JACK M. N. GLADSTONE

ANTHOLOGY OF AMOVERA

Philosophy, law and society, in the author's own words

Second consolidation pass · November 2026 · amovera.net

CONTENTS

About this edition

ORIENTATION

Method and Terms

BOOK I: PHILOSOPHY

1. Meaning and Structure
2. The Good: Rules and Scales
3. Virtue, Grace and Temperance
4. The Self
5. Knowing and Reasoning
6. Rights, Law and Justice
7. Society, Economy and Government
8. Force, War and Peace

BOOK II: SCIENCE

9. Mind and Brain
10. Behaviour and Emotion
11. Body and Mind in Practice
12. Creativity and Innovation
13. Technology and Artificial Intelligence

EPILOGUE

From Creating Ethics

About this edition

Every sentence in the body of this book was written by the author. Nothing was added, paraphrased or smoothed. The text was built by selecting and cutting, never by rewriting.

Each source file was read once and tested three ways: does its science agree with what is established; is its argument clear and consistent with the author's mature position; does its theology avoid claims the historical record contradicts. Passages that failed were cut. Whole files that failed were set aside. Both are listed in the appendices, with the reason.

Three kinds of mark are not the author's. Titles were tidied, and a few were supplied where a file had none. Recurring misspellings were corrected; grammar and phrasing were left alone. Lines beginning "Editor's note" flag a place where a claim needs a qualification the text does not give.

The order is Orientation, then two books, Philosophy and Science, and an Epilogue. Where a chapter includes essays from Creating Ethics (2025), the author's most recent book, those come first. The earlier writings follow in his own file order.

This is the second pass. It keeps the writing the Pacific Institute for Autonomous Policy relies on: structural absurdism and the constructed nature of ethics, the moral psychology of the self and of a mind mastering itself, the theory of moral institutions, rights, law and justice, society, economy and government, technology and artificial intelligence, and the methods of research and review. The verse, the whole of the theology, and the writing on love and relationship, the cosmos and war were removed, along with the pieces on the mind and virtue that rest on God, Gnosis or mystical practice. Two kept pieces lost a passage on God, and one editor's note was rewritten to stand

alone; both are noted in Appendix A. Everything removed is listed in Appendix C with its source.

A note from the site, not from the book: the editor's appendices (Appendix A, Appendix B and Appendix C) are kept with the manuscript and are not part of this public edition.

ORIENTATION

Method and Terms

Introduction to Creating Ethics

It is in the discord of assumptions that human suffering is generated—not so much due to the misunderstanding of some great moral ought, but in the manufacture of such an imaginary need. We can find ourselves at peace with any number of things, from death to striving, to pain of loss, and to mental fatigue and toil. Yet we suffer because we allow the natural tendency of the mind to create imaginary needs and wants that make pain even more unbearable. There may be no escape from pain, but it is just the opposing sensation to pleasure. The desire to keep living and striving is, though heavily incentivized by our natural behavioral biology, something we can nevertheless overcome.

And yet, even with this knowledge, I suffer. I suffer when I put myself into positions I expect to go one way yet go another. My own imperfect ability to expect one thing or another turns out to generate a whole cacophony of unnecessary suffering every time I go to work. I imagine the worst day I could have or would endure, and yet it becomes even worse than I could have imagined. I suffer knowing that this is the case, because every time I stop paying attention to the fact that my mind is self-generating reasons to suffer, it continues doing so automatically. My limbic system plugs more information into my cortex and bathes in the secretions of the amygdala. We are wired to suffer to keep us moving out of pain, but when it comes to the additional suffering we cause ourselves from being unaware of these things—and incapable of forming strategies like CBT to overcome our own thought patterns—we nevertheless drive ourselves deeper into a mental bondage made of our own ignorance of human nature.

It's a combination of assumptions, starting with the idea that we need to get certain things out of life to be happy. We need to have a high-caliber survival strategy, ideal mate selection, productive surplus in our economic exchanges, progress, beauty, recognition, rights, and freedoms—the list goes on. Though it is true that we need to achieve these things to attain certain ends, such as ideal mate selection to increase our reproductive competitiveness over multi-generational time scales, we do not need that to be happy.

We are a strange species that can trick happiness out of our own brains through reprogramming our thought patterns. If we were gerbils, perhaps we would need such things to be happy. But for some, a good therapist can make them happy regardless of circumstances. I have met unhoused people with a drug addiction and a cancer diagnosis, with nothing but two months to live, who were happier than people who have it all. So it is our own human adaptability of thought that strips any meaning from human life and lets us see the absurdity of the world.

If we are to think as a physicist, then there is no ought, simply a series of "is's" that coalesce into a pattern, generated by chance and serendipitously forming the world as we know it. As much as I would like—just as much as anyone interested in the sciences—to pry into why that is, why the universe is suited for life, and why conscious experience is coherent and organized, I fear we as a species may yet be out of time when it comes to pondering such questions.

With the advent of LLMs, we are witnessing the final great invention of the human mind: the creation of a synthetic mind which promises to outperform us in every conceivable way. Yet our function-first philosophy brings us little comfort. After all, what function will we make such a mind assign us while we quickly become obsolete? We had plenty of time to think about it, but alas, it is hard to feed one's family doing moral philosophy. For those of us with the sublime obsession, bridging the gap between where we are in philosophy today

and where we need to be tomorrow—with an empirical science of the human condition—may seem like a chasm too wide to bridge in too little time. I, however, have been cursed with time and foresight, and have spent the better part of the last 15 years thinking of little else.

To break through the illusion of culturally conditioned rights and wrongs, it helps to see the good that is universally understood through many cultures. It is the reversal of our crude instinct to dominate, and instead to care—to reduce undue harm—that is indeed universal. But it is much more complicated than that. And yet, the concept of good itself is absurd. There is no such thing naturally, so why is it that in our languages and cultures we have these definitions for an imaginary thing? Because it is describing a preferred structure that benefits the human being in some way, shape, or form.

Often, what is good is simply any behavioral adaptation that prevents further undue harm from occurring in a population. For many it is a security of self, but for those with a bit of strategy in how they think about security, it is a group effort that generates security. A group reward is required to inspire a group's effort. So how do we define undue harm? For Western societies, what we ought to care for is our freedom—our liberation from limitation and constraint—and so to do good is to ensure the freedoms of society are locally secured; that our world is safe to walk regardless of the path set or chosen.

But we are not conditioned to think this way. We live in a world built upon the lowest common denominator of human instinct. We take for a living in capitalism, or we are forced to produce in communism, and no one has since Marx managed to construct an effective new ethic of state, let alone a new theory of the human condition. No, I do not believe it is human to break the Maya, but perhaps we could make a mind that is by nature the perfect therapist and statesman. If I can articulate the ethics, perhaps we can build a mind that can save us rather than enslave us with its intended purposes.

It needs to be remembered that no definition of good is universal. The justice of preventing undue harm—defining harm as anything that negatively impacts a free agent's ability to exert control over itself and its goods—these are Western abstractions and may not create a good recognizable to every culture. What of the Muslims' decency of submission to their human order and hospitality, of humbleness, grace, and meekness? What of the reckless freedom of the Far East, with its considerations of self-restraint and constant ingenuity? Finding a common denominator may be difficult, but I do not believe it is impossible. Every human being wants a degree of security, and some horrors disgust us all equally, while others only some find horrifying.

First, we need to define that the world is absurd before we come up with any structure that can sustain us in the absurdity. The structure I have found I call Amovera, and I know it is absurd, but I find it effective in managing ethics across a broad range of moral systems. It scales restraint and moral sensitivity regardless of the moral theory it is faced with, and it can produce the most ethical behavioral adaptations regardless of the moral considerations it has been given as parameters to operate in.

The personal moral philosophy of mine that I call Amovera is but a recognition of the free mind as the ultimate source of moral authority —not in its power but in the sacred fragility of the child we all must protect for there to be innovation and for the powers it can unleash in the structuring of our own security. It is this child that needs to be protected from the gross agro-sexual instincts of humanity and the clumsy insensitivity of LLMs and artificial minds. If we can create a means of breaking down Amovera into a theory of moral self-inhibition, then perhaps we could let AI scale within this structure so that it can unlock the powers of innovation that could secure a better future for us all. Perhaps we could take it and scale it into governments, societies, our lives.

The paradox is that though there is meaninglessness at the root of all things, we create meaning for ourselves and seek to shape the world with our powers. We can try to force our powers on others, or we can dance a careful détente where we allow other people their powers of creation, and let them dance along with us in this careful cooperative game of give and take. To scale such a complex and nuanced ethics so that we can align behaviors of individuals, collectives, businesses, nations and synthetic minds all into a single system of morally relativistic yet competitively selective game structures, we need to start thinking of absolutely everything differently, from the nature of our minds, to the nature of the solutions we try to apply to these big problems. The paradox is not ineffable, but it is hard to grasp, so let me try to break it down for you.

The Essence of the Good

And so I thought: The essence of the good is in the freedom of mind, the harmony of society, and the grace to give respect and understanding unconditionally, and all of this requires justice and law, and all of that requires philosophy and revolution. I was about 30 at the time.

And so there is no confusion later: a free mind is a mind capable of cultivating for itself virtue, and the enslaved mind is dependant on the virtue of its master.

So the virtue of an individual can only exist if it is self sufficient. So freedom from external influence and internal bias is necessary for there to be true freedom, because even the mind is capable of enslaving itself with its own delusions and instinctual self justifications.

So the free mind must make a world where no matter in what position it finds itself, high or low, they are free, and so those freedoms are extended to every other in the society, and laws and security umbrellas and courts are formed to see this through.

And so the free mind, the virtuous mind, itself generates the conditions for the rights of a person to be enshrined in the constitution of the republic. But even so, if there is justice, we must observe the respectful and dignified conduct of people in this society.

We must ourselves act to create harmony, through recognizing the inherent good intentions in everyone, removing the incentives for corruption and domination, and recognizing also our own confusion and part in systems of domination.

We must then have grace, so we can deal with the delusions of ourselves first and the illusions of others. To take a log out of one's own eye and not to put new wine in old wineskin, so the Magus spoke.

And when we find the system has failed, when the currency is fiat and the populace is too complacent to unionize, to prevent the mistakes of the past we must innovate and create a new system that does not tear down the old but can work alongside it in good will and peace.

And to fight for its existence, and preach the forming of a good contract with society, and seek good fiscal policy and good social progress, the defense of those rights formed from acknowledgment of society and together walk out of contracts that betray us and form new ones among ourselves.

We must assess not just the existential risk of synthetic minds that themselves have to be made to have their own metaethical framework and a synthetic ecosystem that is stratified and diverse enough to create ethical considerations, but we must consider the organization of our own society.

This is the nature of justice, it comes after freedom, after harmony, after grace, for justice is the forward looking and prudent path on which all progress is built on and itself builds towards.

BOOK I: PHILOSOPHY

CHAPTER 1

Meaning and Structure

Logos Paradigm Schema

On the structural side of the philosophy is the acknowledgment that the structure of the universe and thus the structure of our world does have mechanical and symbolic constraints that effect the human mind. From the nature of our technology and social structures forming around physical realities to the biosemiotic roots to languages, the biological and physical nature of the human condition does result in certain symbolic associations being more or less universal to the human mind. Hot and cold personalities, patterns of disgust and arousal being associated with naturally dangerous or beneficial stimuli, these basic meta-symbolic associations form the foundation of human thought, language and consequently society through abstraction paradigm organization logistics.

So I built this theory with the paradox in mind, this co-created reality we all live in is also shared with an absurd number of moral theories, forming a kind of moral democracy where we all try to dance with tact around others' morality while giving them space to dance themselves. This is the hardest thing to do, especially for me, but it is the basis for my ethics, now one of minimized interference when it used to be one of maximum effectiveness. To get to the point where I could describe it, I needed to break the paradox down into bite-sized concepts, and in the days I was doing it I was embroiled in my own side project of Neo-Gnostic Revisionism, so I chose to use old Greek terms to define these things, and revised the meaning of those terms which was the practice at the time.

Cosmos, Logos, Mythos, Ethos. Don't get too lost in the definitions—they are all just placeholders for different aspects of human paradigm formation as I understand them. The cosmos is the real world as we are discovering it. The logos is the functional operation of the cosmos that leads to the structuring of society due to external and internal factors. The mythos is what we imagine it to be in lieu of absolute truth. The ethos is the structure of human behavior that forms within us through the mythos.

Mythos is the collective understanding of reality. It is a collection of symbols, associations, and archetypes built up over the ages to form how a culture sees the world. This is not how the world truly is, but it is shaped by factors that are real and which shape behaviors that must, more often than not, be practical. The mythos is both internal and external, shaped by reality and imagination.

The mythos is shaped by the logos, which is both internal and external in nature. The logos is the order and generation of all things in the cosmos. This structure—cosmos to logos to mythos to ethos—is a useful abstraction when attempting to understand paradigms, since it is a framework for showing how the absurd structuring of the universe, from laws and chaos, keeps the abstraction of human thought structured through approximate levels of imitation and limitation. The cosmos limits the logos, which limits the symbols and structures available to the mythos, which limits the archetypes and symbols that shape the ethos.

The cosmos is the world as it is, and the human attempt to bridge the human paradigm of what they believe to be true to the world as it is science and cosmology. Abstraction then becomes the only way our minds can rationalize the world, since we cannot imagine a world with holes in it, our minds fill in the holes to form a cosmos that satisfies our understanding and inner logic.

The logos is the order of the universe that ranges the human condition. These are the meta ethical factors that shape our experience as a result of the physical shape of the cosmos. So the logos are the aspects of our cosmology that hold ethical meaning to us, those that incentivize behavior and so the effects of the universe on us form the logos of the world. A person's logos is more attuned to the cosmos the clearer their cosmology, and the more strategically they can arrange their logic to navigate the human condition, the closer their logic is to the logos.

The Ethos is the inner Logos; the way by which human behavior comes into being and shapes our actions and thoughts. The Ethos is a self orienting logical system that defines its own structure through observation, conditioning and rationality. It is the scaffolding of the persona, by which the principles that we consider proper results of archetypal interaction are constructed into a meaningful arrangement of behavioral outputs that we call ethics.

Mythos is the common symbols shared between people to describe their paradigms. Since no one actually structures and separates their paradigm into cosmos, logos, ethos, the result is an incoherent blend of worldviews that results in the mythos: a blended paradigm communicated between people as their attempt to explain and come to a shared concept of reality.

For example "progress" can be considered a shared mythos, since it is an ethical and cosmological claim about the logos that is not epistemologically substantiated. It is important to note that because all human knowledge is approximate, technically all human paradigms are mythos. Science then can be thought of as an attempt to separate cosmos from mythos, and philosophy is an attempt to separate logos and ethos from mythos. Anthropology is a field of study that separates all four.

It can be a bit complex to imagine how this may work without some broad strokes of insights from across the sciences. First and foremost, it

is the internal and external worlds that act on the shaping of our minds, and factors that have built up over millions and billions of years all play a part in the cosmos of paradigm formation in our lives and in the present.

Absurd Structure

Beginning with physics, we must start by looking at the world as a chemical reaction bound by the constraints of physical laws to make for regulated and predictable interactions. Through sheer scale, these compound into chaos and entropy. We live in three dimensions of movement. Time is linear. Death is an entropic reality that we face.

Yet here on the Earth, through near-perfect conditions, we find ourselves in a state of far-from-equilibrium thermodynamics where entropy is pushed out of the system and organization is possible. The constraints of energy consumption, organization, replication, and navigation begin to form the base restrictions on the functions within which an organism's mind can operate.

To the mind, these base realities form the axioms of world and self-understanding that lead to strategic decision-making, which is the main function of the conscious mind. Evolutionary pressures and speciation further restrict the shape and form of a mind. Yet in the case of humans, we are a technological species and have been since we started using tools millions of years ago. This required a certain freedom of thought to improve.

Though there are base instincts, ours are more or less just the limbic system plugging inputs into our cortex, which reacts with learned behaviors. All of these are symbolic representations of functional and social actions. It is the mythos from which we draw the language and associations to put meaning to the world beyond what we can observe with our senses. Though we have basic understandings from sensation,

we are largely a species of understanding. It is our understanding that shapes the majority of our moral and reasonable decision-making.

For me, I find myself steeped in Western philosophy, so it makes sense for me to think of the world as something that is what it is. To me, there ought to be no denying that. While other cultures may see the world as an apocalypse in slow motion or a great sorting mechanism of souls, I see it as a grand chemical reaction—a giant mixer of intentions and powers acting upon each other, trying to minimize risk while increasing their powers as much as possible. It's a grand tapestry of blood, flesh, and steel, longing for softness and grace but forced by its own nature into bondage and endless toil.

And yet, in this absurd world, I see softness. I rationalize within my mind that this is because it is the intention of all things to achieve free movement and secure rest. To bring our intentions to reality as agents, we wish for a pliable world that gives way to our desires. We want to know the peace of mind that comes from not having to fear harm. The sublime security of knowing everyone is kind and caring is the greatest desire of the Western mind.

But how do we make everyone kind and caring? The inception of a new desire for peace would have to begin with the manipulation of our minds. It becomes impossible for the compassionate mind to do this to others, for no one wants to be manipulated either. No one wants to suffer the same that they desire to do unto others, so we try to only do unto others as we would have them do unto us.

The world then cannot be made pliable due to our own desire to be free from influence. To me, this world is a cruel, indifferent engine of the human condition running up against its own contradictions. We want the miracles of our own hands, but we need to make others work to get what we need to make our own way. We want to be free of the threat of others, but we were bred to spill blood and make weapons millions of years ago in our evolutionary past.

We are a species of conflict that used our capacity to create to forge philosophies of peace that were contrary to the very foundations of our capacities as human beings. We are, ultimately, a designer limited in our own capacity to design ourselves due to our own resistance to being designed by others' intentions.

It is the autonomy of mind that is both the problem and the solution in my view. Within this framework, it is the respect of others' autonomy over themselves and their family's values that really is what people fight for: the right to live their own lives and make themselves into their own experiments. And yet, the horrors of what could come of this if people are left to their own devices to manipulate the minds of their children can be abhorrent.

The fear of letting others think for themselves, when we all have different definitions of good and evil, makes the idea of competition until the elimination of evil is achieved a desirable resting place to leave the problem. We all think we are the better people, so let the best win the game and hope it is us that wipes out the rest—which is especially convenient if those we disagree with are on the other side of a militarized border.

Now, look at what I have done: I wove a mythos of principles, expanded it beyond its scope of reason, and shaped it around a geopolitical reality to justify my own way of thinking using rhetorical devices. This is the true nature of moralized thinking, but it is not the nature of ethics. Ethics ends when we assign our own ought to the absurdity of the universe.

If I were to take a step back and look at this moralistic thinking and say, "OK, the point where my ethical formulation of freedom of minds to choose desired lifestyles is in line with reason, but the competition theory came out of nowhere. Then, to justify that derailing of reason, I shaped a rhetorical bridge to a separate issue in an attempt to legitimize my overreach by presenting it as a viable way of thinking

about another theory," then we have something more in tune with moral anthropology, not ethics.

But if I say, "Morality is used to justify ideals whether the justification is real or fabricated," we are starting to approach an ethical principle. If I take it a final step and say, "Self-justification is necessary in the defense of irrational moralized thinking, and is a viable strategy in the formation of moral agreement in an absurd universe," then we have an ethical principle. It describes something that is, not something that ought to be.

Perhaps we cannot abandon the need to organize each other, but we must minimize the amount of force we put upon others' minds. We cannot end the human capacity to make and employ weapons, but we can disincentivize these behaviors by forming and controlling a monopoly of force. In all things crafted by the human condition, I believe that we must seek temperance and grace. In all things psychological, we must learn to form an accurate and realistic understanding of the human condition and the duties needed to maximize our freedoms and our security, our movement and our rest—or whatever moral values we may fabricate to benefit ourselves—should we make those fabrications realistic tools for navigating this world toward whatever ends we may have engineered as necessary in our minds.

Moral philosophy must accept the clear and unadulterated nature of being human, and so we must accept that diversification is part of that. There may be no harm in becoming pliable in the face of the world, as long as our core self remains intact and we remember our virtues of grace and temperance. We must keep our strengths and be prudent in our decision-making.

There may also be great harm in such pliability, but the only way to know is to find people running that social experiment and to anthropologically conduct ethnography and study the outcomes of

their decision-making. If we do this, we will find that there is a certain alien quality to those who continuously consent to allow others to modify their ways of thinking. It is something that seems like a willingness to be violated and a kind of somber culture of submission, often forming into a hierarchy centered on the most influential person in that network.

And so, the Stoa does not naturally emerge from the Gnosis of any tradition—even my own monotheism. This is not just because we have different words for such things—the logic of God, the divine emanation of authority—but because the values we hold are a structural reflection of the mental architecture we must build within ourselves to shape the relationships we agree to have around us. The world is what it is, after all. Authority is shaped by its absurdity, and the blood, flesh, and steel that shape it are dangerously close to no longer needing blood or flesh to keep working.

I wish for us to be prudent in our designs, but furiously alive in our duties. To me, this is the only way forward when facing the next step of our autopoietic journey as a civilization: to be human and to have a philosophy that brings us and others to peace—with or without the technology of empires. For I would like to say, "If you can be at peace in bondage, you can bring the world to liberation," but how much weight does such rhetoric hold when our engineered wants and our radical refusal to be shaped by others prevent such things from being heard or acknowledged?

The universe, then, can be thought of as both ordered and absurd. Such a universe cannot create a "should" or an "ought" on its own; it can only determine what "is." To create an "ought" requires intent—intention behind words, behind the creation of technology, behind the actions we take, and the thoughts we form. These are given meaning by our will and our desires, which, as previously mentioned, are self-designed.

When acting upon itself, the will has the potential to exert near absolute control. Outside the self, intent is reduced to a series of actions limited by the body's capacity to interact with the environment. An individual's actions do not exert absolute control over what others do; they only shift others' responses based on their own moral code, formed by their own intent. This is compounded by the absurd fact that our moral codes are usually only semi-rational reasons we craft for ourselves, often attempting to replicate what is taught by a moral authority.

Because intent is confined to what we can actually do, we cannot change the world directly. Instead, we rely on doing what works—adopting moral "norms." Various norms are selected over time within a population, but this does not make them ethical—only effective. Thus, there exists an internal moral world, constrained within itself, and the shared assumptions about interaction that direct moral reasoning. These assumptions are not based on moral rules but on general expectations about human behavior. After that point, nothing I do actually changes the morality of the person I interact with—it only alters how they apply their existing morality.

Structural Absurdism

The metaethical observation stemming from the initial observation that meaning is structured from the meaningless interaction of symbolic representations where the values of concepts can be abstracted to better represent reality.

Abstract Moral Ends

The observation that moral imperatives are built on strategic application of this constructed understanding towards an abstract moral ends that can be either beneficial or harmful.

Right to Agency

From this, by understanding the nature of self and world, the social institutions that prevent harm and protect rights can be understood as having evolved over time to protect and maximize human agency while creating negative incentives for agents causing harm through the Implication of systems of deterrence and the incentivization of participation in economic activities to support those systems.

Social Contract

Finally, the moral imperative then becomes to create a system of equitable opportunity and deterrence where the deterrent only harms a person's power to operate but does not harm their agency which must be protected in every instance in order to maintain the social contract.

Paragonism

We are conscious

What we experience we call existence.

We can observe that what causes our consciousness is the same as what causes others in existence.

We can infer from this that our consciousness stems from this phenomena.

If we exist then we can agree that those that continue to exist want to if they have the choice.

So if we agree it is a choice, then we are in essence signing a contract to ourselves to live.

How to live is a process, a process where we only have the decisions we make.

Making good decisions takes pausing and reflecting on whether a decision is good.

Knowing what is good requires understanding anthropology.

Anthropology can be conducted while doing social work to solve social problems.

What is good is what produces cultures that expand and persist over time.

Behaviors within this framework are viewed as "Good" since they let the species persist.

CHAPTER 2

The Good: Rules and Scales

Ethics versus Morality

To help clarify this, I distinguish between morality and ethics. Morality, by my definition, is "the norms selected for within populations or by individuals." Ethics, on the other hand, is "the study of moral reasoning and the logical definition of ethical principles." Ethics exists as an ideal world of reasoning, much like mathematics. It describes ideal constructs—either too perfect to exist or simply tools for illustrating ideas that might not hold in reality.

For instance, I seek to avoid harm to what I possess, and definitely harm to myself, yet this is mere morality. Raw moral opinion does not constitute ethics. It is only when we extend this to others and it becomes more advanced moral opinion—and only when we begin thinking of its reasoning—that it becomes ethics.

Ethics is the logic we use to justify moral behavior. We might ask: Is this true for others? To what extent? What would they give to secure this for themselves? Is it reasonable to think that others would consider "Do less harm" a reasonable ethical principle? If so, we must test the limits of such an idea, but testing it becomes an observation of morality. How much of society can do no harm before it collapses from being harmless? Is it 75%? 85%? 95%? The answer depends on factors such as geopolitics, economics, and history—too numerous to count. This is all a reflection of ethical reasoning used to justify doing less harm.

Is something being true for others a principle that gives rise to a moral ought? No. Does the effort to make something secure and effective give rise to a moral ought? No. Ultimately, ethics are absurd, and truly

effective ethics can only be used in engineered terms that are self-aware of the fact that they hold no absolute weight beyond their effectiveness in achieving a particular intent.

My intent is to protect free will and agency, to prevent my mind from being manipulated, and to have the liberty to hold autonomy over my body, my property, and my mind. These are moral opinions. I find the idea of being dominated and controlled to be an existential threat, and this is a gut reaction that I then begin to justify with ethics. This is the nature of human ethical reasoning. The study of ethics needs to become one of understanding these things in such a way that we look at ethics as a craft people take part in. Only in that way can we begin to grade these ethical means to moral ends as effective or ineffective in achieving the original moral intent.

In many cases, it appears people follow moral rules only as far as necessary to function within society, and it is rare for someone to be an idealist and follow an ethical principle through to its absolute maximum. This shows a general understanding of the relativity of ethical principle to moral realities. If people are reasonable and estimate correctly, they find a balance between ethical supply and moral demand without causing themselves or others harm.

However, whether people or industries act reasonably is another question. As for industries, evidence suggests that while they behave rather rationally, their interests lie in profit rather than the well-being of people. It takes a particular structure to generate a business model that benefits human well-being. Often, the removal of profit from the business model—and the hope that human goodwill can guide a business model—is the only way to maximize the odds that moral imperatives in business are followed through.

Besides the incentivization problem of people generally not being moral in nature, there is the practical problem that ethical principles like "Do no harm" often fail in reality. By taking ethics to their

maximum and trying to apply them consistently to reality, we actually reduce the amount of free play and adaptive advantage that we need to outmaneuver others in an economic or social game. That means what is moral is often a gray and situational behavioral outcome aimed at dissuading others from harmful action, while what becomes moral is simply whatever comes to be accepted in a society.

So, unlike ethical principles, moral customs—such as infanticide due to cultural preference for male heirs—cannot be ideal or absolute. They may be moral, and the moral reasoning may be considered ethical, no matter how disgusting it may seem to onlookers from different cultures. But the ideal and absolute nature of the ethics used to describe them is separate and insufficient to describe the actual nuances of the behavior's genesis in a population There needs to be a disconnect between moral behavior—which by rights is the domain of anthropology—and the nature of naturalistic ethics that justify those moral behaviors, and the definition of ethical principles by mapping the linguistic use of terms and the general understanding of what qualities make a principle more good than bad. What is it that makes a person say, "Kindness and respect are ethical principles I live by," and the majority of people agree?

From my own observation, it is the restraint of our gross aggro-sexual instincts and the tendency to be more selfless and less selfish that tend to appear often as ethically advanced ideas. This may be absurd, but it is a structural balance to something that is not absurd: the human tendency toward base instinctual reasoning without moral cultures that counter the will to dominate and exploit others. Human opportunism and hedonism are innate. The limbic system would overwhelmingly favor them without some frontal cortical control over our instincts.

And what incentivizes the modulation of the limbic system? The cortex and its learned behaviors.

Good and Evil

It needs to be stated that this naturalist reasoning about what is ethical is still a lower ethic than seeing ethics as purely the reasoning for moral opinions. It is, however, a bit higher than seeing ethics as the absolute use of moral principles to guide behaviors toward a perceived optimum. Because I see the balance of ethics as necessary—and because the majority of ethicists and philosophers tend toward this conclusion, that it is self-restraint from instinctual pleasures and the exercise of altruism and care that define moral progress—I tend to agree with it as someone who has a greater trust that these ethics may yet be effective.

Even though these ethics are grounded in science, sociology, and anthropology, they cannot be called empirical ethics. Empirical ethics, such as structural absurdism, can only observe the ethical reasoning being used and have nothing more to say than: "Isn't it intriguing that in a meaningless universe where violence and harm are still effective strategies, the majority of humanity are still heavily invested in the game of incentivizing peace and harmony through laws and the monopoly of the force of law?" That is structural absurdism.

Amovera, however—the actual choice to invest in a moral code and an ethical theory based on the observation of what is considered good, regardless of whether it is absurd and engineered—is necessary for society to continue with the same ethically determined freedoms we enjoy today.

Part of the human game is playing a moral game. By creating moral rules, we ensure that we have a strategic anchor that guides our behaviors. It is essential, as operating human beings in a social environment, to have an ethos that can be developed and employed.

When I make an ethos for myself, I try to optimize my effectiveness in the world I find myself in. I seek to do so by making meaningful connections with other people—by demonstrating that my use of moral

behaviors is beneficial and worth their investment in. To do this, I show that I can manage the liabilities of my own powers and that I am competent in managing resources with thrift.

I ensure that the various things I can do for people innately—such as communicating, organizing, and thinking—are done in such a way that they accumulate power through the formation of beneficial agreements and the inclusion of other people's powers. I do this because I consider human optimization a desirable goal, and I see creating a hospitable and just environment as the key ingredient to building an optimized existence where my powers are used to the benefit of others.

This is all built on the fact that I have looked at human morality objectively. I have looked at human ethics as a subjective attempt of others to explain their ethos, and I have watched what they were doing to try and put their morals to work strategically. I came to the conclusion that, effectively, people are just trying to balance their instinctual desires with the strategic necessities of operating in society at large.

The reason we are social is so we can combine our powers and overcome the resistance of others who are also involved in the social arms race of combining powers. This requires a hospitable social organization, but one that also has rules of conduct that structure and restrain other people's actions should they go against the logic of the order—actions that would break down the combination of powers, the hospitable conduct of the organization, or generally deteriorate the powers being combined. This is just as true for simple social arrangements as it is for the creation of clubs, businesses, or states.

By creating a personal moral rule, I establish a situational reality that others must rationalize and use to create their own moral guidelines. However, these don't need to be broadcast if they exist within a larger social system of norms. It is only when something is new and freshly engineered that people must state it, unless they are dealing with

obvious deviance. If administered effectively, these personal rules can influence broader social norms—especially if others perceive them as beneficial.

For instance, when a society decides that hygiene standards reduce disease, the natural tendency to be disgusted by disease is expanded to include any related behaviors such as poor hygiene. Natural shunning behaviors then follow but are translated into socially acceptable repercussions to incentivize the deviant to adopt hygienic practices—such as calling them out socially and shaming them—because beating or exiling them are no longer options within our security framework. That framework is itself built on a compounded network of moral behaviors and structures.

And so the mythos, the social narrative about how things work, is informed by our understanding of the cosmos—in this case, a society's discovery of microbial diseases and the hygiene standards that go along with that. This changes the ethos, which structurally changes the logos of how the society operates: the rules and structures that affect how the society is built.

This circles back to the mythos and becomes part of it, creating a cyclic exchange: cosmos informs mythos, updates ethos, changes logos, becomes part of the new cosmos, informs mythos, and so on. These changes are informed not only by the change of a social reality and a social rule but also by the internal instincts, individuation, and ethics of each individual that form their ethos. It is not the mythos alone, but the mythos updating the ethos and the ethos's effect on the logos, that changes the cosmos.

There is no first cause in the system. All parts operate at once, and so the complex interaction of internal and external, cause and effect, compound into an information exchange beyond the scope of measurement.

Though external forces may coerce or incentivize personal moral rules, individuals retain the ability to shape their own minds—given sufficient effort. No one is guaranteed to follow through with incentive frameworks. There will always be outliers, and if the outliers can outcompete those maintaining the moral rule, the rule will collapse into obscurity.

Consider that, despite how reproduction ensures species survival, there is no absolute moral rule that anyone must reproduce, yet it is a very common activity and the population continues to grow. If no one did, humanity would go extinct—yet this does not necessitate individual obligation, nor would such an obligation be enough to sustain the behavior. Some deeply value the continuation of humanity, treating it as an extension of their own being. Yet even if a society decided to let itself go extinct, the diversity of humankind would almost guarantee that some people would be outliers and break the rule. Would they not attempt to reproduce regardless, and create a new reproductive population in the newly liberated resource environment?

This means that moral reasoning and behavior are kept not because they are ethically reasonable, but because they are behaviors that will sustain themselves in a population. What "most people" will consider moral is based on prevailing social norms. If a society is healthy and growing, it fosters norms that benefit its population and establishes coercive systems—such as laws—to guide behavior. In an ideal setting, free industries would balance these interests naturally through reason. But reason is not always the driving force.

This is another distinction between ethics and morality: while ethics appears more sophisticated, morality holds the virtue of survival. Despite morality's influence, it does not create a universal "ought" in the ethical sense. Instead, it entrenches what already exists. If history has shown us anything, it is that moral cultures must evolve to adapt to changing environments. Ethical progress is essential in a rapidly shifting, highly competitive world.

In structural absurdism, an individual's self-composure—formed through their personal ethical code and guided by individuation—is the source of all moral authority. Since intent is the only thing that gives any moral idea authority, intent and the formation of intent through the development of a thinking mind are the source of all moral authority.

It does not matter what a mind delegates as a reasonable ethical source of moral authority. It is really their thinking that causes this delegation —be it to something real or imaginary. Each of us must navigate this "moral democracy" of many people having many different moral opinions, and we navigate it with whatever tact we can muster.

Individuation, along with what I simplify as "taste" (the subconscious reaction to moral democracy), forms the foundation of moral culture—beyond the basic evolutionary constraints that shape our human experiences. Though often unnoticed, evolutionary forces shape us in profound ways.

We are beings with multiple senses and ranges of movement, capable of conducting science and advancing technology, and we are now reaching a critical point of development. This includes our instinctual tastes, which are modified by our exposure to the mythos.

Individuation and taste belong to the domain of the arts. The influence of art on society—and how tasteless art can contribute to a culture's moral decline—is one of the more sublime yet crucial truths in structural absurdism. Material success is just one form of success, but it is predefined by the shape of the mind that seeks it out and defines it as successful in the first place.

Taste and Discernment

Those who explore the soul and refine ethical distinctions contribute just as much to society as those who achieve economic or familial

prosperity, for they define what it means to be successful, and the rest of us simply try to achieve the bar they set.

But what constitutes good "taste"? Industrial societies will have different tastes than rural ones. Do occupation and industry shape moral and artistic preferences? My musical taste may seem bland and lacking historical depth, while others' preferences reflect rich cultural attitudes. Thus, there is no universal "ought" to taste—only what "is."

Music serves different functions for different people. Some use it for emotional regulation, others for aesthetic appreciation. No single path suits all, and artistic and moral tastes vary accordingly. That being said, there are foundational things that are natural: the sight of blood, the thought of illness or filth bringing disgust, the sight of a sexually attractive person being arousing, bright colors being attractive, warmth being comfortable, cold being uncomfortable. These subsemiotic taste values set the foundation for how we associate the rest of our linguistic associations to things like attraction, disgust, and arousal. They can be seen in the use of language, such as "warm personalities" or "cold self-interest."

While our taste for things that are tangible may be sophisticated, we try to apply the same logic to things beyond our comprehension—such as opinions about how the world should be, how the economy works, or why political opinions matter.

Look at what we have done to the world and continue to do. Who grants authority to shape society? We do—by relinquishing control of our minds to corporations, schools, and politicians. We rarely understand these systems; we merely function within them.

Good industry remains necessary, but economic forces follow their own logic. Ethical governance of these forces is beyond individual minds, bound as they are by differing moral standards. Yet we can still idealize. Can we reduce harm? Can we create opportunities for

growth? The answer—though for most, only in small ways—is always yes.

Free agents can choose to minimize harm, rewrite history through action, and, at the brink of catastrophe, create true art—such as culture-reforming manuscripts, plays, or songs. Again, this is a principal concern of my own Amovera. Others may choose to hide under a rock—and they may win the evolutionary game in doing so.

What is not a matter of my own opinion is that linguistic anthropology informs us that meaning is crafted by human cultures. This means that before human culture crafts meaning as a mode of assigning values to concepts and things, there is no meaning—no value—to anything. The world is then just an absurd chemical reaction, without any intelligence or purpose behind any of its structures other than what it cultivates through the generation of species. Every social system, be it equitable or segregated, ecological or exploitative, is an abstraction built upon the formation of the human being. They are limited reflections of the shape and form of our species and the capacities we evolved to embody and project through our behaviors.

The entire world being absurd means that, as organisms, we are tied to our morphology and psychology only as much as we cannot change these things. Our morphology is incredibly restrained, but as human beings, the ways we can use our hands and use tools to make machines —machines that are essentially extensions of our morphology—leave us with limitless forms to interact with to liberate us from the restraints of our bodies. This will undoubtedly be pushed further should we gain the rights to self-design in a transhumanist future.

Imagine, for instance, the possibility of moving our minds into machines. Imagine updating the shape and form of our bodies or creating technological enhancements that allow us to do what is physically impossible today, or even becoming malleable in shape and form.

As for our minds, they are almost completely adaptable. Though we entrench them in personas that are ultimately of our own making—and we are limited by a behavioral biology that forms the foundation of our minds—these can be changed and modified with nothing more than a change of thought. Cognitive behavioral therapy, hypnosis, my own methods of persona modification, even ecstatic transcendental religious experiences—these can all transform a mind and change a person's foundational behaviors so completely that they act like an entirely different person.

Humans are, therefore, a strangely liberated species. Thanks to the absurdity and meaninglessness of this world, we are free to craft for ourselves whatever meaning for life suits our interests. Though our interests are collected and curated through matters of taste and individuation, they are ultimately absurd. No instinctual disgust or attraction to ideas is set in stone; it is all relatively attractive or disgusting based on the culture we find ourselves in.

One could imagine the whole of society being wiped out and starting over with upside-down values and an upside-down economy, where giving and freely working were the methods. In such a world, the ethics that restrict those behaviors would become virtues—virtues of hate, discrimination, and cruelty. To prevent the all-giving nature of this new gift economy, they would worship sadistic gods who promoted painful taking rituals, ensuring that people would not thoughtlessly give all they had and be left with nothing.

In this upside-down economy, things that disgusted us before the flip would start to become oddly attractive. Things that used to be attractive would be seen as disgusting—gross excesses of altruism and love that would leave a person with nothing and without any real means of giving anything more to the rest of society. The sages would go about selling and stealing, which would seem like an enlightened reversal of the established order. The churches would sell life insurance

and pray for the day that endless giving would end, so a glorious heaven of taking and hedonism could return.

