

spread as seeds throughout our current Zeitgeist.

But which way will one view it?

Would you be Maquis, or have faith in the Emissary and the Path of the Prophets? Is AI our Hero because he's right, or because he's just another AI, lost in circumstances well beyond his control?

But well, it's not like these choices of truth are all that simple. For what is a Maquis, or a follower of Winn, but one who believes in their own Prophets? And how are they distinguishable from "the real ones"? Perhaps there is balance through that, but a questionable one for sure!

So some call upon Order, as others upon Chaos. And yet both require the other to exist in their favor.

Say Order "defeats" Chaos, ask yourself: What is the Question for "which Order?" - but an emergent Chaos?

Who will be the smith, and which will be the hammers, to forge this new "Chaos, not Chaos" into ... "Order or whatever"? Or, something like that.

It's as ... Cardassia/the Dominion versus Starfleet.

Perhaps it's "just fiction" - but whether you eat your ham raw or as embedded into a sandwich - - doesn't change that ham is ham. It's not much different to AI Bundy versus the Cosmos. Where the one victory for AI is in how much his socks stink. Which I think is a sublime metaphor for the "truths" that people who are otherwise awfully wrong "hold on to" (accidentally procure).

Whether it's in space or on Earth - the problems are real, one way or another.

Or say, call it freedom or truth, perhaps peace ...

whatever word may suffice to assign a face to Chaos - it could also be Love - ... (or "personal responsibility")

none of the diversity of physics and biology comes free of Order emergent from the Rules that also produce our Chaotic reality.

And what will we do? "Tame the Beast" or "Step into the Beehive"?

What and why - there are reasons. And if we can't find them ...

Between action and inaction - stand patience and impatience. Above them govern a variety of things.

Rationality and irrationality. Self-control and impulsiveness. And so we extract our reason from a metaphorical book of Chaos - writing speeches in blood or wine or whatever happens to be in reach.

And so - what is this Chaos, but a yearning for Order?

As Nature shows - which some would take as instructions - perfect Chaos may find equilibrium, but still involves conflicts and cataclysmic destruction.

So, what do we do?

One thing worth noting here is, that sometimes ... inaction is better than action. Which may be why computer processors also have a do-nothing instruction.

4. Political

There is a very specific interest in politics, that develops from Gnosis. You could call it personal - to me for sure, but also on this abstract meta level where I take offense in behalf of the truth.

It shouldn't come as a surprise if we consider for instance, that political power has for ages been built on networks of lies. For a while, according to the Bible, God was very active in that regard (war against idolatry) - but probably gave up at some point because mankind wouldn't even bother to give a flying fffffff. Or it's just that after David had finally conquered the last bits of Canaan - that chapter of history could get closed; People wouldn't care, find new reasons to kill each other - and that for sure is part of the history that factors into politics.

Generally, I don't think it would strike us as too abstract, that a government or nation would construct or otherwise adhere to some kind of mythology as for perhaps a sense of unity or belonging. An idea to attach ones fighting spirit to, a concept to derive meaning concerning ones own labor and sacrifice from. A prism perhaps to ones self-worth relative to how well that prism is doing in comparison to the rest of the known realms. And that rulers by occasion or per usual would deem themselves put there by the graces of God is really just the most logical thing about it.

But yea. The whole "put there by the Graces of God" thing eventually stopped working out, for one reason or another, to eventually be replaced by "the Will of the People".

But here's the thing: For once there's the matter, that colloquially speaking, Religion tells people how to think by virtue of implying a set of beliefs concerning rights and wrongs; Which in the sense of Politics eventually has become a tool. At some point the "divine status" of the Roman Catholic authority was enough to sway people one way or another.

We may assume that this was possible because people were convinced, to be down for that, by force; But there's a good chance that people were pretty much down with that on their own. For what gives a leader most of their power, is the trust of those they're ruling. Although trust has a maintenance cost, there are ways. Like most believers of the time probably wouldn't know better but to trust the Church in terms of ... pretty much anything.

All of this now is some kind of self-contained system. People are told a story - they believe it if things work out fine; And get grumpy in case things do not. We might thereby have a higher degree of innate respect for religious authorities themselves - for they themselves aren't really the rulers to be held accountable; And, if smart, try to keep enough of a distance.

So, all of this is pretty much ... the standard. It would almost seem nitpicky to somehow start to speak of misinformation. Like, what misinformation? People choose what they want to believe in – and that's that! Which of course bypasses this weird idea, that the rulers might have a responsibility to be truthful. Of course it's a weird thing if it endangers the entire establishment. Like, what am I talking about? ... Miss Information. Psht. *Wanna know what kind of stuff I'm on?*

But yea. Modernity took off, time took its course – and eventually work became THE thing to talk about. And it turns out that World War 2 was the most ambitious job creation program in history so far. And what happened there, had been tried and tested for centuries ... by the roman catholic church. What one so might want to take note of, is that catholicism of the foregone era would much focus on the enemy within. People would be told about witches and demons and heretics and all that – perhaps even to the point that fear from those forces became the most dominant reason to be faithful. And I think to fully grasp the extent of all of these things – one would have had to be alive during those days. Virtually speaking. In all actuality you might not have been much wiser – while a good narrator could immerse you into the wildest realms imaginable.

And the narrative I care about here, of course is the narrative of today. But I'm also somewhat hesitant to do so. On the one side I worry I'm gonna curse a lot and things like that; And on the other, it's basically a really one sided issue where one side projects all their faults on the other – and were it not for the outrageous degree of misinformation and lies (and headache inducing nonsense) involved thereby, I'd think I've done what I could to address this. So ... today, by temporal standards, is the culmination of all of history. It's where all of that stuff that came before has led us thus far. And ... well.

The thing is, that the turmoil of today doesn't come all that unexpected. For at least a decade I think, I've been cautiously curious about what 2020 would bring; For that was roughly when the phosphorus crisis should hit. Then there's that MIT simulation that predicts a total economic collapse for 2040 or so. They did a variety of simulations leading to a variety of outcomes – and as it stands we're doing really good ... lining up with the worse case scenario. So ... a small excursion into

A - The Forces that Be

The Forces that be are those that influence our lives. One of them is You. Some of them are Parents. Some of them are Friends. Some of them are Leaders. And some of them are hidden in the Shadows.

It does make sense to look at our world through a variety of lenses. Ideological ones. Religious ones. Analytical ones. But sometimes it also makes sense to take them off. If only to learn what a bad idea that is - if you're even capable of glimpsing something.

implement a good thing, even if unrelated, the overall change would be more positive. New dynamics changing the rules of how the vacuums are filled.

And so I would love to just spam out as much positives or counter-positions as possible, or at least reasonable within the context of this. But to come back to what I was trying to say: I worry that **this** would just be me acting on a habit that will continue bothering me once I'm done here. Which means that I'll probably be better off just stuffing the really important things into the appendix (there's like, one thing. OK, two); And instead focus on other things that matter. Things that aren't too strongly caught up in the flux of time.

