=== Abortion ===

Society ordered the steak by playing with nature. Males struggle to admit that they are ordering babies (and changing women's lives forever without their consent) by tolerating the systematic commercial dehumanisation of women. This is the reality of evil; there are always a few innocent lives on the alter for the sake of delusional self gratification. Furthermore, it is the hallmark of evil that it does not recognise that it is evil (for evil itself is a lie).

We can only weigh the well being of a child over its life by asking it. In my opinion, at the very first instance of women's demand for abortion alarm bells should have been ringing. Why were they requesting this? Why did they consider it a right? Why did they connect it to choice? A prudent response would be to analyse the circumstances of the change, and ask why males thought it their right to risk such devastating circumstances in their complement.

Instead of dealing with underlying problem (4 billion year old instincts civilisation was constructed to control), the west took the ring of masturbation - and human beings (like Hal) find it very difficult to process conflicting commands.

[fionaPattenSexPartyAbortionLetter2May2016.JPG]

>   ---
>   One has to ask, what is the Australian Delusion Party doing to help stop women from being sexually abused?

I can understand how a theist (albeit erroneously) could come to perceive teleology in sexual relations outside of procreation, but for an atheist? Artificial contraception has only been around for 100 years so it impossible the human species has evolved any physical or psychological advantage of engaging in sterile relations. Any perceived advantage is a byproduct of its natural purpose.

For females, sexual relations involves sharing oneself (given the natural burden it necessitates), but I would have thought that outside of selfish intent (whether genetic or carnal) this would by definition be love? Of course, it could be emotional, but as I have already argued such taken in isolation (outside of its physical purpose) is delusional.

Promoting abortion as a way of dealing with improbable (yet in the long term inevitable) consequences of playing with 1 billon year old acts is immature. The only way such irresponsibility could be justified is by dehumanisation. Mid/late term abortion is dangerous (deadly) whatever ones philosophy of mind, and for a homo sapiens to be denied life in early term abortion is only safe with late emergence models (which are more compatible with theism, and very likely to be incompatible with atheism).

Most if not all abortion is a consequence of sexual abuse (whether directed towards a female or a male; generally towards a female) - in that one is encouraging another to engage in something they would not do in a right state of mind (manipulation). In this sense targeting abortion is a waste of time. However, it does not mean that we should not question any attempt to justify abortion based on fantasy. I have absolutely no problem with people defending early term abortion in cases of sexual assault (as this is logical; it might involve killing someone but this is their choice).

Arbitrary ejaculation in a conscious state is more related to mental health than protecting a human soul.

I wrote this three days ago:

What is wrong with these arguments;
1. the sentience of an individual begins when it occurs the least inconvenience to a sexually addicted society
2. the sentience of an individual begins when an arbitrary society has defined a four letter word called life

A philosophical issue can't be addressed without at least attempting to propose a philosophical explanation for the phenomenon. Obama's "it's above my pay grade" is both cheap and dangerous. Anyone with a world view needs to take responsibility for that world view. If that world view involves a God that magically assigns sentience to a highly developed physical/neuronal system (late emergence), then early term abortion might possibly be safe. If a world view asserts metaphysical naturalism, then it is highly improbable that sentience magically pops into existence at only a very late stage of evolutionary/bodily development. Therefore, even early term abortion would likely involve the permanent termination of a human soul (one which will never again arise in this universe).

And this a week ago:

It is theoretically possible that people can make purpose in contraceptive relations (this is beyond my scope). But to risk killing someone as a consequence of the exercise..

The immortality or physical independence of a subject/observer (of which the west has traditionally given the label "soul") is irrelevant to the arguments expressed here.

The concept of internal existence was originally formulated with respect to the above features (a byproduct of cartesian dualism; humanity/children's default philosophy of mind). Our discovery/hypothesis of the mind's physical dependence does not invalidate the original concept (but it is a nice way for positivists to avoid philosophical discussions; which I am not implying anyone here is doing).

[personOfSimilarConvictions] just made a point - do you have a counter?

