

Snippets...

4 Principles

4 Ideas that I find particularly important, outline a way of thinking that is useful for interpreting the world, and which would likely result in positive effects upon the individual and the society that would adopt these mental characteristics.

1. ***Skepticism**: A basis of scientific thinking. Consciously recalling that each bit of information influences you. The truthfulness of the piece of information is therefore of vital importance. Thus, one ought to develop a way of thinking that systematically concludes the validity of any idea. This system considers the probability of the truthfulness of any given statement. It would include taking into consideration the source of the information (i.e. the reliability: scientific? —and to what degree?), the variables involved (i.e. the complexity of the presented knowledge and thereby the uncertainty involved), and the elements/variables that are unknown by your lack of knowledge and those that are simply unknowable (at the present time or in principle).*
2. ***Cause & Effect**: another basis of science. It ought to also be the basis of moral action—the ever-continuous analysis and conscious thinking of your actions and the effects they produce. These effects will, in turn, become causes to further effects. This ought to be applied to the analysis of society, economics, relationships, and every avenue of human activity.*
3. *Finding the **balance** in all things. Useful not only regarding the individual's actions, (moderation in eating, drinking, etc.) but the thoughts as well (the degree of attachment to ideologies of any sort, as well as objects, activities, people, and ideas). Finding a balance creates a positive harmony.*
4. ***Universality**: mathematics, physics, biology—present evidence and principles for physical commonalities that unify all of nature. History, sociology, psychology, and philosophy—present commonalities among all people across time and various geographies. The psychedelic experience presents the individual with experiential evidence of the unity of nature. It should not be forgotten that there exists a connection amongst everything. This holistic perspective will not only inspire positive attitudes towards life but provide a clearer understanding about how the details of life—from physical properties to human behavior, social trends, etc.—work together in harmony.*

It is helpful that these ideas exist at the forefront of the individual's psychology. Thereby, ensuring protection from ignorance, the political control via-information, and protection from the lack of self-control via- instincts and emotions.

By being conscious of the information that you receive, you are free to choose what and how information influences you.

By being conscious of causes and effects, you are in a better position to create the effects that you wish to occur.

By being in balance and non-attaching, you are free from mental suffering.

By viewing reality as a unit, you find happiness in your connection to it.

Blog #1: SKEPTICISM, SCIENCE & INFORMATION

The opposite of ignorance is skepticism.

The foundations of science rest on the latter.

Our schools often leave an impression on us that being wrong is an embarrassment.

But admitting to being wrong, or admitting in not-knowing, are honorable actions.

Science progresses on identifying the incorrect ideas based on logic and evidence (deductive and inductive reasoning).

*A skeptic will always remember the possibility of being wrong...
...even after being presented with evidence and logical reasoning.*

And a skeptic will always admit that they do not, and even cannot, truly know.

*In the sea of infinite knowledge, ideas, causes, and effects...
...how can one be certain about anything?
The complexity is too great.*

People have always, by nature, inclined to emotion before rationality.

It is understandable.

Nature is, after all, irrational.

And the infinite can be frightening.

But science does not care about emotions. It seeks to know.

And it does so with high efficiency and reliability.

What to do with knowledge belongs to another domain.

Science does not provide a moral position.

This is a problem of our modern era.

*But science in combination with the arts and the humanities,
may provide a state of oneness with reality—with nature, history, and people.*

And when this oneness is felt—this miracle of existence—morality inevitably becomes a concern.

Unfortunately, our economic system does not focus its efforts on providing people with this feeling of oneness. A oneness with society, a oneness with nature...

The science of today is, to a great degree, merely a tool for economic development, not for humanism.

The commissioner of Atomic Energy Commission (and former chair of Princeton Physics Department) addressed to the American Association for the Advancement of Science in 1950: Scientists, he said, "have become a major war asset... I am speaking of scientists not as men who enrich our culture but as tools of war..."

We are hence, not yet a true scientific civilization. Still at surface-level science.

