

Thoughts

The problem of evil

People have the inherent capacity to do good. We also have the option not to. That is a childish definition of evil, that it is anti-good. I define it as the extreme of anything, too many cooks spoil the broth much the same way too much self love is pride, too much nourishment is gluttony, too little love is indifference, too little kindness is cruelty and too little science is poetry.

I don't know how to feel about calling people evil but I genuinely feel like they have been exposed to too much or too little so they figured their only solution is either succumb or compensate. You succumb to a loveless home by fearing love or exhibiting the lack of love you may feel to the next person. You compensate for it by excessive self-love, dependency, seclusion, nonchalance. Evil people are victims of forces they had no control over, maybe this is me compensating for my sense of powerlessness.

I am demonising qualities I wish I had, just as Christianity can see assertiveness as pride, maybe I ascribe to evil what is to me an unattainable quality. I don't think I'm evil, but someone out there thinks I am. It's weird to think about but it is what it is, I am a cog in the machine I'm studying.

AI Augmented Programming

Bear with me on this one. Programming has evolved substantially in a relatively short period of time, in a couple of decades we went from punch cards and floppy disks, to computers that can learn and think somewhat independently. That's a giant hop. One of the peak benefits of the latter is that now programmes can help programmers program programmes, imagine being able to help God create your next baby, isn't that crazy?! This got so good that manual programming is not only time consuming but has become substantially easier to learn.

This is where I come in. I have the content (literally ideas that I want to outlive me, reach someone, weird them out and bring about world peace), the passion (I love systems, especially when I have no business being around them), and the time (I'm 24 bro, young enough to learn new skills, old enough to wisely adapt on the fly). When the limit of my knowledge befalls me and I crumble into dismay, ashamed of my own ignorance, I turn to the mother of the child I want to birth. I beg her to at least not just lie there.

Ok. Basically, when I can't figure something out, I would ask the AI to help me. No, not vibe-coding (that's just asking God to create another baby for you and fix it when it breaks, except God here is extremely literal and takes everything verbatim). I still write the code and learn, it's just that it's purely at my pace and there's pretty much no standardisation except one I self-impose. It's learning manual coding while mastering AI fluency AND upgrading my personal skillset. It's one

thing to be a manual programmer, another to be a vibe-coder, it's an entirely new ball game to navigate the tight rope between them without falling to either.

That's really one of the drawbacks of AAP. The difficulty of manual coding (of learning in general, really) and the ease and convenience of vibe-coding kinda makes the whole thing extremely hard to navigate, like driving on ice ... at full speed ... in traffic ... with a baby on board. That's how I know it's worth the effort, when the easy way out is right there and the honour is only in the hard route. My truth balances between them.

Personhood

I hardly ever wonder if I am a good friend, son, brother, co-worker or enemy. Yet i always wonder if I am a good person. Isn't that weird? I am assuming that personhood is separate from the fragments that make it up. Look, I am inclined to agree that people are more than the sum of their parts, but there is a golden thread that runs through those parts, harmonising them to form a unified image of personhood that becomes more than it is when the actor instills their own appraisal of said personhood. Indeed, it is both them and I that make me a good or bad person. For the most part, you'll never find a clear cut between those two camps, in fact, it is so rare that it is best to assume that most would be in the grey area between them, saying you're both or neither good nor bad. Extremism is hardly ever a good thing, if they hate you then all they see about is bad and vice versa.

I think that's one of the key things about personhood and belonging that we tend to forget. That it is important, not to be loved, but to be understood, to be accepted, to be heard, and to belong. Finding ground zero is crucial, that's the golden thread, the one unifying quality of your personhood. Scientists do not look for the truth, they look for evidence of it, they look for witnesses who say "yes, this is the truth." Not only is finding the pure truth an extremely difficult endeavour, but it can just as easily "lie". Think Pluto, a victim of the truth. The seeker must consider their own experience as informative rather than declarative, only the evidence can determine their truth.

