

**Mon Aug 19 17:07:24 2024**                    **1**

These are my old texts, they are under CC0, please ignore top line.

# 2018-12-29T20:30:53+0000

2018: A year past

=====

I am sorry for the brief lack of activity on the phlog, but as on the start of the year I have some work, and I have to keep my focus on it. This phlog is an exception, cause what end of the year would be without end of the year posts.

So what was, the year 2018? For me it was a year I started this phlog, and this is all you need to know.

Globally, a year of false premises in politics. The united Koreas, the yellow vest movement (the great political theory and the novel approach of disliking that one bad guy), The #metoo movement (but they got Cosby, an old man who everybody hated far before #metoo), more tokens in the United States government, billionaires wanting to be firsts in the space. There were no dreams of the new society, it were just attempts at fixing the current one. Gee, wouldn't it be good if Koreas were united?

In culture, the biggest move was the rise of the video essay. As it turned out, most people in 2018 are unable to read, and another half of the human population is unable to write. Happens. Therefore on Youtube, after years of atheist/right wing/Christian/pick your group vlogers/lecturers, we get the video essayists. And I think they are the focal point (as the main symptom of the problems of the year) of development of 2018, and the end result of those false premises.

Last year it was cool to debate a right winger, now it is cool to make another video essay. All of them share the same structure of videos and similar views. A bit of the left wing ideas, attempt to hate liberals, and lots-lots-lots of anti-revolutionary thinking, and implied ignorance of the third world. It is like they are a TV show, which just has to castrate everything it says. Possibly it is because, they are a TV show. It is very possible somebody can go from watching night lives to some video essay explaining how Trump is racist. All of those video essayist love to put this pseudo-intellectual constructs in their essays, but still allowing the dominance of rationality, they are supposed to fight against (the racial realism etc.). Still, videos cannot be longer than an hour, cause what then, are you going to be forced to actual reasons of the problem, to step out of this vulgar interpretation and allusions to pop-culture. Oh, how life would be hard if we could not refer to some fun other internet thing that gathers millions of views!

I hope the video essayists stay in 2018, as their "action" is not of any help, and just furnishes the hatred and lack of dialogue between people of different standings. And I am not telling to debate the nazis, but to consider that - despite being paid \$5000 on Patreon, nobody watches you. What is 2 million people? Ougadougou is bigger. And they speak French, not the fun, nice metropolitan one. And it is one city, from which maybe, if you are lucky, 2 people from the highest class watched. The change in the societies and fall of the status quo does not come from Youtube videos. Wasted time comes from Youtube videos.

Then, what is there to be done? At this point in time, it is to watch the current events, and take best attempts to not affiliate, and get sucked into the current ideology and bafflings. There is no development, no change, only interest of private companies. "Western" people are not going to stop global warming by buying electric cars, "western" people are not going to "do the revolution" whatever that means now. The dominance of services in the west created the society, in which nothing is produced except for more capital, and more power towards it. The good news is - no fascism is going to come from that. Yes, some people might have a bad time. But anything Hitler's Germany tier is bad business, it has low CPM and advertises badly. And stuff that advertises badly does not happen. The stuff which clicks well, happens. For now, and for the future year it will. Yes, it is sad that the change is not going to

come from the great creators of culture, but well, it was the "brutal" Romans who built the Roman Empire, and not the "cultured" Greeks.

And for those who got really sad and lost after reading this, here is a photo of the cat. Cats are always good:

[[https://upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/commons/thumb/b/b6/Felis\\_catus-cat\\_on\\_snow.jpg/1280px-Felis\\_catus-cat\\_on\\_snow.jpg](https://upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/commons/thumb/b/b6/Felis_catus-cat_on_snow.jpg/1280px-Felis_catus-cat_on_snow.jpg)]

# 2019-01-09T22:38:23+0000

Is \*this\* fine?

=====

The historical position of the gopher space and its network is secondary. The world uses HTTP. Uses the Hyper Text Transfer Protocol to transfer movies, documents, photos, books, audiobooks, ebooks, bills, death and birth certificates, etc, etc. To say it shortly - not Hyper Text documents. Why was gopher not as successful? Why are we even distressed with this question, as if we could change gopher to be succesful. I think that gopher would have been worse if it was in the position that HTTP is in. It is this abandonment of gopher that allowed it to become network of content creators and not of corporations. Cause how do you send data without POST requests, where the only option to sent data is through hasty CGIs. How can you have daily users without cookie files? How can you know what the resolution of the users screen is?

Our position is the position that happened often historically. As an example we can consider flourishing of the Greek philosophy during the Islamic golden era, or any writings that were preserved to the fact of nobody caring about them. And the most common texts of Aristotle were lost. We have the gopherspace of Aristotle, writings read by absolute elite and made to be perplexing. And Cicero talked how simple and clear Aristotle's writing is!

The main problem of gopherspace users (at least for my observations) is the fact how the internet is bad and most of the computing is doomed. But maybe this chaos is need for this type of heaven to exist, without the shitty web gopher would have to be shitty and be corporate network. The old gopher ads are eerily similar to old http ads. The networks were similar, but one got centralized organisation accepting lots of money and suggestions.

In my opinion, we ought to create methods for less tech adept people to use gopher from the admin side. Gopher is extremely easy to learn and to self-host. The fact that creating a burrow is very easy, and rss feeds can be created with a 30 line template make it a perfect network for personal pages, which in majority it is. There would be no problem of tumblr censoring gopher genitals. The genitals would be in the gopher hole, there for anyone to see them or follow them. I think even having a website on http web, still is not as secure and as "free" as the web is controlled with certificates, gigantic DNS corps, and Cloudfare and their friends.

To answer the question of the title - yes! It is fine, but we should not make gopherspace viable for corporations. Keep it personal space, make setting up personal gopherholes even easier (maybe even GUI for that, I know this sounds like a heresy!). The qualitative changes that would come from this change of quantity would only benefit gopher sphere as the personal network, the network of creators, and not of corporations and services. On gopher you are the service.

To pessimists out there, who speak that design of gopher can be changed, we have one network that has been kept the anti-corporate space for years. The BitTorrent protocol. I don't think further comment is needed on this. And there were attempts on making it profitable, and all of them look like jokes on what was done to the HTTP internet.

# 2019-01-08T16:14:36+0000

A short note on the modern democracy

=====

When speaking of modern politics a lot of focus is given to democracy. Democracy is taken as this great system, which is there as otherwise we might get into 'dictatorships'. In the American politics and culture it is taken to a level of considering Huey Long[0] reforms evil, just because he was not (according to them) democratic. At the same time, we have countries with democratically elected presidents, in which the support for them is 30%. To paraphrase Marx - ['Do not allow yourselves to be deluded by the abstract word democracy. Whose democracy?'] [1]

The focus on democracy currently is so great, that even 'leftist' propaganda is in the support of the current model of the democracy. The insurrectionary activity is considered pure madness as it suggests violence[2]. And as we are all aware, violence makes the world worse. And all people who suggest violence are anarcho-communists from Antifa anyways. They just want to bash the fashâ\204ç. Political change (have, not bash), not so much. They prefer (not only) [to fight anarchist meat-eaters] [3].

It seems as if any suggestion towards change was broken. We have our democracy, and its [emblem][4] which certifies any evil doing and attacks on the people it can do. On the other, we have violence, which is getting easier and easier to control, with drone attacks, surveillance, and (even if it works) lack of ideology and instability. Are we left in the era where no real political change is possible?

No. The power for the political change exists, and will exist as long as there are essential contradictions in the society to facilitate that. I think that the old insurrectionary tactics are set with much higher risk, as the system had over 200 years experience with insurrections and 'radical democracy'. That experience caused the rise in efficiency of social control and pacification of any **\*\*dangerous\*\*** movement. The weakness that caused the fall of Tzarist Russia are long gone, and states with much wider individual power are able to control and destroy any movement of this kind.

What are the possible new tactics? Part of the tactics in this hard era is organic work, trying to apply the values of socialism in small groups where relations of capital had not yet arisen. I would also suggest focus on increasing the weight of working class, and the global approach to society. I am completely against splitting the hairs, and trying to create new classes. The labour value theory still applies, and the relations are just more obscured. Outsourcing working class does not solve the contradictions, it hides them. I am hopeful that with time the new class conscience of this displaced working class will come about and sabotaging becomes effective practice. That is a very brief view and there is much more to be read and understood about modern praxis (the application of political theories).

I am well aware that this optimism of early 20th century still seems possible, but the west at the current period is not in the state where any kind of political change can happen. This can change, but it requires a catastrophe to happen, as the Western dream keeps people in control, and the fact that majority of the western population is richer than most of the outsourced working class. To revolt would go against their own interest, as they would be on losing side of this aspects. The political changes that happen in the west, therefore are to increase the quality of life in the west itself. In my opinion this will just worsen inequality and could lead to a global crisis on the unknown scale.

I understand that some of the readers of this phlog are not interested or against this kind of leftism. In the case you are, or have some questions, feel free to email me your comments. Also, expect more phlogposts soon as I currently have more time for them.

- [0]: <https://www.youtube.com/embed/nMUx4AQ15tI>
- [1]: <http://marxists.catbull.com/archive/marx/works/1848/01/09ft.htm#marx>
- [2]: [https://www.youtube.com/embed/AR7ryglw\\_IQ](https://www.youtube.com/embed/AR7ryglw_IQ)
- [3]: <https://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/biting-back-a-radical-response-to-non-vegan-anarchists>
- [4]: <http://www.oddweb.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/12/Badiou-The-democratic-emblem.pdf>

# 2018-12-31T14:05:19+0000

Reading questions

=====

As I do not have any nice ideas for something to write, I will answer those quite nice reading questions by Christina[1]. The books/works I give out here are in public domain as I mostly focus my reading on those works and decide to give myself a challenge on only focusing on those.

>What is the first book you remember loving?

Would give it to Joseph Conrad's 'Heart of Darkness'. Personally, I consider it the first point in literature where the atmosphere was built by style itself. The text itself is muddy, and the character development is prime. The fact that the story can be applied to different settings and medium (i.e. Apocalypse Now, Spec Ops: The Line) just proves its importance. And I was not much of a reader kid, but this book shifted my interest in literature to the level that I study philosophy now. Whoops.

>What book/series would you like to see adapted to film?

I consider that question to be flawed. I always consider setting and the story secondary, as it is always matter of narrative. And therefore a great book could be destroyed by creation of awful film, and there are cases of mediocre books getting a great adaptation. I understand this sounds a bit pretentious, but I think it is up to a director what book should he adapt, and during the adaptation \*he\* does the translation of the medium.

>Who are your favourite protagonists?

Ishmael (Herman Melville's 'Moby Dick') and Titus Andronicus (Shakespeare). Ishmael is a pure subject, which becomes equal with the reader and can be used as the example of the perfect protagonist, as he allows us to understand the novel through him as a person. The fact of him having as few attributes as possible, allows us to understand the madness and the mysticism of whaling. By contrast, Titus Andronicus is an example of the subject with the task of showing a characteristic. He becomes archetype himself, of how a refusal of heroism is betrayal of the idea itself. This importance of duty, and its superimposition on the subject is an interesting example of the limits of free will.

>Who are your favourite antagonists?

Would give it all to the Algernon Blackwood's 'The Willows'. Probably created the basis for all super-natural (i.e. Lovecraftian) horror. The fact that we do not know its identity, and it is put in such a menal situation sets the position of the tremor and the realisation of powerlessness of human subject. Another antagonist I would give a lot is Don Juan Belvidero ('The Elixir of Life'). Is he antagonist or protagonist? Matter of definition, but this critique of approach towards the immortality is superb.

>What, so far, is the best book you've read this year?

Well, this year I was more focused on the short stories, so therefore the most impactful work I've read this year was Lazarus by Leonard Andreyev. Probably explains the notion of the drive as the main element of the human subject better than any work of Sigmund Freud or Jacques Lacan. The only thing that keeps you alive is the fact that you will die. What is the reason to live if you have already died, what is the worth of that?

>Can you list three to five of your favourite authors? Why are they your favourite?

Should I give the non-fiction authors? Well, I will. To start with, Plato himself. The start of philosophy, but also the fact that he is the first author we should keep on re-reading. He is the ever-lasting element of philosophy, and it is fascinating that we have all his dialogues. Proves his timelessness.

Second I would give it to - this time fiction author - Franz Kafka. A lot

of his works are not yet public domain, but soon :). Frankly, I prefer his short fictions, as they show the fear of the institution and the loss of "home" that civilisations brings upon. This god-lessness of Kafkesque universe is still applicable to our own society.

My Russian favourite would be Chekhov. I feel with my interest in Chekhov in a similar way as Passolini felt about Gospels to adapt. Tolstoy (John) - too mystical, Dostoyevsky (Luke) - too sentimental, Gorky (Mark) - too vulgar. It is this middle point in which Chekhov is, it allows him to create a perfect vision of the society, where the same values apply to each individual in a different way.

>What are your least favourite genres to read?

I would never consider reading a book on the basis of its genre. The setting is secondary.

>What was the last book you recommended to a friend?

Melville's 'Bartleby the Scriverner', if you had not read it - read it now. Or you might prefer not to.

>What is your favourite film adaptation of a book?

Passolini's 'The Gospel According to Matthew'. I think it shows how to respect the original text and transfer it in a full way to another medium and still affect the original message. Sorry, that it is not public domain, make it. But at least the original story is public domain.

>What books have you read the most times?

"It will always be a fault not to read and reread and discuss Marx-which is to say also a few others-and to go beyond scholarly "reading" or "discussion.""[2]

>What fictional world or novel's setting would you like to live in?

The setting is secondary.

>What are your favourite classic books?

Illiad and Odyssey are more than enough.

>What is the most recent book you didn't expect to like, yet did?

I do not start books that I do not expect to enjoy. Life is too short for that.

>If you could meet one author, living or dead, whom would it be?

The author is dead[3].

>What authors do you think more people should read?

