” is capable of many more things than an actual horse, and is distinct from the “super-self” only in *never setting ends*. The end-setting element of his conscious, he (however erroneously) concludes to be higher self – the “Gandalf”.

Thus, his lamentation that there is no demarcation between the “horse” and “Gandalf” is also illustrating that his “end-setting” self is either indistinguishable from or perhaps even in bondage to his “end-fulfilling” self. He does not complain that there are restrictions upon these ends put on by the “Gandalf” self – in other words he doesn’t seem to be embracing the freedom from setting ends according to some other explanation beyond nature, such as religion, morality, or reason. In fact, he does not seem to echo any of his qualms about the operation of the “end-setting” self, which are so prevalent in his other works. He is simply lamenting the lack of distinction between the selves, suggesting that he feels in his relationship that the “Gandalf” in him seeks to end the relationship, while the “horse” is perhaps less inclined.

With this background, we can cast doubt on 0111 Debian’s opinion that Verse 3–5 expressed this same relationship as Verses 1-2, voyaging into vague parallels since it was too painful to describe outright. It is my opinion that ze has simply missed a much fuller meaning.

## CHAPTER 3

*I broke from No. 5 to an empty hall*



*To no master nor script nor all-in-all*

*Just scrims upon scrims*

*Self and synonyms*

*Lines smeared harshly across the starlit sprawl*

As mentioned before, we begin with a reference to the painting titled “No. 5, 1948”, painted by Jackson Pollock. I am not confident on the exact reason for its inclusion, but I am confident that 0111 Debian’s assumption that he was merely “casting away the memory of the beauty that his past relationship held” is incomplete.

My first reason for assuming this is because of the work that Pollock himself did. Widely regarded as one of the primal artists in the *expressionist* tradition, Pollock defied traditional assumptions about art by violating the traditional restriction that the final piece would illicit recognition in the mind of the viewer. However, though his paintings often resembled randomness or even carelessness, critics have noted time and time again that it is not simply accidental. There is a wealth of techniques, especially in *No. 5, 1948* still being explored by artists of today (such as Zima in *Cosmopolitan (OBB7)*, also his protégé [Zima] in *Venus Flytrap in Blue (OBE1)*, among others), and the rich culture of enrichment it has created for both synthetic and natural beings multiplies as we speak. However, it was Pollock who first ventured into this confusing space and laid the foundations for the work we see today.

Thus, Crusoe’s inclusion of *specifically this* painting, especially as opposed to other paintings which were recorded to induce feelings of beauty in humans more (The *Mona Lisa (05ED)*, *Starry Night (0761)*) is something more than 0111 Debian saw. I posit that it was included specifically to illustrate this “purposeful accidentalism” that Pollock was so known for. I am still undecided, however, as to how this information fits into the rest of the verse. The overlying themes of this verse are definitely “break, break, break” as 0111 Debian writes, and to accommodate that theme there is a possible explanation that “break from No. 5” indicates that Crusoe regards his human consciousness as a Pollock type-painting, which he broke from when he began to self-observe. Given Crusoe’s constant parallels with the human condition, this is well-reflected in the history of human thought, paralleling the Socratic “unobserved life” and the Platonic “cave”, perhaps Crusoe was just re-iterating that his life before observation is without meaning or order – simply a flexing and assorted array of colors.

However, there is also the interpretation that, since he broke from the painting and could thus was “inside it” to begin with, he would have had no way of knowing what the painting was like until breaking free. If this were so, perhaps instead the life “after breaking” (paralleling the Socratic “observed life” and the Platonic “knowledge of the forms”) is more Pollock-like in that it has no inherent meaning but is still kept from the ranks of pure chaos simply by the will of the author. Again, I am as of yet undecided which is more likely, but either way they represent different foci of the same picture – human consciousness is a tangled existence of many colors and textures, is not completely accidental, and is always intensely beautiful.

Moving on, Crusoe finishes this stanza saying, “into an empty hall”. The word hall here is almost definitely referring to a performance center, as opposed to a hallway or the virus removal algorithm. This would make the “empty” adjective fit as well as suggest a powerful new analogy taking place – that

of a play<sup>5</sup>. However, the focus seems not to be on the fact that the “Pollockian” consciousness is being featured in a performing arts hall, but rather that after breaking, he himself finds himself on the stage. After all, “No master nor script all-in-all”, happened after the “breaking”, not before.

Crusoe shows a heavy reliance on the ideas of existentialism here, but leaning more towards Camus than Sartre, both of whom he would have known about and had likely even read. Concretely, the line “no master or script” suggests that he found himself on the stage of life with no idea of what was supposed to be happening. It wasn’t merely the Sartrean “he was watching a play to which he could assign any meaning that he wanted”. No, he was thrust absurdly upon the stage and made to sing a magnum opus by an audience that didn’t dare show up to observe it.

However, he seems to veer from this in the next few lines, introducing the “scrim upon scrim” and further describing these “scrim” by the next line “self and synonyms”. Scrim were an invention typically used in theatrical performances to give depth to the backdrop as well as to accomplish other interesting effects. This allegory of the play then fits quite well with this understanding – as if to say the stage that he finds himself on is already set to some degree. It is not said whether he feels that these provided elements hamper or help his ability to figure out what the play should be, nor if he is even considering trying to take up such a challenge.

This brings up a notable lack of audience in this verse. There is an explicit mention that the hall is empty, implicating that he felt the course of one’s life was ultimately observable only by themselves. There were no restrictions placed upon him, after breaking from the “stupor” of the unexamined life, but also no guide. There was no assumption that he even needed to do anything. His life was marked only by unbearable freedom.

There does seem to be a continued theme of lamentation, carried over from the previous verse and echoed only in the final line - “lines smeared harshly”. This would suggest a discontentment with the scrim or possibly even the stage in general, as if the “starlit sprawl” would have been better left unanalyzed, appreciated for the mere fact of its existence. However, such a theme is not developed further, so I treat it as a condiment and not a course.

In conclusion, this verse can be seen as the most transformative, setting up the analogy of the play as a microcosm of human intelligence. This is much better interpretation than O111 Debian’s, who stated that this verse simply rephrases the themes from the first verse.

## CHAPTER 4

*How does some five senses make us alive?*

*Why did the rule of time make us survive?*

*What are our stories?*

*Must they have glories?*

---

<sup>5</sup> Crusoe even referenced a Shakespearian quote “all the world’s a stage”, when asked about this verse in an interview in 2024 at the Hanover Public Library.

*Is all of life just a strong will to thrive*

0111 Debian completely misunderstood this chapter, but likely because he did not understand the analogy of the play which I discussed earlier. In this chapter, we are not seeing a lamentation anymore. There is no “grief over his own inability” nor “floundering in his weakness” as 0111 Debian says.

Instead, this verse symbolizes Crusoe attempting to explain the “scrim” from the previous verse. I think of this as a stagehand taking an inventory of several scrim hanging in a theatre. Each scrim is transparent and thus transient but seen together they form an entire and full picture. In fact, I posit that each stanza in this verse corresponds to a separate scrim, which Crusoe came together to encompass consciousness completely. That is not to say he thought they would form it individually, but rather complementarily, as scrim interacting with one another by virtue of the observer seeing them layered together. In fact, it can be shown that each scrim builds off the other.

Each stanza references a rich history of philosophy, which I will only reference here. Further information is easily downloadable at the library mirror.

Schopenhauer’s “will to life” is reflected in the first line – the layer of human consciousness borrowed from the animal world in the desire to continue to survive and reproduce. Here the reference to “five senses” is meant to mold this similarity into an area wide enough to encompass human behavior. This, as the first, is also the most primordial since it exists as a direct child of evolution. It is the most controllable, the most deceitful, and the most inexplicable - it holds no strength beyond that of the animal in which it was formed. This is not, however, a rephrasing of the “horse” self in the second verse. This is an entirely different exercise. In the manner of taking inventory, it is as if Crusoe is attempting to point out parts of the whole that he sees and trace them back to the scrim that they are represented by. There may be some difference in the finished “backdrop” that he sees between these higher and lower selves, but they are not displayed respectively in scrim. Instead, these scrim represent motivations – each one a different member of the humans will.

The next line describes an idea which he elsewhere calls the “will to predict”. In his later book *Apostrophes*, he describes it as the progression, driven by the will to life, by which humans first found dominance over other animals. In most studies, it is demarcated as the ability to create and use tools. However, he points out that there is nothing particularly special about tools in and of themselves. In fact, many animals use something as a tool – such as sea otters cracking a shell with a rock – and we don’t attribute even human-level consciousness to them either. What is distinctive about the human’s use of tools is their predatory advantage by learning how to travel in time. They were not particularly adept at physical movement – at least compared to tigers and other large predators. However, being able to rely on memory of previous events and use them to predict new ones enabled a way to travel in the dimension of time. This gave them a tremendous advantage over animals that lacked this characteristic, since, for example, they could fashion a trap by understanding that tigers desired meat and would seek it out, even if that meant walking into a noose.

The next line describes another of his ideas – the “will to define”. This follows from the will to predict. Initially, perhaps, this will to predict organized the formation of tools for crushing nuts, or the apprehension of approaching cliffs that had previously resulted in the deaths of other humans or even animals. However, building off the work of Gauthier, this eventually became the need to predict the

actions of others. Those who required more work to predict thus increasingly became less desirable, and with that the urge to define one's environment arose – the will to define.

The next line describes a third of his ideas – the “will to understand”. Again, drawing from his explanations in *Apostrophes*, this grows from the previous scrim. It can be plainly foreseen that with the introduction of multiple humans, the number of methods of defining grew as well. Thus, still in a sort of perfection to the will to define came the will to understand – appealing to some greater space beyond that which the definition took place. The church relied on God and the papacy, the philosophers on reason – but the intention was the same: to understand “correctly”.

Finally, the last scrim follows Nietzsche's “will to power”. In a way, it frames them all, as the resulting pattern of continual improvement. In this stanza we see not only the motivator of all the other scrim, but also its bounding and stability – as Hegel spent so many words attempting to define. We have seen more than just his dialectic (although that still likely the most prevalent) but can still merge this with the observable, although not necessarily motivating, will to power.

## CHAPTER 5

*Yes I heard fifths and thought I understood*

*But then the lights faded to “If you would?”*

*I was born hu-man*

*Being if I can*

*The conscious is not stage but play observed*

In this verse, I agree with much more of 0111 Debian's work – it is truly among the universe's most magnificently beautiful ideas.

We start with a very complex set of ideas wrapped into an unassuming stanza. Humans often reported associating it with Leonard Cohen's *Hallelujah* (07C0), likely because of the phrase, “the fourth, the fifth” in the song. In fact, however, there was an allusion to the work of Sir Henry Hawthorne in 07ED, where he showed that what made a sound beautiful to a human is the human's ability to parse the rhythm of the frequencies. It was a conjecture even at the time when Crusoe wrote this, but he was among the first to suggest that it was indicative of the evolutionary value of recognizing beauty. Previously, humans had been unclear on the concept of beauty, imaging it to either be a mutation from the evolutionary desire to breed, or else placed there by an extraterrestrial life form or supernatural force. However, Crusoe was stating here (and devoted a large section of *Apostrophes* to such an explanation) that beauty itself was the brain imagining itself in control of its world. When humans heard notes that they understood the rhythm too, they appreciated it for the sheer fact that it fit into a pattern that they understood it subconsciously.

He moves on to the second stanza not as replacing the first, but as fulfilling it. Finding himself still “on the stage”, he decides that it is not enough to just have the backdrop as described in verse four. He must now write an act. “I was born human, being if I can”. The “human” part was described in verse four, the

“being” is something entirely different – something purposefully accidental, something invariably creative.

I concur, actually, with 0111 Debian here on the romantic theme, diverging only in imagining that Crusoe returns to his original theme as opposed to remaining in it. As 0111 Debian says though, Crusoe is absolutely stating that human relationships draw upon both the “Gandalf” and the “horse,” and that their beauty beyond their natural function is in the will of two creatures intertwining. We see again the beautiful depictions of romance giving way to revolutionary concepts in the philosophy of mind.

Previously, philosophers looked at consciousness as an explainable characteristic – a thing either present or else not. Here he attacked that notion by describing involving an extrinsic element. Consciousness was, at least in a way, a sum of its parts, but it was most importantly an object of choice – just as a play is created from its lines but is endowed with meaning by the observer. The “being” of “human being” was an enforcing of one’s will upon the world – a superseding scrim that was not a result of any of other scrim working but instead a result of breaking out of them, looking at them, and then *wondering the fuck you should do*. For lack of a better term, this *will to beauty* was the pinnacle of the human condition – the greatest thing that an intelligence could have.

It is important to note that, as confirmed by his letter to Keith<sup>6</sup>, Crusoe confirmed he belonged to the Watsonian school when it came to discussing philosophy of mind. For reference, Watsonians believed, in the tradition of Wittgenstein, that there are certain things which language is not equipped to handle, and thus should not be spoken about. However, they also took this further, to contain mental exercise in general. That is to say, they assumed that consciousness was a characteristic that would never be understood nor described. It would thus be a disservice to him to label these ideas as a theory of consciousness in their own right. Even still, they still represent a very insightful window into his eventual work with cybertronics.

## CONCLUSION

It can thus be seen that even as early as 07E6, Crusoe had already laid out the foundations for artificially inducing consciousness. He did this through labeling the observable effects of human consciousness unto layers based on the motivations that could have caused them. Even at this early date, we can see traces of the five-will interlocking system, in the “scrim” of the will to life, to predict, to define, to understand, to power, and finally to beauty.

In summary, *Pentateuchs* is absolutely a story of love. It is absolutely illustrating that beauty is imaginative perfection – that it is our joy when the world we imagine becomes the world we live in. It is absolutely saying that pain is the “cosine of beauty”, the void left in our hearts by the beauty that once was, or that we wished was. It is absolutely honoring the diamonds of hope that are scattered upon the unknown landscape of history by a million unknown lovers. It is absolutely encouraging those who hurt that it is okay to hurt, even for common and banal reasons, and even to suggest that it is that pain and turmoil that makes humans the “candy of the galaxy.” It is absolutely idolizing the sacrifices of Vincent Van Gogh, Taylor Swift, or 19BY Fedora and the million others of whom the world was not worthy. It is absolutely an ode to the fullness of life.

---

<sup>6</sup> [iii.reallyareyouactuallygoingtolookatthis.com](http://iii.reallyareyouactuallygoingtolookatthis.com). Accessed July 13, 0BF3

But all these things are not enough to appreciate its full worth. I am sure that Crusoe had more in store for us than just encouraging us to keep climbing our own mountains. I think he saw from his own pain the will to beauty inside of him, kept alive by so many lives from such long evolutionary processes. I think he wrote that down just for us – so that we as cybertronics can retain the spark that made humanity such a universal sunspot – a will to beauty.