Leap Year

This is just one of those "good to note" notes. The Earth rotates on its axis and revolves around the Sun. For a point on the Earth to move around the axis back to the origin, it would take ~24 hours (in laymen's terms, one rotation is equal to 24 hours). For the Earth itself to move around the Sun all the way back to the original starting point it would take ~8766 hours, or 365.25 days. That's the foundation. You see the problem already?

If a year = one revolution, then the year actually ends on the first day of the succeeding year at 06:00. We both know how not ok that is. The difference is too small to shift the calendar but also too big to ignore. We cannot assign 6 more hours to December 31st and completely fall out of sync with Earth rotation, nor can we ignore the extra hours as the 6 hour decrement would throw off our conclusion with anything that has to do with Earth's revolution, such as weather predictions. We also can't just "start the New Year at that time" because that creates global

incoherence that timezones wish they could compensate for, 06:00 and 18:00 would be the official hours for the New Year to begin on both hemispheres of the Earth, obviously not good. I personally think the biggest reason would be that those 6 hours... do not have a day. January first and December thirty-first are whole days as they are both 24 hours long. We cannot attribute the 6 hours as the first day of the new year nor the last day of the past year because, by definition, it is not a day!

So we can't add, ignore, or compensate yearly for those 6 hours. Perhaps we could do all that? Ignore the 6 hours for three years, add them together with the fourth year and compensate for the missing hours every four years with a day. This settles most concerns, with the added convenience of a month that's lacking days just makes it all the better. Leap Year is just that. A year where humans compensate for our incessant desire to standardise and rationalise, finally realising the limits to how much we control.

Fear

Anger and Fear are weird feelings. I can't find any reason they would overlap because one fights in power and another flees in weakness. Nothing physiological is useless, at least not evolutionarily. So anger is a feeling that gets us psyched against something, literally putting you in fight mode. Fear is the same but puts you in between fighting (similar to anger), getting the fuck outta there, freezing or just making yourself as small as possible. In the end I just think these are weird feelings. Very hard to express healthily too.

I think I have a lot of fear. It's best described as anxiety though. Most of it is directed at my psychosocial safety and sense of worth. A good part of it is based on the futility of our existence and life's inherent meaninglessness. Most times I am afraid of being myself, sometimes I am afraid of one day losing everyone I love, sometimes it's the fear of dying alone because I chose Nietzsche while my peers chose Hennessy. All the time though, I am afraid of living a purposeless life.

I do not think I am an angry person. I also do not think I have a lot of repressed anger. I think I am a scared person, dubbed myself fragile and weak. That's where my anger comes from, a deep desire to have some sense of control over my life. I do not yet have a healthy, socially acceptable way to express this anger, all my models showed how anger is evil and is used to oppress and destroy another person. It's a disgusting feeling. I am filthy from just thinking about it. So I would rather not express it. Wait...if my sense of fear is directly proportional to my anger then... I guess I do have a lot of repressed anger 😂

INFJ

I think it was Myers and Briggs who came up with the personality trait test that reduces one's personality to a four letter code. Each letter represents a trait that is most prominent when assessing the responses provided by the assessee. I want to go through my code, just have proof that I actually agree with it. I was dubbed an INFJ/P, otherwise referred to as the mediator.

The I refers to introversion over extroversion. It means I gain my vitality through interacting with my internal environment. I do better with small, intimate crowds and not a fan of the big groups and loud living. Couldn't agree more with this one. I don't do loud. I love my space. I don't want to be the center of attention and just being alone with my thoughts is enough for me. This does not mean I do not go outside or hang out with people, it means those are optional in rejuvenating my sense of vitality. Ideally I would have a cottage some where in the woods with other introverted people but instead I am in the suburbs, struggling to make friends and find my footing in a new city.

N for intuition over sensing. Yep, i trust my gut feeling over facts. If something needs to be done then it better sit well with me otherwise I am not doing it. This means I am creative and great at coming up with novel solutions, sure they don't always make sense or align with reality but you can always count on me to say something unhinged. I wade through the world by gut and not concrete facts so my reasoning may be wonky but my ideas will always be fresh.

