

Doomer Mindset

Or Why Some Believe Life Is Unfulfilling

Daniel J. Okuniewicz Jr.

18 May 2020



The Doomer is characterized by entrenched feelings of bleakness, despair, hopelessness, and nihilism. Life is pointless, nothing will ever get better, everything is terrible. A Doomer is one who has incorporated depression into his personality such that the two are indistinguishable.

The Internet

Many will laud the Internet as “democratization” of media. Because any random person can have a voice they believe that is democratized. It is not, because the Internet does not work like that. The Internet is often compared to an open forum where anyone may come in and speak their mind and be heard, but the digitization of speech makes that absolutely incorrect. In a real, physical forum, in order to silence opposition you have to use force. On social media (what most people

refer to as the “Internet” now) you can block people and report them for harassment for having a different opinion. If someone says something you don’t like in real life, and you don’t know this person, there is nothing you can do about it except deal with it, actually try to reason with them, or physically force them to recant. Being able to just silence someone at the touch of a button has created echo chambers. It is the transformation of the Internet from a truly free forum of thought to a consolidated mess of social networks that led to the creation of the Doomer.

Doomer is a caricature that represents a generation of neglected men. They feel society has abandoned them, and who can blame them? The Internet inundates them with messages, both subliminal and overt, that they are the reason for all of the world’s problems. Every bad thing is their fault, even if they’ve never done anything, simply by virtue of being a man. This is not a majority opinion by any means, but the Internet, specifically Twitter and Facebook, has given vocal minorities megaphones with which to broadcast their opinions. However, unlike in the real world, “social media” allows those megaphones to reverberate their opinions in an echo chamber, amplifying until they spill out and people with a healthy outlook are forced to interact with them.

The Internet facilitates echo chambers because it is beneficial to discourage people from seeing things they don't already agree with. The Internet is partially curated. For many interactive websites, there is little control over what the users can see. Full control requires extra effort. For instance, searching for a video on Youtube does not necessarily bring up the most relevant results. Videos which are not already popular do not come up first even if they are more relevant than sponsored or popular content. Google search results will change depending on the political leanings and location of the user.

The result is that Internet users are bombarded with thoughts which belong to a dominant collective. The dominant collective is not necessarily a majority. In fact, it usually is not. However, because the dominant collective is the loudest voice on the Internet, there is an appearance that what the dominant collective believes and how it acts is what most people believe and how most people act. Thus it is simple to shape hearts and minds by manipulating the dominant collective.

The Doomer is a reject of the dominant collective. The Doomer believes it is pointless to fight against the dominant collective, but ironically maintains rejection of it. He is the epitome of a societal outcast, yet is also so deeply entrenched in society that he cannot escape. It is the mixture of irony and despair that forms the Doomer.

The World

The environment is in big trouble.

When people say that, what they mean is that our way of life as it is now is not just unsustainable, but it will cease to exist in the coming decades. Environmental changes on Earth are a constant, and although the change

is now due to human beings, it does not make the nature of the change different.

That doesn't mean that everything is going to get worse. It's just going to get different. However, since civilization is built upon maintaining a status quo while at the same time making "progress", getting different is essentially getting worse when the difference isn't planned for. There is an "inertia of human acceptance". Doomers understand that same, different, and worse are all connected together by the inertia of human acceptance.

If you tell someone to completely change their way of life they'll tell you to go pound sand. People are divided into winners and losers when way of life is disrupted. Therefore the way in which a people's way of life changes affects who the winners and losers are. In some cases the change is due to coercion or force from those who stand to benefit from it. In other cases the beneficiaries don't force any change, but they demonstrate that even the losers stand to gain from accepting the change, such as the introduction of groundbreaking inventions. It is rare that the acceptance of changes happens suddenly. Typically it is due to generational changes.

