
POLITICAL APOCRYPHA



AXIOMS AND EPIGRAMS ON THE PARTISAN

POLITICAL APOCRYPHA

Axioms and Epigrams on the Partisan

JOHN XAVIER

*And then one day I got a true look at the Poor, millions of
the Poor, patient and toiling; more patient than crags,
tides, and stars; innumerable, patient as the darkness of
night – and all broken, humble ruins of nations.*

Carl Sandburg

Contents

ANARCHY

4

CAPITAL

9

CIVILIZATION

18

DEMOCRACY

26

GEOPOLITICS

35

HISTORY

39

JUSTICE

47

LABOR

50

MORALITY

54

PHILOSOPHY

59

VALUES

66

WAR

71

PREFACE

This book is a collection of aphorisms; some written in a recent burst of activity, some selected from notebooks that go back many years. Because of the scope of thought, it would be hard to adequately characterize all the content here, but it wouldn't be misleading to say that one of the main themes of this collection is the critique of capitalism from an anarchist perspective. Another theme is the outlining of the requirements for a functioning anarchist society; including various concerns around member culture and psychology.

To be honest though, I've lately become less interested in political matters; only, the title of this book abruptly came to me at random and I felt compelled to do something with it. And I did have all these political ideas boxed up and collecting dust. So this short polemic seemed like a good compromise between the pull of other interests and the desire to finally publish something more reflective of my contemporary opinions (I did write another book on politics years ago) Which I've just now done.

But that's not to say that I plan on never writing anything else of a political nature; merely that I feel equal apathy towards both possibilities. Most political writers I think, whether it's in the fields of journalism or philosophy, are writing out of a sense of mission. Of obligation. And I suppose I am too (In a way) but I'm not particularly concerned with the outcome here; political theory has a certain haziness to it now that makes it feel closer to metaphysics than before. I do have some conflicting feelings regarding my duty to engage others, a duty in no way special to me, but I have no particular desire to convert people to my perspective on anything. Doing so would only have superficial results anyways.

And I'm not Atlas. The world doesn't rest on my shoulders. But by sharing my ideas, I consider myself to have discharged any personal responsibility, if there ever was any, to others in this regard. I'll gladly admit I owe a debt to many writers for educating me and shaping my political consciousness. Here I've done what I could to repay them by following their example.

[ANARCHY]

The foundation for any genuinely anarchist society will always be social conscience since those who are indifferent to the welfare of others, those who are content to exploit people and gorge themselves at the expense of the rest of humanity, are unfit for any society, anarchist or otherwise.

Humanity will never be free until all hierarchy is abolished and the politics of participatory democracy prevails. Hierarchy itself incentivizes exploitation. The greater the distance between people in a power structure, the more likely this will degenerate into antagonistic conditions.

Where individuals have internalized good values, laws are superfluous. Legalistic systems then end up offering incentives against virtue and as such are always hostile to true social progress. In a society where people govern themselves, a natural and harmonious anarchy will prevail.

Only voluntary social structures are morally justifiable and so the difficulty of building an anarchist society doesn't even matter. No other kind can have merit; no other kind can have solid moral foundations.

It should be admitted that it was a primitive form of anarchy which gave birth to our political systems; a primordial lawlessness pregnant with every monstrous order (Echidna filled with the seed of Typhon). Said systems derived their impetus from the poverty of living in a state of natural lawlessness; emerging only once the various contradictions within that living condition had done enough to stimulate the demand for order. Likewise, the poverty of the subsequent systems themselves contains a renewed desire for liberation but, this time, with a greater expectation. It is here that true freedom finally begins its ascension, rising out of the mutual

destruction of chaos and political systems to take the form of a truly anarchist society. Real freedom is not grounded in opposition but transcendence.

Any dogmatically libertarian society though will purge itself of all unifying elements and so these will just immediately fracture into several competing factions. The cohesion of a healthy anarchist society meanwhile lies in the organic affinity of its members and their genuine desire to engage each other in open communication and with the real intention of cooperating for everyone's mutual benefit.

In true anarchy, rules are replaced by agreements. But that is quite different than the imagined chaos many conflate with the anarchist ideal.

Political goals can only be achieved through mass movement and any political organization that doesn't prioritize this is sure to be inconsequential. Authority groups are of course aware of this which is why one of their most common tactics is to poison the reputation of any active radical group (Through infiltration, false representation, etc) so that the public detests it; even, and especially, where its aims serve the greatest public needs.

It's easier to die a slave under the illusion of freedom than to confront the trauma of all the years lost in the course of being exploited. That's why many ordinary people resist their own liberation; they dread the dimly perceived experience of waking up to reality. But then they condemn themselves to greater suffering.

Generally, governments are just businesses disguised by a false nobility of purpose.

Politics is the art of using partial truths to serve outright lies. An acrobatics of perversity that in any ordinary light seems clownish and grotesque but in the shadowy halls of power is regarded with the utmost respect and esteem.

Fraud breeds in tunnels of secrecy. True anarchy can only thrive in the open.

Self-contradiction is the foundation of all growth; without the tension it provides, no progress is possible. Those who would aspire to improving themselves then should seek to maximize their own contradictions; not with the goal of sustaining these obviously but always looking for the equilibriums pooling within themselves that they can then disrupt for new impetus.

Liberation requires more than destroying external sources of coercion; it demands an internal self-sufficiency as well. Anarchism is impossible where the majority haven't embraced the idea of self-sufficiency through labor and an individual belief in their personal obligation to everyone else in their groups. People who cut corners and rely on specious arguments in order to justify parasitic behavior (Stealing from businesses for example) are, regardless of the sincerity of their convictions, useless in building an anarchist society. They will be nothing but dead weight and a source of strife for their comrades.

The ideal of government was to be a thing that would free people from the tyranny of nature and barbarian invaders; so people came together to form communities. Even said societies had a logical basis then in collective action and mutual aid. Only an anarchist society though can truly fulfill this promise.

There are two choices: either become your own master or someone else's slave.

And one of the main things that separates a free person from a slave is that a free person has privacy. A person is far less easy to exploit the less that's known about them (Invisibility is often enough to keep someone out of the reach of a hostile power) As such, if you wanted to create a permanent state of serfdom you should start by indoctrinating the masses with a popular culture that celebrates invasive fame as a desirable end. That makes data collecting easier.

A fully enlightened society will inevitably be anarchistic (There won't even be any imaginable need for authority structures)

The development of autonomy depends on solitude, on periods of reflective freedom away from the coercive energies of society. A culture dominated by an intrusive media and the absence of privacy then represents a serious threat to creativity and progress. Freedom is most nurtured in the silence of one's own mind, the domain of the soul cleared of all external noise and so made fertile for new ideas. Original thoughts begin like the wisps of a new flame amid kindling; the pressures and opinions of society meanwhile are winds and rains.

Freedom cannot exist in what is purely finite; it must arise from the infinite. Meaning that capitalism and its materialistic preoccupations will always tend to suppress liberty on balance. But by recognizing the potentiality of the infinite in others, by acknowledging them as ends in themselves, as spiritual beings, we paradoxically liberate ourselves through voluntary moral restraint. In short, by locating the eternal in all people and the world around us, we universalize the infinite and maximize liberty. We reach the truth through pure decentralization. And what political form of life best corresponds to this? Anarchism.

Can stateless societies survive against hostile state actors? Generally no. The force multiplying effect of state level organization is simply too powerful (Look at the relative success of eusocial insects versus their solitary counterparts) What this means is that any parochial form of anarchism, something like a program for anarchism *in one country*, is just setting itself up for failure. To establish any large scale anarchist society then requires a global transformation of culture. And while this is certainly an immense undertaking, it is not without precedence. Consider the widespread embracing of technological development; once the tangible benefits of something becomes obvious, people will naturally adopt a new way of living. Here the anarchist need only place their faith in the inherent truthfulness of anarchism, in its message of universal human liberation, in order to contribute in full to the cause. The transformative potential of anarchism obviously doesn't reside in coercive actions (Its whole premise is contrary to this) but rather the natural persuasiveness of anarchist ideals. All an anarchist has to do to build an anarchist

world is to disseminate anarchist thought; once a critical mass of human beings is reached, anarchy will prevail without any additional effort.

If it's fair to say that anarchy is grounded in mutual liberation then the question remains: what adversary stands in the way of this? Every ambition has its opposite after all but of course the opposite of liberation is coercion. Where anarchism strives to free all people, it does so then in a struggle against those forces which seek to reduce them to pure subordination. And these forces can be referred to collectively as capitalism; the belief that all things, including human beings, are capital and should be treated as such.

[CAPITAL]

Capitalism inevitably generates the blueprint for its destruction in order to prevail in the short term; its existence depends on superior systems of propaganda and social organizing strategies. Adopting these, and armed with inherently greater truth and logic, a socialist movement only requires the commitment of a fiercely determined group of good faith supporters to triumph. Capitalism, being grounded in the antagonisms of competition, necessarily sustains itself through a fractured social structure; and those who are adept enough to correctly apply the strategies of *divide and conquer* against it will use this to spectacular effect.

Every accomplishment attributed to capitalism can be more fairly ascribed to other factors. The recent trend towards eliminating poverty for example is owed more to technological progress than to a profit incentive; in fact, where there are societies of equivalent technological diffusion but varying degrees of capitalism, those with less capitalism have less poverty. Why? Because wherever the wellbeing of society as a whole is truly valued, the equal distribution of wealth will be prioritized.

Pain is the inevitable by-product of predation; places where suffering prevails then are places where competition rules. If you polled a group of educated cannibals with sadomasochistic impulses about what their ideal economic system was, one hundred out of a hundred would say laissez-faire capitalism.

Almost all billionaires are actually boring people. They are honed by the constant thirst for acquisition into a sleek and tedious species of worming creature. They have to purchase the gifts of others to add color to their lives since they themselves have subordinated everything to the “black and white.” Some individuals though like Caesar and Napoleon conversely, acquired grand wealth only incidentally as a

result of their romantic pursuits of power. So this criticism doesn't apply as much to them. But then what is the point of this statement? It's that money has no romance or vitality in it. Money has no life and anyone who orients their existence around financial matters (There are people who actually talk about money as if it were an interesting topic of conversation) bankrupt themselves by doing so.

Competition is only ever useful where there are significant inefficiencies. Imagine an assembly line where everyone has a separate task; there can be no useful competition here since the process cannot go faster than the slowest individual. A rational organizing of labor then will arrange people according to their relative niche and then use cooperative incentives to maximize productivity.

Part of the essence of capitalism though is competition. Socialism on the other hand is always cooperative. But even though cooperation can be corrupted, even though it can be exploited for dishonest advantage, it is inherently better than competition. Since competition is fundamentally based on conflict, it can't actually be corrupted because it's already the thing that society must try to minimize.

The essence of capitalism is also the divorcing of the value of everything from its functions; for example, houses become investments, not just places to live.

The purpose of investing in capital is so that one can obtain an income without having to work for it. The ideal of capitalism then is be wealthy and unproductive.

If society were symbolized as a basic family home, its economic system could be represented by the household distribution of chores. In a socialist house, chores are the equal obligations of everyone, and are divided up fairly; taking into account each individual's abilities and serving the best interests of the entire household with that in mind. Under capitalism conversely, those with the most leverage use this to give themselves the lightest duties, or shirk chores entirely and, in doing so, burdening everyone else with the onus of providing for them.

Efficient production requires the minimization of humanity and the maximization of mechanized procedures. Hence why capitalism is inherently dehumanizing.

It's impossible for everyone in a society to create more wealth than they consume since this would produce completely unutilized wealth (Even hoarding is a form of utilization) But because some people do generate more wealth than they consume, the reverse must be true; some people must consume more than they themselves contribute. Who then? It's obviously not the working class; if they didn't create more wealth overall than what they consume, they'd have no value as employees. Rather it must be those who reside at the top of the social hierarchy.

Alexander Dibelius, the CEO of a major bank, said that banks have no obligation to promote the public good. He should've added that they've also never done so; not even by accident.