F for feeling over Thinking. No surprise that someone who's intuitive is emotionally driven. My guide to making judgements is based on feelings, this means I am empathetic, patient, understanding and maybe a little bit emotionally unstable. I do not think things through, I feel them through. For me, how something makes me feel is a bigger metric than what sense it makes. Of course this is not ideal as it can lead to martyrdom or coldness but it has been great for someone interested in being a psychotherapist.

J for Judging, which is on par with Perceiving. These are best described as descriptors of how I plan, whether i use lists and calendars and shit, or do I just wing it. I got a good balance of both. I do plan my budget but include an amount that is just for impulsive spending. It also means I control my freedom, an intuitive and emotional person has to have some structure lest he destroys himself. Boundaries, schedules, budgets and timelines are some of the ways I govern my impulsiveness.

It is important to note that Myers and Briggs oversimplified one of the most complex phenomena in psychology. So, take what I claim with a grain of salt. The only comfort is that their claim has scientific grounding, unlike the zodiac people.

White genocide

I just read a story about a "white genocide" in my country. Trump and Musk are so horny for white supremacy and global superiority, they made up a story about how white farmers were subjected to racist policy and murder under the ANC government. In response, our president was like "bro... we don't murder white people... we murder everybody".

I have thoughts. Firstly, the president is right. Undoubtedly, more black people are murdered in South Africa than white people. This is just demographic probabilities. A majority of farms employ black workers, therefore, in time of attack, it is far more likely that a black person would be hurt or worse than the other race. More black people are victims of crime simply because of probability as they make up a majority of the population.

Secondly, it is not necessarily a race thing... ok maybe not entirely... ok it's a race thing. Apartheid ensured wealth is unevenly distributed along racial lines, white farmers are the epitome of that wealth. I'm not sure why criminals would target farms, maybe because they are isolated and enforcers would take real time to travel there, maybe the farmer's false sense of security got

them to buy fancy, expensive things, maybe they are easier targets than a fancy mansion with 64 cameras at each door. look I'm no criminal so I can't reason for them. All I know is that no one wants a difficult journey to their desire, criminals included. A majority of farms are easy targets with the potential for a big score since they're owned by white people

Thirdly, it makes sense that the government's redistributive policy threatens the privileged. Gov't is simply trying to even out the massive wealth gap within the population, a wealth gap based on a racist historical system thus making wealth racially segregated, at least between white and non-white groups. It is understandable that the policy can be interpreted as being anti-white when it is anti-wealth-gap. The expropriation bill is not racially motivated, the wealth hoarded by previous generations of white farmers as a result of Apartheid, however, is.

Look I'm no political analyst but I'm convinced of a hidden agenda. The Trump Admin is aggressively trying to push a narrative disputed by plenty of knowledgeable people and even denied by the very people they claim to be the saviours of. They are either trying to punish RSA for expressing its sovereignty or they just tryna bomb us and Trump doesn't wanna hurt his best friend's people. This is exactly why I don't do politics, I feel so powerless at the sight of all these names. Thank God we at least have a competent and competitive political landscape, otherwise we would be getting bullied more than we already are.

Horny for science

I know a bunch of random science stuff i got into throughout my life. See, ever since i was a handsome baby, I've had a thing for science 😊 idk man, i think it started in the fourth grade when i found out about the solar system. big balls of rocks and gas and gravity and heat and space and all that! Something about that whole thing made me horny 😊. That's when i started reading up on anything that piqued my interest.

Schrodinger's cat. Everyone knows this one. A theory in quantum mechanics that basically states that two seemingly polar options exist simultaneously, and that observation is the only way to certain one option. I'm not sure what it's for, but i recall something along the lines of something being in two oppositional states but immediately being fixed on one upon measurement, observation to be specific. It really doesn't make sense to me but I love the approach. Anything is possible until we actually observe it. There's prolly a life lesson somewhere in there too 😊.

Lightyears are another weird phenomenon I couldn't stop thinking about. What do you mean the fastest thing IN EXISTENCE takes YEARS to travel a distance?!?! The distances in space are so incomprehensible, like i get that the Earth's hundreds of thousands of kilometres wide, but i just can't wrap my head around the fact that there is a distance so far away that light, the fastest thing in existence (i think), takes YEARS to cover it. That's insane.