[personOfOtherConvictions] I am completely respectful of your awareness of the gender specific nature of the labour, however people don't generally consider chivalry the ultimate guiding principle on this topic because there are little girls on the line. In any case, an open enquiry is being conducted here, and people are being encouraged to respond. We should feel free to question stereotypically male morality also. In fact, we are responsible to communicate to each other our thoughts: we need to communicate to the opposite sex how we feel about things because we often by default/nature/evolution feel very different about things. In the case of child birth, the pain likely conferred a significant advantage on our species (in that it increased the valuation of a child); the terror of reproduction is natural. Likewise, the social/emotional ramifications are enormous (and life long). However, if this fear is real, we need to stop and think and about it, and respect it. It may well influence our decisions in life (our good and natural choices). For until we can scientifically prove that a Jew is not a philosophical zombie, we should not be too eager to deal out death in judgement.

//Abortion
It is pretty hard to argue that we shouldn't kill the natural consequences of objectification when we do nothing, say nothing, and slowly become nothing.

I don't support a right to terminate developing human beings, but I do support the right to terminate sexual predators (out of security not judgement).
[added image irelandAbortionRights.jpg]

//Abortion
There are some fairly good reasons not to deprive a sentient being of their entire life (the only decent counter involves rejecting their existing and future sentience; which is possible under western teleological assumptions; late emergence - where the architect isn't necessarily going to assign a sentient being to an organism she knows will die). However I am interested in understanding the rationale behind the proposed right of abortion (in which it is framed as being a moral good). Here are some existing thoughts;

1. The desire to live in freedom (where a) security measures against assault are not severe enough to be a sufficient deterrent and b) society actively promotes their sexualisation; the fantasy of accessibility).
2. Population control (being convinced of the utilitarian valuation of no life over a bad life).
3. Lack of choice in sexual act (want freedom to not live with the consequences of having been objectified/used; want to maintain ultimate control over their bodies under such circumstances).
4. Moral responsibility to future partner (want to honour future partner by not reducing their social worth; the capacity to attend to them personally + their offspring).

//Abortion
[in response to proposition that males who impregnate females should be legally bound to them]

I think that such an implementation would help people rediscover that males and females have different standards for sexual relations, and that they are not naturally aware of these differences. Historically, it reflects prechristian cultural expectations of sexual relations. In the modern world, where male and female affections have been exploited to the point where they are supposed to mutually satisfy each other in equality rather than complementarity - divorced from all gender endowing moral responsibility - it appears to go against expectations (those designed for us by the marketeers). Moreover, the corruption of gender ownership and the illusion of its equality has paradoxically led to a more natural or base consequence of relations - in that female pregnancy tends to reflect the original genetic distribution of the primate order (sexually biased towards alpha males) - thus misaligning such relations from suitable marriage. The fundamental problem is that our motivations have been twisted to the point where we are acting in ways which, albeit conform remarkably well to social expectations of a false freedom, offer little in the way of satisfying another human being. Yet I see good in any legal mechanism that does not impede upon our moral freedom, but encourages us to see truth. And if it requires some tough reevaluation of relationship, it can only help people in the long term. I would compare it to recent movements to reillegalise prostitution.

=== Anthropic Reasoning ===

//Multiverse

God can be seen as the definition of the first cause (see Aristotle's unmoved movers)

Self-existent is not a claim held by any empirical model. Again, one should review Aristotle's 4 causes; causality is not limited to temporal events.

This does not restrict us from proposing a philosophical quantum God. However, basing existence on contemporary empirical models is arguably futile given that a) physical law can only necessitate observables, and b) there are still non-physical abstract objects to deal with. Metaphysical naturalism should therefore be looking to a new physics (paradigm). The best I have encountered so far is panpsychism (see Nagel/Chalmers), although the Combination Problem is at odds with present neuroscience (the distributive mapping of the neural correlates of consciousness).

(And [personOfOtherConvictions] I sympathise greatly with chaotic beliefs; it is not like everything is obviously teleologically based)

It is also worth noting that;
1. there are no empirical models on which existence (even observables) can be directly based. Contemporary (eternal) inflationary theory makes no definite predictions for our universe; only a subset of inflationary scenarios can be empirically tested (ie denied by observation). Furthermore, their multiverse predictions cannot be.
2. traditional inflationary theory describes the nature of the universe's expansion after the big bang (see history below). Contemporary inflationary theory makes no stance on the beginning of the multiverse. It does not solve the problem of the beginning of existence; it just removes any philosophical dilemmas caused by the observation of the beginning of our own universe (we can't observe the multiverse, so it might not have a beginning..)
3. there are issues with inflationary theory which cut deeper than Occam's razor. Inflationary theory currently predicts an infinite number of things which are not observed. Arguably, "a theory that predicts everything predicts nothing" (Steinhardt, 2011)