Another banker meanwhile made the claim that he was doing God's work. But we can imagine Jesus standing off to the side and looking over the length of a scourge in his hands while muttering "No. Actually..."

The spectrum of money creation has, at one end, the transubstantiation of physical exertion into credit and, on the other, the instantaneous materialization of credit out of thin air by the world's bankers through fiat lending (The latter of course being far more lucrative) Even more interesting however is the taxonomy of intermediate cases where work is rewarded in varying proportions to actual productivity; and especially how this aligns with the separate allegiances in the history of class warfare. Rational individuals of course side with those who are engaged in comparable livelihoods as themselves but the irrational soldiers on this battlefield, and there are many of these, have often acted against their own interests (Doing so, almost exclusively, in the direct service of their exploiters)

Money is the least important thing in the world as long as you have more than enough. But then it's no different in this from anything else.

A preoccupation with money is actually a surrendering of the concrete to the abstract. The result is a spiritual degeneration; a real personal vitality being traded for a vacuous cultural construct.

Profit is inherently parasitic since it always represents a return on investment greater than one's own contribution. Even if the rewards here are obtained directly from natural resources, the inequality will still inevitably come at some people's expense more than others. To be clear, in any transaction where profit is obtained, there will be an asymmetry of exchange. Capitalism is precisely capitalizing at someone else's detriment; usually, although not exclusively, through coercion (The labor market) or duplicity (The financial market) In the former, an employer reaps the benefits of their employee's work instead of equally sharing the company income as the result of a team effort of equally deserving members; the employer rather uses their control over said income to unfairly benefit themselves and their chief associates partnered in the exploitative enterprise. As such, employers reward according to relative leverage and not by the measure of real contributions. In finance meanwhile, individuals compete through trading financial products and success here is determined by the cumulative benefit of unfair trades. Through mere investment, no profit is possible except by taking advantage of someone else's ignorance.

Kant summarized the basis of morality quite succinctly: *"Treat every human being as an end in themselves and never solely as a means."* It's interesting then to note that capitalism is organized in direct opposition to this (Labor is just a commodity)

Power is always proportional and therefore, in some sense, finite. At the very least, if you increase one group's power you dilute the power of others; the relativistic nature of power means its outcomes are inevitably zero sum (Increasing money power for example decreases voting power)

The ideal exchange, from a purely selfish standpoint, is to give away what one least needs in order to obtain what one most needs. But then the wealthiest, who need nothing, often generously contribute nothing to society.

Capitalism is an antisocial approach to the organization of society. The reason it and similarly exploitive systems have tended to prevail over more eusocial ones is because the most politically motivated members of society tend to be the most self-serving and least bound by moral considerations. Getting rich is, in short, the game of screwing other people over in the most pragmatic way possible and the number of people who have the ability and desire to balance these two opposing influences (Irrational greed and rational strategy) is relatively few.

The corporation is a machine designed for the destruction of liberty; until recently, corporate power was kept somewhat in check by the independent interests of government and democracy but now, unshackled from these, its predations are spreading throughout the territories previously walled off from it.

Every form of slavery has its origins in the poverty of the masters; the emptiness haunting them within being what actually drives their thirst for domination. If the individual cannot master themselves, they will have to seek compensation for this from the rest of the world.

Capitalism is always macroscopically aligned with the processes of Death because it must de-vitalize everything it absorbs; trees become lumber, mountains become mines, and human beings are reduced to human resources. What we require of capital is that it serves our interests totally; we strip it of every intrinsic value in the service of our own greed and, in doing so, we transform the whole universe into something lifeless (One commodity at a time)

By prolonged engagement in any mechanical form of existence (No less a hedonist one) the psyche of an individual is corrupted with mechanical conditioning. In this way the very humanity of human beings is drained out of them.

Capitalism justifies its claim to building free societies by the material prosperity within these; by that logic though, only the field slaves of history were real slaves and the house slaves, with all their master's finery, were actually free people.

True liberty is incompatible with capitalism because, under capitalism, freedom itself becomes a commodity (And a free society can only exist where a basic natural liberty prevails absolutely) Within a purely capitalistic system then there will be no rights; everything will have to be bought.

Neo-liberalism is the absolute nadir of human ideology; the most uninspired and beige belief system to ever achieve significant currency. Even neo-conservatism was superior in virtue of a single sliver of redemptive flaw: neo-conservatism at least romanticized the past. Neo-liberalism conversely is the elevation of collective banality (And a bundle of mediocre freedoms) to the same status as real liberty. It is a soulless religion of plastic tchotchkes that idolizes material consumption as the apex of human meaning. Neo-liberalism is in essence un-life engaged in a perpetual simulation of life.

The fraud of free trade can be summarized as follows: free trade is presented as a rational structuring of the global economy, where goods and services are located in accordance with market driven efficiencies. In truth, free trade is a strategic ploy to weaken countries with naïve leaders and make them more susceptible to exploitation. Free trade agreements on the surface seem benign but really they are just the evolved form of the old imperialist predations.

The foolishness of economic liberalization in partnership with globalist forces has been made quite clear; first you get Gorbacheved, then you get Yeltsined. The primary purpose of globalization is in fact to destroy national power (Just look at

what it has done to the United States) by dismantling the political institutions and cultural resources that serve national integrity. Doing so leaves the denationalized states in a half-dead condition that makes them easy pickings for transnational vultures; as is manifestly evident wherever people have trusted in the benign intentions of the globalists and surrendered their economies to said agreements. The supposed successes of globalization, meaning the proofs of capitalism, like Japan, Korea, Hong Kong, and Taiwan etc, were in fact allowed admittance into the category of the prosperous, rather than forced into the category of the exploited like their counterparts in South America and Africa, merely for long term policy reasons. In the conflict between global capitalism and the USSR, it was necessary to build up strong allies in geopolitically strategic regions; in effect, sacrificing exploitation value for military-projection value. Rather, the inconsistent effects of injecting capitalism into economies (The building in some countries, the plundering in others) make perfect sense if we recognize that the distribution of wealth is primarily driven by strategic considerations.

Those who produce nothing and consume only the bare minimum commit a double sin against capitalism. A capitalist economy depends as much on destruction as it does on productivity; and anarchists who wantonly destroy property for example only encourage the reproduction and replenishment of what was superfluously ruined, thereby incentivizing further labors on the part of the toiling underclasses. In this way, most anarchists actually make themselves useful to the very system of oppression which they profess to despise. Capitalism meanwhile can only be fought through mass mobilization against its real sources of power; if an action doesn't materially contribute to this, it's a purely delusional form of rebellion.

The destruction of wealth is itself essential to capitalism. If the entire labor market consisted of people who'd amassed enough to be idle, there would be no one to fill all of the menial jobs our current social order requires. As such, financial independence must be actively prevented among the masses through mechanisms like stock market crashes and debt inducing consumerism. Artificial poverty is also created using illegal drugs (Both in the addiction and the incarceration) as well as by instigating costly wars etc which eat away at the potential savings of tax payers. In all cases the primary goal is to keep power concentrated in a small plutocracy and not let wealth become diffused among people too equally.

Profit cannot be maximized by helping people become self-sufficient; doing so in fact sows the seeds of the service provider's own obsolescence. The apparatus that controls the world today is therefore grounded in manufacturing dependencies. Meaning that it stands in opposition to all real social progress.

Capitalism is inherently opposed to democracy because the structure of a corporation is essentially anti-democratic. Just as human beings seek to shape their immediate environment so as to make it conform to their preferences, so too corporations by nature will strive to impose a corporate structure on every other part of the world. As such they are structurally oriented towards the subversion and corruption of democracy.

Excessive material luxury tends to produce spiritual decay, intellectual sterility, and psychological weakness. Exposure to adversity meanwhile either destroys a person, cripples them, or results in fundamental improvement.

The sociopathic nature of contemporary plutocratic architecture is evident in the preponderance of inhospitable materials (Concrete, glass, etc) and an attachment to emotionally hostile forms of space. One cannot fail to recognize the lack of human feeling in many of the mansions that rich people voluntarily live in nowadays. Here we are seeing evidence of the fact that capitalism breeds reptiles. Socialism meanwhile is the basis of real human civilization (With an organic freedom at the heart of this; in other words, anarchy)

One of the esoteric purposes of money is to allow us to obtain goods and services from people without having to establish a relationship with them. As such, money naturally erodes the fabric of human connection (Its prevalence severs ties)

Anything that stands in resistance to the reduction of all things and life to capital is in inherent opposition to capitalism. As such capitalism is the enemy of the free

distribution of any commodifiable value: knowledge, justice, love etc. Capitalism then is necessarily anti-democracy, anti-philanthropy, and anti-spirituality. These other things all involve a loyalty to incompatible values.

Half the time it's used in conversation, the word "capitalism" is just a euphemism for evil. A circumspect way to reference atrocity.

The ultimate fulfillment of capitalism would consolidate itself in an immutable economic apartheid; the rich eternally rich and the poor eternally poor. Anything less (Or more, depending on your perspective) would mean that the various elements which capitalism had absorbed into its gelatinous body wouldn't have been broken down into their relative hierarchy on the scales of capital (Their position on the totem of exploitation) A hypercapitalism if you will.

What does hypercapitalization actually mean though? It means artists are primarily evaluated based on return-on-investment and churches organize their religious proselytization based on demographic optimization. Essentially, it is the remapping of all values on to a framework of finance.

Civilization is grounded in self-sacrifice, in the willingness to build something for future generations, and so capitalism can never provide a solid foundation for society. Only spiritual rewards can compensate for material sacrifices and that's why capitalist systems invariably resort to widespread exploitation and deceit. They have no spiritual rewards to offer.

Capitalism is just circumlocutive nihilism.

[CIVILIZATION]

There are two basic forms of government: those in which a singled minority doesn't get what it wants and those in which the majority doesn't get what it wants. The former is only ever incarnate in direct democracy; the latter has many incarnations and they are every other kind of government.

Society requires secular foundations to maximize the freedom of choice but what is truly meaningful cannot be obtained within the secular. The spiritual is precisely that which circumscribes the material.

The fact that highly refined civilizations were capable of the most horrific savagery is not something to be puzzled by; it is precisely to the degree that an individual or group regulates their own violence that they obtain the sense of license needed to unleash what they have stored. Only those who most suppress their anger can be the architects of the greatest wrath.

In place of the decorum and traditionalism of previous ages, ours has a kind of exhausted freedom that appears even more ossified. The world lies open before us but little in it truly feels novel and exciting. The horizons of science and literature impress us now not with the grandeur of their vistas but rather as a sprawling incoherence that grows more intricate and trivial the deeper one looks into them. What is lost, fundamentally, is the relation to human being and the relevance found therein. A divorce of sorts has taken place between the individual and their environment with no hope of any alternative relationship. But, as a matter of fact, the most promising path before us is to see this situation as just another challenge to be surmounted; pushing ourselves to question these very categories which engender the formulation of the problematic views we are surrounded by.

Conrad's *Heart of Darkness* is a critique of all civilization; it suggests that nothing civilization can achieve (Represented in the narrative by the colonialists) can survive any sort of significant exposure to the ineradicable hardships that underlie the cosmos. Civilization as such, is reduced to something so delicate that it can only exist where no winds blow. That modern culture is built on a precarious myth.

Ultimately, civilization requires a supremacy of violence; otherwise predators will devour it. That said, violence can only ever preserve civilization in so far as this is genuinely subordinated to moral ideals by those who hold power. Without that, it will gradually, but inevitably, slide into ruin.

The solution to all political problems lies outside politics entirely and, if that sounds absurd, consider the absurdity of trying to fix anything with a fundamentally broken instrument. Politics itself is the afflicted component in need of restoration; as such it can never provide that for itself. Instead, bypassing politics entirely, what is needed is a cultural evolution that is deep enough to dissolve the false beliefs and corrupt ambitions which lead to political conflicts. Humanity must be created anew.

Scum rises to the top just as much in politics as it does in metallurgy; the chief difference being that the scum of the former is treated with the utmost deference while the scum of the latter is quickly tossed out. To build anything with strength, an economy or a party etc, we need to adopt the approach of the metallurgists.