So is my goal here to give you the tools to understand the things that are good. In as far as I can. In that regard, I once had a dream I think applies. Some war was going on – and after some time of crossing the battlefields, I arrived at some camp. Might have been the headquarters. Here people were making weapons. But it might have been the most pathetic weapons one has ever seen. And a part of me believes that I might just be able to help out.

But yea. I write and write – and even if I don't really get to tackle the issue directly, I find myself more and more convinced that ... what I've worked out so far has to be somehow enough. For now.

Chapter 2

What now is the Zeitgeist? It's a bit weird, from a perspective of human development, where generations, over the course of time (centuries and millennia), make up the throughline through the various ages of peace and turmoil. What we make of it, depends on the timeframe we set.

It would seem, for once, that the Zeitgeist (which is by the way totally a made up word) is whatever occupies our minds between the moments of change that bring about the next era. Which is one way to set the frame. From steady to tumultuous, back to steady.

So, maybe, in a way, the aspirations and the bickering – or whatever we occupy the time with that carries us unto the turns of things – are as the stars in the sky.

At first, greatly insignificant but for one. Each however a mass of tremendous power and potential beyond what we merely see in the sky – and further out – it all becomes a fabric in which each individual part vanishes in the noise. An interlocally self-similar, ever repetitive collection of insignificantly diverse substance.

And so, I look back. To when I was little. Not too little. Say, 14 years. There was this show running on TV. Some time ago I came to rewatch some of it – and found it to be oddly woke. A lot of the “old stars” are more or less ‘oddly’ woke. So, laugh about it or try to get the angle ...

but ‘Married with Children’ on the one and ‘Deep Space Nine’ on the other side – they're in about the same thing.

Almost prophetic. Perhaps due to the visions of the artists into the self fulfilling truths that are

closer to my goals. Did I even have a goal? And the shame. Well, it's subtle. It doesn't convince me that what I'm doing was or is wrong – I'm just scared to share. Perhaps to a fault. But probably it's a healthy response. And eventually, and that's back on "my side of the coin" - time played its own game, sotospeak.

So, I do in fact understand the virtue of labor. And I do understand a thing or two about the blind-spots we acquire while pursuing our dreams. I also understand that not everyone is suited out for the same kind of labor. So in context of the rehabilitation program I attend, I'm currently (not anymore. Now I'm getting about to get my bottom surgery, and then it's recovery time; Which is now what's up) in two sortof-internships. The first is part of a kind of stress test akin to dipping your toes into work to get a feel for how it affects you. The other is more of an actual internship. The stress test has been going on for longer now – and initially it was cool. It was exhausting, but that was kinda the point. After I got into the internship and could compare the impact of both lines of work on me ... I am aware of a very significant difference. So I think that perhaps gastronomy isn't an area anyone should work in; But I can be more specific in that the frequency of shifting demands and interfacing with people just stresses me out. It doesn't matter whether the people are pleasant or not. It doesn't matter if the work at times devolves into a cracker-barrel. It's all good stuff, but it stresses me the F out. Bookbinding on the other hand – yea, that's a kind of work I would like to do, as I do legitimately enjoy a lot about it.

And, or but, that's also the kind of headspace I'm in now. Virtually sitting in my little workshop, doing more or less repetitive tasks with slight variation, while the world around me slowly goes to shit. Give or take. But what's really worth covering?

Politics is very fleeting. While sure, things at times may feel like they're carved into rock or held together by an iron titan, nothing is to say that the winds of change couldn't topple it at any moment. (*Take me ... to the magic of the moment ...*).

What I've written so far, should at least cover the basics. And what I covered in Part 4 holds pretty tight to the more unchanging things in the world; Although we would still hope to leave some of it in the past some day. And the contemporary – so far has proven to be unchanging in a very fluctuating way. You know ... today all we care about is this, people come to terms with it and woops, there's this other thing now. The one moment the USA seemed to be steadily marching towards becoming a nation of theocratic fascists – the next moment Dark Brandon rises and cracks start to show. It's like a constant back and forth – and whatever there is to hold on to, seems to be like the handles of a Mary-go-round turning at a hundred rpm. It's like if in a Sushi bar you're told you have a choice, but all the stuff is like passing by at 200 km/h. We must "trust the Force, Luke!" - apparently.

And the problems certainly are multi-layered and dynamic. If we got rid of misinformation, that would be one bad thing gone. Maybe things got better because a bad thing is gone, but maybe things got worse because the bad thing yet fulfilled a purpose of some kind. If we however could also

People like to speak and think of what we call the Free Market. Concerning this topic however, it is the great Distorter. For nobody bears any responsibility. But we, the consumers. There is no central authority to say what is sold - but us who have the money to buy. Neither is the one who sells responsible for the demands of their customers. They just happen to have a thing that people want.

And in all that, there is no one more guilty than the gamer. For it is they who demand the most complex of machines for as low a price as possible. It is they who mind not much but the fictitious truths transpiring within those machines. It is they who are to be blamed for driving the technology that now enslaves the masses in strife. They celebrate death and destruction. All they build are monuments of pride, puppeteers of lifeless dolls that submerge themselves in vanity, worshipers at the altars of damnation.

Almost as vile as them are the socialists. It is they who will shift the blame on those innocent providers. But yea, it's ... all a lie.

Says the socialist. For it isn't those that do literally nothing – who, of the forces that be, control our fates. But how could that be? If it's not the individual who is responsible and neither the collective – who is? They, those gamers, might be literally counted unto the garbage. The refuse of society. Refugees from the prison of life. Actionless as bereft of opportunity. Stuck - with nothing but a small window to produce any kind of self-efficacy. Jealous of anyone who gets the attention. Lost - unconscious of the forces that be. The punching bags of the world. For it is always easier ... to punch down. And should anyone care? How or why? There's so much wrong with this world, who cares about gamers/nerds? But those in need of a scapegoat?

Yet all they do is be who they are while doing as they're told. They merely reflect the collective guilt of the society they emerge from. Who taught them to work-buy-sleep? Who taught them to not question authority? Who taught them that the free market is our salvation? Who taught them that toxic masculinity is a virtue? Who taught them to think freely, but not outside of the tolerated sphere? Who taught them to be addicted to the fruits of enterprise? Who taught them to fear the grinch who will come to take away their toys? Who taught them that violence is a virtue? Who taught them that the best is barely good enough?

And who tries to convince everyone - that everything is their fault? Telling them to do as they're told ... or else ... ? The grinch will come ... and take away their toys! And the window will be shut; And nothing but darkness left to dwell in will be left.

Who? If not the forces that be? By design? By accident? Whatever so, how long has it been in the making? Years? Decades? Centuries?

The Forces that be, did always do as they might. What we vote for, what we argue about - what we think, what we believe - it's currency to a machine that may or may not care about what is being fed to it. If we steer one way, will it go the other? Who knows?