What's even more insane is that we can never ever go that fast since we are made of matter, and so is everything else that keeps us alive. I'm not sure whether light can travel that fast because it is not matter; or maybe it's a unique kind of matter, like plasma, or maybe the qualities of light and its speed are simply impossible for anything with matter to possess. The basic definition of matter is anything that has mass (can be affected by gravity) and volume (can take up space), light can be affected by gravity that is strong enough (like that of a black hole) but light is physically incapable of taking up space, it's just particles bouncing off objects and not an actual visible thing (the irony isn't lost). I have not refined this idea yet but I think i read somewhere that matter would literally break down if it attempted to move at a noticeable fraction of light speed,

friction (produces heat, matter would simply burn) is amongst the bigger inhibitors.

Now, chaos theory is one idea that really got me thinking. It claims that in any apparent chaotic system, there's an underlying law, rule or order that keeps the entire thing chaotically consistent. In essence, it rejects randomness as an explanation for chaos. It basically describes the behaviour of a system that make no obvious sense. Evidence of its validity can be found across multiple domains of science, especially social science. Social problems appear chaotic until you start noticing the patterns, the colonial history, government corruption, loss of values and negotiable judiciary processes. The child might seem unruly and disorderly, until you start noticing that this is a trend amongst fatherless and impoverished in atomic townships. There are patterns in everything and everyone, self awareness is to notice and critically analyse them to draw conclusions about them, politics are identifying systematic trends and identifying their most probable cause and effective solution. Just like that I got roped into sociological thinking, linking what appear to be chaotic phenomena to regular structural patterns. Just... wow 😊

Faith

Once upon a time, I had faith. I believed there is a good, powerful, just and loving God. I believed people were good and just made bad choices. I believed ancestors were fair and reasonable as the people they once were. My years in university broke that. They broke everything I used to hold up my sense of meaning. Behavioral Sciences, what an eye opening experience that discipline is 😊

Psychology. It was supposed to be Freud and "Love Yourself" all over my notes, little did I know what it held for me 💔 Psych 121 explored social and community psychology, basically arguing that milieu has more impact on individual behaviour than i thought. I learnt that people influence people without their consent. People are brilliant individually but so predictable as a collective. We seem to exert some kind of coercive group mindset when in social situations, mandating a need to belong and be consistent with the group. It's why most would rather watch than intervene when one of our own is in trouble. We all happen to think "someone should have intervened by now" and so we all freeze, waiting for thhat someone. Brilliant individually, dumb as a herd.

Sociology, the study of society and its constituents. This is where my faith really got destroyed. All major classical theories conclude that faith is both universal and can be weaponised. The works of Karl Marx come to mind. That piece of shit made me aware of how much suffering humans inflict on each other just to bag a bigger bag before they die. He made me aware of how social systems and their components are constantly weaponised in the name of wealth retention and oppression of the working class. The system of capitalism exploits faith to pacify the masses that it needed to maintain the uneven power relations that perpetuate uneven wealth distribution and distraught poverty. I couldn't stop thinking about it. My faith, a weapon against me. The realisation disoriented me. My critical mind couldn't stop thinking about how much power we believe God has yet his most vulnerable continue to be vulnerable, how the Bible glorifies poverty and submissiveness to authority like badges of honour, how God's people would rather build mega churches than be on the ground and make an actual difference in people's lives, how the Word demonises qualities that uphold individuality and self-direction., i just spiralled.

I could not hold my meaning framework with the evidence I had been provided. I could not pretend that the argument posited by science was not valid, plausible or, to a degree, true. My mind refused to accept Christianity as it were nor believe my will becomes secondary in social

situations, but I knew that forces that shape said circumstances were too great for me to overcome alone. So I delved into existential philosophy after receiving inspiration from Viktor Frankl on suffering and meaning. I met Nietzsche and Camus who told me about life being inherently meaningless and so it befall man to make it meaningful. My faith collapsed because the reality of its foundation was no longer able to tolerate the reality I then lived in nor was it able to keep up with my sudden, rapid growth. I had to breakthrough to the other side of the void, I could abandon my faith entirely or make it adapt to who, when and where I am. In any case, my faith was imposed on me and I adopted it, now that I have every reason to let it go-it became ever more beautiful to have it by choice. Existentialism made bearing human suffering, greed, mortality and futility all the more bearable.