The history of inflationary theory;
1. there is no physical reason for our universe to a) start expanding at all, b) have such a high degree of homogeneity and isotropy, c) exhibit the observed spectrum of non-uniformities in the CMB, or d) have euclidean (flat) geometry
2. propose exponential expansion due to an inflationary field operative during the initial 10^{-32}s of its expansion (observable universe <$1m^3$)
3. discover most solutions to inflation give rise to eternal inflation (bubble universes / level 2 multiverse)
4. in a level 2 multiverse, the physical constants can be different across bubbles, meaning that we have a basis for their anthropic selection (their values in our own universe)
5. thus inflation is claimed to solve not only the fine tuning of the initial conditions (1), but the fine tuning of the physical constants necessary for life (functionally sentient life that can contemplate its existence)

//Anthropic Principle

... The anthropic principle is used to explain why we observe the initial conditions of the universe as they are, why observed physical law is fine tuned towards the existence stable nuclei, molecules, and complex biological systems. It is such because they comprise the substrate of observation (human beings). It must be such from our reference point. The principle is a tautology; it won't help tease apart teleological explanations. But it is important to recognise our universe is bound by it. It has something to say for existentialism (we must exist to be speaking of existence) and related philosophy (the universe was made for us however we look at it). Yet we see the anthropic principle at work wherever we look in nature;

1. Compare the elemental abundances of the universe and those of a human being. The universe is one giant manufacturing line for life.

2. Although we don't know how many paths biological evolution can take (it could be infinite though it is not necessarily; the ATGC genetic construct could support a limited number of organisms with a limited set of properties and body plan), what is wholly unnecessary of any coding system is support for incremental, viable modifications from one organism to the next. Thereby enabling an increase of complexity.

3. It is not necessary that a universe or life favours the development of a CNS with subsystems critical to mental activity (emotion, reflection, task automation, decision making), but ours must. Otherwise we would have to assume every mental act is a miracle (interferes with nature), including the brain's storage of memories regarding self experience (eg "I remember seeing that"). Furthermore the laws of mental experience go undefined (and another, extra-physical construct must define them, the problem of the mental substrate being shifted back one). The necessity versus sufficiency of the observed universe in the emergence of unique sentient beings is a separate issue, and depends on what primitives underly existence generale (what always exists and can but not exist).

[[CompositionOfTheHumanBody.png]]

//Anthropic Reasoning

What precisely has been detected? The image contains simulated data from 2011.

The ability to observe a prediction of a theory doesn't make it an empirical hypothesis. The criteria being: How can the theory possibly be denied by observation? What experiment(s) can be conceived to invalidate the claim (if it happens to be false)? The same applies to groundings of inflationary theory (which is yet to yield any unretracted detections above the noise level).

That being said, any actual confirmation of a prediction peculiar to a multiverse theory would provide philosophical weight towards non-teleological origins (which would have to be judged with respect to other philosophical evidences; for example, the fact physical law as presently conceived does not necessitate mental properties).

Our physics is fine tuned for biology, given that the most abundant elements in the universe (including those forged by stars) are the most common elements in the human body (H, C, O, N, -He). I posted the abundancy charts previously (table of elements). This again invokes anthropic reasoning (or teleology). Note, the probability of a universe supporting two genetic substrates that can evolve into a functionally sentient being is orders of magnitude less than one which can only support a single such substrate. The conditions for the substrate being; 1) it is based on the atomic building blocks of the universe such that it can spontaneously arise (or is more likely to than if it were based on more complex arrangements of matter), and 2) it supports incremental transitions/mutations of which at least one pathway comprises a set of continuously viable organisms (no artificial code at present supports this level of redundancy, let alone the capacity to evolve).

Firstly, it might be worth expanding the reasoning behind the original claim: It is far more probable for
1. the physical constants to be set such that life can be constructed from the atomic building blocks (say $p=x^{-1*(10^{100})}$) and have a relatively low probability of spontaneously arranging into a single celled precursor (say $p=y$) than for;
2. the physical constants to be set such that life can only be constructed from high level arrangements of matter (say $p=x$), yet have an extremely low probability of spontaneously arising (say $p=y^{-1*(10^{100000})}$).
Where $x \sim= y$ (ie are less than ~100 orders of magnitude in difference).