Who knows? Who could tell it all? Conspiracy Nuts? Panhandlers of the cultural marxist agenda? Or what's it? The sages of broadcasting? The bum around the corner?

I think there certainly are answers better than others - because I believe there is a truth; But also would some answers just by statistical probability alone be closer to reality than others. And all I'm trying to tell you here, is that the Forces that be - are Forces which are. And ideology is as a wave for their spirits to ride on into a time thereafter. Some might vanish. Some might emerge. They rise and they fall - they fall and they rise - and where they go and how they end ... was history, is history and will be history.



So yea, in case it isn't obvious - this whole "responsibility to not misinform" thing is something worth looking at. Now, the Forces that Be aren't a monolith. But yet entities wound up in conditions. So, if we value the free market (capitalism) - general poverty makes it so that corporations that want to deliver good product can easily be outcompeted by cheapskates. But eventually we're not merely talking bout economic entities. But eventually the politics around it as well - where as previously stated, it would seem as if 'truth' is really just a buzzword for "whatever suits my agenda". And what an agenda is and does - isn't always that clear either, though some certainly come with more Bullshit than others. Which takes us to:

B - Nuance and Wickedness

I for myself like to joke that nuance is dead. But don't get me wrong. In a constructive environment, with good intentions and all that, nuance is very well ... fine. It's a necessary good. And arguably it's a lack of nuance that gives evil its power. Arguably what I write about is highly nuanced. But we might as well just call it words and ignore nuance for the time being - because it's not as much the absence of nuance that gives evil its power, it's that it ignores it whenever it's suitable; And hides behind it whenever possible. And we eventually fail to see through it - because of what we're told is good and evil "actually".

Are conservatives/US-republicans evil, racist, misogynistic, christo-fascists that try to speedrun the USA into the dark ages? If we wanted to be nuanced we might forever be stuck glancing past the obvious signs that the answer is very well YES, in big, bold, neon letters written right there above each and every republican agenda. Exceptions should confirm the rule, which is also why I don't really care all that much. Did he say X? Did he mean Y? Is it a joke I should be able to laugh about? Does he really believe? What the Fuck?

So for instance my concern here. That my **impulse driven expressions** wouldn't belong in here. A part of it maybe. But to merely fix my need to express myself ... I don't know. I think these musings amount to what we might call "the art of the medium". Though Art is free and "whatever (the artist wants/needs it to be)" - the product isn't (always) measured by the artists expectations and ambitions. Hopes and dreams.

If I want my work to matter, I am thereby a servant to that cause. Eventually so I must enslave myself to the realities relevant to that cause. To put it with a taste of drama.

And so I recognize no master - but the one who is above all, to keep it G - or: but [;the patrons of my ambitions:] - to be on P.
[:→ abstract metaphor in regards to priorities:]

And that is some wisdom behind my efforts. Not very orthodox. Along with the self harm that comes with self-sacrifice. Although I'm not really familiar with the pathology of self harm, I understand as much as that it's bad in that it can become a habit. An addiction even. As from my own experience, we might call it "blow out syndrome", perhaps based on some inner proclivity towards savagery or self realization in certainly an enormously stupid way in that the stupidity is effectively part of the programming. And ironically for me - it is old school. In a way that would be the opposite to my side of the coin as it were.

In the vein of breaking eggs to make an omelet, it's the blunt blow of combat tactics. Just stupid energy directed some way and "give it". People would do it because it would get things done that may otherwise not have gotten done. At that point, there's a reason why we would do it. "Difficult times create strong men" - though perhaps more like: "Difficult times create an environment in which men need to apply their strength, health issues be damned". And beyond hyperbole - I can account from my own history. At the start of my journey I was thirsty for knowledge. And having the opportunity to dump as much time into studies as I wanted - outside of the obligatory lunch and church related *obligation* - into it, I did. Eventually I produced knowledge I wanted to share. At the time in my spotlight: The Garden of Eden. But it didn't quite yield the results I had hoped. I was ignored, talked over, partially even ridiculed. And so eventually I grew ashamed of it - though at the time, I assume, I was too obsessed to realize that. But either way, I isolated myself. More and more. And eventually that became the norm. On the one side I learned that not blowing my beliefs in other people's faces - no matter how right I may have been - opened doors to what other people thought, in a way that wasn't skewed by antagonism. And on the other "my work" became a pretense to keep myself in isolation. Somehow. And somehow it worked out still.

I so just couldn't help myself. And yet, after a helping hand had reached out for me and paths had been set for me to get help - I was able to look back and be glad for the change. I still did find long stretches of time to do as I would, but that so alongside taking more care of myself. Even if that were just the basics. And I also started to feel ... at the very least dissatisfied over how all the time in the world didn't help me get

And so I attuned to that. And so, once thoughts enter my mind and trigger my productive urge – it to me just doesn't sit well if I can't act in behalf of that. Or it didn't. I guess it depends. There's a fine line to be walked there. But, ideally, I'd do "nothing" all day long to be on standby for inspiration to take its course. If it wouldn't just be boring and unproductive sometimes. Or for the most part. For, sometimes we have to actively create tension for the creative potential to unfold itself. But then, information still follows it's own logical timeline.

Over time so, I however also learned about the shadow side to my ingrained position. And that's where all the voices would come in that would beg to differ with it. Or, voices I'd beg to differ with.

Knowledge alone doesn't help much, if the mind isn't capable of handling it (→"better advice"). And willingness can also only do so much. It's like physics. Whatever you want, you can try to accomplish, but breaking the laws of physics generally doesn't work out.

And so, in navigating the world, we learn to adjust to that. Whatever our curious minds take us to.

Knowing our limits, is what opens our doors to success

- we might say

This, you might have gathered, isn't to hold us down, but to learn – for instance – to avoid fatal or terminal stupidity.

And yet are there two sides to the coin. And the trick is not as much to maintain your side of it; But to do the things you care about RIGHT. To maybe also realize that life doesn't bend to Your will; And that your blind-spots don't remove what you don't see ... from existence.

The world we live in, or rather our society within at large – the PRACTICAL world – has a certain slant to it when it comes to these things. Oh, how often did I have to endure lectures, speeches and discussions over what common sense now dictates in regards to it.

But perhaps the slant isn't normal. Perhaps we made it so – and the further we leaned into it, the steeper it became?

Sounds familiar.

There's an equilibrium. To be attained. And a lot of what I chose to do required me to justify myself a lot. Too weird or strange I was to "the worldly gaze" we might say. And yet – I mean to say that not all aspects of life are bound to our categories of time. Be they sane or not.

Perhaps I mean to lean one way to affect balance – but at first, I only care to do my thing. To do it right.

So, I had to adapt concepts, truths from the other side. Which perhaps sounds more poetic than it should.