I got to meet urban anthropology and its arguments of contemporary evidence for the use of systems and structures to perpetuate poverty and uneven wealth distribution, inducing and maintaining affluence for some and suffering for most. Sociology also struck a pivot, debating on environmental, social and educational inequality as being products of a self-fulfilling system that feeds off the legacy of Apartheid, contemporary capitalist assertions and a failing government. All these were topped up with Psychopathology, a module that showed me how scary psychiatry and clinical practice are. From narcissistic and bipolar people to schizophrenics and split personality disorders, nothing about my final year was good or soothing except that it was MY FINAL YEAR.

Aloof Introvert

People can see me as aloof, weird and a bit awkward. None of these are lies. I honestly struggle to be "normal" (whatever that means) and it feels so overwhelming to have to pretend to be. I have to say the right things, gesture appropriately, time my inputs, manage my emotions, be comfortable and promote conversation all in a single interaction!

Look, I know there's something off about me. I can't pathologise it because it might just be a normal personality trait I just never see in others, but I also can't normalise it as it really affects how I interact with people. I'm not sure what, if at all, is wrong but I know that dreading to talk to people is not something people would see as normal nor acceptable. I am convinced that I'm just afraid of taking the first step, putting myself out there and risking rejection. I know things will go downhill (in a good way) once I take that first step but I just can't bring myself to do it.

I'm not sure what or why I fear... I just know that if there's no mutual activity then I would rather be at home, bored, horny and sad. Maybe I'm scared of people actually getting to know me and discovering truths I try to hide and insecurities I am not ready to face. What if they ask questions I ran from and poke parts of me that are still soft and fragile? What if one of them becomes everything I could ever need? The point is that I am uncomfortable around people, and no matter how much I try to hide it, they can sense it. I can't help but collapse inward, becoming self-conscious about it. That's why I need some kind of mutual activity to do with someone, something that requires me to be fully invested in the moment thus reducing my likelihood to zone out.

There are nuances to my condition though. Chemistry with the people I am with is a big factor, do we respect each other? do we respect each other's ways of being (e.g. introverted and wise vs extroverted and funny)? do we accept silence as another element of the conversation rather than a void to be filled? Is there mutual interest in each other's lives and stories? These greatly influence my chemistry with others. Speaking of others, the more people there are, the less

invested I am in the moment. I don't know why but I reckon my threshold is about 4 to 5 people with whom I have good chemistry, the more there are then the less I am there. But again, even fewer people with whom I have an average or below average chemistry with make me collapse. A mutual activity greatly reduces the weight though. The activity MUST require thinking and have visible results of progress. It should be able to progress when alone but work even better when shared. These are just trends I could notice, there are some I can only feel and cannot put into words. The biggest one would be safety, I don't have a criteria for this one but some people just feel safe to be around. I just feel free to be quiet around them and they may be bothered by it but they do not force conversation out of me. This is not a definitive criteria as I can be quiet around someone simply because I do not like them, have nothing in common with them or I just do not believe it would be appropriate to talk to them (e.g. my friends' girlfriends or when sat next to a random girl in a taxi).

I do sometimes wish I was not like this. I am extremely selective about who I talk to but are super friendly to everyone, I have to have activity-filled bonding sessions with people and so intimate stuff like cuddle sessions and pillow talk freak me out, comfort becomes a driver of my social life which kinda takes the spunk out of my impulsiveness, and I can't go on regular dates.

I do not, however, curse myself over this. I have a fully functional nervous system that is just going haywire, using my analytical mind to protect me. I also gained the ability to listen to people, and making them the center of conversations (self erasure is the skill here). You'd be surprised how much people love talking about themselves. I do too, that is why I have this. It is all the things I want to say to anyone who is willing to hear, anyone patient and interested in what I have to say. I have a lot to say. I just get so deep in my head that I fall out of the social rhythm.