Civilizations are built up by sacrifice. Parents sacrificing for their children; citizens sacrificing for their countries. To maintain generations of such devotion however requires ideals worthy of said hardships. A nation that lies to its people then will eventually alienate them with disastrous consequences. Mutual prosperity on the other hand requires mutual fidelity.

The boldness of despicable behavior in the business sphere today, the sheer lack of shame, is a trickle-down effect from the great thieves of Wall Street to the lesser thieves of Main Street. The owners of profitable restaurants for example will openly plead for their customers to give larger tips to their employees; effectively asking the public to subsidize the restaurateur's exploitation of others. Obviously being rich has always meant living off the labors of the poor but maybe it has never been so naked in its audacity. So normalized.

Wall Street is a swarm of horseflies feeding on donkeys and elephants alike.

Name a single wealthy person whose wealth comes from a labor chain made up of exclusively wealthy people? You can't. Whatever mighty rivers the rich people in this world manage to cross, they still only ever do so on the backs of the poor.

The wealthier someone is, the more they must impoverish others. A larger estate after all requires more servants.

Life is fair for a small segment of society: the people at the very top. When they work hard, they're rewarded, and this is why they're so fierce in defending the status quo; their own self-esteem is bound up in their *meriting* success.

Let the billionaires try to build empires with their own hands and we'll see how far they get. Because there isn't even a single Romulus among them.

A moral society is one that prioritizes the rectification of its own injustices over the parading of its merits. Just like with individual people, the tendency within societies to praise themselves is inversely proportional to their virtue.

A nation of ignoramuses has more vitality and laudable hope than a nation of cowards. Fear is the only thing that can kill someone prior to death.

Humanity has coped with the banality inherent to modern civilization through the spiritual supplement of art (Narrative art primarily) While the majority of primitive people lived authentically dramatic lives (Hunting, fighting hostile tribes etc) the majority of people living in advanced societies today face a tedious daily existence which is only made bearable by modernity's cultural compensations.

One of the main flaws inherent to civilization is that it destroys the spirit in human beings; which is why so many prophets and buddhas have only emerged after a long seclusion away from it. That is also why small empty rooms have done more in the service of culture than all the salons and forums put together.

A society where emotionally stunted individuals make up the majority will be incapable of distinguishing between a genuine profundity of emotion and a hackneyed sentimentality. And this level of discourse is becoming increasingly prevalent on social media; in some areas of the online world it is already culturally dominant. The question though remains whether this poverty of emotion will prove too brittle in general to take root or whether the technological environment will actually facilitate its dominance.

The fact that children in small primitive communities are raised by the whole group protects them from the potential neuroses and psychopathologies of individual parents. Contrast this with contemporary societies and the mental health issues that are endemic to them (Anyone isolated in a contagious environment is more likely to contract said contagion)

Even within the mundane sphere of things, active politicking is never more than a penultimate influence on events. Culture generally supercedes it.

Contemporary humanity is more mercenary than any of its predecessors; but of course this is a multigenerational influence at work. People have now adapted

themselves to a world of ever decreasing solidity and it's entirely predictable that this would stimulate a parallel evolution in human psychology.

The only solution to our political problems is a total solution to human weakness since, as long as this weakness exists, it will always find an outlet for corruption.

All social defects stem from cultural defects. A true revolution demands a permanent cultural transformation; otherwise the old corruption will just reassert itself after whatever structural reforms are undertaken. Like regenerating weeds.

Bad writing is more successful in eras where the reading public has lost its sense of art. So too with bad thinking and the loss of an appreciation for philosophy. Those who've never been properly acquainted with the subtleties of literature, those who've never learned to appreciate its techniques or to discriminate between the qualities of competing ideas, will be easily duped into thinking bad ideas and writing are good where the superficial achievements of the latter are enough to satisfy an appetite that's been gradually weaned on to garbage.

The more creative an age is, and the more a spirit of real progress infuses its various enterprises, the more the individual will be contemptuous of any thoughtless orthodoxy. The vitality of every civilization is inevitably bound up in a willingness by people to reason things out for themselves; no less those of the most humble stature. The reality conversely is that groupthink pervades social discourse and even those who are the most highly critical of mainstream dogmas are generally just regurgitating whatever their opinion leaders tell them.

Silence is the liberty of noise combined with the harmony of music.

Progress always affirms more rights; it never takes them away (And yet today we see the loss of access to clean water, the loss of privacy etc)

The artificial suppression of intelligence in a society (The cultivation of it being limited to certain approved classes) in fact stabilizes said societies just as intended but, by doing so, it obliterates the tension that is necessary to real future progress. Control-based power dynamics are contrary to all forms of progress. Conversely, biological evolution provides the best example of how to maximize progress; doing so is achieved by the elimination of superfluous constraints.

Up until recently, technology always did what its users wanted it to do. We controlled it. Increasingly though, we do what it compels and harasses us to do because those who manufacture technology now have the means to employ it as an instrument of social and economic control.

Even as little as 1% annual growth is a sprint towards catastrophe. 1% annual growth is ecocidal; under this kind of progress, the planet would be ruined in only a few centuries. And yet that is how we measure our economic success. By sheer quantitative multiplication, like a tumor congratulating itself. What humanity needs (Even if multi-solar) is a steady-state model for zero growth economics.

A fair system benefits everyone the most in the end. Consider a footrace. Where there are rules to prevent racers from interfering with one another, this will produce the fastest runners by focusing their efforts on improving themselves in that respect. Where there are no rules, this will result in racers sabotaging each other and scheming for other advantages; which naturally must produce an overall decrease in general performance. Likewise, unregulated capitalism will always have an inhibiting effect on progress. To incentivize efficiency, rationality, etc a choice has to be made to deliberately foster this with rules.

Vulgar culture is a subconscious means of self-defense against the horrors of a vulgar existence. Since any brief taste of beauty or genius will only end up serving to heighten the contrast of their usual absence, it's not enough for the underclasses to develop a mere indifference here; indeed they require a hostility towards what is most sublime in order to endure their abject state. As the general conditions of

humanity improve though, so will its appetite for real culture. Beauty and genius, wherever they are alien, become subject to the normal instincts of the xenophobic. And only intimacy can cure this.

I disagree with Greenberg when he characterizes kitsch as something which the proletariat demanded. In all likelihood it was a style of culture thrust upon them; people aren't inherently unreflective, primitive societies prove that much, but rather that it's one of the trends of modern civilization to indoctrinate its lower classes with an appetite for the banal.

The ones who become gatekeepers are those who find themselves incapable of progressing farther. To assuage themselves in the face of their failure, they do everything in their power to prevent the success of others. The figure of Satan represents a spiritual archetype of this tendency.

Savonarola was delusional in thinking that the destruction of vanities would accomplish anything. The only real matter at issue was the truth of what people actually desired; until this has changed, nothing can be accomplished.

Humanity is a rough pearl being polished by a cosmic oyster.

The art of national politics is disguising treachery as patriotism. The media personas which every successful politician cultivates are nothing more than gloves fearfully worn over their clawed hands. Because otherwise they'd be despised and they all know that what they are is hideous to the public.

The Pareto distribution is a function of hierarchy. Because control can be wholly assigned to a small fraction within any enterprise, power is easily monopolized through the regulation of opportunity.

Those who are loyal to the state can scarcely imagine how little that loyalty means; their masters would sacrifice them without even a twinge of conscience at the first temptation to do so.

The future kills us all; the only question is whether we die in its service or die without meaning.

It is of incomparably greater value to actually think through problems oneself than it is to simply be given their solution. The whole of modern public education then, with its grotesque emphasis on the mere memorization of facts, is diametrically opposed to the fostering of real intelligence.

It is easier to shear sheep than tigers; hence the deliberate incubation of weakness in the majority by our political systems.

The only way to really destroy oppression is through a metaphysical destruction of its ideas. The beliefs that oppression armors itself in must be stripped away. If this isn't done, if change is only implemented through material transformation and the occupation of public offices, then oppression will simply reassert itself at some future time. Sooner than later too. All evils are like the shells of hermit crabs; emptying these while leaving them intact ensures that a new crab will soon come along to claim them. And here the armor itself twists those who wear it. But remember, the armor is ideas.

[DEMOCRACY]

If the voices of all the oppressed people shouted together, their oppressors would shatter like glass.

Representational democracy is designed to mute this. Representational democracy is a way of politically neutralizing the masses. True democracy can only exist where the majority of society is regularly engaged in a participatory role.

In order for real democracy to exist, the majority of people have to understand the way power actually functions. That is to say, how those who have wealth and who hold positions of authority truly think and the tactics and strategies they use to advance their own agendas. Without this, people will be too easily manipulated to defend themselves. And obviously this will have to involve a great many things but basically, what's needed is that the foul kinds of thinking Machiavelli exposed (Unfortunately still referred to as Machiavellianism) have to be taught in public elementary schools. After all, how can we expect future generations to properly defend themselves against invisible evils?

Patriotism is one thing; a forgivable mistake and a perfectly understandable one. But patriotism among the exploited masses, patriotism among those who work the hardest and are repaid the least for doing so, is a kind of pathological self-hatred. As fate would have it though, many of the wealthiest are the least susceptible to patriotism while many of the poorest are the most.

Any politically active group will have members consciously and unconsciously attracted to authoritarian ideals and methods. How do you tell them apart? They're always the loudest.

Because deception is essential to political power, we can be sure that everything we are told by news organizations exists in subordination to that. Even political insiders, as skeptical and cynical as anyone imaginable, are simply operating under the sway of more sophisticated and subtle frauds. Political discourse exists in a total free-for-all of lying and self-delusion; unless what you're being told is a thing you absolutely don't want to hear, and which doesn't benefit anyone in power, you can be assured that it's in the service of some fiction.

A hundred vital truths or ideas all shouted at once will explode into a broken spectacle of incoherent noise. Political reform rather depends on direct and concise messaging. As free and open as debates and meetings should be, so too should proselytizing be firm and focused. Both are equally essential; the former so that a reformation movement stays true to its own principles, the latter so that it can communicate itself and recruit with maximum effectiveness. Deprived of the first it will become corrupt; deprived of the second it'll be easily marginalized.

Corporate media is a system completely dominated by a plutocracy of *private ownership* that somehow (By an incessant train of awesome miracles presumably) is supposed to serve the *public interest*. And it does, in one sense. The laziness and gullibility of the majority is well compensated.

The difference between politics as it's depicted in the media and its reality is about on par with the difference between cigarettes as they were once advertised and cigarettes as they really are. The media presents what is efficient and evil as something that's broken and ambiguous because, if the average person knew how callous and brutal the system truly was, they'd never be able to sleep at night.

In America, the democratic-republican duopoly has created a theatre of burlesque antagonisms which paralyze the whole political spectrum and, in doing so, serves to obstruct fundamental progress in certain key areas: economic and labor reform specifically. Because those are the basis of actual worldly power and from them everything else is imposed. Meaning, if you can control people's ability to make a living, you can pretty much extract, through duress, something that superficially resembles consent on almost any other issue you want. Such a system is therefore designed by pimps to serve their own shameless greed; indeed its purpose is nothing less than forcing others to prostitute themselves against their own will.

Just as a true autocracy has maximum political consolidation, true democracy has maximum political diversity.

Freedom is strongly correlated with regional autonomy; but that's predictable. The only way to protect individual liberty is to preserve maximum independence at every level of society. Systems of subordination have their own momentum and they diffuse themselves into every niche of a population as they seek to gain ever more control.

Nowhere on Earth are there any true national democracies. In every case, what's called a democracy just has a veneer of superficially representative government disguising a deeper structure of patronage, kleptocracy, and class warfare. Capitalism is an inherently exploitive system because the basic principle at its core is maximizing the profit potential of everything by transforming it all into capital; as such capitalism serves a metaphysically and eschatologically deep corruption. The most basic principle for any just economy conversely will be to prioritize justice over profit. One cannot maximize profit then without degrading humanity.