*We have built computers and rockets,
harnessed atomic energy and can communicate at the speed of light...*

*... but these were, and still are, first and foremost driven by war
and money.*

The minority of knowledge-driven people—scientists—function as mere tools for our economy.

I say again, we are not yet a true scientific civilization...

*...a civilization in which every one of its citizens thinks like a scientist,
and furthermore... is enlightened by it.*

*Many have studied some basic science in school, and many can quote the scientific method,
but far too many of us have not had 'science' rooted so deeply in us
as to change our mode of thinking—applying it to daily life.*

This mode of thinking begins with skepticism.

*The specific news outlet that you subscribe to,
Does it not position itself with certain principles and ideas?*

Why do you choose one outlet and not another?

I would claim that pre-existing (subconscious) influences drive you towards it.

Are you not selecting your information based on "what you wish to hear"?

*Influences based on your neurological make-up (how you 'feel' regarding certain topics), and
the propaganda that is entering your mind and influencing you without you even
realizing—through media, arts, news, social trends and movements.*

How then are you free if you are not rigorously questioning and doubting information before you allow it to alter you?

Once you have committed to you your chosen news outlet, you are then accepting all of its narratives.

Your pre-existing views are being reinforced.

You are content—you feel that you hold the correct views.

And so, you feel that the outlet is ‘trustworthy’.

How often do you consider the possibility that your views are wrong?

How can you be certain that a view of yours doesn't stand on the wrong side of history?

I'm sure every fascist and slave-owner did not consider that possibility. They truly believed that their views and actions were correct, rational, and moral.

Your trust in your news outlet leads to an acceptance of the information it presents.

You trust them. You accept it.

You have been propagandized.

They own you.

You are their slave.

Without even noticing, you willfully gave them your (manufactured) consent.

The consent to be in their control.

Every bit of information creates you.

It would benefit us all to be conscious of this fact.

Blog #2: On ATTACHMENT

It seems that we humans naturally require an idol.

We incline to grasp onto something.

Otherwise, life seems dark, empty, lonely, and absurd.

And we do so, most of the time, likely unconsciously.

We enjoy a particular state of mind

...and so, we become obsessed with the object that provides it.

money—the feeling of wealth, success, and power,

religion—the feeling of guidance, morality and grounding,

drugs—the whatever state of mind and feeling you so choose,

love—the feeling of being wanted and accepted,

...the list can go on.

The teenage girl—to her it may be of the highest importance to be accepted by her social group.

The businessman—to him he cannot stop that continuous drive for growth and success.

The philosopher—cannot stop pondering on the questions they likely know that they'll never attain answers to.

The lover—who cannot stop their obsession with another human.

These can all become obsessions.

I suppose this was the weakness of polytheistic religions—each individual can pray, and worship, that which they deeply require. If you desire, pray to the god of love, if you need strength—the god of war, good fortune—pray to the god of prosperity....

Each of us seems to have it in our nature to find something and cling to it.

It's a necessity.

A law of existence.

This attachment does not only apply to major objects like the feelings described above.

People are attached to ideas as well:

Political and moral truths.

*Many argue their positions so confidently,
without even the realization of the possibility that it is they who may be wrong.*

Some hold such strong beliefs—beliefs that may have little evidence— that they are willing to physically and violently harm another human being.

That is the danger of attachment.

Does it not bother them when realizing that entire groups of people hold the view that may differ from theirs?

I find it necessary to always ask myself—how can I be so sure that it is not me who is in the wrong?

But it seems that every individual must develop some set of political and moral positions & rules, and when they begin to question their views, they move away from some (developed) system of thought and back into the world of meaninglessness and absurdity...

... in doing so, the individual is at risk of instability and chaos.

It is psychologically necessary.

The irony follows:

Anyone who would disagree with this analysis—who is firmly convinced that their position is the only correct one, whatever so-called truth they advance—only validates the point made here.

Again, it seems to be a necessary aspect of existence. For our survival. Perhaps in some sense even, it is an impossibility to exist otherwise.