Now, we have reason to believe that the probability of the spontaneous arrangement of matter into a basic form of life (e.g. single celled precursor) is relatively low, given that;
1. It is far more likely for the physical constants to be set such that there is relatively low probability for life to spontaneously arise on a planet of sufficient conditions, than for them to be set such that it is probable for life to spontaneously arise on a planet of sufficient conditions, given the size of the observable universe (and the potential number of universes in the multiverse). This follows from the evolutionary benefits (ie ease by which the system can evolve) of a relatively complex foundation to life (albeit based on the atomic building blocks of the universe) versus one which is less complex but inevitable.

In fact, you could infer teleology from a universe in which the probability of the spontaneous arrangement of matter into life was high.

Note with naturalism, the accepted probability for life to spontaneously arise therefore depends on the size of the observable universe / assumptions regarding the size of the non-observable universe, and the number of universes assumed to exist.

I won't comment on absolute probability here. If/when we a) better understand the constraints of the genetic construct (can read the code) and b) have a better understanding of the biological mechanisms behind macro evolution, or c) obtain a sample size greater than one (find independently evolved life on another planet), this will make the calculations easier. Likewise, simple formulae like the Drake equation cannot be used given their existent confidence intervals.

Therefore, until this time, I suggest that we can only rely on anthropic reasoning (like I have been using in this thread), and relative probabilities based on which features are more critical to the evolution of life. We can also provide limits based on those minimal (in principle) mechanisms presumed to have facilitated life on this planet. Unfortunately, their predicted probabilities for both a) the spontaneous arrangement of matter into single celled life / precursors thereof in under 1 billion years, and b) the evolution of life into complex biological systems representing functionally sentient life in under 4 billion years are so low that they are not worth considering until they are better understood.

More importantly, what is essential to any discussion with regards to probability in nature, is that there is in fact zero probability of anything happening whatsoever unless there is law. An infinite set of mutations in an infinitely large non-observable universe in an infinite multiverse would not result in anything more complex than its parent unless the physical constants were set such that the genetic substrate supported the encoding of incrementally complex viable organisms.

Even in a lawless infinite multiverse where everything that can appear to happen appears to happen and we just think things are behaving by law (I challenge any adherent of multiverse philosophy to argue why this is less probable than a system which generates lawful universes), there is still something creating these appearances. Enter the realm of non-physical abstract objects. And this is leaving aside the insufficiency of physical law to evolve anything but a functionally sentient being.

//Intelligent Sentient Aliens

It is actually more probable that we are living in a universe in which only one type of sentient being has evolved to the stage where it can contemplate its existence.

---
1. yes the mirror test is arguably sufficient for self-directed theory of mind, but are you suggesting that dolphins also contemplate their existence?
2. who said anything about "God"? The argument is based on anthropic reasoning (see Thread titled "Good little 6 minute summary"). It can be applied to any philosophical model of our universe's origin where our universe's conditions have been selected for the evolution of a functionally sentient being (this includes both multiverse and telelogical models).
3. interesting choice of information (but it makes me wonder if there is a positive correlation between education and educational assumptions)
4. Again, the number of galaxies in the universe is irrelevant. The argument is based on the anthropic principle. The physical constants are fine tuned for life [functionally sentient life that can contemplate its existence]. For any set of physical constants being generated (e.g. in a multiverse), the probability of that universe both supporting and witnessing the successful evolution of one functionally sentient

being of x intelligence is greater than the probability of it both supporting and witnessing the successful evolution of two or more functionally sentient beings of x intelligence. Again, biological evolution is dependent on the genetic construct supporting the incremental transition (mutation) of one viable organism to a more complex (or adapted) organism. Code doesn't "naturally" support incremental transitions from one legal representation to the next. It is highly improbable that any one of these transitions is supported, yet evolution is preconditioned upon there being at least one viable pathway.

//Observables

Something which is not in our physical universe is by definition empirically untestable (because it cannot be denied by observation). Yet weighting can be given to the probability of various philosophical propositions (others are assumptions which must be taken as true for reason to take place). Furthermore, human beings are (evolutionarily) programmed to believe in non-observables. Compassion is based on the high valuation of these non-observables. Religion is an extension of this belief (an attempt to explain or give purpose to non-observables, or to provide rituals to help people live in accordance with them).

[proposition; are you saying God is not in our physical universe]
Yes

Technically neither are we. We are observers. That which can be observed is by definition physical. If one makes the assumption of physicalism (a philosophical position on the nature of mind), then our neural correlates can be observed. One can infer another's existence based on the core assumption of almost any philosophy of mind. Yet the inference remains untestable.