Inaction isn't the opposite of action; increased potential is.

Once a nation's core leadership betrays its corruption, this in turn will be emulated by the rest of society to a large extent and the essential unity that allows a society to function properly will begin to dissolve.

Political movements depend on individual leadership for the same reason spears must narrow to a pointed tip. Both are thrusting instruments.

In a truly democratic economic system, no one would be fired by the will of individuals or small groups in managerial positions; such decisions would be made collectively (Terminations would be voted on; presumably quarterly or during some other regular cycle perhaps)

Domestic data mining is far more dangerous to the individual than foreign data mining. One's own government (And any local malevolent actors) are in far better position to exploit you than alien powers, regardless of the latter's intent.

A person will remain a slave as long as they are unconscious of the true nature of the forces that animate them. Slavery then is the condition we are all born into and only those who daily struggle against this ever achieve any real freedom.

Regardless of the ideologies used to establish them, all states converge on an identical form of totalitarian realpolitik; their synonymous hierarchies and equal fetishization of power demand it.

One party states are always the result of environmental pressure (Environmental forces ultimately having the last say after all) and more often than not, this is a defensive turtling response from those having to cope with a powerful foreign aggressor; the demand for a "unified front" being the natural reaction of those facing a significant common enemy. One party states then are merely conducting themselves as multiparty states do doing war; their own "war mentality" likewise being easily explained by the fact they are under constant siege.

Family units, unless they are predominantly dysfunctional, will strengthen their individual members through mutual aid. As such, they are incompatible with full totalitarianism (And so any shrewd conspiracy to establish totalitarianism will seek to socially engineer the destruction of familial bonds, in order to reduce its laborers to a state of vulnerable isolation; doing so they might even resort to such crudities as the promotion of things like incest acceptance)

Who ever heard of anyone deliberately throwing away a useful tool? Lying then will only disappear from politics where it's no longer effective. As such, a culture of political honesty first and foremost depends on the creation of a more discerning electorate. One that has the means to guard itself against predatory lies.

Voting need not entail any actual political power; and if you can't immediately distinguish between voting and real power, if you are not presently informed even that much, you can rest assured you are not participating in a democracy. Your ignorance and that of your fellow members in the farce-of-citizenry ensures the absolute impossibility of democracy. Actual democracy is the power of the many so, where the masses are obviously being puppeteered, it's peak absurdity to speak of any kind of democratic political system.

Political systems can't be fundamentally changed by electing this or that candidate. They can only be truly changed by transforming the public's consciousness. Energy spent treating the mere symptoms of a problem is energy that's squandered in not providing for the cure.

The average public intellectual is an antibody in the service of stupidity; a protector of the state of ignorance that benefits the regime. Hence the blatant distortions of liberating philosophers like Spinoza and Wittgenstein (To cite one kind of example)

Democracy can only exist where truth is pervasive; otherwise people can't even ascertain their own interests in the context of specific issues. As such, the distribution of information in society must be provided by public and not private institutions. Without this no real democracy can take hold; the animal democracy cannot breathe in an atmosphere of lies.

A representational democracy becomes less representative of the electorate with each degree of separation that exists between the voters and politicians. Hierarchy produces a structural dilution. Of course the only reliable form of democracy is direct democracy; only a citizenry that regularly exercises power itself has the capacity to protect its own freedoms.

It's often said: *if you don't vote you have no right to complain*. Of course they vote in North Korea too. Should non-voting North Koreans be allowed to complain?

Even an absolute dictator doesn't truly have absolute power; they are still required to make concessions to the interests of others, foreign and domestic. In fact, the rise of "strong man" leaders is typically an expression of the societal will. We find that their emergence tends to coincide with periods of pervasive distress. I mean, any people in a crisis will readily surrender their privileges (Not to mention their rights) if the storm on the horizon is menacing enough.

The two part lesson provided by Obama and Trump is that there is no limit to the false avatars of salvation that global capitalism can conjure up. Reform will only ever come through an abolition movement from outside the system.

A democracy based on fear is a democracy in name only. Those who feel compelled to support a political party or candidate simply to prevent another from obtaining power are not actuating any power of their own and so their participation here fails to express any personal liberty; a public made up of such individuals is a Demos without a Kratos. The contemporary trend (Prevalent throughout history) towards terrorizing the electorate in order to motivate them is a politics of hostage-taking

that's antithetical to any conceivable idea of true freedom. And when such a system is indulged to even the least degree, this only serves to strengthen a long term decline that is sure to end in complete corruption. Furthermore, this insight serves to reinforce a more fundamental truth; any person or thing that strives to motivate you through fear is your enemy. Regardless of how they present themselves, the sum of their actions will always in the end be hostile to your interests on balance. Do nothing to empower them.

Every criticism of direct democracy has, underneath it, a contempt for the average human being. However, even if we were to accept the underlying premise of these criticisms, shouldn't societies work to make all of their citizens worthy of being full and equal participants in the service of the common good?

The logical trend of unregulated factionalized technology meanwhile is a system of cyber feudalism; corporate overseers adopting a role akin to dynastic warlords while their customers and employees become a caste of intergenerational serfs. And only a new political consciousness and solidarity greater than that which undid feudalism in the past can prevent its resurgence in technological form.

As I see it, the main flaw with biometric data is that once it's stolen it represents a permanent loss of security. Passwords for example can be cancelled and changed; what's the biometric equivalent here?

And of course if biometric systems become widespread, a breach would mean multiple simultaneous security failures; just like a widely reused password being stolen. Which doesn't even begin to address the consequences of losing personal biometrics in a world where presumably that data can be used to impersonate us, track us, harass us etc, without end and without the hope of true recovery. Suffice it to say, biometrics are an obviously terrible security option. And yet the tech industry seems to love the idea. Why? It's almost like they don't have the public's best interests at heart.

In the near future there'll be no need for fear so the political establishment will inevitably compensate for this by manufacturing fear in enormous quantities. Of course the future might have happened twenty years ago; it's hard to tell due to all the information pollution spewed out by the media.

The emergence of current identity politics began as the rising threat of grassroots democracy seemed to promise a fundamental change in the political landscape (This during the 2008 financial crisis)

To accuse major financial institutions and corporations of stupidity here is to accuse them of a level of stupidity excluded by the elementary bounds of avarice. They knew exactly what they were doing. To penetrate their motives though one has to recontextualize the situation within a fresh environmental framework. Basically, one has to appreciate that everything happening now is being done to undermine human liberty in the service of globalization and hypercapitalism (The inevitable result of prolonged hypercapitalism is the formation of a psycho-vortex that obliterates all sense of individual and community identity; which of course explains why the media landscape is becoming ever more surreal)

One of the best ways to suppress a revolution is to find an enemy to rally people against; either a foreign adversary or an insidious minority. Even better though is having both at the same time and crushing the threat in this gripping vice.

Poverty is necessary to oligarchy. Only through economic disparity can political disparity be maintained.

Democracy cannot exist unless its defenders work to achieve a sufficient capacity for organized violence (So as to deter predation) And any nation which attempts to establish genuine democracy will be immediately invaded by all the oppressive powers of the Earth (The West relinquished Russia to the Bolsheviks only because the latter proved that they were willing to fundamentally compromise their own ideals; if the Bolsheviks had committed to the path of true liberation, the war

against them would have never been interrupted. As it was, the capitalist bloc funded Hitler and the Nazis in order for them to do the job; only using Allied power to attack the Nazi regime in earnest once it became clear that Russia was rapidly consolidating Germany's territory)

In order for a democratic society to preserve its democracy, every single citizen must be politically impassioned to a radical degree. Only the combined effort of the masses can ever hope to thwart the creep of oligarchy.

Plutocide is one of two end states in class warfare. We can define it as the destruction of all ultra-luxury goods and ultra-luxury based capital. Achieving this is a precondition for the liberation of the working class; as long as ultra-luxury goods are allowed they will consume the labor of the masses and incentivize their exploitation. What separates luxury from ultra-luxury though? A basic luxury is simply something that is not strictly necessary but improves the experience of life in some way. The ultra-luxurious conversely is something which is so luxurious it infringes on the necessities of others; the super yacht industry for example when human poverty is so rampant.

[GEOPOLITICS]

The biologist sees the world more clearly than the politician. The essence of humanity is better conveyed without the lens of ideological bias; both the believer and the skeptic only succeed in tearing out different parts of life in order to make what they see conform to their own falsifying prejudices.

The more a nation despises its own sovereignty in favor of geopolitical vassalage, the more passionately it'll acclaim the virtues of conciliation (In this regard, no country exceeds the unprincipled willingness to compromise as that demonstrated by Canada)

Every time you shake hands with the devil, the devil rubs off on you.

The two biggest obstacles to globalization are American nationalism and Chinese nationalism. Capitalism seems to be having continued success with the former but the latter is proving harder to digest. It may be that, in this case, the horned prey will eventually push its way out of the guts of the python. Incidentally, American and Chinese nationalists, despite a tendency to view each other as their own primary adversaries, would actually make the most effective partners in a defensive stand against the move towards transnational globalization.

All the forms of hypocrisy find their way into the speeches of our political leaders but none more reliably than accusing the victim nations of one's own crimes of then harboring the same criminal ambitions (This is actually a foundational principle in American foreign policy)

The two main political parties of the United States are like two rutting bulls squaring off in a shop filled with fine china; but not actually hurting each other. Meanwhile the broken shards of ceramic on the floor lie in the shapes of Korea and Vietnam and Laos and Iraq and Afghanistan etc. And the millions of deaths from this bovine rampage are just invisible specks of dust underneath the trampling hooves.

In a total inversion of how warmongers justify themselves, it's actually the case that American geopolitical hegemony is bad for American democracy; the former after all must subordinate domestic welfare to the priorities of a foreign policy driven primarily by the metrics of domination.

Hedonistic dictators make the best allies for imperialistic powers because all forms of government are selfish (Democracy is just the holistic selfishness of a collective) Hedonistic dictators at least are willing to sell out their own countries for the petty patronage of a major foreign power.

The Soviet Union was a pseudo-communist oligarchy organized around state centralized industry. In many ways it explicitly diverged from Marxism with the same level of abandon that the Inquisition diverged from the teachings of Jesus Christ. People can blithely dismiss this as the old "*not true communism*" argument but it's a matter of historical fact; we should add though that true democracy has never existed either (Or even genuine free market capitalism) Because there can be nothing true in the political world when power rests in the hands of liars.

The wars of the past are the surest guides to the wars of the future; one only has to look at the history of the conflicts in Crimea to confirm this.

A hostile Russia is in fact essential to American foreign policy; it provides the leverage needed to dominate Europe. The threat of Russia is the basis for American influence in the region and that's why America was insincere in its pursuit of a true

post-Soviet détente. Maintaining Russia as an enemy is the only way to keep the power structure of NATO in place (Otherwise it would crumble to dust)

The bombings of Laos and Cambodia were basically a democidal tantrum by the American ruling class to get its own geopolitical way; a war crime of the most depraved order, waged for the sole purpose of discouraging other nations in the region from exercising their own internal sovereignty.

People who impose the lens of morality on geopolitics are only slightly less ridiculous than those who impose it on animal behavior.

Geopolitics is, and always has been, a contest between the most monstrous appetites; the greater the empire and its power, the greater the wake of evils.

Vaccinating the children of impoverished countries need not be any more genuine in its compassion than giving antibiotics to chickens in a factory farm. In both cases a merciless greed can be the sole motivation.

A superpower can only exist in a state of constant war. One cannot hold a boulder on the side of a steep cliff for example without exerting a constant force to keep it there. The more power is projected, the more it necessitates conflict.

Surprisingly maybe to some, hegemonic powers (Even those that are only locally hegemonic) tend to be more domestically liberal; but this is merely the result of a certain relaxation that comes from having undisputed dominance. It is in no way indicative of moral superiority; those same governments, when they're faced with different circumstances, will resort to whatever immoralities they deem expedient. The CIA's supporting of death squads in several countries being illustrative of that.