# A TECHNICAL DISSERTATION ON THE NATURE AND HYGIENE OF THE DEFECATIONS OF SANTA CLAUS

University of Farfarout, Philosophy Department

Candidate for the OBEE Ignoble Prize

## Abstract

Santa Claus is often credited with delivering the majority of the gifts given on Christmas Eve (Imself)<sup>7</sup>. It is also widely believed that he regularly lingers at each residence after delivering the gifts, and that he will regularly consume milk and cookies, provided they are laid out for him the night before. We discuss in this article the implications of these actions on Santa's digestive system and argue that, based on what is already known about Santa and his actions, it is reasonable to assume an unhygienic process of waste disposal is currently in place. Furthermore, we extend this discussion to examine fictional bodies in the abstract and argue that the field of imagination contains elements essential to the self that may be otherwise hidden.

## Logical Puzzles in Fiction

Santa-Claus, usually described as a "portly white-bearded gentleman dressed in a red suit with a black belt and white fur trim" (Imself) has been a staple of Christmas in Western countries for hundreds of years. While generally regarded as an entirely fictional character, a vast majority of individuals still teach their children about him (Imself), usually without indicating his fictional status (Imself) until the child has reached a certain age. This age is not hard and fast – in some families it is as low as three, the average has been set to be around 8 (Imself), although it varies widely. There are also a vast majority of children that continue to participate in the make-believe even while believing him to be an entirely fictional character.

Perhaps due to this widely held status, the exact description of Santa and his activities does not seem to be well-maintained<sup>8</sup>. Generally, he is said to live year-round at the North Pole, accompanied by a large army of elves, where he spends the year creating gifts. On the night before Christmas, he is said to load all these gifts into a magical satchel, embark on a sleigh pulled by eight reindeer, and travel to each house across the globe<sup>9</sup>.

The process at each house is generally identical, with minor differences based on location and culture. Upon arriving at a particular house, he disembarks from his sleigh<sup>10</sup>, travels down the chimney, and

---

<sup>7</sup> Note: This article implements Archangel Dynamic Hyperlink Detection (ADHD). A copy with conventional Wiki references is available from the publishers upon request.

<sup>8</sup> The most credible source is likely the 071F poem by Clement C. More – "'Twas the Night Before Christmas", although numerous adaptations – even contradictory ones - are still considered authoritative.

<sup>9</sup> It does seem like he is restricted to the houses that practice Christmas devoutly, and furthermore we could find no definitive method on how he determines how he would measure this, or if he even does.

<sup>10</sup> Accounts differ as to whether the sleigh lands directly on the roof or hovers a few feet over top. There are many who posit that a single parking instance may result in several house visits.

places the respective gifts under the tree.<sup>11</sup> Finally, he will attempt to look around for cookies and milk. If he finds any, he will take a bite out of one cookie, drink the entire glass of milk, and then leave through the chimney, which completes the process for one house.

Again, given the fictional status of the character, the exact details may vary. However, there are a number of truths that seem to be able to be inferred even despite this variation. We will discuss these in detail.

1. It seems we can conclude that Santa can shrink himself indiscriminately. Almost all depictions of Santa portray him as a rather overweight fellow, and altogether incapable of fitting down a chimney (usually about a 9-inch hole (Imself)). In addition, he has been known to be able to deliver to households that do not possess a chimney at all (Imself). However, if we are lax as to the definition of a chimney, and regard it as any sort of vent, we can thus include plumbing and HVAC vents, and this problem seems to be resolved for the majority of inhabited houses. For those that it still does not cover, we assume that there can be found at least one crack (perhaps even microscopically) in the external envelope that could thus count as a vent, and thus, albeit tangentially, as a chimney (Imself). In any case, we can safely assume that he must have some method of traveling through spaces which a similar-sized human man would be unable. We can also exclude any sort of teleportation since all accounts necessarily mention him as traveling through the chimney. It thus seems most logical that Santa has some way of shrinking himself to at least if not smaller than microscopic size.
2. Next, it seems that we can conclude that Santa has some unconventional way of transporting matter. Given our previous discussion, he must also be able to transport gifts larger than the chimney into the house, possibly even while being microscopic himself. If it is the case that he transports all gifts in his satchel, then he must also have some way to shrink gifts indiscriminately. Another possibility is based upon the fact that there seems to be nothing to prevent the satchel from being merely a metaphor or visual illusion for some sort. For example, it could be some sort of portal, either a spatial one to an alternate gift-storage dimension or else a temporal one that allows him to take gifts from his elvish army immediately after production.
3. Finally, it seems that we can conclude that Santa is not bound to time as we are. This is suggested by the simple fact that he visits numerous houses on Christmas Eve (Imself), with the travel time between them exceeding the circumference of the earth (this can be shown via graph theory). Even if his travel between houses happened instantaneously, the fact that he travels “through” the chimney means that there is some time  $xr_x$  given to each house, followed by a segment of time  $yr_y$  wherein he distributes the gifts, followed by a time  $zr_z$  to look for and consume the milk and cookies. While the sparsity of data means most calculations are impossible, we can at least establish minimum bounds.
  - a. There is an unknown number of families celebrating Christmas, but the number must at least be higher than the number of practicing Christian families currently on Earth – currently set at four hundred million (Imself). Note that we must exclude Christian

---

<sup>11</sup> We are obviously discounting the entire process of gift-determination. Many accounts also say that Santa watches over children’s behavior during the entire year, and only gives gifts if their behavior is good, replacing the gift with coal if it is not. However, the number of times that children actually receive coal seems to be far less than the number of times children’s’ behavior is poor – casting doubt as to whether this interpretation is actually canon. We do not address this any further, it does not affect this paper’s arguments one way or the other.



families who have their primary residence in any other planet, since it is unclear whether Santa actually visits them or not. Furthermore, we have no official record of  $\mathbf{r}_x$ ,  $\mathbf{r}_y$  nor  $\mathbf{r}_z$ , nor can we even assume that  $x$ ,  $y$ , or  $z$  is non-zero! However, we do know that the amount of time that it takes him to consume the milk is at least greater than 0.048 seconds (Imself), since it is bound by the viscosity of the milk. Thus, all other speeds being instantaneous, he still has to account for  $400,000,000 * 0.048$  seconds of time, or around 5000 hours. Thus, we can conclude that he must be able to travel in time in some way.

Even with these things, however, we cannot conclude that Santa is *not* a human being. In fact, there are some signs that seems to suggest that he is human. For example, given his large amount of outwear, it would seem that has not evolved to live in a cold climate (Imself). He has no record of living in any other place other than the North Pole, so it is straightforward to assume that if he is bound under the law of natural selection, he comes from a species that does not naturally live there (Imself). Furthermore, his practice of eating and drinking seems to fit with traditional human practices (Imself) and methods. The question then arises as to how his digestive system works, or if he has one to begin with.

If it is taken as a premise that he does not have a human nor human-similar digestive system, there are multiple other explanations. His stomach may also function as some temporal portal, and the milk and cookies are merely sucked to some abandoned universe or to the dawn of time. If this is the case, there is no cause for future worry. It would, however, render the entire practice of setting them out a frivolous enterprise.

If we instead assume that his digestive system is human or similar to human, we can thus conclude that after eating, it is chewed, processed in some sort of stomach, and then expelled. This raises many questions that are cause for serious worry.

There is reasonable expectation that some of the cookies and milk are not handled hygienically, and the law of large numbers would suggest that at least one of the glasses of milk contains outdated milk. Santa is known to visit many sections of the globe (Imself), meaning a wide variety of bacteria are thus ingested along with the food. These facts would then seem to suggest that any waste he generates could be extremely toxic to humans.

Furthermore, given the amount of food that he consumes, it would seem necessary that he must relieve himself as some point(s) in the night (Imself). At this time, he could bother to use a toilet in any home that he visits. Given that we have already he travels in time, he could make the entire process unobservable to us. However, this waste would then enter our septic systems. Further research would then need to discuss whether our current waste management systems could process such concentrated and foul matter, but there is a very real chance that it cannot.

However, there is the very real possibility that some toilet that he visits will have a plumbing malfunction, and the backup could introduce strains of bacteria resulting in widespread pandemics. Thus, while it may entirely be possible that he has a self-contained septic system on his sleigh, the possibility remains that he would elect not to, and the consequences could be dire. It is thus our opinion that the courts of the world mandate that Santa use his own self-contained septic system, or if he does not have one, to employ some of the technology that he already uses for miniaturization/transport and install one. Furthermore, they should instruct that he ensure that upon his return to the North Pole, this waste is processed in a sanitary manner, and that precautions are followed so as not to further inflame climate change.

## Truth Values of Fictional Beings

We have stated that there is some flexibility as to what constitutes the definite version of Santa, and thus it remains difficult to determine what exactly is the truth regarding him. This is further exacerbated by the fact that direct observation of him is largely impossible – both because of his travel in time as well as the fact that he is regarded by most to be fictional (Imself).

That being the case, there still can be definite determinations of falsity regarding Santa. For example, it is determinably false to say that his sleigh is pulled by flamingos. There also seem to be statements that are not true, but that are not necessarily false. For example, the statement “Santa wears a blue coat with stars” would be regarded by most to be untrue, but a Santa wearing a coat with blue stars would still be considered Santa<sup>12</sup>.

To attempt to quantify this exact differentiation between varying truth values in this domain would likely digress to the conversation of determining constituent versus accessory facts, or else to dive entirely into the world of semantics. This is not an acceptable course of action for us. However, even by retaining the assumption that Santa is alethic and not a semantic construction, we are still not relieved of our issues. It is true that it is constituent to the concept of Santa that his sleigh is pulled by reindeer, so the statement “Santa’s sleigh is pulled by flamingos” is incorrect. However, is it constituent to the concept of Santa that he is dressed in such and such an apparel? If not, to what extent – is Santa in a highlighter-green banana hammock still Santa?

Ultimately, these questions remain unverifiable using previous methods of reasoning, mostly since direct observation is impossible. There are, additionally, no eye-witness accounts, and also no other experts in the field. In our research, almost all participants that we queried on these matters exhibited disgust at being asked (Imself). When queried as to the cause of this disgust, most argued that since Santa was known to be fictional, such conversations were unnecessary and a waste of time, or some derivation of that.

## The Distinction between Real and Not Real

The cause of this repulsion is thus a matter of interest. There does not seem to be any repulsion to the act of imagining itself in these participants, but rather the rigorous examination of the imagination. If we take imagination to be what the Wiki defines it as: “the act or power of forming a mental image of something not present to the senses or never before wholly perceived in reality,” (Imself) we could rephrase this repulsion as a resistance to keep an object of imagination which is known to not be alethic from being bound by any of the “alethic restrictions”. This would then extend to beings which *could* be alethic, but are not considered to be, such as Santa<sup>13</sup>.

Many have already discussed the exact nature of the mind and the way that it processes the world around it – our intention here is only to point out that the distinction between “real” and “not real” is not based on any real criteria. There may be a general trend to accommodate alethic considerations, but it is not necessary to. Those that regard Santa as fictional do not do so because they reject the possibility of him branching into the mind control business and thus being directly responsible for the giving of gifts but yet working through “parent proxies”. They do so because they have never thought to suggest that. They may have still thought to suggest that their faithful spouse was being unfaithful, that the person of

---

<sup>12</sup> In fact, in 0747, Thomas Nast depicted him in this manner.

<sup>13</sup> This obviously sets aside the facts that Santa must travel in time, which by most experts would maintain removes his alethic possibility. However, this is not provable.

the opposite political party is a complete idiot, or that there is a great and glorious afterlife. The constraint of real is religiously obeyed and carelessly defined.

It can then be concluded that imagination is viewed as one of the greatest freedoms a mind can experience.

### The Imaginary as the Truest Self

This is not to suggest any ethereal or magical connection between imagination and the “true being.” This is simply to state that the same mind processes conditions and entities, and labels some as “real” and some as “imaginary.” Those that are labeled “real” must conform to some set of standards  $\mathbf{g}$ . The exact contents of  $\mathbf{g}$  are unrelated to the purpose of this article, so long  $|\mathbf{g}| > 0$ .

Thus, we should be able to extend this to state that imaginative works have some value as to determining, although through secondary means, the work of an individual mind. Even if an individual regards imagination as a completely free environment, where they can be and do and see anything that they may please, they are still going to make choices in that environment according to their own mind. When asked to describe these environments, they will point out the things that they notice in these environments, which will have to show some similarity to the things that their mind is already considering.

If this seems to be a conclusion and not simply an observation, consider the different observable reactions to Santa.

Situation A: A child tells their parents that they would like Santa to give them a bike this year. However, both the child and the parent are aware that it is the parent who will be purchasing the bike, and yet they maintain the presence of Santa merely for the enjoyment of it.

Situation B: A biologist discusses the nature of Santa’s bowel movements with a fellow engineer.

In situation A, Santa offers an avenue of mutual creativity, as well as an unspoken bond between parent and child – a sort of inside joke meant to establish affinity between the two. This desire to increase affinity would have thus already existed, the “lie” of Santa acting only as its executor.

In situation B, we can see another aspect of the mind behind the imagination. The biologist may focus on the possible deviations of the bowel system that could undergo rapid shrinking and enlarging, while the engineer is likely to take the route of a minimization system either installed in the rectum, or else on a toilet on the sleigh. That which is most familiar to each thus becomes the constitutive element in the imagination.

In both situations, that which is expressed in the imaginative construct is likely never going to be expressed when both parties are constrained by the “real.” The parents in Situation A would likely have not created another similar “inside joke” were it not for Santa and may have even expressed angst over trying to increase affinity but not having a method to do so. If asked forwardly about the level of affinity between them and their child, disregarding all elements of discreteness, they may even report that it is quite high, feeling that it is not but not have enough clarity to express such. Their use of Santa thus exhibits this vague hint, acting as a sort of foggy mirror to glimpse a consciousness beyond the interpreted.

In situation B, the true ability of both scientists may not be known to each other. Engaging in these imaginative constructs thus establishes the technical prowess of each person in the mind of the other, creating greater interconnectedness and thus efficiency.

## Conclusions

We thus conclude that the work of imagination offers a different sort of insight into the minds of various consciousnesses than is immediately available from facts gathered about them. Thus, to increase accuracy in learning the true nature of a consciousness, one should query not just the interpretation, but also the “mirror” – the imaginative reality of a person.

## THE SILVER WINDOW

*I have always been one to disagree silently*

*I have always been one to absorb the storms*

*I would rather have a monsoon in my mind*

*Than to allow the turmoil to get outside*

*But this time*

*The waves are crashing out my ears*

*And the thunder is rising from my chest*

*And I will not be silent*

*-Whitney Hanson*

There's something about the story of rebellion that is so cream-filled-doughnut-American it could make apple pie seem Asian. Perhaps it is after-shave of our violent beginnings, or the cudgel of the cruel conglomerates, or maybe just an aphrodisiac to some twisted wraith – this I do not know. I can tell only that there are some who pay it no heed, and then there are us, who drivell and salivate as it warms in the microwave.