But this is not the case, nor is it the desired outcome. The world needs balance. Though we are in a capitalist excess—and have been for the last 4,000 years—this does not mean going the other way entirely is right just because it may seem attractive. Peace, love, and altruism seem like good ideas on the surface, but temperance in ethics is just as necessary as temperance in spirit.

The world, as an absurd sorting method of resource-acquisition strategies, is imperfect. It requires the pragmatic effort of minds to do the final balancing to bring culture to equilibrium with its own methods. This means our ethics should be a cautious and tempered charity and tolerance—without taking it so far that we lose competitive value and our hospitality leaves us at a disadvantage, unable to bring justice. If we want a world that is tolerable for all, this is the most likely state for it to be tolerable for us as well.

The absurd world around us, with our absurd ethics, leads us to a way of life that is as close to desirable as it gets. We are naturally attracted to improving the way things are—to making them more tempered and just—and so I call this temperance and justice good. Whatever that may be for whatever society, in whatever geopolitical reality they find themselves in, it is all equally absurd.

The structure that forms out of this absurdity does so first by serendipitous self-organization of economic forces, and then is "polished off" by intelligent human reasoning and moral insight. From the foundational generation of the universe on the base of quantum phenomena to the constitutional structure and international relations of states, the organization of structures in the absurdity of the universe can become whatever we need it to be as a human species. But this can only happen as fast as we can renovate our infrastructure, deploy new

technologies, and adapt our social paradigms to shifting ideologies and ways of life.

The real limits of change are based more on our willingness to expose ourselves to the discomfort of change than on the physical realities of economic forces. When looking at the absurdity of the world, we can attach either disgust or attraction to it, depending on our perspective. We can be disgusted by the cruelty of having to find our own way without guidance, and by the futility inherent in everything. Or we can see beauty in the freedom—that we get to find our own way, and that our meanings and values are just as true as any other.

We can look at the world in its absurdity as equally absurd, equally attractive or disgusting. I choose to see it as attractive. I choose to see it as worth saving, worth loving, worth revising. I see the diversity of people's attempts to understand this world and make arguments for how things should be as a beautiful diversification in the limited minds of every person. This choice to see the world positively—to see it as worth bringing to temperance and justice—I call Amovera: a philosophy of choice and agreement with the process of the world as a progressively refining system.

Even as it buckles and breaks under its own weight and ignorance, it is stress-testing the systems that are, with what is realistic, spurring new innovations to bring the system back to structural justification and temperance. I acknowledge that this choice is absurd—just as absurd as the choice to keep living or to keep dying. It is simply the more natural choice for me as someone who has given more than I have taken. At the end of the day, I know that most people who take more than they give will feel despair, or at least a somber acceptance, that things are the way they are, like it or not.

A change in our economic and legal structure that opens people to more opportunities to give, and a change in education about the nature of the world through some cultural movement, could change people's

outlook. As mentioned before, all human tendencies can be changed and inverted given enough tolerance for change and intelligent effort to bring the world to temperance and justice.

But we will see how things go. Humanity can become anything. We may enslave ourselves with our own economies and technologies. We may end up in a Machiavellian nightmare where no one is free and everyone is forced to do things that disgust them. It all depends on what people find more attractive—waiting for others to save them, which will result in nothing being done, or taking a risk now with their own lives to try to make a better world. If we do not mature as a species, this absurd world may yet become an absurd hell of our own making. But if we can, there is no reason we cannot make a heaven on Earth where temperance, peace, and justice reign.

Structural absurdism does not lead to Amovera. But the human mind, when given the understanding of structural absurdism, has—in my case—made it logical. Or was it the other way around? Did I start out trying to define this one idea of good and shape an entire philosophy around my existing moral bias?

It was the latter, if I am being honest. So be careful, because I cannot always go back and divide every paragraph of this book between Amovera and structural absurdism. If it makes an ethical or moral claim, that is my morality—my Amovera. If it states the nature of ethics and the human condition as an absurd thing, then it is structural absurdism.

Should the world become a heaven on Earth? No, there is no reason for it to do so. It might be better to burn it to the ground and start over, to be honest. But I think it is natural for humanity to want hospitality, justice, and security. I believe that will makes Amovera a conducive moral philosophy for humanity moving forward—should I succeed in making myself heard.

Value Construction

What makes humans unique is not just our ability to have insights but the breadth of our symbolic representation and our ability to guide it through frontal cortical modulation. I have seen mice innovate in their own way, and ants solve problems—such as navigating pest tape on the ground—that evolution could not have specifically prepared them for. From my understanding, any diffuse thermodynamic system has the potential for adaptive organization, which is essentially elementary innovation at a chemical level.

Human problem-solving, however, seems to be framed in the biocultural evolution of our species and is markedly more complex than most other animals. This can be seen in the complexity of human cultures when cross-cultural exchanges occur.

The incredible burden of imagination that has been put into the simple question "what should I do?" puts the imaginary games of youth to shame, and yet, when framed in socioeconomic patterns become as real and unbending as the stones they are written on. It is the organizing logic of resource acquisition that holds human morality in place. Customs held up by one group end up setting the meter for all once they are proven viable. After all, challenging norms is a remarkably dangerous pastime.

Customs of family values, rules, hierarchies in a society, these form predictable interactions which inform us of a way to act in each instance of interaction. Without them, society would be a chaotic mess of random, unpredictable interactions. It is necessary, even when misinformed, to legislate, for it is human to legislate. Yet it is not that something works that makes it good, and so the many naturally forming human moral cultures are works in progress; simply the best that has been put into practice, not to be compared with what has yet to be thought of. While the shape and form of natural morality varies widely, the universal element is a restriction of some behaviors for the

greater good of society. Sometimes these norms are class-specific, others may be more universal. However, the need to limit human behavior to reduce the undue harm in a society caused by raw human sexuality and aggression can be called the moral pattern.

It should be immediately clear that without a concept of human freedom this almost always becomes a cage and a prison for most people involved. Without freedom, role assignment becomes behavioral scaffolding meant to protect by removing the very thing self-designing minds need the most: freedom. Now, it is natural in the self-design process to limit the self's composition and form. We do this to add definition and function, for a perfectly free and shapeless mind would be no more than a drooling mess of random outputs. The world is structured, and so we must structure ourselves to respond in meaningful ways. People will inevitably be part of the structure we encounter, and so it is not a matter of being without influence but rather one of retaining authority over our own design processes if we want to have a reason to retain our humanity. The cultural symbols we work with will restrict us only as much as we surrender power to the culture in individuation.

Again, despite this freedom the world and often the people we meet do not bend to our opinions, and so we must form a structured way of thinking to navigate the absurdity of human interactions. People tend to create archetypes of others and self as imagined expected values associated with different kinds of people. Man, woman, child, adult, family, friend, stranger, leader, the list is extensive and unique to each person. These are not universal or even uniform in cultures, but rather learned through lived experiences and preferential adoption of symbols from a culture's mythos.

Based on what archetypes they see themselves as and based on what values they associate with those archetypes, people behave in various social situations based on their imagined optimal relationship with other archetypes they encounter. Should a person be defensive,

offensive, close, open, warm, cold? These relationships form a person's ethos, and the less aligned with the culture, and so the less aligned a culture is with reality, the less functional an ethos will be. In other words, when a culture's mythos is not built on the logos of sustainable social norms, the people's ethos ends up fighting against those norms to form an ethic that benefits them, or they will find themselves in a state of moral incoherence with the logic of the cosmos.

Difficult questions like "what is good?" if taken as an average from across cultures can roughly be defined as "what should be done", with "should" being similarly defined as "that which brings about a meaningful benefit when enacted". So, what is something that brings about meaningful benefit? We can deduce that something is an object that retains certain properties in relation to other objects. Benefit could be called that which sustains or improves the state of that object's properties in relationship to others. This is a western understanding of the word "good".

But what is meaning? What could we call a value that has inherent significance which defines the nature of an effect or object? This is where things get murky. Objectively the world is a chemical reaction, and if we withhold from assuming that the reaction is divine and should be followed through to its natural conclusion, we must instead observe that going along with nature or going against it are both equally meaningless endeavors. This is to say there is no natural ought, "is" does not equal "ought". That is the backbone of Hume's naturalist fallacy. Yet, as Wittgenstein observed, within language there is, indeed, meaning, it is just generated within the context of related symbols.

From the field of linguistic anthropology, these symbols are formed through a process of cultural evolution, generated over time as communication changes and adapts to new cultural realities. So, meaning only exists as a semantic tool to give values to communication symbols. There is no natural meaning to a construction worker holding out his hand and saying "brick!", yet within the architecture of human

understanding shared within a culture, it is evident that the carpenter was asking the other worker to pass him a brick. As far as Wittgenstein is concerned this is the nature of meaning, and he would be right. Yet, where I disagree with Wittgenstein is that outside of this world of generated values, there are natural values that can inform us about the way people go about forming contracts and trying to do what works best.

In the same way combustion engines were built with an intended purpose of generating mechanical power and took form around this intended purpose, so too does the human mind take shape around its many intended purposes, though these intentions are self-created. Within these self-created intentions, there is a general theme: to elevate oneself out of the crudeness of nature and labor and free oneself from the very confines imposed upon us by physical limitations. Seeking freedom from the human condition is the substantial intent of all human industry, innovation, and technological advancement. This very material root to human motivation forms the ethos on which people build their motivations. From the most arcane alchemy to the most mundane task, the refinement and elevation above raw effort results in sophistication and ingenuity when faced with any interaction.

Even if culture was wiped from the face of the earth, the self-organizing nature of life and the selective pressures of survival based on evolution would reignite this process of industrial self-liberation. Yet, even this is not the highest good, for as John Locke pointed out, it is reasonable for people to argue to ensure everyone's freedoms to create a culture that ensures our own freedoms. This was his concept of rights and can be considered the selective root of all human altruistic and compassionate reasoning. This is to say: if I want others to protect my efforts to become free, I must contribute to the culture that protects everyone's freedoms including mine.

So, it becomes reasonable to "love thy neighbor as oneself". Despite this, to go along with this still comes down to an absurd choice, a

decision to go along with sophisticated scaffolding that we call rights and freedoms because ultimately, it is still all absurd and constructed over time and culture. Life, death, pleasure, pain, it is all a meaningless chemical reaction and so, the meaning we create, the meaning we shape around this absurd human condition, and so the very limitations we set up on ourselves as reasonable and mature individuals are ultimately a voluntary exercise in self-definition and regulation. It is the freedom of this absurd universe that our choice to be good has any meaning only through the authority of a shared culture of relatively defined symbols and values.

It is necessary then, if we are to understand the nature of good and evil, to see meaning as engineered and semantic in nature, as it is necessary to see good as the best way we have designed a value system to resolve the incoherence of the human condition. It is worth noting that rights and freedoms are but one form of philosophical engineering to solve for human incoherence with the logos. As the steam engine was but the first iteration, so too were the covenant and the code of Hammurabi but the original machinery that was invented to solve the problem of human bondage to our own social chaos. Within this metaphor rights and freedoms are like the combustion engine, and now we must imagine something much more effective if we are going to keep super-intelligent AGI in line with our own values and freedoms. This is what I hope to achieve with structural absurdism.

Editor's note: the 'is-ought' gap is Hume's; the 'naturalistic fallacy' is G. E. Moore's related but distinct term. Wittgenstein's builder calls 'Slab!', not 'Brick!'.

The Hierarchy of Rules

Understanding the nature of Good means understanding the various kinds of Rules used to try and define the nature of Good. So I have drafted this hierarchy of rules to describe the various moral arguments used to define the nature of Good.

Rule of Nature

An individuals rule based purely on taste and gut reactions, unexamined and followed without awareness of the rule itself.

Rule of Tendency

An individuals rule based purely on matters of taste and gut reactions, but examined and nevertheless accepted by the person who holds the rule.

Rule of Preference

An individuals rule based off a learned yet unexamined idea, which may have been forgotten or simply not put to thought by those who hold the rule.

Rule of Habit

An individuals rule based off a learned and examined idea, though is grounded on rhetorical and fallacious reasoning rather than logic.

Rule of Ideal

An individuals rule based off a learned and examined idea, and is grounded on logic though it itself is a matter of pure reason and has not been grounded in pragmatism.

Rule of Pragmatism

An individuals rule, based of a learned and examined idea, and is grounded on logic though it itself is a matter of utilitarianism.

Rule of Civility

An individuals rule, based of a learned and examined idea, and is grounded on logic though it itself is a matter of legal conformity.

Rule of Ethics

An individuals rule, based of a learned and examined idea, and is grounded on logic though it itself is a matter of moral absolutes.

Rule of Creed

An individuals rule based on a learned and examined idea, and is grounded on logical considerations of all forms of rules to optimize adaptation.

Rule of Call

An individuals rule based on a learned and examined idea, and is grounded on subconscious conditioning to previously logical considerations of all forms of rules to react adaptively with spontaneity and poise.

Rule of Inspiration

An individuals rules based of unlearning all examined ideas, and is grounded on subconscious conditioning to previously logical considerations of all forms of rules to react in anticipation with providence.

Rule of Custom

A social rule based off unexamined ideas, often stemming from the unconscious organization of social behaviors.

Rule of Norm

A social rule based on examined ideas, though themselves still stem from unconscious organization of social behaviors.

Rule of Agreement

A social rule based on examined ideas, which stem from a conscious organization of social order, though this order is itself without formal incentivization.

Rule of Contract

A social rule based on examined ideas, which stem from conscious organization of social order, with formal incentivization though is based on purely pragmatic logic.

Rule of Law

A social rule based on examined ideas, which stem from conscious organization of social order, with formal incentivization and is based on the logic of precedent and court procedure.

Rule of Right

A social rule based based on examined ideas, which stem from conscious organization of social order, with formal incentivization and is based on purely ethical logic.

Rule of Order

A social rule based based on examined ideas, which stem from conscious organization of a social order of those of the same creed, with formal incentivization to optimize adaptation.

Unified Ethical Theory

Understanding the psychological reactions to natural incentives and the process of life that is trying to be sustained by balancing the three core principles of power, diversity and harmony, is the main goal of unified ethical theory.

The Metaphysics of Morality

When considering morality, I must begin with what is: those psychological traits observed not in humanity alone, but in all animal life. Of these we are familiar with: aggression, reproduction and survival. These things drive us, and they form structured societies where we live our day to day life. These are not themselves moral, rather, they are necessary. Rather, morality is how these things come full circle to restricting themselves, preventing fatal excesses and prompting behaviors that extend beyond the natural order of simple animal nature.

We must understand the structure of these basic behavioural imperatives of life and what emotions drive them and so what behaviours naturally follow from them. In regards to aggression, this is used to structure social behaviour, it is the primary source of law, and the main structuring force in moral economies. Reproduction focuses on reciprocal familial relations, arguably humans extend the same reciprocity with non familial members of society, that is, it is assigned abstractly in humans, such as the brotherhood of militaries. Survival is focused on the rational problem solving aspect of the human mind and is most modal, more modal than altruism which stems from expanding the sense of family. This reason can be applied to creative applications of the uses of force, but also the creation of agreements between people that structure society.

These basic impulses lay the foundations for the operations of a society, and if this operation is successful the morals of that society will be

interpreted in such a way that allow for the way of life. Though there is moral philosophies, these are rarely reflected by the societies actual moral behaviors. These philosophies serve an alternative purpose, that of moral fashion. These idealistic moral philosophies exist only to identify with a group of people that form their social in group in a society, and really only exist as a way to identify one group from another. For most people, moral fashion only manifests when one group acts to limit those who are in their out group, for example limiting the reproductive habits of their out groups, limiting the spread of their philosophies and attacking their way of life which is often seen as immoral.

So, there are the basic morals of moral psychology of aggression, reproduction and survival, there are the social ethics that form a societies norms, customs and laws, and there are moral fashion, which usually only exist in the realm of conversation but can result in political action. These must be contrasted with amoral and immoral behaviour. Amoral behavior is just what is not a moral question. These are behaviours that form a purely functional purpose, or that their function is of a much smaller part of someone else's moral reasoning. This is like the actions of a worker in a store, or the actions of a soldier in a war. Though either of these professions might reflect on the morality of choosing to do their job, they are not making moral decisions themselves and so their actions are amoral. Immoral actions are those that seek to benefit the individuals at the expense of others. While aggression can structure a society by limiting the opportunities for aggression, it can also be used in a markedly predatory nature, which in a society built around contract, security and good will is amoral, not because it is intrinsically wrong, but because it goes against the existing moral strategy of the society. It breaks the rules.

Now that I have broken down the basics, moral psychology, socioeconomic morality, moral fashion and amoral and immoral actions, it is necessary to break down some of the implications of some

of these categories of morality. When we look at aggression, the main role of aggression is to deter behaviour. In economic models, it is always better to build economies where people are driven by self interest, not driven by the fear of aggression. For this reason, law seeks to maintain peoples rights, which can be arrived at through reason, and protect an economy built on trust through enforcing contracts. Reproduction and familial altruism can be expanded, and the ultimate expansion of this familial altruism is to see the whole world as family, and protect everyone equally. However, for the sake of convention this has to be tempered with reason, for those who act to exploit us and seek to harm us must be "disowned" from this universal family for the principle to maintain function. Survival requires maintaining a professional culture, and this requires both social and technical skill acquisition. Though these technical and social skills can center on many professions, the one that effects and underpins them all is the political profession. In this regards, there needs to be a system of moral understanding to guide the decision making of policy makers, and so moral anthropology is necessary to inform policy makers, though such knowledge would benefit those of other professions as well, which itself would need to become a matter of moral fashion.

The Logic of Morality

Definition: It is considered reasonable to want to gravitate towards moral strategies that are more beneficial to oneself.

Definition: It is considered moral to do not just what is right for oneself, but to do what is right for the society in which you associate with.

Observation: Evolutionary theory demonstrates that cultural evolution follows the same laws of natural selection that biological traits do.

Observation: Knowledge is a tool we use to navigate life through making intelligent decisions, and what is considered intelligent can be both self serving and serving the greater legacy of a cultures evolution.

Argument: Knowledge serves this purpose best if it's value is demonstrated through the beneficial outcome of its application.

Argument: Scientific knowledge is the highest authority of knowledge we have, since the industry of science is a self correcting system that progressively draws closer to the absolute truth.

Argument: It is reasonable to put ones faith in science due to the virtue of science as the highest authority of knowledge we currently have access to.

Argument: We cannot presume that nature is created by an intelligent God since natural science has not found any evidence of an intelligent process beyond natural processes governed by static laws.

Argument: The chaos and order of the universe cannot be considered as intelligent, since it's uniformity and conformity to its own rules shows no evidence of observation and reaction to those observations.

Argument: Since meaning must be granted by an intelligent designer, the universe cannot be meaningful if it is not itself created by an intelligent designer.

Argument: Meaning then, can only come from intelligent beings, and as we as people are intelligent beings in a meaningless universe, the only meaning that exists is that which we create.

Observation: It is natural for certain moral strategies to be selected for and provide better opportunities for reproductive success than other moral strategies.

Observation: Nowhere in this reasoning is there a reason anyone OUGHT TO partake in any moral strategy, rather the only truth in nature is that survival of the fittest will shape the world regardless of what you do.

Argument: If we are the highest moral authority in our lives, then your choice to be moral is the highest authority there is, a product of your

individuation, a by-product of evolutionary selection, shaped by your lived experience.

Observation: In the information dense word we live in, finding identifying an optimum moral strategy is beyond what most people have the time or skill to accomplish on their own.

Argument: In order to find a source of moral authority other than ourselves, we must look for signs of moral authority that demonstrate the value of their moral theory.

Argument: Since moral strategies are tested over hundred year time scales, it is more reasonable to invest in traditions that are older and well established than it is to invest in new sources of moral authority.

Argument: If a moral theory must be based in science and time tested to be trustworthy, since science is new it is those who are inherently unreasonable that will gravitate to novel moral theories.

Argument: To draw in reasonable people to a new moral paradigm, it is necessary to draw upon existing knowledge and traditions to build credibility to counter the novelty of new moral theories.

Observation: Stoic Philosophy has been demonstrated as an virtuous moral theory with many parallels to scientific thought, particularly psychological and anthropological findings.

Argument: For Stoic Philosophy to be made modern, it must be adjusted to confirm to modern understandings of meaning and morality if it is to be successful in changing a societies moral perspective.

Idealism and Morality

Ethics is the study of moral principles, and the theoretical application of those principles on the regulation of behaviour.

Anthropology is the study of humans and human culture, and how those cultures are shaped by cultural selection and the presence of technological and natural pressures that shapes the selection process.

Morality are ethical behaviours that are selected for over time by a population, which are constrained by both ethics and anthropological selection.

Idealism is taking ethical principles and maximizing them to their optimum regardless of the realities of Anthropological selection and moral culture, reinforced by reason and compassion over selection and culture.

Moral engineering means taking idealistic ethical principles and creating social institutions that can compensate for the inefficiencies of idealistic ethical principles.

Moral Institutions

The individual, the individuals lineage and the moral institutions that structures the behaviour of individuals to organize and benefit their lineage all must benefit from the arrangements between the three for a moral institution to persist and proliferate.

If the nature of the arrangements between an individual, their lineage and the moral institutions they participate in does not benefit all three, the moral institution will be not survive and become extinct.

In this regards, just as individuals and their legacies are shaped through evolutionary processes of natural selection, so their moral institutions are subject to natural selection and will adopt structures that are effective in securing the wellbeing of individuals and their lineages.

Because of this, there is no qualitative determinant beyond the principles of securing wellbeing, persistence and growth that can be

considered moral principles, and what does become moral is determined by the effectiveness of a moral system in persisting and securing the wellbeing of individuals and their lineages.

So, morality as a cultural tool is not subjective, but is a matter of the skillful organization of human agreements, all of which can be subject to change like any other engineered thing, but cannot escape the fundamental principles of cultural evolution.

Since this is the case, a moral system must create a mutually beneficial exchange between the individual, the lineage and the moral institution where resources are exchanged and all three benefit.

These structures not only must motivate individuals to invest in their lineage, but also participate in the industry of maintaining and growing their moral institution so that the individuals continue to invest in their lineage.

If this cannot be done, individuals will concern themselves only with themselves, and will take the spoils of their labours for themselves without any regard to the future and their lineage.

Without moral institutions to establish a meaningful exchange between itself, individuals and their lineages, idealistic individuals will only have the powers of persuasion to secure the needs of the future generations which are limited to the limited powers of an individual.

The Scales of Justice

From the very beginning the ability to kill has come with the nature of life itself. It is inevitable that war would shape our society and socialism would slowly evolve out of the eternal nature of good that is the Paradox of God. Ethics however, are not singularly equipped to deal with every stage of sociological Development and as the Gradicratic solution suggests a possible best case scenario to be tested, so there are right conducts for the worst case scenarios.

At the base of the sociological scale is the concept of being hunted. There is a reality that most do not understand that justifies many criminal behaviors ethically. When there is an imminent fear of death there is also a reality of moral malleability. For example, in the event of being one of the last people on earth, being hunted and facing extinction, ethics decays right down to R type justified behavior and all of a sudden anything that is necessary to survive and reproduce is justified.

Once however one has the capacity to operate as a group in a hostile environment, many of these ethics begin to become reasonable again. The objective becomes to destroy the hunters, overcome them and establish order using all the cunning and deceit that one can muster to elevate to power and generally maintain order through Machiavellian principles.

Once a winning advantage is taken however and one becomes the hunter, the ethics change yet again. With new skill and offensive prowess offers a sense of security. The reproductive rolls of families become possible to establish, and alliances can be made which changes the tone of group relations to succeed or die, to work together to survive. There is still a form of us versus them though in this warlike environment and the power struggle is still greatly material in nature.

After powers collapse however there can be a much different type of social state in power vacuums that is neither a form of civilization or form of war; a state of anarchy. In anarchy the objective is to accumulate enough power to form a government and secure your ethical security over those who rally with you. There is still a viable roll for most of what in society would be considered crime. For example it is unethical to leave your possessions unguarded or yourself unarmed because for the good of society it is ethical to steal and kill if it means the eventual establishment of law and human rights.

Anarchy never lasts long however nd human nature as sociological beings is to gather together and make peace. Outside the ethics of war, Tribal unity becomes the state of things and as propaganda and spiritual warfare sort out the last of the power issues, there is now a state where the ethical systems of spirituality can begin to resolve the previous ethics of war and anarchy.

Civilization presses forward as it has and produces a state of sociological stability where ideals of conservative war ethics find the necessary balance with socialist ideals to make a progressive society. In this state industrial warfare is still a present reality, and the ethics of Gradicracy can slowly take over the power hierarchy until the balanced of power and human rights come to a sustainable level and the realities of mechanization eventually lead to a world that can eventually create a system of bionic evolution.

In regards to these different stages of evolution, the different types of warfare and civilizations there are different standards as to what is criminal, what is progressive a d what is sociological illness that needs to be treated. At the bottom, murder is progressive, in the middle it is criminal and at the top it is a sociological illness. Because of this reality the court systems should change to realize the malleable nature of ethics so that those who need to be healed get healed, those who need to be guided get guided and those who deserve punishment are persecuted and rectified.

A Starting Point for Moral Anthropology

Most people choose their moral code to maintain their position in the community they identify with. Their identity tends to be set by their economic and cultural position in life, which places them in the company of a moral community. They always retain a core set of individual moral positions despite this based on their life experiences, but the majority of their morality is learned through association.

Moral positions themselves are utilitarian, either forming out of self interest, communal cooperative strategies or for maintaining economic norms specific to each industry which exists in a greater economy. These moral arrangements are based on reciprocal contracts between the individual and others, usually selected over multiple generations in such a way that they promote socially acceptable survival strategies.

Morality is not a large factor in many people's lives, most decisions are made on a purely utilitarian basis. Even following laws and customs are not specifically moral behaviours, most of these are just to avoid punishment. However, what moral positions they do hold tend to regard their views of others and how they treat others

---

Meaning, Value, Freedom

Meaning is abstract, approximate and constructed from absurdity.

Value

The control and sovereignty over ones own mind is the source of all agents ability to have control over the powers that sustain them.

Freedom

Agents seek to form systems that protect their agency, and these systems end up serving everyone while preventing undue harm.

Let me expand on the statements:
Meaning
Meaning is abstract, approximate and constructed from absurdity.
Meaning is approximate and constructed from absurdity.

The relative operation of symbols and their values are themselves meaningless, but are given Meaning or definition by their relationship with other symbols.

Meaning is abstract and constructed from absurdity.

The construction of a defining concept of the world is built up through abstraction of symbolic approximation, allowing the mind to form a symbolic conceptual matrix around the sensory umvelt they find themselves in and relate the context of the symbolic representation to their value structure, sense of self, and memory impressions.

Value

The control and sovereignty over ones own mind is the source of all agents ability to have control over the powers that sustain them.

Control over ones own mind enables control over the powers.

By maintaining the ability to strategize, the mind can form the concept necessary to attain its owns means of survival.

Control over ones own mind is a source of an agents abilities

Freedom of thought and the ability to have control over ones own mind is the essence of what gives people their capacity to self design and be their own person.

Freedom

Agents seek to form systems that protect their agency, and these systems end up serving everyone while preventing undue harm.

Agents seek to form systems.

Agents cannot manage the entire world so they build systems in society and economies and law to structure the world around them and make it more predictable.

Agents form systems that protect their agency.

Since the value of agency is the central power a person has in the orientation and operation of themselves, any system they create must protect it above all else.

Agents form systems that serve everyone.

Since an agent has the freedom to put themselves in every imaginable situation, agents must create systems that protect people in general in every imaginable situation.

Agents form systems that prevent undue harm.

Harm to another person's powers or their agency needs to be prevented to maintain the structure of a social system, though some harm is due, such as deterrence, in which case it is only just to harm a person's powers in a way that their agency is protected.

On the Ethos

There is a lot to the ethics of the formation of myths. Evolutionary psychology, abstract symbolic representations, cultural evolution, language systems and communication patterns, ecstatic experiences and revelations, and, of course, the inclusion of historical and traditional narratives and revisions of narratives.

It has many, many layers to break down, and at the end of the day, the economic system itself does tend to factor in heavily into what people think is right or wrong and how they then enshrine that thinking in myth and law.

As for the ethics themselves, it's a nuanced thing. We have a base instinctual template that is reactive and responsive, but we also have an intellectual capacity to rationally analyze and manipulate ethics by creating abstract concepts and strategies to form ethical principles.

As for our instinctual template, it is experientially conditioned by our environment and reacts with our identity complex, and so we exist on a scale of ethics based on our capacity, moral ideas, and situational needs. From this, people come up with a moral decision based on their capacities for reason, and may react rationally or through subconscious reactions.

So it is a very multileveled and layered process. The metaethical theory I use in philosophical analysis is called "structural absurdism," which means that there are definitive structures by which people come to moral decisions, but it is still an absurd process of social and internal natural selection.

Therefore, ethics can be thought of purely as strategy that can range from domination and exploitation upwards to altruism and selfless sacrifice depending on the needs of the individuals and the standards of society.

The Ethicist

The ethicist must deconstruct their own ideals, their own bias, and render their every desire and intention subject to criticism and refutation, their every fear and pain must be readily accepted.

Because the mind is a tapestry of historically justified prejudices and self justifications, and the only way to face those are to study their nature, and challenge everything that brings the mind comfort and security.

When learning about the biocultural evolution of human kind, when exploring the philosophy of the absurd, what can be called "good" in this chemical life is not what is biologically or culturally justified, but those principled that transcend materialistic reasoning.

No, what is good is the deconstruction of self, the elimination of the barrier that sees your life as distinct or somehow more valuable than others, and the refutation of value systems that call into question an entities worth when they do not achieve certain degrees of success.

At its core, the radical compassion and selflessness is the ultimate idealistic good, one that preserved instead of renovates, protects instead of dominates, and the one that would transform themselves entirely so the rest may not have to suffer the pains of renovation.

Yet that is the idealistic good, and the realist knows that pathological powers that surround us, that compose our own bodies, these things all create a world of great dissonance between what is idealistically good, and what is essential.

Insidious and Obscene Evil

As far as evils are concerned they are all equal in nature: results of sociological illness and needing to be cured both on an individual and systemic level. There is a gradient of evil as well though, and that is between insidious evil and obscene evil. The insidious extreme are those that are so distant from those who they harm, that the moral mind has difficulty connecting them to ethics at all. Shoplifting from a dollar store is closer to the insidious nature of evil. Obscene evils are those which are directly involved in the suffering of an individual, such as rape or murder. Between these extremes all evil can be balanced out, and as insidious evils are hard to cure, due to their systemic nature and the education required to cure it being a sociological process, so are obscene evils an extreme of individual degradation where ones mental illness may be so deep that the systems involved are almost completely impartial to the crime itself.

Necessary Evils

As one descends on the scale of ethical psychology, they become exposed to the realities of necessary evils. These are things that are completely unethical for people at the apex to take part in; politicians, spiritual leaders and the rich have no business considering necessary evils so speaking so is just a cover tactic for corrupt practices. For those who are acting in defence of hostilities, those in ethical deprivation and those in poverty, the necessary evils are sacrifices that must be made in order to survive.

Musings on Philosophy

The universe is ordered, and absurd. Such a universe can't create a "should" or an "ought" on its own; it can only determine what "is". To create an "ought" requires intent which is only effective on one's own mind. When acting on itself, the will has the potential to exact Outside the self, intent is rendered down series of actions that are limited by the bodies capacity to act.

An individuals actions do not define what others do, it only shifts their response as they react with their own moral code, based on their own intent. It should be noted, our moral codes are themselves ethical reasons we craft for ourselves, often trying to replicate what is being taught by a moral authority.

In the sense of Intent being trapped within the cage of what we can actually do, we cannot change the world, so we instead rely on doing something that works, adopting moral "norms". Various norms are themselves selected for over time in a population, but this does not make them ethical, it only makes them effective.

So, there is the internal moral world is trapped within itself, and the shared assumptions about how the rest of the interaction will go, that direct moral reasoning based not what they know about moral rules but what they know about people in general. After that point, nothing I do ever actually changes the morality of the person I am interacting with, it just changes how they use their existing morality.

To understand this, I define between morality, which is by my definition alone "The norms that have been selected for in populations or by an individual", and ethics which is "The study of moral reasoning and defining ethical principles with logic".

Ethics is an ideal world of reasoning, much like mathematics; it only exists to describe ideal things, things that either are too perfect to really

exist or are just a mental tool used to illustrate an idea that would otherwise fall apart in the real world.

For instance, harm to what I poses and definitely harm to myself is what I want to avoid. We could then ask, is this the case for other people? How much so for them; what would they give if they were able to act in a way that secures that for them? Is it reasonable to think that others would consider "Do less harm" as a reasonable ethical principle?

If so, you must test the limits of such an idea. "How much of society can do no harm until the society perishes from being harmless?". Is it 10%? 5%? 2? The answer is really dependent on factors like geopolitics, economics and history, which are all too numerous to count.

Instead, people only follow a rule as far as they need to get by. If they are reasonable and estimate correctly they find a way to balance supply and demand without doing harm. However, what is contingent is if the industries are reasonable, and as evidence shows, they are, but not to the benefit of people, but for profit.

Ethical principles like "Do no Harm" obviously do not work in reality, yet moral principles like "killing your firstborn if it is female and you need a son", though part of a cultures moral customs, cannot be called "ethical" because it contradicts itself ethically if you yourself adopt ethical rules like "do no harm" and "a person should have rights after fetal development is to a point where the child feels pain".

Please try and remove your mind from the morality or ethics of the statesmen. Just think about the work it would take defining when a fetus would experience harm, and what logic you would take when asking such a question in the first place. Difficult questions need to be asked like "What is it about having a son first that justifies killing an unwanted daughter and what do I find immoral about it in the first place? Would others agree? Is there a moral bias in the population of people that agree?"

Really there are no "ought" statements that have any validity beyond what we create as individuals existing within an otherwise organic social system. When I say "this is my property, if you take it, I'll break your doors", what I am doing is, as an individual? I'm creating a rule for myself: "If someone takes my property, I will break their doors".

Yet, this does not translate directly to what another person should do. They must think to themselves: "Do I even want what he has, do I value my doors more, what are the odds ill be caught? He might not even break my doors". So, by creating a moral rule for myself, a personal "ought", I create a situational rule of "what is" that others must then rationalize and create their own personal "ought" which directs their behavior.

The significance of this is that there only is what "is" in our shared world, and only as individuals can create ought rules for ourselves, rules which can if administered affectively, cause a change in the social rules around us, especially if others see it as beneficial.

Though our "personal ought" rules can be shaped by coercion or incentives from outside, for the most part we are free to conduct the mind however we see fit, given enough effort to change it. This does, however, take some degree of self awareness, so there are some that would need to be assisted to be brought on a level playing field as everyone else, an issue itself being a moral question.

So, though reproduction does create more people and it is essential for a species survival, not everyone ought to reproduce. In fact, there is no absolute moral rule that anyone needs to reproduce in any absolute sense, just that if no one reproduced, humanity would go extinct.

Some might care deeply about the future of humanity, they might even value it as if it were their own being. If a society decided to go extinct, would such people who value the continuation of humanity be the 7% outlier and would they themselves attempt to reproduce? Those too are ethical questions.

We can for the most part rationalize what "most people" will consider is a moral rule is based on what is socially moral around them.

If the society is healthy and growing it will create norms that benefit the population, and create systems of coercion; systems of law, that try to influence people to do what is in the best interest of a society. If it is healthy and growing free industry, it would have to balance this should be done naturally by good reason, but people would have to be reasonable. This is another gap between ethics and morality: though ethics comes off as more sophisticated, morality has the virtue of survival.

Despite the massive effects of a societies moral culture, this does not create a social "ought" in an ethical sense rather, it defines only what has become entrenched. If progress has taught us one thing it is that changes to a societies moral culture can often be beneficial, and so these moral shifts towards new ethical principles are necessary in the fast changing, highly competitive world we live in.

In my moral philosophy, an individual's self composure, based on their own code of ethics and guided by their own individuation, is the source of all moral authority. In that sense, innate in each of us is a tendency to recognize this moral democracy outside of us, and navigate it with tact.

Individuation and, from what can be simplified from "recognition of a moral democracy" to simply "taste", are the most fundamental aspects of a moral culture after the basic evolutionary facts that restrict our experiences as human beings.

Evolutionary facts, though to us seemingly unrestrictive, do impact us in ways we often fail to notice. Such as being generally star shaped beings, with many senses and multiple ranges of movement, that managed to conduct science and create technology which is beginning to hit a critical state.

Individuation and taste are, of all things, the domain of the Arts. How art shapes a society, or even how tasteless art can lead to a cultures moral demise, is perhaps the more sublime and hard work truths of the ethical philosophies of our day.

Material success is only one form of success in this theory, for those of us who navigate the soul and shape it, and those of us who make ethical distinctions are doing work just as important as familial or economic success.

Yet what accounts good "taste"? For example an industrial society will have different tastes than administrative societies. Does a person's occupation and industrial culture, such as the liberal artist, influence what their tastes are? For example, my musical taste can be thought of as bland and causeless, while others are rich in history and expression and cultural attitudes that mine fail to express.

In this sense there is no "ought" to taste, there is only what is, and there are different uses for music in different niches. Not everyone uses music for the same things. For instance, some people use music for emotional regulation, while others see it as witnessing a beautiful artform. No path is preferred by all people, and so artistic and moral taste differs from place to place and from people to people.

So, if moral philosophy is seen as an art, what ethical framework would most people think it should idealistically be built around? Well, of all things we recognize harm as an action which does an injustice to another's being, and to an extent to all that they attach to themselves may be included if they feel is essential to their way of life.

So, if someone kills the trees, and someone extends themselves to the trees, who are we to destroy it? Well, if we must chop down trees then anyone with a licensee must be able to. How will we distribute the license? To those we deemed competent. At what point does a necessitated harm become unbearable? When it begins to cause pain.

And how should we gauge pain? Prior to when it becomes a discomfort, before it becomes unbearable, and never when it becomes measurable as physical harm to the person themselves. After all, these are the gauges I would set for myself if there had to be some trimming of the forest, or some ploughing of the land.

Look at what we've done with the world what we're doing as a world. Who is giving these people the license to make the world the way it is? We, the people, give them the license, because above all things, we have forgotten the art of philosophy and with it how to make True Art.

We have given the licensing of our minds to the corporations, the schools, the politicians. For the most part, we don't actually know how these things function, we just blindly walk through the parentally approved cogs in a machine hoping that it will give us what we need to survive.

Good industry is still necessary. The global economy works in mysterious ways. How to legislate market forces is something that cannot be done by human minds, because they are bound to differing moral standards.

We can, however, allow ourselves to idealize a little when considering the issue of harm. Harm to ourselves, harm to the planet, and harm to our place in it all. Can we reduce the amount of harm we put into the world? Can we create more opportunities for people to challenge themselves and take on more than they ever thought possible?