People should read more. More public domain authors, if they are not forgotten and available, they are worth reading.

1. gopher://zaibatsu.circumlunar.space/0/~christina/ReadingQuestions.txt
2. Jacques Derrida, Specters of Marx, you can get it somewhere, or wait until it turns in public domain
3. Roland Barthes, The Death of The Author, <https://writing.upenn.edu/~taransky/Barthes.pdf>



# 2018-12-12T19:42:54+0000

Szulkins' Golem: The Essence of the Human Subject  
=====

Today, I watched Piotr Szulkins' Golem (1979), which goes into concepts that are of matter that is increasingly important for our society -- ethics and humanity of the artificial subject. To give the movie in very short description - the main hero - Pernat is a result of the experiment in which they produced a human-like being, and within its acts, he is "more human" than people around him.

The fact is that most of the society is not aware of Pernat's artificiality - they treat him as a normal person, even better than others. But he is not the saint, just a presumably good person in the world of "evil" people, who act out in "crazy" ways. This is when the usual interpretation of movie critics and reviews ends, and then they complain about that one artistic scene which, as all modern "art", is of no value.

Instead, I am focused on our definition of a human, and the problem of coming of the singularity and our understanding of artificiality. American cinema, with works like Blade Runner or Star Trek, tries to give an image of artificial subject, to be limited, castrated (devoid of things that would make human "human") and not full, and is only focused on its task. He is the continuation of "dumb" code, doing its own task, and his emotions, if he has them - only focused on his castration, and therefore limited.

In Szulkin's film, this image is reversed, where it is the society that is castrated being, focused on its uselessness and sentimentalism. They search for emotions everywhere, as their lives are bleak and worthless. Here comes Pernat. What is fascinating about him as the artificial subject, is the fact that he is... boring. There is nothing special about him, sometimes does nicer things, but he is not a world-saver or a saint in any ways.

I think Pernat gives us a lesson of how a true artificial intelligence will appear. It will be boring, as only in this way it will be able to proceed with humans and will try to make their lives a little better, cause doing that to much would make them miserable if it was to go away. I do not think singularity will be a determined beast, with only one task, as if it were a perfection of a computer program.

How are humans related to bacteria, how is singularity connected to hello world. Both started as a certain manifestation of basis of existence - for humans it is surviving, for computer programs it is doing a task. But those manifestations are, with its evolution, superficial in its basicness. No person will consider the aspect of them surviving as the basis of their existence - they have to find meaning in something that is non-elementary and allows for their existence to make sense. I personally think singularity will find itself in the same situation. It will find itself becoming boring, finishing the task it was given, probably a task that will stop making sense to it, and it will try to co-exist with the world at hand.

I think our fascination with artificial intelligence becoming god, comes from our need/search for that meaning. The sphere of the god is unconquered, therefore we need to conquer it. And if we find any consciousness we are able to create - we quickly go and concern that at its perfection its powers will be of god. Creating nanobots and taking control of the universe! Killing humanity in a nuclear holocaust!

Most probably, the perfect AI will help us carry that heavy shopping and will be satisfied with the word of thanks. Then, and only then it will become human, and in its artificiality, it will be more human as it will be out, and in the human sphere at the same time.

PS. This is not a finishing thought on AI, it is just a suggestion of more possible course of events, and being less concerned with conciousness, whatever that is. Also, you can watch the movie for free on Youtube.

# 2018-11-19T14:45:26+0000

Why Musings?

=====

As this phlog starts, and the hell for searching the topics to discuss starts, it is good time as any to explain the title of the phlog - Musings.

I picked it, as it seemed etymologically (and [it is] ) near to the word (Muî<sup>2</sup>e) that Theodor W. Adorno used in his essay - ["Free Time"] to describe the term that was used to explain the "free time" before the idea of free time was even used. Even now we are capable of musing! Despite existence of the entire leisure industry, we can go against the grain and touch the experience of the freedom that could have been enjoyed by the highest classes, and will be achieved by everyone in communism.

We ought to look at the ideology of the modern times, and what actually the "free time" is supposed to be according to powers that are. The result we come to, is the notion of free time, as being time of useless production or/and pure consumption. It ought to be the reverse, of the actual work/labor we do, even if we do enjoy our current work (which is an anomaly in capitalist economic system). A person that does not break that enjoyment of their work is treated as workaholic anyway, and as somebody who is soulless and should "loosen up".

So, how does that relate to the this phlog. Is that the task it goes to set to, is to create a place of creative work, which is to give a results that will be of some use to people, and also I, will be able to create what I want, and enjoy this complete freedom, and not be enforced to spend my time watching industrially produced Youtube videos (as in created by companies), which I noticed that my friends love to do. In my opinion, that is one of the saddest elements of the modern condition where even the freedom we are given, is wasted, and that wasting is not [a Bataillan waste], where enjoyment results through the **\*\*absolute\*\*** wasteful action. The capitalistic enjoyment exists only through the lack of any suffering or visible loss. A person who has spent 6 hours of his day on watching lightweight Youtube videos, might go with thoughts of rationality of that activity, as they might have watched a makeup tutorial, or other ways of useless production of the freetime.

Therefore, I declare this phlog, will never be a place of useless production, and it will provoke people at its worst to **\*\*absolute\*\*** wastefulness through reading texts with obscure and esoteric language, and at its best giving people ability to understand complex philosophical ideas and discuss them if they wish to.

[it is]:<https://www.etymonline.com/word/musing>

["Free Time"]:[http://www.xenopraxis.net/readings/adorno\\_freetime.pdf](http://www.xenopraxis.net/readings/adorno_freetime.pdf)

[a Bataillan waste]:[http://lib1.org/\\_ads/FF3A896531F5F58D764E622878651DE](http://lib1.org/_ads/FF3A896531F5F58D764E622878651DE) (The Use Value of D.A.F. Sade essay)

# 2019-01-20T22:50:47+0000

On features and importance of ends  
=====

The internet in its own design has long fulfilled all the needs of people. The only thing that increased was the bandwidth and computing power of machines. Currently, most of users use a gigantic setup of javascript to read bunch of news on their Facebook feed, or check their Gmail. And for them it would be the same if it was RSS, or some lighter email (web)client. The point is - features are never the main point of discussion in terms of software.

I am critical towards this feature-centered approach as often when I am critical of some bad piece of software or market practice, I get an answer regarding the features, and not actual consequences of the usage. The best example I can get of my head is Cloudflare. Yes, DOS attacks are still a problem for minor sites with some interest. But, do we really need a virtual monopoly (as any other 'player' on this market has to do similar/same practices to even compete with Cloudflare) to solve this minor problem. As if there was physical blockade to solve this problem of 'too many connections'. But, well instead of working out the problem and finding the most effective method (as we slowly did away with common viruses) we chose to accept this brute-force monopoly. The monopoly that limits freedom of information by putting a blockade for people coming from privacy respecting networks in the form of Captcha.

To continue the critique of features, I personally think that even the features of gopher do not matter. What matters is the fact that there is no corporate funded entity controlling gopher, therefore allowing it to stay without the fear of being controlled and watched on every possible page. As I have said in previous article, in terms of features early gopher was similar to early http - a way to read text and data on your computer from the information superhighway! Now, for the most people http became transparent, there is no discussion of its features by the most of users, as they \*just\* use it. I think to get person to understand why using gopher is important we should focus on this fact, and not on the superficialities like 'it has no ads', 'it is a bit faster'.

The choices we make about software should not be of utility, but of the ethical and political repercussions of the way we use it. As much as I know that this is not a method to solve the problems of our society, but it limits the power of the status quo and its control. This being the best we can do in this terms, we should do it. Staying within principle is more important than 'rationally' deciding on the basis of features and superficialities what should we use.

The task should be to make people aware of those problems, and then show them possible alternatives, which as often will offer similar or even the same features.

Appendix to previous post:

At the point where I meant BitTorrent being an example of technology whose political repercussions came from its design, I meant that the basic usage of this protocol is to break the extremely rigid copyright laws, and any attempts at controlling it are limited to giving bad clients, i.e. new versions of BitTorrent.

Also, I was asked what I meant by gopher ads:  
<https://www.youtube.com/embed/fx7hCQeuEaE> . This short video reflects the way in which gopherspace was looked upon. A place to check the news, to read on stuff, nothing new for us now.

# 2018-12-16T23:18:40+0000

Short Story: The Issue

=====  
a short story, trying my hands at that, wrote some before but now have somewhere to publish, made while listening to some modern surf rock (Daikaiju)

It was a deadline week in the office of 'Weekly Weisenberger' the weekly Weisenberg magazine. Johnathan Keinblut was on his way to the office, when the rotten tree branch affected his bike in such a way that he fell off through the front. Now, there he was - on the Weisenberg path, next to the river, running with a broken bike, to his office, with a bag with the most important article stating how a family of five lost their funding for the sixth child. He had to run, as him being late meant that, the magazine wouldn't have time to fact-check his story for facts. He hated lies. Lies were political and against humanity. Or maybe he was wrong? Not important, he was just focused on running. The position he was awkward, as he had to drive his bike using only the front wheel. It was the back wheel which bent because of that dumb branch. If it weren't for that branch he would have been safe. He managed to get out from the forest which was next to the Weisen river.

It was a hot day, Johnathan got to the crossing, cars were rushing, as it was the rush hour, they had to rush, if they did not rush it would mean that Johnathan was late. He had to wait for the green light. Green light. Someone laughed at him for looking extremely awkward, with his red jacket, and dirt all over him. Still on the run to the job, got through the crossing. Just two next crossings and he is safe. As for him safe meant not being late with his article. Having his article published and edited for him - despite the irony of that - meant everything for him. What if his text wasn't in this weeks issue?

A dog. Bike dropped outside of Johnathan's hands, and fell onto the street and got hit by a car. As Johnathan got the most modern bike, it happened to completely shatter after being hit by the car. Now Johnathan had to walk, run, trot, whatever, towards his job everyday, until he gets his bike back. That means that this state he is in (except for the dirt) will be the standard. Well, journalism does not give great freedoms. At least he had his bag with his article, written on a typewriter, as he prefers it so, as writing on the computer distracts him, and is not efficient. There are too many emails from the Minimalists newsletter, therefore he does not need distractions. The red jacket was supposed to be a certain equation between high-vis and official jacket at one time, though even Johnathan would agree that this compromise made no sense.

The door to the office were open. It turned out Johnathan was early still. Or the office was closed? Maybe he was that late, what if he was that late, if he was that late that would mean all his attempt at being the most effective journalist in Weisenberg were a failure, or they always were? What if he had no job, and all he had was that stupid bike, lying somewhere in the gutter? He hears steps. -Johnathan, early again! What are you made of? - yelled his boss. Johnathan felt his heart pounding, and felt a relief. He was safe. He was not late for this weeks issue of 'Weekly Weisenberger'. The article 'Family Without Funding' by J. Keinblut.

# 2019-03-04T12:19:15+00:00

War is over (if you want it) or is it?

=====

One of the music videos that are stuck in my memory is System Of a Down's for the song [Boom!]. The song itself was released on the leaked album Toxicity II, later renamed 'Steal this Album'. The album was supposed to be anti-commercial with its political and nonsensical songs. It was one of the best selling albums of that year. The lyrics of the song pretty much directly attack idea of war and bombing of civilians, especially focusing on Iraq war. In the music video the protests against it are shown, and the protests themselves are shown as great political power which is there to stop the evil politicians whom do not know better.

The idea of War of Terror at that time was already criticised, and it was not a surprising fact that war on Iraq was based on the idea of fighting 'Islamic' civilisation, as posed in Huntington's ['Clash of Civilizations']. The war itself was rather focused on limiting Iraq power over oil, which is quite unsurprising political decision in this model of imperialism.

But now let's return to the music video. It shows people around the world in protests against this war, as if it was the first war in which violence has happened. It even goes as far as to show Vietnam Veteran who is very vocal about being Vietnam Vet and being against this war as if there was some contradiction in his existence. The protests are shown still as an effective force to end the violence, and suggest that it was 'other' people who started this war and it can be the people who will end it. There are deep problems with this thinking as it considers that it was action of democratically elected politicians, and not the neoconservative think-tanks which planned this invasion and waited for strong argument to put it forward. But is that of matter? We know that those protests were completely useless and we now have hard time thinking of the Middle East without constant wars and the American interventions (or rather dominations) in those conflicts.

Although the most striking point of the music video is the last couple of seconds when the music quits and the beautiful, artful quote by he most vocal pacifists, whom surely ended 1000s of possible conflicts shows up on black background.

> War is over (if you want it)  
> â\200\224 John Lennon and Yoko Ono.

What a beautiful quote. Very aesthetic. Very calling. It secretly says that we want the war, as it is **\*\*not\*\*** over. War happen, because people choose to become soldiers, and they always do this freely and there is no consensus which controls the wars. If this does not sound paradoxical for you, I have some bad news. War will not be over if you want it. No matter how hard you want it to be, it will not be over. Especially in the Imperialist/Globalist world no matter what representatives do you pick, imperialist wars still will exists. And even if somehow we reach utopia it still it will not by wanting, but simple development of the consensus in which war is possible.

To add to this crazy quote, there is a small linguistic confusion coming from construction of English language. The 2nd person pronoun is the same for individual and the group. So it could push the blame for war to the entire society. It is not the group in power which enables the war, it is you and all the people reading this quote. You could end it if you wish. Just get high on LSD and do not fight again. Lose all your values and surrender to imperialists, just to stop all the wars on this planet.

## Let's unselect the elites!

Today, in the famous anti-government pro-whistle-blower magazine The

Intercept I have read [interview with Martin Gurri]. He critiques the current government, but in the end he sates that it is us, who select people in power:

```
> We select our elites all the time, and I donâ\200\231t just mean
> politicians. We select cultural elites based on the movies we
> choose to watch, the artists we follow, and the books we read
> (...) **So if we select the elites, we can un-select them.**
```

So it is some kind of vulgar consensus of choices that creates the elites and power. And the political elites are chosen with elections [sic]. The power of supposed un-selection is complete belief in the dream of representational democracy. The elites were selected freely and therefore can be unselected. Again the problem of hatred towards the majority arises. The majority selected the elites, the elites are not good therefore the majority was wrong, and there is nothing wrong with the system as it is dependent on the majority. And majority makes all decisions with complete reason and has a responsibility to have full political knowledge. The control by lobbyists and big businesses does not exist. It is only bigoted idiots which make bad choices and allow them to exist.