//Software/Information
[in response to question: 'What is the nature of Windows XP'?]

---

8) Certainly not a computational (information processing) model for a sentient being.
             ---
         that is cool [personOfSimilarConvictions]; it is just a joke in the cog psyc/AI world

---

Does information exist outside of our minds? Yes. Is software reducible to information? I would argue; yes. (In terms of purposeful information; this depends on our philosophy/teleology [see 5]).

Software can therefore be defined by the physical world, at ~any layer of abstraction; binary/microprocessor logic through to assembly through to high level code. (Although the layer at which it is created/written [1] along with a complete specification of its language will tend to capture all the information necessary to replicate it in a different hardware environment [see 5]; barring precompiled libraries). Lower levels (hardware states [4]) typically represent an instance of software execution and not the software itself (being dependent on user/hardware generated input: eg quantum interactions, microprocessor/memory states, etc). The software however must exist somewhere in physical form (media, harddrive, etc) [3], assuming it is not being executed as it is being written. Higher levels (eg programming logic [2], measurable user experience) may fail to capture specific information necessary to replicate the software (in any environment) - depending on how well defined the documentation/test requirements are.

Any experience which differs between users in ways not generated by the software [6] is likewise by definition not part of the software (not its nature). Similarly, software is not dependent on there being a user to experience it (it is not defined by that experience; be it called "XP" or otherwise) - it will cause the display (output) to function the same way with imaginary user input.

[I have added in the references post hoc; but seem to have covered the options presented; note 7 is rejected. As [personOfSimilarConvictions] has mentioned, 6 is somewhat dependent on the purposeful/meaningful assumption in 5. The model the programmer/user has of the software in their mind [6] will most certainly fail to capture parts of the software (necessary to replicate it), although if the software is meaningful/intentional [5], it may capture those essential elements/logic considered by the creator/user to be the software. I don't think this is an appropriate formal definition however].

A great analogy for software (in particular operating systems) is genetic code. Genetic code is an instruction set which operates on a given hardware (the molecular constraints of our universe; interacting also with its specific environment) to produce and maintain a functioning organism. We don't understand the code at present; how it works: the logic behind the sequence (it is for example likely to be compressed/encoded) - although we can isolate the effect of manipulating certain regions of the code. I wouldn't call this engineering; but the ultimate aim is reverse engineering.

Note in the case of gentics, the code actually manipulates its surrounding hardware (as opposed to manipulating the flow of electricity through it). Moreover, there is no dedicated CPU that performs the interpretation (executes the code); but it is simultaneously executed throughout its environment (body).

I see that you have already identified the genetics candidate [personOfSimilarConvictions]. Software specifies an output based on logic and an input. Information can be created and destroyed in this universe. The meaningfulness question is a separate one.

If we take information to mean negative entropy (which is a matter of debate), then information is present in any low entropy system. For example, there was a lot of information in the big bang (the energy of the universe was in an extremely unique state). There would be no chance of life evolving without the high information (low entropy) initial conditions of our universe. Life/biological systems store/localise information, and a lot of information in the environment is destroyed in the process (to maintain the second law of thermodynamics).

Note there is no single definition of information in the context of the physical universe.

//Fine tuning (anthropic principle)

There may be one or more alternate sets of physical laws that facilitate the sustenance and evolution of life, but those of our own universe are well recognised to be fine tuned. Any tweak of these parameters would prevent life of any kind for various reasons; from the stability of matter, to the generation of friendly habitats (solar systems), to supporting a set of backbone building blocks to a genetic construct. I wouldn't call it a shocking conclusion however, maybe for someone predisposed to inane self-godified optimism.

The fundamental constraint with life as we know it is that it requires a genetic construct to not only support a set of viable organisms in a given environment, but the incremental and successful evolution of such organisms (their code) to more and more complex states. There is no reason why a code base should support this evolution in any form (decoded/encoded/compiled/compressed), and no existent artificial code has these properties. The best explanation I have come across is that "everything that can happen will happen", in conjunction with the possibility of large scale mutations occurring between generations - for example, the crossing of exons. While there is nothing wrong with this, and the fossil record suggests something like it must be happening (although the details of such evolutionary processes are unknown; and if they recognised this it would probably help the so called creationists take them more seriously), there is a problem with applying it within a naturalistic paradigm.