This is the central problem of existing.

(Identified particularly by the Buddhist, although western existential philosophies describe something similar... in fact, all religions are providing a systematic framework, a solution, to this problem).

It is this necessary clinging onto things that are impermanent, and (therefore) illusory in providing the final state of happiness.

This illusion provides disappointment.

This is the suffering.

The only reconciliation is to make peace with this fact.

*And to be immune to this suffering, one must find a fine balance—
—laugh. But know this will end.
—cry. And this will end too.*

*To be conscious of your thoughts, speech, and actions—and the law of cause and effect.
As this will help find that balance in daily life.*

The ultimate state—nirvana—where you simply exist, resistant to pain and pleasure, conscious that it is all merely fluctuations of energy—why? how? You don't know. But you are a part of it. And you are able to experience it.

And for this, you let out a smile. ☺

Blog #3: LEARNING

There is a “collective consciousness” of our society which, like a living organism, is continuously learning.

*Overtime,
Ideas, technology, diet, and understanding that took time for a generation to acquire become, subconsciously, an “obvious” element of life in the next generation.*

Blog #4: UNCERTAINTY, UNKNOWING

There is a way of thinking that I think will be a feature of future generations.

It is:

“Trying to figure out the game as opposed to playing it”

This statement comes from Roger Penrose explaining Godel's Incompleteness Theorems on Lex Fridman's Podcast.

*There are three major ideas that I present here.
They are all related.
And they all develop a particular attitude towards our nature, and how we understand it.*

The ideas are:

- *Godel's Incompleteness Theorems*
- *The Uncertainty Principle (and Quantum Mechanics in general)*
- *Skepticism and Science*

I have already written about the latter. I will say, however, that the former two results in mathematics and physics only support the realization of our inability to know through logic and scientific evidence.

One of the peak mathematical results of the 20th century:

Godel's Incompleteness theorems

It states that:

if you have a consistent logical system (that is, a set of axioms with no contradictions) in which you can add and multiply:

1. then there are statements *in* that system that are unprovable using the system's axioms.
So, if you make the unprovable statement itself an axiom, you will come across more statements that are not provable. It is an infinite regression of unprovable statements.
2. then the consistency of the system itself is unprovable (assuming it is indeed consistent).
i.e. the system itself cannot say whether there are statements that lead to contradictions or not.
i.e. i.e you cannot prove that math does not have any contradictions....

(A system is complete if for every statement in the system, either the statement or its negation can be proved; hence Incompleteness Theorems)
Since it is reasonable to assume that we—humans, society, and the universe—are some sort of mathematical system, (given the “Unreasonable effectiveness of mathematics” (essay by physicist Eugene Wigner)), Godel's Incompleteness Theorems must therefore apply to us.

The Uncertainty Principle states that there are certain observable quantities (such as position and momentum) that are impossible to measure simultaneously beyond some limit of accuracy (\hbar divided by 2).

In other words, there is a limit to “how much” we can know about a value—and the more information we gather about one of the values, the less certain we are in the other observable.

Human beings were aware of this before these results—on a philosophical/intuitive level. (Absurdism for example).

The Scientific Method is brilliant because it takes into account this fact.

Hence, Einstein's statement that

"The whole of science is nothing more than a refinement of everyday thinking."

is, of course, accurate.

The future generation will process information, not with an attitude of whether a statement or event is true or false, but rather

—the likeliness of it,

As quantum mechanics becomes more prevalent in our “collective consciousness”, our future societies will think in terms of probabilities—which is, seemingly, all that quantum mechanics provides us.

Blog #5: CAUSE & EFFECT, and ETHICS

Cause & Effect is one of the most fundamental truths of all time.

*Not only is it the basis of all of science,
But it plays a deep role in our day-to-day lives and understanding of the world.*

A question that has been given much thought throughout the centuries:

Is there such a thing as free will? And if so, to what degree?

And how do we adjust ourselves to the answer to this question?