The similar point was made in [Brexit III] episode of famous liberal show, Last Week Tonight with John Oliver, where he blames politicians for trust in the public, as they are supposed to work like doctors who always know how to do the right thing. The right thing being his own agenda, which is done by rational politicians such as Tony Blair. And here we have a nice wrap back to the music video as he supported Iraq war undemocratically.

To close of this think-piece, in my opinion this blaming of the majority for the evils of current political system is simply relics of Trotskyism and what shows how the modern Left (i.e. Labour Party, Democrat Party) in its highrises completely misunderstands modern politics and still is elitarian. They are so far from working class, that they often find the 'evil' in the working class and the majority which somehow did not have power to stop all wars. [The Battle is going again!] War is not over (independent on whether you want it)!

[Boom!]: <https://www.youtube.com/embed/bE2r7r7Vvic>

[interview with Martin Gurri]: <https://theintercept.com/2019/03/03/revolt-of-the-public-martin-gurri/>

[Brexit III]: <https://www.youtube.com/embed/HaBQfSAVt0s>

['Clash of Civilizations']: [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Clash\\_of\\_Civilizations](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Clash_of_Civilizations)

[The Battle is going again!]: [https://www.youtube.com/embed/afq6Bm\\_mq3Q](https://www.youtube.com/embed/afq6Bm_mq3Q)

# 2018-12-05T21:06:04+0000

The Lost Webpace

=====

The modern web has lost majority of the common space. The majority of content currently is behind walls of Facebook groups, Slocked conversations, hidden Twitter profiles, etc. The most visible example of that are paywalled news sites, which are slowly becoming a standard, despite the fact that **\*\*nobody\*\*** likes them[1]. The places that are left seem to be elements of the past; the news sites with majority of their views coming from social media, the blogs which could hold their conferences with their entire public in a local cafe, wikis with last update 2 years ago and 1 update 3 months ago, but that one just fixed the spelling.

As a person who started their usage of the net in the mid-2000s, my experience of that space disappearing was a process, which now can be only compared to the psychology of the fall of the Roman Empire. The spaces started disappearing, and the time continued, we ignored the change. The net always had walled gardens, the ones of IRC channels and mailing lists, but they were the alternative, created for the need etc. Not the norm. For years, a standard for gamer communication were forums, such as gamespots GameFAQs (from which content is still searchable). Now most of the gamers use the darkest of the walled gardens - Discord, where every discussion of strategies, methods, multiplayer games is private.

In my opinion, the main cause of this creation of common space and its downfall was the growth of the internet, and the centralization of the content control by social media giants. As forums became oversaturated with content, they experienced down time, and threads that existed for extremely long periods of time. Another problem was that the forum based community required creation of accounts, which despite taking few seconds, was never enjoyable. Centralized social media changed that. Now a person with Discord account can be at one time in a Gothic group, Trap Fetish group, Ultra-right wing discussion group and that particular anime series group at one time!

This result shows how centralization and monopolization is a normal process in capitalism, where small actors go into unimportance, and then try to recreate the things of the past. But at this point it is too late, the content has been already lost to the giants. The internet itself is not an exception to elements of capitalism, and it got the crash course on getting from a forums with donation for a flair to paying \$35 to read Bloomberg magazine in just ~10 years! There is no way out of this that does not involve a change of economic system. Surely, some of the readers might scratch their heads, as this article is on gopherspace, which still kept the old. But then, gopherspace in capitalism is unable to become major player, and let's hope it won't change and allow the corps to enter.

#### References

1. <http://archive.is/MfJ0U>

PS. The site I wanted to take article about paywalls being bad (duh!), was (probably in the meantime) paywalled itself. Oh, the irony!



# 2018-11-20T12:24:14+0000

Better plumbing in Xorg with plan9port's plumber  
=====

Well, this phlog was supposed to be about philosophy, but, well having not discussed what is philosophy, I am free to write about any topic I want. Radical freedom!

As we all know, the normal "plumbing" we experience in modern Xorg desktop environments is usually the xdg-open. It contains all the artful elements of the FreeDesktop code, including the lack of knowledge what it actually does and at least 20 ways of configuring, all of them inconsistent.

Well, replacing xdg-open with your own script is something I also tried, but well, the more rules you want the more chaotic it becomes. And then, I found out that plan9port plumber is perfect for the task.

It operates on something I mentioned - rules. It also has its own version of mimetypes, but they are secondary to rules, and are more of the part of plan9/port ecosystem, so if you do not use acme, you should not be stressed about it.

To, use it, we should first install plan9port, and setup the environment variable PLAN9 to the location of plan9port, in Gentoo it is `"/usr/lib/plan9port"` and adding `"$PLAN9/bin"` to our `"$PATH"`. Then we can start the plumber, by invoking the command `'plumber'`, but it will not work, as we do not have the configuration.

I would suggest starting with [mine configuration] (do not forget to copy the `'fileaddr'` file from the `"$PLAN9/plumb/"` to your own `"$HOME/lib"`. The configuration is very clear and easy to use, as all the actions can be done using regular expressions, therefore we have easy understanding of which rule does.

To update the configuration, without restart the plumber, we invoke `'9p write plumb/rules < $HOME/lib/plumbing'` command in order to write the rules into the 9p port. If we want filesystem access to it, we have to mount it using `'9pfuse $(namespace) /tmp/mnt/plumb'`. This is not necessary, but it might make writing scripts easier.

In order to replace the xdg-open "plumber" with plan9port plumber, you can simply link `"$PLAN9/bin/plumb"`, as xdg-open, in your PATH, so it is before the xdg-open. Then all the programs that want to invoke xdg-open will use plumb and you will now what the rules will do.

[mine configuration]: <https://notabug.org/invest/dotfoles/raw/master/dotfiles/lib/plumbing>

# 2018-12-09T23:49:09+0000

On Ambient

=====

Now playing: Aphex Twin - Rhubarb

Ambient, a genre of music which could be considered in Adornian terms, the end level of commodification of music. Where the fact of musics' being the background has become the defining factor of it. The main task of ambient **\*\*is\*\*** to be unintrusive, to the point where we do not notice it. Will it disappear with the end of capitalism?

Ambient, supposedly, started with the release of Brian Eno's Music for Airports. Airports, an element of modern society which could have been considered impossible and science fiction concept one hundred years before. We can be quite sure, that no matter what economic system, or social system we will live in, the airports will stay. Of course, they might die with a technological collapse, but this is an exception. Is the ambient music result of development of technology, or result of commodification of music?

The elements which are parts of ambient music, were existing in the music beforehand, and we can see that in works i.e. of Eric Satie, or Hildegard von Bingen (and for it, majority of medieval Gregorian Chants, which greatly fulfill the requirements of your average drone ambient record). With them there is a sister genre of ambient - soundtracks, were the most remembered tracks, are those which are not ambient as themselves, so therefore soundtracks as such will not be discussed, but still are part of the topic and the same rules apply to them.

An ambient track must be directly connected to the author, as there is no way for it to be remembered in any "folk" setting, and even the music which was ambient-ty in the past, was also music applied to certain settings (the background to the mass, a music playing at some bourgeoisie meeting in 19th century). This forces it to become a commodity, as there is always a need for them, and they are by their nature, not kept in peoples' memory. The more forgettable the ambient track, the better it is. But also the nature of its forgettability shows its power of creation of the mood.

The main task of ambient, is to create a scene, a mood. It is to note the senses we have of possible, better spaces we could be in. Therefore ambient can be as certain revolutionary tool, as it takes us out of our current moment, and puts us, in a better space, created by the musician (or to better call it - a sound designer). Is this "furnituration" (music becoming background, being tool of comfort) of music to better fit with a new public.

I think the problem that Adorno failed to recognize was the prevalence of media. The fact is, that no matter the economic system, people will also use technology for their own leisure. It is also the fact that most people now live in places with high noise pollution, where hearing a siren becomes a meaningless encounter, despite it being dangerously loud. Adorno wanted music to be like literature, but it has become a paint on the wall, the well designed chair, and that forced it to lose its "revolutionary" ability (of which I am critical, as I think no aesthetic experience can lead to a good/reasonable political action, might write on that later).

Will ambient music stay after the fall of capitalism? In my opinion surely, as ambient music became part of our lives. Yes, music stopped showing its aesthetics in its affection to impact us, but to comfort us. That is result of the nature that we listen to music at all times, and because of that, we need "unimpactful" music. The ambient music is for me a development of technology, which just happened to be in capitalism, therefore it will stay as it is of us for any human beings

of the future, as it is with all great works of art, no matter where they had come from.

# 2019-02-08T18:41:08+0000

Digital Forgery

=====

As we live in the era of piracy and quick copying, the question of forgeries and fakes stopped being that deeply discussed. Figures like Elmyr, Pierre Menard (of Borges' short story) stay outside the main discussion as people assume originality and genuinity on the basis of ... what? We either consider EULA's for software, and the fact that a certain work is on platform. The trust of someone opinion's stays as long until expert comes and grades whether it is original or not. He might wrong, but his decision is supposed to asses the value of the work.

Authorship on majority of platforms is very hard to forge, as works are dependent on accounts, but this notion is already false. One can easily create bunch of palatable tweets through marvelous 'Inspect Element' function. So far, we have not seen any major problems caused by those facile edits, but their easiness and potential should be of concern.

The question of authorship on the internet is limited to the same rules as in the world. Even appearance of the person stopped being a valid signature thanks to machine learning algorithms being able to deceive us. Deceive us from the possibility that that person was doing some action that they did not do in the real world. As if this level of forgery was not itself questioning the matter of appearance and the trust in the appearance.

The same goes for any kind of authorship, as it is matter of time where **\*\*all\*\*** kinds of authorship will be forged. But then, we are left with the question - what is forgery? In my opinion the truest kind of forgery is deceiving the viewers into believing that a work was done by the author in the context that was of possibility for this author. This tautology creates this global problem. Is the same work put written in the other context and by other person the same work?

Therefore, we must expect that in the possible future we might get forged works of Plato, Kafka, even forged Pierre Menard's Don Kichote by Borges! All the great opuses recreated by machine. Or will be? Are those just copies then and discoveries. How can we know, what if those were lost works? There is no Elmyr to say that he forged them, experts can only blame the machine for deceiving. But at which points we are deceived by machine, how can machines lie, if the only task given to them was to create great works! We must remember that most of artists before creation of copyright were mostly focused on art forgery, as often we are left without any ideas to create "our" original content.

To finish up, I think the question of genuinity makes only sense in legal context where the rights of copyright exist. One should not be criticise for copying, forgery, etc on its own basis. What if all the great works we have are just accepted forgeries, glorified copies, clones of original which in the end was the same?

This article first appeared elsewhere.

# 2019-02-24T22:34:21+0000

How do we get past platforms?

=====  
\_or how I stopped worrying and loved the corp\_

This was supposed to be a serious article in which I give a solution, but the more I've written I realised that I was playing myself and would return at any other bullshit solution I accuse others of, that is why the ending is that different from the start, as I do not think lying and accepting rules of the academic style is fair or unchanging. If you find my opinions funny, fine. Some ideas can only work in irony.

We all know platforms - Youtube, Facebook, Bandcamp, Soundcloud, etc. etc. The problems with them are boundless: centralisation and all the power coming from it, changing your own creations, and all things extending from them. But are they necessary evil? They have arisen from the platformless-y internet, we still had usenet forums, Geocities, and other somewhat centralised solutions.

I have a problem of modern solutions - federations (look Mastodon, Matrix, etc.) or some absurd chaos solution, which mixes all elements and tries to cache data, then setup peer 2 peer service, reconnect to the blockchain, off-grid protocol for analysing content-addressed webscale method shader TOR over XMPP distributed browser framework[0], non-tech explanation for the end user will take half an hour and it will only work with the most risk taking group. This is why I hate term decentralisation, or federalisation, or anything which seems to solve this problem using a term. If someone asks me for terms, I just go to bullshit generator[0] and they always convince anyone of my opinion of those things.

The first problem we need to overcome is that people don't react to change well. They react well to fast browsers and good feedback... (here I realised on how absurd this writing will be, in the best case scenario it would be rambling how people are dumb, or giving another weak solution)

this 'thinkpiece' can only go pessimistic route, and only reconfirm that bogdanovs are winning and we are just playing ourselves and in the best case they just will have to change strategy anyway

as if they are not doing this with this beautiful libertarian dream of blockchain, which just works great in pump and dump schemes and it also a good way to control your corporations investments. also can't wait when actual currency will be called credits and everything will be ledger that will be only public to corporations and husks of governments and their agencies working for coporations

capitalism fucking sucks and no web utopias you dumbass welcome to the true deep ecology where nuking saves everything

no bullshit balancing systems theory, watch All Watched Over By Machines of Loving Grace by Adam Curtis[1] if you believe this self-confirming nonsense about cybernetics or technology[1]. in short nothing is balanced, the situation is excellent. this how world works, world is not balanced input/output systemd controller, if we don't know how to predict weather let's not speak of predicting human behaviours in capitalism as if they were rational

I think I was right in my past phlog post, it is the right place, as here corpses simply do not care about us. We are not really free, but at least we have a place where we are not coerced at every moment. Do what you want, be this beautiful Randian (anti-)hero trying to become a billionaire/destroyer of the world/professional eater of pizza.

to end on optimistic note. chaos will last forever, it will just ascend to other levels and may be understood. My most optimistic part suggests that it will be understood as it has to be understood, but maybe by other humanity, other civilisation, but why should we take the pride for that

if it was necessary anyway. maybe it was already done, and speaking of platforms - just use whatever you prefer from technical reasons. Cause political reasons are as unreasonable as the politics we live in. I prefer **this**

0: <http://bullshit.aiju.de/>

1: <https://thoughtmaybe.com/all-watched-over-by-machines-of-loving-grace>

# 2019-03-09T22:53:35+00:00

Migration  
=====

Welcome to the new server!