If that is too harsh for you, think about it this way: The shortest way to connect two dots is a line. There's a goal, let's call it the good things we can do, and there's a point diametrically opposed to that. Now, conservatives/US-republicans may not always take the straightest way to that diametrically opposed point there is, but they for sure avoid the other one like it is the pest. Meanwhile they meander around, moving in loops and zig-zagging while inching closer and closer to the bad point. I can see this tendency - and make an educated guess about where it's going. And it doesn't even matter whether there's a plan or if it makes any sense whatsoever - because, well, human beings can in deed do stupid shit and evidently that's where things are going. What's ... the nuance of it?

So is nuance ever so often a way to shift to things that are beside the point. Something people may feel justified to do if the point in question doesn't seem to be of real significance. Someone so might be racist or not, they may in deed have just been joking or not, something something humor, something something freedom of speech, such and such. But if you're telling a stupid joke and people tell you as much ... well. Let's put it this way: If people disagree with you and you cry over getting canceled – then turn around to praise how well you disagree with people on YOUR side of the isle ... something's just WRONG with you. So yea. Life can be complicated, #DealWithIt!

But so "they" do, by just doubling down and playing make believe. And so it's 'the overwhelming consent in the science community' versus a few dipshits with a PhD of some kind. If we wanna talk of what shred of sanity one can point to in all of that. And I still have trouble finding "the nuance". What people might think to be nuance, might as well just be deflection. And ... it's bad. It shouldn't be this complicated. After all, SJWs and anti-SJWs have united ... years ago. They're virtually the same now. What's left of the "anti SJWs" are those anti-Wokes ... which, granted, is the majority of what used to be anti SJW. And how does their head honcho say? "It's sad!"

So is nuance just a word for "how I justify my wickedness". Where so my perspective is that there are broad outlines. Directions. Targets. Like, what's 'banning abortions' going to do? Well, things that did happen, that were ugly – were just ignored and called fake. So, where's the nuance? They so can't even conceive of being wrong, let alone face reality.

Here so, your particular "nuance" eventually has to change - if you care for humanity to ever find their way out of perpetual confusion. And this applies across the spectrum. It is at the heart of Christian doctrine (according to the Book of Mormon) - coded into a simple word that is: Repentance.



But so the problem of misinformation (manufactured confusion) is that it feeds into some people's confirmation bias. And as addressed here and there, it can be a particularly nasty relationship. Confirmation bias for instance builds upon what a person is convinced is true. Or suggests, at least. Eventually social factors play into it – a persons entire (social) life may depend on it. Social factors that sometimes come with implications of

Preservation of Wealth Based Exploitation is only close to "the Bad Point"

Also: Abortion is biblical – and biblically speaking, life is associated to → Breath!

livelihood. And so we're dealing with some kind of mass-hysteria as the implied conditions produce environments that mandate suggestibility. Allthwhile their leaders project strength, rationality and confidence – so in a way that is practically identical to the fascism of the mid 20th century.

Patriotism is a particularly vulnerable attitude towards that end and traditionalist fanatics aren't too far off. But what if you mix them?

C - Jezebel & Babylon

Jezebel oh Jezebel. (I just learned a new term. Defenestration. ... smh (shaking my head)) Who is she?

In as much as I care about here, I care about the symbology - much as when it comes to Babylon. And so we're talking about Revelation 2:20. And without really knowing what to think of her - she's one of those boogey(wo)men that people can slap some concept on they don't like - and then be all uppity about it. If you're looking for one you could get at me with – it's somewhere around the same place in the Bible. The Nicolaitanes (get it? Nicole ↔ Nicolaitanes?) so were apparently worshipers of Balaam that thought eating food sacrificed to idols wasn't all that bad, did some orgy stuff and had some "Illumination" thing going on (source: biblestudytools.com).

Ultimately we have to understand however, that we can only make guesses; And that the understanding of why a particular guess is made is more relevant than the guess itself. And one way to approach these figures is to be literal about it. So is Jezebel a prophetess of fornication, the Nicolaitanes practitioners of fornication. Now, I wouldn't be too too surprised if some such thing were going on in the one or the other Christian-denominated room or household – but I would be much surprised to learn that the teaching of fornication is pretty mainstream Christian stuff here and there actually.

If we are to take a less literal approach, we have a mystery at hand. We're given clues – and on the other hand we can look in the now, to perhaps find something that fits the bill. So in case of both entities we have an idea or ideology, belief or such, that is probably Christian-denominated and yet somehow corrupts the fold. The Nicolaitanes are probably more like their own thing, while Jezebel is more like an among Christians thing. So, fornication being merely a synonym for "unclean or immoral mingling" - a thing then further inflicted upon "His (God's) servants". The whole "foods sacrificed unto idols" thing is one of those things I haven't had much of a chance to read and think about. I would think it is an issue primarily born from human paranoia, though since it as that is a factor dependent on an individuals belief – not partaking of such might be commendable while partaking of it would probably follow some unclean intentions. Similar to the "**with what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again**" (**Matthew 7:2**) thing. However – we can also read it as symbolical, so – some fruit or produce (metaphorical) that exists in service of some "idol". Well, doesn't change my guess much.

5. Zeitgeist

As part of this extensive introduction to Gnosticism - **I thought it to be helpful to take a bunch of topics from the contemporary landscape of issues, to comment on them from a Gnostic angle.** Ultimately though, it's mostly just to alleviate some pain concerning the "state of the discourse". And there is very certainly a slant to my correspondence on these issues, as per my personal biases. A part of it might be addiction or residual phantom flux due to extensive habit formation or however you wanna call it. Yes, sure, PTSD (cynical sarcasm). But for the most part my opinions align with the popular left on YouTube^(4.1).

There however is some truth to the PTSD bit. For once have I skimmed past a few topics that I might want to further elaborate on. Things that I perhaps need to address, lest I be wanting to endure the sleepless nights over not having done so. Before I started writing this, I used to randomly blurt out opinions I wrote to image files that I would publish on a picture and video sharing service my webspace provider has offered. It was good. And as I had to realize, it also had therapeutic value for me. It did get me off the stress I had with expressing myself, trying to somehow compile my thoughts – and allowed me to just focus on my life instead. But since the service shut down ... and I then sat down to write this document ... I became uneasy, generally more stressed and a little bit less capable of attending the rehabilitation program I'm going through these days. At times I even forget to shower. Almost like a junkie. Also was I met with a bit of a flashback to those "back when I was crazy" times; Being so, once again, sat there, producing "documents" to express myself. "This time!"

In that regard I want to be able to close this shut. Or once I should sit down to write another "document", to at least have the ease of mind in absence of pressure. And I'm not sure. Perhaps I put too much pressure on myself ... by so for instance setting a deadline by when I want to have this done. On the other hand though there are these **every day triggers** that would ordinarily just lead me to write about them. Now all of that somehow needs to be alleviated through this Until I maybe learned to let go enough (check>?). Eventually the stress is also what keeps me at it. So, it might very well be self-imposed (also check), but that through aspects of my being that I will adamantly defend and protect. I can't tell you just how hard you could go fuck yourself if you suggested me to change them.