Since no one can hold onto power forever (because everyone and everything will eventually die) we have developed the concept of legacy. Though a person may die, their offspring or creation will hopefully live on and pass the torch. In this way people can achieve immortality and retain power forever. That is how "old money" forms. Those who stand to gain from certain changes are usually people with a strong legacy. Therefore people who have inherited a legacy and intend to pass on a legacy will do their best to stop changes which prevent that legacy, and will attempt to produce changes which strengthen it.

The existence of legacy is the reason why true change is uncommon. The more things

change, the more they stay the same. Natural resources, money, power (in terms of killing potential), etc., have always been major factors in how things come to be the way that they are. Traditions evolve based on those factors because tradition is culture's legacy.

Tradition's purpose is to pass on collective wisdom. Inevitably the knowledge gets lost and forgotten due to generational losses, and so tradition ends up seeming useless or malevolent. Then tradition is updated and rotted portions discarded. The problem is that society does not attempt to fix the degraded part; it just gets thrown away. It's true that some things are so fargone that they should be tossed, but most things are still salvageable. Change occurs when traditions are abandoned.

The question then is who stands to benefit from abandoning tradition? Two types stand to benefit: those whom tradition has exiled from the circle of normality and those who seek power through destabilization. Change is a destabilizing force. Just as knocking something off balance makes it easier to capture, disrupting a society is the easiest way to conquer it, whether overtly or covertly¹.

People who don't fit into society naturally will try to change society to accept them. However the out-groups themselves follow the same behavior as the society that they rally against. They, as a whole, would also not accept people who are different from themselves if they had the power of tradition behind them. That is because people want to protect their legacy. Accepting differences that go against a legacy ensures its destruction.

Even more powerful than legacy is the forces behind it; natural resources, money, and

power. People mistakenly believe that they can effect true change simply by removing a few "problem" individuals, e.g., assassination. This is perhaps true on a small scale of space and time, but not so beyond that. For as long as those forces are in play, nothing will ever be different fundamentally. Small groups will always have control over natural resources, money, and power because most people are incompetent and have a limited capacity for care. That is the Doomer Revelation; it is the reason why nothing will ever fundamentally improve.

The Prison

People are inherently self-interested². Even when someone acts selflessly, they are doing so out of self-interest. They may feel good making other people feel good. They might want recognition for their good deeds. They might reluctantly believe that what they are doing is right even if it is not a direct benefit to themselves (or even hurts them). Deep down, everyone would hope that someone else would do the same for them.

True selflessness does show itself from time to time in rare individuals with extraordinarily strong spirits. Certain situations even arise which awaken a person's spirit and enables them to be truly selfless. Such cases are rare, and most of the time people act out of self-interest. That is because helping other people is beneficial to everyone. If everyone were selfish then everyone would suffer. But because most people are not selfish everyone benefits. Thus, paradoxically, being unselfish is acting in self-interest.

However, self-interest has a price. It is a prison

¹This is not a conspiracy theory about the "Deep State", this is literally just how societies are conquered and controlled.

²Some may say selfish here, but I'm not that harsh. Selfishness is an extreme case of self-interest; most people are not selfish but everyone is self-interested.

that inhibits humanity's growth. We are stuck the way we are because of self-interest.

Ask someone to change their ways and they will not respond kindly. To act righteously at all times one must have:

1. Perfect information
2. Unlimited capacity for care
3. A good soul

In order for someone to accept change they have to know that a change is beneficial. They also have to care about more than their immediate environment. Finally they have to actually be a good person.

Change is disruptive because most people are ignorant about any given subject, thanks to specialization, do not care about most things (why should they?), and could not adapt if the change was forced upon them. As people age, every single one of those factors amplifies. As we get older, we rely more and more upon specialization; we trade breadth of knowledge for depth of knowledge. We care about fewer things because our time on Earth is getting shorter. We are less adaptive because we are built upon past experiences. Since it is typically a younger generation initiating a change, older generations would lose out in the end.