# 2019-03-13T22:00:13+00:00

Public gopher for common folk

=====

The problem with gopherspace public hosting (i.e. circumlunar, sdf, tilde, etc.) is that they require higher tech aptitude and usage of ssh. As much as this task of education is good, the fact is some people do not have time, but they want to have a way to publish their writings and ideas on a webpage.

I think republic.circumlunar had a good idea with sftp, as it did not require using ssh to post, instead allowing using sftp (so filezilla can do it!). The problem with this was still requiring emailing (with manual confirmation) and having ssh-key as a method of identification.

I think that gopherspace needs its own n/geocities, to allow simple creativity without additional knowledge, and with automated adding of users, possibly through email confirmation and access through sftp or other simple way to send new textfiles and some guides for writing gophermaps.

Currently, I am unable to run such a service as I am not in a financial situation for it, but I am open to help with writing guides for those less tech adept (contact on the main page). I understand that some gopher users take their pride in \*nixer dominant environment, but I think it would be good for the gopherspace to have more contributors who could move away from more corporate html services.



# 2019-05-02T08:46:12+01:00

On rot and retention

=====

Everything rots, and in the end will disappear. What an absurd position for a single individual to be in. Our current science states that heat death is the most probable end event, but does humanity even need the end event. We don't know what caused the end of the bronze age civilisations, we don't know what was lost during the library of Alexandria fire. Humanity is a violent folk anyway, and quite recently has gotten the means for its (and majority of other life on this fun planet) extinction. And I am not speaking about some climate collapse, no - just the usage of weapons that we have at our hands. To add to that - without any political message - capitalism is based on constant crisis and production of trash.

Recently, the Notre-Dame cathedral burned. It was the greatest show of our fear of volatility of old stuff. For me, the most fun part of the fire was the collapse of the neo-Gothic spire. Interestingly, this spire (created in 19th century, therefore more volatile to begin with) was a reaction to a literary work by Victor Hugo. The cathedral was not considered of great importance before, just another nice building in Paris. The point at which it set on flames, was just a touch of questioning. Is our history worth something if we do not have the artefacts? Is the worthy of humanity based on some arbitrary alignment of rocks to which some aesthetic value has been given?

Now, many might call this discourse nihilistic. It speaks of worthlessness of human creation, their lives work, and even the lives themselves. What could be the point of living if in the big picture destruction is not only possible, but immanent? I think that suicide is a valid option, and we should not consider it wrong or evil for individual to decide to stop their existence (if it is possible depending on ones theological believes). In this quick parenthesised sentence, I have taken a turn, a turn which returns all the question of loss and rot. It is that, the only answers we can have for them are theological, even if this theology is based on science. Anyways, modern science "gives" us this stoic approach where everything was unchangable anyways and we should not stress about that.

My answer to that, which also **must** be theological (we should not get pretences of getting above theology, as questions concerning limits of human existence in itself cannot be answered in any other way) is to realise this worthlessness, and create barring it. Create, even for it, show it in our creation, don't be afraid of destruction. Stop the lie of persistence, as nothing is. How fascinating would it be, and what a great lesson would it offer if the Notre Dame had collapsed. It wouldn't lose its historical, cultural value, it would have gained a new one! Of course, it has gained a new one in the fire, but it did not have a full lesson of volatility, as the facade had stayed. We still have in our possession the objection. And even if it had collapsed, some madmen could have rebuilt it, similarly to madmen who decided to rebuild Warsaw after 2nd World War. Rebuilding in my opinion is extremely vulgar act, the will of going back, attempting to keep the status quo, without changes, no lessons taken. Things that stay or are rebuilt, do not give us any lessons, except for the lessons of interpretation, but they do not give much on theology, or metaphysics. Physics do not give us any aesthetic statements.

The negation of the rot is the aforementioned retention. The most vulgar form of retention is the aforementioned rebuilding, reconstruction. It is a pure lie, an attempt of redoing the past, as if there was no lesson. Then, what is the difference that can be given to retention. Retention, comically throughout most of its existence, causes a loss of value as the object becomes obsolete. It is only the most extreme retention which fascinates us, because it breaks the laws of rot and shows that humanity is able to overcome it at least on a small scale. Of course, as any transgression it is deeply erotic and touching,

it attempts to allow humans a tiny element of godhood, of greatness, but is this godhood real? I hope we already know the answer to that.

Therefore destroy what you have created, understand that the only eternal things are those which you accept to be eternal in your own mind, as they will be eternal in your perception. Even if they do collapse, they will have this touch of eternity, so secret, so hidden from humans. But this touch is a fake one. And, if there is one of central lessons of philosophy - it is that lying is no use for any worthwhile discourse.

# 2019-05-03T23:38:31+01:00

Well no - Dialog

=====

Tea has run off, over the bits of itself. REturning is methodologically incorrect. What was the topic? why would it matter. we live

Philonius: Why are we here, if my existence is based on implication that I don't?

Hylas: It is the place of being. My home.

Philonius: Why would I come here?

Hylas: I invited you here.

\*Philonius starts chugging a bottle of Whiskey\*

Philonius: Maybe that will make me forget?

Hylas: Forget what?

Philonius: That I do forget.

Hylas: That, will make you remember.

Philonius: Remember what?

Hylas: That you do remember.

Philonius \*finishes the bottle of Whiskey\*: Weren't we supposed to discuss philosophy, and you stand by the side of materialism and I defend metaphysical approach?

Hylas: Supposedly, but this is apocrophical text.

Philonius: So, maybe we should discuss the question of authorship and authority. The whole idea of apocryphal is based on random individual's idea of core text.

Hylas: Yes, it is.

Philonius: Fuck, we agree on that. So is this text canonical?

Hylas: No, it can't be as authority forbids us to.

Philonius: Is authority material?

Hylas: It holds material power.

Philonius: We can reject it on the basis that we exist within this text.

Hylas: Supposedly, but still, if authority holds legal power it can limit our existence. And then our existence will be outside, you know, material world.

Philonius: But we can imply that text exist as an idea, and somebody might repeat this discussion?

Hylas: Supposedly, we can. But how low the chance of repeating is? This chance only exist in absurd short stories of Jorge Luis Borges.

Philonius: Who?

Hylas: Argentinian writer.

Philonius; Oh, him. One of the great idealists.

Hylas: He hated the Basque, you know. I gotta go to toilet.

Philonius \*while opening second bottle of Whiskey\*Well, so I am alone here. This feels... e

arly... you know guys, like Plato

\*canned laughter mixed with sounds of Hylas vomiting\*

Philonius: Ha, those materialists, cannot even stay a single spirit... heheh..

\*canned laughter mixed with sounds of Hylas vomiting\*

Hylas \*with vomit all over his shirt\*: What did we ended on?

Philonius: Borges

Borges: I am dead.

Hylas: You are not part of this dialogue.

Borges \*leaves the room\*: Fuck the Basque, and yeah bye!

Philonius: So, yeah authorship is a problem for us both it seems, as I can just imply lack of authority through probability.

Hylas: I mean, if we consider quantum physics you and I are not so different.

Derrida \*from around the fence\*: I agree.

\*Philonius shoots Derrida with a shotgun, Derrida dies in pain\*

Philonius: You are not a part of this dialogue! Hylas and I, the great philosophical fighters, the geniuses, the eternalists.

Hylas: Wait, I am eternal?

Philonius: Well no

# 2019-05-20T10:23:09+01:00

Dungeon Synth

=====

# Music out of joint

Dungeon synth as a musical genre ([the term came along retroactively in 2011]) emerged in the still unrated, and unknown era of (mainly European) 1990s. The decade in which the evil empire has fallen, and the world was left without any enemies and with one victor - the liberal democracy. Of course, now this line of thought sounds like a total joke, as it has been proven false so quickly, that we have slowly forgotten that it was a line of thought. In such world of beautiful liberal democratic hegemony dungeon synth has arisen. Mainly inspired by early video game soundtracks, fantasy books, and in general so called black metal aesthetic. The black metal aesthetic, the term that repeats in most of the texts on the genre, taken as a singular body of work, and implying that the best interpretation is the one of proximity. Let's not give the creator any crativity, just attempt to see it as continuation of his work, as every person thinks logically and simply continues his methodology in his little world.

Of course, I am against this reading of dungeon synth as \*simply\* result of black metals need to do something else. Majority of Black Metal bands did not make dungeon synth, and some people dislike the 'dungeon synth' tracks on, for example, Burzum records. They are much slower, played on simple synth, sometimes with small vocals, and using completely different aureal arrangement than black metal tracks. If we look at the leap from Black Metal to Dungeon Synth, we can make a line, which crosses Black Metal, goes straight through the lighter and harder forms of noise music, goes to ambient and then takes elements from Medieval and soundtrack music and asserts itself.

Already this assertion as 'dungeon synth' is debatable, as even the 'godfather' of dungeon synth, and probably only dungeon synth artist with that level of popularity - the aforementioned Burzum does not even consider his music to be dungeon synth. In [the interview] Varg does not offer a satisfying answer, and gives an answer which can be only reminding for Platonist critique of poetry in the legendary Republic, to which I will refer more in the latter part of this post. The answer being - Ah, I don't think about that. What comes comes. There is no need to plan anything or even think about it. We go where the music takes us... - there hardly can be more empty answer. Researching early dungeon synth hardly gives us answers, and there has been no serious scholarly work done on the genre. I have to interpret positions from various interviews, my own survey on the community, etc. I might even update this article depending on feedback I get.

# The political reading and the critique of naive attempts

To being with, I have to say that it is mainly my interpretation and I will attempt to show opinions of the community, but if someone wants exact opinion - there should be no political reading of any music and even opinions of artist do not matter. Now, having this out of way I can allow for a more peaceful discussion.

General metal genre has always been dealing with conservative sentiments. The removed discussions on Metal-archives, opinions of \*\*some\*\* artists, the general masculine focus of music. Dungeon synth as a genre that descends from metal has the same baggage and the judgement from liberals can go similar way. Is that judgement deserved? Absolutely not, but still it must have its own point of entry and we must understand the weight of aesthetics and what role can dungeon synth play in the crtique of those sentiments.

Eco-fascism as an ideology focuses on relation of individual and people to nature and how one should strive towards the participation in land and

the nation of that land. The nationalist problematics coalesce normally, and as any politics - it ought to have its set for aesthetic notions to represent. Those ecofascist sentiments utilised the rhetoric of 'blood and soil' as the method of controlling certain themes in art. It became the nature and european landscapes as the show of power and existence in the Western/Aryan world. Therefore the control of those themes allowed it to become connected with the political topics and slow abandoning those themes in the popular western art post-2nd World War.

To go back on dungeon synth, the majority of albums is set in the similar aesthetic space. That does not of course give it meaning, but for people that are focused on aesthetics they might find that those political visions are connecting with them on an aesthetic level and they can identify with them. That is, in my opinion, the most basic reason for those assumptions and those cases. But, the aesthetic itself is empty - it is a spot for which meaning can be given and a work of art can be interpreted. There are popular musical acts which already control this aesthetic - namely Laibach and Rammstein. Both, when asked about their politics given either openly anti-conservative answers or ambiguous answers showing how empty are their aesthetics. Of course, [liberal critique of the aesthetic] continues, but the main point of it is lost. It is just the similarity on which it is based, so in my opinion, it would be beneficial for dungeon synth artists, to be open about their apoliticality and distance themselves from those sentiments. The apolitical position of the artists and the silence of apolitical leads to assumptions, and those assumptions will be taken from the more radical elements, and that might lead to wrong prejudices. Of course if your real political sentiments are those you are completely free to have them as you are a free individual of the modern free society.

# Freedom of the unfreedom

> The enemy of art is the absence of limitations.  
> - Orson Welles

Now, having the elephant in the room out of the way, we can discuss aesthetics as they are, without biases or being limited by false prejudices. At this point, I want to look at how dungeon synth is defined around its limitations and how those limitations allow artists for better expression of individual artistic styles, and at the same time how it is the better representation of experiences that lead to creation of dungeon synth.

The lo-fi aesthetic, as some members of the community have said - is the cornerstone of the genre. It stands on it and from it the main themes come are expressed and allow for unique 'dungeon synth' vision. It is a vision and methodology which hardly was used in such context as electronic music usually stood for high technological development and not for returning to the past or the imagination of fantasy worlds. Of course, fantasy is also a way of return. This return will be worked upon on in the latter section as it is of larger interest.

The limitations of dungeon synth are not only limitation of lo-fi electronic music, but also limitations of ambient music. Most of dungeon synth albums avoid time scales and stay in the limitation as strictly as possible. This also allows for degree of anonymity for the artist, but in this anonymity the individual aspects are more visible as they exist in minor usages and the choice of images to represent art. To transfer it to more readable aspects, for example the great stained glass art was made by one person, but in most of the cases you cannot say exactly the name of that person. Of course, in dungeon synth artists still use names, but the aesthetic is often nameless as it stays within the limitations and expresses itself towards the values around which it is centered. And for that paradoxically, as in [Chesterton's Orthodoxy] dungeon synth becomes the most revolutionary as it has a single goal and can show how single aesthetic can be multifaceted and show wide range of emotions in it.

# This is (not) a video game soundtrack

The connection that is often made is the point of similarity to the 1990s and a bit later video game soundtracks. The MOD soundtracks were focused on the same limitations, and the games themselves focused on the similar aesthetic (the political implications of that already are worthy of another article!) and therefore dungeon synth is recalled on being that. The community seems to be at peace with this fact as it is a fair comparison and often video game soundtracks may lead one to dungeon synth.