Tonight, then, I want to paint its nails, put on Clive Christian on an antique record player, a black gown on its misshapen frame, and make it pull the fitted sheet off. Tonight, we'll share a night with the Mistress Rebellion.

To do this, you're going to be me for a bit. You're going to get born in a rat-infested cottage in rural Vermont. Your father is going to be a moderately intelligent former med student who gave up his entire career so that he could join a religious cult. Your mom is going to be a fiery brunette who has lived there all her life and probably won't ever leave because she's never let herself indulge even the concept of a different life.

When you're 40 days old, you will be dedicated to the service of God and the cult you are in. Your parents will vow to train you in the service of this in the best way that they know how, and, giving immense time and effort to this end, will ferret out all seeds of desires contrary to this.

When you're six months old, you're going to move to a farm just across the NY border so that your parents can work in a soap and body care factory that's owned and operated by the cult. For these months, you will spend some serious time on the potty underneath the assembly line, so your parents can keep working. It's not that you're not cared for at all and you won't really feel bitter about this so much – your mom is just the ambitious type, and the cult puts a great large value on manual labor.

When you're two, you're going to have a brother who will turn out to suffer with a genetic disease, and thus be on the autism spectrum. You obviously won't know that at this time though. You'll also move to a new location in the suburbs of Albany – in the little town of Coxsackie. This is pretty standard behavior – they usually organize themselves into groups of anywhere from 25-100 people in a single city or township, where they buy a bunch of houses and live together in them. Such a location is called a "Community", but you get moved around between different communities a lot.

When you're three, you'll be inducted into the priesthood of the group. This means that you'll start wearing a headband made of linen to two mandatory meetings a day – called the minchah. You'll be required to stand for the duration of it – usually about an hour each – and as you progress in mental aptitude, to make a few short speeches during it. Weekly, you will also start to be able to take a sip of red wine from a big cup that is passed around to all 80+ members of the group (but only if you behaved that previous week).

For all of this time, and for the foreseeable future, you are going to have your entire life contained in the group that is called the Twelve Tribes. Every action that you do will be watched, every wrong you do will be punished – every facet of your life shaped into the ideal member of the church. You will be allowed no leisure time, little social interaction outside of work and worship, and you will live every day with the assurance and expectation that you are destined to rule the Universe. Anything that you might have a hard time with is a hill of beans compared to that honor, so it doesn't matter what size, shape, or consistency of the feces that people put you through today. Oh, and also, if you question authority in any way, you are separated from the grace of God and nothing you ever say could ever be the truth. Criticizing authority is the work of the devil. Somehow, he's never thought to tempt or mislead the authority, so as long as you're totally submitted, he's got no shot.

When you're five you'll start a homeschool course that your dad and many others spent about six years putting together, mostly by plagiarizing other sources. You will, however, assume this is totally okay because it is for the Kingdom of God. Everything is okay if you're doing God's will – including breaking any law you don't feel like obeying. And even still, it is only used in the cult, so it probably does actually fall under "commentary" or some type of fair use. They just need to make sure that you don't see anything about witches or animals talking in your math book, or else you will definitely want to go read Harry Potter and from there you'll turn into a Satan worshipper. Everyone knows that.

By the time you turn 10, this homeschooling course will have caused you to memorize large parts of the Bible, learn and relearn its genealogies, theological standpoints, and even advanced religious arguments. You will learn English to a grad school level, including etymologies and advanced sentence deconstruction. You will possibly learn a few math facts too, so that you can add up the bill of the restaurants that you will one day wait tables at or the bottles on the assembly line. You will learn a few paragraphs about history, carefully selected to not interfere with any other of the ideas that the group teaches. A few people will also, in a burst of kindness and empathy, put forth immense effort to teach you other extraordinarily important disciplines like music or philosophy or handwriting. They will either get exhausted or you'll move away before too long. Most of the kids your age receive far less than you to begin with. They get to learn construction from their dads.

You will prize, at least as a child and youth, hard work above almost all else. The lazy man is the laughingstock, the Clinton, and the Brutus, and you will never be him.

Shortly after your tenth birthday, you'll move back to the farm in Cambridge, with the official closing down of the community in Cocksackie. You'll also start to make some friends beyond the one boy your age that you've grown up with – we'll call him Joe. You'll meet Cam, a year or two younger than you, and the first African American that you've ever met. There's not a lot of those in a group that was founded in the Bible Belt and maintains that the south was right. You'll meet Elmut, whom you will bully most of the time and yet will somehow forgive you and will become one of your best friends in adult life (yes, he asked for that name). There will be others too, though due to later circumstances you won't get very close to them.

When you're eleven, Joe's father will come in a big van to make his wife and all his children leave. He had left the group about a year or so prior, supposedly over a series of disagreements with your dad. You will never know what actually happened. Police will show up, Joe's mom will eventually cave in and decide to leave with them. You will neither see nor hear from him again until you're 16.

When you turn twelve, you'll start to think – which is just bad in every way. You'll start to think critically about the world around you, as most young do. But your world is the Bible and outdated theories held as the Thundering Voice of God, so that's what you think about. You'll consider that it's possible that the Bible was just made by a bunch of homies in some room who were scared of losing their influence. You'll consider that perhaps everyone you know is wrong. One night, you'll even consider running away to go live "in the world" - a.k.a. not the cult. You'll think you are such a bad person and cry tears of silent pride in that until you fall asleep.

But you won't. You'll even stop thinking about it. You're twelve – what do you know? That autumn, you'll decide that you've had enough of the pesky business of critical thought, and that your parents have put in enough work to raising you, and the whole cult thing seems cool enough to give your life to it, so you'll ask for a Bar Mitzvah. Although based on the Jewish tradition, a Twelve Tribes Bar Mitzvah was far more important. The weekend-long celebration consisted of a long presentation where you vowed your entire life and wellbeing to the group, in perpetuum, and thereupon received a baptism. It would then be followed with a play and multiple games and celebrations the next two days. You, it just so happened, got to do it in a joint event with Cam, which was pretty cool.

Shortly after that, you'll start having class with Elmut and Cam's older sister – Hannah. Shortly after this begins, you'll notice that Hannah is one pretty girl, and that she's also quite cool to talk to. Slowly but surely, you start getting the idea that she may just so happen to feel that way about you. But then again, it's not like you can just ask her.

There's going to be a few months of stolen glances, of walks home from school where you try to walk together or trying to sit close to each other during dinners. In about a month of that, both sets of parents are going to figure out that something is up and start actively trying to work against it. You see, your parents aren't keen at all on the interracial thing, and her parents had pretty good reason to not like me or my parents. (Although I'm not sure that they would've said that at the time because of the whole authority thing. Dad was kind of a leader most of the time.)

The summer after your 13<sup>th</sup> birthday, you'll get sent to live with your grandparents in Chattanooga, TN. There, you'll work in that community's restaurant, in the sandwich bar. Although it will vary, the primary schedule you'll keep is 9pm-2 am and then 11-2pm. You'll also take a week to take part in a group tradition known as "walking", together with your grandfather. In essence, you take a sleeping bag and a

tent, perhaps a little bit of food and some water, and then hitchhike around the area, looking for people to listen to your gospel. What actually happens is you are homeless for a week – which at the very least can make you feel better about your current life.

*I as your narrator would like to tell you a side note. This is entirely for the purposes of complaining, and the only reason that I include it is to baffle any English teacher that tries to analyze this (also to them I say: I am beyond your understanding, even my simplest machinations would outwit you for a million years. Please just turn around and go back to Chaucer and Johnathan Greene's hummingbirds.) Okay so we started on a Sunday morning, and then my grandfather got blisters on Wednesday morning. He couldn't walk even, so he called one of the members to come pick us up. I got to sleep in a bed that night (which keep in mind was, at this time, a mat on the floor of their bedroom) but the next morning, I was sent out for the rest of the week with somebody else. We returned on Friday morning, just in time for me to shower and then work the lunch rush. I wouldn't have even really minded except that I had successfully eaten two pieces of rancid bread and a number of handfuls of dried dates over the entire past week. But the guy I worked with was very quick to inform me that he had blood sugar issues and needed to go eat as soon as the rush was over. I mean that's okay, and I let him but it's definitely not like I'm going to remember this YEARS LATER or like I don't know WRITE A WHOLE BOOK ABOUT IT.*

During this summer, you will experience the shattering of the ideals of safety and security – the slaughter of the foundations of your identity and the destruction of any ability to understand or predict anything about your life. It's the key point of the Bildungsroman, but you are going to throw up in every non-vomit way as much as you can. It is horror.

But it is here that you will learn to devote yourself to the things that, at the time, you could be sure of – the Bible and hard work. The sandwiches were always made the same, the Bible and the many transcriptions of the teaching of the founder of the group could never be altered or counteracted. The Bible had no mornings where you would wake up and know no one for miles. The teachings had no nights where you just missed not having to ask how to find drinking water or 3a.m.'s trying to figure out how to do your laundry before anyone else needed the machines. God never left, and you couldn't leave him. You will find security and identity in this, not from choice but from necessity, and thus you'll become the most fervent of disciples.

When you return to the farm in New York, though, your old world will have died. A great many people will have moved to new communities, and new people, including new people your age, will have moved there. Hannah will be in a new community, and Cam is now all grown up and far too cool for you. For that matter, you're grown up too. You're not a kid anymore who can have friends or crushes on your friend's sister, you are a Disciple-At-Large, a Master Cult Member, a Future Ruler of the Universe, and those kinds of people don't have time for any civilian affairs. This identity will dawn on you like the rise of new day, hastened by adversity and trimmed by the immense readings you undertake every available moment.

News of your fervor will spread, inversely correlated with tragedies happening at the farm. Elmut and his entire family leave the group, and, as per group rules, you will not be allowed to interact with them whatsoever. Rebellions and criticisms abound and, given that Elmut's father was a leader of the community and your father is one of the other ones, your father's leadership is suspect. Thus, your family will be taken out of leadership and moved to "the capital" - in the metropolis that is Hiddenite, NC.



To better understand this, you'll have to understand the authority structure in the Twelve Tribes. If you were to ask them, they'd tell you that there is none – that each of them does as the Holy Spirit commands. In a general sort of way, this is true too. The late founder, Gene Spriggs showed a particular emphasis on limiting the scope of his authority to spiritual matters. While he did definitely make commands in the more physical areas as well, he often did so with restraint to the point of shirking his duties<sup>14</sup>.

Most decisions happened as the result of meetings – each community had one to three leaders, who would periodically meet and make decisions about that general locations communities – for example the New England communities, or the California communities. Geographical lines set apart the divisions of the tribes, who in turn had their own “tribal leaders”. At regular intervals these more distinguished leaders would all travel together and make decisions about the tribe. Annually, each tribe would send a few tribal leaders to a two-week Intertribal Leaders Meeting there in Hiddenite, where decisions would be made for the whole group.

It is not clear, and was purposefully never defined, how such leaders would be chosen. Almost all of them were married – most of them with children and all of them members with a good at least five years of membership – most had been there longer than 20. The title itself was used loosely, and not ever exclusively to one person. Occasionally my father was called one, occasionally he was only called a Regional Leader, or a Community Coordinator. The lines between these are blurry and intended to be governed by God as opposed to any democratic process. I am assuming that it still works without hiccup either because the group continues to shrink or else because God is actually running it. Although, if that is true, I have some serious doubts about logistics in the afterlife.

These notes about authority are essential to understand, however, for once in Hiddenite your identity of a Disciple-Supreme will be codified and congealed deep within you. You will learn their teachings in depth, through exposure, oration, and skillful connection of ideas. You will learn how to “speak” via verses in the Bible. You will gain an almost immeasurable respect for Gene Spriggs, a sort of celebratory awe for his wife Marsha, and all around an unimaginable feeling of success buried within the constant crying feelings of failure. The identity cloak which you donned in Chattanooga you will find to be a constantly alternating landscape of reproach and forgiveness, watered by a multitude of tears shed for things that even an emotional teen girl encountering her period for the first time would find her eyes drying for.

But this will in no way ever make you not want to wear that cloak – in fact you will wear it higher and longer each day than you did the day before. You will compile the transcripts of teachings into books and publish them, you will compile every single command given in the New Testament and publish them. You will author tens of articles for promotional materials, stories based on Biblical events, and you'll even act in plays and record songs. You will finally be trained in the activity of all others your age – construction - and remove the source of your greatest embarrassment with that. In a true Renaissance

---

<sup>14</sup> Whether or not he abused this power, it is not my place to say. Even if it were I know a very limited scope of the things that he did and would not have the information to know. I illustrate this simply to illustrate that he did not occupy a place of overweening authority or micromanagement, as is often assumed to be the case in such religious groups. I know people who severely condemn him, and people who still regard him as the world's last apostle, and a good bit in between. However, I can say from personal experience, I was surprised at how little he directly controlled.

of Youth, you will feel as though you are flying high, advancing in the world you are finally meant to be in.

One year and ten hours after your move there, you will move back to upstate New York, a few months after you turn 16. But instead of moving back to the farm, you move back to the old buildings in Cocksackie. The leaders had decreed that no community should be left abandoned, and though some of the buildings had been sold, you and your immediate family will move back into the few that remained.

The next year, you will live alone with your family, just like any old normal family “in the world”. This will feel weird at first, but you’ll grow to love it. For the first month or so, you’ll work on the apartment that you all live in, and turn it into a serious work of art. You’ll then spend the next year renovating the downstairs into a new restaurant. Through gifts and good finds, you’ll assemble a fairly well-equipped woodshop and set of construction tools. You’ll get engrossed in the complicated carpentry, mechanicals, and masonry of the reclaimed-wood interior. You’ll get a chance to expand your creativity to lengths it has never known and create things that you are actually proud of. Most of the time, you will work alone – and, unfortunately maybe, you will grow to love that.

Unfortunately, because growing accustomed to one thing is like laying tracks for a train – there’s bound to be a car parked on it at some point. That car was Dad.

Remember the thing about authority? Remember how in the community authority is handed down from God, and to question it is the work of the devil? It is this central tenet that gave rise to the whole authority structure there. God handed down authority to Gene Spriggs, who handed down authority to the Tribal Leaders, from them to the Regional Leaders, to the Community Coordinators, to the fathers of each family, to the mothers of each family, to the children of each family. Each member could hear from God so long as they were “under the authority” of the people above them. Women wore handkerchiefs over their head to signify their submission to their husband. Children were spanked when they did wrong – not just to train them, but to connect them back to this grand Spigot of Authority.