From a physics point-of-view—the answer seems to be more likely that there this idea does not exist. Or rather, that it simply does not even make sense to discuss it—it is impossible to even define it. It is a concept that cannot be grasped or understood in any logical sense.

It is evident that we are bounded by our physical features (we cannot fly, for example)—but this extends to our psychology: we are wired a certain way to behave a certain way.

Therefore, if we are to discuss this, then the most that we may possibly accept is that we have a certain amount of free-will—a “degree of freedom”.

This too though has its flaws. Perhaps it is best acknowledged with the following quote:

*“Man may do what he wants, but he cannot want what he wants”
— Schopenhauer (reaffirmed by Einstein).*

*My impression is that this conclusion, however, bothers most people.
Particularly when dealing with ethics.*

*The reason is clear:
When an action is taken by an individual, especially an evil one, how must we respond?*

If certain influences lead to an evil action, to what degree is an 'excuse' allowed? And what would be a proper punishment?

There seems to be a spectrum of answers for different scenarios.

On one far end lies the tradition typically religiously-led attitude that the individual is fully responsible for their actions. And hence, in societies where the sum average of people hold this perspective, you will find capital punishment to be reinforced and supported.

On another far end, in more liberal-societies, individuals seem to apply this 'cause-and-effect'-like reasoning as a scapegoat to avoid certain consequences. That is, as an excuse for why an individual is the way they are. But in doing so, ironically, they prevent any opportunity for improvement.

As a result, the most honest answer seems to me, to apply the answer of the "degree of freedom" to the question, and as a result, hold the view that:

You are indeed the way you are as a result of certain causes. But you are also a cause and hence whatever occurs—you must bear the consequences. It may not seem fair, since you were not responsible for the causes prior, but the fact that you were not conscious enough to alter those causes so as to produce a different effect.... You must still face the consequences.

There must always exist a fine line, a balance, between discipline and sympathy.

Blog #6: LIBERALISM & CONSERVATISM

The existence of conservatism ('right') versus liberalism ('left') seems to be very naturally explained.

Generalizing, in the U.S. we see an inverse between social and economic liberalism—the socially liberal (democrats) are economically conservative—in the sense that they want to restrict 'free markets'—while the socially conservative (republicans) follow economic (classical) liberalism—that is, maximize market freedom.

(Definitions vary with terms like liberalism:

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Liberalism#:~:text=Liberalism%20is%20a%20political%20and%20their%20understanding%20of%20these%20principles>)

The definitions I use here are simple—based on political party:

Conservatism (which we may view as the 'right'—republican) and Liberalism (the 'left'—democrat).

The two positions are viewed here as “more authority and control” and “less authority and control”, respectively.

The purpose of this view here is to present how strongly these two forces affect and alter society.

It begins, in my view and to a large extent, with the individual. That is, there must be a relationship between the degree of self-authority and control in the individual (and their attitude towards authority of any sort), with their position on the political spectrum between conservatism and liberalism.

It seems to be the general case, as follows:

The child is under the strong influence of their surroundings (usually their parents) until an age where they begin to question, rebel, and experiment with life (the teenage years).

It is during these years of “finding themselves” that the child becomes particularly rebellious to both societal and parental authority. It is perhaps these years that the human being will be 'the most liberal' in their lifetime—rejecting the values and customs of their elders, countering the

social order, experimenting with the body through sex and drugs, developing new forms of art, etc.

In going through this process, the individual learns and decides (consciously or subconsciously) which aspects of their behavior, traditions, practices, ideologies (etc.) they wish to keep as it (in their view) holds value, and which of these aspects they reject.

In this manner, the individual begins to understand the reasoning and purpose for the values and traditions that have been held by the previous generation while simultaneously filtering out that which seems to be useless and problematic in the new world.

The collective sum of individuals going through this process forms the evolving 'collective consciousness' I described in a previous post.

After going through that process, the individual now has a (generally) formulated view. The placement on the conservative-liberal spectrum depends on the degree to which they filter out the aspects of the previous generation (behavior, ideologies, traditions, etc.).