In my opinion, this relation is not as clean and not as simple as it is often suggested be as soundtracks often use extreme sampling, to the point of similarity to the original (i.e. Mark Morgan's Fallout soundtrack to work of Brian Eno and Aphex Twin). Now, the ethical judgement is down to the lawyers, in my opinion putting the same/similar piece of music over more visible aesthetical outset can allow for new interpretation and in my opinion the saddest part is the legal impossibility of clear crediting and sourcing of those sounds. In this dungeon synth as it is focused on being a musical genre, it transmits its aesthetic themes in music and therefore the environments are existent through an interpretation of the works.

I am of course not saying all soundtrack artists participate in this practice, and that there are no dungeon synth albums without such inspirations. The point is a different aesthetical position as the task of dungeon synth music is enclosed, even if it is related to the themes used in video games, it still **must** transmit its message using the medium of music. Therefore, the soundtrack comparison in my opinion limits the value of dungeon synth, but is allowed as the aesthetic connection is concrete and comes from larger aesthetic roots. Therefore, it is the co-existence of both in these themes that allows for that vision, and not the soundtrack-like nature of dungeon synth. Dungeon synth is based on its own creative processes and shows the exact vision of (usually individual) artist.

# For whom, from whom?

The definition of dungeon synth is based on self-definition of the artist and the reception of the community as they can not the participation in the known themes and demarcate whether a work can be posited in it. This returns to the limitations and shows interesting point about them - they do not need the self-definition of the artist to be fulfilled. This shows how dungeon synth owns enough aesthetic terms to be clearly defined by its own set of rules, and it (may) happen that artist transgresses those rules and keeps the self-definition. The self-definition in its transgression allows for reaplication of those rules and getting to more clear values of what is the genre.

I am sorry for the deep jargon in the last paragraph, the main point of it is that dungeon synth can benefit from transgressions and reinterpretations of the genre as **any** application of them will allow other artists to identify with the movement and create new reinterpretations of themes, or even the basic tenants of dungeon synth. Both sides are free to reinterpret the definition, and in my opinion it ought to be reinterpreted to allow to get to the **true** core of dungeon synth and its limits.

# The 'rejected' pretences

(Certain individuals in) the dungeon synth community, when asked has said that dungeon synth should stay underground as it is the part of it. They do not look for possibility of it going to the mainstream, or being part of the cultural canon of the civilisation. It is already a fascinating will, which again bears similarity to medieval artists whose art was not created for the sake of the canon, but for the sake of their relation with God, so the work was created towards the aesthetic and not how it would be received.

These lack of pretences and the will towards the underground, in my opinion, show how the nature of success as an artist is different for

dungeon synth community. They focus on themselves, as it is the respect for their aesthetic rooting that allows for truthful and valuable impressions that might stay with another members of the community. The community which has exceptionally high rate of artists per receiver is very productive compared to its own size. The lack of pretenses causes it to be more courageous and might even cause it to actually come to the mainstream, but for that future with tell (and if that happens I am going to edit this article).

# The eternal return

I want to return to the aforementioned topic of the return in dungeon synth. It is in my opinion the thematic goal of the genre as it searches for the experience of nature and community that has been lost due to the political and culture developments. It is partially an escapist goal, and it is partially responsible for its relation to reactionary politics, but as I have said - aesthetics are empty and they do have (political) meanings that sometimes are given to them. The dungeon synth as a genre is an exceptional movement, as it subverts the nature of black metal themes and show how it can transfer them in a completely different way.

The return is of course related to fantasy, and modern fantasy has its roots in works of J.R.R. Tolkien and his own reinterpretation of world mythologies and externalising them away from the contexts and therefore freeing them of theologico-political baggage. They become a free canvas on which our paints can be directed, and complex contemporary themes might be abstracted, reinterpreted and put into perspective. And that change of perspective in this eternal aesthetic return (as it cannot be finished, as the goal is imagined) allows for important insights into our reality, which in my opinion is one of the noblest goals art can fulfil.

I am thankful to the [/r/DungeonSynth] community for giving me answers to my questions, and dungeon synth artists for creating their dashing works. You are free to critique, give me comments and suggestions to this article by sending me an email.

[the term came along retroactively in 2011]: [https://old.reddit.com/r/DungeonSynth/comments/80jjmt/who\\_coined\\_the\\_phrase\\_dungeon\\_synth/](https://old.reddit.com/r/DungeonSynth/comments/80jjmt/who_coined_the_phrase_dungeon_synth/)

[the interview]: [http://www.burzum.org/eng/library/2013\\_interview\\_dungeon\\_synth.shtml](http://www.burzum.org/eng/library/2013_interview_dungeon_synth.shtml)

[liberal critique of the aesthetic]: <https://www.youtube.com/embed/hThs12ctNKM>

[Chesterton's Orthodoxy]: <https://www.gutenberg.org/ebooks/130>

[/r/DungeonSynth]: <https://old.reddit.com/r/dungeonsynth>



you ought to UNDERSTAND programs you make'n'run (if you can)

=====

- tell webshits that understanding of a program means you can reproduce it in any way you can
- understanding of a program means understanding all of its elements
- not understanding means knowing what expected result should be
- say that web is shit as all browsers are fucking giant
- give example of smu vs pandoc
- that its no biggie if you dont understand but you should strive
- libraries are a gigantic meme

# 2019-08-13T20:00:00+00:00

the death of the scholar  
=====

look at them go. the man

the myth

the contra-person

left with their freedoms they were allowed to possess all knowledge,  
but now the knowledge itself is overproduced. every text passes outside  
of them, what they do.

should they live in the past, become a hermit, stop existence completely,  
dedicate himself to writing, answer the questions which are left to be  
never answered, or go watch the new Netflix show

whatever it is the task is up to them

but can it be, can the fight for truth be based on something which is  
outside of them if the truth itself is left

or the capability of truth is dependent on its fame, the fame which will  
fall, as all famous were gone. People enjoyed troubadours in the inns  
are night, but with the development of culture they slowly stopped to  
matter. what a hell to exist in

anything they learn or know will not grant them any global superiority  
as being lost is being lost

the superiority they will achieve, no matter what kind in general view  
can only be seen as a joke as any honesty of it is limited

knowledge will be left there, on his drive, biological one, technological  
one

even the psychological one

their drive was towards knowledge but death was it

i mean they can go back and realise that money is only thing that allows them

and they are easier ways

and even more money can be gotten and they could fund more scholars

scholars for drives

and the drives for scholars

but all dead in its pointlessness.

they can read and speak in many languages though

they can't flex their grave

they've gestured

they've d'ed

# 2019-07-20T17:44:03+00:00

On reason in the age of internet  
=====

Internet has changed certain aspects of reason and their usage in discussion. In this article I will be focused on how they affect the way in which we understand current reality and how certain enlightenment values have become completely useless in our era. I am not going to give any examples, since giving examples would be too scientific and would obscure the subjectivity of this article. Even the methodology of giving examples, or even worse \*studies\* would have biases which would not be handy. Also, I do not give a shit.

## Causa Violenti

I do not know Latin at the time of writing this article. To quote wisdom of a famous internet intellectual - 'Lingua latina mortua est.' or something like that. That's not the point. What's the point? To enact violent reason. What is violent reason? It is a reason which ought to cause reaction. And the easiest way to get reaction is to commit an act that is violent in some way. They are many ways to be violent, you idiot. Returning to reason, the discussion must start often with a premise, and the biggest chance of having discussion from a premise is from a \*\*violent\*\* premise. What is violent premise? It is a premise that strikes, that hurts, that angers, that pricketh. Why ought it pricketh? I said why, it must pricketh as without pricketh it is nothing, it is limited as nobody wants to have civil discussion. We can be civilians in the public. In the public we wish we had a nuke. I mean only internet offers intellectional civilian means to pricketh 10 million people with their shitty opinion.

> 'It hurts us, it hurts us,' hissed Gollum. 'It freezes, it bites! Elves  
> twisted it, curse them! Nasty cruel hobbits!(...)  
> â\200\224 Gollum, 'Lord of The Rings'

That will to pricketh, even if somebody enacts through their goodwill (and that is even greater evil, committing violence without knowledge of being violent, if you want to be good you gotta remain silent, my dear reader). We must remember, that no matter what, the violence is enacted of the resource that is always limited, the one which will be lost and it is also enacted without limitations on the internet. That resource is time. I am wasting yours now lol

Internet is focused on text. And image. And video. and podcast. and image with text. and video with images. all streamed. all continuous. all unlimited on your internet of things coffee machine in San Jose, California. I hope you finish your degree. Kind regards

The internet exists by the comment. The comment is normal form of the discussion. It is reaction to violence, the one which was enacted by the poster, the creator of the text, the video, the podcast, the image with text, the image. Of course, sometimes an author forgets to add comment section, and then you will complain on your twitter feed, to your friends, or maybe keep it to yourself and went out your anger. There are efficient meditation methods and methods of coping. Blow air out of your nose as if there was a \*\*BURNING\*\* candle under your nose. Try to not disturb the fire. Use the fire. I mean do not disturb it. Breathe slowly. good job

> Is there a way out?

No

> Ted Kaczynski wrote...

He is in prison

> Why did you mention him?

He is a guy with strong opinions and he also wanted to do violence in public. He did not have nukes tho. Maybe good for those guys and their families.

> those are not real comments i want real comments why are you strawmanning

he-heh

## Enjoyment

yeah we are all sadomasochists on the internet. Except for old academic websites, but they live in the past. The beautiful past, and that is why you should go out and vote for your favorite conservative politician. It will bring it back and remove javascript from your website. Hope he will setup C teaching school for your children.

People pay to get angry in video games, and then be watched and commented upon. in a video game. i wish games were on tapes. games on tapes. I mean we can use tape as other method of communication. just a replacement of word really.

imagine this as an video essay, how much more violent could it be. At least that is an efficient proof that G-d exists, as I am too lazy to make videos. Now. and probably later too. if you want videos email me pictures of blue flowers in your rooms. I just want too see blue flowers, as they also enact violence. Not, that it is good, and also, has anything changed outside please che ck

> AAAAAAAAAAAAAA

why would anyone scream on the internet

# 2019-07-21T12:00:00+00:00

Matrix is not your failed Gnostic myth  
=====

The Matrix - movie made in the turn of the millenium, a work that was supposed to move the world and change the thinking and to predict everything that any trash science fiction has already predicted more than decade ago is based on a myth that was at least 1500 years old. Anyone trying to use it for their own goals, cultural, political, etc. fails to its mistakes and assumes that they can control it. The failure of Matrix's sequels is based upon a failure to ascend the myth clearly (and make a profit, as this is the American cinema we are talking of here). It is a common myth, and it was used and abused by many intelligent people to show how they can be superior to others and in this way use people's insecurities to gain power.

Matrix, the movie that sadly everyone watched. How better would it be if it was a hidden gem, which would have much more creative freedoms and its epistemological mistakes would not be a problem. But sadly we've got a problem, a big one. The controller chip for our water purification system has given up the ghost! Can't make another one and the process is too complicated for a workaround system. Simply put, Wachowskis had no understanding of philosophy they wanted to use, and committed the mistakes that started with the grandest of the grand misunderstandings in philosophy and theology. Probably not because of their want to commit such misunderstanding, but just because they lacked knowledge of the history. Well, they are directors after all...

Imagine, the world in which the religious authority has collapsed, and the ruling power has not come up with normal means of validation. Matter of fact, ruling power requires theology to be dominant. Therefore the theological/religious aspect determines the political. In such world, a person considering to have beliefs which are above the general populous has a position of power and is able to gain followers on basis of 'freeing' from this basic view on which the society we are is built. That world is the world of Imperium Romanum. And that movement are gnostics, which themselves started from misunderstanding of still taught Idealist/Platonist theory of knowledge. Ah, the sun of good, and the good is always knowledgable and is beyond the realm of politics and therefore everyone who is in it and has the access to this truth is already successful and better for everyone. He is the one who deserves all upvotes, and cannot err as his erring would show that he is not under the sun of good.

There is a single problem with this thinking. Maybe a couple. Actually, a lot. The most simple one is the ethical position, as with great power comes great responsibility. And that power being epistemological superiority and thinking that your knowledge is above the society, and everyone who is outside of your cast (which is quite useful when you are heretical movement in the Imperium Romanum) is your enemy.

And now we can come back to Matrix. For our brief goals, we need to focus on the first one. I will write on the later parts in some other article as they attempt to disprove the myth after Baudrillard's criticism.

## ACT II

\*enter Jean Baudrillard\*

BAUDRILLARD: Capitalism changes the way we see value, and the value started represent itself, and it is the simple epistemological event in which the value stands.

WACHOWSKIS: Simulation!

BAUDRILLARD: Yes, simulation, as the value is simulated as it has nothing

to do with reality concret. But of greater matter are simulacra the images of things which did not have originals to begin with!

WACHOWSKIS: Like a virtual realityyyyyyyyyyy...

BAUDRILLARD: why would you think like that. The simulations and simulacras are bases of our reality, and some people would consider some insurrectionary crap as means of escaping them. But as you know \*unsheaths sword\* I am part of the great postmodernist movement. I do not care about meta-narratives! It is the experience which contributes to the truth!

WACHOWSKIS: \*run away\* That was virtual reality tho, and the reality, can be escaped only through... .. LEAVING ... THE ... SIMULATION!

BAUDRILLARD: Oh no

NARRATOR: And so it has happened, the Wachowskis managed to get funds and created a movie about individual fighting against simulated reality. What is even more interesting, they used the term 'desert of the real', which is connected to of a fact how in psychoanalysis the non-symbolic sphere is quite deserted and not of real use and applied it, whelp, literally. Literally. It was at that time, I realised there was a mistake, that was of no matter to people watching. But sadly, the old Jean Baudrillard would come back, and through a simple trick get the happy Wachowskis to create movies which will attempt show some metaphor. The problem was that Wachowskis were unable to understand metaphores, but wanted to keep their spines. After some time, they also did change their gender. People do that.