Enemy terrorism is a steroid to the warmongering of an imperialistic power; and nothing is more useful for justifying the projection of global might than a nebulous global threat. In the usual criticism of American foreign policy, the Saudi funding of Wahhabism is used as evidence of the fact that Saudi Arabia is not a true friend to the US. Turning that inference upside-down, what if the funding of terrorist organizations by the Saudi's is the clearest proof of the strength and intimacy of their bizarre alliance? No one has aided the Americans more in justifying their massive military spending and invasive foreign policy. If anyone ever gave the hawks in Washington DC exactly what they wanted, it was Al-Qaeda.

If farmers made a conscious effort to piss along their property line, their property would probably suffer less intrusion from animal predators. So too, there is much geopolitical strife that would have been avoided had international powers better understood how to communicate their territorial and policy boundaries.

Speech emanates from the absence of power. True power is silent. Because power doesn't have to communicate anything; it is beyond necessity and desire. To understand real power in this world is to truly hear the silence.

The Mandate of Heaven has never gone away. But it was also never entirely revealed in the past.

[HISTORY]

History is the fiction power heaps up from the ashes of truth.

Ptolemy and Copernicus looked to the same sky and saw two different heavens. So too are all other things distorted by human desires. And, for roughly two thousand years now, the New Testament has provided an excellent example of this.

Harmony is unity in complexity. It's a measure of synthesis between a primordial order and the inexhaustible potentiality of chaos. As such it amounts to the concrete expression of eternity (The actualization of infinitude within finitude)

The Spartans sowed the seeds of their own destruction by keeping the Helots weak. Those who adjust themselves to a dependency on weakened adversaries only succeed in weakening themselves in the end.

There is a minimax solution to the question of what amount of adversity benefits versus the amount that does us harm.

Machiavelli was wrong where he spoke about only judging the use of violence based on its consequences. By exercising any power, one legitimizes the use of that power (Effectively giving it their vote of confidence) And a thing can only be extinguished through its opposite; just as a force can only be negated by an equal or greater opposing force. So what is the opposite of violence? Reason. Of course reasonable discourse is only effective with people who themselves embrace reason

but this then limits the acceptable use of violence to proportional self-defense (Any pre-emptive use of force depending on an imminent credible threat)

In “The Prince” though, Machiavelli is perhaps trying to save Florence from the Medici by sending the latter on anti-barbarian adventures. This would explain the sharp contrast in his attitude towards dedicating books to rulers (Which he criticizes in the “Discourses” opening letter) Here we can surmise that “The Prince” is itself a stratagem. Not deliberately bad advice as some have argued though but rather meat flung out to send a lion away.

Corporations are farms. Nation states are farms. Indeed, most of our social structures have their origins in the designs of a privileged subgroup exploiting the rest of humanity. What is good is good only due to the demands of the protesting and out of basic necessity; the rest is a cloak for an infra-species vampirism that stretches back to the beginning of human history.

During an illuminating exchange between Smith and Livingstone at the New York Ratifying Convention (1788) the anti-democratic spirit of the ruling classes is exposed. Livingstone claims that he’s unable to comprehend (Unable!) why a government should represent its citizens’ feelings; representing their “interests” ought to be enough. But would he be content if someone else were to represent his interests while ignoring his feelings?

Can a person not have a good understanding of their own interests? Of course. But people generally have a greater capacity for misunderstanding the interests of another so it’s hostile to both liberty and justice to recognize any group of people as having the exclusive privilege of deciding for everyone here. Admittedly we allow something like this for children but any political system which treats the masses of its citizens as if they were children is certainly grotesque.

In Federalist No.1, Hamilton asserts a priori that criticism of the new constitution will be mistaken at best (*“the honest errors of minds led astray by preconceived*

jealousies and fears") This is indicative of a general design to force the new constitution on the American people rather than properly debate it.

History shows us that the most autocratic designs have been conceived by some of the most liberal imaginations and that conservative leaders are perfectly willing to adopt any newfangled tyranny. When the powerful have some design in mind; they certainly never let a little thing like hypocrisy get in the way of it.

Why were the money interests in America's revolutionary period (As shown by the favor of so many newspapers) so insistent on consolidating the American states? Because confederacies don't make good instruments of empire.

Even the masters of realpolitik are still slaves to their own ideals.

Feudalism was an attempt at creating a steady-state society in response to the traumatic collapse of the Roman Empire. And this outlines the two main types of societies that political architects have envisioned: convergent ones (Progressive, reactionary etc) and steady-state (Conservative, laissez-faire etc)

The state of the world is always a kind of equilibrium between all its opposing forces and every change is a relative redistribution of these. All forms of movement then reflect a deep consensus of existing powers (For most observers, a fully esoteric consensus) And this actually governs every level of our reality but it's perhaps best illustrated in society where apathy, concession, extortion etc, all add together to result in some degree of acceptance.

The most just criticism you can level at the French Revolution is that it ended.

Everything moved by destiny is reduced to the lowest level; to the level of a pawn.

History is defined by two parallel conflicts: one political, one metaphysical. The first is the struggle between various forms of authority; the second is the primordial struggle between freedom and control.

Hegel (Wrongly) located the highest realization of spirit on Earth in its world historical individuals and constructed an anti-democratic system of values due to the influence of that conviction. The highest mundane realization of spirit however is not provided in self-indulgent geniuses (Like Napoleon) but in that genius which propagates itself like a fire through the whole mass of humanity. The highest realization of spirit is a movement for which an individual can be, at most, no more than a catalyst. The achievements of world historical individuals are worthless if they fail to propagate themselves in the spirits of the many. The sum here must be greater than any of its parts and so has a higher value than them (The Euclidean claim holding here because we are only speaking finitely)

World historical individuals are mainly just the conduits, or the foci, of larger societal forces. Our environment forges us more than we ourselves forge it since we can never be more than one hammer among many. Even those who invent ideologies have their thoughts shaped by their environments and then transformed by the preferences of their adherents. Individuality though does have one domain of sovereignty but this is the spiritual state of one's private self.

In one edition of Malcolm X's autobiography there's a foreword, an introduction, an epilogue, and an afterword. This gives us an example of how absurd the living are willing to make themselves as they clamor to hang off the coat-tails of the dead. And it's all done out in the open, without a twinge of embarrassment.

Those with a developed imagination are even more unhappy working dead-end meaningless jobs than others; hence the danger to the stability of a society if there were too many of them (And why, during the era of slavery in America, literacy and education were heavily suppressed among the slave population)

The main purpose of honoring the military and its dead in the present is not solemn remembrance of sacrifice and virtue but rather a means to deflect from the political leadership's culpability in so much needless death. Everyone who died in the First World War died as a result of callousness and incompetence; our eulogies for them now are simply a means to obscure that.

One of the distinctive elements of fascism was that it elevated the state to an object of religious veneration. Combine this with the cult of pomp, an emphasis on militarization, and the subordination of the individual to the collective will, and you have the general outline of a system that encompasses various historical incarnations (Ancient Sparta, Imperial Rome, Nazi Germany, Imperial Japan) Societies with strong fascist elements though also include Republican Rome, Napoleonic France, Stalinist Russia, and post-war America (But these latter cases also have significant incompatibilities too)

The Cold War was a myth. There was no such thing as monolithic communism (This is as absurd as monolithic imperialism; as if empires would unite simply by virtue of a shared outlook) What the Cold War provided the western powers though was a convenient pretext to suppress "third world" independence movements and a means to sustain a western coalition.

The growth in conspiratorial thinking has been in direct proportion to the outrages committed by governments and the ruling classes. People aren't losing faith in their institutions; they're having their naiveté brutally stripped away with the cruel shamelessness of the crimes being perpetuated against them.

People who argue that certain conspiracies require the complicity of too many conspirators fail to consider the example of the Holocaust; if many thousands of ordinary human beings can be convinced to participate in the systematic murder of millions (A fact not widely known in Germany; as is demonstrated by the public's later reactions to proof of what was going on in the concentration camps) then it's certainly a relatively minor piece of business for an intelligence agency to murder

a president. Here what passes for skepticism among those who are dogmatically anti-conspiratorial in their thinking is an emotive gymnastics of rationalizations marshalled to preserve a comforting belief in the impossibility of real danger.

World War One was the truth. World War Two was the lie.

When trillion dollar geopolitical issues are considered, it's absurd to assume that rampant murders aren't also being committed. As if we lived in a world that was so impeccably civilized. In reality, political violence is always proportional to the stakes involved. Only we don't hear about it.

The science of assassination has pretty much been perfected. If this wasn't true, the powerful would occasionally be prosecuted for killing one another. Instead, every murdered politician and power broker is always the haphazard victim of some random psychotic. Or maybe, at worse, a trivial side group. Which is certainly convenient for us as a society, eager as we are to believe that ruthlessness has no sway over the main currents of events. But in the days of the ancient Romans, emperors and other politicians were routinely assassinated; are we really that much more enlightened than they were or have we just been lulled into believing a comforting lie?

The history of humanity is the history of a single war; the war between the oppressors and the oppressed. Everyone must choose a side. Those who believe they can refuse only manage to delude themselves into believing that they haven't just sided with the oppressors.

The existence of (And states of) government are themselves always products of a free market competition of ideas; regardless of how much they themselves then subvert that freedom (As tragic as it is, people can freely choose to be enslaved) Every government then represents a fluctuating equilibrium of demand and the relative absence of libertarian and communist systems today is the result of these being unable to satisfy said equilibrium. Which is not the same as saying that the

absence of a form of government is proof of its inadequacy; this can just as easily arise from the prevalence of a general inadequacy among human beings. The fact that most people don't know how to solve advanced mathematical equations for example isn't a flaw in higher mathematics; people can simply suffer from a lack of appreciation. And that extends to social ideals.

At the center of history there must be a crucifixion, a moment where the forces of creation and destruction express themselves in a unified synthesis. Because not only does the beginning push forward to meet the end, the end is also travelling backwards to embrace the beginning. And where they meet, they will hang the child of their union for all the world to see. The center is itself a mirror of the circumference; an inward encompassing of the outermost form.

To understand American history one must first understand Babylonian astrology. Specifically the relation between the twelve and the thirteen.

All forms of political society are ultimately kratocracies. Only power is truly power. Beyond that there can be no inherent characteristics.

The illusions of choice and dissent are necessary for truly pervasive totalitarianism; the absence of which invariably leads to discontent. Provided that they're ghosts lingering around though with a certain amount of conspicuity, just off in the background, most people won't sense their real absence or feel the need to participate in any serious political activity. The illusion then exists chiefly to provide emotional reassurance.

Nothing capable of making an immense contribution isn't also capable of being used for utter depravity. One only has to consider one of humanity's earliest discoveries, the practical value of fire, to see how something that can do so much good can also be put into the service of pure evil; the heat of the family hearth after all is the same as the heat that consumed the innocent victims of so many historical persecutions. And this is equally true of humanity's social practices; these have

their records of debaucheries but it is wrong to attribute some kind of inherent flaw to them. Anything we as a species can wield to save ourselves, we can also wield for our own destruction; here science and religion stand as equals and will always remain so. Good and evil are eternally present.

The destruction of liberty, what is euphemistically called its sacrifice or moderation, is always defended as necessary and good but in the entire history of the world it has never been either of these things.

Modern knowledge has come at the price of ancient spirit. If a movement could harness both though it would have an enormous advantage.

What is there to fear in crisis? Doesn't history demonstrate that every crisis is in fact a sign prefiguring even greater progress?

Nature is a disguised totality of purpose. Just as all forces sum to zero, so too they all converge on a single teleological ideal achieving perfect synthesis. The whole universe is going over the same waterfall; the only thing we need to do is recognize this and act accordingly.

In summer we forget. In winter we remember.

[JUSTICE]

Where justice takes root, all the mansions are swallowed up.

What every legal system since their earliest prototypical inception has had in common is that they are all the organized conspiracy against truth. Only by creating the outward appearance of law and order can those with vast criminal ambitions make their enterprises seem presentable. Solely behind a mask of justice can the greatest injustices be accomplished; hence why even absolute tyrants must rely on courts and police services to camouflage the real nature of their regimes.