The average of all the placements of individuals provides a placement of the society on the same left-right spectrum.

This can be seen when comparing societies: present-day Switzerland, fascist Germany, Soviet Union, Roman Empire and Republic...

All these societies can be placed on the spectrum of 'less authority' versus 'more authority'.

Even within a society, the placement changes within a short of a timespan as a decade (the U.S. with the common 8-years democrat- followed by 8-year republican-presidential cycles).

It is my view, that Marx's historical-materialist position is the correct (and scientific!) analysis of human sociology.

That is, the view that human social structure and organization—including the political system, political ideologies, religion, education, arts, etc.—are first and foremost driven by economic (that is, materialistic) needs.

This makes perfect sense: we each must first and foremost survive physically.

It is always a matter of survival.

A simple example is Nazi Germany.

After having lost WWI, now in a state of ruin having the economy shrunk by a third with production down by 40%¹, Germany was to owe ~\$31 billion (\$442 billion today)² to the Entente through the Treaty of Versailles. Alongside this was the hyperinflation followed by the Great Depression towards the end of the 1920s.

It was with the rise of Hitler that the economy began to grow—largely as a result of government subsidies toward military-driven economies. Moreover, the German economy was sustained by the conquered nations during WWII. The GDP of the country grew by 55%³.

Fascism is the most extreme authoritative philosophical and political system—existing on the very far right. It is the solution that, arguably, allowed Germany to survive after the war. (Despite, of course, the horrific events that it produced).

My point here is that the left-right position
—both for the individual and the collective society—
shifts based merely on the calculated likeliness of survival.

*First by the individual mind, followed by the collective society.
(Although how the former influences the latter and vice-versa seems quite complicated and is, in fact, the two disagreeing starting points between neoclassical economics and Keynesian economics).*

CITATIONS

¹Ullmann, Hans-Peter (October 8, 2014). "Organization of War Economies (Germany)". *International Encyclopedia of the First World War*. Retrieved January 26, 2020.

²https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Treaty_of_Versailles

³Baten, Joerg & Wagner, Andrea (2003). "Autarchy, market disintegration, and health: the mortality and nutritional crisis in Nazi Germany, 1933–1937" (PDF). *Economics and Human Biology*. 1 (1): 1–28. doi:10.1016/S1570-677X(02)00002-3. hdl:10419/76312. PMID 15463961. S2CID 36431705.

NOTE:

I will build off the previous section by applying the left-right idea:

First, to the individual in the case of spiritual practice (religion and philosophy)—man's search for meaning.

Afterward, to the social order of today. Particularly, perspectives on capitalism and socialism.

Blog #7: SPIRITUALITY, RELIGION, NIHILISM, and HAPPINESS

From my experience, various people are interested in various spiritual "modes" to varying degrees.

*There is, however, a spiritual aspect in every human being.
I am convinced that it is a fundamental part of a human being.*

This assumption that each human has a spiritual aspect implies that we can attempt to find and explain it in universal terms. That is, a common point applicable to all human beings.

In my own experience, influenced partly by physics, partly by my interest and reading of philosophy, & partly by psychedelics,

I believe it to go something as follows:

*There is merely One fundamental idea.
Perhaps it is better described as a 'state-of-being'.*

This state can be drastically frightening.

- a state where there is no meaning and no purpose.*
- a state where there is no happiness or sadness. A state of madness.*
- a state where there is no good or evil.*
- a state where you feel connected to every aspect of existence.*

It is a state of emptiness. Of non-existence. There is no You. Because You are It.

This state can be drastically blissful too.

- a state of feeling in awe at the presence of infinity*
- a state in which mere existence is a miracle*
- a state of ultimate euphoria and an endless striving for it*
- a state of ultimate freedom and Oneness*
- a state where you feel connected to every aspect of existence.*

A state of existence. The entire Universe was made for You. Because You are It.

It is mathematics. It is information. It is energy. It is The Mind. It is consciousness.

It is existence. It is emptiness. It is the Universe, Nature, and Infinity.