If we take it to its logical conclusion (eg eternal inflationary multiverse theory), we are left with an infinite number of identical individuals. Now this is OK if you are philosophically cool with an infinite number of versions of yourself/family existing. Occam's razor suggests however that an exorbitant multiplication of entities to explain the phenomena is indicative of poor theorising. (Note a computational optimisation paradigm has no such implications given that the system's evolution is being executed for a specific purpose).

More critically, even with a set of physical laws that facilitate life and its evolution, nothing in those laws explain why some physical systems (space-time subsets like neural network activity) have internal observers mapped to them and why others don't (eg rocks). Mental properties (including qualia, eg the redness of red) being entirely redundant to the evolution and function of the physical system. This is why the best contemporary philosophers (Nagel, Chalmers, etc) have come to the conclusion that physicalism is a dead end to metaphysical naturalism, being fundamentally teleological in its implications. They currently suggest panpsychism might be a way out - in that all forms of matter has mind - taking us right back to the days of animism. This theory is by no means complete, suffering from the combination problem (the method required to formulate coherent/unified sentient entities from individual sentient particles/quiddities is unspecified). The remaining naturalistic models comprise eliminativism of some kind, which no human mind takes seriously (have being created/evolved to think otherwise). Meanwhile the scientific popularists think (presumably unconsciously) that by comicalising the discipline they can ignore the problems it generates, and the general public untrained in the empirical method become indoctrinated with garbage.

Regarding simulation; there are various features of our universe that support simulation theory. Though given that it does not solve the fine tuning problem for the base level universe under a naturalistic paradigm, I wouldn't say fine tuning is necessarily one of them. Without assumption of recursive simulation or metaphysical naturalism, fine tuning is definitely an indicator of simulation. The specific evidences for simulation are the discreteness/quantisation of nature (energy and perhaps space-time), and the indeterminstic/probabilistic nature of physical law. I would argue also the redundancy of mental properties discussed above (technically; overdetermination, or colloquially; the mind-body problem).

The beauty of a law abiding universe is that we can predict what it will look like with a given set of parameters. At least in terms of generating stable equilibria for the formation of elementary particles and compounds (taking into account current computational limits).

[personOfOtherConvictions] are you seriously calling Aristotle's first cause an "old theory/thought experiment"?

Yet presumably you admit that there is a big difference between rejecting a good argument in favour of a better one and rejecting a good argument because it is old. So what is your argument for rejecting it?

I was concerned with how you glanced over [personOfSimilarConvictions]'s reference to classical/Aristotelean cosmology, without providing any clear argument against it, while highlighting for whatever reason the fact it was old. It might be interesting to hear at some stage what you think about the concept of an unmoved mover; of course taking into account the context of his four causes.

That existence requires space-time is an interesting theory; where did you come across it? Space-time are just dimensions of our physical universe. I understand that human purpose/design is generally seen as an event/process involving a temporal component (of this I anticipated your concern), but I don't think any theologian would presume to reduce a characteristic assigned to the root cause of our reality to our phenomenological experience of the concept. They certainly wouldn't presume that the root cause existed in a realm with matter, space, and time - in any ordinary sense of these words. Furthermore, it can be demonstrated that a set of existants taken for granted by the human brain are not space-time constrained (these are known as non-physical abstract objects).

Had they confirmed an eternal, static universe, with no dependence on specific physical constants, would theism fit the findings better? [personOfSimilarConvictions] is (amongst other things) pointing out that what has been discovered regarding our physical universe is consistent with teleology. I am concerned with an off hand dismissal of this observation - as as true as the anthropic principle is, it is not an explanation for anything in of itself. A positive thesis on existence must still be provided. And its claims will be assessed on their own relative merits.

Regarding the evolution of religion, or its necessity for alignment with science; while I agree with the basic tenant of adjusting philosophical beliefs based on empirical evidence, I am not sure if it is entirely accurate. It appears to be a generalisation (based on popular perception rather than actual intellectual dialogue), while being largely irrelevant to the content presented by the post. I am still waiting for a demonstration of the religion is a necessary evil generalisation; are they by chance related?

At what stage has anyone attempted to prove scientifically the existence of a god? God being by definition non-physical (having created physical reality), cannot be empirically observed. The fact a concept is not empirically verifiable however doesn't stop people thinking about it. You are making a number of non-empirical assumptions in our conversation;
- that logic exists, and that I will respond to such deductions.
- that I exist; and am not just an intelligent machine (philosophical zombie).
- that even though a root cause of our experienced existence may well exist, it is less complex than we are, or otherwise cares little with how its creatures respond to it.