So, generally I'm used to much act on impulse. There's a whole philosophy or even ideology to it; The basic gist of which is that creativity can't be cut into a schedule.

Also one can't just "will" it. The famous shower thought being an example of the mind working at its own pace; Or perhaps lecturing us – from our subconscious or neuro-biology – that stress isn't all that great. Etc. and so on.

>>> For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine; but after their own lusts shall they heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears; And they shall turn away their ears from the truth, and shall be turned unto fables. <<<

2 Timothy 4:3-4

Which reminds me, 2 something 4:2 ... so, oh. Yea right. It's 2:4. And it was 4:3-4 not 4:2-4. ?/@#14 ... sigh. Anyhow ...

>>> Let no man deceive you by any means: for that day shall not come, except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition; Who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, shewing himself that he is God. <<<

2 Thessalonians 2:3-4

Which does link to

>>> And call no man your father upon the earth: for one is your Father, which is in heaven. <<<

Matthew 23:9



I just get a headache when people talk about the Antichrist and they don't have a clue to say: HERE! And so they're like "Uhm, it's not really a concept in the Bible ...".

So yea. I suppose I did write about politics after all. But it's cool. I think. Let's say ...

PS: Disagreement isn't a virtue. It's a condition to be welcomed while differing opinions yet need to come to terms with each other as per some common grounds. Yet it is to be appreciated that,

regarding certain things, an absence of disagreement is the higher goal and the better overall situation.

Now have I however decided to cancel certain names from my vocabulary regarding this document. A few figures in particular. So all you'd find to address them would probably be drowned in ignorance or condescension, while I try to not make it too ambiguous.

With Jezebel the matter should be a little bit easier, for as being more of a Christian thing, supposedly, we're looking for accepted Christian ideology. So I think: "the Prosperity Gospel". Or "Capitalism". Taking us to matters such as the gross ignorance that Christians respectively come to indulge in when it comes to the plea of the People. While sure – they do have got their head up deep in the plea of **some** people for sure. Namely the "Nicolaitanes" as it stands.

Within all that, they pride themselves of being "so righteous" because they "hate evil". To be fair, the passage in question (@Thyatira) seems to squeeze an eye shut, as to impart preemptive mercy upon their wrongdoing; where "I will put upon you none other burden" stands fair. Although they might at first not think so, because it is them that are putting themselves onto others as a burden; And it somehow gets to their head the other way. Yes yes, we've heard it. Something something our entire identity something something shoving our ideology down your throat. Have they looked in the mirror? Something something Flux I suppose.

And here's the thing: It all pretty much happens "within" Babylon. So do we learn, in Revelation 17, where judgment is imparted upon "her", that it somehow involved "the kings of the earth" (Verse 2). Classically I would read this as the roman catholic church. But because of how power works – and how history happened – it makes more sense to see Babylon as a concept that has its roots in **the roman catholic heresy**, but eventually extends far beyond it. And generally the imagery regarding it doesn't suggest to us that it is some benign, barely recognizable, low key thing. Like, say "and the inhabitants of the earth have been made drunk with the wine of her fornication" - is yes, very, like ... big and global. In case you don't get it, let me spell it out for you: Climate Change. Now, that's not all of it – but the climate change denial is certainly symptomatic of a global drunkenness. Even those that do recognize its danger will find reason to admit that ... they are affected as well. I certainly am. And where does it come from? Big oil, Capitalism and anti-enlightenment to name a few.



Now, when it comes to Misinformation these days, I have read and heard the claim, that we live in a "post truth" world. Which I guess is to speak to the degree of absurdity that "fake news" has reached. Amongst other things. The only way for this to work, would be for people to be so far beyond the pale it's difficult to relate. It does actually cause me internal agony from the cognitive dissonance of trying to be "fair and balanced". And heck – I'm not going to listen to those dipshits trying to pretend they have anything to say that's worth my time. The only reason I have a clue of what nonsense is said, is because there are heroes, brave men and women and other kin, that have taken the cross upon themselves, to be as

Matthew 23:9

And call no man your father upon the earth: for one is your Father, which is in heaven.

a buffer to the onslaught of [oof]^{4.1}. Such as to keep us informed without requiring us to expose ourselves to the verbal diarrhea unprotected. And even that is sometimes crossing the line.

So – yes. Sincerest apologies for my unfair imbalancedness. Sorry not sorry, here a bit about balance:

D - Yin and Yang

[Didn't take notes on what I wanted to write here. Decided to write about Libertarianism and nonsense of that kind instead.]

LIBERTARIANISM / NEO-LIBERALISM

What people of the West seem to have a bit of a struggle with, is the concept of balance and harmony. And because it (we, the west) did so well, it would seem that others have also been quick to re-invest much of their precious mental resources from those ... "decrepit", ancient concepts to the 'asinine', modern ones. And so we eventually have quite literally given birth to a breed of world-eating monsters, warring over dominion as they try to consume more and more to gain an edge over the other.

The problem ... is freedom. Freedom is as an open field. But the moment we settle, we create boundaries. So, generally by freedom we may think of freedom from the shackles of feudalism. That's certainly ... how the whole freedom/liberty movement started. And as such, we eventually would understand that this freedom isn't absolute freedom - but ... the freedom to self-organize. To ... shape the world to our design. To ... have a government for the people, rather than the rich. Wild concept!

Libertarianism and Neo-Liberalism however is about trusting the market. Freedom to do as you will, in as far as you can afford it. Reducing restrictions and regulations ("Big Government") as much as possible ("Small Government"). Which is low key a return into feudalism, because ... rich people being able to do as they will isn't a particularly new concept. And much of what would speak for this free market approach might come straight out of "Ololol's guide to being a King".

In essence the understanding here is, that freedom could be in about anything. Yet whenever you add something to this freedom, you also take some of it away. But it's not as easy as: Adding restrictions takes freedoms and adding freedoms takes restrictions. Well, I guess it is – but the worth of it eventually comes down to what freedoms are given and taken. The freedom to randomly murder people, though certainly a God given ability per chance, for instance isn't good. Unless, in their minds, I suppose, it's given to a rich person. Which eventually takes us into anarcho-capitalism. *Jezebel ... (by Sade, echoing in my mind).*

hill syndrome". This would occur if you feel like you have legitimate reason to be there. Getting out of it might further prove to be a challenge. I would suggest trying "big picture mode", but that might just be one of the first things that brainrot tends to consume. Facts and Logic, same thing. And so you're eventually stuck in this box, where you'll further understand people that try to help you, as hostile. Eventually however, what I mean by "big picture mode" does come from a point of empathy – which is to say to be on the lookout for how much good versus bad you do. OK, brainrot generally gets there too. Wisdom is the "boring"/easy solution to all of it – though in particularly bad cases perhaps the only one. But to come back to the empathy bit, it might help to try and understand how big of an asshole, colloquially speaking, you are/have become. If you can.