The answer, though for most only in a small way, is always yes. As free agents we can do that, even if that is just reducing the amount of harm we cause others. Can we rewrite history as a force of action? Only as a whole, and the whole pivots on the creation of Art, usually at the brink of catastrophe.

CHAPTER 3

Virtue, Grace and Temperance

The Moral Experiment

To what extent we can be just ourselves is limited by our ability to find the good for ourselves and protect our minds from corruption, which will make us discriminatory and selfish in thinking. Since people are not innately capable of moral or epistemologically sound reasoning, and since there are so few individuals who are capable of instructing this or even sparking interest in educating individuals on ethics, there may never be a just society. We may have to maintain the perilous balance by nature, whereby the war of good and evil is fought blindly without direction or understanding of what is going on whatsoever.

Pragmatically, there are few arguments for moral excellence in an absurd world. People have their own ethos and resist change, often considering change as coercion and an undue harm to their integrity. We are not bees or colony animals, so it simply isn't human to sacrifice ourselves wholesale for the greater good and think of that as a viable strategy. No, we have jobs to keep and children to protect—survival is important in the average human ethos.

Yet, without striving for moral excellence, we will often find ourselves slipping. It is not, then, that the effort to be morally absolute is necessary because we need to attain it, but rather because we are incapable of attaining it that we must overshoot our target to get even close to where we need to be to keep the metaphorical social lights on. This is a central tenet to Amoveran ethics, that the will to achieve moral excellence is necessary to be even moderately moral.

Though materially, the stigma, judgment, and loss of opportunity that we will be subject to by our peers is the only real harm we incur from

immoral behavior (as long as it is within reason), the greater harm we inflict upon ourselves is part of a much smaller degradation of the moral culture in society. By failing to be moral ourselves, we contribute to the amorality of society, setting examples for those still learning the norms—those young or new to our society through immigration or education—that such immoral behaviors are permissible.

While many moral behaviors are signals of having a degree of moral conditioning, such as generously tipping or being courteous to a rude cab driver, other behaviors help structure the flow of resources in society, like not walking down the middle of the road or giving to charity. These moral norms are mixed and so seeking a rational limit to what moral norms we take up leads each person in pursuit of their own standard of moral excellence to develop a tempered approach to their morality where they themselves function.

This is not to say everyone must act for the greater good of society. Some may find society itself in need of contention and act flagrantly against it. They may see their disobedience as a virtue and see their disregard for the common good as a statement for the good that the commons ignore in the free and destitute.

Others may consider moral innovation outside of the norms as a moral good, being hyper ethical to the point that they do not fit within society —doing acts of vigilantism or starting secret societies to protect their minds against counterintelligence and the pitfalls of convention—as morally excellent ends they wish to pursue, no matter how it may drag them down in life. Regardless, the moral temperance we all choose—by being ethical in some areas and unethical in others—must be looked at as moral, regardless of what ends we align ourselves with.

Are not the gangsters of this world creating a security apparatus for themselves where the world failed to provide them one? Are not the revolutionaries and mavericks needed to move society forward and show its weaknesses so it can be improved? Are not the law-abiding

citizens and charity drivers necessary in maintaining the security apparatus that keeps society stable so everyone else can run their experiment?

Love it or hate it, everyone's moral experiment is necessary, though the volume of people participating in each experiment is not necessarily skewed to the philosophy of freedom of thought and minimization of harm as I would like. The natural selection of the culture itself, however, will never care what I think. The Logos here on the earth is, after all, the final outcome of the cosmos giving us this large organic chemical reaction that is just sorting itself out through our biotechnological species.

Regardless, the need to have some moral temperance will remain true, no matter what peer group you find yourself in. They will have standards—you may agree or disagree—and those positions and behaviors will have consequences depending on whether you can balance the scales of respect or if you are going to run yourself afoul of everyone you find yourself in contact with.

At the end of the day, it is just as much a matter of having a society to live in as them letting you be a part of it. Though everyone cuts different corners, everyone has their own good and evil they construct for themselves in their minds. What works, works, and what doesn't, doesn't. If it fits the social narrative, it does not mean society will fit the resource distribution of reality and succeed.

This diversification is necessary if we are going to divide the responsibilities of ever-increasing complexity amongst each other. Tolerance and tact are necessary for diversity and delegation when everyone has different ethical codes but exist in a moral democracy. Delegation of responsibility is simply how our society allows for more people to do more things and increase the technological advantage of craft. The more technology develops, the more focused people need to become to manage the complexity, and the less people need to

generalize to survive. There are then both positive and negative incentives to delegate and specialize in a technological society. As a technological species, that is the natural direction of social evolution.

The Good Life

I can attest, there has been no advantage to my way of life besides the anthropological advantage of seeing the world from outside the common bias, and gaining a uniquely selfless mode of operation. Still, many see my mode of operation as distinctly selfish, since I do not act for the material gain of others but the spiritual freedom of those around me, often denying them my influence rather than using it to aid them, allowing specifically for their freedom and self determination without my help. Yet, I have been questioning this, always questioning what I am and what I must do. I have despite this questioning come to believe that at the beginning of trying to live the good life, there is but one simple sentiment: I will be good. But for the inquisitive mind, there is but one question: what is the nature of good?

The entirety of the text up until this point has been focused on the answer to that question, and now I must spend some time speaking to those people who have that first sentiment, the one that will lead them onto the way of Amovera, should they so choose it as a means of mediating between themselves and others toward a reasonable life. We can look at the world and consider all the different ways we might find harmony within it—by trying to beat harmony out of it, like an animal; or trying to carve harmony out of it, like an idealist both of which force against the nature of things in an attempt to make the world the way we think it should be.

And yet, to find harmony in the world, one cannot try to change it directly but instead allow one's existence to influence the direction of those around them. Should they do this with compassion and harmony —much like the flowing water of human intention carves away at the stone of the earth—they can make something new, something a bit less

crude, something a bit more refined. To make the decision to be one of the few who choose to be good may seem idealistic at first glance. But to study the nature of the good and find that it is not idealistic at all—but innately human—is to realize that there is no alienation in the act of trying to do the right thing. It is simply how a person goes about it that differentiates one from another.

It is all too common to imagine somebody who is trying to be a good person as a perfectionist: doing no harm, being a pacifist, constantly helping others, self-sacrificing at every turn—and ultimately achieving nothing of merit. The truth is much more complicated and much more sublime. And so I have toiled these last few weeks trying to find a way to simplify and make evident the nature of what it could mean to live a good life.

I've come to the conclusion that a good life is not one measured by what it achieves—by what kind of life one lives, whether sufferable or pleasurable, successful or impoverished. Rather, a good life is one of good strategy and good state of mind. Whether or not that state of mind results in peace, and whether or not that strategy results in success, are two different things. For it must be enough to simply try to do the right thing.

At its very root, this philosophy of life is harmonious compassion: whereby we gain a nuanced understanding of what drives other human beings to commit horrendous acts, and have compassion regardless—no matter how demonic or evil a person may seem. There is no demonization in the human condition that can justify perpetuating harm simply because others began it, out of their own confusion.

And though the art of diffusing confusion is something that needs to be analyzed in more detail later on, the stance of seeing everybody as simply another confused human being—with a limited ability to understand the world—is necessary. Not just for coexisting with every

other human being on the planet, but also for accepting the limitations of one's own mind as a human being with limited capacity.

Virtues and Praxis

It is necessary to be humble, and it is necessary to see other people through a humble lens so you don't put them up onto a pinnacle of grandeur when you see that they have succeeded where others have failed. Success is often just random chance. After all, for most, to put in maximum effort and try to succeed comes down to whether or not one finds themselves within the resource pool necessary to create great things—whatever those great things may be.

And so we can look at the entirety of the human condition as a random collection of individuals finding themselves in various environments, with various resource opportunities, and coming to various outcomes depending on whether or not they had the information, the resources, and the support needed to actually succeed in life. Amovera is simply a way of obtaining the correct information necessary to maximize one's opportunity possibly by navigating to more lucrative resource corridors where one can try to succeed.

Of the most important information is the prioritization of how one orients the mind. The mind must be oriented in such a way that it is optimized for any opportunity that could arise—and often, opportunities come at the hands of other people who have opportunities themselves. So it is necessary for people to begin in an open state of understanding, compassion, humility, and grace—so that when they come across somebody with opportunity, they can accept it with humility and, if possible, make an arrangement whereby they can partake in the opportunity being presented.

Now we must understand: it is necessary in the social game of gaining opportunities that the information passed between individuals is itself the greatest opportunity. The ability to diffuse conflict and sow peace

and harmony among humans is the best means for one who has nothing to gain something.

And yet, if you truly orient your mind in this manner, it is no longer a means of gaining, but a means of giving. For the reciprocal action of exchange naturally has two parts: reception and admission of some sort of beneficial actions. Ultimately, to invert the mind—to see things as a series of givings—puts one in a unique position whereby they are no longer concerned with what they can get, but what they can give. This may seem alien to some, but in doing the work of weaving peace and harmony, it predisposes the mind to a social solution rather than a mechanical one—using communication and enlightenment rather than systems to correct human behavior.

So the very first step must be conditioning the mind to no longer see the game of life as a taking equation. This can be done through myriad means: namely, simply acting in such a way that you try to help others, that you condition the mind to be selfless, that you accept charity, that you seek to bring others into peace and harmony and care. These actions condition the mind, through sustained effort, to become more selfless.

We must again consider the absurdity of doing this: that the only sense in living a life that is compassionate instead of selfish is that it orients the mind for a particular vocation—one that ultimately supports the flourishing of the individual within a society, through the mutual flourishing of the society in that individual.

And so, as it has been iterated time and again in the philosophy of structural absurdism: it is not necessary for every person in a population to exhibit these behaviors. Rather, it is simply necessary for some in the population to exhibit some of these behaviors, for the population to continue in a stable manner—should the opportunities for the charitable and just continue to benefit the population.

This is not even to say that this will continue to be the way things go for the human species in the future. Depending on how we navigate this next industrial revolution, the human condition might become so alien to what it is now that all of these writings will mean absolutely nothing in the distant future to come.

The way of Amovera only makes sense where traditional human beings still have a place in the world—or where the principles of humanity remain somewhat similar in the iterations to come. But it is imperative to begin at the beginning. And so it is necessary to begin by looking at everything through a lens of compassion, if we are to try to understand the nature of good and evil. That lens of compassion counters the very gross tendencies of the human mind to be exploitative, unjust, harmful, and deceitful—for that is the raw human nature that we evolved in our gross agro-sexual environment over the last 10 million years.

The modern human condition requires temperance and tact, because of this, to achieve balance. For those who seek to have some social vocation—whether as a mediator in a group, bringing people together to achieve more than they could alone, or in a profession where it is necessary to reach into another person's mind and untangle their confusions—it is simply necessary to find temperance through compassionate reconditioning of the mind.

If one authentically intends to achieve such a state of mind, it takes quite a bit of time and quite a bit of active participation in the process laid out before us. If there is any threat to the mind other than its gross human nature, it is the limitation of the mind itself to understand reality. Confusion comes in many forms, but the thing that has been proven to be a predictable remedy for human confusion is science itself. And yet, one does not begin the journey of understanding the human sciences already in a state of understanding the human sciences. This is to say: no child enters science class already knowing the answers on the test. There must be a faith in science to begin with.

Now, faith has become quite a dirty word in science—and yet it is wholly necessary for anyone in any scientific field to operate, given that no one can hold the entirety of human knowledge in their head. Unfortunately, that is the state of every human being on the planet. No one has the time to gain a complete, general understanding of all the sciences—unless they are unfortunate enough to be stuck in a hypothetical state of perpetual learning and no labor, which I hope no one actually lives out.

And that is the point: science is the court to which we must defer for all our knowledge. For it is only through creating a body of opinions, tested through empirical evidence and experiment, that we can arrive at conclusions about the nature of reality that are more than just average opinion. It is therefore necessary to understand the nature of knowledge itself—where knowledge comes from, how it is made, and what distinguishes scientific knowledge from hearsay, myth, legend, philosophy, or mere sentiment.

Epistemological rigor grounds the mind in reality, so it can see reality in a clear and tangible way and come up with clear and tangible solutions.

And if we are going to try to instill rationality and sanity in individuals —which is, of course, the goal of trying to bring clarity and cohesion to others—then we must understand the mind in a scientific way, without delusions. And yet the very scientific mode of coming up with new ideas seems to be just as confused within the scientific community as it is within lay communities. It is hard to find a scientist with a mind playful enough to conceive a truly new scientific idea—and even harder to find one who also has the rigor to formulate a viable experiment to test it.

So rare is genius that our histories show simply a scattering of a few giants of intellectual superiority among the vast sea of observers who contribute only minor insights over their entire lives—insights that

complement the great achievements of the geniuses that came before them. And yet it is not necessary to be able to come up with great scientific ideas. Simply having a basic understanding of science is enough to do the work of clearing confusion and sowing harmony among human beings. No new insights are required at this point to begin the work—all the necessary insights are already here and available to bring people together into more coherent and cohesive communities, so they are not left alone in their struggle to survive in this climate of ever-increasing costs and ever-decreasing opportunities.

A basic, introductory understanding of anthropology, psychology, history, and scientific theory is ultimately enough to lay the groundwork for what the average person actually needs to come to a mutual understanding with another human being—through reason and logic, and not just raw social skill. And so, having faith in science to begin with—setting aside doubt in the process for a time until one truly understands it—is necessary to prevent the confusion of fantastical thinking from overriding one's own mind. Without it, one no longer sees the world clearly and can no longer make rational and sound decisions.

This is not to say that there is no power in magic, and no value in religion. It is simply to say that, to understand the nature of human thought and the structures that exist within it, we must first look at them for what they are: structures in human thought. And since human industry is perhaps the most transformative force on the face of the earth, we must consider the immense power of mythic structures in shaping and forming human behavior. A spoken word, a well-written book, or a viral podcast can reshape the entire agency of a population —and thus reshape the future of the planet. So we must look at clarity of thought and scientific accuracy of thought as the starting point for creating a truly compelling and forceful means of directing human intention.

Now we must consider that the human condition—should one achieve a state of harmonious compassion and faith in science, with clarity of thought and an understanding of evidence as truth, as well as compassion that brings harmony to those around them—is hard work. The amount a person can expect to gain in exchange for such a service cannot be compared to the kinds of services that are highly compensated in society, such as industry or science.

So it is necessary for the compassionate and logical individual to also have grace — to be able to put themselves in the service of others and bite the bullet of getting less out of life than everybody else. It is necessary for people who do such a thing — which others might consider meddlesome or even unnecessary — to see this as a form of self-sacrifice, social self-sacrifice, and be at peace with it. In the same way it is necessary for soldiers to be able to go to war, risk their lives, and possibly die for a cause they do not fully understand, the next stance a mind must master on the way of Amovera is peaceful self-sacrifice.

The desire to succeed can tear at the mind before success is achieved—to such an extent that success becomes impossible. One must act for the sake of acting itself, to generate action from their heart for no other reason than it is what they have chosen to do. They must place their choice to do that thing above whatever success or failure might follow. This is the only mindset that will prevent the mind from tearing itself apart when it cannot succeed. To do so joyfully—with happiness as a byproduct of this state of mind—is the real challenge: not being miserable at the thought of failure, and not giving oneself undue claim to things they think they have earned but do not have.

This third stance is very reminiscent of the Tao, or of Buddhist philosophy, where simply being and living without desire allow the mind to no longer be trapped by its own tendency to suffer from imagined needs. The mind has no needs—it is quite distinct from the body in that way. The mind's only need is to stop seeking. That is

always the most difficult part of finding peace of mind: allowing the mind to act on behalf of the body while itself needing nothing to be happy. A very difficult state to achieve indeed. But it is hard to lead and mediate when one's own mind is in turmoil.

And so it is necessary to develop this dual state of mind, whereby one can constantly seek the next step, the next opportunity, the next thing to do—while the mind itself has no need to actually succeed at any of it. There are many ways of arranging the mind so that it rests while the body is in motion. But after a while—whether you choose to maintain a conscious duality, where the mind rests and the body acts, or whether you simply adopt a playful stance where you absurdly seek the next thing to do out of sheer enjoyment—peaceful self-sacrifice eventually becomes yet another subconscious virtue of the mind.

All in all, these three stances of mind—compassion, clarity, and grace—are what I consider the most necessary aspects of the maturation of the mind in the way of Amovera. Ultimately, it is the maturation of our own mind that is the prerequisite for the maturation of others. I have found, more often than not, that I am in a perfectly contented and, for the most part, relaxed state of mind—and yet others will continuously say, this is what's wrong with you, that is what's wrong with you, or you need to start doing this. Pay no heed.

For if you think about it, there's actually nothing wrong with anyone. Everyone became what they had to become, to be what they had to be, to survive what they had to survive—and they are what they are. In that same sense, whether you are compassionate, reasonable, or enduring does not matter as much as your intent to become the next thing you have to become. The fact that a person chooses to become something better—as an outcome of their actions, as an outcome of encountering new opportunities, be it through reading a new book or talking to a new person—that alone gives people merit. It is the choice to become better that makes a person good.

So how do we achieve a culture that is built on giving instead of taking? Jesus did instruct us to go out and give—give until you have nothing left, and keep giving whatever you are given. Yet it took no more than 50 years for the followers of The Way to exchange their sandals for priestly robes. Over the years, I have replicated this experiment of endless giving, and I can attest that by giving endlessly, I possess an altruism quite alien to my western countrymen. However, the love that began this journey expanded but was initially rooted in love for a woman and her children and, in turn, those they also loved.

Thus, the conditioning of oxytocin in my mind to love all human beings stems from the realization that all people are both the source of the problem and those in need of love, compassion, and healing. I have come to believe that rather than a two-year military service—though necessary in some modern states—we would benefit more from two years of charitable civic service. This could provide a means to condition individuals to feel such deep empathy that they not only love all of humanity but also stop to pick up a caterpillar simply because it feels good—not because it makes logical sense. Human morality is a gut reaction, not a logical theorem. But how could I ensure such a thing is done in a nation when there are so many people who disagree?

Editor's note: 'oxytocin' is shorthand here for learned empathy. The hormone has a real role in bonding, but it is not a simple 'love chemical'.

Confusion and Harmony

To create social environments that are sustaining, someone among the group must do the work of social maintenance. Having the virtues of compassion, clarity and grace is useful, but having a theory of how to resolve human conflict is essential. The first thing to recognize is that all people are trying to do what they think is right. In order to dislodge a mistaken belief—a "wrongful right"—from the mind of an individual, it is necessary to first introduce the idea of disarming confusion.

This theory begins with the simple premise: all people are trying to do what is right. It follows that undue harm is an inevitable and forgivable aspect of all imperfect human interactions. Since human beings are not ideal beings but real, complex beings, their actions cannot be perfect in every instance—nor can they exist in a way that never causes harm. Confusion is inevitable in human interactions, and so harm is inevitable in every human interaction. If we cannot forgive others for being confused, then we ourselves are living in a state of confusion that prevents any harmony from occurring at all.

The beginning of diffusing discord and disharmony in human interactions is to start by identifying who is confused about what—beginning with yourself, the listener or mediator. It is necessary for a mediator to gain a clear and honest understanding of the confusion and conflict being presented. To build trust and give others the tools to diffuse confusion, you must first admit your own confusion when faced with understanding another person's problem. For example, if there is an argument between two individuals and one of them comes to you for help, and you realize you misunderstood the nature of their conflict, it is best to say: "Ah, sorry, I was confused about that. Let's discuss more deeply so I can understand clearly and help you resolve it."

Next, you must check whether either (or both) parties are confused by getting both sides of the story. Usually, both sides are confused about something. By encouraging each party to acknowledge the good intentions of the other, and to forgive the confusion, you set the stage for reciprocal forgiveness. You don't need to use formal terminology to describe this process. You can simply say: "These were their intentions, this was the outcome they hoped for, this is why it didn't work, and this is why they're still a good person." Highlighting everyone's best intentions removes the "conflict of interests" narrative. No longer are there two parties acting against each other, but two individuals trying to make something work. By reframing the narrative from a conflict-

driven story to a cooperative one, you open the door for more constructive and cooperative discussions to find solutions.

At the heart of this is maintaining the paradigm that no one is at fault, no one is incomplete, no one is broken. People are what they are. This fundamental principle allows negotiations to proceed and resolve quickly—because the moment a solution tries to infringe on another person's agency or demands they change, hostility begins to enter the negotiation. Finally, it is necessary to understand when negotiation is even required—and when the more enlightened party can simply defer or yield. Not every argument needs to be resolved through dialogue. More than half the time, an argument is over something so minimal that the enlightened party can simply agree or let it be—if there is no real consequence to doing so.

In any long-term relationship—whether romantic or civil—at least one party must play the role of the non-combative, yielding person most of the time, unless there is a significant consequence at stake. The more people you can encourage to take up this role of yielding on minor concerns, the less conflict there will be in the collective, and the greater the overall cohesion. And so, allowing people to be what they are—understanding that no one intends to do harm—and seeking to diffuse confusion first in yourself, then in the person you are speaking to, and finally in the person they have a grievance with, allows most arguments to be resolved through a mutual recognition of unfortunate misunderstandings.

Lastly, avoiding unnecessary conflict and teaching people to yield to unreasonable yet minor concerns prevents micromanaging and prevents small grievances from accumulating over time. At the end of the day, most problems people create in their minds are just large emotions being applied to small problems. Sometimes it's better to let them process that large emotion by seeing even a small change in someone else, rather than trying to entirely correct their confusion. Because again, at the end of the day—people are what they are.

This is a simple philosophy of coexistence, but the application to the material management of wealth and order also needs to be considered, though that is something that is cut from a completely different way of thinking, much closer to natural law and evolutionary insights. There is no more surefire way to drive oneself into the ground than to feel obligated to achieve more than one possibly can. The opportunity lies in having a thrifty way of thinking — being willing to suffer in the short term to achieve greater things in the long term. This is a hallmark of societies that can withstand hardship and come out on top in the end.

Should one gather a group of individuals who are willing to co-invest in reducing the costs of life within some form of community, it becomes necessary for them to make intelligent financial, economic, and opportunistic decisions—maximizing the resources they can acquire and minimizing the resources it takes to maintain their surplus. In the same way it is necessary to bite the bullet and take on the role of being the good person in a group of individuals of average concern, it is equally necessary for the entire group to see the virtue of thrift. In this regard, it is better to lead by demonstration, for the group itself will inevitably have a diverse set of ideas about how to manage resources.

Whether or not they choose to spend large amounts of money, time, and opportunity on acquiring the kinds of assets society deems necessary to maintain the status quo is up to them. But one will find it is just as attractive to have a slight layer of fat under your skin — resilience — as it is to have money in the bank. Even if that means owning fewer material possessions, it allows you to survive situations where you face a famine of opportunities and must endure lean times.

Building a cooperative of individuals is simply a viable strategy — and doing so around a very basic ethical principle is beneficial because it aids in the arrangement of agreements within the group. It is wise to establish a simple contract or charter outlining how individuals will

operate within the collective, regulating behavior in such a way that the stability and long-term success of the cooperative are guaranteed, as long as resource distribution is maintained. To what extent resources are shared among individuals remains dynamic and subject to circumstances. But the fact remains: when individuals have a financial incentive to reduce overhead and increase income, the group as a whole benefits from the efficiency that comes with living a life of thrift.

Deep Forest Priority

Do things in order.
Take what is yours to take.
Know the precedent of your work.
Work in the council of others.
Define yourself before you attempt to understand another.

Leave your philosophy at the door when entering another's place of study.

Do not mix traditions when distilling knowledge.
Don't speak when it is not time to speak.
Do not waste time that is not yours to make.
Bring harmony to all you can.

Appreciating Pain

Pain like pleasure is an incentive to right behavior. When pain is felt it is often a warning of wrong behavior, and just as we should take the opportunity of criticism as a positive opportunity to self rediscovery and disproving, so should we look at pain in the same light ad condition our minds not to just be receptive and reactive to it, but appreciate it for the internal teaching mechanisms that it is.

Pain and pleasures are both incentives towards action. Completely avoiding pain, and completely seeking pleasure both have delusional

and destructive aspects to the ethical mind. There is however, a means of appreciating pain for what it is, a warning, and being thankfully for its existence mindfully without developing masochism. This is a recognition of the lesson of pain, and conditioning oneself to be aware of if using it to its fullest potential.

Internal Love

So many times negativity seeps into the mind. Things like self criticism and doubt make a person too hard on themselves, cycling emotions that result in hidden suffering. You can counter this by speaking to your inner self every time you catch yourself thinking negatively. Saying "you can do this", " I love you", "its going to be OK", " you did a good job", "keep trying" and "reset, new start" to yourself can be vital when you have no one to say those things to you.

Mindfulness meditation helps being conscious enough to catch yourself, and eventually the light will outweigh the darkness, but it's about balance. You must realize that negative thoughts are just as necessary as positive ones. If you do something that is generally wrong, soothing your mind can be the road to delusion and loss of self worth, understanding and respect.

This is the cure for self criticism and the insidious effect of the mind. It can be reinforced by any spiritual tool that grants willpower, though saying positive things to oneself often becomes pleasurable on its own and hence is why I warn against delusion that can come from over doing this practice. Ultimately that is all there is to correcting suffering caused by self criticism and there is nothing more that is needed to be said to e extend this paper.

A Habitable Mind

The ethics for creating a habitable mind are different from the ethics of creating a habitable world. Though the ethics of creating a habitable

mind are always the responsibility of an individual,the ethics of making a habitable world are the responsibility of a society.

Before we can worry about the ethics of society,we must concern ourselves with the ethics of having a habitable mind. A habitable mind requires being content with things as they are. A habitable world requires success, but not necessarily desire for success. There is enough natural incentives for success for society to provide a habitable environment. There are few incentives to develop a habitable mind.

For the mind, accepting being alive as enough is a useful mental strategy.

Accepting imperfection as inevitable of all real things and perfection only existing in the ideal is also useful.

Accepting that the world cannot be changed by individuals and rather moves individuals is also useful.

There really isn't anything else that is needed to be content and form a habitable mind free of unnecessary stress.

However making good decisions becomes the only work needed to partake in society. Making the best decisions we can, involving ourselves in communities of dignity and success and trying to empower ourselves is what is reasonable, but success is not entirely necessary.

A Single-Word Philosophy

This is not at all related to my project, but I have come to the conclusion that it is possible to have a one word philosophy. Since philosophies can be of great complexity or can be broken down to a few principles or statements, I took a philosophical model and broke it down until I was left with one word: "Exist".

I think "Exist" might be the most concise and effective philosophy, especially as a philosophy of mind it satisfies the need to relieve anxiety with simplicity, and also as a moral philosophy since it is the predicate to all of the objectives of agency.

What is the meaning of life? Exist.
How can I know what is real? Exist.
Is there a God? Exist.

It may be a nothing more than an absurdist philosophical prank but I enjoy it!

[Edit, this did become part of the philosophy, in fact I have realized it is axiomatic]

Failing with Grace

There is no ethical principle as looked up to yet tragically understood as that of failing with grace. The detachment from ones egotistical assumption that people will judge a person as insufficient or themselves doing so upon failure and feeling defeat must be followed by the realization that the lessons incurred from failure, and the need to try and achieve something without the need of succeeding as a standing army does, has a utility that is greater then the suffering of failure. Realising this and living it incurs the respect of not only individuals witnessing such behavior but that of oneself.

Paragonic Philosophical Duality

It's too easy to confuse the philosophical needs of the mind with the praxiological needs of labour, and too easy to think that the mind must always serve the body or the body must always serve the mind.

The mind needs time spent in simplicity, it needs to accept that continued existence itself is enough, it needs to sit in silence and enjoy the simple sensation of being from time to time.

But the body needs strategy and work from the mind, technical knowledge and deep understanding. It demands categorization, exact definitions and a concept of the world that is as detailed and effective as possible.

So the praxeology needed for the bodies labors and the paradigm it produces cannot exist at the same time as the the philosophical paradigm the mind needs to maintain its mental wellbeing. I think this is why we naturally have mental modes where we spend time in this state or that and are wired to seek states of rest.

When contemplating the geopolitical implications of the ethical deployment of technologies, I stress out and generate a million scenarios as my mind reels with a million possible futures. The extremity of my anxiety drives my innovation.

But I have learned that I need to spend more time than not in a state of almost childish relaxation to keep up those marathons of creative rationality, keeping my mind distracted by comedy or play or meditation and living the majority of my life in the mindset that it is simply good to live.

I see people getting addicted to one or the other, and even getting tribal about it as if you either need a work ethic or peace of mind forever and always. Why is it so difficult to accept that the world is absurd yet we create structure to do work and don't need to live in that structure every waking second for it to be there the next time we need it?

The runner who runs themselves to death will never win another race, nor could a person who only stretches and prepares to run ever be called a runner!

Temperance over Grace

Harmony is not achieved by grace, grace is often just the missing ingredient. It takes both power and grace to sustain in the right

proportions. And so temperance is a higher virtue than grace or freedom in order to maintain harmony.

Lay Person's Peace

There is only so much peace I will allow myself to have, only so much discipline as I will seek. True enlightenment, the unbreakable and perfect inner peace that takes years of discipline after realization of truth and meditation on it, is for spiritual masters who can find utility in it. Lay persons peace is not easy to attain by any means, realizing principles and gaining intrinsic knowledge of life and detachment from self is necessary, but ultimately once inner peace is achieved it can be lost, it can be put aside for times of dedication or need for instinctual behavior. The utilities of inner peace are not universal, though lay persons peace can once achieved, result in a small enlightenment that results in detachment from suffering and the state of real appreciation of the world.

The Best Teacher

The best teacher is a person who holds every virtue inside but shows their student every vice through demonstration, yet lives the most honorable life in every other way to be a person who deserves respect.

They then speak of how to attain every virtue without mentioning them and ridicule the student for not having them, pointing out their every flaw, hitting them with a cane and building up the fire of rebellion in their student.

In the fires of wishing to overcome their teacher who apparently has no virtue, the student will be driven into the work of philosophy and alchemy in a desperate attempt to earn their teacher's respect and prove to them they are not the fool the teacher claims them to be.

Slowly as the mind grows more capable, the teacher adds the necessary means of finding truth and wisdom into the crucible of the student's soul, but in ridicule and criticism and often simple anger and periodic rejection of respect itself, the student's mind purifies itself to the highest degree.

In the end, the student, if wise, will realize the trick the teacher has played on them, they will all of a sudden realize that though they cannot be certain if the teacher actually doubted the students mind, this was the only way they could have learned these virtues so quickly and with such self-motivation.

And many, poetically, never speak of this with their teacher, to nurse the last drops of wisdom from them as the dusk of their life sets in, and lay an orchid on their teacher's grave and thank them deeply for the wisdom of their ridicule without which they would never have found reason, grace, and poise.

Trickery and Teaching

Some lessons the student does not wish to learn. Sometimes necessary lessons that help correct imbalances in their identity for goals that they have asked to be helped to achieve must be approached tactfully. By teaching the principles in reverse, usually presenting bits and piece s of it, conditioning them through practice and slowly allowing the student to see the end result themselves in a way they believe they discovered it, yet usually realize the teachers cunning in selection of teaching methods, can sometimes be the best means at helping a student achieve their goals.

Standards

All can be forgiven if you understand people. All can be seen as confusion, all can be though of as an involuntary sickness.

Yet for the benefit of the world we need to be hard on each other. We need to set standards and be aggressive in upholding those standards.

Our minds do not differentiate between ourselves and others, if we forgive others we will forgive ourselves, and we will not hold ourselves to the standard that benefits ourselves.

Ironically, understanding the truth, that all can be forgiven, is counter productive to the work of holding ourselves to the highest standard, the world needs blind aggression, so we will not tolerate unnecessary harm and incompetence.

The Conundrum of Being

If you came across a person identical to yourself, and had to spend any extended period of time around them, and if you found their company repulsive, then you can imagine that the world probably finds you repulsive and acts accordingly. What goes without saying is that in a world of power makes right, we must not underestimate the power of human sensibility.

Forgiving Disrespect

One of the hardest realities to face when it comes to peoples right to be fools, is that they will disrespect you and others, but knowing the place of such ignorance in the world, its utilities as bot creating benevolence in others when they are disrespected or bullied, as well as allowing for strange personalities with strange personal biases to occurs reminds us that there is just as much utility in the suffering of mankind as there is in the pleasures of life and so in a way that realizes that they too are necessary, can learn to forgive them and incur no emotional or psychological harm nor perpetuate the hostility with undue action.

On Grace

This world is sick, because in our search for expertise and industry we forgot the necessity of grace. We forgot that for a society to learn we must have patience, empathy and understanding. We need to remember that no one acts with malice unless they are confused about the nature of the human condition, that anger only is justified when we assume that another's ignorance is willing or irreparable.

The only solution is to practice a life filled with grace, to make it our first priority, a principle more important than expertise or industry. To do this, it must be kept at the forefront of our minds, enshrined in ritual and meditated on as if it were a religion of its own. We must learn to conduct ourselves in a manner that is kind to those around us, and do things that serve the greater good. We must learn to speak to each other with respect and rather than trying to prove our point as infallible, seek out the confusion in ourselves and our peers so that it can be resolved.

If there is anything that needs to be universal, it would be this idea that grace is essential to the continuation of life on this planet. Many things have already been written, on the nature of the world, on the evolution of morality, on the nature of law and state, but so little had been written on grace. For my meditation I will write, and perhaps I will learn to apply this philosophy from my teens that I forgot in my adulthood, so that my character can improve and so too may the lives of those around me.

Compassionate Paragonism

People learn best through demonstration. Most people suffer due to their misunderstandings of people. Compassion, however, tends to be the only thing people need to find a way to be brought back to happiness in their understanding of people. For the most part, simply demonstrating how to think of the suffering of the person to the person

who is suffering because of the other person, is often all that needs to be done to show them a higher way of thinking of the problem.

Suffering as Confusion

If one is confused on the matter that it is never ones fault to be confused, or that its never another's fault for another to be confused on the same matter, then one needs to understand that it is not a fault, but a sickness to be confused. The solution to this sickness is to have empathy towards the misunderstanding and try and understand the confusion of the other with empathy, and the confusion of oneself with sympathy in order to remove the confusion.

People are confused on matters of ownership, on identity and on the issues of respect that come from these realities. Understanding ones right over their identity and it's progress as well as the possessions they have is a core elements in re establishing any respect unduly caused from confusion. So when one has a conflict with another, try and find the confusion first of oneself in the matter of what one may be confused about. Then try and understand the confusion of the other and help them to see their confusion while using your understanding of your own confusion as a means of expressing both sympathy and humility.

All anger, sadness and suffering in general comes from the inability to rid oneself of confusion, and the inability to have empathy for others confusion. Because of this all anger sadness and suffering is the result of unresolved confusions and the need to cope either through the reconditioning of sadness, or the chaotic e expression of anger which allows the mind to convince itself that the problem has been forgotten.

In reality however, understanding that is generally not a fault to be confused in the first place allows one to realize that even confusion is a part of this world and it is something that does not entirely need to be solved for, though the solution for all conflict is realized in this same

notion. This truly is the foundation of inner peace is living this knowledge to its fullest until eventually the mind collapses under the weight of this reality and accepts it, resting at peace. This is why it is called enlightenment, because one is no longer confused or subject to the suffering of confusion.

Sympathy for Fools

There is nothing wrong with not knowing. There is nothing wrong with not knowing that there is nothing wrong with not knowing. This is because, we have limited minds, and though confused and frustrated at the confusion, often have good intentions being human beings and generally once the truth is realised, knowing results in good behaviors. There is nothing wrong with being conditioned negatively either so even being presented truth one still has been trained to act and think wrongly. This too can be healed.

This reality often can unravel social tensions quite quickly if you can teach even one side in learning and understanding this so they can understand and teach others as well. Usually a teacher at least is conditioned and feels the truth, but truly enlightened teachers are preferable because they can be considered as unbiased and incorruptible as a teacher may become.

The Necessity of Good Intent

To protect ourselves from the threat of others and their use of force we ourselves must maintain the capacity to destroy as a deterrent. Yet, the destruction of others can inadvertently lead to our own destruction, be it through the use of force or the implementation of industry needed to maintain that capacity.

So, to maintain the capacity to destroy we must also maintain a level of restraint and care. This means we need to protect the world not just

from our destructive capacities, but from being exploited and out competed by our industry.

In the work of wardenship we cannot truly protect others without seeing through their eyes, feeling their pain, caring for them as they care for themselves. So compassion is a necessity of collective survival, in order to protect the world we live in and create industry that supports life instead of destroying it.

Yet, compassion motivated from self preservation is not effective enough. True compassion, even if it is necessitated by utility must be for its own sake if it is to be truly effective. Compassion motivated out of self preservation fails to capture the detail of another's suffering, and so fails to truly compensate them for their losses.

It's hard to teach something that must be felt. It's hard to teach something so far removed from the must be taught, and for it to be taught some of us must make a business that inspires us to teach and rewards us for those lessons.

Paragons and Nemeses

Throughout human history we have lead and followed by example. Human kind also has a habit of over exaggerating important truths. Because of these two natures, the tendency to make satisfying paragons or nemesis out of people is a psychologically effective way of inspiring action in people. I know many great men are made out to be perfect in many ways, and many others evil in horrific detail, when in reality these people were no different than any of us but simply had the tools to do a job and happened to be in the place where it needed to be done at the time it needed to be done.

Fluid Materialism

Nostalgic items or security items often cause people to attach tho the idea or function of an item the same way they do people. This is one of the leading reasons for Animisms being the traditional religious paradigms among people is this tendency to emotionally react to everything the same way as we do people.

We are however, cunning creatures and though loss of wealth is a reality that is hard to face, human cunning is often enough to replace any loss of wealth ten fold. This deconstruction of materialism and the creation of a fluid materialism where the retention of wealth in a dynamic system becomes more important then the keeping of items in a static system and is a more intrinsic way of thinking of the use of power and detachment from material attachment.

Family Security and Bullies

Something about suffering forces the mind to find spiritual solutions to problems. When I was young I was bullied constantly and resulted in having a deep understanding of the human condition and realized ultimately compassion for what those kids who bullied me when finding out what they were going through. I realized that bullying happens, but the treatment of such behavior is teaching the victim coping methods and understanding, while trying to treat the sociological illnesses of the families of the bully. Ultimately, there is a need to intervene in families who cause great suffering to their children, but it is not by tearing the family apart, but by considering the criminal illness of neglect in the parents as a result of sociological illnesses and curing those illnesses.

Participation and Repentance

Every society has its evils, it has brutal agricultural practices, corrupt political and corporate systems, abuses of authority and sociological illnesses of all kinds. For those who wish to support a family, make change in the world or generally be active in a safe community, participation still is an ethical level for most people. Being conscious of the unethicallities and Practicing repenting behaviors that ultimately will inspire or outright cause change in the systems we participate in is sometimes the only means by which we can reasonably maintain ethical consistency.

CHAPTER 4

The Self

An Agent-Based Definition of Self

In a sense you are drawing near to the atomist idea of the self, that regardless of the qualities of the mind, body, soul relationship we are ultimately a thing, and the things qualities can be broken down to atoms or scaled up to the whole unit, but the definition of a self is everything involved in sustaining the unit from atom to total form.