However, the old generation has a legacy. No matter what the young generation does, no matter what change they bring about, the old guard will entrust their legacy to a chosen few. Those chosen will carry the torches of natural resources, money, and power. That is why nothing really ever changes.

Escape

The prison exists for those who want to change things, really change things, but understand

that change is impossible. For to truly make a difference requires the foundations of natural resources, money, and power to be dissolved. That means that nothing will ever be different until those things are made unnecessary.

Natural resources include rare Earth metals, food, wood, water, oil... the list is endless. Particularly true for water and energy resources, whoever controls the flow has great geopolitical power. It is the flux of natural resources and money, and accumulation of power that fosters control.

Technology has only made it easier for those in control to stay in control. People think that technology makes their lives easier but it also further enslaves them. Bartering gave people freedom to conduct their own commerce. The introduction of money (which is a technology) made commerce easier, but it also made tax accounting easier. Transition of money to currency³ enabled control on inflation, to some degree, which gives governments more control over their economy. Advances in information technology, from the printing press to the Internet, made research, learning, and literacy easier and more available, but it also enables dissemination of misinformation, propaganda, and censorship. It is ironically easier to censor digital information, which spreads faster, through social media and the Internet (Google and Facebook are doing it right now) than analog information.

We have a misconception, engraved deeply into our culture, that we must always seek to "progress" from our current technological and cultural position in space-time. Even the so-called conservatives of our day are progressives wearing a mask. They want progress when it comes to technology, but don't realize that technological and economic progress bring with them cultural "progress"—as peo-

³The difference between money and currency is that money is a store of value, whereas currency is representative of money (except fiat currency). Think gold versus a dollar bill.

ple have more burden released by technology, they are enabled to engage in practices once or currently thought of as degenerate. The result is you see more people engaged in those behaviors. Cultural change is most often due to technological change.

We've reached a point where people want to change things just because they exist; that is arisen from Post-Modernism. What makes this sort of change different from the desires of the Doomer is that it is not well-thought out. Post-Modernists see everything as a power structure that needs to be dismantled. The problem with a worldview based on power structures is that it looks at the top of the structure and disregards the bottom. No one can say that homeless people benefit from a patriarchy even though most homeless people are men. It is a few men who reap the benefits of control and the rest are stuck in the same position as everyone else.

Change has to be *fundamental*. Technological advances change things in a trivial manner. Real change requires changing human nature. To escape the prison of seeing the world for what it is, to be able to live a meaningful life, is only possible through two ways: rejection of society and all of its comforts, or elimination of society as we know it.

Transcendence

At his heart the Doomer is an idealist. He wants things to be at their full potential. What is humanity's full potential? In some ways we are already at our full potential. We are very good at destroying things, for example. We are also very good at making new things. In that sense we are ourselves a force for change. Perhaps that is another reason why it seems that nothing that really matters changes; we are too busy changing things other than ourselves. It is clear that for fun-

damental change to happen, humanity has to change too. The transhumanists understand this.

Transhumanists have the right idea, but most of them have the wrong approach. Transhumanism—to become more than human, or to transcend humanity—is a necessary mindset for producing actual change. However there are two major problems. The first problem is that transhumanists presume that technology will be the catalyst for transcendence, and the second problem is that they believe transcendence will be for everyone (or they don't care that it won't be). The result is a transhumanist ivory tower.

Technology has arguably resulted in human *degradation*, not enlightenment. While technology benefits people, it makes it even easier to enslave them. The cotton gin did not eliminate slavery despite enabling fewer people to harvest cotton; it *increased* slavery by allowing the cotton industry to expand more than ever. Despite connecting everyone in the world, the Internet allows a few to manipulate connections for their own ends (e.g., Cambridge Analytica). To say that technology will be our saving grace is to ignore the fact that we more often abuse the graces technology has granted us.