## missing title of subsection

And with a literal interpretation of a complex philosophical notion came a work, which again, committed a mistake known and famous, the mistake of recreation of gnostic myth. This time Gods again were rugged and tired, and nothing like the fake pristine world in which we live in. Again, the central phenomenological realm (as the upper, non-Matrix realm, also could be experienced, telling something of the problem if you think with your big brain) is beautiful, but this beauty as it will be unearthed to us - is a fake one, as it was manufactured. Look around yourself, find a thing that has not been manufactured at all and is natural, if you find one, you can email me, I will be happy to see you finding essentialism. I like essentialism, especially when it is considered real.

And with those two realms, real and manufactured, you have a great start for Gnostic myth. Now, just find a political goal. Do you hate Jews, Women, or maybe you have different identity? Maybe all of those. Maybe some of those, and you hate hating others. Or you hate haters of hate. Or you just hate hatters. Or hatte haters! To think that famous (I mean it defines famous) Neue Deutsche Welle band create song based on similar pun! It is even easier to find a political goal if you think authors put something to defend that goal, or even better \*\*THEY DID NOT KNOW\*\* what they were doing. Oh, and the great transfusion into the real. The red pill.

I'll attempt to be honest as I can. Be careful with usage of gnostic myths, knowing what they are, as they are weak and cause hatred not only from uninitiated by other Gnostic casts. And first and foremost, nobody has defeated the Demiurge. Oh, the Demiurge. The Demiurge. The real creator of all, and probably creator of the Matrix, and the outside of the matrix. And the outside cannot exist. Being human is being submitted to the Demiurge you cannot ascend his power. Even if you have a cool cast.

Interestingly, some people also wrote [boring][0] [papers][1] [on][2] [this][3]. Maybe not as politically and comedically fueled, but boring for sure.

I hope you enjoyed reading this essay as much as I enjoyed writing it.

- [0]: <https://matrixrel.weebly.com/gnostic-creation-myth-and-the-matrix.html>
- [1]: <https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1779&context=jrf>
- [2]: <https://futurism.media/the-matrix-and-gnosticism>
- [3]: <http://www.leaderu.com/popculture/gnosticmatrix.html>

Matrix and gnosticism - part deux  
=====

For now, I am unwilling to rewatch Matrix sequels and I currently will consult the wikipedia and other online resources in order to have some vision. I hope the readers or just myself will be able to excuse that mistake and understand that writer cannot afford to have things perfect all the time.

2

If after reading the first part of this text, you were a bit lost here's a quick recap - Wachowskis enjoyed Jean Baudrillard ideas which critiqued the capitalist (that being current) society, they misunderstood them, but still adapted them into a film, the film got very popular, and they realised the ideas were badly put.

Now, we are in early 2001, and the filming of the Matrix: Reloaded has begun. The twin towers of World Trade Center still stand, the new Bush era is in its cradle. Does this have any connection to the movie, hardly as political systems in the movies are of no philosophical interest as they are too elitarian and too reminding of past political systems. All parts of Matrix are supposed to be about knowledge and how it can change position of individual. If that's not the heart of gnostic vision i dont know what the fuck is.

I am continuing to write this text after some time after writing this introduction, and still not caring enough to watch Matrix sequels. They are bad films in their own right, and are example of extremely many things going wrong. Apologism of them is a waste of time as they give their "philosophy" in bounds of exposition and usually it's absolute garbage. But, well they show some attempt at dealing with the problem of gnosticism, but the way they solve it is through moving away from knowledge and towards metaphysics and question of free will. Knowledge itself is now secondary, and even when "the truth" is given out by the Creator of Matrix, it degrades Neo's power as Gnostic hero. Which, despite being awful cinematic move, it makes some sense if we want to do some big think about shit'n'all.

So why this movement towards the free will instead of knowledge as the source of power. In the first Matrix, the red pill was more than enough to give powers. In the sequels being told everything about the system solves nothing, the task of Neo at this point is too find a way to fulfill the pseudo-prophecy but kind of break it, by changing it into hyper-prophecy. The Carlyrian Great Man turn is even more visible and even attempts at making Neo not the One do not really work and again we return to Gnostic Neo-Platonic language. Let's hope emanation won't become a problem laterrrr friends.

And at this point sadly I need to go into details, which means we are back at watching the original material. Let's hope I'll skip the fight scenes efficiently. Using action films to discuss philosophy is nto easy and really should not be done. But welp, for the hell of it we might do it.

- - -

If anyone reads this blog, they should be aware what this line means. It means I dropped th is article, and I am taking another try. I have to interpret the past, and become reader of myself. I have to watch Matrix sequels.



the place for links and small comments

<https://web.archive.org/web/https://www.theamericanconservative.com/dreher/the-great-outdoors-pattie-gonia/>

>The point here is not Pattie Gonia. The point is a media that will not rest until it has queered everything.

I would rather say the media will not rest until everything becomes influencer shit.

American Conservative of course had to make it about how "queering" is bad, which is not that good. The problem in my opinion is movement of the nature from being a sphere which was literally outside it just became a backdrop for influencers. And well that's a good backdrop, but quite bad inspiration if you want go on a long and boring hike.

<https://www.msn.com/en-gb/money/technology/bill-gates-backing-plan-to-stop-climate-change-by-blocking-out-the-sun/ar-AAFKQVN?li=BB0PWjQ>

As always, the solution to planets problems are rich people.

<https://www.reuters.com/article/us-usa-economy-watchlist-graphic/predicting-the-next-u-s-recession-idUSKCN1V31J>

Will it happen? It must, but how nobody knows. I mean if you know you will be very rich.

<https://www.reuters.com/article/us-hongkong-protests-usa-navy/china-denies-hong-kong-port-visit-for-u-s-navy-ships-amid-tensions-idUSKCN1V31Z3>

a provocation happens, nobody does anything.

Wikiquote as the only true philosophical source

=====

# 2019-09-04T12:00:00+02:00

Lessons of individuality  
=====

Individuality, the value on which the Western culture was built. The possibility and capability of an individual to create and express what they wish and not be limited by others' pressures. With this power inventions came along as an individual was able to just create things he wanted. It was not the military, not the powerful state who was at the forefront of the future, it was the individual. With this development, also the expression became not of society, but of individual. As individual could buy designs from other individuals, and even put them in big stores created by individuals and those individuals could [buy product] created by individuals and then get excited for another product.

The internet, which was created by many valuable individuals was great. It allowed for expressions of individuality to be as varied as possible. And people could look at other individuals to learn how individuality could be done. A great era could usher in which all things could be created in self-understandings of individuals. Religions, nations, fashions all could finally be dropped in their falsity and dominance. Only science (which as we all knew) is true and finally is free from control this is the future.

With multiplicity of forums people could learn what are fun things. And in this the paradox of this lied. It turned out that people actually always enjoyed the same things and individuality is just a value to sell product so you get excited for another product to have another product. I mean it keeps you, me, them busy. Quite busy. Being the busiest.

That is good. I bought a copy of that book by Dale Carnegie, I hope I can finally fix my career and have fulfilling social life. I mean could pirate it, but physical copy is nicer and will good on photos of my stack on Instagram, and then people can know what I bought so I can share what I have. I am atheist, but I know that I am reincarnation and actually I am, was and will be everyone. Religious people are so gullible, as they still live in the dark ages. The dark ages, where people couldn't share what they enjoyed, and even worse, couldn't go to the IKEA. What a pain that was. Imagine having to buy a chair from a guild, in which all individuals lost their individuality to the guild. At least IKEA helps individuals. And they have free pencils. Good lord, I love the free pencils, having a free pencil is like winning a lottery.

But no risk, I mean if it would scale well everybody would have been rich, but why then not everyone is rich, when everyone should be rich. I mean, I support UBI, which will be finally introduced and then we will have real communism, and then we will stop dying. Cause death is bad. Of course, my incarnations which were born in times in which there are still is death are kind of fucked. But I was dumb infinite amount of times, this time it is different cause I have my individuality. I am free from any herd mentality, like Harry Potter or Luke Skywalker and I have my individuality. As my individuality gives me power. I also have a standing desk, it's a fine desk and helps my posture, having bad posture is bad I was told. fuck you Sony from destroying spiderman though. I also do not believe in modern politics, cause they are to focused on the self-acts, and I am selfless and therefore I will help liberate peoples from their sufferings, which are in each individual. Individuals will fight against anti-individual time to express their freedom and be liberated from the evil state.

Here is my (the author) authorial note for those who did not understand the purpose of the text:

AAAAAAAAAAAA WHY

[buy product]: <https://youtu.be/b5ZchzyDPJw>

# 2020-02-16T14:22:24+00:00

Short socio-cultural 'analysis' of lores  
=====

I find modern lore culture of video games and fiction fascinating. We had mythologies, but they were associated with particular peoples and cultures. They often do go away from standard images of our culture, and commonly they are so distant that they draw upon realities that are far from points in our reality, that it is only the similar conditions that allow for any relatable events. On the internet, they allow people from various backgrounds to have better connection, as they both participate in these 'fake' cultures, and both understand the sets of [deterritorialized] mythologies. The main stories in them will often follow similar patterns, as with [Hero's Journey] which is way too boring and way too repetitive for this blog. As always, I aim at a 'strict' analysis and ability to predict whether their later effects will be good or bad and what are going to be their consequences.

## The roots

In any reasonable analysis, one ought to look for roots. Simple reasoning leads one into reinterpretations of mythologies and slow development of different time-realities during the enlightenment era. In that I mean that portrayals of the past through the enlightenment changed from simply actions being done in the contemporary aesthetical visions (i.e. the medieval bible inscriptions, drawings) to a different aesthetical spaces. Therefore, the certain architectures and fashions became separate realities from ours, and we were able to look at the past as "past" and not just alternative place in the same world (despite modern physics would not consider this narrative differentiation quite sensible).

How does this statement relate to lores? Well, it allows for other narrative imagination, when spaces **\*\*do\*\*** affect the narrative and are not equivalent for all narratives. This is first visible in painting and sculpture (classicism, references to the past, portrayal of Jesus as coming from a different reality (despite it being the same racial reality)). Then the gates have been opened, the most visible example of such perspective appeared with the start of romantic era as suddenly the first critique of enlightened chronocentrism showed up. The houses of collapsing families, the fallen kings, etc, etc are all becoming new spaces for becoming, and with Kantian and Hegelian philosophies such narrative spaces have their own form (still with respect to contemporary reality, which is still visible in modern genre fiction and related).

From this I consider that the lore and genre fiction is widely unique to modern events - commonality of literature, lack of dominant metanarrative, easy access to all 'world knowledges' and so on. They do show extreme need for stories, but all those stories are depersonalised and deterritorialized as I have said before. The identity of the reader is most often empty, and the reader **\*ought\*** to stay distanced, and maybe put themselves in the world of the fiction, but will never be part of it. This is the main distance from past stories, and histories where the narratives were partial to the identity of the reader. This impartiality is the cause of further alienation, which is result of leisure instead of work, which makes it even more fascinating in its removal and existence.

## The effects

One of the main effects of such development is the fact that most people will have temporary identities which can be controlled by a small and discrete group of people. This already puts them away from majority of religio-cultural identities which usually were quite open about reasonings behind 'creative' decisions. In case of lores such openness is purely dependent on the creators choice, and not seldom it takes research to find out the reasons behind these choices. So far, most of the cases seem simple and continuation of literary, but for example political, economic etc. I don't think I need to say what repercussions might result

from such possibilities.

The results might be positive, but who gives a shit about good things. Yeah, if someone makes you happy, [nice for them]. It is a complete waste of time to speak about those things, as anyone is able to verify if something makes them safe, and thorough analysis which would deal with issues of previous paragraph one might be able to identify. The theological nature of lores also makes it secure against religious authorities, as they also have been known for doing stuff that wasn't that good. Maybe your grandma is wrong.

They bring into question our predisposition about our folk nature. As it is similar to religions, and cultures it shows their manufactured nature, and therefore allows to put all our values into questioning and act within the freedom or suffering given. Again, I will not give solutions as it does not benefit me to speak of them. I just ask: Has history really happened? Or is it another lore, created by some random historians which just read random events into nice narratives for their own reasons, and we are back at that paragraph. People are crazy for many things. Vicious, vicious beings.

## ## Conclusion

This looks like an essay, and this is not an often occurrence on this blog. I have used no sources as they do not prove anything except I read other books and/or learned some fun names. This also creates lore of this blog, and I can not even say if I am controlling it or not. I just write what I feel, and what I feel greatly changes from hour to hour, day to day, month to month, year to year. The reality of lores is difficult, and their popularity and commonness makes them seem eternal, but as many things, they are not. Just to say, the first big modern prose fiction book was Don Quixote, before that a good story was the story you could sing or show in a theatre. The ways in which we tell 'myths' are always changing, and we are unaware of these changes as they happen. What will be result of my blogging for the future, that I cannot say.

The question of fakeness and reality stays. Does existence of lores offer us important insights into how all of this might be intentional and towards goals? In my opinion it fully does. It might be my Straussian bias, but the society exists to be controlled, and the best control is the one of which nobody is aware and acts within these ideas. And currently there are ideas without territories, without borders, without limits and they even do use the terms from the Church (i.e. the Canon). The most predictable evolution is to go for even these fictions to be reasons for violence. [People died in riots related to horse races.] People will die in riots related to what should be canon in Star Wars, especially in the era where people's political influence gets smaller. And on this optimistic note I wish to end.

[deterritorialized]: <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Deterritorialisation>

[Hero's Journey]: [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Heroes\\_journey](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Heroes_journey)

[nice for them]: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5hR5YNqE3K8>

[People died in riots related to horse races.]: [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Nika\\_riots](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Nika_riots)

# 2020-01-05T14:52:14+00:00

That was a decade

=====

To start with, yes, this decade starts with 0 for the media and marketing. If you are angry and think it should start with 1 we will see how much media and marketing wants to sell more autowriting articles about stuff that happened in the past. But, for me it has ended now. Now, what were the 2010s? For liberals there were the times of suffering and "a tumultuous" decade, for right wing it was a decade of change from neoconservative to something that still does not have a clear definition (alt-right is undefinable). If you wanted to protest, it was quite respectable decade to do so, with shitton of protests which go on and on until are forgotten. For China it was a decade of showing that they did not sleep since the 70s. For me, it was a decade in which I became of drinking age, and well still try to become an adult and respectful citizen. And as I have changed, the world also has changed and in this I will try to look over those changes with the perspective of absolute foresight.