It is that which we do not and cannot know.

It is, as many may call it, God.

It is the highest universal principle. The higher power.

The ultimate reality, binding everything that is or can be—Brahman.

All these words are mysteries to us.

But there is something spiritual to which all of us, to varying degrees of awareness, have an inclination towards.

But this in-grasp-ability for this as a result of our limited form, lack of imagination, and inability to know (that which we make up), seems to be the exact reason for what historically leads to various religions and cultures.

A religion, as with a philosophical system, is a framework of living—it shapes the individual's perspective of the world, and dictates the behavior, attitudes, morals, etc.

It seems to be (historically) a necessary part of human development, as it formulates the common point of a society. It is “the reason” for which people live.

And so, this one fundamental idea takes some representation. As an image, as a story, as an abstract entity, which instructs and guides the lives of many.

It must take a representation. Otherwise, it seems very difficult for an individual and a society to survive with merely an unattainable and practically unexplainable “state of being”.

The representation of this is clear evidence of the human necessity for attachment.

Otherwise, it seems that a human would attach to anything that comes its way. Attached to the feelings evoked by sex, drugs, violence, greed, madness... all of which, fundamentally, would lead to self-annihilation.

The idea of a God, is, therefore, a form of guidance in life.

Moreover,

It psychologically brings more strength in praying to a God of War who is standing by your side as you prepare for a terrifying battle against the enemy.

It psychologically brings more hope in praying to a God of Love who will someday ease you from your loneliness.

It psychologically brings more comfort in praying to a God of Death who allows the death of a loved one to live on eternally in an afterlife.

It psychologically brings more relief in praying to a God of Justice who has a plan to serve the appropriate punishment to the one who caused you pain.

But in the present day, the traditional God is being challenged with every passing decade.

*Nietzsche predicted it —
“God is dead” he said... “And we have killed him”.*

*Nietzsche’s philosophy explains how the result of this conclusion
—which we may largely attribute to science—
leads to the rejection of a divine order and of absolute, objective truths,
thereby breaking our foundations of morality and a guided system of lifestyle
—for the individual, and therefore for the collective society.*

Today, we see this battle between religion and atheism.

This is the same struggle between conservatism and liberalism, respectively.

Again, the natural balance between these two forces is explained.

*When times become difficult, a conservative and authoritative order is required.
When times become easier, our restrictions loosen.*

The liberals exist to push society forward. They are willing to experiment with change. (It is no wonder academic institutions tend to lean liberal).

But since they may be incorrect in some of their proposals, the conservatives challenge the liberal ideas until they are proven worthwhile.

*These processes of our society are to ensure our survival.
And whatever position you take is You simply being a bolt in the society-machine.
The sum of your experiences dictates your contribution to society.*

Indeed, the atheistic mentality (that is, a rejection of the traditional authoritative God) driven by science can be problematic.

Science offers immense power—nuclear energy, genetic modification, etc.

But there is no morality attached to science itself.

Nihilism has dawned upon our civilization—as Nietzsche has predicted.

Hence the dilemma:

A challenge to tradition on every logical frontier—a tradition that provided guidance and meaning—will no doubt leave many humans with much distress, depression, anxiety, and a disorientation in life.

How do we overcome this nihilism?

Science alone may simply make you a tool for economic development, void of morals and spirituality.

But science combined with art and philosophy—and perhaps a little of psychedelics—will lead an individual to a state-of-being that is blissfully connected to their fellow humans, to their society, and nature.

This is the enlightenment that the 17th- & 18th-century philosophers spoke of.

And this is the principle for happiness: the feeling of connection.

A connection with other human beings—that is, love and friendships, a connection with nature, with the community...

Each one of us must aid our fellow human beings in realizing this truth.

Each one of us must aid our fellow human beings in maximizing the feeling of being connected.

Each one of us must work and dedicate ourselves to building a society that allows for such connections—to people, and nature.

This is the source of all happiness: The feeling of connection.

This creates meaning to live...