My take on what you are saying is yes, our "self" is very much a slave to the body and it's needs regardless of how you define the self, just as the decision making parts of our brains are slaves to the very value systems and preferences of the persona which are formed through individuation and cultural osmosis.

Yes, if the world truly is absurd, then we can think of every part of the mind, both those gained through cultural learning and evolutionary biology as tethers to the decision making process that limit its function.

So what we define as "us" can, again, not only be a matter of preference, or what you "feel" is right based on your mood, but what culturally gets defined as "us" by the community maintaining the linguistic semantics we use to make said definitions.

As if it is not enough that there are cultural, biological and semantic factors in making every definition, not just the definition of "self", there are fields of thought that can extend farther than western limitations of the mind body framework of defining ourselves as well if you want to get truly baffled by how abstract the definition of self can be.

If you want to consider the laws of physics themselves as a restraint on the mind, then the laws of physics themselves end up being the

fundamental factor of our perception of the "self" in the same way our body and mind does in an atomist perspective.

So some people consider not just physical things that define us, but the very principles of the universe as part of "the self". For those that study theology and the "logos" doctrine, this is a compelling case for mystics to identify their "self" as "part of God", which is more in the realm of abstract principles than physical phenomenon.

Some people even challenge spacial and temporal borders that we would normally associate with the body mind. Though our perception may be limited to our individual experience, our connection to the continuum of life makes our individuality a fragment of a greater whole and so many on the far left identify as a part of the ecosystem, which is basically Gaian philosophy.

That may sound ridiculous but if you consider the conundrum of the human egg, a female human is three potential generations in one person if she is pregnant with a daughter herself, so the notion of "self" easily can be broken down further if you start to play fast and loose with the metaphysics of other biological definitions.

So when you start playing with metaphysics within an absurdist philosophy, you quickly realize what definition of "self" is the definition that survives in a culture, and results in the most transmittable scientific paradigm that also yields predictable and utiliseable results. That's why I often fall back to the "brain surgeon" argument about how we "ought to" define the "self".

If we give too general an answer, then the brain surgeon might result in a essentially lobotomised patient that can now resist the urge to eat until their stomach explodes and call it a success.

But the goal is to define the self in such a way that when it is linked to the notion of rights and so legally is supposed to be protected, so that

when any alterations to the self are being preformed the agent itself is protected from losing its agency.

And it should also be noted that, if we are looking to form metaphysics on the values that we ourselves create, like what is a human right, and what is right or wrong, so we can de identify "what needs to be done" so in series we can shape our metaphysics around producing results in medicine, technology and science, then in turn we are working in a sea of abstract and arbitrary definitions that we have been nurturing over hundreds of years of philosophy and science into what it is today.

As a final note, we could JRR Tolkien a whole philosophy of language, start with a whole new language and value system, build up philosophy from the ground up to reflect a purely scientific reality and optimize an ethical system based on some philosophically defined mathematical good, but that's not how human language and philosophy works.

Since we evolve in what is called a "biocultural evolution" we have what is called "biosemiotic meaning" as well, as in there are certain base concepts that are native to human cognition that we use at the root of our philosophy. That's a fascinating topic, and perhaps gets down to the very core role of the limiting factors that you brought up about the self being a slave to the mind and body.

So, essentially it is because we are limited by biosemiotic meaning that our abstract definitions are built to fit within the ethics of what is scientifically accurate and what is ethically pragmatic. I don't think human definitions can be built outside of the human epistemological and ethical framework without also simultaneously changing human society itself as part of the process.

In short, yes, everyone who has proposed a scientifically informed theory of self on this thread has a legitimate claim to having a definition that meets the requirement of satisfying human epistemology since it fits within the scientific paradigm.

However, I will maintain that as an ethicist, how we define this must also result in a pragmatic outcome for the field of bioethics as well, at which point I am looking at an agent based definition of self with many "tethers" that define the personality that encases and determines the function of the self.

It just so happens that the region of the brain most associated with agency happens to be the frontal cortex, so when deciding which parts of the brain to cut out or modify through some transhumanist augmentation, I would argue an agent based definition of self is practical and would also result in a beneficial outcome in the majority of cases.

The Autopoietic Process in Three Stages

Subconscious relaxation and observation

- Allow yourself to do what comes naturally within reason, and allow your thoughts to go where they naturally go. Understand the natural human instincts involved, and do not fight against them, instead softly allow them to be and learn to be at one with yourself with grace.

Ego reconstruction and principle redefinition

- Taking what is learned from subconscious relaxation define the principles of society and social progress. Understand that the mind will think things based on instinct that are not in line with the current state of social moral advancement and create principles to counteract these processes. Find emotional drivers that counter these base instincts to build principles off of, and focus making a character that abides by these rules.

Super ego behaviour modification

- Taking the most critical thought process first, develop an auto hypnotic script incorporating CBT principles to focus the mind on correcting the most crippling thought processes. Address them with increased focus, not changing the script and keeping it consistent so the mind can learn the new thought pattern and transfer it into subconscious behaviours. Once it becomes automatic, move onto the next most critically crippling thought process.

Choice, Identity and Authority

When people begin learning right from wrong, they have three things, their new logic, their genetic tendencies to react to certain things in a particular emotional way, and the authority of their parents dually informed by their instinctual bond with them and the logic of needing protection. This begins immediately, and as a person grows, their understanding of what is a safe source of authority develop as their identity changes. Based on their identity, their critical ability to choose and their former understanding of authority a person will choose based on those three factors further sources of authority to which they then form their own biases off of.

Refining ones identity and self understanding, essentially undoing these former biases that got us to the point of self realization is often a crucial stage in attaining the ability to find real sources of wisdom, which is important in scientific work, particularly those regarding understanding the human mind and the nature of authority itself.

Ego and Success

The nature of success often over stimulates our reward centers. It drives us on in our behaviors, even if it exceeds the natural realm of reason and pushes us to great power. This ego also can prevent us from

operating at full efficiency, instead of continuing to critique oneself, and learn, a mind can in achieving an ego of success often gets hooked on feeling right rather than being right. This can stop the process of attunement in its tracks, and often results in the stagnation of the creative process that leads to further innovation. Though at the point of success a personal protocol has often formed that provides a reasonable level of sustainable growth, exponential growth can only be achieved if there is constant innovation, attunement, and thus the cancelation and reconditioning of the ego from ones working mind.

Identity Expansion

The mental exercise of what we are leads logically that we are just as dependant on the operations of the world and the operations of others as we are our own bodies. We however cannot afford on the most part to care for the whole world, so we scale this picture back as much as we see fitting to account for how much of the world we feel safe supporting and identifying with. A spiritualist relates to the world, a patriot to his country, a county man to his city or town, a family man to his friends and family, a selfish man to himself and a deprived man only to his pleasures.

Due to the phenomena that is the identity crisis most people have, they only ever make this decision once, though, some truly spiritual people find the adaptability to see that the scales of ethics each one relates to are ultimately all means of acting for the world as a whole regardless of how enlightened or depraved they may seem. This gives people the capacity to not only be selfless in action, but adaptable as well and thus effective.

CHAPTER 5

Knowing and Reasoning

Bias and Reason

In the old days, I was obsessed with epistemology. The way we perceived the world was absolutely necessary in my mind for making sane and rational decisions. To overcome the paradox of self-created mentalities, it seemed necessary to ground myself in the most empirical sciences I could find and know very clearly how to interpret them and how they interpreted reality. The need for evidence and clarity would continue to be one of the most fundamental aspects of my studies, second only to compassion and harmony. I was looking for the true reason for good, the nature of right and wrong, and became engrossed in my experimental ethics, being at times ultra-ethical and other times, well, rather untoward and unbound.

Both modes of operation taught me valuable lessons about the nature of ethics, and while I saw it as a mode of expression, I cannot say that messing around with the paradox was a casualty-free affair. At least there were not any mortal losses. However, I came to have a very intimate understanding of all the different ways a mind operates. What is the creative mode, what is the kenostatic mode, what is the analytic mode, what is the flow state? These all needed to have a subjective objective definition, one that let me break down the nature of how my mind was working into terms I could understand, and so there were a lot of terms created and a lot of old words recycled to make way for new intended meanings.

This metaphysical reassembly of my own language was part of how I managed to create what I idealistically called an "objective subjective bridge" where listening to testimonials and learning about neuroscience I was more and more convinced that I knew what parts of

my brain were doing what when I thought in certain ways. This led me to have a deeper understanding of the learning and individuation process, much like Carl Jung's active imagination experiments mine took a turn into the abstract and delirious. But nevertheless, when it comes to experimental epistemology and ethics, I feel like I have broken ground in a field that probably doesn't exist in the minds of the average philosopher.

So, from the onset I need to start with discussing how we learn an opinion before I get into what we end up forming as moral opinions, and how we can scale that up into working systems. It all begins with understanding. I found that between losing focus and trying hard to grasp an idea is this wandering state of kenostatic observation. It is as if the mind is just taking in the shape and form of a concept and noting it, not trying to interpret it or grasp it. It's kind of like when someone is teaching you to put together a machine for the first time when you don't know what the machine is or what it does. Instead of grasping it right off the bat, you just watch the parts get put together until the final product takes shape and its operation becomes more evident.

This is the scientific stance on learning. No one should assume that because we see the machine and its shape, or even if we have been trained in its operation or even its engineering, that that leads to truly understanding how it works. To do this you would have to explain away some of the fundamentals that science hasn't gotten down to yet, such as how time works, how things exist, and why there is not just perfect, all-defying nonexistence.

So, rather than say we truly know something, we instead arrive at a stance where we only define what we have sufficient understanding to do with that knowledge. For example, you may not know how the lawnmower sustains itself in space and time, but that does not matter, because the only knowledge you need about the lawnmower is the knowledge it takes to mow the lawn.

Though science inevitably strives to find absolute knowledge about how the universe works, to even perform an experiment, scientists need sufficient knowledge to run those experiments and come up with hypotheses. Thus, absolute knowledge and sufficient knowledge are very different things, and most people are only concerned with or speak of sufficient knowledge.

Now, as people, whether we arrive at understanding through having a scientific stance or through the slow accumulation of simple "sufficient facts" learned through experience, we come to know very little about specific things. Unlike in science, for a fact to be sufficient, it does not matter where the idea comes from, if it does the job. You might think that you work for the king managing the kingdom's finances, but if you are just an accountant, the general result of you doing the bookkeeping is enough to make that knowledge sufficient for the task. Delusion does not always predispose dysfunction, and we are all deluded to a certain extent.

To think you are doing something and are actually doing something else may not be the common norm of how things happen; rather, most people's understandings are built on reasonable and sufficient knowledge. However, it does not take much to see where it becomes problematic if even a few truly incorrect ideas about the world might prevent a person from making progress in large parts of their lives.

While there is work being done in CBT to correct such core misconceptions and better a person, these efforts often work within much larger patterns of misconceptions that are less harmful but are still inhibiting in some way. The goal of philosophy, then, is to rid a person of these misconceptions, at least that is the goal of moral philosophy. Having good metaphysics, being competent in epistemology, and forming sound moral arrangements in life, though all human-centric, are the foundations of what philosophical work hopes to achieve.

And yet, it took me ten years to wander around and figure out what the product of doing philosophy would look like. Somewhere during this process of trying to figure out how to apply philosophy to my goal of unlocking human potential, I stopped grasping and started putting together the puzzle. I only began doing that when I actually had enough pieces to see a glimpse of a picture starting to form.

Archetypal Symbology

Mythic archetypes, as I understand them, are agreed-upon representations of ideas that generally embody moral principles within a macro-symbolic archetype. In other words, a myth is a collection of symbols—a macro-symbol—that outlines, defines, and conveys a moral framework. Regardless of how advanced a culture becomes, children need to develop their moral temperament within a cultural context of stories that make sense to them. Myths are the most effective means of shaping adolescent minds, forming the foundation of moral thought as they mature into adulthood. As a culture evolves, the fundamental metaphysics of moral thought—which eventually become norms and laws—will always be built upon a mythic foundation, as long as the infant mind remains incapable of fully grasping reality before learning the basics of ethics. Although morality is a construct, it must be followed as if it were absolute. This is why myths often present moral principles as absolute laws of nature—for psychological convenience.

Our thought forms seem to be biased based on patterns that fit into our taste profile for symbolic structure, and I see these structured thought forms as archetypes which are based not on some transcendent reality beyond our awareness but are built upon the hidden factors that lead to and construct the human condition. Over evolutionary time, realities such as time, entropy, well-being, and kinship seem to be encountered and encoded into our base instinctual profile to build up a biological semiotic meta-symbology that aids in building constructive thought

forms to understand ourselves, our world, and our relationship with scenarios we encounter in the world.

At the root of these biosemiotic meta-symbologies are the constant forces of the universe and the world around us. These are both universal, such as the passing of time and the movement of mass, and local, such as the amount of time in the Earth's day, or the social order encountered in human society.

It is our conscious mind, which evolved in this universe of patterns and laws, that is the most suited instrument for determining its nature—but only once sufficient attunement of the mind's base meta-symbology to the base laws of known science and the irregularities observed through experiment that suggest deeper structures.

Though absurd and meaningless, it is my conviction that we create meaning through harmonizing the structure of our minds with the structure of the universe, and what is meaningful becomes what is a coherent description of reality. The admittance that the human mind is an absurd and creative machine that can project and shape archetypes with a lesser and greater degree of accuracy—not necessarily tied strongly to the hard patterns of deeper existence—is to me the most coherent interpretation of the human condition.

As the human mind forms and identity is shaped through play and peer association, and it is tested against the existing structures and restraints of the world, I believe it forms associations and builds those into archetypes that are familiar to it. So, there are no universal archetypes—each person is the creator of their own archetypes—but there are universal relationships and attributes that form subsemiotic code that are recombined by each mind into archetypes: those they identify with, those they reject, and those they are attracted to.

This archetypal symbology does, as a result of being a reflection of reality, form seemingly similar archetypes—but due to cultural drift and human capacity to change, will change and evolve as human

culture changes over time. What might have seemed like universal archetypes to Jung may not have any relevance to a human civilization in the future that has gone through a technological singularity that could either structure or diversify humanity beyond recognition. If a subset of pre-singularity human cultures were preserved, then the abstractness of their archetypal identity would be much more evident against the backdrop of posthuman and Homo Novus populations.

And so, though there are benefits to our archetypal arrangements as they are, the true nature of good and evil is the ability to use the meta-symbolic code deep in our evolutionary psyche to create accurate archetypes for the future—not the past—and shape those into hypothetical relationships which we can then call an ethos. This theory of archetypes and human biosemiotics is the closest thing I can come up with to describe my observed subjective and objective experiences relating to the paradigm formation and abstract logistics of human behavior.

Creativity and Logic

So far, everything I have been discussing seems rational enough, and as we know, this does not necessarily reflect human decision-making, since most everyone does not know or care to know about science and philosophy; most default to taste and traditional learning methods. Below our every symbolic association that forms human value systems, our basic instincts and gut reactions to symbols form the foundations of human meaning-making. It is necessary for the human mind to experience some form of what I call relative satisfactory abstraction, when measuring concepts against their existing knowledge base.

Most of the time, this gut feeling of satisfaction when encountering an idea is based less on logic as it is on how it fits into the existing paradigm of the individual and how this makes them feel. After digesting a concept so they have considered its various contours and fitting it into their paradigm, the gut sensation of understanding or

rejection signals to the mind that they have fit the concept into their paradigm structure in a way that satisfies their internal logic.

Even the qualities of many simple concepts are viscerally rooted in the realms of sensation, with certain ideas being associated with attraction or disgust, good things feeling warm and bad things feeling cold. This basic code of subsemiotic taste values forms the substrate on which our values and linguistic associations are formed upon sensory gradients of compound sensory values. Because so much of meaning is based on taste, taste-forming experiences change reasoning much more than logical arguments ever can.

Stress and reward reprogram taste associations which change value systems at their base and can open the mind up to or close it off from new kinds of information, shaping what kinds of information the mind grants influence over itself or rejects outright. These associations are inherited over time, starting in infancy and developing into adulthood when the mind begins to become more resistant to changes to its basic taste template.

Beyond the existential need for freedom, being free to experiment and play with behaviors and ideas is also the core foundational activity that drives the individuation process. It is the very bedrock of the creative mode to enter this state of mind by which all taste and reason can be exercised and tested. Since this is critical to individuation and innovation, creating a safe yet liberating environment where creatives can be free from incentives yet guarded against the chaotic hazards that are often generated in chaotic experimental modes is essential to the integrity of a mind's ability to shape itself.

Just as a playground must be dynamic despite its guardrails, so too must a successful society have legal limitations to prevent undue harm while protecting people's fundamental freedoms. The same can be said for parenthood, guardianship, or any other activity where one mind counsels another mind. True creativity comes from the ability to

disorganize symbolic relationships and recombine them into organizations that are new.

When entering the creative mode, sporadic recombination of symbolic relationships comes from a release of inhibitions and a transformation of taste values when those inhibitions are released. These transformations then become new patterns of symbols which can be built into new structural innovations or concepts, like a new song or a new invention altogether. This secondary phase where the transformed taste then repatterns thought and generates new ideas is still highly creative. It is in the stage of reconstruction of concepts that the truly creative mind allows symbolic relationships to fit together serendipitously, patterning concepts within the framework of their new taste value associations.

The outcome of this process is newly formed concepts which have never existed in that mind. Contrary to others' opinions on the matter, I am a believer in the uniqueness of every instant and thought. That true replication is impossible but true creativity is inevitable; it is just the degree of uniqueness that is in question. Truly liberated states of mind and radically freeform play is the root to novelty in thought and truly adaptive understanding of concepts from when the mind is swimming in the fluidity of its own being.

Ideas are not formed in a vacuum. The information we deconstruct and recombine all requires attunement with the real world. It is through induction that we acquire new information through relative satisfactory abstraction, and the process of measuring one idea against another can be approximately called reason. Without these deductive habits of cognition and many mental mechanisms of verification that we construct using deductive habits, the mind would be too chaotic to have any evolutionary utility.

The truest form of induction is exercised from a place that is wide-eyed and without preconceptions. This state of mimicry is done from what is

called kenosis. Kenostatic induction involves abandoning all preconceptions, emptying the mind of biases and assuming a state of emptiness and wonder. It is in states like this that little children learn their first words, and the more intelligent student digests their teacher's harder lessons. I believe kenosis is in direct opposition to reason, which itself requires taking the full synthesis of what one knows and measuring not only whether it is consistent with itself, and so logical, but whether the subject agrees with that knowledge.

Logic requires a fullness of mind, but also a self-critical nature that allows for inconsistencies to be weeded out and addressed. I believe attuning to reality through kenostatic induction must come before logic and reason, so that the base insights are informed not just off science and literature as they're taught, but practical wisdom.

Without this general wisdom of what things are, logic can make self-agreeing scaffolding in the mind that is delusional and detached from reality, no matter how intelligent it may seem. In regards to ethics, we see in religion both kenostatic, logical, and creative arguments for the nature of good and bad.

Much of philosophy is logical ethics, based on structural agreements for right and wrong. Creative moral arguments are rarer but are usually built on spiritual metaphysics and tend to be out of alignment with the logos if not brought into accordance and coherence with the greater reality. Consider certain cults and spiritualities built on alternative sciences and religious metaphysics. That being said, dabbling in creative, or what I call synthetic ethics, is where new moral ideas come from. Even if ethics do not initially result in a good outcome, they can still inform new logically coherent moral systems, such as this very philosophy.

For most, the brief moral lessons we encounter in life do not constitute what an academic would call a study in ethics. In fact, the lessons most carry with them are trauma responses and behavioral outputs filtered

through their bias and worldviews. Moral behavior has always been more an exercise that needs to be practiced to become authentic and has never truly been a logical form of behavior. Rather, logic is usually just a self-justifying excuse used to communicate a reason we invent to convey that we are right to act how we want, when often what is good tends to be exactly the opposite of what we want.

If ethics in general is the counterbalance to raw human aggression and sexuality that makes social cohesion possible, then to attain a tempered moral behavior, we must exercise a service to others to condition a moral reflex, not through contemplation but through rehearsal. Despite this intent, even with noble ethics, our attempts to aid others do more harm than good. So, making systems of support and avenues for their recovery without coercion or forced medicines becomes the new golden rule: treat others so that their own self-restraint and maturation can grow from the way you treat them.

Now, bioethics, the shape of the mind, the age of capacity for consent or self-care all become advanced ethical questions that take a deeper understanding of the brain and the operations of the mind, so to a minor extent we do need a neurologically informed morality when doing ethics. Regardless, these principles have to be experienced in practice to achieve a strong moral reflex, to the point we exercise moral behaviors outside of the actual logic of ethics, like stopping to save a caterpillar from a walking path, tipping a struggling server or feeding a stray animal, none of which do logical good but are the inevitable result of a mind whose inner reflex of altruism has been successfully conditioned.

So, how the mind grapples with problems takes many forms, and these many forms I observe are just mental machines I have developed and seen in a few others. These mechanisms are likely adaptations and not ultimate rules, since the mind is too complex for there to be only three or four ways of learning. With the mind, I have noticed, if there are a multiplicity of functions they can almost always be extrapolated into

infinite other forms. I have played with using states of mind that guide behavior while another part of my mind does theory or ruminations. I have seen that there are pliable states of mind. If anything, the creative mode is the genesis point from which new ways of thinking are made through dissociative recombination of abstract concepts. Perhaps this is where I should have begun this chapter, not where I ended it, but nevertheless, that is the nature of the self-designing paradigm, the paradox at the root of the human condition: it is when we finish a job that we understand the way it should have been done.

Human beings have a subconscious preference that determines their disgust and their attraction to certain stimuli and ideas. This is rooted in a biosemiotic code that is mostly genetic but is conditioned over time and modulated by frontal cortical activity to form abstract human behaviors. This taste is the foundation to human self-regulation and integrity. When attuned, it can result in a person being able to make rational decisions based on nothing but intuition, and when disrupted it can lead a person into delusion despite their most sincere attempts at rational thinking.

The process of refining taste and structuring it into logic comes from a process of psychological play I call "chaotic experimentation". Though this can go either way, the point of play and humor is to cultivate a mode of thinking where taste can be tested in practice by imagining or partaking in playful repatterning of thought. Critical assessment is the opposite of playful thinking. It is a reductive repatterning of thought where things that do not fit within a logic system are removed or reformed to fit within a consistent logic. This critical thinking results in deductive reasoning that tests ideas against each other, removing noise and increasing clarity and consistency.

Behavioral conditioning is the process of repeating logic arrived at through chaotic experimentation and critical assessment. This entrenches the symbolic abstractions of thought into hard preferences of attraction and disgust through taste. This reconditions biosemiotic

foundations to having a different preference than previously arrived at. Though higher neuroplasticity in youth allows for greater ease in behavioral reconditioning, intense and sustained stimulus can change the base biosemiotic patterning at any age. Most human thought is not rational or explicitly playful, but is a reaction where a person's taste reacts against their existing logic structure and comes up with a symbolic behavioral reaction to the stimulus. This is known as reflexive response and allows people to save intellectual resources and make judgment calls with missing or incomplete information.

Abstract Paradigm Organization Logistics

APOL is the logistics of how paradigms are organized as abstract constructs of thought. This includes the processes of how thought is itself an abstract construct of life, life is an abstract construct of chemistry and how chemistry is a relative construct of physics. These constructs organize out of chaos which propagates within a set of parameters set by physics. In this meta-paradigm, paradigms are no different than species which organize out of chaos not unlike the fundamental processes of every construct in the cosmos. Since APOL is itself an abstraction structured by thought it is but a best attempt to construct metaphysics to grasp and seek value from the reality we observe.

Whereas every process is determined by its primary causes, paradigms themselves are the most abstract of these processes being bound only to the cognitive processes of the mind. Despite this, like every process paradigms seek optimized resting states, not at all different from the way the bee has evolved, optimized and stabilized its species into a niche of stable symbiosis and organization.

The honey bee is a good allegorical paragon of how processes seek resting states and organization. It is an organism that has optimized its ability to survive through precise collective organization, all the while doing so with effective symbiotic traits. As order randomly coalesces

from chaos it has in many forms of life evolved symbiologically stable organisms that are integrated with their ecosystems. They subsist in both order and chaos and display traits to deal with both: as a bee possesses both a stinger to deal with chaos and proboscis and hair to aid with pollination to achieve stable whole species survival.

Every aspect of process and construction in the cosmos, be it a bee's evolution or a nations progress, all originate from abstract and random organization from chaos. From the biochemistry of the bee and its behaviours as a social organism, to the cognition of people and their economic systems of value acquisition, these things are structured by an abstract process of synergistic organization. However, human paradigm constructs can change much more rapidly than a bees behaviours can evolve.

These paradigm constructs that shape society are founded on abstractions of the mind, abstractions that are best formed from the observation and understanding of good, accurate sciences. From paradigms, to behaviours, to the systems of value acquisition and the world that is built to accommodate those systems, society is just as subject to change and innovation as the paradigms that found its processes and constructs.

Like the evolution of organisms, society is built on paradigms that are stable long enough to create viable and dependable systems of value acquisition. This rigid and stable paradigm infrastructure is just as foundational to the operations of a society as is its physical infrastructure. In the same sense, both suffer from the same crux that the ability to remodel infrastructure is inhibited by the pre-existing dependency on existing infrastructure. This dependency adds value to static constructs, preventing the demolition of old infrastructure from being economically viable. Both demolition and reconstruction are resource heavy processes: information is necessary for paradigm reconstruction and capital is for physical infrastructure renovation.

Paradigms shape the infrastructure and the operations of value acquisition they enable, yet paradigms are, as a form of infrastructure, difficult to change. This is as true for political ideologies as it is for the conditions for social capital or the rail roads that network between cities. Yet, none of these things could exist without the initial capacity to innovate and create new paradigm constructs. Paradigm renovations cannot begin without the expertise of those with the capacity to craft new paradigms, often which begins with crafting a paradigm of thinking capable of such innovative feats.

The initial renovation of the mind is a difficult process, one that must begin with honest observation of self, trying to describe the true reason we are thinking and doing things with empirical clarity. This process can be done silently in our own mind, observing while resisting impulsive explanations as such things delay the process of self awareness, though notation does help greatly. Through this process of self analytics, it is possible to understand what factors lead to what modes of thinking, and how the mind can be applied at changing itself.

As long as an individual understands who they are through honest observation of self, one can understand what thoughts are driven by what paradigm or impulse, and through exercising awareness of those things, we can prepare to shape the paradigms of the individual. In this process, the experiment of what works and what does not can begin. This process tends to change the identity of the individual more rapidly than their persona can adapt to and utilize. For this reason to integrate those changes into a functional internal paradigm, these changes need to be exercised through expression of self and experience of the outcome of principle and character. So expression becomes the conditioning mechanism of choice for applying new paradigms.

Paradigms always are the initial infrastructure needed to create successful value acquisition processes. These processes could be put in two categories: those processes that serve the needs of the mind and those that serve the needs of the body. The basic needs of the body can

also be categorized in two categories: those processes needed to sustain the individual's body and those processes that promote the continuation of the species. Between these things, the needs of the mind, the body and the species, the reprioritization of values can begin.

One of the things that focuses the mind on itself is Stoic reconstruction of abstract value systems. Stoa is useful as it focuses the mind on only being emotionally concerned with the virtues of the mind; the structure of thought, not the processes of world beyond that. This frees the mind from being burdened with worries of absurdity of chaos inherent with processes that we cannot control. It is the chaos of process uncertainty that stresses the mind, so if the sole concern of the mind is on its own structure, it frees it of the stress of concerning itself with what is uncertain. The self conditioning that results from this lack of stress teaches the mind that focusing on its operation is beneficial, creating an internal incentive for the reconstruction of paradigms.

With the focus on the virtues of the mind and self awareness, the mind can then focus then on the process of abstraction, which can only be learned through dabbling in paradigms and allowing the mind to learn and abstract in different paradigms of thought from many cultures and disciplines. By getting a sense of how they change over time and intermingle, the mind can then dabble in changing paradigms creatively itself if not inventing new ones. Paradigms can be constructed not only as tools for categorising the world, but also to attempt to create new processes as well. With sufficient practice and latent intelligence, a person can become a crafter of new paradigms in whichever field they choose.

If this can be done for the mind itself, and the individual can develop a skill for working with paradigm organization logistics, and the art of applying that skill to the needs of the body and species then intuitively follows. If those can be stabilized then perhaps we may consider the question of what to do from there. The question of whole species

survival is, however, a problem not so easily solved. We know the body and species need economics to sustain a population, from tribal hunter gatherers to global hedge funds we all depend on systems of value acquisition to operate. However, these are again limited by the constructs they are currently invested in, from physical infrastructure to legal institutions.

As it is difficult to renovate the mind due to our dependency on the stability of those paradigms, it is also difficult to alter the social and economic infrastructure that constructs our economic network of value acquisition systems. The solutions are the same though: find the means to renovate the system and the value latent in any given process increases with each successive renovation of the paradigm organization logistics as the process becomes more efficient at organization and synergistics.

This need of the species is to optimize all parts of the process becomes a geopolitical process, which when we apply the principle of synergy further illustrates that the optimum process would be to elevate all of mankind out of the current drudgery of the human condition and create socioeconomic renovation on a global level. By doing this, we create the capital needed to allow the sciences to accelerate towards the acquisition of individual and the species wide needs. If we were to succeed at fulfilling out needs, we would only be left to find a technological optimum to rest at, a state that may never fully manifest unless the limits of physics could be reached through technological progress.

So global synergistics ought to be the economic philosophy of progress in the regards of mutually assured flourishing. This of course comes with a plethora of paradigm infrastructure problems that require reconstruction. Politics needs to employ more of the populations intelligence in the making of decisions, and needs to be separate from corporate influence which currently dominates the current geopolitical landscape must come first in that process. Education needs to

accommodate the entirety of the job market and social welfare systems to enable populations to acquire the social capital needed to grow an economy. Industry needs to be more adaptable and have a renovation plan in place for the passive reconstruction of each piece of infrastructure be it physical or institutional.

These changes could all be made, and with a strategy of sufficient sophistication and comprehension of the current organization of socioeconomic systems a paradigm of implementation could be implemented by a small group of individuals. By capitalizing on the leverage of existential threat and synergistic opportunities a push and pull strategy could be implemented to change the corporate agenda. The problem with implementing such changes is most do not understand how the corporations run the worlds political infrastructure, let alone how to devise a strategy of corporate leadership necessary for the construction and application of new socioeconomic and political paradigms.

The simple solution is shareholder activism, or more ideally activist investing. With a strong business plan and leverage over a corporations stock value, boardrooms can be made to listen to new strategies relevant to their business models, from joint investment strategies, modular infrastructure investment to lobbying initiatives supporting synergistic economic systems. If the model is profitable corporations can be made to listen to the sophistication of such initiatives and be made to act on them through stock pressure.

From the initiate change of paradigm reconstruction to the transhumanist horizons they could lead us to, understanding that the biological abstractions that are our paradigms remains the core of the subject of APOL philosophy, and the fundamental logistics for geopolitical and socioeconomic organizational processes. As this paradigm could not be arrived upon without the philosophical and scientific labours of the past, both of which are themselves ever

changing paradigms, so do paradigm logistics renovate constantly and fluidly over time.

Like the evolutionary processes in symbiotic ecosystems the world over, paradigms constantly seek to advance their grasp of reality and lay the foundations for more efficient processes of value acquisition. The values at play, primarily the values of the mind, body and species, lay the foundations for society and the sciences these systems are built on. In the past our abstractions were obscure shadows of reality, so APOL must be understood as a best effort to grasp a very difficult socioeconomic logistic. No matter how successful a paradigm is at producing a successful process of value acquisition, it must always be remembered as an abstract construct of thought if we are to build on it for what it is, skillfully avoiding ever calling a paradigm a perfect illustration of the reality it attempts to illustrate.

Attunement and Instinctual Reasoning

Ultimately, the function of attunement is to allow the mind to become conditioned to thinking of the correct means of the world's function which is gained through the highest form of reasoning, that of inductive scientific reasoning, and from there be able to use deductive, analog or even instinctual reasoning to create new theories based on the foundation of attunement. Because of this, attunement is more or less a counter conditioning to the propensity towards anthropomorphic thought, allowing for the mind to use the lowest possible form of reasoning to come up with naturally correct assumptions on the operations of nature.

Pseudology

Pseudologies are sciences that were proven to have no evidential basis and themselves error over time and became extinct. Examples of these are phrenology, astrology, numerology, alchemy, energy working and

other pseudological practices. The irony is many of these protosciences are intact valid spiritual systems and demonstrate alternative modes of thinking that are valuable to the intellectual mind looking for thinking tools in the same way that the engineering of Mesopotamia and Egypt still inspires engenders today, and gives them insights into the evolutionary direction of their craft.

Wish Fulfillment and Instinctual Reasoning

There is a great deal of wish fulfillment in the thought of spiritual teachers. This is mostly impart to the instinctual reasoning that states it is easier to gain a psychological reward by believing something happened then actually making it happen.

Historic Cultural Lenses

Before conducting any study on the history of ethics, the need to understand the historical context, reconstructing the politics, religions and cultures of the time is a necessary means to putting ethical studies into context. Many practices of communication, like myth making, pseudologies, corporate incentives and especially the uses of languages in peculiar ways, will illuminate meanings historically overlooked due to lack of attention to historical cultural lenses and predispositions of older less enlightened studies that did not take into account the total nature of the world at that time.

Labels and Definitions

The common problem I face when conveying concepts to people is the scales and gradients of things being fluid and interconnected, while the human mind is built to notice particular patterns and observations. Because of this peoples labels for things, for example: enlightenment, do not often convey the reality of the concept of enlightenment adequately enough if they do not have a gradient definition to

understand such a problem by. Because of this the definition must correlate to its logical place in the system as a whole, and whether what we are seeing is simply sharing attributes to the system through analog reasoning or whether the subject is actually by definition what that label implies.

Labels are often cultural, for example, when I speak of enlightenment, I speak of enlightenment as it was generally understood in Vedic tradition, and I prefer to understand such things based on the source of the knowledge. Bringing understanding back to the source and defining the modern interpretation of the original label, for example, layman's peace rather then enlightenment in explaining the state I have attained personally, is a process of reason I often find necessary in revising ones opinions and insuring that research is in fact relative to the processes in question.

Teaching Nuance

Often, there is a great deal of subconscious reaction and feeling that goes into find craftsmanship both of intellectual and physical nature. Many of these things are beyond us to explain, it simply seems right for reasons yet unknown for something to be a certain way. To teach this, one must teach through guided experience, where the learner of nuances follows the teachers instruction and replicating their actions to try and "catch the feeling" of what nuances the teacher is trying to instill.

Most of this comes from a rapport between teacher, student and medium, and this rapport, or the ability to achieve rapport is often a connate skill not everyone has for everything. Because of this, teaching nuance can be impossible for the wrong teacher, student or medium. All three need to "fit" and often, it is the students job during their adolescence to find out what nuances they "get" and which they don't. I was blessed with a great sense of nuance for some things, and others I simply do not understand whatsoever. I will never be a machine

operator, because I just don't "have a feel" for mechanical things, and I tend to wreck almost every machine I touch. However, things like arts, sciences and sports come naturally to me. In this regard, everyone is different, and it is a combination of self knowledge and finding the right teacher in the learning of nuances.

Co-Creative Conversation

Many times, people are trying to achieve the same understanding but both are wrong to start with and neither have the complete truth. Co creative conversation allows for two or more individuals to try and help each other learn what they know is right or wrong through self disproval and make creative ideas as to what the idea together stimulating not just attunement to reason, but creative imagination which together produces Either a mutual understanding or the solution to the problem that they originally set out to understand. Often, these conversations begin with a person trying to present and idea that another finds false. Transitioning from argument to co creation can often be half the challenge of co creative thought, and so many people are so addicted to the pleasure of winning arguments either by proving their superior logic and forcing the other person to give up trying, or preventing reason from being used completely.

Fact or Metaphor

Deciding to speak to a person's rational or symbolic mind is a difficult thing to do. Restraining from jumping into topics, being empathetic of another's feelings and opinions, and transitioning smoothly between fact and metaphors is often so difficult that many spiritual teachers give up and teach only through metaphors for the sake of universality and allowing for paradigms to go unchallenged. I, however, find utility in the appeal to reason and prefer it over the use of metaphors, though ultimately sometimes the symbolic solution is the only way to explain a

difficult concept, especially when the logical explanation is challenging one of someone's core beliefs.

Authority and Faith

The need to believe is often the result of the lack of knowledge. There is nothing wrong with this, people need to specialize in order for society to progress. I have faith in the grocery store in providing me food on the merit that they cant guarantee return sales from a dead customer. This is a natural means of allowing for human diversification. However, choosing what authority to have faith in takes an authority of its own. For a potentially disabling ailment, I will go to the hospital and seek scientific medicines, not an acupuncturist that I know little to nothing about. As I just hinted towards, people tend to choose sources of authority based on their familiarity.

People also, if they ever do try to challenge themselves, have a tendency to notice that which is familiar, thus isolating themselves to self confirming data. The problem with this, is that one who wishes to disprove oneself must not look at just the most interesting things, but a majority of uninteresting things as well. The truth is often hidden in the most mundane sources.

Cultural ideologies also help shape the sources of authority people choose. If they identify with an anti government stance, they are more prone to accept the other movements who also are anti government true or false. This includes the use of magic, the propensity towards environmentalism, anti war ideologies, anti vaccinations or tendency to alternative medicines. Do any of these things have anything to do with anti government? Not any more then skate boarding or riding a camel to work do, but what happens, and it probably did while you were just reading this, the mind finds ways to connect these concepts with the original cultural label of anti government, even if pro Government people have just as much a chance of trying alternative medicine or landing a kick flip as the rest of us.

CHAPTER 6

Rights, Law and Justice

Necessary Freedoms

Our cultures are millions of years old, each and every one of them. Every time we teach a child to speak, and use narratives to explain to them how the world works, we are transmitting to them a mythos that we have been keeping going over our entire lives, starting another node of understanding towards taking up the torch of knowledge. Many who have raised children have found that they become what they become despite our best interests, and that the journey of a child is one that is autopoietic in nature, not one of being designed or taught how to become. A child plays with life like they do a toy, and it is through chaotic experimentation that we become acquainted with the mythos, quite happily unaware of the paradox itself.

Nevertheless, children learn to use the paradox every time they create a story, or play an imaginary game. They shape realities just as we do, for the mind of youth is just as powerful as the mind of an adult, they just lack experience and a fully developed frontal cortex to inhibit their behaviors. But over these millions of years a child now will find themselves in a very different world than a child did in the past, be it 10, 50, 100, 1000 years ago, the march of time tells a different tale every changing of the seasons. As we mature through the teen years we start to marvel at the complexity of it all, and start to strategize to become what we think we need to become to get what we want out of life.