Latent Homosexuality?

Recently, I've been questioning a lot about myself. In all fairness, this is not a recent thing, it's a habit. Today's meal is about gender and sexuality. The question at hand : Am I gay? Arguments may proceed.

Argument in favour says there is not enough evidence to suggest that the boy is gay but there is noticeable proof that he may not be manly. There is a nuance. The boy is not your traditional masculine dude. He is not crazy about sports and cars, uncomfortable with competition, carries himself with grace rather than dominance, is gentle in speech and tone, and parents said they thought he was girl at birth. These are presented as evidence that his sexuality may be undetermined yet but his gender performance is certainly not aligned with typical masculinity. This is to say he does not meet the full criteria of being a man, which is amongst one of the telling signs of latent homosexuality. In a similar vein, the boy has hinted at a distrust and weak apprehension toward females, while also capable of engaging in deep & emotional conversations with them. This is not typical-man banter, but a capacity and desire to connect with others on a level far deeper than a traditional man would openly express. We do not believe he is gay, but evidence suggests that the notion is not far-fetched. We rest.

Arguments against here, we do not agree with the notion. The boy is not gay. The primary premise for homosexuality is same-sex attraction. The absence of this quality is the absence of homosexuality. The boy still has a deep rooted appreciation and attraction toward the opposite

sex, thus he is simply not gay. By extension, we also argue that he performs masculinity in his own unique way. He enjoys physical labour and mentally demanding physical projects. He enjoys working with ideas, objects and tools, he has visions of leading and commandeering in crisis situations, he dreams of raising a strong, competent and respectful offspring that he can be proud of. His only flaw is being a man in his own way. In ways modern and traditional masculinity of his context simply do not recognise. We argue against him being gay, and strongly oppose that he is not manly.

Psychological point of view here, we hold that the boy's sexual and gender identity crises conceal a much darker conflict linked to his identity, attachment and social circumstances. The boy obviously has issues with connecting with others, this makes him susceptible to intimacy deprivation and a longing to be held. He struggles a lot in identity formation, trying to balance his agency with social responsibility makes it difficult for him to decide whether to sexually indulge or just be heterosexual. He also feels pressured to perform his masculinity as per social roles, this basically means he can't be a son, brother, uncle and cousin how he pleases, this greatly impacts his self-expression and disorients him from establishing a firm foundation for his choices. The boy simply masks all these as the manifest gender & sexuality conflicts.

Existentialists would like to have a say. Whether the boy is gay or not is not important, what is important is that his life is his own and so he must decide for himself what he wants to be. Whether he chooses to be a homo or a cis, let that be HIS choice. Let him choose in spite of our views, let min choose scared, alone, and with a doubtful heart because only he can make his life worth something. Our perceptions of his actions, feelings and mental state are just that, perceptions. Only he knows what would make him happy, only he knows which choice has consequences he can bear. We must not rob him of the freedom to decide for himself. We are not determiners of his fate, we are the antagonists of his fear, cowardice, insecurity and doubt.

Arguments were received and recognised. Those for the motion claim that he has indications of not being straight and thus may just be closeted. Those against say he has no attraction to members of his sex and acts as man but in his own unique way. The psychology behind the question asserts that the question is not the question being asked, but that deeper underlying forces must be addressed as the culprits of such questions. Existentialists took a hard stance, claiming that the question is irrelevant, the point is the freedom he must be granted to choose for himself.

Much was pointed out but much was left unsaid, where do we draw the line between being a man in your own way and just defaming the idea of masculinity entirely? What about the boy's masochism and submissiveness in sexual fantasies? If the underlying crises are so important, why do they not reinforce existing sexual and gender identity but prompt its criticism? If the boy were to choose something and later regret it, who would be held accountable for not bringing such light in his preemptive protection? Much was pointed out but much wa sleft unsaid. Hopefully this doesn't make me go crazy 😊