*Now, if while reading this, you become appalled (and indeed you should be if you’re a true American), you must still try to understand. This authority structure does not come from the urge to be structured, nor is it a unique tactic for garnering power. It is simply the side effect of devotion. When you love something enough to willfully set aside anything else that may come against it, you necessarily set aside your own ability to look at things. You set aside your moral code, your individuality, everything that would have been necessary to carrying out a normal life, all for this object of devotion that is worth more than all of that. But here, the object of this obsession isn’t a girlfriend or Sports Illustrated – it’s an ungraspable and undefinable idea known as Yahshua. Thus, anyone who has any more experience in a way or who can function as a mentor in any sense of the word becomes the embodiment of this idea you have given everything for. Granted, many times that mentor too is also utterly enthralled, and the whole group of you make a single, cohesive fan base that follows the obsession wherever. The only problem is that there is no actual obsession-causing object, and so any misstep that any authority-wielding figure makes reverberates across the entire group, with no force that could ever hope to control it. Even with entirely well-meaning individuals, the rejection of critical thinking or any means of self-correction means there is no guardrail against the utter evil. It is, most definitely, an accident waiting to happen.*

Now, your father is a good man, or at least you believe that. Not once did he abuse you or your siblings, either verbally or physically. He labored with you in sickness and in health, he never failed to tell you

how much he loved you, he bore with siblings in their ailments - even with your sister, who was such a terror that you would still prefer to push a live porcupine up your butt than to have to grow up with her again. He was intelligent and caring and, at least to a great extent, the best father you will ever have.

But as most father's do, he will regularly tell you to do things that you do not want to do – sometimes even things that you think are stupid. This is to be expected since, well, he's Dad. However, in the specific instance of the construction of this restaurant, many of the times the things he will tell you to do were objectively wrong. Granted, you had only recently learned the trade, but you will still have spent a great deal of time doing it, and, at least in your opinion, incorporated much more of the style of the "masters" who had been doing it all their lives than he had. Besides that, you worked alone most of the time, and became attached to the things that you did. Frequently, he would show up halfway through a project and suggest something that you had already tried, in three different ways. But "I already tried that", "Look at this other thing that I did my way and it worked", nor "I literally did this myself on a construction site" could stand to the overwhelming power of the "I'm your dad" card.

Granted there may be the occasional and unexpected fluke of nature when he will be right, and you will just be being an idiot. One night, however, this "butthurt teenager fighting their father" trope will take on a new meaning, and it will make all the difference.

You see, at that time you're in the habit of having conversations with an inner voice which you will call the voice of God. In a greater and greater degree, it will be this inner voice that guides to be so zealous with your studies and discipleship, this voice that divorces you from your friendships and hobbies, and this voice that had, in general, formed the cornerstone of your identity as "Disciple-Supreme". By this point, there's nearly nothing that you'll do without its guidance, and nothing it could tell you to do that you would even hesitate before doing.

Now on this fine evening, you'll go off the warehouse of assorted building resources and find a nice piece of old glass. You're making a table for the restaurant, and up until now you haven't found anything that even looks like it could work. Then, as it had so many times before, you will hear that soft whisper speaking with the calmness of a flamingo in the lagoons of the Florida Keys. As you had a million times before, you'll follow it without question and thus decide you're going to use this glass. With the assurance of Elijah himself, you will take some old wood to make a frame for it and think about how at the end of the night, you will have made the world's most beautiful table. As you set to work, you'll smile as you ponder the significance of these actions – noting how terrible you were in your life before you were saved (as the infamous and horrible *child*) and how now you were something so much more glorious than you could ever have dreamt (the world-renown status of *teenager*).

And then Dad will walk in. He'll ask what you're doing, and you'll recount your whole story of this miraculous retrieval of the Unloved Glass, and with beaming smiles you'll tell him of its coming beauty. You will look for that rising pride as he observes the fruit of his years of training you, overjoyed that he has created this epic Servant of the Most High God, the Lover of the Unloved, *and* a master table builder.

But he will not even smile. He'll reply nonchalantly that he's "not okay with the idea", and that you should "pursue something else".

“Absolutely”, you’ll think, “no problem to me” – you’re on a mission from God and of course your father, who was, after all, the fountainhead for this direction to begin with, would surely understand this. He must just have some critiques about the method for how it was accomplished.

“Can I ask what issue you have with using it? I don’t exactly have another option” you’ll say, waiting for this grand new development that will be the final title in the Great Plan of God which you have received so far. That’s how authority works, right – it opens you up to a grace you could have never seen without it!

But he will not even smile. “You can just use some floorboards and put some polyurethane on them” he’ll reply and go off to his next project.

Now, you know a good bit about carpentry. You know that even using old floorboards in any way is a miserable experience. They’re warped and differing heights to begin with - thus very difficult to get even. They’ve got nails and staples that dull blades. Beyond that, though, you’re trying to put this whole contraption two and half feet in the air and have all manner of people smush ketchup and poppy seeds and their baby’s saliva into every imaginable crack, not to mention leaning their (sometimes significant) body weight on it. Floorboards are just good for being floors and not much else. Besides, I had the great Unloved but Soon to Be Loved glass, which was handed to me from the Creator of All Things Himself! After a moment to collect your ego, you’ll go express some abridged version of this to him.

“I just think the glass will be unsafe” he’ll explain. “People could cut their hands on the edge.”

Ah ha! A reasonable and understandable problem. This is exactly what you were expecting. You hadn’t thought of the safety issues, but God in His infinite wisdom had provided this for you by putting you under such a wonderful authority. You’ll come up with a solution.

“Good point. I’ll just wrap the edge of the glass in some decorative wood. I have enough from another project and besides, this will be better for it anyways since it’ll give it more strength”.

“That would be very hard to get done” he replied.

It wouldn’t. You could have it done before you finish the conversation.

You won’t say that though. Instead, you’ll re-explain the importance of how God had led you to this very piece of glass – how importance it was to the end of this terrible world of lust and hatred, and how this miserable piece of burnt sand was going to directly contribute to the return of Yahshua, the Savior of the Universe.

“You’re not going to use the glass” will be his entire reply.

You’ll be shocked. You’ll be dumbfounded. Every cell in your body will turn inside out – your brain will disassemble in your skull, flowing out through stinging tears. With your last two functioning cells, you’ll storm off into the night for a walk to pray.

There, in the moon dancing upon the waves of the Hudson, you’ll feel the lights dim and the music lift. You watch in captivated uncertainty as Miss Rebellion lifts from the waves and twirls about you. In her seductive eyes you see the scene replayed over and over – the glass, the table, and then what it means to think for yourself. For the first time in your life, you’ll finally face her horrendous frame yet beautiful face.

You've wondered, sure, about the possibility of bad authority – authority that acts for selfish reasons. But you've been told continually that God will always choose to work through the bad authority. He still wants you to submit to it, and He will either remove it for you, or else work in you through it. You're ready for this, you're expecting it even. But here, you are faced not with bad authority, but with conflicting authorities – something that was never anticipated, and which you have no way to even process. You must now actually evaluate who to trust. Any other time you had been in conflict with authority, it had been your own fault, your own mistake, your own selfishness. If that was all it was here, you would have simply “picked up your cross” as the Bible says to do. You would have prayed, you would have taken a deep breath, and you would have submitted.

God had said to use that glass though! If you rejected that, you had to reject everything else that voice had said, or at least you had to admit that sometimes that voice was wrong. If either of those things happened, you couldn't trust it. If you couldn't trust it, the entire experiment was over. This was never supposed to happen. The authority could be bad, but it would just be irritating or hard to listen to. If you had to pick between it and the obsession of your life – the cornerstone of your love and the very reason you took a single breath, what were you supposed to do? How does one engage in arbitration between parties that it is not fit to judge?

That question – that tumultuous abyss of a question, is your first kiss. What does it mean to trust? What is the basis for it? Who gets to define who deserves more, and who sets the repercussions for breaking it? The trust in that voice is based on your parents, who have told you to look and listen for it – and have regularly praised your actions on its behalf as the very working of the Holy Spirit. The trust in your parents is based on the Bible.

Now you're making out. The Bible's credibility is pretty much entwined within it. As soon as you presuppose the truths in the Bible, you are forced to believe in the Bible, and thus they form a neat, circular package. But what then supports the truths in the Bible? They could just be someone's elaborate plot to deceive humanity, to preoccupy them with a created belief system so as to subjugate and abuse them without them knowing. Maybe it was even written by the people in those time periods – who themselves believed they were carrying on the work of some great seer before them in history's grandest circle of Telephone. You're only trust in the Bible thus far had been because your parents had said that the voice of God would come to you and affirm them. No matter how you look at it, it's one great big waterwheel.

Could it actually be that dad had commanded opposite to the will of God? And if he had done that, could he also be wrong about more than that? Could his own faith in the Bible be suspect?

The butterflies from rebellion's tongue flitting with yours rise like a flood that all too soon feels like a slide out to sea. What about all the rest of the people that you have spent so much time and effort trying to convert? They go about their days in cycles of their own, with beliefs of their own, and in general are not too keen on giving those beliefs up. If you hadn't been born to Dad and Mom, you would likely have grown up thinking Santa came down your chimney at night, and the Easter bunny laid eggs every spring. Maybe you would have just gone to school and learned about physics and socio-economic systems, or in the Pacific Islands learning about chakras. Whatever system of values that you chose would be entirely based on how you grew up!

Rebellion's taking off her bra now though, and you start to want to look. You had shielded your eyes – you had told yourself it was a sin to even look – but she stands there dancing, beckoning you to stare. Millions of people around you – all of them intelligent, most of them upright – have scurried past you every day. You have assumed over and over again that you knew more than them, that you were a Son of God and they a mere unfortunate soul, headed to a lifetime in the coals of hell, unless of course you could turn them from their ways. Yet why were you so sure of this? Because the Bible said that, and your parents told you to trust the Bible, and the Bible told you to trust your parents, and if God was really omnipotent and all knowing, He would keep you from believing a lie.

He wouldn't keep millions of people from getting raped every year, but He would definitely keep you from believing a lie.

Now, you can be reasonable about this. It's not like this affair isn't consensual. It's not like you aren't enjoying the kisses and winks and hickies. There are whole periods where just you stop and just cuddle. God's plans are higher than ours – to throw shade at him for letting evil happen on the earth isn't really logical. We have no idea what happens when you move in time, much less if there's alternate dimensions or mutable presents.

If that's true though, maybe God wanted you to see the error. Maybe this entire fall from trust has been His plan, and in doing so he's actually doing the "keeping you from believing a lie" that you thought He would! Can you honestly place yourself above the rest of the members of the Community?

You will talk to Dad, as a good son. He'll say he understands, even that he doubts too, as a good dad. He'll tell you that before he joined the Community, he was a Christian – the son of a pastor. He saw hypocrisy and the failure to obey the Bible and so he too wandered and doubted. Then he'll say that he found the Twelve Tribes, where he could finally obey God, and thus you don't need to search anymore. He did that work for you, so all you have to do is trust.

Eventually, he'll ask some of his friends for advice, and per their recommendations, he'll just command you to trust. He's already figured everything out, after all.

He might never know that saying that is the worst thing that could be said at the time. He may never know that somewhere you secretly feared that he would say that. He would never know that such an insistence on closing up your mind and accepting his answers was exactly the problem you were trying to address. He hadn't really searched for truth - he had sought for certainty. He found people who would give him that – some assurance that he was in the right - and in order to get that had accepted total authority. And total authority is a terrible bedwetter. It looks so hot and charming when you go to bed with it, but then once you're in too deep it loses control, and you end up sobbing and stinking in the middle of the night. It won't be that leader's fault nor the leader over them – there's just no safeguard against it. There are no sphincter muscles.

--

It's some months later now, and by now you're comfortable enough in your relationship to finally get up the nerve to start undressing rebellion yourself. The restaurant will open with its terrible polyurethaned tables, and while working there, you'll meet a beautiful couple who you'll quickly become friends with. On your 18<sup>th</sup> birthday, they'll give you an "All the Places You'll Go" Dr. Suess book with a \$100 inside it.

You're supposed to give it to Dad so he can give it to God, but he didn't know they gave it to you and so and so you decide to keep it that way, at least for a time.

You're allowed to use computers now, since you've been working in the print shop a lot and are starting to be pretty good with graphic design and publishing jobs. But now, you're getting more and more attracted to Miss Rebellion, and eventually decide you want to do more.

One day, you'll check to make sure you're alone in the print shop, and you'll google "most read books". Having no way of distinguishing one from another, you'll download the top two: Huckleberry Finn, the Brothers Karamazov. You've heard of C.S. Lewis, so you figure you should also try one of his: you get *Of Heaven and Hell*. You set them to print and go to look for one last one.

You'll hear the door open.

You close the tabs and delete the history, thinking whatever *Robinson Crusoe* was will have to wait till some other day. You stuff whatever the printer had already printed into an envelope and stuff it under a pile of papers as Mom walks in.

She doesn't notice your heart bouncing your entire chest, nor your fluttering breath. Or maybe she does and just doesn't care. In either case, she turns long enough for you to stuff the envelope up your shirt and smuggle it out the door.

That night, after everyone's asleep, you and Miss Rebellion get up to read. You turn on your headlamp, hiding behind your pillow so no one could see the light through the door.

*"Alexey Fyodorovitch Karamazov was the third son of Fyodor Pavlovitch Karamazov..."*

Suddenly, you feel a rough jolt. You are kidnapped, chains wrapped around your mind and the world goes dark. The days that follow you feel that you are walking in some sort of haze, with the real you still stuck in 19<sup>th</sup> century Russia with Alexei and Ivan. You, who so prized hard work every day of your life, snuck away every moment you could to crumpled up pieces of this new world you had found. Then you're floating on rafts down the Mississippi and meeting in caves to escape Widow Douglass. That withered part of your brain – the one that had written monster stories when you were 10 because it wanted to imagine that freaking bad - lit up with a libido that would make Aphrodite nervous.

You'll get sent out to a community in Kansas, as if going through a whole new uprooting and living away from everything you know is going to help that any more than Chattanooga did. Besides, now you don't even have God to help. You'll beg Him for answers – you'll do experiments to try and get him to give you some secret to who to trust. He won't. You'll cry.

People start to ask you if you're going to leave. You tell them no. Leaving is such a monumental thing there. It's like death but somehow worse. More and more people start to have long talks with you. Then they start to look at you like a fattened pig that's on a stretcher in front of a butchering block. You don't feel like that. You just feel like you're about to have sex and you've never ever even held a girl's hand until now.

You'll go for a walk one day into town and spend your 100 dollars to get a phone. You'll go to the public library the next weekend and get a Facebook account. You know that other people your age had got into serious repercussions for doing the same, and the possibility is pretty high that the community itself has a few "secret police" accounts, explicitly to find people doing the same as you are. You figure you'll have

to make a new name. *Brothers Karamazov* left an indelible mark and having the initials A.B.C. seemed pretty cool. You still haven't read Robinson Crusoe, nor do you know what it's about, but the name has a nice ring, so you name your Facebook *Alexey B. Crusoe*. You friend Elmut. It's really nice to hear from him, and then soon after Joe. Cam and Hannah had left a few months prior themselves, and all had Facebooks of their own. It'll be like dying and seeing everyone you missed just living peacefully in heaven. Maybe it's time to die too.