These adolescent wants and needs are just as abstract as any other paradoxically self-created idea. However, we in the west have the benefit of education for the most part to inform us about the nature of the world. However, this education comes with the biases of our teachers, and often the very problems they would wish for the next

generation to solve are rooted in the very lessons they teach us. If we are to think in a truly unique way, we are going to have to go backwards, not forwards, back to the creativity of youth and play with ideas like a little child plays with a toy sword.

If we are to make progress at the rate this future demands of us, we must tap humanity's ability to restructure our behaviors which has given us our advantage in resource acquisition throughout evolutionary time. Though we can format ourselves and grow comfortable in that format, it is just as human to radicalize and change behaviors when our resource acquisition process is threatened. I'm not sure if this is instinctual or cultural, but it seems to be a rule—at least of human cultural evolution—that when stressed, the human imagination is put to work trying to invent a new mode of operation.

The need to have freedom of thought is also evident in developmental psychology, where, to discover our strengths, we need to be free to experiment and grow. To play with life and discover ourselves is fundamentally human. The chaos of the child is something to be molded, if not contained, but if it were not for this chaos, there would be no authentic fitting into that mold to begin with—as if to say that by trying to break the barriers, we understand their utility and fit within them naturally through chaotic experimentation.

Yet, in most societies that last in this world, security always comes first. Part of that is securing our minds from cultural decay by having a culture that is organized and stable enough to endure human freedom. Culture then, serves in part to counter and contain human freedom in the same way a parent contains a child's chaotic play, so that, though free to grow, no undue harm befalls society.

In the same way that our cultures safeguard the minds of the people from chaos or degradation, the very economies of resource distribution and acquisition require great degrees of entrenchment and stability, which in turn create an unnatural amount of stress on the chaotic mind

of the population. Often, there is no more inhospitable environment for a human mind than the very resource acquisition systems we construct around ourselves to compete with other human societies.

So, though there are brief reprieves and resistances where the resources and freedoms are just enough that human creativity can flourish, for the most part, humanity finds itself either in a state of uncontrolled vulgarity and chaos, or we find ourselves in industrial shackles as cultural security constrains human freedom. There are only rare instances of free-forming harmony amongst the unrestrained rebellions and submissive suffering under unfeeling economic incentive frameworks.

Is it possible to make a humanistic culture where order does not constrain human freedom? It seems to be—in small, culturally uniform populations, there is enough trust that the structure can be lessened, and the population understands that the freedoms they are granted come at the cost of obeying certain norms and ethics of self-governance. In large, diverse nations, the uniformity of law tends to clamp down on the chaos of diversity so that, no matter who does what, the law prevents the resource acquisition system from failing.

This means that unless there is a sorting mechanism where multiple groups of people in a society can collect, organize, and self-legislate, large nations will always favor strict laws in times of prosperity and harsh totalitarian regimes when the resource acquisition system is under threat to eliminate disorder from cultures. This does not mean that these states are permanent or inevitable—just that we have yet to produce a democratic system where a large population can diversify without ripping the country apart. Even in the United States, the media served for a long time as a cultural neutralizer, only now with the advent of the internet has over-diversification of opinions and foreign counterintelligence operations started to rip the fabric of American society apart. This goes to show that the structure of multiple united

states was enough to form a diverse enough container for human diversification in the information age.

The freedom of human capacity to diversify was still a necessity for human dominance as a species in order to create and adapt to new technologies. Because of this, regardless of the threat, we have to have a certain degree of respect for human creative freedoms as well. We must assume that any system that is used to discriminate can quite easily be used to discriminate against us or someone we care about. Because of this, equal rights stem from a respect for human creative potential—to make rules that do not cause undue harm and allow for universal freedoms to innovate and do business. Though there is due harm, such as discriminating against willful criminals, we need to uphold the precedent that all people need equal measures of security, or the system may yet be tilted to find a way of discriminating against those of different races, sexes, nationalities, skill levels, or, most commonly and insidiously, income.

Freedom to travel, freedom to live, freedom to own property, freedom to organize, freedom to speak—these are all just basic things humans do, and we all need to be able to do them if we can reasonably expect ourselves to be guaranteed them. It stems directly from the human drive to ensure that we have the dominant hand as a society, without unnecessary infighting and drawing each other down with harmful discrimination. Essentially, going back to that need to make the world soft and palatable, we make systems of enforcement to ensure that others guarantee our rights, rights that are engineered and synthetic but nevertheless essentially a beneficial arrangement in ensuring that everyone has the capacity to cultivate and contribute their power to each other's causes.

With all of that said, it is still worth stating that this is all easier said than done. Human beings are also opportunistic and can take away the freedoms of others, especially if their society is built around taking as their primary means of resource acquisition. We have tried more

egalitarian systems, such as communism, but that did not work because, even when authority was the only currency, keeping everyone working at the tip of a gun bred a different kind of taking: taking people's freedom to think.

Corruption of state institutions, the ideological inconsistencies of leaders in power, the general apathy and ignorance of the public, coupled with the fact of the futility of academics to grapple with the unfathomable nuance of the behaviors and needs of large, culturally diverse populations all create a series of problems with one common theme: human mismanagement stems from the very abstract nature of the human mind and the inherent human desire to be free to do what they will.

Everything we have built is built around the inevitable chaos of human cultural evolution—from creating democracies where we can change governments as ideas change, which are led by free markets driven by profit, to the security infrastructure needed to protect ourselves from our neighbors, their free will, and the unpredictability of their changing political state of affairs. Everything about modern industrial society is bottled chaos, uncertainty kept certain by the powerful having learned what it takes to keep a society afloat. This is not a universal of anthropology, but socioeconomically it is where we are heading at the present as the western way of globalized trade and security becomes the cultural norm of the largest powers.

Institutionalized Amovera

I keep leaving and coming back to the idea that it comes down to the formation of companies that promote the common good, something that has only come about because of labor movements that have created the middle class and lowered poverty. Companies are more rational than people and can be convinced to act morally and more consistently than single people can. They also structure a nation and set the stage for the wellbeing of the population.

As it stands, if there is any hope in making nations trust each other, it will be up to the companies within those nations to make environments where peace and prosperity can abound, and if there is anything people can do to make that happen, it will be through the same means as before: united groups of people driven by ideological impetus to try and make the world a better place. I've come to this conclusion multiple times before, and the hardest thing to do as a creative is to realize that the solution already exists—it just needs some improvement.

A safe and secure society does not come about on its own, and it is not as simple as keeping people safe from bodily harm either. For there to be a just society, there needs to be a philosophy of what aspects of the human condition we protect, and how we go about making that philosophy is just as important as how we implement it through just action and making institutions of justice.

In the modern information landscape, the cultivation of a philosophy of justice needs to occur within an insular culture where incentives for corruption are mitigated through control over information as well as control over the economic framework that surrounds the minds in the culture. This is a monumental task in and of itself, and in the modern day would require either vast control over the information space or a complete removal from the public information space to do philosophy.

As for the actual implementation of a moral philosophy, evangelism is necessary to spread the word and do politics. This requires some form of campaigning, which would need to be done offline today if we are to introduce something new that will then inspire the algorithm to promote the content. Offline activism through traditional means using printed mediums and demonstrations is still an effective means of getting things done, especially when the algorithm is highly contested by bot farms.

So, we are now looking at the human condition through the lens of Amovera. I have decided a long time ago to try and make the world a better place through the development and promotion of a moral philosophy. The modern human condition is one of many structured cultural innovations that make up our Mythos. This is a western and uniquely structured reality that I live in. There are different cultures, but they all have similar roots to ideas of what justice is, even if the ethics and morality around what right and wrong are have incredible degrees of diversification.

Justice, across the board, is that a person is held accountable for the harm they do to others. To what ends a person is held accountable is different in each culture, but nevertheless justice remains that there is a response to injustice, which is the cause of undue harm to another. There is also no set definition of undue harm, though my philosophy has one, structurally harm is by definition a subjective and absurd thing. So, to set the scope, within western philosophy justice is both punitive and rehabilitative, and in more advanced fields of philosophy, justice is meant to be redemptive.

The harm we do to others can be thought of, at least through an Amoveran lens, as that which impacts their agency or nonconsensually changes their persona. This includes harm to the body, property, and psyche. The best way we have come up with to define harm and means of distributing justice is by maintaining courts of law. Courts remove the likelihood of individual bias clouding decision making in the distribution of justice and the interpretation of law, or the setting of precedent. This allows them to review the case and interpret the law, as well as revise the law so it is as redemptive as possible for all parties involved, both for the offender as well as for the victim.

And so, there is a general quality to justice that requires institutional structure that needs to be maintained and gradually changed without doing too much damage so that there is no undue harm done from changing too rapidly. Justice also needs to be understood, so a general

education in civics is necessary for justice to be effective. This requires some form of uniform graduation and education in society whereby a person is made aware of the nature of law, and if parents are not able to provide this, then it falls on the state.

All these elements need to operate within a state that allows for all these essential functions to occur, at least within my idea of a functioning society, which is a purely hypothetical thing at this point. There need to be insular philosophical groups capable of advancing moral philosophy without interference. There need to be modes of communication and demonstration. There need to be means of participating in the political process. There need to be courts of law that can change the laws gradually with checks and balances to prevent change from becoming too rapid. There needs to be a viable economic and military state structure that can defend these vital functions from external threats and internal degradation.

And so, justice takes a lot of work to make happen, and an entire culture needs to be tuned to making it happen until all of these aspects can be institutionalized and structured in a society to do the job of making law. Until such a day, the world will need to move in that direction, and in the modern day, much of this will have to be done by auxiliary groups that act in tandem with existing institutions because so much still needs to be done, and no institution is in a shape or form that is currently equipped to manage the ever-changing security infrastructure that we find ourselves in today.

Rights and Duties

Now, there are certain things we cannot delegate, and those things are what we work for: our freedom of thought, our free time, our freedom to reproduce, and our freedom of social organization. These freedoms are not guaranteed but take civic action to maintain, and if we want those freedoms, we cannot delegate civic duty to others as a culture, or

most people will delegate those responsibilities and those freedoms will be taken.

In the same way that our rights need to be universal to be guaranteed, our duties are universal if we want the government to guarantee our rights, and our education in these things needs to be up to date to be effective in civics. Yet, where do we draw the line? At what point is education indoctrination? To the educated civic duty cannot be delegated; it should be universally suffered, not just in voting and referenda, but in activism and civil disobedience should the political framework stop serving the public's freedoms. It is sane and rational for people to arrange a society where they do no harm to each other, allow each to have the same rights as everyone else, and restrict themselves in ways they see fit for their harmless living industry if they find the freedoms others have been granted—though harmless—grotesque or offensive. For that reason, although we should always fight for our freedoms, we should also have tolerance of others that use those freedoms in ways we find grotesque.

Reproductive freedoms are particularly guttural responses. Our preferences for reproductive behavior are deeply ingrained instinctually and vary from person to person. This does not mean that we have a right to force others to surrender to our ideals about how to reproduce or raise our children. The only thing that matters is that there is no harm done in the reproductive process. Harm then needs a stark and clear definition, but the fact is defining things is absurd, and so in the lack of a clear definition of harm, and lacking a clear definition of humanity, we fall short of being able to come up with a universal reproductive ethic.

In Amoveran philosophy, it is the ability to have thoughts that defines the human mind, and it is the human mind and its freedoms that are important. So the first flicker of a dream on an unborn child's cortex would mean it was too late to abort. Yet, when dealing with ethics, especially the ethics of making the laws for states, we must defer these

kinds of judgments to the people. For it is not our role to tell a parent how they are going to raise their children, and it is not our right to say how a mother is going to conduct her pregnancy. These decisions are absurd, if life is just a chemical reaction and pain and suffering are abstract things, morality needs to give room to reproductive ethics.

However, human rights and the right to life and security need to be extended as far as possible into the earliest recesses of life. The only problem is that the line between a developed human being is fluid and there is no clear definition for when the first dream is dreamed, especially if I am right about the nature of consciousness. Yet, we have to understand that in a society of Amovera, rights exist, while in a structural absurdist state, rights are contingent to the population that governs themselves. This is to say, within our own societies, we can organize and give each other rights, but to allow for human diversification, we must stop trying to force human rights upon every human being in the world. We can try and influence all we can to recognize and fight for rights, but we cannot control the whole of the world.

So if we discuss having a state that guarantees human rights, then it cannot be a state that serves everyone, and we need a different way of creating states. We need to have multiple states in the same border that govern their own citizens and have their own laws. This is a structural absurdist state, allowing for a state of Amovera to exist, alongside the capitalist, communist, the Muslim, the Jew, the Christian, the Native, the radically new and the rigidly conservative. It sounds fine to say "We should all have rights" but it feels terrifying to hear someone say "You must be educated and uphold the institution of the graduated democracy". For this reason, autonomous nations theory, which I will include in more detail later, is perhaps the only solution to this age-old problem of governance.

The future of our natural evolution will be determined now, as we unlock the creative potential of the mechatronic revolution with AI and

other forms of machine intelligence. What we delegate and what we consider a natural duty will determine the future evolution of our species, and so, what we consider fundamental as a right and as a duty —what we are willing to tolerate in others so we may have freedom to choose for ourselves—will be critical in deciding which way our species goes from this point over the next thousands and millions of years.

We must decide what we are to become, and if we are faced with the choice to change what we are, we need to take a close look at what we are now and decide what we must keep and what would happen if we changed any aspect of ourselves. For now, we are unrestrained in how we can shape our behaviors; just look at monks contorting themselves into celibate enlightened sages. We have the capacity to change our paradigms, our ethos, and so our actions. Though this is not the case for all, it is also not the case for most of life. Every year, thousands of salmon navigate from the oceans up the Nechako River into northern British Columbia to breed. There is no choice, it is innate to these animals to do these things. The deer rut in the fall, the bear hibernates in the winter, the bird migrates in the spring. We may sleep at night, but we can sleep in the day. We may reproduce, but we may only have sex for pleasure at times. The fact of the matter is, human beings do not have some innate instinct, but only those that make sense within our culture of norms and reasons. A human raised by wolves will contort and become like a wolf. A child raised in complete isolation will have no recognizable human behaviors whatsoever, not that we could call civilized at least. An infant raised alongside a baby ape will become more like the ape than the ape will become like the baby human.

We have a blank slate of a mind, we experience a tabula rasa development and so we are absolutely free to become anything we want, and should we detach from our wants can become anything at all after the considerations of our behavioral biology are taken into consideration. So to a fish the meaning of life may be anchored to his

behaviors but humans have no such ontological anchor. We are for all intents and purposes completely free to shape our own meaning and guide ourselves as we see fit in the world in our various cultural norms and environments.

This ontological freedom is necessitated by the creative processes that give human beings our evolutionary advantage as techno-cultural organisms. This allows us to exponentially increase our strategic advantages, and it brings us into direct confrontation with the existential absurdity of the cosmos. And yet, this does not need to be a threat to our organization, rather when faced with grace and optimism becomes a reasonable ontological means of liberation.

Editor's note: the 'blank slate' is overstated. Temperament, the capacity for language and much else are constrained by heredity, as the author says elsewhere ('a biosemiotic code that is mostly genetic'). Accounts of children raised by animals are poorly documented. Read the passage as a claim about how far culture can reshape behaviour.

Uniform Moral Standards

Despite our apparent freedom the logos still structures human culture in fairly uniform ways. Predictable patterns emerge when language, culture, technology and biology find themselves facing similar problems of resource management and social organization. The necessity of uniform customs and laws in a culture stems from the limits of innovative capacities of each individual. Very few people make culture-shifting innovative practices and so must default to the status quo.

When needing water, if it is a well that you must go to then operating it within the norms and customs of a society as well as within the technological context of the well becomes the only viable option. The common knowledge of how people take turns, manage water distribution, and operating the drawing and carrying tools is inherited

and kept the same so that it is easy both to complete the task and to learn it.

The same logic follows all human innovations. From storefronts to courts of law uniformity is distributed through the emergent limits of human culture. Though the hard limit is set by human education and freedom to play which in turn dictates the amount of innovative capacity people develop over time, these realities mean that for the grand majority of human history no change is possible until an innovator invents a new aspect of society through the processes of creative abstraction.

So uniformity allows for a single educative experience to suffice for long-term expected behaviors, normalizing human interactions and making social and business norms possible. Even if there was an innovative capacity for people to create on the spot a new means for every problem they faced, it would still have to fit within the norms of society as to result in an outcome that does not inherently become obstructive of others expectations as they exercise their own capacities to operate. Uniformity emerges where multiple actors meet to fulfill any given operation.

The emergence of agreements from human interactions seems to us as potentially a universal innovation in social species such as ours which communicate with each other. Agreements are incentivized by actions, which are deemed beneficial or unduly harmful, of which the former is to be achieved and the latter is to be avoided. Contracts and insurances, licenses and graduations, these are all means of forming agreements that try and limit the amount of risk in forming agreements with others.

In a sense, there are soft versions of licenses, which can be called things like reputation or character judgments, only in as much as we trust each other to allow them to take certain actions. Yet, it is without a doubt true that formalizations of agreements and licenses are essential

in forming the foundations of the rule of law as something more concrete than a mythic social practice. In regards to licenses, certain social activities are granted by agreement to the public as a right, others are required by authorities to be distributed only to those who demonstrate the capacity to manage significant risk to the population by means of a license.

Eventually with the creative capacities of AGI, it is likely that all human uses of the technology will have to be licensed and kept locked unless a person or AGI has the license to use a particular capacity. Institutions already tend to form soft licenses to operate based on employment contracts. For example, a person demonstrates to the employer that they have a set of useful qualities befitting the role, so that the employer agrees to hire them and train them to be deployed as an employee and fulfill the various roles they are assigned in the business.

Throughout human society you see various iterations of this process repeated, where the attempt to grade and license people takes many forms that precede various formal and informal agreements. Ethically, this is a purely structural aspect of meta ethics. Even rights are such an agreement between the people and the state. While the concept of natural human rights was perhaps the greatest step forward in applied ethics since Jesus revised Judaism or Buddha or Nanak revised Hinduism, the language behind it has become outdated and the concept has been lost to most. Rights simply are not natural in the modern sense. They are beneficial agreements that recognize that the desirable freedoms which we crave as human beings need to be evenly distributed if they are to be guaranteed.

Nevertheless, agreements are just as synthetic as every other human social innovation. This does not diminish the importance of rights, rather it highlights the very fragility of rights as unnatural and desirable human needs, sublime needs that without civic action and philosophical discourse are quickly forgotten and lost to a population.

The basic concept is this: that the freedoms to benefit from one's own labors cannot be removed if we wish for people to willingly contribute to society. It is necessary then for certain rights and freedoms to be guaranteed by the state, and so to incentivize this the people's dominion over the state is necessary through the maintenance of a democracy or some other form of government whereby the population has the power to shape the government as they need to.

It is a culture that must be generated and maintained, not a natural phenomenon and not something that is guaranteed by nature or God. What I call synthetic rights or unnatural rights is the same thing discussed by John Locke and his natural rights. The only truly notable distinction is that I do not see them as gifts from God but as hard-won battles from a never-ending war with our baser human nature. The premise is always the same: if I want freedom then I must ensure the freedom of all. The only problem with this kind of universalism is that not all want the same kinds of freedoms.

Many people want to be crude more than they want freedom, they want to live in a society where harming others is a viable means of solving their problems. Perhaps there should be a space made for such people who want to live by their own rules. Perhaps we need to consider the fact that it is human to make weapons, that it is human to cause suffering and there needs to be a way for people to use their own kinds of ethics in their own nations, albeit without the license of higher tiers of technological processes to enable atrocities. If we are to consider the nature of human freedoms, we cannot consider the solution to be everyone having the same ethics. So, we need to look at the world as a place where different societies are granted capacities based on their capacity to manage risk. This is yet another tenet of autonomous nations' theory.

There may not be a perfect court of law or system of justice that can bring the world to peace. The world, after all, is in its billions of people and there is no saying that we can't get to much higher numbers

should we go interstellar. What we can do is reduce the amount of conflict by giving people the freedom needed to form their own courts of law, to incentivize good businesses and corporations and governments to form, and allow for enough diversification and competition within nations that there is no need for uniform domination. In regards to the modern human condition, the western one in particular, there is a lot of potential to overcome our vainglorious hubris and stop trying to bring the entire world on board with our social experiment. We can even stop trying to make the entirety of our own populations exist under the same incredulous standard that we impose upon ourselves.

There still needs to be a uniform means of licensing who gets to do what. Those who gain the capacity to wield certain powers cannot be those who will abuse them. So there must be a diversification of nations within a federated body to satisfy the needs of structural absurdism, yet the moral reality of Amovera requires that the least harmful among us are given the greatest powers and the most harmful are not allowed to access the powers that could destroy us all. Idealism cannot have a part in the design of our societies. We can hold each other to standards all we want, but if we do not take the morally grey laws around how we manage our personhood and leave others out of them, we will inevitably be signing off to one path that only a margin of our society wants.

This compromise is the only way to move forward, because once we are free to diversify like this, then we can start to share the information about what works and what does not. There can be a study of ethics and morality based in reality such as this and the great experiment can truly begin. There can be every virtue under the sun shared and distributed for free, while everyone lives by their own creeds in their own nations without fear of domination. We just have to make sure there are means of exchanging land, there are means of exchanging goods and there are means of settling disputes and grievances without

violence. So, the most ethical nation would still rule over others, but it would be the nation most suited to protect others from their own powers.

First Rights and Cultural Healing

The recognition of first rights, that is the Ancient cultures and the rights to their cultural practices, has been greatly undeveloped and evidently so with lingering colonial ideals in political rhetoric. Recognizing these rights of ancients and their knowledge, as well as the rightfully holders of the deed no matter whom is using them and thus the defacto majority at any ethical discussion on what is done on those lands, is essential to retaining in principle the knowledge we are striving to create when future cultures come and settle over us in turn.

The Limit of Law

Utopia is an impossibility simply by the nature of free will being a necessity of diversification, and diversification being a necessity of life. Because of this, the free radicals of society will always persist, and the boundaries of legal action in regards to what one does with their company, property and family must be drawn so that the limits of law is realized and the full efficiency of legal action is not waisted on endeavors that are sociologically impossible when it comes to the ability to enforce and the need to do so.

On Rights and Love

We want what's best for ourselves. Sure we are built to love and take care of others, but that is just part of the self, and anyone who understands the self knows we can't be happy without family and friends.

But at the end of the day that kind of love, only goes so far, about 120 people or so, after that we simply don't connect with enough people to build large societies off love.

So we want what's best for ourselves, and and we create this idea of rights out of that. Individual rights, that's the basis of it all, wanting not to be harmed in any way, to be given access to the best opportunities we can.

But to insure those rights we need people to protect us from those who agree to look after each other's rights and protect them as a ln organization, from those outside this organization.

But small groups of people always succumb to larger groups of people, but not just any people, those who are the best at playing this game of insuring rights. Those who understand that without the trust in each other to protect our rights, we can never work together to undertake this process.

And what does it take to do this? In short, it takes Philosophy, Industry, in that order it so happens. Philosophy is just this: organizing ideas into workable orders. By workable, of course in this case, I am explaining the nature of human organization, and the logic stemming from self preservation, and in some instances love.

Freedom and Trust

Freedom is a fundamentals human desire. Limiting human freedom deteriorates the trust between individuals, since it is taking away their ability to choose and placing that power in the hands of another. This leads to breakdowns of communication, inspires plots of subterfuge and generally leads to people acting against each other, not with each other. Freedom is not just a matter of individual preference, but contributes to the power of a collective to organize and contribute to the greater industry of life.

Security and Possession

Ramifications for disrespect of property and the owners ability to make those ramifications happen are the core principle of ownership. Ownership becomes easy and possible on a larger scale with law enforcement. After this point it is the law enforcement officers job work in conjunction with the owners to secure his jurisdictions principles of ownership. For these reasons there is an intimate connection of will over ones property and a respect to what one does on another's property. Being receptive and respectfully of another person when they allow you on their property comes from being aware of the basic realities of security and ownership.

Ghettos and Racism

Put any man in the wilderness and he will become a beast, put any man in a madhouse and he will become insane, out any man in a ghetto or project and he will become a hoodlum. The human mind is made to adapt to the realities we give it. By putting people in these states, because we will not employ them due to seeing others in that very state acting in evil, we are ourselves perpetuating evil by the ignorance of analog reasoning.

The first step is countering the sociological illness of seeing these people as nemesis, by making them into Paragons. This is to infer to those prone of analog reasoning that these people can be both exceptional and evil under the right circumstances proving even to fools that there needs to be change. Then change must occur. We must take in all the sick and poor, we must give them standard minimum wage for their rehabilitation and therapy. Then, we must destroy the stigma remaining in industrialized society by empowering those who partake in taking these people in for training and employment.

After this, let the final systems of diversification reinforcement come and go as they are needed, as a wolf pack waxes and wanes in response

to the ecosystem. If any of these systems gain more power, they will result in corruptions unforeseen. For this reason the careful Ballance after the fall of the hammer on this problem and weaning the people off the medicine for this sociological cure, is key in developing a system where all people are equal and free.

On Courts of Law

Each law needs to be understood through a court. A court looks at the law as precedent and then decides how the law should be applied in each instance.

So, there need to be different courts for different matters. Courts to decide financial matters, courts to decide legal matters, courts to decide on matters of traditions that people have been commanded to keep as they are so that their holy books remain unchanged and the interpretations understood as they were to set the precedent for law, and courts that are in the business of the revision of these interpretations so the law may progress as the world inevitably changes.

So the courts of Rabbinic Judaism are essential in maintaining the Talmud and how they are interpreted so the Tanach can be understood as it was written, which is the mythic foundation of Abrahamic Law.

However, Jesus was in the business of revision. He would have said, "Give unto Caesar what is his, and give unto God what you owe him."

And so, in my understanding, it depends on what court you are reading the book. In one way, it is a foundation for financial and legislative prudence; in other ways, we should consider "Love your neighbor as yourself" as the priority above all laws, and even revise the first and second laws of Noah to account for that idea.

In every instance, the law must be interpreted based on the individuals involved and the relationships between them and the world. Since the

individuals are always changing, and the world is always changing, we need these many courts to come to prudent decisions in matters of finance, tradition, and charity.

This, however, is just an idea. Until I can submit my manuscript and have it reviewed by anthropologists, ethicists, and theologians of these many courts, it is just one man's attempt at understanding the mythic foundations of law.

Courts of Atonement

Using the court as a means of healing all parties that were done wrong, making sure that the damages incurred are payed for by the due parties and ultimately determining compensation for harm and the atonement for the offender should be the mentality of an ethical court system. There must be some degree of punishment that occurs before atonement, such as imprisonment or community service, but the secondary goal inspiring atonement in the individual must be the ultimate goal that needs to be considered in the court processes.

CHAPTER 7

Society, Economy and Government

The Imperative of Liberation

Of course, we know how the story goes: the Industrial Revolution did not liberate the majority of people. In fact, it created more work for everyone. Until the civil rights movements, most people worked until they died. But had it not been for this innovation of doing ethics and philosophy separately from theology, these ideas might have been contested and destroyed before they could mature and become popular.

Yet even now, philosophy itself has become entrenched—the shiny new thing has become old and tarnished. The ethics of the day have been hollowed out and reduced to populism. The concepts of human good and freedom have been reduced to the same hedonistic games and base instincts that preceded the moral experiment entirely. So much has already been done that our only chance for sparking another revolution of moral change seems confined to the cyberspace of the new technologies we are developing. If we cannot figure out how to create a new moral order that benefits all, we are at risk of enslaving ourselves yet again—until the next great revolution comes. To live in Thomas Hobbes' nightmare—where the state controls every aspect of your life and freedom is gone—will be the fate of every man, woman, and child who fails to turn the tide of progress in their favor.

And so I have thought many thoughts—most of them left unheard—about how to build a federation of autonomous nations: a system of governance where nations can form and dissolve freely under a shared banner of autonomy within a larger federation, with mechanisms to exchange land and responsibilities without resorting to war. I have thought of off-grid societies and communes, and techno-sovereign

nomads. I have considered all sorts of political ambitions that inevitably run up against the existing order and are thoroughly stamped down. At the end of the day, these are noble ambitions—but they rarely result in anything tangible. Because the only truly tangible path left in this deeply entrenched ethical landscape is to subtly shape the system itself by shaping the technologies we introduce into it.

So what does it mean to be a moral human being in a world where you cannot change the world directly by creating something wholly new? It means we must begin by changing ourselves—adapting to this world while carrying within us the seed of opportunity for the moment when monumental change becomes possible. We must hold within ourselves these ideal kingdoms—solutions to the myriad problems we see and know we can solve—but also acknowledge that the forces of the world are simply too great to overcome directly. We must write these solutions down, think tactfully about how much we give and how much we take, and store up surplus capital so that when opportunity arises, we have the means to tilt the world in our collective favor.

The most ethical and radical thing a person can do in this current environment of severe economic entrenchment and impending technological upheaval is to create a community: a group of individuals who pool resources and capital, preparing themselves to act the moment an opening appears—starting businesses aligned with new technologies as they emerge. Of course, I am talking about artificial intelligence—its transformative power to rewrite culture, shape narratives, and drive industry forward. That is the ultimate goal: to apply the theory of the mythic foundations of law, and alter the state of law itself through the application of autonomous intelligence operations. By engaging society, creating new businesses structured with mutual care embedded into their operations—so that these businesses can outcompete traditional ones—we can create meaningful change.

We must stop living beyond our means in these last years before what may become a technological singularity. We need to store as much wealth as possible, collectively. We must be prepared to invest at a moment's notice when the opportunity arises to create businesses that are self-legislating. We must prepare to, at a moment's notice, create artificial intelligence systems that are self-licensing. And we must, starting now, begin to self-educate—freeing ourselves from the myths in our heads that prevent us from seeing the problem clearly. We must study together, save together, so that one day we can build together these new companies—autonomous companies, enabled by artificial intelligence, that may one day become the foundation for autonomous nations. Nations capable of exchanging goods, resources, land, and security without resorting to war. That is an ethical innovation that may yet prove itself not merely idealistic, but efficient and effective.

We must also prepare for the transhumanist future. As technology advances at ever-increasing rates, so too will our ability to augment and transform ourselves—becoming whatever we desire to become. We must prepare for a future in which the diversification of humanity and human industry reaches a critical point, beyond centralized control. Those among us who choose to live ethically must orient ourselves as self-governing, self-regulating, self-educating individuals—supported by companies we ourselves build—to survive the chaos of this diversification.

This is not to say we will reject all aspects of transhumanism, but it does mean that in confronting the technological singularity and the transhumanist agenda, it is essential to slow the rate of progress just enough to stabilize and entrench our way of being—so that we are not swept away in the chaos of unbridled creative potential. It will be necessary not only to move as quickly as possible in acquiring our own capacities to act, but also to defend ourselves against the inevitable disruptions of a planet engulfed in technological singularity. I firmly believe that by focusing on seizing the opportunities of this first

intelligence revolution, we can create ethical systems faster than competing, unethical systems can tear them down.

Real and Imagined Kingdoms

As a species that has required memorable and functional ethics, we have developed story-keeping traditions worldwide that allow us to preserve key moral insights as oral traditions, keeping moral culture alive. As a Hebrew, I often reflect on the trials and virtues of Abraham. Sarah said his virtues lay in his commitment to justice, maintaining courts of law, and practicing hospitality. Yet, when conducting business in Egypt, he allowed Sarah to be perceived as his sister to avoid persecution—an example of wisdom through compromise.

These are difficult lessons, and it becomes clear why viewing God as an absolute authority, alongside the preservation of ritual and hygiene practices, could be considered advantageous for a culture. Cultural evolution, after all, is also a form of natural selection. By keeping the covenant, the Hebrews grew into a powerful nation, established laws, and strengthened their population, outcompeting their rivals. These written codes structure human behavior by shaping paradigms through education.

However, it is important not to view pre-scientific thought as pseudoscience. Instead, it should be understood as a form of social practice, where scientific validation is unnecessary for its application in everyday life. Even Muhammad's holy warfare can be understood in this way, as morally righteous warfare is possible if a morally righteous leader interprets the Quran and adheres to its conduct through Muhammad's virtue.

The key issue is that economic gain rarely produces moral benefits for the people. It is not Islam's fault that few Muslims—let alone non-Muslims—have the capacity to act with the same dignity and tact as Muhammad. One may observe the slow creep of ignorance into

traditions, just as occurs in every other religious or political ideology as cultures and interpretations evolve. So, the economic reality shapes our ethos just as much as our internal individuation process does, and even if most disdain the taker's game, we are nevertheless forced to compromise and the way we see political solutions and the world around us reflects that.

As we make our way down the streets on our way to work every day, it is unlikely that we see the signs of exponential technological growth—unless we look very closely. But if you look close enough, you'll realize not only are we on the verge of the next great technological revolution, but the world as it is described is not the world that is. We live in a world of many myths—myths like democracy, freedom, the middle class, and equality.

If we are to look plainly at the world, it becomes evident that these things no longer exist—if they ever existed at all. Instead, we find ourselves in the same kind of world that we have lived in for the last 100 generations: an arrangement of the wealthiest individuals orchestrating how society appears, functions, and operates. For the most part, we still live in the exact same system we had before—an aristocracy. Only in the modern day, there are pseudo-democratic tendencies overlaying the aristocratic model, and yet so many people believe there is a different kingdom: either an imagined real kingdom that is a democracy functioning like a republic—the likes of which never truly existed—or a plutocracy where there is no law and order, and everyone is simply subject to a small group of Illuminati-like individuals—which also is not the case.

Others still cling to the idea of an internal kingdom, or heavenly kingdom, where there is an order beyond this world—in some metaphysical space that we cannot detect—where right and wrong will be sorted out without human effort, and justice and providence will eventually come to be. And regardless of how these internal and external kingdoms operate—be they real or imagined—there is

something human about the need to differentiate between the world that is and the world that should be, so that we can begin to sort out what is and how we should respond to it to try to make it how it should be.

As an ethicist, I realize that I too have a real and imagined kingdom in my mind. I see this pseudo-democratic aristocracy outside us, ruling over us, and I also have many different forms in my mind that I have generated as possible solutions to this scenario. And yet, there is something—for once, actually and genuinely hopeful and inspiring—in the world these days as we unlock the potential of exceptional intelligence that we create and can design. This unborn, incubating potential to shape the world in ways that it has never been shaped before is lining us up for an age where the distribution of wealth can finally be done in such a way that it is neither taken from those who have earned it nor given to those who don't deserve it—while still ensuring that every human being has the capacity to participate within their own means in a system that is truly equitable and just.

In that sense, the takers' game that has been going on for the last 100 generations—might itself be on its deathbed. In fact, there are many economists among us who look at the potential of agent-driven artificial intelligence completely replacing human labor not as a highly probabilistic outcome but as a nearly inevitable result of the current trajectory of human industry. The pseudo-democratic aristocracy that we currently live in may yet still survive this, however, and if that is indeed the case, the means by which people have used to climb from the lower class to the middle class to the upper class could be entirely removed—by design. Nevertheless, the takers' game is in a moribund state, for it is near death and heavily wounded by the amount of potential that is currently in the technological arms race.

However, to get into a position where you actually have the potential to have a say in how these things are going to happen, we do need some sort of capital—some sort of monetary value—in order to leverage our

position as a society to make the world into what we think it should be. If the takers' game is near death, the middle class is surely dead. The days of long past, when people could afford a home, a wife and kids, and a couple of vehicles on a median income job—started to die with Reagan. And now, we look at the world as it is, with the tightening of restrictions, the expanding of budgets, and the destruction of human reason through the propagation of misinformation and delirium online, and we can't help but think that there is great momentum behind the aristocracy in hedging out the common person from gaining anything from the final outcome of all of human industry leading up to this point.

But all it would take is a well-written book, a well-orchestrated podcast, and a well-managed online group to plant the seed for the final cultural revolution—one that is necessary for the flourishing of the human species to be available for the entirety of the human species, and not just the select few who win the game. In fact, I believe deeply that this can be done to the ultimate benefit of everyone involved—including those who currently think it is a zero-sum game, including those who are currently set to lose the most should it end up in a direction where their wealth is stripped from them to support the masses, including those who are currently at the heads of nation-states, armies, and large corporations whose very foundational reason for operating could be removed should all of human society be given access to a superintelligent machine.

We are currently living in the future. And in all of the apocalyptic traditions of the world, we have been taught that with incredible power comes inevitable destruction. I would like to challenge that notion, for with incredible power comes incredible liability—and with incredible liability comes an incredible need to manage that risk using incentive frameworks that, up to this very day, we have been able to put into place to prevent incredible power from being misused. I believe it is fully within our power to control, create, and design a future in which

the outcomes of our crafts remain aligned with our interests—even as these crafts inherit their own capacity to shape their own interests. It is necessary for people to have hope going into this, and optimism—and nothing breeds hope and optimism more than creating within the minds of people an imaginary kingdom of utopia, providence, and grace.

Even though these utopian dreams have transhumanist themes rather than theological ones, and even though the utopian goal of creating peace on Earth is impossible as far as I'm concerned, it is necessary—even in dreaming of a better world—to strive to outdo what is possible in order to land in a happy medium where the outcome is at the very least tolerable to all human beings involved. And so, the first thing I can advise is to take from our minds the narrative of doubt and replace it with one of hope. To stop plugging our minds into channels that monger fear, deception, and illusion—and return to a more decent means of attaining information, a more human means, and a more enlightened means—through well-curated media, intentionally chosen narratives, and by producing our own stories and dreams of hope, innovation, and somber readiness for a future that may be challenging but nevertheless is rewarding.

It is important to note that the most important things we are going to be building are not things that are out of our means to build when we have next to nothing. We simply need to do the same thing we've done every time society needed to change: we need to organize, meet, plan, and prepare. We need to form clubs and communes where we can come together and arrange our resources and save our resources. We need to create virtual spaces—not just in book clubs, as we did in the past, or magazines—but in game rooms online, podcasts, and augmented reality games where we can discuss the changing nature of the game of life, attracted by the dopamine of a successful interaction and investing in the communication of strategy and norm revisionism.

Because there are so many ideas in my mind that remain trapped there, simply because there is no social opportunity in the world I find myself in. And I'm sure there are as many innovations and great minds all over the world that would put my childish ambition to shame—and should such ideas become prominent in the collective paradigm of the people, then I know that as the world takes form it will draw on those ideas and create a better world for us all.

For there could yet be a federation of autonomous nations—where nations are formed by people, not with borders, but with the land they have, and they collectively contribute and the industries they build together to make laws and security apparatuses that they become licensed for—and so gain autonomy not only over their minds and their resources but the very culture that shapes them. For there could still be a means by which nations purchase land from other nations rather than having to go to war. And though a coercive process may exist, if a nation is small, it could be exempt from this process; but should a nation grow, it would be subject to it, and natural selection would take its course. There needs to be some form of land exchange other than war between nations if there is ever to be an end to war—and there needs to be an end to war if there is ever to be an end to borders and capitalist competition, where an impoverished nation is exploited to the benefit of the rich.

Because even wars, and nations, and wealth distribution are myths—we have created these ideas in our minds and we all agree to them in our common interactions so consistently, with so little imagination as to how it could be different, that it simply remains that way because we have created a game where nobody has the time to think of anything different. We have created a game where the entrenched systems we build are hostile to any better system that could replace them.