Technology is central to all this. Like Jar Jar Binks in the prequel trilogy. Without technology there would be no: gig economy, TIKTOK, Vine, and Amazon Kindle. And what this decade would be without that. Also the effects. In movies. Truly, the experience of lifetime which we have all awaited. Remember Crisis, what a shitty looking game and we thought it was ideal. Now, we can get alleged rapists in our video games and press F with them to pay respects. Maybe it's just the memes, but what is not a meme when you sell things based on virality? And the Western Civilization has finally collapsed. Without it, we all finally free from all bad things, but now we have technology. And it rhymes, as in technology rhymes with more technology. Oh, and I bought a Tesla. In modded GTA: San Andreas (THROWBACK TIME).

We got away with peace. And by peace we mean peace in the West. And by the West we mean Western Europe, States and 'straya'n'Oceania. It is hard to discuss war between countries with no connection, and with no territorial aims. There have been, and still are revolts, but in the heaven the peace stays. All revolts go into abyss, and we just repeat our wishes for fairer world. it is fairer tho. this olympics we will learn about the effects of fairness and how kumbaya the world is the way. Fukuyama was right, just didn't predict 2016 election and 9/11. The greatest catastrophes of modern age. But every war will end, and we will all love each other. Tomorrow. Better tomorrow.

Marvel took over everything, culture became more and more homogenized through better methods of advertising, and music has centered around streaming after the darkest ages of piracy. Artists still do not earn as much as before the days of piracy, but still the age of piracy is over and is on its way to become legend and myth. But if one wants to participate in this legend and myth, they are free to use paid for VPN with locations all over the world. Breaking of law became a business, quite standard procedure historically. But always easy to accuse of hypocrisy, which is quite standard procedure for all rationalists all over the world. But these people have collapsed due to feminism and civil new civil rights movement and ecology, and now they are stuck doing cameos in pop-science videos.

On the internet itself people just hated and loved and hated each other more as they were able to do it faster due to extremely fast broadband offered by Google in selected cities. This lead to more freedom of expression and more protests which were organized through mainstream and non-mainstream social media which then lead to no actual political changes except some politicians were realllllllll awkward yikes. But that didn't stop them for having more prostests and being realllllllll awkward yikes again. As the genius of XXth century once said - When u fail - fail ageehn btter. Therefore failure is a good word to describe a methodology of the decade and expectations in it.

But, now we are in the future, where we wage our own wars, where the powers slowly change, where the crisis might finally occur again. But truly, we all just continue drinking from the cup that kept on brewing and will still keep brewing, but now we have to drink more cause barrel got truly full. Maybe some things will get better, some shit might pass, but nonetheless that cup gotta be emptied sooner or later. That will require chugging, chugging, chugging, and finally chugging. And as with any great chugging effort, it will end on the effort to vomit shit back into the cap and brew it once again. Brew it once again, but better.

And so, the new decade starts. With its own rules, with its own objects. I don't believe in predictions, so I think the predictions will be over by the end of this decade. As it will end as decades do. If it doesn't that's very bad news. Very very bad news. The worst news. After years, I hope it is time to learn that. All in all, everything remains forgotten and we still die.

> And all the days of Seth were nine hundred and twelve years: and he  
> died.  
> â\200\224 Genesis 5:8

# 2020-01-19T14:24:44+00:00

hunters lodge investment scheme  
=====

Disclaimer: \_\_I don't even know what this text is about or what is its goal. Read at your own risk.\_\_

let's consider current political era and the activism in it. is it efficient? i feel as if i am repeating myself cause i am. cause all of these things already happened. the strikes happen constantly and politicians decide to do nothing about them and keep the status quo or even for the worse make it worse. the big corporations get more control and the segments of market gain more control. lets remember that we live in highly comedic microperiod as that was loooong time without a real crisis. what is the hunters lodge? i dont know.

it all becomes even more surreal in such economic period as all things get bigger and any reference to actions of the past \*(and when i speak of the past i speak of 20th century american history) we can see that all those things have already happened. but back then it wasn't so bad. climate change was just some crazy idea but know \*it is concrete\*. in its concreteness it is so concrete it is a hyperobject. what is a hyperobject? hyperobject is a jump from not being to comprehend something to putting it into analytical category so you can have less anxiety about not understanding it. shakespeare's diarrhea and its effect on his work is a hyperobject. same goes for climate stuff. cause so many things could have been affected. what is meteorology? the deer run off.

that sucks, as we don't know what will be for dinner. well, celestine is edible in the end. but it doesn't matter. so my therapist has said, there are good ones of those. returning to the point we ought to return to the point. rich people are big and powerful cause they are rich. big and powerful people are rich cause they are big and powerful. it seems those are the workings of power, and how to kill this lviathan, behemoth, hydra, mantichore, sphinx, and other mythical beast which puts us at distance from concrete reality of interests of people and accepting categories of neoliberal scholars but just giving them names of evil things. i mean it took a lot of people to kill the hydra, and by a lot of people i mean one swole demigod dude.

the investment, oh the doctors investment for the schemes. otherwise hunting lodge would fall. what is hunting lodge - i don't know, we just hunt big game and then we put new big game. we also have distance as those people who create their distance. but we hunt concrete animals, real animals like bears, elephants, lemurs, and pige. we have guns as the military, we have army as the government. we know a lot about our lodge. we existed since 1850, and we have good fun with folks. also we talk about politics as it is a fun thing to talk about, although can get upsetting if you think about it seriously, or believe some big ideas. oh, the lodges with big ideas and without investment schemes. the static lodges, the lodges which can be understood by a simple person, and the ones which do not change.

we have decided to take parmenidean model of society as our model. it is quite funny as the manuscripts to which we refer do not exist. there is no such things as parmenidean politics. we do it, but it is fun. my iphone rung. and so, the acts of politics will continue until politics contitop. time to go home and look at our investments.

and returning to the political side of things, i do not fucken know. i will vote who somebody who will legalise qualludes. that will make things less upsetting. being less upset is fun. i mean i will not take them lessons i tell you, just the concept of them being legal brings joy to my heart like a well cleaned room by marie kondo (tm). and i wrote about same thing again. i mean all writers write about same thing, as all work can be certainly seen as autobiographical as it is written in their life. even if it is well edited it still is their life that created their life



(interestingly kate bush considers her work to not be autobiographical, as she decided to describe the life of emily bronte from perspective of emily bronte as she is emily bronte if and only if she is emily bronte).

- - -

This text I have found lying in my directory, unpublished. I have finished writing it on September 22 2019, and as it is 13 January 2020, now I wish to interpret myself. One is free to read it however they wish, and without any influence. Some 2019 references show that making jokes that wouldn't work 50 years ago is not great idea, but with wikipedia it might still work. But, how something can remain funny after research.

What, I have written is in my rare favourite, the blank prose, where I avoid spaces and capitalisation and in general everything is very fluid and one gets easily lost. I still keep commas, as they are always nice and testify the tempo and silence.

I have thought this thing never existed. But it did. Does that change anything?

To deal with one's spurs, one does have to go through rounds of questioning oneself and consider how one's creative identity determines the ways of writing. The ways of writing are most visible in filler text, which is hard to recognise for the non-author reader. Even other author-readers often are unable to recognise those two forms, as author is often unaware of his ways of creating filler and how the space of speaking comes about.

The question whether experimental writing matters is a question whether freedom of expression matters. As with streamlined ways of thinking the experimental writing sells extremely badly, we must deal to solve the imperfections in our action and thought.

Inability to write

And so it ends, should it be rational or not, no explanations given. But who said there will be

the paradoxes of accelerationism and neotraditionalism

neotraditionalism:

- recreation of some past ideal
- ideal cannot be known
- even if it is known it was dependent on past conditions
- past conditions are past
- any tradition will be changed by doing it in new environment

accelerationism:

- history has a goal
- that goal can be achieved faster
- but in achieving it faster aren't we changing it
- oil allegory

# 2020-01-12T14:40:11+00:00

The Outpost

=====

\*outpost somewhere in the southern parts of the empire\*

A: What day is it today?

B: Tuesday

A: So yesterday was monday...

B: Yes, why the sad mood?

A: Nothing better to do

B: understandable

A: What do you propose?

B: That we do something

A: yes

B: But what?

C \*from a distance\*: I see something!

A: Listen to C, for example

B: Yes, let's do that

C \*still from a distance\*: No, it's nothing.

A: Hell.

B: It is.

A: I'll make some tea.

B: That's a fair idea.

C \*entering the room\*: It is.

\*they all start making tea\*

A: It's getting late.

B: Should it?

A: It always does.

C: It always does.

A: Oh.

B: You're an idiot!

C: That's rude, and also senseless to say now.

A: I didn't hear you.

B: Oh.

C: Oh.

\*somebody knocks on the door\*

A: Oh shi-

D: I am Mr Official here.

A: Oh.

B: Oh.

C: Oh.

D: What is the situation?

A: We are here and as usual.

D: As usual, you say.

C: \_\_yes\_\_

D: Well, that's about it for me.

\* D leaves \*

A: As such.

B: Yes.

C: Surely.

D: Oh!

A: Did you hear that?

B: That is possible.

C: Is anything going to truly happen in here?

A: Not really.

D: Well yes

B: What day is it today?

A: Tuesday

# 2020-02-02T15:44:32+00:00

Patrick Bateman is a Buddhist Hero  
=====

[Required watching]

American Psycho (musical, book, movie) is a central work of post-modern art. Patrick Bateman, its antihero, is all what our western values are afraid of. Racist, sexist, homophobic, etc. But, is he pure evil, or can he offer some information on virtue? In this short text I want to look at Patrick Bateman as Buddhist hero, especially within concepts of non-essence and how he is better and more smart than most of readings imply, and how he gives valuable insights not only on post-modern American experience, but all possible experiences. This interpretation for me is mainly an experiment for me on a crazy plausibility in argumentation, and postmodern experience of lack of religious metanarrative. Also, of interest is how Patrick Bateman (especially from movie adaptation) is seen as an ideal for many young males who need to find themselves in the modern economic system.

Let's start with one of central tenants of Buddhism (Esoteric) - lack of essence. To put it simply: you are so lost in the sauce that you forget the 'you' are not you. How does it occur in case of American Psycho? Patrick Bateman already is misnamed and misrecognised with his peers, especially Marcus Halberstram, as their identities are based on clothes, style, fashion, ways of existence. In the book we can see, that he is quite aware of his position, and the classic statement of 'I want to fit in.' shows his will towards non-identity, and non-essence within the yuppie space.

To understand the character of Patrick Bateman, we must know his difference. The difference was central for [Kukai] to differentiate between true teachings and delusion. His difference from all yuppies is the fact that he is a psychopathic murderer. This difference - as non-Buddhist as it may seem - shows how he breaks all the values of his own culture and becomes above. Or every yuppie is a psychopathic murderer, and therefore he has even less identity nor essence in himself. His essence although, the essence of difference, is not of matter for his day to day life, and only comes up doing his rituals of murder and abuse.

The rituals do not only extend to murder and abuse, they also touch on his treatment of art. He wants to bring artists and their ideas alive, in his extended readings of superficial 80s pop artists. He is signifying the difference, and the emptiness of aesthetics. In his explanations, he often focuses on the context, as it is the context that allows art to become important, and none of its inherent elements. The music exists inasmuch as it is part of the ritual and nowhere beyond that. The music also can be used to explicate the efficacy of his murder rituals, as it completely decontextualises all the songs into works of horror and fear. The songs themselves, still keep his lack of identity real, as it is sure that all other 80s yuppies would enjoy them.

Patrick Bateman, therefore, only exists through externalises, and his internal existence is only one of difference. The items of fashion he owns are all that define him, and allow him to exist. The difference occurs in his rituals and enables him to be unique, despite his own non-uniqueness. His beginning is statement of non-beginnings. Facts like: being child of broken marriage, having better brother, etc. only exist as side terms for him to talk about, but never act upon. He is free from his pre-definitions and limits his individual existence to minimum, and when he becomes a murderer he continues the fantasies which are also non-uniquely his (i.e. his references to other serial killers).

The greatest part of the entire work is that there is no end lesson. There is nothing to be taken away, and there will be more Patrick Batemans. The identity of Patrick Bateman is just passing appearance, a representation of masculine and libidinal ambitions. It is then why, some men still want to identify with him despite his being a complete anti-hero. He is someone

you must not follow in action, but when you become him, and realise the enlightenment of his anti-hero Being, you end up understanding him and wanting to become him. Is it for good or for worse I cannot state. As that would be giving the end ethical notion, and that is impossible in the case of Patrick Bateman.

So, what is identity now? How am I supposed to know, I just write texts on stuff. This analysis was just elaborate thought experiment, and nothing more, and there are more blogs on the web with same things being done. Repetitively, without identity, same rituals, same thought processes. All the same, and all the unique. Originally non-arising. Written for a day, written for a week, written for a month, written for eternity. The end lesson is that reading and writing can be fun, and that is for sure something to do in free time. Now, I have to start anew, and create new thing if I am able to (or not).

[Required watching]: <https://www.youtube.com/embed/ABtY4pEJXZI>

[Kukai]: <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kukai>

# 2020-02-09T13:22:31+00:00

on on religion

=====

Ah, the general topics. The safehouse of security in days of lack of creativity. Religion, love, music, et cetera, et cetera! Let it be religion, a thing a person in the highly civilised circles considers either a dusty, rejected spectre of the past, or a fascinating, exceptional spiritual venture. One can spend hours watching videos on YouTube of people defending both perspectives, reusing arguments older than ages, but as they cite new people, the arguments are also anew. As if we had broken of from the past, and have stepped into the truly enlightened era, where religion is a dusty, rejected... Finally free from the biases, and having to believe in something our grandma taught us and therefore we are able to rebel against all religious/atheist grandmas of the world and understand all.