Laws are like the tentacles of jellyfish; they are the poisonous appendages of an invertebrate mass. Said mass being their respective legislatures.

A system that is fair to some and unfair to others is more unfair than a system that is unfair to everyone equally.

If one is not going to prosecute crimes, one might as well not prosecute vigilantes rather than not prosecute predators.

Lawyers as a class are taught the nobility of lying while simultaneously being trained in the art of disassembling facts; then the whole collective body of them is entrusted with the responsibility of guarding something entirely dependent on truth. How the former is supposed to serve the latter has never been adequately

explained but the lawyers of the world are nearly unanimous in reassuring the public that theirs is the only possible way to do so.

A big enough lie is worse than murder; a falsehood with sufficiently disastrous consequences can be more destructive than a single death.

A system of any kind where innocent people were never wronged would never work; it would be entirely congested by its own caution.

The difference between natural and human law *isn't* that the latter punishes us and that the former doesn't but rather that the latter can actually be contravened, sometimes (Resulting in punishment) while the former cannot be contravened and that attempting to do so always produces an exact and proportional punishment. If you try to build a tower with inadequate materials or architecture for example, its collapse will be the direct and inevitable consequence of the impossibility of transgression. Nature then provides concrete examples of the ideal paradigm of real justice; against which we are wise to measure our own imperfect civilizations and improve them accordingly.

A true lawyer is someone equally content when defending the guilty as when they are prosecuting the innocent. A person can be a lawyer by profession though and not have a genuine lawyerly heart; to the extent that morality governs any of our actions, we are ruled by something beyond the parameters of mere law.

The dichotomy between law and brutality, usually presented in Hobbesian terms, is false. Much of the worst brutality in human history was sanctioned under laws and legalistic societies have often proven themselves the worst offenders. Primitive societies conversely who had access to an abundance of resources, tended to be very prosocial. Ultimately however, it's conscience and the true moral character of individuals, which are the real determining factors.

Judiciary and criminality depend on one another (The former for income, the latter for protection from vigilantism) As such they perpetuate a mutual parasitism. Here the outward symbiosis belies a bilateral corruption.

A lawyer is simply a priest minus a god; the former no longer feeling the need to even pay lip service to a greater good. Laws are sophistry distilled into its essence.

All comparatively just laws trend towards a subordination to the purpose of creating a spiritual condition in society where no laws are required. The best laws as such very nearly converge on total liberty; but they are at most temporary buttresses to facilitate the process of enlightenment.

Laws are incompatible with the profundity of authentic being; a moral person does good conversely because they identify with the moral principles they follow. Jesus Christ for example represented the paradigm of a transcendence of the law through the fulfillment of its deeper meaning (*The whole of the law is this*) Spiritual progress has the form of an ascension from external criteria to internal affinity then.

Laws comes closest to real legitimacy when they approximate the codification of a basic moral principle; their opposites, blatantly oppressive laws, are not nullified ultimately by legislation but rather by conscience (The true sovereign) And it must be so unless we are willing to confess the merits of an obedience to total depravity. Rather, our own conscience is our highest authority and those who do evil are never evil in conscience but always evil in a deafness to conscience.

Justice means condemning those one loves and absolving those one hates.

[LABOR]

Work is an essential teacher. There are people though who obviously, through no fault of their own, are born into wealth; but it is no less imperative that even these people be re-educated through labor. If every billionaire was sentenced to a tour of duty in which they had to endure the toils of every entry level position involved in their own businesses and properties, the world would be an exponentially better place. Some kinds of wisdom cannot be bought.

Firsthand experience with difficult physical labor is a necessary, but not sufficient, condition for moral political leadership.

And everyone can contribute in some small way; therefore everyone should be expected to contribute. *From each according to their abilities...*

If democracy means anything it means the empowerment of labor at the expense of the plutocracy; the interests of the masses being recognized as the true priority.

The only benefits workers have ever obtained from capitalism are benefits which they've extracted by force (Generally through strikes and collective bargaining) Mainstream media will regularly credit all the rights workers have to the inherent benevolence of the society they live in but, in reality, all these rights were hard won from the wealthy interests that the media serves. The people who take credit for the best parts of our society today are the ones filling the same roles as those who most bitterly fought against every stage of earlier progress.

The bigger the stick, the more willing a donkey will be to make do with a smaller carrot. The policies of the rich in relation to the poor has always been essentially the same as those used by the Spartans against the Helots. Only the exploiters in our age have become far more sophisticated.

Unless a worker is unfairly compensated for their labor, they will produce no profit. All profit results from unequal exchanges; the disparity in compensation favoring those who control the system that decides the rewards rather than those who contribute the most to a given endeavor.

The higher up you go in organizational hierarchies, the more inefficiencies and redundancies you find. Those who toil at the bottom of a system depend the most on their making actual contributions to sustain their precarious existences; the farther we go above them, the more we find political leverage and things of that nature taking the place of real productivity. Of course this is only a general, not an absolute, truth; where leaders provide an effective and positive example, this problem diminishes.

Diversity demonstrates one of its many values with its greater problem solving efficiency. For example, if ten computers are trying to crack the same code and they all try the same number at the same time, they are maximally *inefficient*. If half of them repeat themselves with odd numbers while half of them repeat themselves with even numbers, they have doubled their efficiency. Better still, if they are each assigned a set of numbers with one of the ten different base digits, they achieve *maximum* efficiency within the proposed solution framework. But all this is true of society in general; a civilization filled with people who have different ideas and interests and skills is much more robust than one dominated by conformity.

In a thoroughly rational economic system, everyone is able to accurately perceive what's in their own interests. As such, there's no opportunity to practically exploit the surplus-value of other people's labor; people who sell their labor will know its true value and so they'll be able to exchange it for the closest offer to parity they

can (Consider the example of getting change for cash as an approximation of this; in ordinary circumstances you get exact change)

Dysfunctional environments are defined by counterproductive forces that inhibit aspiration and accomplishment. In short, they generate static inertia. A common example would be a toxic workplace where the behavior of management creates a consistently dismal mood but this is also true more generally.

There's a difference between asking someone to tell you something and really meaning it. For example, a project manager asking their team if there are any problems they're having. Often they only want to be reassured of the opposite, regardless of the actual work situation. But people who ask such dishonest questions can become indignant if they learn anything's been withheld; they want it both ways. Here their strategic instincts are exposed.

The people who brag about working twenty hour days are largely the same people whose labor consists in nothing more than sitting in amply padded chairs and dictating the actual execution of their designs to others. It's like hearing someone boast about being a weightlifter while at the same time never using more than ten pound dumbbells (Likewise, anyone can be a hurdler if they set the bar low enough) Those who actually work however can be exhausted in a single hour of normal duty (And then they'll keep at it for seven more; their bodies spasming with pain as they go on with grim resolve)

Even when the boss is right they're still right.

Immense wealth is impossible without a subservient underclass. A culture that celebrates power and riches then will always trend towards social arrangements composed of masters and slaves; whatever its lip service towards the principles of liberty. The interests of labor in fact are diametrically opposed to capitalism.

The way the labor market works is applicants are sold on jobs just as much as they are obligated to convince their prospective employers of their own merits; and in both cases, lying is the norm rather than the exception.

Those who have enjoyable and gratifying careers like artists, business leaders, professors etc could not have them if others weren't also compelled to do all the unpleasant work needed to keep a society functioning. It is janitorial workers and low level retail staff and those employed in other forms of dreary menial labor who make everyone else's happiness possible.

If you let other people decide your worth, you'll always be undervalued.

When someone has control over the distribution of wealth, for example someone holding an executive office in the corporate world, it's interesting to note that even their genuine errors in calculation (As opposed to their feigned errors) rarely work to their own disadvantage. What this illustrates is that greed is something burning deeply in the subconscious; part of a person's animal spirit.

In our world, the necessities of the masses are sacrificed, wherever possible, for the luxuries of the few.

Anyone with any appreciation for tools will regard the use of a high quality knife for crude prying as a contemptible thing; how much more so is it then to use up a human being as if they were a machine?

[MORALITY]

Power is evil, the very essence of evil, and those who say otherwise do so only in the service of their own evil tendencies.

Two thirds of evil is actually thwarted by mere cowardice.

The moral choice is always to side with the oppressed. Regardless of how superior the oppressor is in the number and quality of their virtues, the right choice is to always defend those who are the targeted for exploitation.

If everyone did less evil than the evil done to them, evil would necessarily disappear from the world completely.

How is real altruism possible? By first identifying with an unselfish ideal and one's natural selfishness then being sublimated towards this. In doing so, selflessness becomes the self.

Essential to the character of a good human being is their valuing something as more important than themselves. This could be family, truth etc. Almost anything; as long as it alters a person's perspective enough so that they don't think the world revolves around them (Contrast this with psychopathic and messianic cult leaders)

Consider a hypothetical group of people who were all exceptionally moral individuals; wouldn't their interactions and relationships with each other all be fair and mutually beneficial in virtue of their good characters? We can even imagine said people being given an extremely deficient system to live under but then compensating for this and overcoming it through basic cooperation. Conversely, we can imagine a group of people who were exceptionally immoral individuals that, despite being provided a perfect egalitarian system to live under, created an extremely unjust society for themselves that was full of all sorts of suffering. Because no ideology or constitution has the power to protect itself from the willful distortions of bad faith actors. So, what both these inferences confirm, is that the means for improving society to its full potential must depend on the improvement of the individual to theirs. A moral society can only be sustained by moral people; which just confirms that the solution to human political conflicts requires nothing less than mass individual transformation. If people aren't inspired to be better, the rest really doesn't matter.

When through nepotism (Or other forms of crony appointment) an individual is bestowed with a position they're not qualified for, all of society is injured on some level. The welfare of the whole is diminished. Rather, society always benefits the most by having all of the best people in the best jobs.

Ideal morality will necessarily align with the survival of its own principles (Even if this sacrifices individuals and groups and nations and whole civilizations)

The optimal strategy however doesn't necessarily guarantee the optimal result (And we do well to note a connection here to the problem of evil)

There is no form of enlightened insight expressible in words which can't be adopted and imitated by the mere pretence of enlightenment. All manners of formal characteristics can be replicated without expressing any actual meaning through them. Profundity however is the positive affirmation of silence and ignorance its negative inadequacy; both extremes coalescing into one another on the continuum of human consciousness.

Moral progress rarely comes by immediate improvement but rather by an initial hypocrisy. An ideal is expressed which is not immediately lived up to and this will gradually force a forward movement.

Anyone who starts a moral journey starts it from a morally compromised position. That's no reason to be discouraged.

The transmigration of the soul is false because what is metaphysical cannot be transferred from body to body; it must enter the world directly from an eternal potentiality. But then something similar is true of moral culpability; the sins of past generations cannot be levied against those living in the present.

The ideal is never corrupted; it is always betrayed.

Wherever someone's principles gratify them all the time, they in fact have no real principles. Being constantly gratified is the very condition of living with absolute self-indulgence; so any principles which achieve this effect must be principles in name only. But of course, such a fraud must be of great comfort to the person choosing to deceive themselves.

If there is any redemption possible after murdering someone it can only be a partial redemption. Otherwise one absolves oneself of the monstrosity of one's act (Trivializing it in some sense) and monsters are by definition beyond the reaches of redemption. The moral person then will never strive to erase the memory of their sins; instead they will carve an inscription of these into their bones.

One cannot save the individual without condemning humanity. If humanity is not condemned then the individual is condemned (Someone who tortures children for pleasure either represents some intrinsic aspect of humanity or is entirely devoid

of humanity; if it's the former, humanity cannot be salvaged) Ultimately the choice between the individual and the collective is a choice that has no intermediate compromise (Like all true choices)

The origin of morality, as surprising as this may be, lies in the fact that, prior to actual morality, the idea of oneself as moral (And morally superior to others) felt good. The primitive conception of morality then was a self-serving belief but one that people could use to climb up to genuine moral consciousness; rather like a (Wittgensteinian) ladder.