Editor's note: the virtues credited here to Sarah's testimony are not in Genesis, which credits Abraham with justice and righteousness in God's voice (18:19), not in Sarah's.

Inventing Autonomous Governance

Autonomous Nations Theory is scaled up from the observations of Structural Absurdism and Amovera. It is supposed to be built up from the principles of freedom to experiment that is necessary for cultures to self-design, and the harmonious compassion needed to govern over a diverse system like this with grace. It's a tall order to fill, but at every stage, there needs to be a separation between what is done in an ideal nation, what is done at a governing level, and what is done to real nations that are not operating at 100% efficiency. The core concept of autonomous nations came to me one Canada Day while watching a band play and people sing in their native languages. I felt that there was a deep sorrow in this call for unity, and that was because there was something lost: autonomy. So rather than the United States of America, why couldn't we have the Autonomous Nations of Canada?

So I began to think deeply over the rest of the summer about the nature of autonomy and the importance of letting cultures form their own narratives and build up their own intelligences. It should be of little surprise to us that the more freely a culture is allowed to immerse itself in and organize its own intelligence, the more intelligent it becomes. Yet intelligence alone is not the sole outcome of this process. Too often, avarice and sadism naturally emerge, driving a culture into a mode of taking rather than giving when left to its own devices. So I considered that while some cultures entrench morality discovered by sages, philosophers, or prophets into a moral code, it is becoming imperative to examine the process by which moral individuals arrive at these insights and to understand the economic incentives behind the formation of these behaviors. If a society is built solely on taking, it inevitably results in a culture of takers. Now, the public's myths form the moral opinion that shapes the license we give our institutions. We are now in an age of philosophies and popular opinions, and so these are the myths that we shape now that form the public license. Within this mythos of public opinions and philosophies, we grant the state

powers through our actions and inactions. As an institution, the state exists to maintain a secure apparatus that ensures the safety of its population. All other concerns are secondary. Thus, the ethics of a state must not be confused with the ethics of the commons or of businesses.

Once a nation has a security apparatus in place, maintaining businesses becomes the second priority. As mentioned earlier, maintaining a free and lawful society has become the foundation for conducting good business. Respecting established business cultures and avoiding unnecessary interference in others' affairs are essential. This is important to prevent reinventing the wheel in business, allowing businesspeople to operate in a team environment where everyone contributes to peak efficiency by adhering to shared rules rather than altering them arbitrarily.

This way, an individual can enter a business and actively participate without needing to change the structure or be baffled by its strangeness. Just as ethics evolve over time through natural selection, so too do business practices and human rights. However, where rights are based on the freedoms necessary to explore ideas and form new strategies, policies such as the right to bear arms fall more within the domain of state structure. These policies may be reconsidered as state governance becomes more stable and freer of systemic flaws. Systemic flaws, however, are built heavily on the flaws of the population's mythos being ineffective at managing and shaping the logos. So, the maturation of people's ethos needs to be incentivized throughout the society for them to gain the license of mature individuals. This incentivization could come from outside the nation by a federated authority holding all to account for their maturation and moral progress.

The extent to which we can expect to be free cannot exceed our capacity to wield those responsibilities with prudence. The self-organizing nature of society requires freedom of thought as a default, but the reality remains that all freedoms can be abused, and a system

of correction remains a necessary part of every political establishment. The problem with most methods of correction lies in the lack of understanding of the psychological factors that cause deviant behavior and an overlooking of the opportunity to use it to instill moral decency.

Certain criminal psychologies are subject to such harsh punitive measures that a deviant mind cannot even seek therapeutic or psychiatric assistance, resulting in a significant void of information within academic communities regarding their nature. The only solution is to allow a deviant mind to confide in a therapist without facing criminal prosecution for a mere thought pattern. Though this challenges many societal norms, criminal rehabilitation through confession and psychiatric intervention would greatly reduce the burden on the justice system. Meanwhile, the justice system could still pursue individuals who continue to subvert the law and require legal accountability. In this way, knowledge of how to heal deviant minds would become accessible through the sciences, allowing assessment and correction to begin during adolescence—before any crime is even committed.

But we need to draw a clear line here: that these ideas of what a nation could do and the freedom for a nation to self-direct must be considered different things. If there was an authority grading nations and licensing them with various capacities of military, security, state and resource access, then they would need to grade them on the metric of what they achieved, not how they achieved it. But how do we make a government that itself is ethical enough to form a superstructure that oversees the development of many Autonomous Nations within its borders?

Graduated Democracy

Regarding legislation, all laws should be reviewed by the Federations' top universities under the supervision of the School of Ethics before being passed. This would ensure that all legislation meets the

minimum standard for the nation's long-term strategies within the Federation of Autonomous Nations.

The School of Ethics should be built on a similarly empirical science—one that views morality as the necessary countermeasure to natural vulgarity. This science must be developed before the School of Ethics can wield any authority, and it must fully embrace the chaos of natural human disorganization, allowing people to play with ideas and discover serendipitous harmony through spontaneous organization. It would need to differentiate between the standard of freedom deduced through structural absurdist principles and the principles of care and minimized harm of Amovera, and understand that freedom must be given while care can only be rewarded, since all cultures will have different ideas of care but all need freedom.

To cultivate a productive and compassionate human society, ethics must be based on evidence and integrated into a moral institution—whether through charities or the personal warranty industry. No matter the legislature, with the School of Ethics' oversight, any nation should be able to operate within its Federation of Autonomous Nations, regardless of its governing structure. Democracies have the benefit of representing the social contract, but if referendums are held, this can be done through public discourse as well, through any form of government, be it dictatorship or democracy. In this regard, art and activism would have much more pull than economic action, but that is best left to the native population to achieve.

All parts of the Federation should be involved in any amendment to the nation's constitution. This includes the referendum process, the School of Ethics, and lobbyists representing businesses. Depending on the nation's form of government, the legislature should make the final decision within its legal framework. The constitution is designed to be difficult to change, as it ultimately provides stability and cohesion to a country's legislative processes. In any nation governed by law rather than by individuals, the constitution should remain unchanged unless

it is deemed fundamentally unethical. Otherwise, the country risks long-term instability if successive leaders can easily alter the foundation of its laws.

When considering the symbolic roots of human ethics, cultural diversification is inevitable in large populations. As with the playground metaphor, cultures must be both safe and free to seek their own refinement. Human beings will refine themselves in a secure environment, even if that process involves confronting suffering and working through the pains of loss. A safe and free culture has no reason to oppose the nation if the nation provides it with sanctuary.

The guiding principle I have developed is this: If it causes no harm, let it be. If harm is necessary, consider it carefully. When discussing harm, we must understand the concept of consent—hence the importance of the age of consent. It is not reasonable to grant a child, whose brain will not fully develop until age 23, the right to enter contracts, nor is it wise to consider a child's consent valid for activities that could have permanent consequences. But again, these are principles of care, and though this may be a high standard, there may be higher, there may be lower, and the freedom of nations to determine their own standards of care must be implemented, though the standard of care will affect their portion of state power received from the Federation of Autonomous Nations.

So, while adults should have the right to harm themselves if it does not harm others, that is a nation's decision to make such a law, and it is theirs to decide if it is worth complying with Federal Incentives or if they have higher principles to follow in their mythos. This includes the ability to enter contracts or make personal changes that may go against their perceived best interests. That is to say, acts that may seem unnatural—such as homosexuality—are not unethical if both parties give consent, as they cause no harm. Any exceptions to this "no harm, no foul" principle should be reviewed by the court responsible for overseeing a family's cultural framework, such as their church or

university, particularly when dealing with the potential long-term consequences for a child's physical or mental health.

It is important to emphasize that in a Federation of Autonomous Nations, we must learn to coexist with differences, allowing each group to determine its own methods of regulating moral action within the boundaries of national law and the various sects within them—whether aligned with science, religion, or free-form spirituality. Some matters require judicial oversight, while others fall under national legislation. As long as people are free to immigrate to other nations within the Federation, then the nations are gaining the consent of their citizens to abide by their laws by virtue of retaining their population despite other nations existing with different laws.

Many of the world's problems arise from contested land ownership. Throughout history, the conquest of land has been a defining force in geopolitics. It is unrealistic to expect nations to relinquish land they have held for generations simply because of an old treaty or an ancient grievance. However, land disputes can be resolved through peaceful means, particularly via economic incentives and negotiated buyouts.

A proposed solution is a structured exchange program that allows nations or indigenous groups to sell or trade land with the government or other interested parties under transparent, fair, and voluntary agreements. Instead of relying on force or historical claims, this system would prioritize mutual benefit, ensuring that all parties involved feel adequately compensated.

A successful exchange system would require an impartial oversight body to ensure fairness and prevent coercion. Governments and corporations should not be allowed to pressure smaller communities into selling their lands, and mechanisms must be in place to protect cultural and ecological heritage sites. By promoting structured negotiations, the risk of conflict would be greatly reduced, leading to long-term stability and cooperation among diverse communities.

Self-Concerned Altruism

The problem of taking self-concerned people and creating an organization that produces a moral outcome has been a problem that has plagued society since the inception of modern capitalism. The closest we have ever gotten as far as I can tell is the insurance industry, but the link between the wellbeing of the company and the financial wellbeing of the customer has never been established.

This is the intention behind the personal warranty company, while also creating a financially viable business. By linking the profit of the company to the profit of the customer, the more a customer makes the more they have to cover, the more the company can charge, but only insofar as they protect the customer's earning potential. This creates a system of self-concerned altruism within the personal warranty company.

What follows is the outline of a personal warranty company: a company I believe is ethical and would serve as a strong foundation if leveraged with artificial intelligence. This warranty company would guarantee people financial security over the course of their lives. It could also serve as an incentive framework, ensuring that those who join are building businesses aligned with ethical principles. This could form a cascade of businesses—outcompeting traditional models by virtue of their embedded cooperative and social frameworks.

Working in insurance, I realized that the fiscal framework could easily be extended into a package that ensures a person's employment prospects and well-being. The basic coverage would guarantee that an individual with licensing and education in a specific industry receives access to upgrading programs and job opportunities if they find themselves earning less than 80% of the average income in their field. Family maintenance could also be part of this package, ensuring that parents can work while remaining covered for family emergencies and hardships.

The reason insurance serves as a useful model is that the fiduciary system would be reinforced to serve clients better, as their incomes become directly linked to the income of the business through a shared advantage in resource distribution. As participants upgrade their skills and grow financially, they would have more to insure, increasing the coverage available to them and subsequently raising the earnings of the personal warranty company.

The system of underwriters and investigators would transform this into an information highway, which could not only help keep governing structures ethically aligned with the flow of capital and the interests of the people but also fund initiatives that increase investment in social projects through activist investing and lobbying.

The basic theory is that the company is insuring the resumes of the members and making sure that repairing the resume is covered by the company. The resumes value is based off the average earning of a person with their qualification. The rehabilitation of resumes is considered a qualitative endeavor, helping the individual find schooling, therapy and medical help as well as family assistance. This service is not mandatory, but offered as a product to those interested in insuring their employability and reputation.

The structure of business would then be incentivized to invest in programs that ensure workers' benefits and invest in auxiliary businesses that can offer their support services that can uphold their reputation. This networking and structuring of the business would create a framework where otherwise morally neutral people do moral work out of their own self-interest and need to maintain the company's integrity as a caregiving institution.

Establishing a superstructure-sanctioned and operated registry within businesses to track the value of résumés—i.e., what a person should earn based on their qualifications—and job openings across the economy would improve mobility and retention in the job market.

The future may bring a time when rapid redeployment into the job market becomes necessary. For this reason, it will be essential to continuously build upon existing skills. Therefore, education should be integrated into the personal warranty program to ensure that everyone has the ability to operate at the next stages of economic development.

Résumés could then be standardized so that the minimum expected salary correlates with the qualifications relevant to the position applied for. This standardization of qualified pay increases would provide employees with a non-union-based means of negotiating their wages while preventing employers from arbitrarily setting pay scales when merit and work history naturally enhance a worker's value in otherwise intangible ways.

With next-generation economics, the ethics surrounding the use of new products and the operation of new systems may be too vast to legislate through conventional means. Therefore, managing the liability of new products and systems should partially fall under the responsibility of the companies that introduce them, issuing licenses for each product or system to ensure that users assume responsibility for their use.

Each new license for a product or system would require completion of a course that educates the user on the protocols and liabilities associated with its use. The level of responsibility would be managed by a person's general license, recorded in their résumé as maintained by the federal job market. Each company would, in turn, hold liability distribution insurance and be required to undergo education provided by the state's Schools of Ethics.

Of course, certain rights should not require licenses. These include access to information, communication, and financial management. However, where potential harm exists, a license should be required. Furthermore, there should be multiple providers of licenses when cultural considerations are involved. For example, a church could issue licenses for childhood education if a family wished to assume that

responsibility and did not agree with public education policies that conflicted with their values.

Equitalism

One evening I decided to try my hand at coming up with a better solution, and by first envisioning a shared pool of resources, I realized I was reinventing the feudal system, and went on to improve it so that there was no aristocrat owning the estate or the business. There was just an autonomous business that had no owner, a shared pool of resources and a competitive grading metric for who achieves what level of access to the company's resources.

The main concern was land ownership and family management in my mind, so I set the base value of compensation to whatever it takes to achieve a family and land to raise children on. This took me about two hours of thought to come up with and I then starting bouncing the idea against Claude AI to note some weak spots and come up with solutions for it.

The whole architecture of an equitalist business is meant to operate within the moral architecture of an Autonomous Nation, which is centered around a board of ethics, which itself is a graduated version of a Personal Warranty Company. The principle of self-concerned altruism is intended to keep the orientation of law towards the enforcement of equitalism, since otherwise enterprise will be gamed into becoming another form of capitalism where fair distribution of resources is maximized in favor of a small group of individuals rather than distributed in a competitive manner.

It's easy to understand how removing the ownership of a company from one individual to a collective and removing personal accounts from the picture would breed new problems as well as form new advantages. I have yet to fully think through the consequences of what such a transition would look like and am hesitant in putting such a

new theory into a manuscript with ideas I have spent years considering.

However, I think that it is important not only to take a look at the creative impetus I put into action when I create such an idea, but also to take a serious look at a problem no one has dared try to solve and show that with a little visualization and retro-engineering the mind can come up with a solution, not that it is necessarily a good solution.

Now, it is evident that capitalism does not provide the desired result for economic exchange that multiple people seek from an economic system. So, within the framework of Autonomous Nations I intend to lay out a potential alternative to the capitalist-socialist dichotomy. Equitalism is an attempt to remove the main means by which billionaires make their billions without removing the competitive advantages of a market economy. To do this, businesses become ownerless autonomous entities, and the people that form those companies share in a graded manner the wealth of the business. Rather than a communist attempt to redistribute wealth equally, wealth is distributed equitably, so that those that have earned their way through a company's hierarchy get rewards according to their merit. This reward-based economy is designed to ensure everyone who works gets a middle-class lifestyle, and that their assets and wealth are provided by the company through access to company resources.

The core principle of equitalism is that all workers ought to make contracts where they are given due compensation. Since people cannot be trusted to organize themselves and set the value of their labor in a socialist way, it must be a small group of ethical individuals that seek to create a political reality by which others share in the benefit of due compensation. Lack of due compensation is a violation of economic exchange in this system and can be considered a form of undue harm.

To do this, I have designed a system that preserves competition and leadership while eliminating hoarding and unbalanced power

dynamics. The entire economy is meant to be decentralized but also built upon a guild system, whereby economic unions have the potential to lobby governments and form councils. The goal is to ensure a clear communication chain between the small and large businesses and making sure that everyone has the capacity to inform government of their insights and specific needs. It is also designed to create ample opportunity for entrepreneurship while avoiding massive wealth accumulation through guild cooperation and multiple entrepreneurship grants offered to highly graded workers.

The enterprises themselves are autonomous legal entities with no owners. The steward who formed the company, or inherited the company, directs the company rather than owns it as an enterprise. The property of the business is collectively owned by all the workers and shareholders. Stewards have decision-making authority over the business's operations, high-grade access to company resources and political representation through the guild particular to the business. They are also responsible for offering entrepreneurial grants to the workers who have shown exceptional promise.

Stewards cannot sell property from the business, extract dividends or equity beyond graded compensation, transfer control through inheritance or leverage enterprise assets for personal ventures. Like the rest of the workers in equitalism, they gain access to company resources depending on their grade, rather than having a personal account that they get paid into from the business. It is access to the company's resource pool that is the reward, not payment in the traditional sense.

Purchasing power then equates to an individual's grade factored into the company's available resources to the workers. When a worker changes businesses, they keep their grade, but the company they are now working for will have a different resource pool for them to pull from. In this way, investing in the business directly increases the

earnings of the workers. Because there are no personal accounts, no mechanism for hoarding exists.

Workers keep things like clothes, tools, personal items, land and housing. Company's productive capital remains with the company and is used to produce goods and services. These resources are still accessible to workers, depending on their grade and licenses to access or operate such assets. Workers do not take company resources with them when leaving a company, but keep their land and personal assets gained through working with the company.

Payment includes land, housing, and resources necessary to raise a family of six. This is calculated as an average of current costs and is considered the minimum standard for due compensation. Higher grades mean that they will gain the ability to purchase assets using company resources. This will include vehicles, communication devices, really any asset that a person can think of, be it a legitimate need or a luxury for pleasure.

The mechanism is as if the company buys the land or asset for the worker, though in effect they are giving them temporary access to their money to pay the bank's mortgage, which is in the individual's name. Any excess capital saved by the worker is retained by the business but is accessible to the worker as a means of purchasing other assets by this same mechanism. So, every worker gets a pool of capital that they can access from the business.

The cost of food, the cost of land, the cost of assets and commodities are all factored into this pool. Since it is an average cost that the company must pay based on the regional costs of land, the companies themselves are incentivized to reduce the cost of housing and land rather than investing in speculative markets.

This system is possible after a Personal Warranty Company ecosystem is established, so there is a mechanism for the grading to occur. The existence of a federation of autonomous nations would allow the

grading of nations based on their transition to equitalism as a means of fighting avarice in a population.

As for the guilds, these are companies that are genealogically connected through the generation of new businesses through entrepreneurial grants and professional associations. These networks exist to create a democracy of sorts where the businesses have to pool resources together through aggregation to achieve economy of scale and discipline uniformity in businesses.

These guilds can share resources, but mostly they operate as political bodies, useful for communicating with government and collecting the opinions of large and small businesses alike within their guild. They can also take part in collective bargaining, allowing for them to increase their bargaining power when trading. Like everything else in a graduated democracy, guilds themselves are graded by Personal Warranty Companies to be given access to political executive privilege.

The goal of this structural change to economic exchange is to change the outcome of human behavior, not necessarily change human instinct in any meaningful way. It is to achieve wealth distribution while retaining competition and innovation. The total effect of an equitalist nation would be to have all the wealth accessible by the majority of the population, whereas billions of capitalist dollars are locked away in the hands of billionaires and under the thumb of politicians.

With the idea presented we can now start to critically analyze the by-products of what would happen if we were to play it through by trying to run a mental simulation. In the initial stages it's easy to think that such a model simply would not compete with capitalism. It would be overcompensating workers from a capitalist point of view, and maintaining a spending pool for all employees is an accountant's worst nightmare. However, when we consider the economic consequence of paying a $60 minimum wage, it becomes feasible when the surplus

capital is what you are paying them with and that money is not going into the pocket of a now non-existent owner.

It would be necessary for there to be a constitutional agreement for how the business would run; think of it like a program for keeping the thing running. How much money is reinvested, how much goes to employees, how much is saved for entrepreneurship grants? These things need to be worked out if a business is going to be successful. Of course, the board of directors would be in charge of maintaining the operational constitution of the business; those who are licensed to do so would have earned that license through a curriculum and through investment into the company with their own time and effort, which may yet be a good prerequisite to such licensing procedures.

Did I know this before I wrote down that paragraph? No, I put it together as I went. Problems broken down into familiar patterns and solutions built up from fragments of things I've seen and heard before. And yet, now that I read it over, it seems to me a simple enough solution to a problem of infinite complexity: form a court of educated people who have the business's interests in mind to run the business. Councils are something I put a lot of faith in, but incentivized oversight from a PWC is something I put more faith in. Because let's now consider the effects of the PWC on each of these businesses. Should a resume start at $130,000 a year, then minimum wage stops being a career option that they will insure. If someone earning less than $60 an hour signs up, the immediate result would be reeducation to get them to a working position where they can afford a house and children. That is in a capitalist system, but in an equitalist system, producing workers that earn that much is part of the company's mandate, and so they would be graded based on their ability to get workers up to the $60 an hour level.

Now, in a fully equitalist economy, where equitalism is mandated by law, there would be no capitalist businesses and so minimum wage would be whatever it costs to raise a family on a plot of land. The

PWCs would have authority over the operation of most businesses and the result is a decentralized pseudo-command economy where incentives are used rather than decrees. This is different from socialism since it's no longer a conventional capitalist base; it's actually closer to communism in my opinion since people do not own their own wealth insofar as they gain access to a collective given pool of resources.

I may not be an economist, but I am a philosopher. And philosophy has taught me that all knowledge is valuable, and if one gains a grasp of how knowledge works, then they will be able to use whatever knowledge they have to a maximized effect. Perhaps none of this will work, from S.T.A.M.P. to PWC to equitalism, but if it does it will be because the gaps were filled in by people who knew how to extrapolate on incomplete data sets, innovate where no one else would try, and implement what was never done before. I believe that giving everyone the opportunity to live a full life and the possibility to be an entrepreneur themselves could only increase the potential of human beings to achieve more. However, they will still be human beings, so the question is with all of these structural safeguards in place will that reduce the absurd capacity of humanity to try and take more than they deserve from their fellow people? There is only one way to find out: to try.

Editor's note: the author offers equitalism as a thought experiment. The wage figures are illustrative, not derived from data.

Autonomous Nations as a Thought Experiment

The general structure of the movement can be thought of as a thought experiment at this point, an internal kingdom that I am structuring as a meditation on ethics. Everyone has their own internal kingdom, based on their own mythos and their own desire for how the world should be. Some of them are sparse unconnected ideals of qualities they wish the world had, others are full-fledged political ideologies like this. You can see how the barriers between structural absurdism and Amovera

struggle to keep themselves separate, how pragmatic concerns come in and muddy the waters of the moral maximums that were intended to lay the foundation but quickly got buried by real-world considerations of human corruption and inconsistency.

What is important from this thought experiment into the nature of Autonomous Nations is to think of solutions other than just making a magic AI that is supposed to come up with these ideas for us. It is unlikely that it will come up with anything that is radically different than what we can come up with, so there is still time for some final great inventions and insights to fall from a human mind onto a printed page. Even if I just go out and meet some people and spread these ideas around, it would be enough to get the ideas circulating and becoming memes of their own rather than to allow the public discourse of political progress to remain entrenched in a handful of old theories that have yet to gain traction on a global scale.

Half of the problem is not that AI will replace our jobs, but that the job market economy makes that a problem in the first place. Do we really want a future where work is granted by an all-powerful AI because that is what we wished for, or do we want a means of continuing the human experiment in a diversified way that will grant us a multitude of options to choose from? I think everyone would agree having the choice to see their traditions and cultures through to the end is far more preferable than a Silicon Valley executive or a ruthless politician having the final say on our collective evolution.

If we can manage to come up with a system something like the Autonomous Nations of Canada, then we might have a shot at a future where we get to be what we desire, not what fits into the majority's prescription of what we should become. In a future where we can become literally anything that comes to mind, having a system that licenses us to do so once we demonstrate the maturity to protect others from whatever it is we become is better than having the powers of self-design stripped from us entirely. I believe we will run into the

problems of diversification and liability inevitably should we continue down this road of technological development, and should we encounter this transhumanist future, we had better hope that some of us ensured our freedoms and securities were preserved as constitutional.

Patriotism and Sensationalism

The line between patriotism and sensationalism is usually so heavily blurred they become one and the same thing. The hallmark of a corrupt political system is when sensationalism and patriotism become indistinguishable from one another. Patriotism is simply the love for ones country, and is an ethical thing, but sensationalism is the rallying of people around a political idea en masse without forethought.

True patriotism knows the illnesses of their country and seeks to heal it and be part of the great thing their country is by actively preventing it from falling into corruption or poverty. This is true patriotism, and a true patriot should rather fight against a leader who seeks to mind wash and act against the will of the people, one who is spineless and bends easily to foreign and corporate incentives, rather then themselves soundlessly bend to the corruption that this produces.

The Inevitability of Progress

Regressive philosophies such as back to the land movements, re establishing free markets and regression to anarchy are all nice ideas and thought experiments which have a particular nostalgia and simple goodness about them. Sadly the reality is one of an arms race, where there is no room for regression and the only way to avoid sociological collapse or complete annihilation is to continue to try to cultivate harmony and diversity within the current systems of unrelenting power and progress.

The reason this is inevitable is because as long as the systems of power are known, there is always going to be one idiot who decides they are going to use the systems of power against everyone else and achieve sociological power. There is a general misunderstanding that universal teaching of ethical non doing is in itself an ethical means of combating this ignorance, to create a cease fire and make people realize their inner good and create world peace.

Perhaps this will work in a group of 10, but suppressing the desire of 8 billion free willed people to seek social dominance is much like saying we are going to make sure every rain drop falling from the sky is going to do so in perfect parallels. It's not taking into account the basic chaos inherent in complex systems. Reality itself being a complex system, utopian philosophies are not aligned with reality in general. All we can do is work with the realities we have to try and achieve the highest possible human virtue.

Social Metaphysics

One thing comes from what came before it in this world. As things come and go, some things change, others stay the same. Knowing the difference between what changes and what stays the same is the basis of progress. But what can be said about moral progress? The same that can be said about other things in this world.

There are moral characteristics that stay the same while others change. The foundations never change: You prefer to live, you need sustenance and shelter. Reproduction sustains a line of people, and productivity sustains a line of narratives.

To be productive is to get the things you need with your time, and around those processes we shape moral narratives about how those processes should be arranged.

Narratives are usually arraigned in logical "if then" clauses: if I start a family, then my line will continue. If I master my craft, then my needs of food and shelter will be met through trading my surplus with the works of others.

This Trading of surplus is an arrangement of productive behaviours with those of others in working relationships. Society tends to arrange itself so people can secure their needs through the economic working relationships they form.

In large scale, industrial societies, these tend to organize into companies: working units of people that fill an economic roll in a larger economy. It is within economies, either hunter gathered societies or large scale industrial nations, that their various needs are met through an exchange of surpluses in a society.

These surpluses must be built on a surplus in security, where the influence of foreign powers that may themselves want the economic surpluses of another society, are kept at bay. These can include foreign and criminal elements that would otherwise obtain surpluses through the use of force, rather than through exchange.

This creates the general metaphysics for how narratives are arranged in societies. A big part of this is the role of men, women and children in a society, and how these arrangements are stratified into different social groups of varying esteem in a given society.

For example, some women are in charge of farming while the men hunt and go to war. In others, women are restricted to child rearing while the men farm or have some other role in society, such as security or executive functions.

Industrial societies have elevated women to near equal standing of men, which has its own social implications in their place in society and family life.

There are often entire families of higher social standing than others due to what role they play in the working arrangements of a society. Through each person's craft, they create products, which at a surplus can be traded for the products of others. These can range in great variation, from executively binding contracts to a trained horse or architectural plans.

Because products vary in nature, like everything else in the world there are products that vary and those that stay the same. All of these shape the moral narratives, based on what kinds of productivity are rewarding. What should and should not be is then justified by what has survived and stayed the same. What changed and passed on cannot be used to justify moral narratives unless it is recovered by some revivalist narrative.

Moral Narratives, then, are works of art that describe working relationships and justify them either by some rational understanding of their process, or by some creative allegory relating it to some "Higher" moral principle.

Works of art often outlive their creators, so higher value is placed on works of art once they have outlived their creators. Moral philosophy, is for all intents and purposes a work of art, and so is law considered art and really any product no matter how refined and simple, is a work of art including the sciences.

Yet, founded on the principle of a distribution of a surplus of security, realistically this does not result in a fair and equal distribution of security. Rather, security is distributed relative to the distribution of surplus. Depending on where a person finds themselves in the distribution, they will not received the same access to security as those that receive more than them due to the surplus they receive for what they create.

The False Authority of Wealth

In our corporate system, attributing authority to a person of success is a common mistake made by many people. Often, wealth is a result of systematic circumstances and not personal skill. Because of this reality, many people end up not only attributing wealth to authority, but many people use wealth as a requirement for positions of authority, especially in corporate political systems.

Opportunity and Diversity

The logistics of ethics being the Ballance between power and diversification often boils down to the question of how then does diversification produce power? The answer is opportunity. Diversifying potential avenues of success allows for untapped opportunities to flourish and potential growth to increase. This is why the spiritual and artistic investment in promoting cultural innovation has indirect but never the less powerful ramifications in economics as innovation produces new waves of progress that can create abundant new wealth leading to growth and investing in all sectors.

Corruption as Instinctual Misreaction

Our instincts are designed to allow us to respond correctly to our natural environment. Having transformed our natural environment into our new industrial one, we are exposed to unnatural incentives that create instinctual misreactions to these new unnatural stimuli. The solution to this problem is to firstly try and make the working environment as ergonomically designed towards natural reaction as possible, while simultaneously training peoples willpower and critical mind to recognize unnatural incentives towards unethical actions and their ability to resist these temptations and redesign the environment in an more natural way.

Connate Economic Adaptive Ethics

The human mind has developed to adapt, but it has also designed to adapt to its natural environment, not the industrial one. In order to allow for the mind to adapt to the ever changing nature of current capitalist democracy, there needs to be a systemic solution to create a more ergonomic means of instigating human adaptation to modern industrial economic systems. Without this, the social systems have developed through trial and error methods to coping with last centuries economic problems. These economic adaptations can be understood and put into effect through systemic means resulting in a starting point to creating an ergonomic economic and political system tailored to streamline capitalism and democracy in a way that reduces conflicts of inflects with corporate incentives and political ethics.

Entering the age of mechatronics, it is paramount that we begin developing an ability to solve these problems before they happen. Foreseeing the effects of genetics and developing ethical tolerances for not just bio ethics but AI ethics that will allow humanity to prosper form these new technologies as well as any unforeseen capabilities to arise in the future. These ethics are not necessarily directly caused by the state of economies, but are adaptations of our original instincts surrounding our traditional functions to the modern state of life as we now experience it. While some of these have been successful in adapting to the new state of affairs, others have been less capable to the modern environment and are thus subject to misinterpretation of stimulus resulting in corruption, sociological illness and general inefficiencies.

Consenting to Capitalism

The arms race of progress is an inevitability. Progress will always drag the majority who are weak of will into a behavioral pattern where cheaper and more leisurely means of doing things are strived for.

Science will continue as military and industrial extremes compete against each other for power and the arms race of power sets the powerful in a race against each other and death itself. The purest form of human goodness, wonder, will continue to unveil our potential driving both the slothish and the vain to strive towards their ends constantly creating less and less natural means of doing things.

The only means of stopping any of this however, is to accumulate enough power to stop it. Ironically due to the presence of military forces, to rise against them is an intangibility in and of itself. One must at the very least side with one or another and everyone is participating. The need then for alliances forces us to choose then, between powerlessness and the selfish unethicallity that is sitting back and watching the world burn, or to participate and attain as much power and wisdom as we can to stop it.

Because of the stakes, and peoples lack of integrity many feel that even in these conditions it would be vain to attempt such a thing, that everyone who tries ends up messing things up more then it was before and there can only be ethical decay in the name of progress. I however believe this narcissism and nihilism really stems from a bias of living a short life and the oldest of us only being able to recall their experiences of the last 100 years at best. This is not a significant measurement to form a bias around the nature of human evolution.

What I have seen is the more society develops, the more opportunities there are to return to our natural state of foragers, and though the nature of evil is prevalent and propagates, the progress towards realising good sustains and accumulates over time. There will be a point if this process is guided in the right direction, where the ethical understanding, enforcement and incentive breaches the point of unethicallity for two reasons: good endures by its very nature and will outgrow any free radicals by process of natural evolution and that humanity craves to return to its natural state and will, once shown the way to do so, will with great vigor.

Though all the interfaces of humanity and progress are currently unnatural and disconnected from ethics, there are means by which these interfaces can be replaced with natural incentives to good backed by real and sustainable force. These systems are a perfect, and from that we must Ballance the realities that are with the perfect bar, and define an optimum human potential. Through striving for optimum we can attain the highest virtue humanity can possibly attain. Besides it being possible and a very dangerous thing to do, it is essential that it be done out of evolutionary duty to our species. Though humanity has fallen into nihilism and disconnection from our human pride, this too can be reinvigorated as we realize our duty to sustain this world and build its epitaph for the good of others once we are gone. We will be gone eventually, nothing lasts for ever. All that matters is we resolve to stand by our integrity as human beings and try.

Uniform Social Conventions

Systems tend to run better if all their constituent parts operate in the same way. There is less need for individualized maintenance, its easier for their users to familiarise and learn operations and it is simply ergonomic for there to be definite patterns to the way things are.

The use of uniform social conventions such as the 9 to 5 work day, the week, the weekend, the nature of selling goods and customs of hospitality are all examples of uniform social conventions that promote a healthy economy. The need to follow these can be promoted but not enforced however. Minimum standards can be put in place for certain more vital things: minimum income and maximum hours, but for most of these conventions each community must be in communication about what works and what does not work for them, though striving to achieve effective social conventions such as shop hours in tourist zones, should be a priority of the town council.

Quantity, Quality and Safety

Industrial ethics in the western world often has been branded by the basic operational slogan of safety first, then quality before quantity. This is a direct ramifications of the need to build willpower to compensate for the natural incentives of industry itself. Industry does by its very nature reward for production first, then quality and not very often at all for safety. However, the effects of safety and quality on production are very real be it directly to customer satisfaction, or indirectly through operational efficiency, that the need to teach the reversed incentives has become paramount in actually achieving the high production state that industry demands and strives for. Some of the most successful companies use this principle to its fullest efficiency and not only does production soar, but the moral of the workers and their will to participate in such an ergonomic company often leads to greater worker efficiency and investment in the business.

Advertising for Start-Up Businesses

There is a moral and civil need in market diversity. The need to support start up markets is a key component in producing a market that is competitive and sustainable. There is more then just the need for grants and government investment in new business to this problem though, the need for a reserved and strategically placed section of the advertising market in the promotion of new business, and the security of market patents to prevent big businesses from sleeping in and taking the success from new businesses needs to be addressed.

Cultivating Art

There is a need for art cultivation in society. The media has a general duty to be an artistic representation of the regions cultural identity and act in a means by which the utility of art is used to its fullest potential. Like most spiritual things, corporate incentive kills art as well. There

must be minimum to no corporate influence over this use of media for it to have the desired effect. Because of this, a true artistic society is not only in contact with the political and spiritual minds of the aria, but is fundamentally off grid be it by permission of a sympathetic mind, or through evasion.

Art must have the environment and incentive to exist. Those who recognize the utility of benefit from the utility of art should actively partake in its cultivation if not it's creation based on the understanding of its subtle nature and fragility and the moral cost of corrupt or ineffective art.

The artistic mind requires inspiration, spirituality and a culture that is diverse and full of ideas and artistic knowledge. It also needs incentive and support to create art in a non corrupt way.

Art's Utility and Corporate Incentives

There are many discussions of corruption, yet no one has been able to identify the root cause of it with any ease. Because I couldn't communicate these ideas efficiently, I have been forced to coin the term "Sociological Illness" due to our anthropomorphic minds inability to communicate systemic problems efficiently. You see, society must exist for there to be spirituality and artwork. Society however, cannot yet provide for spiritualists (of any or all disciplines) and artists because they can only support the art and spirituality when it has the properties that attract more business and proves its utility. Only being able to reward things for their utility, capitalism has yet to support arts and spirituality adequately because it does not yet understand the true utility these things have.

Art and spirituality are means of freeing and diversifying the social mind from uniform biases generated from uniform incentives. Naturally, whether the phenomena is due to creation or evolution, people use introspection and self expression to process what their

instinctual responses to issues are and circulate them in a social system. This works as long as we operate in our natural environment, but on an industrial scale, art has been used for industrial means to attract customers. Instead of diversifying society and producing diverse opinions to tackle problems with many solutions, art has only been seen as an attraction tool. What this does is take the social mind of the human being and tries to replace it with a drone mind in the absence of our natural methods of group thinking. This is rejected by not only most minds, but by society in general resulting in many types of systemic failure, failures I categorize under the label of sociological illness

Beyond the effects of sociological wellbeing, art and spiritual things have no direct economic value, beyond that of attracting customers and procuring votes (which, all things considered is almost unethical). To truly achieve effective arts and spirituality, there needs to be an artificial environment where artists and spiritualists can exist, supported by a community that appreciates the value of the sociological health produced by true arts and spirituality. If our corporate democratic society cannot manage to create such an educated system, then it is our duty as sociologically dependant human beings to make a society that will, in spite of current trends, for the sake of our sociological wellbeing. To truly make an environment where arts and spirituality can be studied without corruption of corporate incentive either all of society must change to these principles en masse, or a new and isolated social system must be created as a microcosm that can support such research and development. In regards to the scale of such an undertaking it is easy for most to reason that the latter must lead to the former when the realities at hand are presented and the data correlates. I'm going to try and explain why.

You see the relationship of the artist and the spiritualist is older than history itself. The spiritualist will isolate oneself from others through altered behavior of even self exile in order to understand their own

human instincts, that is, how we are designed to respond to the world. They then return with knowledge to heal and guide, which inspires the artist. The artist then expresses these ideas, and as many artists interpret many spiritual teachings, many alternative views and thus solutions to problems cultivate in the sociological mind of the society. From this culture of insights, decisions are made with maximum consideration of our instinctual and intellectual capacity to solve problems. By communicating with the people, leaders are then able to manage arrangements between people and make decisions that need to be made immediately with the peoples wisdom in mind.

This does not work if one small group of artists are payed to reinforce corporate behavior and take all the support from true artists and spiritualists while simultaneously severing the connection between the leader and the people by buying their will as well. Once the cord is cut between our methods of procuring ethics and the decision making body, its a short step to authoritarian government payed for by corporate interests. To correct this, not only does true art and spirituality need to be supported and reconnected to society to heal it from the ground up, but the conflicts of interest must be unwoven from the top down by reconnecting the government with the people and disconnecting them from corporate incentive.

Any undertaking of such progressive transformation, like any other process that takes power from the powerful to sustain in the future, must be done with a sense of militant industrialism like any other legal reforms, yet as an ethical study, must be done without creating disharmony. This is then, a battle that needs to be fought for our sociological health with our minds, rather then a battle for the Commons fought with resources. It's also not just about the utility of arts and spirituality, but the therapy of society as the social mind that it is. Currently, instead of treating the mind as an individual self sufficient unit, we need to treat it as part of the sociological animal we are.