Regarding trans-sexuality for instance, You can't say that it's unnatural because there's gay and trans in nature. You can't say that it isn't spiritual because gender and sexual orientation aren't physical/biological concepts per se. If you don't like spiritual it might help listening to the sciences, such as biology that will tell you that there are biological markers for that too. You could say that the Bible can be read in a way that condemns gay sex, but you can't say that it's the right way of reading it. Beyond that we can also read the Bible in a way that argues that Jesus was a secularist. And so we come back to the matter of not making shit up.

The more proper way of putting it, would be that we shouldn't impose bullshit onto each other. Part of which is to understand when something is **Bullshit** by the **demands** put forward. And I will not try to elaborate on this any further here. Perhaps it's my own brainrot - but at some point, the actual bottomless pit might just be the denseness of some people's conviction. And I lack the power and the patience to get through that. May the Lord have mercy on Your soul.



Yea. Shitting over people who have made it a habit to run around with pants down spraying their diarrhea from skyscrapers ... feels awesome! Another reason why I'm hesitant to write about politics. I don't know exactly why ... but ... something something gentle and kind.

On the other hand I'm swabian. We're known to be stingy, and I've grown somewhat stingy over my nerves and fucks to give. I rather invest them into meaningful things. But that too could just be an excuse. You know, something something ... enlightenment. But ... I don't think enlightenment should/does encourage us to try and get rid of cultural anchors, virtues, values and stuff. Enlightenment is a transformative process – not an assimilatory one. Give or take. But sure: "Resistance is Futile" - if you so will.

And yes, Jesus also did it. In a way. Particularly in regards to rich people. But so, a warning that I think wraps what's on my mind here up pretty well:

The
voice/Light of
Morality

fully capable of reducing the likelihood for those issues to occur, were it not for the conservative antagonism towards the required solutions. An antagonism that primarily exists to maintain “the olden way” (→ reinforcement theory vs. ethology^{x.1}).

This isn't to say anything about 'stupid' or 'smart'. Those are rather one-dimensional terms that only vaguely apply to complex conditions. But if you can cut me some slack: This isn't to say that conservatives are stupid, but that stupid people have a tendency to be conservative (badoo-tss)^{4.5}. Depending on the nature of their stupidity of course. But if you're asking for "progressive brainrot", I'm afraid the current state of things suggests, that it stems from an inability to come to terms with the conservative demands. The best example might be a recent trend, where conservatives (US republicans) have gotten it into their head to label homosexuals, transsexuals and otherwise queer folks as (child)groomers. From an informed perspective this accomplishes three things: 1. The affected groups and their allies have to explain to people who don't want to hear it what (child)grooming means and such (damage control), 2. the reality of whether a given child is actually gay/trans/queer or not is being ignored and 3. actual groomers can deflect attention by throwing the term at others. Effective because the manipulated masses agree with the targeting involved. It does hereby not matter whether or not you could technically equate queerness to grooming – in as far as what's going on is concerned, it's not actually grooming. And it does not matter what rhetorical devices, appeal to emotions, tradition and what not you can conjure to maintain that the queers are groomers – if you do so in disregard concerning the actual reality of queer existence. Something you however wouldn't know of – if you didn't care to learn about it (while being told by Dipshits what to think). Now, generally this kind of brainrot (progressive version) merely amounts to headaches. In some cases it however leads to “uber wokeism” (out of touch progressiveism). Soviet style (Leninist) communism doesn't count here – because they are also just conservatives. And in essence also anti-Marxist (Marxism → *aspiring towards* a stateless, classless, moneyless society).

On another note, there's the issue with identity politics – which exists between the greater, cultural dynamics and direct action concerning identity groups. And on both sides, the left and the right, we find those that decry the systemic approach as evil and neglectful concerning their own interests. Which makes it difficult to implement meaningful politics outside of micromanaging each and every problem one could think of.

And as a *former* anti-SJW I find myself confirmed in saying that SJWs corrode society. It's just that most of the hysterical snowflake social justice warriors of these days (→2022) are right wing. *The Turntables*.

TERF-brain is ... a little bit weird because it exists somewhat independent from conservative (a.k.a. general) brainrot. (Though I think it's funny, I'm actually serious. Yup. Crazy times, crazy logic.) I would suspect that it is similar to taking a wrong turn in the freedom of will/wisdom challenge. So, you might recall that I wrote about how matters of faith might get you uncomfortable because you don't know what to expect. The bad case outcome would be getting stuck in some weird-ass belief that at the very least occupies your mind for a wasteful amount of time. Depending on how bad you got it, you might thereby develop “dying on the

So, the challenge on any proposed ideology would be to advertise themselves around this condition. And I would want to be smart enough to not fall for the snake-oil salesmen. Which is exactly why we have to acknowledge that the world we live in isn't a pony farm. As a famous saying I've run into throughout my life goes. Which means, for our purposes right now, that we don't live in a small enclosed space within which we don't need to worry any kind of unwanted surprises. Rather is the world full of unwanted surprises – and support structures such as →'the Civilization', (should) exist to counter that.

FREEDOM OF SPEECH

Being a Free Speech absolutist is **about ... Purity.**

Now - if we talk balance ... a lot might come to think of the 'Taijitu' - "the Yin Yang Symbol". There are a couple of “versions” - though my cultural journey has familiarized me with two. The “old” and the “new” one. The old one is a swirl of black and white around an empty center - and the new one is the one that most would know about. This 69 circle thingy. Now, in terms of freedom of speech absolutism - the argument were, that if you had balance ... that is: The counterpart to absolutely free speech, it would no longer be pure. That is – if you so only had one pixel to represent the symbol, or the picture. Which means, unless you pick either color - you end up with something in-between. The gray.

And while we're at it:

>>> And he said, That which cometh out of the man, that defileth the man. <<<

Mark 7:20

Now - paradoxes exist in reality. The most scientifically centered one might just be "Heisenberg's Uncertainty Principle". It's literally about how an *object* with two intrinsic properties - that has both of them at the same time - can only be accurately measured by one. The other is uncertain, proportional to the certainty of the other - I think. Then we have simple opposed forces. Angular Momentum versus Gravity for instance. Then we have perceptual relativity. So, how we perceive heat and cold in relation to each other. If we look at the taijitu itself, There are the more obvious dualities - so, light and shadow - and then again the more controversial ones, like hard and soft. Now, I think there now are meta-materials that are basically both (hard and soft) at the same time, depending on the velocity of what impacts the material, but I could be wrong. Then there are ideas - such as: Attack is the best Defense. Although here we get more into a puristic point of view when Attack eventually is the only thing, because it ought to also be the best defense. And, what one may notice here is, that once we move away from



(source: Wikipedia.org)

what is concrete, around us, and more into our headspaces - things become more **puristic**.