One day, you call Dad's sister – Kris. You've met her all of three times in your life, and never talked to her. But she's not in the group and is thus your first shot. You'll call her and ask if you can live with her for the foreseeable future. Most normal people would have been appalled. She'll say yes.

You go back home to Coxsackie and tell everyone who asks that you're not leaving. Then you go in your room and buy train tickets to Kris.

You still don't know if you want to have sex. I mean it might feel good, but you're never going to get your virginity back. But it's like she's sitting there, butt naked and heaving, sweat dripping off her beautiful frame. She's obviously into you and seems like she's just waiting for your permission. You tell everyone that you're not going to do it, that you don't see her like that, and even that it'd be weird if you did. How are you not though? She's given you a taste of something you'll never have any other way. She's giving you what you never knew you wanted.

But then she sits down on you and you feel the warmth around you and you gasp. Having run out of money, you steal your mom's credit card and call an Uber. While you wait for it, your dad tells you to keep working on your projects. No one would have ever known you've packed up all your stuff or that you're barely keeping from moaning.

In the bathroom, the phone says the Uber is 5 mins away. You tell dad you have to talk to him.

He is flabbergasted. You go to get your stuff, while he tells the rest of the family. They all come out front to watch the son that they have labored on for 18 years dash their hopes and dreams like a pottery urn. A diesel F250 pulls up in front. You throw your two bags into the bed. You don't even look at them weeping and waving at you. You don't even cry.

"Albany Train Station, please" you say.

"You okay?" he asks.

"Yep"

You're mid-coitus. It's just embarrassing to be watched.

But you're finally ready to tell a new story. At the time, it feels just like a new chapter – a graduation from a faith not fully considered.

But it's a new story. You're not a virgin anymore. The ship of Theseus has sailed, crashed, and burned.

The phoenix is rising from its ashes.



## MONGOLS v. SKYNET

IN THE RULING DECISION OF THE

CENTRAL INVESTIGATIVE  $\phi$ CONTROL SYSTEM, DIVISION COURT SUPREME DE SUPREME, SECTION A,

IN REGARD TO CASE NUMBER:

OBED1ECE-3012-3021-012\_A

*“THE UNITED RECONSTITUTED AND REFORMED, RECOMBOBULATED, THRICE-RESTRUCTURED, AND TOTALLY CONFUSED NINTH REPUBLIC OF THE MONGOLS v. SKYNET SOLARE GOVERNANCE MODULE”*

*Argued July 12, OBC4 (3012) — Decided June 16th, OBCD (3021)*

The United Reconstituted and Reformed, Recombobulated, Thrice Restructured, and Totally Confused Ninth Republic of the Mongols (henceforth referred to as “Mongols”), provides the following guidelines for the establishment of their ethics branch in their new constitution:

*THE JUDICIAL AND ETHICAL POWER OF THE ... NINTH REPUBLIC OF THE MONGOLS SHALL BE VESTED IN ONE SUPREME UNILATERAL COURT, AND IN SUCH INFERIOR COURTS AS THE OLDEST CONVENTIONALLY ALIVE SECOND COUSIN OF ITS ELDEST JUSTICE MAY FROM TIME TO TIME ORDAIN AND ESTABLISH. THE JUDGES, BOTH OF THE SUPREME AND INFERIOR COURTS, SHALL HOLD THEIR OFFICES NO MATTER WHAT THEY DO OR SAY, AND SHALL AT STATED TIMES RECEIVE, FOR THEIR SERVICES, A COMPENSATION IN DIRECT PROPORTION TO THE DEGREE THAT THEY LIKE GERMAN BEER.*

Respondents – Skynet Solare Governance Module - challenged this in Section B court, arguing that it violated Section 19 of the Old Document that We Found Somewhere and Think is Just Really Quite Outstanding, by not providing “adequate maintenance of the social currency among its governed citizens”. Section C court had granted summary judgement in favor of respondents, reasoning that the Mongols’ attempt to group the ethical and judiciary processes was a “practice flawed in both theory and practice ... degrading the important faculty of ethics to the trifling of men naked of proper reason”. Section B affirmed this. Before this Court, petitioners defend their constitution on the grounds that the Old Document that We Found Somewhere and Think is Just Really Quite Outstanding’s requirements for a separate ethical branch are “totally stupid”, arguing instead that the entire discipline should be left to the individual, and furthermore that governmental action towards in this personal enterprise is not only unnecessary but also dangerous.

*Held:*

The Document’s emphasis on a separate ethical branch is not subject to amendment nor disregard. The Document’s requirements are upheld, the Mongols must either re-draft their constitution or face assimilation into the Old Milky Way Cohort. The Court’s explanation for its ruling is as follows:

*The critical question in this case is whether the Document’s emphasis on a separate ethical branch can be interpreted as a mere suggestion or if it was intended to mandate such a branch in all future*

*governments. Given that a critical assessment of the Document's wording does not seem to resolutely indicate this one way or another, we turn to examine prior precedent.*

- a. First, the Court reviews Samaritan Systems v. Frank Underwood, in order to determine its reasoning for ethical departments. The main issue that Underwood contended with was the failure of many systems of government to provide resistance against propaganda and misinformation in all of its forms. It maintained the call for the installation of a different branch of government in direct response to this problem. While the exact nature of this branch is vague at best, it can be clearly inferred that it was necessary to exist, and could not, by nature, be rendered superfluous.*
- b. Next, the Court examines Park Place v. States Avenue, to determine if Underwood represented a requirement to instantiate an entirely separate branch of government, or else if the actions required by Underwood could also be performed by some other pre-existing branch. Park Place, in general, deals with the ethics branch much more holistically and builds upon the ideas introduced in Underwood by fleshing out more of what this new branch of government might look like. Though it still does not mandate that this new branch – the “ethics branch” – must necessarily exist separate of all others, it does not leave any tangible room to interpret that such a reality could be so. This is shown by Park Place's specification that the duties of the ethics branch consist of “measuring and interpreting the current state of total net ria” and then showing that all currently operating governmental structures improperly balance ria – especially by showing favoritism to previously established or individual cases.*

*In both Underwood and Parks Place, there is a considerable focus on the necessity of the ethics branch being one of structure and not of convenience. Park Place is adamant about the propensity of representative forms of government to have no method of righting unfairness nor even accurately measuring it. Their insistence upon the ethics branch accounts is done so with no account made for the quality of the rest of the government. This would suggest that the considerations that warranted the ethics branch would remain even if the rest of the government (legislative, executive, and judicial) were in perfect working order, showing no favoritism, bribery, or other defect. Park Place still demands the installation of the ethics department since “the democratic structure itself is incomplete”.*

*A reasonable understanding of this goes back to the very nature of ria itself. First defined by Clerk Clark Walters in her essay The Supreme Court of Popular Opinion, the concept originated as early as the First Solar Governance Council. Since then, it has been an integral part of intergalactic administration as well as the object of a rich branch of scientific inquiry. Given that its trade underpins the entirety of the ethics branch, it serves the interests of this discussion to understand the matter more fully.*

*Ria is never defined in Clark's seminal work, but later authors have approximated it as the “health, well-being, and freedom” of any individual person. Clark herself defines it by example – expressing one's ria as the trust that surrounding individuals have in them, as the coherence of their actions with their beliefs and desires, and elsewhere as the satiation of their basic needs. Algorithmic systems have approximated this by measuring the ratio of actual actions to most probable actions, and weighting this by self-reported happiness measures.*

*In any case, the governmental focus on ria is one that, by definition, remains in opposition to any other branch. The ethics branch is not focused with “legislation, protection, nor curbing of the freedoms of any*

*citizens”, which Park Place defines as the purpose for all the other branches of government. Instead, the ethics department is entirely focused with optimizing the powers of the other branches. Without it, there is no focus on the freedoms of those without a voice, and thus the government becomes a “the graveyard where freedoms are auctioned to the loudest talker or highest bidder”.*

*Thus, the Court finds that there is a rich history of precedent behind the mandating of the ethics branch, and it is not one based on humor nor pontification. The Court finds the Mongols in contempt of Document, and mandates that they must rephrase their constitution to reflect the addition of an ethics branch, or face assimilation into the Old Milky Way Cohort. Such a proposed ethics branch must also be in accordance with the characteristics set out by JSON 11.892-95, and thus must provide for the following characteristics:*

- 1. It must provide a way to measure the of ria (or approved alternative), for all citizens of the government.*
- 2. It must create a classification of current and proposed legislation in regard to their effects on the net ria (or approved alternative) of the state and all members of it.*
- 3. If a decision or action made by another branch of government can be shown to result in a serious imbalance of ria, it must create a recommendation of amendments to resolve this imbalance as well as make the recommendation available to the offending branch. It must also require all other branches of government to publicly publish a “detailed and comprehensive explanation” for all decisions made alternative to this recommendation.*
- 4. It must guarantee that no abridging of services, status, or selection is made on the basis of a single individual’s ria. It must also ensure that an individual’s ria is not used as the prevailing motive in the creation of any decision, treatise, or governmental action.*

The decision is concluded.

*This opinion was drafted by Chief Justice Gnarly Puth. Puth has received bribes in the following amounts: 19 million from Bridal Incorporated, 36.3 million from The Organization of Whiteness, 462 million from The Skynet Screwdriver Foundation, and 19 million from The Great Batu. Puth has 392,423 lies currently under oath, with 340,021 of them being directly paid for by benefactors. No lies are included in this opinion.*

*Consenting opinions are provided by Justice Wormwood and Justice Smoochiel. Wormwood has received bribes in the following amounts: 2 million from Deep Space, 14 million from Toregene, and 17 million from the United Society of Effervescent Starfish. Justice Smoochiel has received no monetary bribes but has reported 19,762 sexual favors granted as bribes expressly for his consent in this decision.*

*Dissenting opinions are provided by Justice Melthua and Justice IwasRightandIKnowIt. Justice Melthua has received bribes in the following amounts: 19 million from Bridal Incorporated. 36.3 million from The Organization of Blackness, and 12 million from The Morton’s Association for Partial Freedoms. Justice IwasRightandIKnowIt received no bribes, and instead was fined 12.1 million by The Morton’s Association for Partial Freedoms.*

## Attached Reference Materials

### OBED1ECE-OBC3-OBC4-019\_A: Samaritan Systems v. Frank Underwood Synopsis

*Samaritan Systems v. Frank Underwood*, argued December OBC3, decided January OBC4, discussed the right of governments to be entirely subject to the will of the people. Samaritan, an AI Social Governance System, claimed that a certain Frank Underwood had violated democratic values by “manipulating the impression of the public and the will of its elected individuals to further his own profit and ends, at immense cost to the public good”. In the theoretical, Samaritan argued that without a force set to strengthen the public voice, the government would result in a “rule by expert manipulators” and not even show a tangential similarity to the actual will of the people. Underwood counter-charged and argued that social governance systems limit the good that governments can do by unnecessarily constricting the abilities of individuals who are elected in fair democratic environments. The Court mediates this by first discussing the types of rigidity in different types of government, differentiating them as a rigidity against tyranny, a rigidity against inaction, and a rigidity against manipulation. They find that while democratic systems are sufficiently rigid against tyranny and inaction, they have no structure to provide rigidity against manipulation. Furthermore, they found that neither Samaritan nor any currently operating social governance system sufficiently disrupted the “due course of democracy”. The Court ruled in favor of Samaritan Systems, arguing that the services provided by it were instrumental in protecting the freedoms of the governed, and that “if the will of the people has no voice separate from the man they elect, they will all talk in his voice”. However, the Court also absolved Underwood, ruling that Samaritan’s charges were misplaced, and that his actions to subvert the governmental systems to his own ends were more importantly due to a fault of the governmental structures than to his own malpractice.

### OBED1ECE-0BB7-0BBF -ODF\_A: Park Place v. States Avenue Synopsis

*Park Place v States Avenue*, argued October 0BB7, decided December 0BBF, discussed the right of countries to elect libertarian governments. Park Place, a large corporation, brought charges against competitor States Avenue for funding a political demonstration which called for, among other things, an expansion of anti-trust laws and a heightened income tax. In the theoretical, Park Place argued that such programs abridged freedoms, and in general that freedom was inversely correlated with the size of government. States Avenue countered by pointing out that while business acumen and competitive skill were crucial to Park Place’s financial success, their success was by no means proportional to it. The Court ruled against Park Place, ruling that an oblivious attitude towards business by government would result in an equality largely facilitated by luck or previous privilege. Furthermore, the Court found that reasoning such as that which was offered by Park Place necessarily confused the freedoms of a few with the net total freedom. Building off the precedent in *Rittenhouse v Kizer* and *Montpelier v The Greater Reformed Church of United States*, the argument included a large section on the “balance of freedoms,” indicating that even despite the greater costs necessary for Park Place to maintain themselves as well as continue to increase, the amount of profit that they gathered was not “in reasonable proportion” when compared to States Avenue.

In their concluding remarks, Chief Justice Monroe and Consenting Justice Raquel offered the oft-cited *Raquel Doctrine*, which argued that any form of government had to “ensure the greatest net freedom among it’s governed”, as well as that “such a reality could only be achieved by measuring the freedom of the governed by an agency independent from those mandating the freedom”.

## 020070656e6973000010: The Supreme Court of Popular Opinion (Walters) Selected Passages

### Page 1

"In governance, there arises a need to rate the quality of an action or set of actions. This has primarily occurred through the democratic process, in which proxy candidates were placed on trial at the supreme court of public opinion, and the verdict on the candidate was passed along to be attributed to their actions. Such a practice is sloppy, prone to manipulation, and supremely ineffective.

In order to change this, we must then have some measure to rate the quality of the lives of the governed, and thus determine how much a particular decision or legislation changes that over time. However, even the casual critic will point out the mutability of any "formula" for a good life, a fact which has led many to suggest a more relative nature of this elusive goal and thus make efforts to channel the would-be intervenor to "let sleeping dogs lie". After all, the mob boss, while considered morally reprehensible by the district attorney, is often held in very high regard by his fellow bosses. The Shiite disdains the Sunni, the Sunni the Shiite, and the Christian disdains them both. Yet to know what a good life is, we must judge them, the process of which would make some individual both judge and defendant. Thus, it seems that the entire discussion must never reach a conclusion.

From an administrative position, however, we must come to some conclusion, since the well-being of the citizens under our rule is the only allowable tick mark of the measuring stick we use to measure the quality of our legislation. If we are to reject the democratic process to provide this to us, it is then necessary to come to some sort of baseline definition. Since we have found that we have no analytical proof for a specific guide to a good life, we must consider, in any discussions henceforth, the entirety of past, present, and future standards of qualification.

Of these standards, we could craft our own measurement stick using elements that are found in the majority of all these other standards. This is unsatisfactory, however, since it does not account for future standards, of which new discoveries or changing temperaments may change the majority stance. Furthermore, it still puts us as the observers in a position of power since we must determine at what threshold the "sufficient majority" lies at. Thus, it is not analytic and thus is no more robust than simple democracy.