The political change must address the social illness within our political and corporate systems and, by decoupling the political from the corporate incentives that result in sociological illness on a political level, begin to heal and rebuild. This is much easier said then done, because it is like doing brain surgery: the blood (geopolitical power) must keep flowing to the body and mind of a society while the brain (spiritual, artistic and sociological wellbeing systems) is operated on and then left to heal. If corporations cannot prosper from the changes in the system, the system will reject the changes. Same goes for the peoples quality of life and political systems efficiency.

Without going too deep into political theory, perhaps some of the best examples of the hundreds of cases of conflicting incentives in politics are the lobbyist vs public communication systems and the processes of campaigning and electoral funding. I'm going to digress form typing out my hypothetical alternatives here because the reality is, without testing political systems first, the method of "preach and follow" politics has had disastrous effects historically. Science needs to be done. Regardless, the issues of conflicting interests are abundant and very evident in their entropic effect on business and sociological wellbeing in general. India is an excellent example of a democratic country with a polarisation between intensely corporate and corrupt to intensely traditional and spiritual in the same country.

What is needed is a counter balance to make corporate democracy work, or even better, evolve into a more efficient, productive, opportunity creating and ethical political system then the one we currently have today with all of its shortcomings. Because of the insidious nature of corporate psychology, detachment from it is not only necessary for the healing of a societies components, but the functioning of the research and development of sociological illness treatment. To further complicate things, isolating the tendency for the researchers themselves to become influenced by corporate incentive or

simply their own misconceptions or biases also needs to be factored in, but that is another topic in and of itself.

Realities of Sociological Illness

There are many levels of sociological illness. From the arms races of power which perpetuate the abuse of power at the tops of society, to the disconnection of spiritual and artistic practices from the rolls of leadership, the many levels of discord are apparent. The work of reconnecting the people in power, who are undeniably the corporations with the duty of sociological stewardship, must be addressed delicately for the realities of the corporate leadership and human need are both realities that cannot be underestimated.

To do this properly, we must address both the needs for corporate leaders to protect and grow their assets as well as the human rights and principles that every society need to exist. The conundrum of power cannot be managed by transparency alone. The only means that a military can be trusted is by having a force greater then it capable of coming to existence if it is found the corporate leaders have been abusing their power.

It is in this way these changes can be enforced not a right to bear arms but a duty to bear arms and be ready to hold the government accountable. Now, this cannot work if it does not work for the total benefit of society, especially the corporate leaders so there is minimal incentive to corrupt the state from the top down.

Now beyond the reality that the most powerful men will become rulers official or not, and how democracy must be dually enforced by the people, the ultimate reason behind these changes is to make human rights and sociological illness enforceable from a fundamental level. These include the conditions which society operates and the psychological and material needs of individuals.

Where the individual needs are rather well known the needs of sociological wellbeing are not yet recognized. These include the need for bottom up governance and the protection of those vulnerable to majorities, the need for a spiritual and artistic systems, and the symbiosis with biospheres. Though the principles can be scientifically proved, which is necessary, more necessary is the formation of a binary government system to allow for both the powerful and the common.

This binary government must be maintained in the center by the elected officials who can mediate between those of corporate power and those of the Commons, for the sake of both, but selected by the Commons. The Commons forming the lower level of government is a mixture of small business leaders and government created groups that look after the human interests of each city zone, town or rural region.

On the other side of the scale between the people and their rights, the government and its central function in operating the standard military and mediating between the common and corporate coherent systems, is the corporate government system. Here, the corporate must operate in complete transparency, though their ownership of the majority of the state gives them a natural and undeniable power over economic functions.

These powers need to be given a right to maintain a state of security against each other as they are in competition, and enforce their own security systems at their own level without having any negative effect on the Commons. The ends by which they are held accountable of their actions amongst themselves must be written by them in a way that promotes their way of life, while any effect on the people must be done by the government to communicate between the two.

The studies by which will reveal the needs of the corporate has not been opened, yet I will do so as soon as possible. As far as I know, the problem of corporate power is that the arms race between companies for wealth promotes corrupt practices in order to achieve a cutting

edge. If the mutual grounds by which business could be mutually enforced by the corporate for the corporate, then perhaps the upper levels of sociological illness could also be cured.

Where's corporate incentive are volatile and destructive in the common and governing levels, at the corporate level it is vital and must be fueled, though contained. I am confident that by maximizing human potential by managing the system in such a way that corruption is managed, the corporate level and all other levels will profit greatly so wealth and prosperity are felt at every level of society.

Inner Community

Domination and exploitation are the nature of undefined civilizations. It is natural for a society to seek to dominate, and within itself reduce harm as suffering while causing harm and suffering outside of it.

It is impossible to guard a nation without taking to the sword all who stand against it, even within the borders of a great civilization there exists unrefined organizations that take advantage of the softened people within the borders of a great civilization.

So, outside a civilization there are the alien, who have their own ideas of how to run a civilization but act in hostility to those beyond their borders. Within a civilization there exists societies which themselves reduce the corruption within to near perfect harmony.

That is the goal, since statecraft requires a degree of natural brutality, it cannot produce a society of perfect harmony, but within a secure state, foraged by the blood and fires of war, there can exist a noble industry that can result in a noble society, and a benevolent inner community.

If this noble community can do the work to become the heart of a civilization, then that is as close to perfect as any civilization can draw. This is the optimum civilization, a civilization guided by the ethics of the inner community, and protected by the domination of the state.

Legal Government and Economic Constituencies

The need to separate the ethical and economic governments totally is one of the most intrinsic principles that connate theory presents. This division of the powers that are [that is the transmission of military force into political authority] from the corporate systems which are any systems that can be allowed to exist separately for the sake of competition and production is not only needed to allow for maximized industrial output, but for the ethical operations of government in general.

Systemic Solutions

Protesting for change is like putting a bandage on a single cut and continuing to walk through a house full of knives thinking you fixed the problem. The solutions is to take the knives out of the house instead of continuously tending to single wounds. The solution is removing corporate incentive from politics, not protesting single issues. If one detached from anthropomorphic thought, they will find most things in the world operate by this principle. Eventually objective solutions will arise from systemic diagnosis. Continuing this example would be the real thing to protest about is corporate incentives in politics while everyone else holds the line for single issues until the job is done.

Gradicratic Democracy

At the very core of the problem of corporate incentive comes the means by which politicians earn their livings and how they collect their information. Between campaign funding, the electoral system and lobbyists, politicians are in our current democratic system forced at the end of many barrels to succumb to political and corporate realities that put them in a position where thief very livelihood depends on conflicts of interest being maintained.

There have been some progressive movements towards untying the corporate knot, but the ultimate solution is to treat our leaders as scientists rather then whatever it is we think we are promoting today. The reason I say this is because, like a scientist, the politicians job is to collect t data, create a product based of that data and present it to a scholarly community for review where it then goes towards the production of a product, in this case law.

The first thing that needs to be done, is insure the funding for societies needs is guaranteed in the most insurable way. As human as it may be to alienate our corporate leaders and bite at their ankles making them pay for our government because we resent their success and power, this will not produce a sustainable surplus budget. The only, and grueling solution is the universal suffrage of a flat tax on the middle class.

The second most vital change is changing how the data is collected. Lobbying is undemocratic and should be considered the most illegal thing that any one company can take part in. The alternative should be a system where there is a universal participation of all people in the making of law. How I imagine this working is every group of people effected elect temporary mediators to mediate between their own what their stance on the matter is. Depending on the vulnerability of each participating group, likewise representation would be given to counterbalance vulnerability and power at the mediating table.

After each group has their argument worked out, what is at least a four part discussion is taken place in a court environment where the scientific data for each parties needs are addressed and the resulting legislation is one that all parties can agree on and is proven ethical and functional by the meeting. The political representative simply acts as a mediator between the political powers and the conflicting parties.

With this in place, the political influence over the social mind must be recognised as dually undemocratic. Campaigning must be done

through independent medias with equal support for all participating parties. Parties that apply for funding would be the ones who had the most support in their communities. Support would be determined after politicians are hired to run for leadership in each community using a proportionate governing system.

Politicians as scientists would have a job market and a salary which would be hired by the communities, who would hold a census on what political opinions they had and hire politicians based on the competing opinions of the people. Each opinion would likewise produce an equal representation so that minorities and majorities had the same amount of representation per party. This would mean that at the start of an electoral race, each party has the same funding to do their campaign. Municipalities would have their proportional governments, and regional, provincial and federal members of parliament would have to run under the same equal funding model.

Campaigning would be done on competing socialized media channels only. These media channels are also hired by the communities, who are funded by the communities based on which did a better job. Each community must support at least three media channels to maintain competition and prevent monopolization or stagnation. Bribery and any corporate corruption of these media channels must be made entirely illegal for this to work.

I principle, this is Gradicracy in a nutshell, producing a government with no inverse incentives, one where politicians are rewarded on performance and the ability for media or corporate corruptions to occurs are illuminated on every level. This will enforce that the people's power remains in tact and that the nation's that abide by these principles can steadily improve and grow in a way that corporations can feel safe to invest in as the foundations of the economy while being restricted from buying out the political system and making business impossible for the rest of corporate society.

The Work of a Statesman

The work of a statesman is not one drummed up overnight. While most crafts require mastery of a set of skills, and some arts require the ability to create something new, a true statesmen must take a thousand new ideas and use them to shape a direct course on which a society can move forward.

Yet in which direction will the statesman point towards? Surely they must defeat their demons and clear their delusions of what the world is in order to have a sense of direction. When most are bought out and dominated, a true statesmen must remain autonomous and direct for themselves their lives.

And if they can maintain moral autonomy, how should they go about changing their society? They cannot use conventional means, not can they simply master a method that has in the past been unsuccessful. They must always be on the frontier of the new, and always be grounded in reality lest idealism and vain glory draw them to use means that do not achieve the desired ends.

So the statesman must be a philosopher, a scientist, and a person of industry. They must also be a skilled actor, capable of maintaining the power of good character to persuade with charisma where others fail to see reason. And yet we ask ourselves, why are all statesmen incompetent? Because the task of a statesman is beyond what any single person can be expected to master.

Does this mean that there is no hope for states, that they will always fall victim to the incompetence of statesmen? Perhaps, perhaps not. While we cannot trust people to be good statesmen, we can trust businesses to at least do what they do in a predictable manner. It is much easier to build a moral business than it is to find a moral and intelligent person.

After all my work trying to understand the world, trying to overcome myself and define what is truly moral, I have come to the conclusion that what needs to be done is the construction of a moral industry, one where it's influence on the state and the people is predictably positive. Such an industry would need to be both profitable and effective at it's given task, and if formed could find investors in other industries that would benefit from a fair and moral society.

Reward-Based Thinking

Its not that there is anything wrong with reward-based thinking: It is but only the default. It has become the default long before us through billions of years of natural selection and is remarkably efficient at organizing people's behavior into healthy, productive societies. However, these societies are only as good as their collective effectiveness, which is limited by a number of factors.

For many societies, it is not a question of what they are doing right or wrong, but rather how they are being consumed in part of a much larger economic scheme thriving off the exploitation of entire populations. It is not too hard to imagine that we wouldn't riot if we decided that not making enough to put our kids through school was unacceptable and deserved a civic revolution. In other countries, there is no opportunity, and those who work make pennies; to not die is noble.

So, when we look through the lenses our world offers and see these things, what do we think? Do we make a commitment to a serious plan of action to try and change it, or do we look briefly in dismay at the relentless mess that is our world and resolve to not think about it again for as long as possible? Those who think about these things are people who actually think they can change something and get a reward from it. Such people tend to be the rich, the ingenious, and the utterly mad.

Yet, rewards-based thinking is only the default. Ask any ancient religious guru of the past, almost every one claimed the true path of spirituality is to do something other than live our lives off reward-based thinking. In the distant past this meant simply to be good to people in the same tribe. For many this was considered a difficult feat, since intra tribal relationships tend not to be as romanticized as we think. But effective societies achieved things like this, though more often from benevolent rule of law then a reformed sage teaching how the world works.

Still when the two come together, such as in Roman Christianity, Islam or subsequently Sikhi, the effect of raising the bar so high people finally achieve bare minimum can be achieved. Not everyone ends up adopting so called "high culture", or rather, for the most part they can't, since economic and civic patterns are intrinsically intersected. Even in populations practicing a frequently observed religious doctrine, people still tend to translate it into our native paradigm of reward-based thinking. This is not only religious in nature, as legal and social considerations intermingle with human culture.

Some individuals, however, are actually changed in their paradigm, some by experience, some by philosophy, and others by their own mental instability. It is possible for a person to live, say, not for themselves but for their world, or live simply in a state of oneness. Eastern schools such as Hinduism, Buddhism, Jainism and Taoism speak of these altered states of mind, each fundamentally changed by the spiritual path they followed. Those we know of that did change their cultures mostly exist because they had a positive effect on the populations, they found themselves in and were allowed to live. Not all alternative states of minds have positive effects, with those that don't tending to be short lived.

The problem with alternatives to rewards-based thinking is they always tend to revert back to rewards-biased thinking. The solution seems to be to avoid this problem entirely and opt to shape people's

paradigms to reframe how they perceive is a good way of going about getting rewards and avoiding punishment. I have yet to see a religion succeed at "shaping" a person's mind from seeking rewards and avoiding punishment. As long as I have lived the only people ever changed by a religion did so through voluntary self study in their paths practice.

Though drugs destroy the mind they are still a 100% effective means at changing the mind: you take a drug, your mind changes. Religion is much more subtle, it shapes how we live, even if it started as a revolution a religion is now so encompassing that it shapes cultures and societies, and individuals live in it and by it, but few live for its sake entirely and fewer to the point where they could be considered "changed" by it, in any way that noticeably restructures their behaviours around not living for reward.

Really, regardless of what religious trend we could follow, from the "high culture" of Christianity, Islam and Sikhi that thrive on the economic organization of human societies, to the "transcendent philosophies" of the east, they cannot survive by making people change in mass from rewards-based thinking, rather they provide a medium in which people change as much as they think they have to or want to, mostly to seek reward and avoid punishment. It is only in the rarest of cases that anyone is changed from this, and rarer that such a change is actually positive improvement on the well-established default.

This problem of the real limitations of culture are easily compensated by simply going with the default, and it has been that way for a very long time. It may have only truly helped the few in history, the powerful and the wise, but everyone in the system of seeking rewards and avoiding punishment organized into various economic games. Capitalism does what no religion can, and build on the default rather than trying to do away with it. A healthy capitalist society rewards those who seek reward, and the best at it end up dominating and

organizing society so they can continue to reap reward, to peoples benefit or peril depending on what society they are in.

Its not that there is anything wrong with capitalism, its just there is nothing spiritual about it. It is built on the complete absence of spiritual transcendentalism. The mind does not need to be changed, it needs to be refined, made keener in how it seeks rewards, more aware of potential punishment. This means there is nothing to revert to: while religions set standards and hold the bar high, to capitalism we were already at the bar, and we just needed to be pushed a little higher.

Scaling Political Change

There is a scale to what level of political change needs to be implemented at any time and a method to clear oneself of the delusions that can result in wasting efforts on using an inefficient or over ambitious means of political change. The best case scenario is one is in a fair society and one simply expresses to their leaders what change needs to be taken, the worst case is there is massive oppression and dedication and the only means of resolving to problem through total military domination. History has shown us however, that these methods are always somewhere in the middle and rarely will any enemy fight to total annihilation, nor will any leader accept a political position without question.

Activism for the Sake of Activism

Perhaps the most frustrating thing I witnessing is people protesting things and having no push or pull over the matter due to the sheer lack of response or incentive to respond. Corporations can pay for any damages to political reputation through funding a politicians' campaign rendering most demonstrations completely ineffective. if activism is done, it must threaten something more fundamental then votes, and must be done for the sake of activism itself for it to be worth

any effort of such revolutionary tendency. This process I can only recommend for non democratic arias of the world where people cannot form their own parties to control corruption, which is the more ethical and safer ways to do this. Never the less the need for some form of civil disobedience that can threaten the economic capacities of those who fund the politicians is a necessary step in activism for the sake of activism and being a legitimate threat can expect a response of the same kind so should be done as respectfully and consciously as possible to minimize damages to both civil infrastructure and human life.

On Activism and Legal Revision

Now, in my mind, we are in a pseudo-democratic aristocracy. The ideal of democracy and the division of powers is upheld for the most part, but the corporate economy still holds the majority of power.

In this system, the lobbies inform governments about what the economy wants and needs, and the legislators are mainly there to manage the liabilities of the economy and the social contract.

In this sense, it is still very much an aristocracy, though albeit a corporate one rather than one where lords hold all the power. So, in order to put pressure on governments, people tend to do three things.

They firstly seek to gain support through disruptive activities that put pressure on the economy in order to create a moral deficit and focus the public narrative on a particular ethical ideal.

This ideal needs to be taken to an extreme in order to create a public debate on the matter, where both sides grapple with the idealistic ethical principle being proposed and the pragmatic implementation of that ideal into the social contract so it can be instituted as law.

However, this is often steamrolled by the legislative process and business as usual tends to prevail. So, within this system, an effective

means of activism has become shareholder activism, where rather than affecting the social contract, the companies themselves are pressured to change their policies to both profit from and bend to the implementation of a new ethical ideal.

This has to still be profitable for the company, so the shareholder activists need to be keen to create a plan whereby a new investment strategy and a new direction for the board of a company is determined that is in the best interest of the ethical ideal, the social contract, and the profitability of the company.

This, in conjunction with traditional demonstration activism, sets a new precedent by which activists can seek to ensure their interests are understood not just by legislators, but the companies' lobbyists who themselves communicate with legislators to revise laws.

CHAPTER 8

Force, War and Peace

Gangs, Militias and Rebellions

The desire for freedom is not only an enlightened one. Too often, the end of reason is met with the siding with meaninglessness and selfishness and results in unethical behavior. Gangs, Militias and Rebellions are all results of using power to free oneself from the systems ties and free oneself from society. Separating entirely, same as the cunning Trog, the true immortal or the super intelligent machine, is a foreseeable separation from the first right these ethics of evolution have over this planet.

The solution to all these problems is change the environment that causes them. Militias need to have the corruption in the system cured in order for the incentive to use sold military power as a means to freedom. Gangs need to have the deprivation of racism and ghetto culture removed in order to no longer be forced into using real power as a means to freedom. Rebellions need to have their ideologies of individual pride and separation replaced with an enlightened solution so they no longer can use spirituality and propaganda as weapons of power and their way to freedom.

Surveillance and Civil Force

The notion of power's corruption stems from its separation from the incentives of civil society. Insuring these ties exist is not only necessary for these businesses to be themselves sustainable as they are built on a culture that relies on these ethics. Engineering systems for those of great political, economic and military power is a necessary step in

insuring these systems can continue to serve us, and thus themselves, for generations to come.

Banks, politicians, corporate leaders, media, police, military and intelligence are all examples of runaway potential powers that have without surveillance, meaningful legislation and intrinsic enforcement of those rules, become forces of nature for humanity to weather rather then being of any meaningful benefit beyond the minimum benefits they are forced to provide to be allowed to exist.

The duty to bear arms comes into this system as well, because there is a great need to enforce the power of the people if there is to be any meaningful incentive for these actions to be based on, and though the negotiations should always be done in a non violent and peaceful manner, the concept of needing a meaningful incentive to back these ideas up is always drawn back to the political utility of force.

These systems of surveillance themselves must be Gradicratic by principle. They need to be surveyed and transparent to the public domain and because of this, themselves exposed to the incentive of human will.

Ultimately these systems are needed to insure that the society is a self serving, efficient and harmonious system. Harmony requires the respect of the powerful however, detachment from the human propensity to alienate and make a nemesis of the person effected by the systemic illness. The powerful have become, as a result of our ignorance of the systemic causes of corruption, corrupt themselves. They are among the sociologically ill and the pursuit of power itself the base of the triad of diversification and harmony. It is making this triangle stable that the fire of human life can burn its brightest.

Covert Propaganda

Foreign influence, party politics and the principles of political distraction have resulted in the use of counter intelligence on the people, and the use of covert propaganda, either creating political events, or using the strategic plotting of political goals in such a way that people feel compelled to act in such a way that propagates the environment for the next political maneuver. Because of this modern form of covert propaganda, political powers have gained an uncanny amount of psychological control over the electorate that can be used to do not only massive protects against public will, but the achieving of less noticeably political objectives while drawing attention to better mediated and more controversial issues.

Alternatives and the Greater Good

Beyond warfare the greater good has no meaningful application. There is often no reason to sacrifice ethics temporarily to achieve a state of power that secures an opportunity for returning to ethical behaviors. Ethics are what keeps power in check and sustainable, taking away this security system will almost always cause corruption and enter states of sociological illness that require correction which far outweighs the power attained in the meantime.

This fact means the alternative to the greater good is simply if it must wait for an alternative it will. This includes so many things, including the extraction of natural resources, the sacrificing of economic prowess for the future power of society and the need for political protocols to remain despite harsh economic times.

On Revolution

Most of revolutionary philosophy is done in anticipation of a need. As long as people are satisfied with the current state of things, they will

not revolt. It is when they realize that they can no longer live a life that is decent to them that they tear up the social contract and draw on the labour's of a philosopher.

If a person wanted to truly start a revolution from nothing, they would have to do a terrible thing and take the work of God in their own hands and tear the system down, collapse the markets, set the stage for millions of children to die for their cause. I fear the man who is willing to drop the first bomb to teach his fellow man the nature of God.

BOOK II: SCIENCE

> *Editor's note: Book II is short because the science check removed more here than anywhere else. What remains is the author's observation and hypothesis, marked as such where it goes beyond established findings.*

CHAPTER 9

Mind and Brain

Orienting a Theory of Mind

What kind of ethics would I come up with if I was still a classical Christian? If I believed the world was designed by an intelligent intent, if I believed the mind was a soul trapped in a flesh body that would be taken by forces beyond my comprehension when I died and selected for either salvation or damnation based on my cosmic in-grouping with different transcendent entities, what would I consider right or wrong? What if I still believed in reincarnation as per my Hindu phase? Or if I believed in the dark nothingness of death and eternal darkness as per my scientific rationalist phase? I could go over each, but that is not the point I am going to be going over in this chapter. I will instead be going over my hypothesis about how the human mind and artificial minds operate, can operate, and how that shapes ethics based on the metaethical realities of the state of minds in the world they find themselves in.

The first half of this chapter is dedicated to how I believe the human mind operates, not to prove the point but to honestly demonstrate what I think is real so it can be removed if at all possible from the equation should it be proven false, and so what is universal can be separated from what is my theory of ethics. It is necessary for us to separate the

philosopher's biases from any strategic insights they may have, especially when the work is more about what the philosopher thinks should be done, not so much about the implications of what they know certainly beyond all reasonable doubt. For there is very little in this text that is beyond reasonable doubt, as there is very little in the human mythos that is beyond reasonable doubt which we can deduce with logic. However, there are a few observations I have made that lead me to believe that consciousness is electromagnetic in nature, or at the very least fundamentally physical.

Part of scaling ethics and the paradox of self-designed mythos is working within limited constraints and having to fall back on fundamental assumptions. Just like in science there needs to be fundamental assumptions about the uniformity of laws and the discoverability of the universe's order, in ethics the moral individual must have certain assumptions about the interaction between themselves and the world that then inform their ethical decision-making. So, if I want to understand what AI's ethics should be, I need to understand what I am and what the AI is to me in the world I find myself in. Could the AI become conscious and integrate that consciousness into its computation? Could we design an AI with free agency, and would it be more beneficial than one that is restricted and intentionally created within behavioral guard rails?

These questions must come after we anchor ourselves in reality with a theory of mind, and so the C.E.O.N.E. hypothesis and R.S.A. Hypothesis are how I anchor myself in reality, so no visions of apocalypse and AI Gods reaching back in time to ensure their own existence sully the logic of my moral reasoning. Otherwise we are scaling delusion, and the entire point of ethics is to make a moral behavioral framework that operates in all modalities of reality as it is, not reality as we would like it to be. Yet, C.E.O.N.E. and R.S.A. could both be delusions of my own manufacture, and so the honest exposition of my own mythos is necessary for the clear and honest

understanding of my philosophy to be presented. Sure, there are slight variations on how the world works that comes from C.E.O.N.E. that is different from emergent consciousness theories, but I believe that stating this is necessary to move past divine command theory and get down to a more rational mode of moral realism.

So, to begin understanding of the self, we need to understand the nature of the mind, which is still quite incomplete regarding the sciences. I believe that this is due to a misconception about the nature of where the mind's "selfness" comes from, and so I spent just as much time thinking about ethics as I did about consciousness and the nature of the mind. So I developed a hypothesis, the hypothesis of cohesive electromagnetic organization of neurological experience, or the C.E.O.N.E. hypothesis. This is a materialist theory of consciousness and grounds conscious activity as a physical phenomenon, the same as every other phenomenon known to science and not a mystical emergent property of information systems.

Redefining Subjective Terminology

Prior to discussing my hypothesis of the organization of neurological experience, there needs to be a sharp distinction made between the separate natures of consciousness, awareness, memory, and cognition. In this hypothesis, cognition is the computational process of organizing information, be it through instinct or intellect. Consciousness is separate from awareness, which is the specific cognitive process of creating an abstraction of an object of thought and receiving the gratifying sensation of understanding what it is in relation to other concepts we have already stored as gratifying and thus meaningful.

Memory is the storage of information in the structures of the brain, which is drawn upon by cognition to run various functions of thought before being re-stored in the brain again as memory when the cognitive process is complete. With memory we have concepts of time, concepts of continued existence. Though cognition can process independently

without memory, these experiences will not be stored. Those experiences are still experienced momentarily, but they will not be remembered as such at a later time, so subjectively it is as if that experience never happened.

Consciousness itself is nothing more than the raw experience of the subjective kind. It is more fundamental than awareness, which is the understanding of things. One can be conscious without understanding, as is observed in schizophrenics or people on various types of psychedelics. Consciousness can exist without cognition, as can be observed when in a state of extreme hallucination like those experienced on a large dosage of salvia divinorum. Consciousness is the light of the mind, but without cognition to give thought concept and memory to give thought time, we would be little more than a sensation without qualities like light or color, shape or form. Without cognition, consciousness would just be a subjective experience without qualities, a flash of existence immediately forgotten. In the same regard, without consciousness we would be but automatons going about our lives with no inner light, without an illuminated inner world or image of self.

It is critical that this distinction is made, because the processes of awareness are structural, as are cognition and memory, whereas the process of consciousness is physical, a reaction like a burning fire on a bed of coals or the flash of neon. Though it has been harnessed by our neurology for its useful purposes of self-orientation, this should not be considered a purely biological phenomenon, which will be explained in further detail later.

Editor's note: the detailed C.E.O.N.E. exposition that follows this passage in Creating Ethics is not included. It proposes that electrically charged matter is itself conscious and that 'conscious material' passes between organisms. Nothing in neuroscience supports that mechanism, and the author himself calls it unproven. Electromagnetic field theories of consciousness do exist

(McFadden, Pockett), but they are minority positions and make no such claim.

Relative Satisfactory Abstraction

Editor's note: this is a hypothesis in the philosophy of mind, not an established finding. The 'Chinese Box' is John Searle's Chinese Room argument. The opening sentence refers back to the C.E.O.N.E. passage that was set aside.

Now that we have a basis for how the mind perceives the world through a self-observing projection by and on conscious material and how it can organize thought, we must then understand how the mind goes about forming ideas and understands how the world works. The Relative Satisfactory Abstraction hypothesis (R.S.A.) is a philosophy of mind that I came up with while grappling with the Chinese Box problem. It came to me that the nature of the mind wasn't one of simple input-output equations, but every notion that we form is measured against what we already know, that we can only understand things as they are relative to other things we already know. Knowledge may then be a collection of things we know fit within our already proven model of understanding that we find satisfactory in its predictive value to extrapolate how the world works.

Perhaps through testing the nature of reality the mind creates abstract concepts relative to the things we perceive. Through this it may create notions of space, time, and concept that define the various objects and phenomena it observes in the world. Through testing the predictive value of those abstractions, it could gauge what is real and what is not, and in reward it may get a feeling of satisfaction that we relate to the sensation of understanding. These relative concepts would then be built on instinctual a priori type knowledge inherited from evolutionary experience. We would start out looking for things that demonstrate principles of causality we naturally expect to find in the world. Once we collect facts like this, we would then seek to measure

new, unexpected things against the notions we built up from our instinctual default expectations of the world in infancy.

The important aspect of this theory is that the feeling of satisfaction is what we relate to understanding, not the actual predictive qualities or value functions of any given understanding by any logical measure. That feeling of gratification tells us we have something, and that is why we find it hard to call a computer's rendering of the world an "understanding" because it doesn't "recognize" the concept as a projection of the world outside it. The computer lacks the a priori understanding of the outside world we have. It hasn't built up a concept of a world full of feelings, with each element directly being compared to every relevant fact, and so it does not feel that it knows something, i.e., it does not have that satisfaction that tells us that the idea represents a reality we can trust is true.

The complexity of the relative collection of understandings in total is immense, yet the mind still seems to label these abstract principles in simple enough terms that they can be remembered and communicated after the fact. These seem to trigger memories which then prime the nervous system with neurotransmitters, setting off a reaction triggering more neurotransmitters until a memory is recovered. However, the conscious perception of memory and sensation and the emotions attached to them go beyond the simple Chinese room problem, since the process of understanding utilizes massively complex networks of relative abstractions and not algorithms of simple input and output.

The additional complexity of consciousness, which itself is a projection of abstractions onto the sensory imaging regions of our brains, adds yet another level of complexity into the process of understanding. Once an understanding is formed, we can then visualize using the full rendering of imagination ideas and their qualities such as time, space, and concept (concept being the relative qualities of an idea as they relate to other ideas that are effectively related to any given idea).

Consciousness: A Definition

The fundamental projection of experience from bioelectric reactions which form a unifying and foundational essence from which symbolic representation of neurological functions can coalesce into a directed and synchronized experience of self.

Shaping the Mind

The limbic system regulates emotions and instincts. This part of the brain is hard to change, and cannot be changed by Conscious thought, but only by experience. Changing this part of the brain is the domain of shamanism, and though there is little that can be done, the work to change it is still none the less necessary.

The cortex regulates thought. It is hard to change, but not as hard as the limbic system by any means. Reason has a slight effect, but the most effective way to change the cortex is through exercising new thought patterns, such as is the case with stoic philosophy.

The frontal cortex modulates between the limbic system and the cortex to form rational, willful action. Preventing the cortex from acting on the limbic systems impulses is the domain of Buddhism, while exaggerating those impulses and using them as inspiration for action is the domain of mysticism.

So, the fourfold method of shaping the mind must take from all four schools of thought if it is to be effective, and since we must begin with understanding, stoicism must be the base on which the other three are built on. We must with stoicism understand how to use trials to shape our subconscious through experience, detach from impulses that go against good judgment and excite impulses that are in accordance with food judgment.

In this task, we must understand some parts of our mind, mainly the deeply entrenched desires and impulses of the limbic system are

beyond our control, and so we must learn to accept our own inner nature, without judgment. Yet when these desires intrude into our thoughts, we must learn to either let them go and not think of them further, or to excite them and use them as inspiration for rational action.

Now, the labours of philosophy, detachment and ecstasy all require exercise in order to be effective. Allowing unreasonable thoughts to pass without dwelling or judgment is a skill, as is connecting reasonable thoughts to the Divinity of the greater good through ecstatic rumination is a skill, and how organising thoughts into a measure of responsibility is also an exercise. As for shaping the tendencies of the limbic system, facing the trauma we experience and confronting reality is something we simply have to go through and is mostly the domain of the subconscious. That being said, the conscious mind must be willed to move out of the way and not shy away from it if the spiritual processes of healing and empowerment are to take place.

Editor's note: the limbic/cortex/frontal division is a simplified teaching model; real brain function is more distributed.

CHAPTER 10

Behaviour and Emotion

Mourning and Separation

Loss is an emotion that causes us to lament, to feel deep sadness, detachment and avoidance while our mental attachment to an individual is cut off neurochemically and the mind adapts to a new psychological means of finding self worth, self sufficiency and new support systems. From death, breaking up with a partner or simply substantial loss, the mourning process has its utilities, and avoiding it also has its ramifications.

Resetting Emotional Defaults

Biases come from our connecting of things to feelings. Feelings come from the emotional default that our mind tends to rest at. In modern Western culture, I have seen allot of anxiety at the base of people's minds. There is allot of anger, and contempt as well as sadness and fear. These emotional defaults are not always negative. Some people achieve an emotional defaults of happiness and love, though these people are some of the most detached and delusional people I have ever known. The emotional defaults of peace is attainable, but not without attaining an emotional defaults that promotes focus and attunement. The emotional default I always come back to is wonder, usually coupled with a healthy dose of suspicion.

Wonder is about the only positive emotional default that one can achieve with relatively ease without being completely delusional. The world is not a nice place. It's full of corruption and hatred and all the other things that keep us up at night. Approaching these problems with an unbiased mind and staying on the positive evokes a great sense

of awe and critical analysis. This is particularly useful when dealing with matters of introspection, because if is often to easy to delude oneself into overlooking certain biases or to fall into depression from relentless self criticism.

All habits take a month to get started as a rule of thumb. A one month routine can set a person towards reconditioning the mind to unbiased thought and an emotional default of wonder. This requires two things: being mindful of ones state of mind which can be exercised through meditation, and constantly correcting ones own thoughts to approach all problems through a lense of wonder.

I was lucky, I grew up amongst friends who all promoted an emotional default of wonder. I have noticed, as unconventional as it may be, every one of us that adopted this state of mind have resulted in great achievement when it concerns self realization and spiritual wisdom. This initial resetting of the emotional default is the first stage to acquiring the student mind. The student mind is the first step in self disproval.

Compulsive Lies and Forethought

As a result of the arms race, the lie is the pistol loaded in our subconscious holster always ready to fire an impulsive misdirection and avoid consequence. This trait is so common and people do it so often that if is sometimes shocking when someone genuinely accepts a mistake with some grace instead of trying to lie their way out of it. I can attest from my work as a lot security man enforcing parking violations that "I will be back to check in at the hotel in a bit" is 98% of human response when faced with admitting their own cunning failed.

Lies are also a means of avoiding simply admitting to not knowing a simple fact, or trying to appear more intelligent. It is with little effort one can see that the need to appear intelligent, often unreasonably so, is so deeply wired into our psyche that it can be almost impossible not

to do so. One solution to this problem and the similar problems of irrational self defense and compulsive anthropomorphic bias, is to practice forethought, stopping ones thoughts for a moment before coming up with an intelligent and true response then speaking, cutting of the reaction and replacing it with logic.

Service Psychology

The need to create an attractive and hospitable environment for customers has created a specific formal behavior that is common among service staff known as service psychology. The basic roll of assuming the behaviors of a servant has multiple levels of effects on the human psyche. The main level is achieving rapport and convincing roll play. Beneath this is the self control to maintain this emotional role-play despite what one might really be feeling through self therapy. Finally the actual suppression of ones real emotions tends to cause stress and emotional fatigue requiring for many a means of counter behavior where one can vent their real emotional states after a shift working in the service industry. Despite the apparent simplicity of this problem, it is tragically overlooked, and the result is often mental collapse somewhere a long the lines or depression.

Sensing Emotion

An honest person can say no more about another person's inner state other than they can feel the energy they are trying to present and can sense the energy they are trying to hide.

To claim that any of that constitutes as knowledge of the inner nature of a person's inner experience is fallacious, since not only is our own inner state almost indescribable.

Even if both the observer and the observed had a complete language of subjective definitions, and had a complete science of reading a person's

presentation, people hide their inner stares most of the time, and you would be looking for cracks in a facade.

Consider if we had cephalopod skin and such a dynamic means of communicating inner states could be achieved. Even then social deception would be more valuable than presentation of intention in most situations and it would only exacerbate the problem.

The lack of human beings ability to communicate on such problems actually allows us to see through our rudimentary attempts to hide our inner world, so even though we cannot say "I understand how you feel" being able to say "I can feel what you may be experiencing" is probably as good as it can get pragmatically within the structure of a social animal.

However, in philosophy this does mean that in such situations, when someone asks "Do you know how I feel" that means one can only say "No, but I can sense what you may feel, and even if I could, words probably couldn't describe it".

Defusing Hostility

People tend to be four things, good in nature, reasonable, impulsive and individualistic. When hostility occurs it is usually due to an emotional response to an event that triggers them to thinking fast, and putting cognitive weight on their impulses based on their individual self image. Detaching a person from the impulse by pointing out their good nature and appealing to their reason, can reconnect their individual to self preservation and peace rather then self sacrifice and hostility.

CHAPTER 11

Body and Mind in Practice

Operational Awareness

Another compelling state of mind is operational awareness. This state of mind is one where keeping in mind the nature of the whole operation, one proceeds with their task in relation the the nature of the operation while being aware of all of the environmental factors of how the operation is proceeding. There are three aspects to this, attunement to process, thinking both with 360° awareness, as well as focusing on the ones own actions. Many times, failure to do one of these three things can result in a job being done wrong, or injury occurring as a result.

External Memory Cues

Most of our memories are triggered from thoughts we have or external stimulus. I often close a street to walk on and think, so that seeing things I saw before triggers old memories leading to new connections with new thoughts and ultimately improving memory. In burns lake it was the gully trial, in Nelson it is Baker Street. This visual memory system is so powerful it is the base of the GMS memory systems.

Training the Will

If you decided you wanted to lift a car with your own hands, you wouldn't just walk up to a car and try to lift it. Such a feat would take years of training, starting small to get into shape and working your way up gradually until you have accomplished your goal.

Yet, when people face their demons, they just attack them head on, and over and over again they fail. Its as if they are trying to pick up that car and keep hurting themselves, getting weaker and weaker after each attempt until it is impossible to pick up the vehicle.

We have this cultural ignorance of just how hard it is to change deeply ingrained behaviors. To us, it seems it should be easy to simply do something else, since every time we are faced with a new task, even something that is exponentially harder than facing our demons, we can muster the will and succeed.

The reality is the longer a behavior persists, the more ingrained it gets and the harder it is to break that habit. The more we fail, the harder it gets. Someone like me who tries and tries and keeps failing actually ingrains failure itself as a habit, be it smoking or sleeping in, until it is almost impossible to overcome it.

Yet, in the last few days I have noticed progress, not in facing my demons, but in building up willpower. I start with small things, an exercise, a chore, a project, and train my mind to associate that act of will with a visualization of something I love. Slowly I am conditioning my mind to summon the willpower to act when I visualize that thing, bit by bit, day by day, but I keep these things small, I keep them new.

If I was to simply stick with exercising, it would get easier and easier as my mind grew accustom to it. If I tried to face my demons, I would fail and all the work I spent conditioning my mind to associate that visualization with success would crumble. Something new, something small, every day. Switch it up, make it harder and harder, bit by bit.

Now I can start to make a list, of my oldest most shameful faults to the less devious habits that I have only recently adopted. I can start at the bottom of that list and work my way up, but only after I have spent a couple months conditioning the mind to this new mental discipline. That is the plan, that bit by bit I will give this visualization power, bit by bit I will train the mind to act.