To understand how this must be done... we must begin by analyzing the system which guides our daily lives and find solutions to it. The system being: capitalism.

Blog #8: SOCIALISM & CAPITALISM

Capitalism has achieved incredible technological progress and material wealth for nations.

It has clearly proved to be the best economic system we have thus far.

But it contains flaws that one must be either blind or ignorant not to acknowledge them.

The fact of immense and growing inequality: <https://mkorostoff.github.io/1-pixel-wealth/> , gives rise to hostility among people.

A competitive and greedy society is what emerges.

Citizens become individualistic, not concerned with the well-being of all the members of society.

There is no care and no plan for the future—society revolves around short-term profits.

Racial tensions are also a result of this fact, as black people in the United States, for example, are already at an economic disadvantage, with few opportunities for a way out of such a state.

The incredibly immense financial backing in the political arena results in the government being swayed to act in the direction of corporations—losing the meaning of “for the people”.

Imperialist expansion through foreign policy, environmental problems, a mental health crisis and drug epidemics, and an unstable economy are the consequences.

Division in society, the worker’s alienation from their work, cultural dissolution, the

“dumbing-down” of society, surveillance through data, occasional market failures...

These are all problems inherent in the capitalist system.

The only solution that has been proposed remains the only active one despite its failures—

socialism

(And its various derivatives).

Now before I scare anyone off: I am using the word socialism here in the broadest sense.

Socialism:

— a society whose focus is on the well-being of every citizen, and whose citizens share the common goal of creating a safe, healthy, and happy society.

*Most people must be socialists. Unless they are in the top 1% of people—who would be at risk of losing their wealth... most people are socialists.
They simply don't know it because of their misguided understanding.*

“Socialism” has been used as propaganda—by the Soviet Union to enforce their totalitarian state power, and by the Americans who were threatened by the potential rise in worker-led revolutions (the common attitude seen across the world at the time), and by the Soviet Union—using the terms ‘socialism’ and ‘communism’ as anti-Soviet propaganda.

Socialism has been attempted via revolutionary methods and has led to dictatorial powers—a result that frightens many people.

*But there are various forms and proposals of socialism.
Some of which would lead to a true democracy.*

Discussions should therefore be about how socialism should, and will, be implemented as society transitions out of capitalism.

*The American liberals who advocate ‘socialism’ have also failed.
The major issue seems to be the problem of bureaucracy.*

*Bureaucracy spreads like a cancer of society. A bunch of pointless, useless, paper-filing politicians who care more about formalities than getting a job done.
Moreover, the large sum of money that bureaucrats must allocate for the benefit of society is poorly spent and give opportunities for corruption. (BLM is a simple example of a socially driven non-profit organization: <https://www.nytimes.com/2022/05/17/business/blm-black-lives-matter-finances.html>)*

This bureaucratically-led government becomes inefficient.

A simple example is the progress made between the government-run NASA and the company-run SpaceX. From the 118 space missions, NASA had a 90% average cost overrun while SpaceX had an average of 1.1% for over 16 missions. Moreover, NASA's space projects averaged about seven years while SpaceX's take about four years. (https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=4119492).

And if capitalists aim to gain power via finances, the bureaucratic (“socialist”) government aims to gain power via ideology—which we have seen recently, like the ‘woke movement’.

Many people fear a strong centrally led government and view liberalism (‘socialism’) as taking away the individual freedoms that conservative values stand upon.

And so, the problem arises: how do we develop a system in which we care about the well-being of the citizens of the society—socially and economically, while not falling into the hands of capitalist or bureaucratic powers?