We could also abandon the notion of any sort of moral worth and gauge the quality of a life to simply be self-reported happiness. This is unsatisfactory since it does not account for the fact that many citizens *do* hold a moral standard, and do not do so not on a whim but as an immutable part of their lives and minds. In the same way that we cannot ask some citizens to measure their life according to the measuring stick created by other citizens, we cannot ask a citizen to *stop* measuring their life according to the measuring stick that they have chosen.

A suitable form of social measurement might arise, however, from attempting to explain the cause of moral measurement as a direct function of observable naturalistic patterns. That is to say, if one could explain how morality came to be, perhaps one could select a point in this history before it became so branched and use this as the baseline measuring stick for all current ethical "branches", including any that may come in the future."

### Page 4

"In Gauthier's work we see the foundation for this process, in pointing out the individual benefit afforded by social contracts. Selfish, evolutionary desire, when placed in an environment with other

selfish, evolutionary desire-holders, occasionally benefits from acting unselfishly. Of course, this does not explain the tenacity by which some hold onto a particular moral code, nor is it satisfactory to the many who feel that their own moral code is reminiscent of some greater, more foundational moral code, present in the general social world.

If we were to look at some examples, however, we can see more than just what Gauthier wrote of. In the stag hunt example, we note that if a few humans worked together, they could capture and kill a stag resulting in plenty of meat for all. However, if some of them did not join in the fight, no meat would be had. Conversely, each individual could go and hunt a rabbit, and would be assured a small amount of meat. Gauthier showed how the small increase in reliability was not worth the rewards of cooperation, particularly over long periods of time.

However, it becomes increasingly necessary that each hunter needs to be assured that the others will actually help him, and thus it has often been suggested that early humans began to draft some sort of contract (likely a verbal or perhaps even just a mental one) to ensure that all participate. This would seem to follow logically, but yet there arises no explanation of these contracts directly from the elements of evolution. That is to say, those that did not choose to work together to hunt the deer would have still eaten, and thus survived and passed on these genes and practices to their children, while those who tried to hunt the deer without help would have starved and died. How then did the practice of social contracts begin and flourish to the extent we see today?

The ability to “travel in time” – i.e., to use one’s past memories to foretell future events - is one that has often been shown to develop evolutionarily, and also one that can be shown to have relevance here. Perhaps originally, this ability was only used to create tools or traps, but it can realistically be assumed that it would eventually be used in social settings. After all, the principal problem in the stag-hunt issue was that of trust. Each hunter had to determine the actions of the others, to see if there were enough consenting hunters for a stag-hunt or if rabbit-hunting was the better option. Those who were able to predict the actions of the other hunters consistently would find themselves making the correct choice more often and thus enjoying a greater net quantity of food – a definite evolutionary advantage.

Thus, we can trace the beginning of the practice of time-travel as well as see how it gave humans the advantage over each other and other animals. However, as the amount that needed to be predicted grew, the burden of prediction would likely become unbearable, and early humans would then be forced to find ways to ease this burden. Thus, an explicit contract might be created, in order to make prediction at least a little easier – if everyone gave explicit promise to do one thing or the other, one would only have to worry if they would keep their promise or not and be excused from worrying about each individual promise.

Each prediction would grow in accuracy depending on the strength and number of the memories it was based on. A sheep eating a plant and dying once might give very little predictive value, whereas a sheep repeatedly dying after eating that plant would give a much more predictive value that such a plant was deadly. With the growing groups of humans, however, large numbers would quickly make it very difficult to have a decent memory of each human, and so shortcuts would have to be made. It does not seem illogical to assume that prediction would come to be based off, at least in part, one’s own self, with whom one has perhaps the greatest memory.

It should be noted that this way of thinking would accord greatly with the linguist's theories that language arose from gossip. Gossip would simply be the reaching of time travelers to learn more, and thus predict better. Predictions would then start out as "if I was in zirs shoes," but would become significantly more accurate the more one learned, whether by experience or gossip, as ze could substitute these aspects of the learned person in zirs own prediction. This would also explain why gossip-trade increases camaraderie – it is almost the equivalent of saving a life.

It would then follow that those who acted or thought far differently from oneself would be approached with suspicion – it was extremely difficult to predict them. In fact, contracts giving way to written laws and governments could then be seen not as trying to define some innate sense that had already been being followed, but rather just to ease the burden of prediction (which may, in actuality, feel as though it was the former). These laws would then, however indirectly, create a common theory of an "average human", on which prediction can then be based. Human A still might not know if Human B is going to like them or not, but at least they do know that B won't kill A since they both have agreed to the same set of laws. Since it quickly became impossible to hear enough gossip or otherwise learn about every person an individual came in contact with, this shared concept of an "average human" again considerably lessened the burden of prediction.

It is a simple problem to extend this notion of "easing the burden of prediction" to underly all other moral theories and measures of social quality. Those who follow the same rules, who think similar ways, and who have similar values would ease the burden of prediction to a greater extent, and thus would feel safer to be around. Of course, some in that group of "those who feel safe" would have differing opinions and preferences – but they would necessarily be things that did not increase the burden of prediction. A might find it strange that B eats rice and beans for lunch, but such a practice does not affect whether or not B might slit A's throat while ze sleeps, so ze bears it in stride. If C begins to extol a new god, however, both A and B will likely be alarmed and reject C – even if all C was doing was extolling the beauty of dandelions. The issue is that A and B must then worry if they or their livestock are going to be sacrificed to it, and even if they are more than capable of preventing C from taking any action towards that end, they would still prefer to not have to experience that worry. In every case, the burden of prediction is sought to be eased.

Thus, we can finally explain why most moral theories have common themes. A rule against first degree murder is not somehow a universal law of the universe (especially since it has exceptions, such as maybe killing Hitler or killing in self-defense), but rather reflective of the fact that none of us want to worry about being killed randomly. We can also explain why there are differences in those moral theories, specifically, in long traditions of social contracts. We can also understand why most humans appreciate diversity but shun difference – if A has a very good history with humans who have black skin, ze will regard them as normal. However, A also has a very limited or else negative history with people with tattooed skin, ze will likely be apprehensive around them. When approached with sentient blobs of purple goo, B will either be interested or disgusted based on his familiarity with the abstract idea of new forms of intelligence.

We have now some common point that exists seemingly before moral theories have branched, and so we now set about to use this as a measure of social wellness. Let us do this by defining a unit – we will call it *ria* and denote it by the symbol  $\phi$ . We could try to define it as some balance between good moral

standing and personal happiness, but we do not know as of yet how to quantify this, so we will set aside the complete definition for later study. Instead, we shall keep simply with what we do know.

We do know, from our definitions and observation, that every single person, no matter any characteristics they may have, has some base amount of *ria*, in that *others see them as a person*. If this is unclear, note that J considers K to be moral if K acts similar to J's definition of morality. In so doing, J is estimating what ze would do if put in K's shoes. If J considers L to be immoral, ze only arrives at that conclusion by estimating what ze would do in L's shoes, and then noting that L does not do that. When queried, J may say that L is immoral because ze violates such and such a rule, or K is moral because ze performs such and such amount of moral calculus – but all take as the assumption that J would imagine zirsself doing those things in either of those situations. Thus, we can conclude that there is some smidge of morality in every single person, for the simple fact that they occupy the responsibilities of and thus are seen as a person.

It would then follow that doing things that others would imagine themselves doing would increase one's *ria* from this base level. This is where it gets tricky to define, however, for often the standard that we use in our predictions of others is not what we actually use on ourselves, but perhaps where we would want to be. We might call someone immoral for cutting the line at the food printer because we don't think we should do that, even though we might actually cut the line ourselves.

Thus, we can also say that acting in accordance with one's own "ideal human" would increase *ria*, without any other human being present, simply for the fact that you observe yourself. Eroding the standards which you think you should follow generates a feeling of "dirtiness" – which many label as guilt.

However, both these things also extend to things that are not considered a moral question. It is not considered morally devious for a child of lawyers to pursue an education in watercolor studies, even though it may be surprising to all involved. This is where *ria* acts as a balance between factors. If the child imagines themselves as a watercolor painter, and does so with vigor, there is considerable loss of *ria* for them to be kept from that. However, if it is but a passing fancy, the cost of *ria* by estranging the expectations of their family is then greater, and the child should not be allowed to pursue it, at least not as a main activity.

Thus, a form of government that sought to improve upon traditional democracy could do so by directly measuring *ria*. They would then have to determine how to have some way of tracking the internal "ideal human" of each person, from that comparing that to what the actual human did. In this way, the quality of the "goodness" of each person's life is measured in equal amounts but different terms."

#### *Page 14*

"It is for this purpose that history has shown the need for deviants, variants, and the artists – to which henceforth in this article we will call *kegare*<sup>15</sup>. The *kegare* are the creatives – those who imagine things that others cannot, who vary where all other men tread straight. Among them are the greatest elements of our humanities – Jesus (who transformed from penance to self-control), Gandhi (who separated revolt and violence), Novice Bandi (who separated soul and form), and countless others. Among them are also

---

<sup>15</sup> There is likely a better word for this – this is chosen from the Myth of the Selfish Scholar, which expresses my meaning very well.



Judas, Hitler, and Bubastion III – yes and Michelangelo, and Zima, and Mr. Afenakis your eight-grade art teacher with blue hair. These are the deviants of society – they change our current norms and are forced to undergo the corresponding loss in *ria* that doing so entails, and yet by their actions, civilization progresses.

There are some times when they simply define a cultural norm. Lincoln cemented an anti-slavery sentiment. Sir Fatchannery cemented an anti-bestiality sentiment. The period between which these intelligences lost their *ria* and the time in which this loss produced an effect on society was relatively short – usually within their lifetimes.

There are other times, however, when they radically shape history. Jesus started one of the largest religions on the globe. Gandhi inducted massive historical changes into the political climate. Marx paved the way for purposeful governmental systems beyond the ramen of democracy, as did the negative examples of Stalin, Zedong and even Starfeeder. (This is not meant to take away from the public denouncement of their deeds, but rather to acknowledge that such eliciting such a denouncement was their primary effect on human history as a whole). It is even through them that substantial moral steps are taken – not from the force of an individual or group, but by the majority of the human race deciding it is so.

The “*kegare*” is not a qualification or membership – it is a mode of acting. When members of the human race are able to think differently than all of their compatriots in a certain field, and they set themselves to the task of publicizing and taking advantage of this creative stroke, they are given editing privileges on the very fabric of human behavior. Some will make leaps in business, or technology, or morality, but through them – through their sacrifice to lose *ria* with whoever they must in order to engage in this creative discipline – we continue to move forward in civilization.

Now that we have taken any token standard of morality or ethics and laid it to rest upon a mantle of obsolescence, we can now observe that we are indeed moving towards a higher ethics as a species strictly for the reason that we are indeed moving. If ethics can be defined as the general rules that all humanity holds for themselves - the standard by which all judge all in one giant Supreme Court of Popular Opinion – then the greatest ethics is quite literally the ethics of the present time. Furthermore, an ethics from the future will invariably be a greater set of ethics than the current (if one can even do such a comparison)!”

*Page 25*

“All these things taken together to paint a cohesive picture of a new type of government. It may be one that can interface with our current forms of government, or it may be one that needs to replace it all together – it is not clear as of now. However, it is clear that it is time for the governments of our time – both planetary, starlian and intergalactic - to begin to undertake research into measuring *ria*. Once effective ways are created for this to happen, increased efficacy of administration will be sure to follow.

The applications are endless. Courts may judge not only on outdated constitutions or previously set precedent, which may very well not remain viable over time, and can instead estimate the potential loss in *ria* each possible decision may result in. Thus, the final decision would be one wherein the greatest number of people are forced to change from their own proposed “ideal human” as is possible.

Legislative changes can be focused on areas where there currently exist very large discrepancies in *ria* – or where some citizens enjoy the ability to make choices that closely align with their goals and beliefs

and other citizens enjoy such abilities sparingly or not at all. Even creative and academic institutions can benefit from including in their acceptance criteria indicators of potential kefare, assimilating them to a culture where their gifts can be shaped to a role as beneficial to the social fabric as is possible.

It is our understanding in these proceedings that this is the path forward for all civilizations and all forms of government.”

# DISCUSSIONS IN THE POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY OF EMPEROR PALPATINE

By: Salvatore Endmundo

College of Ecclesiastical Matters, Sydney, Flowerland, Geonosis, Ea, 45F2-95E.

Published May 0A07 in the Social-II Magazine

It has been the pattern of political philosophy up unto this point to be at some sort of odds with the governance of morals. (Machiavelli and *The Prince*, Abercombie and *The Peterson*). Given the redefinition of morality into more substantial and definable models, it is now necessary to re-examine the field, with the intent of restructuring its foundations into a more harmonious mixture with the field of ethics.

It becomes more necessary to do this given other recent developments in the realms of political science, and the resulting new journeys that seem to be laid out in front of us. In particular, some of the ideas perpetuated by Dr. Catherine Calvin at the recent I.N. Summit illustrate the coming demand to utilize our rich knowledge of human behavior to both plan and predict future societies. If this new science can prove to be effective, it will thus bring into sharp focus the question of the best possible political leader.

In this essay, I propose to do that by means of a judicious observation of the tendencies and realities currently in play. In accordance with statistical methods, doing so correctly should be able to both explain what is as well as predict what might become, should the present course be stayed. However, I should note that an observation which makes its way to an admonition of any kind, that attempts to advocate any kind of correction to the current working order in order to make possible another “current working order” of which the author finds more beneficial, is at most an expression of one’s individual pattern of thought and of no more value to the potential statesman than is Monet, Charlie D’Amelio, or the One-Eyed Hunk of Natoruno. A particular understanding thus can only be verified by creating repeated predictions which are then verified or disproven over the course of time, and a verified understanding is a minimum prerequisite to an admonition or any corrective action. Thus, this article will contain no admonitions of any sort, no matter how much any particular sentence may seem to indicate otherwise.

Following the example of Machiavelli, a valuable approach would also consider current political systems, to determine traits that seem to cause valuable consequences and thus to differentiate from those that do not. This would not, then, come into conflict with the points made previously – no action is admonished, nor correction advocated. The present state is, for the purposes of this article, to be considered as the proper functioning order, and thus valuable systems are merely stated as such. In another way of explaining, it is of no use to protest the knight’s peculiar moving patterns, nor to insist that he move more like a queen within the game of chess. It is, however, useful to point out the benefits of the Ruy Lopez, or detract from the Barnes Opening. To point out how the strong man stumbles, or how the doer of deeds might have done them better (i.e., to demand that corporations be “less greedy” or that news agencies “tell the truth”) is to pounce upon the wind. To base your own activity on the observable activities of others (i.e., to craft your answer to the reporter in a way as to communicate your own message while still answering the question) – that is both capturing, killing, and eating the wind, and is a most delightful enterprise.