Reducing the relevance of Aristotelean philosophy to arbitrary cosmological models is interesting, but you should probably read more of him to understand the expectations he had for his readers.

While deism is not new, simulation is relatively new (being dependent on the concept of computation), and not directly relevant to the conversation. I concur with [personOfSimilarConvictions] that simulation is not interesting because it is necessitated by the anthropomorphised "fine tuning" of our physical universe, it is interesting because people are coming to recognise the laws of our universe as indicative of or otherwise consistent with simulation and therefore design.

---
http://classics.mit.edu/Aristotle/metaphysics.mb.txt

"But again it is not the case that all things are at rest or in motion sometimes, and nothing for ever; for there is something which always moves the things that are in motion, and the first mover is itself unmoved."

...

"The words 'prior' and 'posterior' are applied (1) to some things (on the assumption that there is a first, i.e. a beginning, in each class) because they are nearer some beginning determined either absolutely and by nature, or by reference to something or in some place or by certain people; e.g. things are prior in place because they are nearer either to some place determined by nature (e.g. the middle or the last place), or to some chance object; and that which is farther is posterior.-Other things are prior in time; some by being farther from the present, i.e. in the case of past events (for the Trojan war is prior to the Persian, because it is farther from the present), others by being nearer the present, i.e. in the case of future events (for the Nemean games are prior to the Pythian, if we treat the present as beginning and first point, because they are nearer the present).-Other things are prior in movement; for that which is nearer the first mover is prior (e.g. the boy is prior to the man); and the prime mover also is a beginning absolutely.-Others are prior in power; for that which exceeds in power, i.e. the more powerful, is prior; and such is that according to whose will the other-i.e. the posterior-must follow, so that if the prior does not set it in motion the other does not move, and if it sets it in motion it does move; and here will is a beginning.-Others are prior in arrangement; these are the things that are placed at intervals in reference to some one definite thing according to some rule, e.g. in the chorus the second man is prior to the third, and in the lyre the second lowest string is prior to the lowest; for in the one case the leader and in the other the middle string is the beginning.
These, then, are called prior in this sense, but (2) in another sense that which is prior for knowledge is treated as also absolutely prior; of these, the things that are prior in definition do not coincide with those that are prior in relation to perception. For in definition universals are prior, in relation to perception individuals. And in definition also the accident is prior to the whole, e.g. 'musical' to 'musical man', for the definition cannot exist as a whole without the part; yet musicalness cannot exist unless there is some one who is musical.
3. The attributes of prior things are called prior, e.g. straightness is prior to smoothness; for one is an attribute of a line as such, and the other of a surface.
Some things then are called prior and posterior in this sense, others (4) in respect of nature and substance, i.e. those which can be without other things, while the others cannot be without them,-a distinction which Plato used. (If we consider the various senses of 'being', firstly the subject is prior, so that substance is prior; secondly, according as potency or complete reality is taken into account, different things are prior, for some things are prior in respect of potency, others in respect of complete reality, e.g. in potency the half line is prior to the whole line, and the part to the whole, and the matter to the concrete substance, but in complete reality these are posterior; for it is only when the whole has been dissolved that they will exist in complete reality.) In a sense, therefore, all things that are called prior and posterior are so called with reference to this fourth sense; for some things can exist without others in respect of generation, e.g. the whole without the parts, and others in respect of dissolution, e.g. the part without the whole. And the same is true in all other cases."

...

"This, then, is plain, that we are not inquiring why he who is a man is a man. We are inquiring, then, why something is predicable of something (that it is predicable must be clear; for if not, the inquiry is an inquiry into nothing). E.g. why does it thunder? This is the same as 'why is sound produced in the clouds?' Thus the inquiry is about the predication of one thing of another. And why are these things, i.e. bricks and stones, a house? Plainly we are seeking the cause. And this is the essence (to speak abstractly), which in some cases is the end, e.g. perhaps in the case of a house or a bed, and in some cases is the first mover; for this also is a cause. But while the efficient cause is sought in the case of genesis and destruction, the final cause is sought in the case of being also."

...

"According to this argument, then, it is obvious that actuality is prior in substantial being to potency; and as we have said, one actuality always precedes another in time right back to the actuality of the eternal prime mover.
But (b) actuality is prior in a stricter sense also; for eternal things are prior in substance to perishable things, and no eternal thing exists potentially..."