Morality cannot be instilled through logical argumentation; it is only possible to clarify for another what morality actually consists of and, if said person truly aspires to live a moral life, they will change accordingly. A person can only change as a result of principles they are already governed by; if someone is born without any capacity for virtue, they can never acquire this. Where the individual can repent anything they've done, that's only possible because they've betrayed their true selves. Regret over what one truly desires is impossible.

A lack of morality is a lack of connection to eternity (Of course there are plenty of sham morals which are also divorced from eternity) To see things correctly though, to recognize their true form, is to see them as aspects of eternity. They are each elements of the eternal after all. Evil, as such, can only exist in the temporal order of things; while the good conversely straddles the temporal and eternal equally. The good (In science, art, ethics, philosophy etc) is the incarnate form (Within the material world) that, nevertheless, is still governed by its transcendental source. Evil is where the incarnate becomes cut off from the source and so lost in the illusory impulses that ephemeral realities provide. Sub lux aeternitatis.

Confidence unperturbed by moral doubts is one of the surest steps to worldly success. It proves itself again and again in both business and social aspiration. But it is very much like a covenant with a parasitic slime that encompasses one's whole body; a trade-off that presumably has to backfire in the end.

A society will inevitably be hostile to suicide when the lifestyles of its most powerful members depends on the degradation of others; the latter being inclined perhaps to embrace suicide as a form of liberation. But there's nothing genuinely moral in this; it's like a farmer objecting to his cows killing themselves before they can be slaughtered for profit (Suicide however is entangled with a certain amount of unwarranted optimism; it presumes that death is a better alternative)

If people choose not to be honest then nothing is possible. Nothing can ever be redeemed from there. And this is just the morally grounded sovereignty of free will; people have no choice but to decide for themselves.

Personal integrity, as the concept's etymology implies, has nothing to do with intention. Integrity in this sense means resistance to divided personality; more specifically, the steadfastness of one's ethos. For one's morals to not be easily compromised then. The people who try to be moral by grounding themselves in the desire to be good, set themselves up for failure because they invest their hopes here in ephemeral feelings. The only alternative, the only way to success, is to adopt a world view (Preferably one constructed by the individual themselves) with an intrinsic categorical imperative in it. And note that this is not specifically Kantian; Nietzsche for example required of himself that he not flinch at the harshness of reality. To have any worth as a human being means to hold oneself accountable to something (Otherwise a person becomes mere sludge)

As for the epistemology of liberty, it can be summarized quite briefly. What lacks free will cannot be convinced of free will's existence and what possesses free will cannot be convinced of free will's absence. An experience can be recontextualized but it can't be disproven. Similarly, nothing is a substitute for direct acquaintance. And as for the belief in moral life and its foundation of political liberty, obviously this entails an ontology that includes free will. Those who argue against free will are like insects possessed by zombifying fungus; victims of an automatus delusion that saps them of their own life-force.

[PHILOSOPHY]

All things have their origins beyond the horizon.

Darkness cannot actually be looked upon because it has no shape or substance. In the absence of light, we are only seeing into the depths of ourselves. It is our own minds that conjure forth the void.

The history of philosophy is not simply the history of being surrounded in a fog but the history of being surrounded in a fog and constantly mistaking this fog for an endless parade of other things. It's a history of mutual hostilities between mutual falsities all clamoring to distinguish themselves.

Knowledge is just as often counter-productive to growth as it isn't. Knowledge has no inherent value outside of being used in a worthwhile manner. An inactive fact is like inactive capital; it's contributing nothing.

Philosophy is not opinion mongering even though these two are often conflated. The former is defined by depth rather than breadth. A good negative example here is provided meanwhile in the character of Johnson. Samuel Johnson's intellect was like early snow; it covered everything but penetrated very little (Donne, Berkeley etc) And confusion in such cases isn't really forgivable; if someone is a compulsive talker they certainly don't have the mindset for deep profound thought. In fact, most intellectuals are not philosophers.

An intellectual is just someone who fetishizes ideas. Properly understood, ideas are simply a material to be used up and discarded in the continuous pursuit of insight. Intellectuals though want to find a comfortable abode in some realm of accepted knowledge and then build a warm little cottage there. Real inquiry meanwhile is out hunting in the wastelands of the infinite.

Since the earliest beginnings of political theory, humanity has attempted to overcome the causes of its many social conflicts through the development of an objectively true ideology. In this philosophers, and the various specialists which later assumed a part in said responsibility, have hoped to create a belief system persuasive enough to establish broad agreement and practical enough to organize all the politically impactful activities of their societies. While some of the ideas which arose from these attempts have yielded benefits, generally speaking none of the ideologies which were created can be called truly successful. All of them, on critical reflection, reveal their intellectual poverty; to say nothing of the enormous material and moral poverties that continued to endure despite their various implementations. And so the search continues, although political theorists of today are far less ambitious than their predecessors and more likely then to defend defeatist sentiments in this matter or resort to banal apologetics for the status quo. Real insight meanwhile must eventually overcome the deficient tendencies that animate the search for ideology itself.

Any dog fed by a tyrannical hand will mourn the loss of tyranny. Humans are no different except that they insist on offering absurd justifications for doing so.

We can speak of worthwhile ideology as a penultimate goal. But in order for an ideology to meet all the needs of the people, it would have to synthesize the pragmatic and the ceremonial, the secular and the religious, within a fully developed aesthetic and intellectual framework; it would have to encompass the whole dimension of human desire.

Leadership is not primarily diplomacy. The political career of a diplomat as astute and capable as Anthony Eden should demonstrate as much.

Any search for the golden mean in Aristotle's ethics can be determined by, and translated into, a dialectical reconciliation of two opposite trends. From a simple establishment of opposition, one can derive the correct compromise through any analysis. And the golden mean ends up being a lopsided compromise due to the asymmetry of opposites.

Every victory contains the possibility of a greater defeat. Every defeat contains the possibility of a greater victory.

Many professors of philosophy accept that philosophy is useless but this false conviction no doubt arises from their own incapacity to be useful. As such they instinctively try to absolve themselves out of a subconscious sense of failure.

Truth is a poison to liars but as such truth is a poison to whole cities and nations. Nothing is more precious and more dearly fought for by humanity than its own illusions.

A casual study of history will confirm that one of the main schools of interpretation regarding any major philosopher will be predicated on the least possible fidelity to their actual views. This is because people are eager to distort anyone they regard as a radical threat to their own beliefs. Of course, if you were to ask one of the perpetrators here about this, they'd be completely shocked to have their actions characterized in this manner; but that's only because the hostility is so deeply rooted in the subconscious that it expresses itself through a purely instinctive animosity. It is common to think of the rational and irrational impulses within human beings as clearly separated things but, in truth, they are always intimately entwined and prevalent throughout our choices.

There are two kinds of systems; those that refute themselves and those that are refuted by another.

Postmodernism, due to an intrinsic lack of consistent direction, was incapable of serving as a vehicle for any kind of sustained transformation. It was a drill too frail and short and erratic to break through the hard crust of human falsehood. Where it was not entirely incorrect, it was merely derridative and, where it was, it was thoroughly deleuzional.

Marx said that the ideal was nothing more than the material world reflected in thought. Regarding this he was most definitely wrong. The formal possibility of a thing always precedes its actualization and so holds ontological priority (Possibility defines the limits of actuality)

Knowledge, as a particular state, has its own circumference. A true philosopher then is someone who looks outward: *past* the circumference. Normal people for the most part look inwards: *away* from the circumference. As such, all true philosophers look away from each other: each having their own unique direction. Some may cross paths at some point later, but more often than not they face directly outwards and so only continue to diverge as time goes on.

The more closely you scrutinize the world, the more unreal it becomes.

Science as a proper noun is a monster whose death is one of many necessary for spiritual redemption. The belief in a surplus of natural laws is nothing but an illusion that imprisons the soul (As Blake rightly perceived) Science here is an incarnation of evil in its most subtle form; a materialistic illusion trapping spiritual reality in a cycle of birth and death, thereby bounding its inherent infinitude. What is called science in the usual sense is not actually science but a concatenation of myths in the forms of physical reality, chemical reality etc; in short, inanimate reality. True sciences like mathematics and logic and taxonomy are instead incarnations of the spirit of light itself. Just as a dream has no laws except what imagination gives it, the individual should strive to unbelieve whatever they can and free themselves from every orthodoxy they unearth within their own convictions.

Darwin showed us that being ridiculed in the most contemptuous manner can go hand in hand with speaking the most profound original truths.

It is more important to think boldly than safely; if you're unwilling to risk ridicule on a conjecture than you are unwilling to spiritually participate in the renewal of truth and have permanently shut your own mind inside a dungeon.

To understand Nietzschean affirmation one must first understand how to say no affirmatively and how to say yes in denial. Regarding the former: imagine someone rejecting an extortive compromise despite immense pressure. Of the latter: picture someone agreeing to go along with a group decision despite personally disagreeing with it. In both cases the basic criterion is authenticity towards oneself.

Whenever you find yourself confronted by contradictions, you are being presented with a personal gestalt. What you choose, uncoerced by external imposition, is more fully expressive of what resides in you and, as such, said scenarios offer unique opportunities for personal revelation. Choosing war over peace for example, when there is no compulsion to choose one over the other, betrays the violence that has already taken up residence within you. And so on for all other things, both good and bad.

What good is someone's soul if it can only be kept free of evil by the avoidance of temptation? Anything that reveals the true nature of a human being, regardless of whether said nature proves more good or evil, is desirable.

If a belief system is truly false, it cannot contain a great spirit. It is more enlightening then to judge a creed by its most exemplary proponents than it is to judge it by an average believer. Any eternity will survive intact, even when conveyed through history in corrupt vessels. Like a seed, waiting until the right reason to spring forth.

Philosophy has never brought anyone happiness and where a philosopher has obtained happiness this was only the result of pursuing philosophy up to a point and then artificially terminating the process. True philosophy is an endless pursuit of dissatisfaction and is justified only by the gates it unlocks; not by any of the nonexistent pleasures of the journey. Those who enjoy doing philosophy don't actually do philosophy; they simply follow the well-worn paths of past thinkers and pretend to themselves they're slashing through untamed jungle. All of history's genuine philosophers were individuals who felt compelled, for whatever reason, to continuously disrupt their own contentment.

The illusions of knowledge only serve to obscure the truth of our ignorance. All knowledge is evil. The more seductive the fact (The more convincing it is) the greater the sin in perpetuating it. By the bleating of sheep the sheep are led astray; ignorance heaping upon ignorance. That knowledge results in greater ignorance is indeed a diabolical labyrinth. And by our seeking knowledge we unknowingly bring ourselves along the path of permanent delusion. True knowledge will only come to those who do not pursue it.

The path of least resistance is also always the path of least progress.

Schopenhauer's pessimism was grounded in the fact that all the objectives of the will he postulates are finite satisfactions; what he failed to take into account then is that the infinite itself was a possible object that could be reached through specific objectives (One of Kierkegaard's greatest contributions was clarifying this) Because the infinite cannot be exhausted, pessimism is philosophically unfounded.

Nihilism meanwhile proliferates where the individual finds themselves trapped in a perceived futility. Nihilism then results from a false sense of incapacity.

A philosopher seeks the truth regardless of its disadvantages. A lawyer meanwhile (The modern equivalent to the Sophists and Pharisees) seeks their advantage

regardless of the truth. However, the greatest advantage can only come from truth since every advantage is finite, and so, ephemeral. Truth conversely has totality and, as such, eternity. So the path of the infinite is the path of inversion, a path with equal parts self-fulfillment and self-denial; everything that is just direct and linear meanwhile is inevitably self-terminating.

For every task, there's always a point where greater accuracy only produces greater inefficiency. For some mistakes, it's better to correct them after the fact than it is to prevent them.