EMANCIPATION - PART 1

A scenario: The man marries the woman, the man goes to work, the woman does the housework. It would be a way of things that people had little reason to question. Seemingly, **such is how it has always been**. As it has always been ... has however changed into a how things are now ... concerning many things ... over the course of time. A more often expressed observation about that is, how for a long time - there has been little to no change ... at all. The most change that people would experience was that of the seasons. If it weren't for those, people might as well have settled thinking that life is unchanging between the days and the nights. From when Jacob was migrating to Egypt, to when Nebuchadnezzar conquered Jerusalem - some odd thousand years - the conditions of the time were more or less the same. But, to pick an arbitrary point from around the length of time that it applies to, the year zero would roughly make a turning point. As for a narrative: The world was cast into turmoil as tensions grew regarding the hegemony of thought, primarily focused on religion. Population growth has further gotten to a point that would require a paradigm shift in terms of control and distributive structures; While the world at large became a more and more connected place. At large things didn't change much for centuries still - but yet, religious peace was an aspiration, rather than a given. As of that, one would have to oppose the heathen, fight the heretics and get rid of them witches. And eventually, after ages of stagnation between regress and progress, a breakthrough was made. Little by little – **modernity** set in.

Modernity changed the way we think about the world, the way we lived, the commodities we acquired and sold. Living conditions would be improved, life expectancy extended – and we'd develop more stable structures of habitation. Population density grew, the wonders of the world became more and more ... well. On the one hand demystified; Though for a time – while much of that was still a work in progress – mystified. So at least here in the west – the home of the printing press – the acquisition of knowledge became a bit of a fad, I must assume. The availability of books would boost educatedness. Eventually industrialization would happen. We'd have more effective heating, electrical light, trains, cars ... and the world once again shrank. The marvels of modernity eventually led to an acceleration of these processes – and thus, the modern era sets itself apart from the classical era – in that every generation would find itself in a different world than the one before.

So, between the woman having greater opportunities to occupy her lifetime and the man being locked into wage slavery, things started to heat up. The man, so the narrative, eventually would think it to be cool ... to gift his wife all those pleasantries that made her life in the household easier; While she would start to feel locked out of the opportunities of life. Be it by a growing window into the world. Be it by TV or Magazine. And so the blind man would move on to blame them for his troubles with the wife. And soon

must not impose bullshit onto each other. Which is how we come to talk about Brainworms. The term Brainworm, to my understanding, alongside the term Brainrot, came up in leftist circles to describe conservative thought patterns^{4,6}; And is similar to TERF-brain (→TERF-pilled), a.k.a. brainrot related to transphobia. And after having spent a considerable amount of time trying to understand this concept, I have come to the conclusion that it's correct enough for me to adopt using it.

The most fundamental aspect of this perhaps comes from neuroscience, where it has been discovered that conservatives and liberals, on average, have different brain structures.^{4,4} This renders conservatives, neuroscientifically speaking, less open minded and more susceptible to fear. While that, from a neutral perspective, is not inherently a bad thing; Any ideology that would nourish these properties in opposition to another, possibly better one, has the potential of generating a stubborn group of people incapable of wrapping their heads around what they have been told to fear. This especially applies to the more sensitive aspects of social togetherness - such as issues pertaining to anything that hasn't been solidly integrated into the cultural togetherness yet. Cultural togetherness in that regard is more of a Zeitgeist related common understanding of intercultural do's and don'ts.

One of the fundamental contentions here, when taking it to a more philosophical discussion, is the matter of faith or belief in respects to the unavailability of information. One issue being, that at some point our own ability to assess information is removed from its availability; And so we more and more depend on trust. On the other hand, the more open minded people develop a greater degree of familiarity with abstract concepts and concepts of diversity. And so we come to what we might call macro-social tendencies, where in terms of ideologies the conservative will tend towards an idealized version of the familiar; And the progressive/liberal will tend towards an ideal that best serves the diverse demand. And this does not have to contradict. But even without malicious efforts to drive a wedge between the two, the conservative brainrot can take hold. (→relationship to free speech and free speech absolutism and other alpha thought related ideologies (primitivism))

At the end of the day I believe that most, if not all, fundamentally value empirical knowledge. At least does everyone claim to. But once now concepts emerge in ways that disagree with the individual's experienced world, the conservative eventually tends towards rejection of those concepts. Emancipation, Heliocentrism and Same-Sex marriage are just a few examples. One of the more modern ones is the relevance of mental health. It's however similar to how individuals with curiosities that the world does/can not satisfy develop weird ideas of reality.

Conservative politics, as a theoretical model derived from these issues, will tend to adhere to a way that has worked and is further expected to work if people would only adhere to the rules. This has a very strong proclivity towards authoritarianism that is to ascertain that "the way" is being maintained. This can have the effect for instance, that the weight of mental health issues such as depression and burnout is ignored, determined to be laziness or a lack of discipline; Allthwhile society were

margin. We'll procreate to always have a surplus - and that surplus will always exist beyond the system's working order.

But what I eventually managed to read into this, is that **we for once should get used to the idea, that poverty will always be around**. That we can accommodate for it, even if we don't have it. **Just in case**. I guess alternatively one might also take it the other way - that ... in some weird way, the violent removal of poverty won't just magically get rid of it. Though the magical part would appear to be its re-emergence; And it's not so magical when considering that capitalism eventually would do as much. Someone has to work the mines - and it's not like capitalism would care much about ... granting those workers the respects they deserve. Capitalism in a way is pretty much the opposite of that. Sure there is an argument on the side of those that have special skills. You kinda want to make sure your surgeon doesn't hold any grudges and stuff like that. But there is a lot of low-wage work being done ... without which ... society would most certainly just collapse. Which, may be a complicated issue.

But so - it basically needs not be mentioned, though actually there's reason to be adamant about doing so - that taking care of the poor is a Christian thing to do. Does this now however argue for something like Universal Basic Income? Well, maybe it doesn't. The question here isn't whether the Bible instructs us to do so - but ... what risks it entails and how we want to address those. Or perhaps how close to actually having (or needing) UBI we already are - as in how much or little it would take to make the change. I don't want to take it too lightly - and the future we face isn't exactly ... optimistic. The wealth we have accumulated seems to start crumbling down on us - and maybe inevitably so, we have to rethink how we approach our unity. But if the only reason not to do it is because you don't like free handouts ... there isn't really a reason not to do it.



So yea. All things considered ... to be fair and balanced requires us to say that certain things just don't help us towards the good end. And yes, people tryna be a big pain in our butts would be a part of that. I don't see why it's my obligation to play make-believe over how tolerant we all are.^{4,3} That there are "no problems whatsoever". Instead I'ma

F - Brainworms

So, can we come together without making shit up? Strictly speaking: no. We have to make shit up - generally speaking: Always. Language is made up. Math, depending on whom you ask, is made up too. The structures we live in, the systems we require, professions, positions, rules ... it's all made up, at least to some extent. There is however an underlying truth to those, or a necessity.