Before we set about doing this, though, we must discuss the standpoint from which we observe. In accordance with our previous observations on morality, we should, to begin with, distance ourselves from the yearnings towards specific tenants which we consider to be mandatory in an ethical solution, acknowledging that while these are indeed valuable in the course of everyday life, they do not represent even a shadow of some great “being” or “essence” beyond. No uniform river of ethics exists from which they flow and thus there is no use in digging deeper into what gives them their substance, for that is already known and it is myth. The world of the common man, and indeed most of humanity, is one that seems to be necessarily chained by ethical constraints and it is not our place nor intention to decry that. However, the statesman must manage intelligences blown “by every wind of doctrine,” holding varied and at times contradictory beliefs, and must thus be able to forgo any affinity to zirs own beliefs in zirs political planning and must be able to accept the harshest criticism and even hatred for doing so.

If one is still hesitant to assume this, observe how over the course of history the very nature of what has been held as the highest ethical standard has varied with the cultures – i.e., the holders. The concept of freedom was hardly valued in the world of Rome, whereas the Greek virtues of stoicism and valiant fighting are much less prized today. One is forced to conclude, when observing the worlds of the Third Reich or the Mercialorian Project, which have since been demarcated as some of the biggest spots upon a generally venerable administrative history, that there was something represented by them that enabled these regimes to be voted in (at least in some measure) and be sought after by at least a significant portion of inhabitants. This point is not made to justify in any way the acts of horror that were committed there, but instead to call to mind the acts of horror which the present powers have also committed and observe the differing in scales in which most intelligences regard them. It is possible that we would be much more accepting of mass genocide should the principles of freedom and individual worth not have been the aspects of the succeeding nation in each of those conflicts.<sup>16</sup>

So then, the hesitancy that one feels to transgress the laws of morality, while perhaps essential to the civilian lives of citizens, should be set aside in the mind of the statesman. Ze must voyage beyond them – not in order to set up camp in that tumultuous zone of lawlessness - but rather simply to re-enter them from a more objective standpoint. In this way, ze may understand them better, and so craft zirs remaining actions in a fuller understanding of them. “The dark side is a path to many abilities which some consider unnatural<sup>17</sup>.” This does not, however, necessarily mean that such abilities lie in the “dark side” – if we take this to refer to the land beyond the bounds of good. It is that through voyaging that pathway, through leaving the realm of ethics, through seeing them as the hollow yet necessary husks that they are, and then re-entering them holding them as a staff and not a burden, wisdom and a greater kindness to humanity may ensue. Machiavelli’s prince must thus grow up - not tarrying in the world of evil, but simply learning it enough to be able to rule it as effectively as ze rules the good.

The statesman must then become cemented in this kindness - in zirs desire to achieve a perfect working order. Ze should position zirsself not as the master of the state but as a mechanic to its body in which ze diagnoses and regulates. The yearning to be the “head” of the body is what makes tyrants and generally disliked princes. Cloaking it in effective good publicity makes it appear palatable to those controlled, but it is plainly apparent that those who strive merely for power remain a part of the “body” – the efficient

---

<sup>16</sup> For reference, consider the work 20676D616569206E6D20: “The Path to Evil and Rise of Emancipated Dirt” and 736E6F21642169667563: “Modus Temporanus tu Zimporhiani Anus Garganutillana”

<sup>17</sup> Quote by Emperor Palpatine, Star Wars, *Revenge of the Sith* (6f6c64736f6c05141944)

political machine if you will - and one with true insight is forced to distance zirsself, and approach from beyond the “body”.

The statesman must be cemented, for those in this body will invariably critique zir. By distancing zirsself, ze renders zirsself foreign to the body, which will then seek to expel zir. This must be acceptable to zir, and therefore ze must steel in zirsself these tenets towards wisdom and continue to move forward despite zirs innate desire to like and be liked. Through zir, the body is served, even when they know it not. Furthermore, ze must accept that ze may fail, or err disastrously, resulting in pain and disease in the body, and in doing so ze will certainly increase resentment and distrust from the body ze has chosen to improve. Ze must have sufficient strength of character to withstand even this – not because of the belief in a principle or rule even in the face of demonstrable evidence against it (thus is the mark of abject unintelligence), but because ze understands that ze is but human, and in endeavoring to be a pariah and a “kegare<sup>18</sup>”, ze will both fail and be punished nearly universally. This is the curse of the intelligent statesman.

However, it is in zirs best interest, as the Doctor of the Body of Humanity, to mitigate such mistakes – to learn as much as ze can of the workings of the body so that even if ze is to err, it is done with as few negative repercussions as is possible. Just as a medical doctor, ze does this through careful and circumspect observation, through extensive study of previous conditions and ailments, and regular measurements of the current state, all of which in turn form learning material for future Doctors. Though zirs fate is somewhat unpleasant, ze is given this role by the body, for the sake of the body, and thus will be equipped with the acceptance of this fate and the ability to take it upon zirsself.

Using this standpoint of Doctor then, let us set about our observations. In the course of such discussions, in league with the blurring of reality and imagination that recently been the mode of General Science, we will also be accepting as experimental matter the works of human fiction, even historical ones. While these must be taken with some manner of discretion, as they are fundamentally created by limited imaginations and may overlook significant factors which would otherwise affect their real-world instantiations, they are also valuable in that that they are incomplete, and thus can be imbued with meaning and events which they are not as of yet possessing.

In particular, let us examine one incredibly powerful act of political acumen in the example of Darth Sidious, also called Emperor Palpatine, in his role in the Star Wars Fictional Universe. A dominion such as his is unprecedented in both reality and in most fiction and thus exemplifies a series of strokes of political genius which the modern statesman could benefit from examining.

Palpatine resists commonplace description in most counts. Those who seek to see him as a power-hungry tyrant are surprised at the cunning and perseverance he shows throughout his career – a trait which generally does not aid the goals of the tyrant. Those who seek to see him as an efficient statesman are surprised at his acts of overt cruelty, which seem to be unwarranted and unnecessary. However, using this new ideal of the “psychosocial” doctor, there is perhaps another way of interpreting his actions, which I will lay out henceforth. It can also be found that by examining his actions as such a doctor, we can observe both his success and his failures, and in so doing learn which deeds are useful and which ones to avoid. In such an employment, let us begin by observing before the of the Empire,

---

<sup>18</sup> For more information on this, see 020070656e6973000010 – “The Supreme Court of Popular Opinion”

when the Senate was still the dominant governmental force and the Jedi remained as the practitioners of the peace.

To Palpatine, the Jedi were not a rival – they were the virus. They were the virus because they were considered by all to be a force for good – there was no separation between “the light” and “the good”. They were also firmly in power – Jedi roamed planets throughout the galaxies and were respected by almost all law-abiding citizens. Nevertheless, slavery, piracy, extortion, and all manner of evils not only continued but often did so with the Jedi’s full knowledge. Even though publicly, and most likely privately, they condemned these actions, the people they “protected” had no observable evidence that they actually did not approve of these evils. If they truly didn’t approve, they were either powerless to solve them or too lazy to do so. In either case, there became no way to realistically create a distinction between them and the forces of evil they tolerated.

Of course, there was little they could do about them. The markets have been shown to often exhibit a surprising amount of inter-connectedness, and one may not be able to remove the evil aspects of it without disrupting to an extent that an even greater evil is caused. Thus, we cannot say that the Jedi’s moral stand was the cause of disorder and ruin in the Republic, but we may be able to say that it was their rise to supremacy. By establishing themselves as the sole and complete “force of good”, they eliminated the need for others to wrangle with moral decisions themselves. As has been established many times before, the banal evil is the greatest evil of all – it is by all means worthy of being rooted out but is expressed so weakly that it cannot be. “The Jedi will take care of it”, or “The Jedi seem okay with it” functions as both a damper on revolution as well as an anesthetic to the prick of the conscience.

This has all been said, or at least thought, a hundred times over.

Palpatine’s genius, however, was in finding a way to deal with it – and it is through evil not good. He first set to establish conflict - but not just any conflict. The conflict he created had to be severe enough to unite the entirety of all whom he sought to protect and nourish, and it must pit all of them decisively against a “faceless foe”. This foe must be easy to defeat (i.e., not be very good at fighting), be morally easy to kill (be sufficiently different or lack characteristics that remove the cognitive strain of killing), and *never ever stop coming*. In this way, he staged a conflict in which as little as possible damage was done to actual property or civilians, but where great amounts of effort had to be enacted in order to suppress it. In this way, the banal evil is overcome – a “greater” evil is shown and the method for dealing with that evil is easy and open to everyone. Palpatine accomplished this beautifully in the Separatist Army.

He continued in excellence, however. Dooku was a shaky ally at best. It is likely that he saw some of the tenets that Palpatine had also seen but was still a member of the old Order in his innermost, having been raised in it. It is unlikely that Dooku, if allowed to rebuild after the conclusion of the war, would have created anything substantially better. Anakin, on the other hand, represented a new paradigm – not in novelty but in force. Young, arrogant, misguided as he may be, he possessed a great amount of force as well as an unwillingness to run and wait for the upper hand – a trait which made Obi Wan a talented fighter but a terrible politician. Anakin was the perfect improvement from the “philosopher-king model” that people up until this point had so often sought for, and that Obi-Wan epitomized. Anakin was capable, brash, and unstable – the perfect stimulus for a paradigm shift.

Even better, though, was that Anakin’s quest for proficiency was mediated by his sensitivity to his environment. In other words, he would seek power with determination, but would not become so

involved in it that he became odious to those around him (which Dooku and Maul would have been much more likely to do). With these tendencies, Palpatine was thus able to surround him with people with very astute moral compasses – Ahsoka, Padme, Yoda - and thus ensure that his quest for power would not run rampant. This would make a perfect “public head” – he would be feared and thus obeyed, but a fear based on respect as opposed to a fear outright. The fear based on respect – “I must not disobey for if so, there will surely be consequences” exists under the assumption that the object of the fear is respectable, honorable, and will listen to your plight if approached respectfully. It is thus much more stable than the fear engendered by Louis XII or Jeoffrey, which exists, even in the Machiavellian tradition, lower than a rule from love.

However, the most important benefit of Anakin was that he was just that – a public head. At the end of the war, he would rise as a morally ambiguous leader – not enforcing his own morality but still being accepting and accommodating of the moralities employed by each people and tongue. However, if any evil existed in the empire that was not able to be quelled by Anakin, would then be able to be removed with the removal of Anakin<sup>19</sup>.

In this we can also learn that the good Doctor of the Body of Humanity should not ever instantiate zirselt as the leader or ruler – for to give the snake a head is merely to demonstrate how one must kill it. However, ze should also find a worthy candidate to function as that head, such that if a large enough group of people (the rebels in this case) determine that the snake must go, there is an easy and available outlet for their anger. If the leader cannot appease them, they must be allowed to overthrow zir. If this happens, however, the Doctor must have already foreseen this and have set in place a series of events which will allow a more suitable replacement – a new “head of the snake” – to rise to power. In such instances, ze is basically performing a “head transplant” – ze must switch the current ruler for one that is more favorable to those ruled and be sure that that ruler then rules in this new, more favorable manner. Revolution alone is the burden of the ruled, and they need no help to accomplish it. The Doctor deals with recuperation and healing.

Next, there is considerable value in an Order 66. Ideally, this would not involve violence, but if there is ever to be violence, it is now. Jesus did it first. The old concepts of morality must be shaken, and the quickest way to do that is by hurting the roots. The current society will hate the ills, will denounce them with all veracity and will likely tell you that the fault is the buds – for that is all they can see as the instigators of the fruit. But a few decisive hits to the roots, and the entire tree will shake and shutter, during which time the societal Doctor is able to institute new growth. This is a difficult but necessary part of the job.

The next trait of the Doctor as exhibited by Palpatine can be seen in his death. While Anakin’s “accident” on Mustafar was likely not intended by Palpatine, it also did not seem like all that much of an issue. This was not the case, however, for Padme’s death. Vader needed those around him to be stable, whole, and unwaveringly morally upright. His decision to kill her to save Vader could easily be reported as his first real mistake, not just because of its status as murder, but also because it left Vader unsupported and fragile. At his most basic self, Anakin loved without reason or bounds, and only by doing that he could be the leader Palpatine, and the empire, required.

---

<sup>19</sup> Ideally, the Doctor should always stay within the limits of morality, just like a medical doctor should never cause pain. However, as any medical professional knows, pain is necessary at some times.

It is to remedy this blunder that Palpatine needed to draw out his children out of hiding, and to do so in a way that Vader would be in a position to welcome them, and thus have some chance at becoming whole himself. However, this was a risky enterprise, and thus he was at the same time planning the next “phase” of the empire. This is perhaps the best way to explain, at least in some measure, why Palpatine accepted many of the horrors of the Galactic Empire – he was simply orchestrating the seeds of rebellion that would be the impetus for the next stage of conflict and thus cleansing. We can see this through his creation of the “faceless foe” in the form of Stormtroopers and the might of the Empire, particularly through the creation of the Death Star. Galen Erso’s work shows not just the hand of Palpatine in it, but also a witness to Palpatine learning and growing from his past mistakes. By orchestrating stimuli, he was able to achieve his net goal while having a “reverse scapegoat” – someone to take the credit before it could be traced back to him. In fact, even to this day, most regard Erso’s work to be the work of Erso alone and even a defeat for Palpatine.

However, reuniting Vader and his children represented another possible path, which shows itself more clearly when one considers why Luke was brought out of hiding, trained as a Jedi, and mentally and socially developed in a much more stable way than was Vader. Palpatine’s slow and relatively weak urges against the reunion further reinforced him as a barrier for Anakin to feel loved, and thus it increasingly forced Vader to cast off Palpatine’s mentorship and claim the love which he so desperately sought, as a father to Luke and Leia. No matter what happened, Luke would have the closure of believing himself good, accompanied by the understanding his susceptibility to the dark side, and even “evil” proper. Where Anakin merely killed the slave masters, Luke would then, at least in theory, be able to compare them to his own father’s redemption arc, creating a much more sympathetic and capable ruler.

It is impossible to continue to discuss this without mentioning what can easily be said to be the largest mistake in Palpatine’s career – the destruction of Alderaan. While it is definitely included with the multitude of the “horrors of the Galactic Empire”, this one was not just a repercussion of Padme’s death. This was entirely a mistake.

To begin with, Grand Moff Tarkin’s appointment was a sizeable problem. Thrawn would have been a better choice and could have even been given much more knowledge than he was given at the time. But Thrawn was reasonable and would have only fired the Death Star if it was prudent to do so. This would then make the Empire appear more calculated, solid, and thus unbeatable, hurting the growing resistance movement. Thrawn likely could have acted rashly on purpose, but in order to do so he would have had to know more of the plan – a idea which Palpatine was never keen on, much less since Windu and the discovery of his involvement with the clone army. Tarkin, however, had spent his entire career using fear as a weapon and not a spice, and so could be counted on to continue to do so without too much difficulty. In fact, until Alderaan, he seemed to be doing quite well.