*“I grow little of the food I eat.
I do not make any of my own clothing.
I speak a language I did not invent or refine.
I did not discover the mathematics I use.
I am protected by freedoms and laws I did not conceive of and do not enforce.
I am moved by music I did not create.
When I needed medical attention, I was helpless to help myself survive.
I did not invent the transistor, the microprocessor, object-oriented programming, or most of the technology I work with.
I love and admire my species, living and dead, and am totally dependent on them for my life and wellbeing.”*

—Steve Jobs

“Unlimited competition leads to a huge waste of labor, and to that crippling of the social consciousness of individuals which I mentioned before. This crippling of individuals I consider the worst evil of capitalism. Our whole educational system suffers from this evil. An exaggerated competitive attitude is inculcated into the student, who is trained to worship acquisitive success as a preparation for his future career. I am convinced there is only one way to eliminate these grave evils, namely through the establishment of a socialist economy, accompanied by an educational system which would be oriented toward social goals.”

—Albert Einstein, *Why Socialism?* (Essay)

BLOG #9 CAPITALISM & SOCIALISM.... AGAIN

It is the case that over time things change.

This includes societies, economies, cultures, traditions...

*The question we can ask is:
What will society look like in the future?
In particular,*

Considering that capitalism

- a) Has its flaws*
- b) Will, as with everything, eventually cease to exist*

the question becomes: what will a post-capitalist society look like?

Analyzing history:

All societies, as with individuals, evolve in a manner as to optimize the likeliness of survival.

As cruel as nature can be, the awful events of history like systems of slavery and colonization were in accordance with this fact.

As humans became more intertwined with one another through exploration and trade (14th-18th century), mercantilism evolved into a new economic system—capitalism (1750's-present).

Capitalism provided a solution to a major human problem: lack of resources. A better word: poverty.

However, early and modern capitalism cannot solve certain social, economic, and political problems, and in many ways, contribute to some of them.

As such there are things to discuss and analyze to continue to improve the human condition. The most notable discussion and analysis are Marx's critiques of capitalism.

Marx, however, never offered an exact solution to how a future society would look like. (In fact, he said: "I don't write recipes for the cook-shops of the future").

So, it has been up to human beings to collectively find solutions to the problems posed by capitalism.

Since the materialist-wellbeing of individuals has been ('essentially') solved by the capitalist system, there remain problems concerning the social-wellbeing of society.

These are the problems of social hostility and division, and of personal well-being—feeling of security, stability, and mental and physical health.

Capitalism cannot tackle these issues, as it is fundamentally built on these through competition.

As a result, the future system,

which will incorporate the social-wellbeing alongside the materialist-wellbeing of individuals,

can be called "socialism".

To clarify:

Too often we confuse terminology.

“Socialism” is a system that has not yet been fully determined. It is a big question mark.

The 20th century saw attempts to induce socialism.

The Soviet Union, Cuba, and China... can all be viewed as ‘experiments’ of how to, or how not to, alter a society to tackle social problems. They were proposed solutions.

None of those systems ended up as true ‘socialism’—the word that is essentially synonymous with “post-capitalist societies”—as they were not successful.

Oftentimes socialism was, and still is, used for propaganda purposes, or/and as genuine solutions. But none of them to this day has proven itself as a solution to the problems we face today.

Nonetheless, as with capitalism and other economic + social systems, it takes time for its evolution and ripening.

Some bits and pieces of socialism have already been implemented into our modern-day societies: Free education for children (and university students in some countries), free healthcare, and social security, among others.

As such, to say “socialism does not work” is ignorant of the scope and details of the historic situation,

unimaginative to the future civilization,

a give-up attitude concerning problems of today,

and if considering the definition I present here, frankly makes no sense—since we do not know what it will look like.

End note:

Dear Reader,

I know that a vast majority of individuals do not read often. Partly because of a lack of time in our modern busy world and partly as a lack of interest or trust in the credentials of the author.

But whatever you have read through, I hope has inspired new ideas and perspectives for you in the same manner as I have been inspired by others who have transferred these ideas to me. None of these are original ideas. And I understand wholeheartedly that I am who I am as a result of the various positive influences which I was fortunate to have experienced. I wish to share these ideas as I believe they serve a positive impact on the world. And if even a single mind comes across these writings, perhaps it will at the very least somehow slightly aid the condition of the human story.

*Thank you,
Yury Chernyak*