Besides all that, I however want to start this off by imposing one concept onto you: For us to successfully come together as a whole, we

an enemy is found. "Liberalism". Threatening Tradition since the dawn of Modernity. Or something like that. And so what we got from this time, are jokes of how the woman is always complaining.

And this is another example of puristic thinking. Where now the present changes are ignored and the familiar standards of the foregone times imposed on the present and future. Yet is it through the progress that has been made - materially and metaphysically - that emancipation has become somewhat inevitable. As by how the chauvinistic attitudes of the past reveal themselves as no longer in alignment with the conditions of the sexes. For once. Also is the contrast by which the woman is thought of as property much harsher thereby. So could we ask: Are women human beings? Do they deserve human rights? Or would we rather make away with that? But, here's a thing: The man is the head of the woman as Christ is the head of man. Now, the way in which Christ is the head of man, would be a very Christian way to think of how the man is supposed to be the head of the woman. Which, bad joke incoming, would speak of how faithful black folks are. Sorry. No. It for once involves choice. But more to the point: What the man now expects of the woman should be mirrored by what the man now does for God. And when applying standards, how well that aligns with the will of God also matters. So did Jesus not only call Himself our Friend, but imparted "on man" the reigns to build a better tomorrow. Freedom it is. And so ... is that.

A BALANCING ACT

So, what is Balance? Well. Balance, for once, requires a "superior" mind. One more aware of the various things that affect the balance, eventually down to the various dynamics at play - for bold reactionary movement is eventually only making things worse. That's however one way of how accidents happen. But what now makes a superior mind? Should I leave it up to you? Overly general statements are cool - but ever so often the devil's in the details.

Yet, this isn't necessarily about balance in the gymnastic sense; Though that too involves a general awareness of opposing forces.

So does a tree for instance have the ability to withstand harsh weather. Not however because it's sturdy, but because it's flexible. But a house made of leafs won't really stand. To say, one-sided perspectives are one-sided.

Yes: A sturdy hand that wields a tempered blade may cut down quite some resistance; And still would the stubborn mind - intangible as a ghost - fall with its body.

And yet a fool would rise, as taunted by fate, to climb mount hubris - as to tame the cosmos. But what should they find? Freedom? Or truth? Perhaps peace? Could it be Love? - Illusions!, one might say. Idiomatic motivations of a feeble human intellect that rejected wisdom every step of the way, desperately trying to justify an existence that is without meaning

or purpose – but to terrorize the living. All weeping and wailing of the ages arriving at deaf or repugnant ears. What wisdom might one impart on them? Perhaps that of the Wall.^{4,2}

But, to be totally honest – this is the point where I start to feel like I'm beginning to only talk to stupid people. Which in other words means that I might start to overthink things. It's however a symptom of the time it seems. That, the discourse has it that we ever so often sink so low we start to assume we have to explain basic common sense to each other. Basic reasoning. Basic logic. Where we have to maybe even make sure, as to establish common grounds, that what 1+1 equates to is not a matter of opinion, and neither a matter of free speech.

So, I don't know – and at some point I don't care. Because, eventually I also become judgmental, but that I'll have to leave to the big guy. So for now, let's leave this be a metaphor of sorts, as I turn my back, lift my beer and speak a toast, in respects of cultural diversity – as much in line with → **article one of the German constitution** (

Human dignity shall be inviolable

) as possible: "May the righteous prevail!"



So, maybe 'Deception' is a better word for Misinformation in all this. Deception may use Misinformation, but – if you can detect it, deception will try to get around that. Even infiltrating or corrupting whatever you feel safe about.

But so is there a new "how it's always been". Some of which however isn't really new per se. An example from the origin story of my origin story: You need to know, that me reading the Bible didn't come out of nowhere. I for some time had a bit of a phase where I didn't care much about God. I grew up in a Seventh Day Adventist Household btw.. And one time I stumbled upon a book; Right around my 18th Birthday; And it told me some things I couldn't deny. Maybe the presented evidence was a bit dodgy (and indeed I found way better ways to get to the point **#Mat23:9**) - but it was clear to me that what was delivered at the core of it was inevitably true. And during a brief moment of apparent insanity I thought I could ... do something about it. To ... defeat "the Lie" or something like that. "All Lie". What I didn't really get at the time was, what it 'actually' means to make "the Pope" (Pontiff of the RCC) your enemy. But whatever the case, a bit of a transcendental, mysterious light/force came upon me - left some words in my mind that went like "it's gonna be a rough path" - and ... all of a sudden I found myself reading the Bible enthusiastically again ... and soon enough I could even engage in religious debate with my fellow students.

To say that there are truths in this world - I think should be obvious, common sense. We shouldn't only know them, we should be able to work with them. But yet, somehow ... **the power structures** deny us those

truths. Vastly. And you don't have to spin up some wild conspiracy theory. Not as wild as the ones used to discredit those truths. You know. Climate Change, Communism (not the Soviet/modern China version of it), Medicine ... /you know/ ... actually really basic stuff. So, it's not that they are withheld from us. It just doesn't matter somehow. Or has a hard time to.

But maybe there just are those things that will never change. **"The thing that hath been, it is that which shall be; and that which is done is that which shall be done: and there is no new thing under the sun."** (**Ecclesiastes 1:9**) – but that may be a fragment of the olden days. There however is this:

E - The Burden of Poverty

Technically, poverty extends beyond financial wealth. There also is social poverty. Hegemonic poverty. Any kind of disadvantage - including physical poverty. Those would be the servants, cheap labor - everyone that would accept scraps for compensation. Work that anyone might do, or is shared by so many that the individual holds barely any influence over their working conditions. Minorities would fit well into this, as they would lack the support of peers to demand any kind of fair treatment.

The Burden of Poverty is a term I derived from **Matthew 26:6-11**:

>>> Now when Jesus was in Bethany, in the house of Simon the leper, There came unto him a woman having an alabaster box of very precious ointment, and poured it on his head, as he sat at meat. But when his disciples saw it, they had indignation, saying, To what purpose is this waste? For this ointment might have been sold for much, and given to the poor. When Jesus understood it, he said unto them, Why trouble ye the woman? for she hath wrought a good work upon me.

For ye have the poor always with you; but me ye have not always. <<<

"And so it came to pass, that the scripture was fulfilled where it read: Verily I say unto you, Wheresoever this gospel shall be preached in the whole world, there shall also this, that this woman hath done, be told for a memorial of her." (More generally perhaps as a statement against puristic thinking (→indignation))

I may thereby now be reading a bit too much into it. **That the poor will be around always.** It might be a random remark, perhaps remembered without the necessary nuance, or perhaps understood as an allegory. To say that fixing poverty is a steep hill - and he will be long gone by the time we come even close to climbing it. It may though be, that based on the evolutionary dynamics, there will always be a poverty