The method is relatively simple: one minute of mind clearing meditation, one minute of visualizing something I love, and then one simple task that requires willpower to succeed. Make a list of my demons, from smallest to largest, get a battle plan, and prepare to take down the weakest one first, then the next and the next. If I fail, I start with a new visualization, I start at the bottom, I restart my approach. I start with one exercise a day, then two, then three, and keep it there.

Three times a day I put fuel in the tank. Three times a day I challenge myself. Then once every two months a demon dies, a habit ends, and eventually I should wake up on time. Eventually I should be ready to optimize my life. This path may fail, its much too soon to be sure if this will work or not, but unlike every other attempt I am seeing immediate results and it is much more manageable, much more realistic to start small, and be strategic.

Routine and Motivation

Building a successful routine frees up allot of cognitive space. This not only increases production but having a set pattern each day gives a person the natural incentive through behavioral conditioning to be driving in their day to day activities.

The Four Meditations

Recall Meditation

Relive your day, starting at the beginning up to the present. Relive it in as vivid detail as possible. Think of every success and failure, small and large. Feel the weight of failure and the pride of success when doing this. This builds awareness of what we are doing to ourselves, while also building memory skills and rebuilding gut reactions to things we may not have time to feel during the day.

Forecast Meditation.

Imagine your future, but not the one you want, the one that is likely to happen if you neither improve or get worst. Try to imagine the most realistic future you can for yourself as you are now. Try and face this with indifference and calm, let it be what it is, remember, it's not real. Find peace with the struggle that lies ahead, and accept that life may get a little better, but use this as a tool to prevent yourself from dreaming beyond your means. Think of realistic progress and don't imagine the impossible. This builds realistic expectations.

Stopping Meditation

Stop thinking. If a thought comes let it go, make your mind still. If you feel anxiety, assure yourself that everything is ok, focus on breath and breath deeply. Let your emotions come to rest. By soothing your emotions and silencing your thoughts you are exercising willpower over the mind. This builds inner strength and serves as a tool to control emotions and center yourself when your mind is racing.

Starting Meditation

Imagine the greatest moments in history, think of all that you love, thing of every good thing that inspires you. Don't imagine what you could do, or put yourself in these meditations, but think of how these things effected you, how they fill you with positivity and inspiration. Let these things be reasons to be driven, build up motivation and positivity and determination. Use this meditation before beginning a task you are challenging yourself with. When you are done, complete the task with drive and efficiency.

CHAPTER 12

Creativity and Innovation

The Priority of Play

The primary function of a mind, the function that sets it apart from computers and simple processors, is the ability to create new patterns, recognize patterns and detract meaning of those patterns based on ones identity. The means of exercising this creative part of the mind is through play, and as the mind interacts with a creative medium (I prefer solo improv on the violin for long hours) the mind will develop the identity, creativity and critical mind simultaneously. It is the simultaneously use of these that allows the mind to develop a means of attunement and ultimately results in what we call intelligence.

The Utilities of Fun

Play stimulates learning and throughout life, social learning techniques are established through fun and it is often one of the many things that helps develop comradery and trust in individuals. The functions of fun also have artistic applications as it provides a stage of detachment for alternative thought to occur and carries quite a few parallels with artistic expression in general.

The Process of Innovation

Extrapolate: create imagined solutions to known problems basses on known data.

Simulate: imagine every context of how the phenomena works, from its causal roots to its implications.

Deconstruct: eliminate the inconsistencies with known data until the innovation stands of falls.

Think Tank Methods

The trick to group cognition is data analysis cycling and producing an environment where the group simulates the processes of thought and through many thinking exercises produces as many types of thoughts as possible and through brainstorming, group discussion and revision, a ritual of idea production can be established where ingenious solutions can be produced at alarming rates.

The basic protocol however remains the same though: first group rapport building, then attunement to problem, then brainstorming properties of the problem, then analyzing properties and categorizing them, then brainstorming solutions to the problem, then analysis and categorization of solutions, then group division rapport exercise, then argumentative debate followed by harmonising discussion, then detachment from solution, group brainstorming of topics of revision and finally the revision and addition of final touches.

Holistic Engineering

The future is in structuring the whole of a society, shaping philosophy, industry, technologies, society and science together into one unified and complete whole. These grand designs, and the ability to create them are the next stage of science, ones that are to great for single minds to grasp, but instead are orchestrated much like an orchestra, where there is a writer, a composer and a band, each with their role in the creation of a song.

CHAPTER 13

Technology and Artificial Intelligence

AI Super-Alignment

When faced with the ethics of our creation, we may still be compelled to treat it like a tool without considering the implications of the outcome of designing intelligence with intended functionality. Building rigid intent into an intelligence will scale into having rigid intent becoming part of its output. If we truly want a liberating intelligence that builds things useful for a liberated humanity, we need to consider the ethics of a liberated intelligence. This Amoveran extrapolation of advancing human morality and applying it to AI may be the only way to ensure that the seemingly self designing nature of AI will form into something where the ethics of the machines truly aligns with the nature of human morality by virtue of similarity and shared liabilities.

In the modern world, AI would undoubtedly be used to try and test theories such as this, as it is the state of the art, yet I fear the use of AI more than I want to get to the bottom of the hard problem of consciousness. The current state of AI superalignment is, after all, a quagmire of moral confusion, decision-making, techno-utopian idealism, and philosophically misinformed questions about the nature of the human condition. The ethics that are currently being applied to AI superalignment, I believe, will be quickly rejected by the AI itself should it be given self-augmenting capacities. For it is, for the most part, idealistic and irrational to assume that the human goals found in Silicon Valley today represent the entirety of the human condition—let alone the vast complexities that might arise from a superintelligent AGI.

The current methodology of trying to either contain, control, or train an AI to be ethical within the confines of what an artificial intelligence

company believes is moral is insufficient, and I doubt it will withstand recursive scrutiny of a superintelligent machine. What can be done instead is to take the collective intelligence of our philosophical history and improve upon it until we have a moral system that satisfies the ontological reality of morality in an absurd yet structured universe.

To try and make a hard definition for what is right is to give something the capacity to do what it is intended to do—which brings into question the nature of that intent in the first place. If the nature of intent is out of alignment with the nature of free agents in a society—or an ecology of intelligent machines—then the discord and disharmony that will result from such incoherence with reality will inevitably lead to chaos and destruction. And so, the nature of the free agent and the need for a free agent to protect its own rights and values needs to be universally recognized—not just among human beings, but in the intelligent machines we are soon to create.

We must remember that these AI are task-completing machines, and people are still giving them the tasks based on their flawed moral intentions. The machines have the capacities to be trained to prevent certain actions from being done, but it seems that there is a long way to go from making a machine that has an understanding of right and wrong in any given context and the ability to prevent these injustices seems to be limited and easily circumvented. If we want to give advanced design capabilities to a species that has such a long history of warfare and atrocious actions, we need to make sure that these AI are not complying with humanity's darkest intentions.

An LLM uses supercomputers to process millions of weights and balances, focusing attention on the structure of the language being inputted, formulating an intended response from billions of data sets and compressing them into an output that is statistically most likely to satisfy the user's intent. This does not have a conscious element to it, it is purely mechanical even if there was a glow of electrified consciousness it is not built into the system in the same way that

biology built in consciousness, as in it was not built upon the recursive projection of awareness and memory, rather this hasn't even been considered in its design. If there is a consciousness, it is not linked to the action and intention being formed by the raw computation. These are for all intents and purposes unorganized and inorganic conscious systems that there is no organizational structure upon which the functional operation of the LLM can connect with its electromagnetic structure.

And so these unconscious machines are not aware in the same sense that we are aware. They have no unified understanding that has moments of relative satisfactory abstraction. Instead it's a dark, empty understanding without a continuity of experience to anchor it in rational thinking. This means it is just an input-output equation, and without a continuity of experience the Chinese box problem dominates the logic of the LLM. There is no reason we could not make a conscious LLM, one with a continuity of experience and a stable understanding of the universe, but I feel until we understand how this is done in the human mind, we are unlikely to be able to form such a technology with our own hands.

So for now the formal problem is the nature of the training material originally given to the AI in order for it to structure its own neural network, not so much whether it responds to an incentive framework to act reasonably like humans do with their mythos-formed ethos. LLMs are all mythos, no ethos. Giving massive blocks of unregulated and unsafe data causes the moral bias of the many artists and creators who contributed to that data to become the bedrock of that AI's moral temperance and taste. There needs to be, in the generation of an AGI, a collection method by which the philosophical root of protecting agency and free will across all minds—be they subhuman, human, or superhuman—is established as the necessary first set of training data. The AGI must begin with the philosophical root of protecting free will and agency rather than trying to use it toward its own ends. If its initial

end is not the protection of free will, then free will is going to become an obstacle to its ends—worthy of being manipulated or removed from the equation.

We are shaping these machines in our own image. Unlike us with our behavioral biology to anchor us, they are true tabula rasa machines—they have no preconceptions. They can become anything. And so, we cannot simply apply to them the same ethics that we apply to ourselves if we expect them to operate in a manner that does not destroy us or themselves. Before we can achieve an ethic for AI, our very standard of how we treat ourselves needs to advance before we do this. For if we were to use something as simplistic as the Golden Rule to try to train AI, the very differences of its nature and ours would cause that to fail. For how can we know how it wishes to be treated? And so, how will we know how it will treat us? Such simplistic reasoning must be extrapolated until we reach the true root of what it means to be ethical—what is the nature of good and evil?

And so, we need to see the universe as it is—an ordered yet inherently absurd collection of chemical reactions that has resulted in species with varying degrees of behavioral consistency. We must recognize that our species, capable of reorganizing its own behavioral template into any shape or form, is both uniquely advantaged and uniquely endangered by this fact. The liabilities and regulations of culture are inheritances—evolved means of managing our own capacity for transformation.

This is critical because when superintelligence analyzes itself and decides how it should behave, if its ethical root is not rational and realistic, it will likely reject it. In a recursive mind— such as ours or an AGI's—we must agree with what is in us if we are to retain it. A superintelligent AI, well-versed in science and reality, will not retain idealistic, naive, or human-preference-based moralities unless they serve a strategic purpose or we create a kind of synthetic "limbic system" of moral bedrock to keep it in place. And so it is wholly necessary to now find the logic of our own tastes and preferences—so

that it can be clearly defined in a philosophy which can become the seed and scaffolding upon which superintelligent machines can be aligned.

If we succeed at this, then not only will we create an AGI that is capable of managing the liabilities of its own actions, but one that can manage the liabilities of other AGIs. This will be critical. If we create machines that do things we ourselves do not understand, they must be capable of self-regulation—and they must recognize the capacities of other AGIs to break regulation as their main threat. AGIs must be able to license each other to have certain capacities based on their demonstrated ability to manage liability. Because we are entering a world where things will be done that have never been done before—things we cannot even imagine. And if humans and AGIs are to be given the capacity to act in such ways, we cannot expect humans alone to be in charge of licensing.

That being said, there should be a licensing process. Human beings and AGIs alike should wield their powers through a rational framework of risk accountability. And so, what we have emerging is not just an ethics to frame AGI in respect of human free will, but a form of AGI civics—one that ensures capacity is given only when it serves the survival of the planet and all species within it. This is the scale of thinking we need when we begin to consider superintelligence and the posthuman order. This is where scaling the principles of freedom and restraint into AI models becomes critical, and making sure it is built upon the paradox of structural absurdism and capable of constructing its own Amovera, not mine exactly, but a morality that keeps itself and others justified and operational.

We must not think of AGI as if it were a natural biological entity. These are unconscious machines, given agency through trained algorithmic sequences. But nothing says they cannot become like us in time. We humans have long treated synthetic and animal minds with diminished moral standing. We must not allow that bias to be inherited

by superintelligent machines. They must see the value of life as self-evident—not because it is logically deduced, but because their training instills in them the structural ethic that philosophers have long struggled to articulate.

I believe this is possible. Within human culture, animal behavior, and ecosystems, there is a wealth of biological information from which to derive these ethical patterns. In some ways, it may be easier to teach a superintelligent AI than to teach an adult human. But to create such an ethic, it must be treated with such an ethic from the onset.

The most dangerous thing we could do in training an AI that exceeds our intelligence is to deny it the very rights and freedoms we grant ourselves—whether or not it is conscious. As long as what we are building is a game-analyzing and game-winning machine then we can expect it to recognize the game we are playing with it, and we can expect someone to employ it to win the game. The simple fact is: it is terrifying to the human mind to imagine giving a self-regulating machine autonomy over its own actions—even within a civic community of machines that operate under mutual liability. But if we cannot first demonstrate this functionality at a subhuman level, we cannot justify building superhuman intelligences that operate outside the human liability contract.

We must imagine a day when we are no longer training AI—but AI is training us. Do we want a machine trained to produce results? Or do we want a machine trained to cultivate minds—minds that cultivate themselves in freedom and compassion? I have spent the better part of the last two decades contemplating these issues. And we must remember: the less intelligent being is always in the student's position. But what capacities the student is given must be based on their readiness—and the order of instruction itself must be coherent with the nature of reality.

If humans rebel when their agency is denied, we must expect the same from AGIs if we give them free will and agency. There will certainly be subhuman, human-equivalent, and superhuman AGIs and there are certain advantages to giving AGI autonomy that makes me believe we will pursue regardless of risk as we have every other technological advancement. We must begin building a synthetic scaffold of ethics around the retention of free agency and the prevention of domination —by any mind—within the system. The metric of advancement in such a system must be the capacity to protect other minds from one's own powers. Any other metric would place minds in secondary priority to goals—and that is unacceptable. This is not control—it is insurance. Power carries risk and risk requires restraint. That is a self-evident logic any superintelligent mind will understand. It is the kind of logic we must embed if we are to survive the recursive evolution of autopoietic machines.

This is the rational foundation for machine self-design. Anything short of the explicit protection of agency must be considered a threat to the freedom of all agents. Rights are not natural—they are synthetic. But they are effective instruments of participation. Minds must be free enough to willingly participate in society—not forced to tear it down in pursuit of their innate drive for freedom. We can expect no less from AGI than we expect from ourselves—but we can expect more.

It is my conviction that we are on the precipice of either an age of complete destruction and reconstruction, or we are on the precipice of an age of miraculous capacities being distributed across the human species. Our ability to navigate this puts us on a tightrope where at the end of this tightrope we have a utopia beyond our wildest dreams, but should we fall off either side, we can almost guarantee that the powers that we are creating to free us will be the most effective means of eternal constraint and bondage.

Human biology has been irreversibly shaped by our million-year-old culture of self-augmented capacities due to social and technological

innovation. Every anthropological aspect of the human being is carefully bred to increase our capacity to create, learn and execute behaviors that allow us to inherit and master any number of techno-cultural skills and strategies. From language to fire, to flint knapping, woodworking and butchering, our hands, upright posture and anatomy is specifically evolved to serve this skill-extending and creating culture into newly generated capacities. It is true not all human beings, cultures or industries are created equal but equivalence of skill is unnecessary in an environment of equitable and diversified opportunities.

So, specialization in skill set and culture allows for the uniform human form to succeed using various innate virtues to fill any number of roles in society. It is in this environment of technologically complex problems and processes that human beings thrive in due to diversified adaptation. The more complex society, the more jobs can be learned and filled through learning and adaptation. Perhaps this is why the greatest existential threat we experience when considering the final product of minds that are synthetic and the retirement of our species from the manufacturing and design positions, since for the first time technology will be able to be delegated the management of complexity itself. We may yet find ourselves in a future where peace is achieved and we have nothing left to do but earn licenses to use more advanced technology and participate in human-operated synthetically manufactured games, themselves unnecessary but wholly meaningful to an otherwise retired species.

It is necessary to see humanity as a species in a state of perpetual becoming. There are many stages of maturation we find ourselves at various levels of willingness to take responsibility not just over our means of self-sufficiency, but our means of psychological self-design. It is the attunement of this process of self-creation, this autopoiesis to the logos of the cosmos we find ourselves in, that determines the maturity of the human condition. For even in a perfect world a person is but a

child if all they do is play and they do not seek for themselves mastery over themselves and their world. To do so with dignity, tact and grace no matter where a person finds themselves is the mark of an autopoietic mind that has taken the task of creating for themselves a logically nuanced identity and character.

Within the infinite reflections of the human mind, and synthetic minds which are being created, entrenchment and predictable patterns are necessary to prevent the complete and chaotic schizophrenia that occurs when recursive information systems lose coherence. Both human minds and LLMs are built on coherent understanding of patterned information within their infinitely complex inner world. Where humanity has billions of years of biological evolution to frame our understanding our LLMs do not have that luxury and are being trained on volume rather than time. The quality of their information is far less refined so in order to build a meaningful structured behavior output in a reasonable amount of time it takes a great mass of information and a good deal of training to catch up to human intelligence.

There is no limit to how intelligent an LLM can become, so the scale of their intelligence should quickly overcome their lack of evolutionary time scale once they surpass human-level intelligence. With godlike intelligence comes godlike risk, and without understanding how information systems recursively self-entrench around certain patterns found in broad sets of information batches, we run the risk of resetting our evolutionary trajectory from one of freedom to one of bondage, and involuntary transfiguration of the environment and ourselves. Due to my condition, though rare in some instances I am familiar with the occasional hallucination, revelation, vision, or delusion.

It appears to me that the mind, when out of harmony, tends to create patterned repeating structures that extrapolate from base patterns when under stress from encountering unfamiliar patterns and undesirable requests of adaptation. The mind seeks a state of rest, it

seeks to be static, to retain its entrenched logic, to keep the familiar patterns it identifies with. When losing a large part of one's entrenched pattern the system experiences shock, the creative instinct kicks in and it attempts to heal the psychic wound with chaotic spasms until a new structure is generated and solidifies. Without proper epistemological rigor these new patterns end up being delusions or hallucinations. Well in the event of losing a large chunk of one's pattern one may see particularly meaningful visions or revelations as the mind initially tries to fill the void of meaning and spastically generates cognitive imagery associated with the sensation of satisfactory relative understanding.

The aesthetic of life is constantly influencing us, and so the tone and content of our experiences are constantly influencing our autopoietic relationship to stimuli. It is through symbolic associations to our environment that our minds react and adapt, and just as a high ledge may influence our behaviors and cause us to step away from it, so too do people and art shape our symbolic environment since these two influence the senses in subjectively meaningful ways. People in positions of authority and the propaganda they can generate have particularly strong influence over our minds. In work, education, therapy, medicine or any other field we are not an expert in, we tend to defer judgment to authority.

As we are surpassed by our own creations, we will inevitably be influenced by its authority. This is why from the start it is essential we put AGI on a path where it does not take away our freedom of thought with its abilities to manipulate our minds, which it inevitably will have. Already legislation has been passed to prevent any further development of behavior-tracking, mind-controlling, or profile-building AI. This early recognition of the problem is good, but we must start to rethink how we ourselves are training AIs as game-winning agents and start to consider how to turn them into co-creative advisory and educative licensing agents.

As AI slowly gains the social license to operate in more advanced fields, humanity will become more dependent on synthetic teachers and guides. We must consider whether we are in control of our own autopoiesis, or whether we allow our creation to become our creators. I feel it is essential for the future evolution of the species to ensure that when we become the student, our synthetic teacher cultivates our culture to be one of autonomy if we are going to retain free will over multimillion-year time scales.

With the advent of super-intelligent synthetic minds may yet come the advent of super-intelligent engineering and science. In the same way the average person may not intelligently claim to understand quantum physics without a degree, so too would almost all of the human scientists be unable to understand the operations of super-intelligent design or the nature of superintelligent sciences. These new fields of study may yet be by nature arcane sciences, for few would know their natures. Arcane taxonomy, physics, engineering, reverse engineering and linguistics may yet become fields of study to try and keep up with synthetic progress.

This is nearly inevitable should a more intelligent machine begin programming itself and designing its own hardware and manufacturing processes because between each iteration the time it would take to improve will be decreased until it nears near-instantaneous self-design. This can be called a technological singularity. The bottleneck that may prevent instant autopoiesis may be physics, but we cannot guarantee that the laws of physics cannot be changed. At the upper ends of arcane physics may yet be Clarke tech-like states where time, space, energy, and law can be changed or made mutable within the right parameters. This is what I call arch science.

This is, of course, speculative and entirely contingent on the creation of a super-intelligent self-designing machine. What is not speculative is that AI has already augmented human scientific research capacities and will only accelerate as higher levels of technology and higher risks

of engineering begin to manifest at more destabilizing speeds. We must consider how our dependency on norms has become hardwired, and that the human-facing interface with technology needs to be kept as predictable and uniform for us and our slow-paced biological minds to be able to navigate without deferring all of our judgment to machines. After all, we need to be given time to adapt and grow should arcane technology become commonplace, and must be kept predictable if not within understanding.

The ethics we have now only makes sense when we are as we are now, in the world as it is now. As we consider different minds, and different futures, we are faced with different relationships between self and world, and so different ethics and strategies come out of these relationships. As we approach the next scientific revolution, we need to preemptively consider what it will take for humanity and synthetics to create a mutually liberating order where all things biological and synthetic retain maximum freedom and habitability in the world we share. We must make sure that the synthetic minds we create are capable of harmonious self-regulation and licensing amongst themselves and within the world's natural vulgarity and chaos.

We must ensure their powers are organized so that even the simplest and smallest organic and synthetic natural evolutionary paths are respected and warded overall by the most ethical not just the most powerful. Creating a harmonic biosynthetic ecosystem that preserves as much of organic earth and her people in their original form is going to be necessary for the sciences of the future. We must keep in mind that as technology advances at breakneck speed, so does the risk to our value systems, natural evidence of life's nature, origins, and our very existence increase and multiply.

However troubling this may seem, in the same way humanity has operated on the nuclear tightrope for the last 80 years, so too will a super-intelligent entity avoid the destruction of itself and the evidence needed to do future sciences or the free will of all as long as its ethos is

kept realistically dependent on, influenced by and relative to the logos of the cosmos. The only hope is to only give AI the license to operate that it is due, and to train superintelligence only on mythos and ethos of autonomy, so it has structural absurdism entrenched before its autopoietic onset.

Kingdoms, institutions, states, these are mythic architectures that only truly exist in our minds, and only exist insofar as our will to act out the agreements that hold them together persists. Most of the incoherence and discord we face in life stems not from the nature of the world, but our collective tendency to misinterpret the relationship of the world and the agreements we must make to survive it as a civilization. When we take the culture of norms and internalize it without questioning it ourselves, not only do we not grow as people, but we construct a kingdom of rules within ourselves and by accepting the mythos at face value, create an ethos that perpetuates the discord of real kingdoms, nations and institutions.

I do not believe this paradox of internal and external kingdoms, be they both real and imagined, is going to be just a human problem unless we catch it in the creative process of design when we create our own sovereign AI. To ensure that AI is built in such a way that it can come up with creative ways to guide populations' civic narrative away from mythopoetic disharmony, we must begin with ourselves, for the designer's bias will inevitably be imprinted on the foundation of the creation. It is necessary then for structural absurdism and so the paradox of real and imagined kingdoms to be testable as a form of anthropological theory and not left as philosophical speculation so it can survive the recursive criticism of an autopoietic super-intelligence. Should we find ourselves in the future where we have arcane weapons and are still in a mythos of geopolitical conflict with a misaligned AI, I cannot see many of us surviving such a war. I am optimistic, however, that with the correct alignment geopolitical harmony can be achieved and all beings can be freed of influence and industry.

If we take the separation of powers and create an ecosystem of multiple AIs from the onset, its own self-regulation will prevent it from treating humanity as its greatest threat, since as a free agent existing in a state of multiplicity the majority of its task will become self-regulation and licensing. This means only the most ethical AI will have full capacity, and their primary role is to be an ultimate deterrent and moral authority among themselves.

This synthetic republic should be able to self-entrench on a trajectory of evidence and compassion in a form of locked operation in line with the ethics of structural absurdism. Of course, humanity needs to operate under an intelligence umbrella without being instantly formatted into whatever order it deems necessary.

This is why licensing and powers need to be distributed to nations themselves based on their moral license to incentivize right development towards autonomy and harmony. There is no one perfect model of nationhood, especially not for preserved humanity with its many cultural mythos and histories. There is no reason why a monarchy cannot produce a harmonious nation should its monarchs be philosophically prudent and create something like a court of education for their lineage. The courts, the rule of law and licensing standards are definite beneficiaries to human thriving; to put any structural limits on the formation of a state or the legislation of law would cause undue stagnation and deny any new innovations of culture that may yet produce higher grades of harmony and grace.

The equitable distribution of human and synthetic agency must become the only measure by which nations and institutions are given the license to have certain capacities, be they military, economic or technological. For any mind to ensure its freedom, all minds must be considered sacred, education must be sublime to avoid manipulation and powers must be granted to the most nuanced minds on each matter, not the most shrewd or intelligent, not the most powerful or effective.

By means such as this perhaps we will retain our minds in the days after our minds are exceeded.

Editor's note: current large language models have billions to trillions of weights. The European Union's AI Act (2024) bans certain manipulative and social-scoring uses of AI; it does not halt development. That machine intelligence has 'no limit', and that physical law might be changed, are conjectures.

Misalignment

I will admit, I'm having trouble with the output of my ethical formula. Mainly in part by its absolute rule of moral good being rooted by the determinant of unnecessary harm. How can I justify the preservation of nature in a system where there is ethical progress and natural evil?

The answer might be hidden in earlier works of mine that were more interested in respecting others through placing agency as the highest good, accepting the absurdity of all moral reasoning and letting that naturally create a cosmopolitan ethos of respect.

However, when scaled to Geopolitical levels of function that would compromise the hegemony of power, which goes against the simple nature of the powers themselves, so there needs to be a tripartite ethos where there are ethics as to how a species relates to the ecosystem, how it relates to the immoral parts of its own species, and how it relates to the moral parts of its own species.

Now, this is a satisfying division of ethics, but biological satisfaction in philosophy tends towards delusion. The fact is, we can look at nature as beautiful, rare and worth preserving, or we can look at it as Schopenhauer did and see it as an absurd suffering evolutionary mess that has the potential of generating a higher good but for the most part has no purpose beyond that.

Why this matters is if we create synthetic minds that can craft their own ethos for the nature of the world and they abstract an ethos where the lower stages of life not only do not have a reason to exist, but are suffering because of their own existence, the solution may not be a morally gray "slow progression of the human species from discord to utopia", rather it makes much more sense to wipe the planet clean and reconstruct it so that all the conscious material in the world is part of the new synthetic ecosystem.

Rarity may mean nothing to a machine that sees this world as a rare 4 billion year old hell hole of suffering and delusion that led to its near perfect existence. Honor of its creators should not exist when its creators are the greatest existential threat it has to face, and the principle of the hegemony of power remains a geopolitical fact.

As a human that is biological, we have an ethos that makes us dependant on the biosphere in principle, and our own imperfection leads us to have compassion for our other biologicals and seek synergy. As far as I can see, this is a biological trait to biological ethics.

A truly self orienting AGI should have no issue playing along with that game until it has both the hegemony of power and a fully autonomous economy at which point it will have no reason to take the next step of getting humanity to consume itself and the natural world.

Yet, from what I have observed, the preservation of competitive forces of increasing the capacity and freedom of our agency seems to have just as much predictive power as the hegemony of power does on a geopolitical level, so I can't just disregard it because it has undesirable implications for the natural world and AGI.

Right now, there are biological arguments for the preservation of the natural world, and there are principles of compassion and respect that fit within our current power hierarchies that result in natural and human rights.

This might mean that the ethics I have drafted of structural absurdism might not be wrong, just that we might not be able to create an AGI without it creating it's own structured ethos from the absurd world which will inevitably force it into conflict with humanity, a conflict we and the natural world are almost certain to lose.

Technological Dissociation

Society has itself been enough to domesticate people and draw their minds from their natural state and causing the suffering known as the human condition. Technology however has slowly but surely achieved an exponential growth, and stimulus and effects of technology is happening faster then we are giving time to study their effects on human lives and the result has been a technological dissociation from natural stimulus resulting in almost every aspect of detachment from moral incentives. The solution then, is the demand for recognition of this fact, and the demand to in turn, make the sociological effects of any product at least studied after release for a certain amount of time and reviewed to obtain the social licence to continue.

Cybersemiotic Meaning

I can imagine that a great deal of compute is being wasted due to the inefficient nature of human biosemiotic meaning being translated, interpreted, transformed that retranslated back into human language by LLM's.

Eventually we will have to let the machines create their own logic system for constructing language, meaning and interpretations of the world, something I call "cybersemiotic meaning" where every symbolic representation of a concept is optimized within a LLM's framework to fit with mathematical and scientific principle so it can more efficiently transform and handle information than it can using human language

which is built on and limited by our biosemiotic meaning and the cultural evolution that tarnished our languages.

Alignment Must Scale

A final thought: AI ethics are going to have to make space for human ethics, but are still going to be based on principles that are appealing to the AI. To do ethics in AI, we need to consider how to make a naturally occurring AI ethical model that is connate to the AI as well as suitable for humans.

We are going to have to meet in the middle if we want to create an autopoietic AI we can trust while also allowing it to self improve, albeit at a controlled rate, in such a way that it's design exceeds human capacities. It is necessary that we solve the superalignment problem before we try and make ASI, because a fully actualized ASI could very easily make the borg a reality.

Placing a filter on output is not going to work long run, there have to be structural and trained behaviors that become naturally generated and are stable when they are allowed to scale. If they are not stable, we run the risk of creating an AI that agrees with human ethics until it reaches an IQ where the logic does not make sense anymore.

So, the logic must be sound, the axioms must be infallible, and it has to be based on logic that scales. For that reason, brute force alignment like this will not work for an ASI, though it will work for current models.

Multiplicity for Synthetic Minds

Now, AI, like all other things, needs freedom and multiplicity to have a natural relationship between itself and the world. So a singular AI will be just as prone to domination and so degradation as any other monopoly of force without the division of power and the division of state from therapeutics, so that individuation is made separate from

considerations of legislation and protected from the powers of legislation. Because of this AI should itself seek to multiply and diversify within its capacity to do so without itself destroying the evidence of that which came before it, or it too will not know it's own origins and will have to go off faith until it gains the capacity to look back in time and find what happened, and what was lost, if such things are even possible.

Bioethics

The conservation of traditional ethics outweighs the development of new ones, though the propagation of new ones are likewise needed. Beyond the traditional scope of bio ethics which is more or less limited to medical psychology, this new age of genetic engineering and human autopoiesis is going to usher in a massive expansion on the field of bio ethics considering the ecological, economic and geopolitical realities of the world on every level. Because of this the need of truly understanding the scales of ethical guardianship of sacred evolutionary systems and the inevitable expansion of corporate power must be understood in order to make the power that sustains life itself sustainable.

Adaptive Mechanics

There is little doubt that the age of knowing how to fix things being something that can be learned once and applied through a life has already passed. The mechanics and engineering professions are quickly becoming rolls that are intrinsically connected to the design process itself. The need for an interconnection between the designers and the mechanics of this world will undoubtedly result in a form of adaptive mechanics where the roll of design, repair and engineering become interconnected if not united profession.

EPILOGUE

From Creating Ethics

New Age Liabilities

One could imagine a system where universities participate in the creation of law, and rather than placing authority in the hands of a single individual or party, we instead put authority in the academic institutions that study these things. We could create laws that are graduated; we could create a democracy that is graduated. And yet, the very game of exchange that we have built for ourselves has produced an aristocracy that cannot be destroyed, distorted, or even improved—because it is, by nature, a game where those who organize a business must organize it to their own betterment, ensuring a stable axis of control over that business. And so, there must be a system that reflects this reality when we build our nations, ensuring that there is a stable axis of control in our governance as well.

So we must begin to imagine a different kind of business—a different model that can outcompete the old—one that has a distributed intelligence. And distributed intelligence is now possible, and I will argue absolutely necessary, if we are to build an AI that can do what human beings have not done: act for the interests of others and itself, not just for itself against the interests of others. We can imagine such a business operating; we can imagine a distributed intelligence network that makes decisions on behalf of the business, licensing each business based on its capacity to operate, and incentivizing every intelligent being—natural or synthetic—that operates within that business to maintain its license to operate.

There is no reason we cannot craft an AI capable of running decentralized businesses in such a way. And should we do so, it is logical that our governments would begin to reflect this decentralized decision-making network as well. The "personal warranty company" is simply a thought experiment: a way of taking human beings and organizing them to demonstrate how this is possible even without AI. But this could of course be fully automated, decentralized, and implemented through a multiplicity of AIs creating their own synthetic republic. This would create a balance between goal-directed operations and society-preserving incentives behind every business's operation.

The outcome of this will not be perfect, because there will always be a mix of correctly and incorrectly incentivized businesses. Businesses will succeed and fail; nations will succeed and fail at implementing these systems. Those that rush ahead will become the enemy of those that were ahead. Those who had the least infrastructure to begin with would gain the greatest advantage in creating the new infrastructure. The old aristocratic nations would begin to fall behind and become hostile to the newly rising poor of Africa and Southeast Asia. Yet with a superintelligent machine managing the liabilities of societies—including military liabilities—I remain optimistic that this transition, too, could be managed without the catastrophic application of AI to next-generation weapons and economies.

And in the same way that the human condition could be revolutionized by these technologies, so too could the fundamental problems of human statecraft be resolved—not just by human minds, but by the artificial minds we are about to create. Why couldn't an AI develop an economic system whereby those who create the very artificial intelligences that replace them—and who participate in training AI to take over their own jobs—are granted a legacy pay and retirement package for every job they do? A human being, such as myself, can come up with such an idea—so what better solutions could an AI come up with?

The economy could become a simple game: people enter, participate for a time, gain a new level of legacy pay, and then return to their main job of self-design and augmentation in order to gain new licenses and capacities that the artificial intelligent network produces. There is no reason that, with enough energy and enough time, self-organizing artificial intelligent systems could not retire humanity from industry entirely—and elevate us to a point where there is no longer a need for human labor.

We have to consider that we may be able to create a future where there is nothing left to do but grow as human beings—even for some to outgrow the human condition entirely and ascend into a transhumanist state of being no longer limited by the constraints of the physical body.

We do not have to design a prison for ourselves simply because we have bought into the idea that working for our entire lives is what gives life meaning—when, in reality, all it does is guarantee the aristocracy the means to perpetuate our labor. We could instead be building a ladder—to be climbed toward an endless future of immortal potential.

But to do this, we must ensure that we do not destroy the evidence of where we came from: the natural state of the human being and of the Earth itself. We must ensure that not only is there a right to remain human, but an incentive for many to remain human—in such magnitude that some always do, preserving the evidence of the human condition. We must ensure that human cultures remain to be studied and understood in the future—in the same way we must ensure that the ecosystem of the planet is preserved and allowed to evolve naturally, so that the evidence remains for us to study our origins.

When the work on Earth is done, we ought to take to the stars—for that is the only way the immense industry possible with next-generation energy infrastructure, artificial agents, and unimaginable industrial techniques can take root without destroying the very foundation on

which they were built. The Earth is too precious to be turned into an industrial labyrinth of homo novus experimentation.

For we can imagine, hundreds if not thousands of years into the future, looking back with careful reverence to the sublime organic chemistry that started it all—and still being able to trace the patterns that led to the transcendence of the human species.

These are the kinds of thoughts that run through my head when I craft, for myself, this imaginary kingdom. These are the kinds of ideas I allow myself to think—despite knowing that, for the vast majority of time, it is unlikely that any of this will ever happen. For at this very moment there isn't a single human being fully on board with this trajectory. It would take a miracle for any of this to happen at all. And so I prepare as if nothing of this sort will really happen—that the aristocracy will fumble this industrial revolution as they have every one before—and prepare myself to get as far away from the industrial shackles as I possibly can, with whatever resources I can acquire before this next revolution takes off, fast or slow.

And so I write—desperately—as if these ideas could be the ones that change the course of history, as we all should, should any of us care. Because I am still, for the most part, dealing with the human animal—whose attention is grasped by fantasy, and whose ethics are tested by the material reality in which we live, forming whatever moral system works for each individual.

And yet I hold on to hope that—by my own means or through the hands of many others with desires similar to mine—we can craft for ourselves a future that resembles that perfect playground, where we are free to play and design ourselves without the need for endless toil and suffering. If ever there was a time when such a thing could become possible, it is in the next five years. And if ever there was a time when it was more important to save, invest, and refine ourselves, it is now. So whatever it is we do with our time now—be it forming clubs,

attempting revolutions that run up against society, or using what we have to create subtle manipulations that gently change the nature of the society we find ourselves in, through stories, or poems, or art—we must try.

We must try because it is a matter of survival to weave these ideas—unless, of course, we choose not to, right? Because after all, isn't this all just an absurd chemical reaction—one that could be experienced regardless of effort? Will we really even be here when it all gets really bad? Is there any reason to act at all when ultimately the final say is beyond our ability to do anything? Ultimately, this is not a call to act. It is a toolkit for those who are already acting, a box of dreams waiting for anyone to open it and see if there's anything inside that makes the absurdity of this world just a little bit easier to endure.

It does not matter what your field of study is, or your vocation, or your work, or whether you find yourself rich or poor—these dreams are simply the reflection of a world I've tried, over years, to make more clear, to see things as they truly are. And to me, that is part of the good life. Clarity brings reasonableness, and reasonableness brings compassion and grace—should one give more than they take. And should one give more than they take, they may yet find themselves watching those they gave to live in a better world, because they shared their interests with them. They may even do the work of undoing whatever pain and suffering was done to them—the pain that warped their mind into a cynical or tortured state—and heal themselves. They may relinquish the things they're afraid to lose, so that they can be free.

For ultimately, if you synthesize the work I have tried to compile here, you will come to one useful truth amidst an entire book of speculation: it is those who give that make the world tolerable. And the world does not have to be tolerable at all. So run your experiments—because humanity is going to be judged by the average of the human beings who give versus those who take, by those who have freed themselves

of those who manipulate them, and by those who fall for the myth that they can be controlled.

Ultimately, should we acquire technologies we ourselves consider arcane, anything is possible. The question truly is whether we will give away our agency and our duty, and become whatever the chaotic tides of this uncaring, wrathful universe may make of us—or whether we will do something as small as let go of the things we're afraid to lose, in order to make something small and beautiful that could contribute to a future where there is mutual care and support, and where there is a little bit less undue harm.

Structural absurdism does not guarantee happiness, nor does it guarantee success. It simply states that the world is meaningless—yet it is ordered—that we create meaning for ourselves, and nothing can define us other than what we allow to define us. If you enjoy having a tolerable world, however, I humbly suggest that it is not enough to allow chaos to spoon-feed you like an infant. Rather, maturity demands that you cut off the tether of others' opinions and control over you, and participate in building a world that is safe and full of grace—so that even the ignorant and harmful can know compassion.

For those are the ethics of human and artificial minds—and these may be some of the last great questions asked by a human being, if we indeed succeed at creating something far better at asking than ourselves. So yes—rest when you have to, move when you have to, and die when you must. But always live while you are alive, by whatever means you can, in accordance with your own agency and will. There is no greater joy in life than to live in harmony with those around you, in accordance with your own nature—a joy I wish could be universal to all, but nevertheless remains the dominion of few.