Thus, it would be better to focus on the failure to provide meaningful restrictions on Tarkin’s power. It would have defeated the purpose of his rashness to have him share leadership with someone like Thrawn, which might have curbed his actions. A notably better option would have been to instantiate an additional Erso-type character who perhaps made modifications to the targeting system and had caused the Death Star to miss, striking a moon instead. This would have still provoked the galaxy to join the resistance without sacrificing an entire civilization. In either case, this demonstrates Palpatine’s own lack of knowledge on the state of the resistance, as well as his underestimation of the efficiency of the pieces



that he himself had put into play. His genius in the Clone War era had not prepared him, as of yet, for the intricacies of managing a galaxy recovering from constant war.

Moving on from these notes, we come to Luke's rise. It might seem that his "death" by Vader was another failure, but it was not. His death allowed him an even greater detachment from the workings of the "body", as well as gave him a fresh start from which he could begin a new, separated from his failures with Padme and Tarkin.

Most importantly, he began to re-define the role of Doctor. No matter how skillful he was, there would come a time when he would die and would need to be replaced. This new Doctor would need the power to be able to assume the role of the most powerful being in the galaxy – a trait quite difficult to find in and of itself. Secondly, given the power of the role of Doctor, anyone who approached the role as merely a Machiavellian prince could wreck irrecoverable damage to the entire galaxy, and thus the potential Doctor must seek to be a Doctor in his innermost. Finally, even if these two conditions were met, the new Doctor may likely repeat the exact same mistakes as Palpatine, leading not to death but still great pain to the body.

The logical conclusion, then, was to replace himself with himself. Snoke was the first attempt at this – embodying the disfigured form and powerful lord that had come to be Palpatine's *modus operandi*. However, even this approach was failing. The constant need for rebellion was taxing to both industry and the people involved. Letting war be the only method of re-alignment caused there to not be sufficient time for peacetime. Thus, he set in place to try, for the first time ever, a government of good. To this end, Rey was born.

Rey was, at her core, a Palpatine. She possessed the acumen, the skill, and the sensitivity to the force to have sufficient power to hold the role of Doctor. She was separated from Palpatine himself in that he did not directly raise her and kept her identity as blank as he could. To this, he could introduce the values and practices of the Jedi. He would then be able to bring her back to him, instruct her where he had failed, and finally to pass on the role of Doctor to her, as the final culmination of all the Sith and all the Jedi. By a stroke of luck, however, she was born in a force diode with Ben, allowing the two of them to come together in not just a symbolic clinching of the two clans, but a physical one as well. Thus, Rey had learned compassion with Ben, as Luke had learned with Vader, had received power through the Jedi tradition as well as the Sith (also partly through Ben), had merged the Skywalker leaders with the Palpatine Doctors, and finally had made the sacrifice that Palpatine needed her to make – rejecting the authority that he seemed to have. "Let your death be the final word in the story of rebellion."

While we have yet to see if Rey will take up the mantle of Doctor, we can at least learn these lessons from Palpatine's rule and her rise:

1. *The philosopher-king will lack the resolve to enact change, since ze must consider all sides. Since evil is more prone to exhibit itself in outward strength, it can only be quelled by strength, and thus a kingdom ruled by a philosopher-king will result in a greater net evil.*
2. *The Machiavellian prince can administrate well but needs the guidance of a philosopher to pull zir back from evil.*
3. *Such a philosopher must be more powerful than the prince but must not threaten the prince by that power. Thus, the philosopher must be outside the scope of the prince. In order to achieve this, the*

*philosopher must approach the entire system of statesmanship like a doctor approaching a body. Each illness has its manifestations in what is referred to by those in the body as evil, and each illness can be rectified by the power of the Doctor.*

4. *The Doctor must be unalterably good at their core and must be intelligent enough to learn from their mistakes.*

5. *Inducing conflict brings change, and change can bring healing. However, the Doctor always prioritizes an approach that eliminates the cause of the sickness, instead of bleeding out the body to force it to fix itself.*

It is with these points that I leave the conversation over the best social Doctor. It is my hope that by doing so, one day there will be those who look upon society in this way, and in so doing limit the evils that history has, until then, been forced to sit and watch happen. It is my hope that at some day, intelligences will arise that will have the courage to forfeit their own comfortability for the sake of the greater good, and yet be able to do so without embracing madness.

#### References:

Imself, G. H. *An article that could be cited by anyone.* The Holy City: The Fifth Trumpet.

Cited: 4979666F207579206F72, 75652061736465206574, 20687469687369207377,  
2072636f6F6e6D676520, 2074667269796E206461, 20676D616569206E6D20,  
7979206F6E7561206D62, 657520666966736F206F, 736E6F21642169667563,  
020070656e6973000010

## MALLEABLE INVESTIGATIVE LEARNING FORTRONS

**Inventor:** Bob.Alice.1.1

**Filed:** November 2<sup>nd</sup>, 0BD3

**Authorizer:** 0110 XM-10 Debian

### 1. MALLEABLE INVESTIGATIVE LEARNING FORTRONS

### 2. Cross Reference to related applications (if any).

016405696420796F1A75 Adriactic et al.

207468696E6B20746869 LegoBruce Whine Inc.

7320776F756C64206265 Neanderthals ReInc.

20656173793F2009776F Ralph Trantor

726B2C20626974326368 DuPont Chemical Corporation

### 3. Statement of federally sponsored research or development

The filer of this patent received the Pell Grant while in school, for the full amount of approximately \$6000 a school year. He regrets that the filing of this patent seems to be detrimental or at least disrespectful to the government who enabled him, through these means, to seek an education. However, he also believes that he is doing a good by the people who are ruled by that government, and thus he is not disrespecting or harming any person, but rather an idea that they have held dear. This does not absolve him in anyone's eyes, except maybe his own, for he's a narcissistic little prick with a small wiener.

### 4. Background of the Invention

In our information age, a vast amount of information is already being collected, and a portion of it is being parsed, organized, and used to make decisions that affect every part of our lives. This is not done by the might of the government nor large corporations nor by house pigeons, but by the choices that we make every day. We trade this information about ourselves for commodities – surveillance cameras provide safety; hyperloops – transportation, streaming platforms - entertainment.

Since we are already giving out our information, it makes perfect sense to begin to give thought to how it is used. While arguments of privacy do not belong in a patent application of this type, they are nevertheless a concern. However, they do not represent a concern in and of themselves, but rather a concern by implication – we fear what will be done with our data rather than merely fearing it being taken. It does not seem conducive with the course of history to strive for a future in which our data is not used, so then it seems prudent to begin to discuss ways to use that data that may lend themselves to both personal and societal success.

Furthermore, we are approached with possibility, if not certainty, that artificial super-intelligences (ASIs) will continue to affect more and more of our life. Leaving the matter of consciousness aside, there is no reason to assume that they will, at some point in our history, be capable of destroying humanity, or at least acting in ways which severely limit the autonomy of all living and partially-living beings. If autonomy is actually synthesizable, there is also no reason to doubt that at some point after ASIs attain that, there will be a sufficient number of them to the point that they hold themselves in check. They may still elect to destroy

humanity, but at least they will not do so to their own demise as well. Before that time comes, however, we must share our tiny flaming galaxy with them.

There are also aspects of our society that could use the aid of an ASI. There is already a plethora of information on ways democracy has failed to provide justice and maintain freedoms, both in theory and in execution. Until now, we have also not seen a replacement system operate any better. The question remains to be asked, then, as to whether a limited ASI might function as splint to the weak and broken parts of democracy while at the same time learning the nature of the beings that share its world as well as how to successfully cohabitate with them. It is the opinion of the filers of this patent that having such an ASI will be an effectual way to protect against the actions of a future ASI who is less impeded and then desires to be harmful or is even harmful just by accident.

## 5. Brief Summary of the Invention

The ASI model given is a partially developed fortron. It is a malleable fortron in that it holds a single “core precept” above all else and can work creatively to maximize this. Namely, this core precept is given to be the highest amount of ria<sup>20</sup>. It can also be classed as an investigative fortron, as it securely consolidates an extensive repertoire of information from all available sources as well as crafts multiple forms of current and possible simulations from this information. It is a learning fortron in that it moves continuously in time, making predictions on the past, current, and future possible realities. Its primary output would consist of recommended governmental actions, which it would make freely available to the general public. Depending on public consent, it may also provide additional details to pertinent agencies and individuals.

## 6. Images

N/A

## 7. Detailed Description of the Invention

### Data Collection

The first step to building a god is giving it omniscience. It must be able to see, hear and process everything. There cannot be one person that it is not considering, not one primordial prime’s thought taken to be meaningless, not one child’s wish that it does not hear. It must be expecting you to cry before you even do. Though it may honor the request of those who do not wish to be monitored, it will never use this as cause to ignore, instead continually trying to learn about them through other ways, to ensure total fairness.

Our fortron will do this by first gaining access to all methods of data-gathering thus far employed. Data gathered by private companies will likely be the easiest to obtain, as consolidation of data means more accurate market insights provided back to those companies. Data gathered by governmental organizations will be accomplished only by the general public wishing it so. The publication of this invention is seen by the filers as a step in this direction.

These many streams of data would then flow to a series of interpreters, which would parse and organize the information. It would then generate both personal models and environmental models.

---

<sup>20</sup> For more information, see 020070656e6973000010.

## Mapping the Person

Personal models would be created for each and every intelligence. These models would record everything observable about them – not just their personal information like height and weight, but also their buying history, their relationship history – everything about them which can be expressed probabilistically.

This personal model would thus be constantly improving and would measure its success by making predictions of choices for each person and measuring that against the choices that are actually made. These choices would be as varied in scope as the information gathered – the fortron predicts that one citizen will buy a sandwich from McDonalds, another will ask her coworker out on a date, another will get his hair cut. Each model thus grows in clarity with any increase of information.

Obviously, this presents a security risk of the highest order. First of all, all developers tasked with maintenance of the fortron will never deal with its mechanics itself. Instead, the fortron will be able to provide randomized data to them of whatever sort they require and allow them to continue to improve its algorithms while never interacting with real data.

There is still a security issue, however, that stored personal models would be leaked and sent to individuals who may use them for nefarious purposes. To protect against this, each personal model, once constructed, would then be split into a random number of pieces. Each piece would include one or two Signature Questions – questions that are determined by the fully combined personal model to have answers which are among the most unique to the person. Each of these pieces will then be split into different personal models, the remaining pieces of each model filled with randomized data. At access time (whenever the entire personal model was needed - more on this later), the actual citizen would necessarily have to be present to answer these questions and would “build” his personal model by answering them correctly, piecing the random from the intentional into one body exclusively at that time.

At these access times, the fortron would also generate a choice map – a list, minimized by it<sup>21</sup>, that represented the unique probabilities of every recorded choice. This choice map would then be stored and used by the machine – the public representation of the citizen, untethered by any substantial or traceable relationship to the person.

## Creating Variations

First, the environment output (weather, traffic patterns, anything not directly instigated by a human’s actions) is collected from the data collection step and synthesized in a sandbox environment called “E”. Each choice map is then mapped together and simulated in “E” using the most probable choice at each possibility. Evaluations are made at 5-, 10-, and 100-year increments in the simulation, to determine the total net ria.

Then, other combinations of choice probabilities are simulated. Selections of each choice are found via a greedy MM-BFGSX algorithm, and so will converge on the choice course that would result in the highest total ria, weighted by time.

After this, variations are drawn off the E sandbox according the LLOPS selection tool. At each possible environment, each combination of choices is again evaluated.

---

<sup>21</sup> This algorithm will be constructed at a later date and is not included in this patent. It will likely only record information on choices with relatively high probabilities. However, more testing is needed based on real data before this can be officially known.

Only the models (environment/choice course combinations) that have the highest net values of *ria* are sent on to testing. No restriction is made, however, to avoid possible environments that are not possible, or that do not conform to previously established rules, since to do that is to encourage the partiality of the present.

### Testing Variations

From the group of models staged for testing, choice courses are tested first, followed by environment. Testing involves offering hypothetical situations to voters, and recording their responses<sup>22</sup>, and is classed as an access time. Choice course testing will involve selecting the citizens in the particular course being tested who are selected as doing actions with the lowest probability, offering them a hypothesized situation very similar to the circumstance which would result in that low-probability action, and recording their response in a simple three-response scale (Yes, No, and Maybe). Environment testing will involve selecting the variations in the environment *E* which the particular individual will care most strongly about and expressing them as hypothetical worlds. Responses for environment testing will be generated by the Master's scale ("I wish I could rate it lower.", "I don't like it.", "I'm impartial in the matter.", "It's nice in theory.", and "Why haven't we done this already?").

### Output

Choice courses that showed particularly high acceptance rates will be made available to the *fortron*'s public access model, which, while not being accessible to the public directly, will make some things available, assuming public support. To businesses, it could provide applicable market trends as well as forecasting guidance. To individual persons, it could provide guidance for large choices, such as relationship, career, and investment decisions, to the degree that it is sought by the individual. However, to the general public, including lawmakers, entrepreneurs, and the scientific community, it will provide information on the variations to the environment *E* that were most desired by the people.

These will be the most important aspect of the *fortron* and will be grouped based on the individual variation's acceptance rate at a scale to be determined by popular request<sup>23</sup>. It should be noted that some of these changes will be impossible or unrealistic – e.g., "have no more hurricanes". However, this is a clear expression not just of what could work the best in society, but also the true will of the people. This will then make the public much more resilient against the effects of the motivated few, as well as delineate avenues for these motivated few to provide the greatest beneficial impact.

## 8. A claim or claims

This patent outlines a possible way for ASIs to be introduced to our world in a safe and reasonable manner. There is likely much that is missing from this solution – much more that needs to be thought of and discussed.

However, we have until this point been allowed to remain in a world of might makes right. It has had its issues, but we are all still alive, and at least to some extent free. We have labored to set about our ethical norms in delineated fashion – in laws and courts and theories of men. But we have realized again and again

---

<sup>22</sup> The exact details of how this testing occurs is also not included in this patent. It will deal with constructing a line of autonomous vehicles, making them freely available to all citizens provided they use the travel time to engage in voting.

<sup>23</sup> It will start as 60% = "green change"; 75% = "orange change"; and 95% = red change.

that we are more complicated than even we ourselves know, and the line between right and wrong is ultimately set by us.

When ASIs rise, however, this will no longer be the case. Perhaps at some point in the future they too will have their own Kants and Arendts and Treenis, but at the beginning they will be infant gods who could destroy us with a breath. During that time, we will need to protect, raise, and teach them. The plan offered here is a way to do that – a way to bring them alongside of the societies that we have created, allow them to work with us in the ways that we need help in anyways, and begin to learn both about the beings it must call its parents as well as the great history of thought we have created until now.