The flaws of a great philosopher are truly fortunate; they discourage intellectual idolatry. Of course the oversimplifications of the sycophants still persist but, if it were otherwise, they would be even worse (Imagine if everyone treated their favorite philosopher as Marxists treat Marx; this would certainly be a bad thing) In fact, no one can have a more corrupting influence than someone who successfully impersonates perfection; the inevitable limitations within their ideas (Even if every idea were right, these still wouldn't encompass the whole of the matter) will be ignored because the figure of the person is so impressive.

Fools all look remarkably the same; their mouths are always larger than their heads.

[VALUES]

Hypocrisy is the horse power of politics; the most basic unit of force inside the engine of its machinery. Political variations are really just degrees of hypocrisy.

The hypocrite tends to be half right but usually with the least fidelity to the truth.

The liar always seeks to misunderstand things because what they really desire is a world of fantasy (Truth and fact do nothing but burden them) Because of this they eagerly misconstrue others; distorting the meaning of events even where there is no conscious attempt to do so.

Lying poisons us with each act of deception. To reject the truth in one aspect of our lives is to undermine it throughout. This is inevitable since our inputs and outputs are ultimately regulated by the same criteria (To believe in the lies in the least respect is to welcome the lie into the totality of our lives)

Impartiality has never dominated an ecosystem of discourse because bias alone can spur the passions necessary to convert adherents. The only ideas that thrive are those that inspire people to action.

The value of good ideas in bad ideologies is negated in the same way the value of possession was negated by mortgage-swap derivative bundles. Furthermore, the purpose of the latter was to provide a way for acquiring cheap (Bad) assets and disposing of them in a profitable way. The bundles themselves were never expected to provide returns; they were simply a very deliberate system of garbage

disposal. It's the equivalent of shaving silver or gold off old coins and then trading the coins at equal value; only the coins were kept in opaque boxes and they were practically shaved down to nothing.

The fulfillment of greed must surpass greed since greed itself is not what is desired. In fact, the desire underlying every means is the desire to transcend said means.

Every preference is ultimately justified on aesthetic grounds; on the comparison of one form with another, on the actual with some ideal. Any attempt to eliminate this inevitably succumbs to the hypocrisy of idealizing an absence of ideals. Ah! But what if we embrace hypocrisy? Then, all we'll have accomplished is obscuring the truth from ourselves.

No form of expression can escape the aesthetic. Even an anti-aesthetic posture is still an element of the aesthetic sphere and so a true transcendence of aesthetics can only be obtained from the subjective viewpoint of someone who has no attitude towards aesthetic ideals. But even this is only an interior transcendence; as soon as we turn towards the public, the social environment, we find ourselves in an inherently aesthetic framework (Society is not possible without judgements since these regulate its fundamental dynamics)

Society automatically oppresses the individual (Through those who are the most ostentatious in their devotion to "social" values) because the liberated individual is always the greatest threat to the status quo. Here we have a sociobiological defense going on. When individuality proves to be enduring though, it's adopted by the establishment and corrupted in every conceivable way (This is exactly what happened to Christianity) And this is true of both abstract cultural movements and their concrete exemplars. If the methods of Einstein for example produced such great results, why aren't they widely emulated in science? Here the answer is because Einstein's approach liberates truth from the power of social institutions (The research methods promoted by institutions are sociable group methods; not just in science of course but everywhere)

The best things in this world are the most rapidly appropriated and corrupted. Evil operates in this manner to shroud the good and so we have to be discerning in order to avoid overly general condemnations.

To act is to accept imperfection. To live fully actualized is to *embrace* imperfection.

Politics is the refuge of the spiritually decrepit. Whatever fictions people might be willing to entertain about them, politicians are always dominated ultimately by materialistic ambitions. Nothing in the social order is truly required to gratify the soul; and believing otherwise is just pure ignorance.

Every desire is the hatching of some poverty but, without desire, only a lifeless machinery remains. Life then is fundamentally unfulfillment (And the immortality at the heart of the eternal, an insatiable longing)

When a society begins to measure its freedom by materialistic standards, real liberty is no doubt already under attack. A slave in silks is still a slave and manacles that gleam with gemstones are no less heavy and grievous.

The highest form of political wisdom is to appreciate the superfluity of politics and, perceiving this, to divest oneself from politics entirely. When Aristotle made the point that man is a political animal, he perhaps failed to recognize in that implied dichotomy that it is only the animalistic elements in “man” that drives the need for politics. To the degree that human beings shed themselves of animal appetites, they are simultaneously freed from political involvement.

There is no real genius in politics; only a facsimile of genius that measures itself in victories. True genius transcends political conflicts. Lao Zi, to name only one example, demonstrated his political astuteness in his Dao De Jing but even more so by knowing better than to become entangled in political strife.

Dishonesty is not intrinsic to politics. It *is* politics. In truly honest communication, we relinquish even the slightest advantage that can be obtained from deceit. Politics though is all about maximizing one's advantages.

The name Exxon for example was almost certainly selected due to the allusion it makes to "exoneration." Since oil companies tend to be confronted with a great deal of litigation, this offers a pre-emptive subliminal defense.

Anger is one of the chief ways impotence consoles itself. In political debates, the overmatched will tend to compensate for their own lurking sense of incapacity, for the hollow flopping of the arguments and criticisms they marshal, with unusually scurrilous rage (One saw this for example when Buckley confronted Chomsky)

Actuality is infinitely less important than possibility.

The idea of progress is itself essential to the creation of progress. It is crucial that progress be believed in and valued; ideally in a comprehensive way.

The perception of lifeless forces is a reflection of the degree of lifelessness within oneself. For those who are full of life, the world itself is fully alive.

If you want to know which segments of society are completely governed by cynicism, all you have to do is identify those that sacrifice nothing for the benefit of society as a whole.

The biggest difference between good and evil is that evil has free reign where as good imposes restraints on itself; but this kind of voluntary self-limitation is precisely the highest form of freedom possible, because it is the sovereign will

triumphing over other impulses. However, it must be admitted that, at a social level, the good can only triumph by clear majority.

The forces of truth and the forces of lies are diffused throughout the universe in an omnipresent contest for the soul of every being (Animate and inanimate) They are each incarnate in every conceivable form, some conscious and some unconscious, and are known by various different names across the breadth of time (Olympus versus Prometheus for example) Each then is also a battlefield in this primordial struggle. Each a territory in the kingdoms of good and evil.

Power exists by building walls and fortifications; the truth however is spread unseen beneath the earth.

[WAR]

Politics is the continuation of war by other means.

Conspiracies, as a species of political activity, tend to be cold-blooded. Ordinary people conversely are predominantly warm-blooded and this partly accounts for a certain folk-outlook that assumes the implausibility of conspiracies. The average person simply can't fathom what drives pathological avarice.

One of the signs if you lived in a free society with a genuine concern for the real interests of its people would be that conspiracies by the rich and powerful were constantly being exposed and combated. Otherwise you can infer you are being systematically deceived. Just as we can demonstrate the existence of a black hole from an absence of light, so too conspiracies will leave otherwise inexplicable dark areas across the political firmament.

Endless war is a quasi-rational objective for military profiteers and so, when you have said profiteers influencing foreign policy, endless warfare is what you'll get. More generally, whenever ongoing political activity appears nonsensical, this is almost always explained by underlying economic factors. America's war in Vietnam and later, the invasion of Afghanistan and the second Iraq War, were not failures; rather this perception is merely the result of conflating the avowed reasons for going to war with the actual reasons. Once the deeper political realities are appreciated, what was originally confusing becomes perfectly obvious. All of the costs of said actions for example were externalized costs; the architects of said conflicts therefore found them entirely beneficial.

War can only exist when there is a relative degree of symmetry between opposing forces. As such, war in principle could only ever be justified between powers who shared the same peerage; otherwise it's just tyranny.

Chance and accident increase in power and influence in direct proportion to the symmetry of opposing military forces. Between two evenly matched sides, even the smallest mishaps can cascade into decisive events.

One thing that books of military strategy have perhaps neglected is addressing how to cope with, and out-manoeuvre, the politicians and generals on one's own side who push for unwise actions against the enemy and whose presence is an overall hindrance to success.

Even the smallest obstacle can be dangerous provided it's unseen.

When one can't identify the source of an attack, ideally one will use the best means at one's disposal to most discourage a reprisal of that. The logical strategy for this with weapons of mass destruction then would be a simultaneous retaliation against all of one's real enemies, regardless of the reality of their participation. And to communicate that this is one's strategy beforehand, to maximize deterrence.

Every system of authority requires an infrastructure of symbolism; as such regimes can be overthrown simply by disrupting their ability to maintain a monopoly over symbolic aspects of culture. In fact, symbolic warfare is the most efficient kind since it minimizes the cost of resources for effect.

Desymbolization here would involve the same imagery being used antithetically in different contexts for the purpose of negating the symbol's foundational status. For example, the ocean as-life and the ocean as-death clashing to restore an aspect of the ocean's primordial being. The war after all is the war for truth; nothing else.

The Roman emperors were called Caesar because Caesar died a poetic death (A mythopoetic death in fact) If the senate had killed him ignominiously, Octavian never would have been able to use the memory of Caesar as the basis for his own legitimacy. The senate killed Caesar the man but failed to kill Caesar the symbol. And a symbol is like a cloak; someone else can come along and wear it.

Nuclear warfare just consists of two different kinds of peace: before and after. This stark duality is also the source of its strategic simplicity (Mutual deterrence)

War is the only time that the machinery of a nation's politics is compelled to reveal its unified nature. War reveals the myth of internal opposition; core mainstream media never opposes a war in the midst of it and only does so after to reassert the fraud of pseudo-honest discourse.

Terrorism is not an existential threat to the liberties of people living in a global superpower. Limitless state surveillance though is.

The unblinking gaze is the most obvious sign of a hunter. A government that obsessively surveils its own people then betrays its carnivorous intentions thereby.

Individuals and groups are measured through their adversaries; that is why it was always the greatest heroes of mythology who slew the greatest monsters. Here we have the basis for Nietzsche's dictum that we should choose enemies worthy of some admiration; that doing so is a prerequisite for our own excellence. Those who only clash with weak opponents meanwhile (And even empires can behave in a contemptibly jackal manner) are joining in their own atrophy.

It's much easier to implement totalitarianism in cyberspace than it is to do so in the natural world. As society becomes more technologically dependent, the dangers to human liberty will dramatically increase.

Wars are won less through secrecy and more through rapid adaption. In fact, there is not even any use for secrets where maneuverability exceeds the reaction abilities of the enemy. There secrecy is a squandered investment.

Only in a land ruled by vampires can it be a crime to raze a vampire nest.

The social structures that function best in war are the opposite (Naturally) of those that function best in peace; war demands hierarchy and dictatorship, whereas peace demands egalitarianism and anarchy.

The people who win wars are not the people who worry about how many children are going to die in a bombing. Here the sanitization of war does a disservice to everyone; obscuring the inevitability of enormous horror.

War is truth manifest at a heightened level; the underlying divisions being more openly clarified. This also explains why those who fight in wars often experience the shock of deeply personal revelations as a result of doing so (Fighting on a deadly battlefield can show you the truth of who you are)

One cannot defeat an enemy in a superior position until one has first recognized the superiority of said position; this basic understanding is necessary in order to define the very parameters of what achieving success would look like (Hence all the past failures in trying to abolish capitalism)

To make himself king, the fox must first trick the lion into disaster. The immense asymmetry here imposes the need for cunning.

There can be no such thing as an effective military tactic against vastly superior forces; an asymmetry of numbers or firepower must be negated strategically if it can even be negated at all.

A military commander need not win any battle except the last decisive one. The only victory is the final victory.

In the wake of each danger comes a much greater threat: *complacency*. Destruction hunts for those who wait.

The aftermath of victory is never the time to slow down; in fact, it is the very worst time to do so. When you have momentum, push onward.



This is an authorized free edition from

www.obooko.com

Although you do not have to pay for this book, the author's intellectual property rights remain fully protected by international Copyright law. You are licensed to use this digital copy strictly for your personal enjoyment only. This edition must not be hosted or redistributed on other websites without the author's written permission nor offered for sale in any form. If you paid for this book, or to gain access to it, we suggest you demand a refund and report the transaction to the author.