Transcendence will not be granted to everybody. We do not live in a world where everyone is the same. That is clear from our division between the “developed” and “developing” countries, which is really just an homage to the concept of first, second, and third-world countries. There is a sense of superiority among “developed” nations, and they actually are superior in the sense that they have more natural resources available, more money, and more power. Their citizens benefit from the security and abundance provided to them. Transhumanists must accept that transcendence will undoubtedly come from a

nation with the resources, money, and power available to make it happen. Then the world will only be further divided.

So what is the role of transhumanism? True change requires a fundamental change in human nature, and that is the elimination of self-interest. In a sense that also means an elimination of capitalist economies (because capitalism is based on self-interest). The anarcho-capitalists believe the contrary—that capitalism taken to its extreme is really the answer. However for anarcho-capitalism to work as intended also requires the elimination of self-interest: the very thing capitalism is based on. That is because there is a paradox of self-interest. To be fully self-interested requires self-sacrifice, because giving something up to work with a group is more beneficial than defecting from the group. Anarchists believe that their answer is the most logical when it is really based on emotional attachment to ideal principles. A wholly logical being would always take the better option and give up its individuality.

A real example of the downfall of anarcho-capitalism is groundwater. Cities get most of their fresh water from groundwater reserves. When groundwater is discharged faster than it recharges the reserves deplete. Simple. But much more complicated when multiple cities are involved with no overseeing authority. One city taps in, everything is fine. But then two, three, four, five cities tap into the same groundwater aquifer and now the discharge is more than the recharge. That's a clear problem easily solved by reducing discharge. But who should give up some groundwater access? Everyone? One? Each city is self-interested (because groups of people also behave as self-interested bodies). No city is going to totally fuck themselves just to help everyone else. And that's how wars start. Then when the winner emerges we're back to pre-anarchy.

It's not such a simple thing to treat something like groundwater as property when it can easily span multiple jurisdictions, such as the Ogallala Aquifer. How does a Non-Aggression Principle apply to a shared resource? It is clear in such situations that anarcho-capitalism only works in a post-scarcity world, in which case what need is there for a capitalist system in the first place? Or any system for that matter? By the way, post-scarcity will never happen. Cornucopians are delusional.

Anarcho-communists are just as delusional as "ancaps". People can hardly work together on a small scale. People get the most done and have the most impact when there is clear leadership and direction, which requires a hierarchy: the antithesis of anarchy. Why should people strive to have the highest impact and most productivity? Because having the highest impact and most productivity is the most satisfying. Winners and losers will still exist in an anarcho-communist world. Coupled with the fact that most people are incompetent and don't give a shit, it's clear that there needs to be some fundamental change in human nature for anarcho-communism to work. Just like anarcho-capitalism, anarcho-communism requires the elimination of self-interest in a *post-scarcity* world.

The reason why Doomers know that post-scarcity will never happen is because they are confident that even if such a revolution were to happen people would absolutely fuck it up. Thomas Robert Malthus, the original Doomer, recognized that when food supply grows, human population grows to exceed the food supply. A post-scarcity world in which there is more food and resources than people need cannot exist because the population will grow to exceed capacity every single time. To think that resources can just grow forever is absurd. Eventually our technology is going to plateau because our intelligence is limited

(people think “AI” will solve this problem but I’m very skeptical because I don’t think we’ll ever have real AI).

Of course, if we purposefully kept our population constant then that problem would never happen! That would result in post-scarcity and we’d all live happily ever after, right? The drive to reproduce is a product of self-interest in order to carry on a legacy. That is why self-interest is the ultimate obstacle to human

enlightenment.

But we all wouldn’t live happily ever after. No one would be happy. No one would be sad either. Everyone would just be bland shells, robots. Do this. Do that. Eat. Sleep. Work. That’s what post-scarcity looks like. That’s what “transcendence” looks like in the corporeal realm. That is why suffering is necessary for enjoyment. And that is why nothing will change.