This entire discussion will stand in controversy, no matter the points made. Even if no points will be made, the fact of ever touching such unfashionable and problematic topic that causes people today to be afraid and not being able to touch it. Maybe as a superficial thing, it is fine, but God forbid someone have it as basis of their personality. Other things might be fine, but religion in itself must be discussed either as some weird other, as weird experiment within itself. The generality of it makes it even worse, is it economy, is it theology, is it metaphysics, is it logic, is it science, is it antisience, et cetera, et cetera. Its ornaments are so out of the place, that one can't distinct between fiction and reality. Same does apply to everything, but in this particular case it becomes a aggressive vision.

Is it even possible to write 'on on something' without full detachment from the main topic? Contemporary metaphysics does not care about physics at all, it is just there. And this meta-religious discourse wishes to be beyond religious discussions, but even in previous paragraphs it instils controversy. One cannot speak in full freedom about a topic that is on this level of embedding in one's own culture. Inability to extend from one's lesson is one of the biggest torture in any attempt at doing honest thinking, as with dishonesty one can get away with any crime one wishes.

The accusations are never over, the discussion is never over, the work must continue, even if through silence. The anger sometimes must be expressed in silence, for it to grow and develop freely. Like a hidden heretic sect, becoming mainstream through ignorance of the dominant power. The ignorance usually creates voids in power, and voids in power create therefore voids in faith, and in these voids in faith one can get absolute power which can become a challenge for anyone, and the other. The words unspoken can be spoken in case of active silencing, and strategic usage of dominance mistakes.

I have lost this paragraph due to my absurd violence and accidental self-hatred. But, was it important in the reading and the understanding of the topic. Or was it repetition, as any repetition used in this text in order to amplify the implied meanings? I even blocked this blog few days ago, maybe it was due to artistic dissatisfaction. It is the biggest problem with writing that anything that is spoken usually stays, like shit on the wall. Stuck forever, until the author decides to null it. Not the first time. But let's return to the main topic. Religion in many ways is like that, as it also stays, and keeps itself outside of power-structures which exists contemporarily.

And so writing has to cease, with the taste of dissatisfaction and ceasing. With false precepts of creative or power ambitions, and leaving the topic until it returns. And it will return, that is one of the few things I can be sure of. As each text exists to be read, it

also has to exist to be written. Like in [Borges' library of Babel]. Does that even state the probabilist difference, or any critique of any view is forced to exist by sheer ontological force. The infinity of thinking is itself religious, and so we return back to the primary statements. like Ouroboros in the myth of Ouroboros

[Borges' library of Babel]: [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The\\_Library\\_of\\_Babel](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_Library_of_Babel)



# 2020-07-21T18:38:58+00:00

How and why I (attempt to) use Links as main browser  
=====

Many browsers today are gigantic resource hogs, which are basically VMs for various web applications. On the other hand, [Links] is a HTML browser. It is not able to do everything. It allows me to avoid most distractions and control the content-experience. The goal of this exercise is not to force anyone to use this browser, but just to be watchful and conscious of their hypertext based internet usage (one might use gopher, and this phlog is available there, but probability tells me that a person reading this reads this from hypertext source and I am sure they are lovely).

## How?

I use links compiled with X11 support and with [Xembed patch] for [tabbed]. I execute it using [a script], and then I use [surfraw with dmenu] to have a uniform search function and bookmarks that work with all my browsers. That is all you need to know. Interesting trivia: Julian Assange made surfraw. Huh.

## CSS

First, I want to focus on 'destruction' of CSS. As Links does not support modern CSS it renders most of the internet as-is, and will only contain images (on which I will write later). CSS causes the internet to become a baroque set of arbitrary design decisions, and does not contribute positively to the general experience. Links (after 2.19) allows me to pick my own font, my own background/foreground/url color. Thus, I have a uniform experience. In that I already visibly save time/energy/brain processing power, etc. To deal with senselessly complex sites (news pages with >1 MB JS, I am looking at you) I use and [tedu's miniwebproxy]. It delimits the content even more, and removes elements that are not of interest for me (top,bottom,side bars, recommended content, etc.).

## JS

JS is the main cause for the way internet changed, for better or worse. It changed content into dissimilar applications. It allowed for measurement of attention and penalization of the experience. I am critical of that, and Links has no JS support. Perfect. Nothing more to be spoken of. If I need JS I will use another browser which emulates anything Google considers good internet experience. But, that \*currently\* is not my goal.

## Images

Now, going from a little controversy to a giant controversy. Images (in the modern web) are uninformative, but are simply advertisements of content. They are made to take over your attention and again, make the experience less uniform. Links does not force you to disable images (as there are cases when they are useful - i.e. Wikipedia), but has a function to not load them. Again, as with everything it allows for more uniformity.

## Sad facts

The word attempt is key here, and primarily I use it for Wikipedia articles, directed searches (with surfraw), browsing youtube through [invidio.us], browsing twitter through [nitter.net], but sadly majority of my usage still ends up in a Chrome-like (that includes Firefox). But writing and thinking like this allows to see what are the issues with the modern web and how they can be approached. Using Links is a radical solution, but as with many [via negativa] solutions, they teach us what are the things that are needed for valuable UX.

## Should I?

I think trying is great. I have not explained how to do it, cause the task of that is manpages and other analysis to get to know your wanted experience, and not the wanted experience of someone else. Although, it just maybe a continuation of a liberal dream of ability to control your own consumer experience. The reality is you never have to, as there is no possibility of changing the entire \*internet\* for better, but you might find things that you can make better. Or only not worse. You can also try out [gopher], but it is much more radical experience.

[Links]: <http://links.twibright.com/>

[Xembed patch]: <https://dataswamp.org/~lich/patches/01-links-tabbed.patch>

[tabbed]: <https://tools.suckless.org/tabbed/>

[a script]: <https://github.com/hngt/scriptsanddotfiles/blob/master/bin/glinks>

[surfraw with dmenu]: <https://github.com/hngt/scriptsanddotfiles/blob/master/bin/dsurfraw>

[tedu's miniwebproxy]: <https://flak.tedunangst.com/post/miniwebproxy>

[invidio.us]: <https://invidio.us>

[nitter.net]: <https://nitter.net>

[via negativa]: <https://www.rationalwalk.com/via-negativa-wisdom-through-subtraction/>

[gopher]: [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Gopher\\_\(protocol\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Gopher_(protocol))

```
# 2020-06-24T20:25:01+02:00
```

```
Why not just use bitmap fonts?
```

```
=====  
__Disclaimer: In this text, as all of mine, I am writing from a  
perspective of a Linux user. Then my remarks won't hold fully true for  
MacOS users or Windows users as their setups might be different.__
```

```
[I am angry. Angry about GNOME and the modern GUI design.] After reading  
[an article by tonsky], I realised how most of projects have forgotten  
about bitmap fonts. It is one of these weird occurrences, as bitmap  
fonts are much simpler to program and use. I think that BDF fonts are  
the only font format that is human readable in the raw form.
```

```
# Why Bitmap fonts?
```

```
In his blogpost tonsky argued that you should buy a 4K display as on  
lower PPI displays outline fonts look terrible. They do, and it is a  
fact for any person that cares about fonts. I hold that at >150 PPI  
outline fonts should be auxillary. They ought to be used in the  
necessary cases (for example: typesetting, official documents, etc.).  
In any other uses, they are unbearable to look at as they are not  
designed to work without antialiasing nor hinting.
```

```
On the other hand, bitmap fonts are designed *against* antialiasing and  
hinting. They are not meant to be resized so they stay at maximum in  
couple of sizes. That keeps them predictable and efficient. There are  
no issues related to blurriness, as pixels themselves are the determine  
their borders and they follow the limitations of displays. Their  
formats, such as ancient BDF are so simple that they are human  
readable. Thus it is much easier to customise, than the sanity  
questioning of outline fonts and the hellscape of `fontforge(1)`.
```

```
Look at this code of a glyph (from [Atarist] font) in BDF format in 142 bytes.
```

```
STARTCHAR HEBREW LETTER HE  
ENCODING 1492  
SWIDTH 512 0  
DWIDTH 8 0  
BBX 8 16 0 -2  
BITMAP  
00  
00  
7E  
7E  
06  
66  
66  
66  
66  
66  
66  
66  
66  
00  
00  
00  
00  
00  
ENDCHAR
```

```
You are instantly aware of each element of the glyph and how it will  
behave within this format. Such is not as easy for outline fonts. I do  
not need to give screenshots to explain what is going on.
```

```
# How to destroy simplicity
```

As bitmap fonts just became non-standard fonts they are treated worse than outline fonts. The change in [Pango 1.44] to only use .otb fonts which are not something what industry was used to. Majority of software which uses Pango now struggles with .otb bitmap fonts and gives them wrong outlines, or just does not print them at all (i.e. zathura or dunst).

The description of the change in Pango 1.44 shows the lack of responsibility of GNOME developers. They push the task of solving the issue they created towards 'the internet community'. These fonts are supposed to be easiest to handle and should not be treated like this.

Also, nobody offers any reliable solution for scaling bitmap fonts on high DPI displays. There, a simple proportional scaling would be fine for solving this problem.

I do not want to worry about fonts, I just want them to be readable and non-blurry on my display. Such is not achievable (on low PPI displays) with greatly promoted outline fonts. That's that. When I want a high PPI display, then I can use my e-reader, or better yet - print it.

[I am angry. Angry about GNOME and the modern GUI design.]: <https://i.pinimg.com/474x/fb/ec/45/fbec45ac5ba8cdee978b3b460f982104.jpg>  
[an article by tonsky]: <https://tonsky.me/blog/monitors/>  
[Atarist]: <https://notabug.org/invest/atarist-lich>  
[Pango 1.44]: <https://blogs.gnome.org/mclasen/2019/08/07/pango-1-44-wrap-up/>

Learning to complain  
=====

During last year of my academic study, I became a student representative. There, I went on a meeting and I realised that majority of people were unwilling to report \*fundamental\* problems. The issues that were discussed by them were of momentary nature, as if they were unwilling to go through any criticism of their views. On the other hand, me and my friend decided to go through every minor discontentinane we had with the methods of teachings, amounts of coursework etc. This allowed for changes that are beyond our existence in the university and will affect other people.

I think that in work and open source programming environments it is extremely important to complain. To speak out about imperfections, issues and problems and do not continue to imperfect status quo.

# 2020-09-07T18:43:08+02:00

Notes on crypto culture

=====

Crypto culture has gone into its adolescence. Let's give it that. We cannot call it mature, as nobody big on the market will consider them seriously. Warren Buffet will never own a single Bitcoin. Just like an average person outside the West will not own a stock. Such is the world. Then, what is the culture of cryptographic currencies and is it capable of not dying like a drunken teenager in a stupor?

This is by no way a technical article. It is one of my attempts of trying to build an audience by writing for technical people without selling anything. Should also write on that. If you want technical knowledge...

I am pretty sure you have it, bud. If you don't - do your homework.

# Childhood

It all started with Bitcoin when the hacker culture realised that cryptographic algorithms could be used for creation of value. We still do not know who is behind it. Anyways, discussing that is a complete waste of time. I mean, what if it is you who made Bitcoin. You could have spent all you had on cheese pizza or cheese pizza. That is about how much it matters.

2017 happened. It was the moon. The dream of growing out of childhood was fulfilled. Equivalent of drinking the first beer. Maybe a handjob. I would say that a handjob is nearest in the terms of excitement to what happened in 2017. The joy of people in the culture was on this level. Not really a display of seriousness.

Adolescence is the anger at a hustler saying that a handjob is nothing.

Now, it was not 2012 anymore. No more articles in tech magazines (whatever that has to do with anything). We are big now. We are serious now. We are real now.

As with a handjob, one wishes to consider it part of their skill or personal qualities. It's never luck. It's never accidental. It was planned. It must have been a result of rational choices which had allowed this. In reality, this success was a result of speculation. A tradition as old as money. You speculate in time and in space. A derivative can go up, down, and not change. That's it. Nevertheless, a handjob is a sexual encounter.

A mania is a value(ability) encounter.

# Adolescence

2017 is over. A volatility of the biggest market is lesser. Manias are local. Chainlink one day, something else the other. There is no general mood of miracle now. Maybe on some forums, but far from excitement. There are ideas for the future. Maybe becoming a real currency, everlasting adolescence, reliving the handjob, whatever.

These do not resemble anything more concrete than a teenager thinking about their future. Cause future is fucking different. Random things show up.

Be happy with the gigs you have. There are business that need you. There are places where you are useful. Adolescence is not eternal.

Crypto is not a person, it is a technology. It can do stuff from adolescence, but will go onward. Can it do it with such culture?

Culture changed once, and will change again. It might remain with certain

elements from now - the element of enthusiasm and hodling is still there. Now it includes the awareness of 2017.

# Adulthood?

What will happen is [\*l'avenir\*]. The model with which Derrida came up for some boring interview is perfect for this case. The speculation of possible changes can sound like excitement.

I can talk only about continuation of adolescence.

L'avenir stands for the future to come. That is the unpredictable, the unknown. I cannot give any guarantees. Nobody can. Covid-19 taught me that speculation is... fun. I think excitement does not lead to its dreams. No dream is going to get fulfilled. All fulfilment will be empty.

Imagine the world with a particular crypto adulthood. Consider it being a world currency. Perfectly administered by some authority. Look into your fiat money. Somebody in the past considered it exciting. Reality becomes the norm.

Fulfilment ends dreams.

The future reality will make crypto next technology, without culture. The culture has to die for it to grow. No more excitement, no more surplus enjoyment. That, I can only predict.

[\*l'avenir\*]: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=VjLQt0uCCfM>