"... the final cause - for that is the nature of the good, and this is found in the field of action and movement; and it is the first mover-for that is the nature of the end-but in the case of things unmovable there is nothing that moved them first."

...

"That a final cause may exist among unchangeable entities is shown by the distinction of its meanings. For the final cause is (a) some being for whose good an action is done, and (b) something at which the action aims; and of these the latter exists among unchangeable entities though the former does not. The final cause, then, produces motion as being loved, but all other things move by being moved. Now if something is moved it is capable of being otherwise than as it is. Therefore if its actuality is the primary form of spatial motion, then in so far as it is subject to change, in this respect it is capable of being otherwise,-in place, even if not in substance. But since there

is something which moves while itself unmoved, existing actually, this can in no way be otherwise than as it is. For motion in space is the first of the kinds of change, and motion in a circle the first kind of spatial motion; and this the first mover produces. The first mover, then, exists of necessity; and in so far as it exists by necessity, its mode of being is good, and it is in this sense a first principle. For the necessary has all these senses-that which is necessary perforce because it is contrary to the natural impulse, that without which the good is impossible, and that which cannot be otherwise but can exist only in a single way.

On such a principle, then, depend the heavens and the world of nature. And it is a life such as the best which we enjoy, and enjoy for but a short time (for it is ever in this state, which we cannot be), since its actuality is also pleasure. (And for this reason are waking, perception, and thinking most pleasant, and hopes and memories are so on account of these.) And thinking in itself deals with that which is best in itself, and that which is thinking in the fullest sense with that which is best in the fullest sense. And thought thinks on itself because it shares the nature of the object of thought; for it becomes an object of thought in coming into contact with and thinking its objects, so that thought and object of thought are the same. For that which is capable of receiving the object of thought, i.e. the essence, is thought. But it is active when it possesses this object. Therefore the possession rather than the receptivity is the divine element which thought seems to contain, and the act of contemplation is what is most pleasant and best. If, then, God is always in that good state in which we sometimes are, this compels our wonder; and if in a better this compels it yet more. And God is in a better state. And life also belongs to God; for the actuality of thought is life, and God is that actuality; and God's self-dependent actuality is life most good and eternal. We say therefore that God is a living being, eternal, most good, so that life and duration continuous and eternal belong to God; for this is God.

Those who suppose, as the Pythagoreans and Speusippus do, that supreme beauty and goodness are not present in the beginning, because the beginnings both of plants and of animals are causes, but beauty and completeness are in the effects of these, are wrong in their opinion. For the seed comes from other individuals which are prior and complete, and the first thing is not seed but the complete being; e.g. we must say that before the seed there is a man,-not the man produced from the seed, but another from whom the seed comes.

It is clear then from what has been said that there is a substance which is eternal and unmovable and separate from sensible things. It has been shown also that this substance cannot have any magnitude, but is without parts and indivisible (for it produces movement through infinite time, but nothing finite has infinite power; and, while every magnitude is either infinite or finite, it cannot, for the above reason, have finite magnitude, and it cannot have infinite magnitude because there is no infinite magnitude at all). But it has also been shown that it is impassive and unalterable; for all the other changes are posterior to change of place."

=== Argument ===

//Rhetoric

I think there is a difference between using emotion to persuade and expressing emotion (arguments should not be based on emotion)

//Ground shifting (argument/logical fallacy)
An introduction to ground shifting.

Elementary ground shifting: simply ignore rebuttals to your argument and create a new argument.
Remembrall ground shifting: create a new definition for x which contradicts your original definition and pretend that you never defined x as such.
Elite ground shifting: decide that you are too good for logic and publicise your opponent's opinions on a related topic out of context.
1984 ground shifting: implicitly convey the consensus of the inquisitorial squad being that it is unethical to express any opinion the matter (e.g. the evolutionary, zoological, or psychological abnormality of sexual desire being exclusively directed towards arbitrary objects).

Ultimate ground shifting: state that there is no absolute truth, and logic only exists in so far as it can communicate the absolute truth of this sentence.

//ground shifting (continued)

Unsatisfactory toy ground shifting: claim that you or another person are being victimised by the expression of an idea.
Academic ground shifting: claim that everything is too complicated to be understood by the masses, and so it [is] not worth them attempting to find the truth.

//Reason
[in response to question: 'what would he consider absurdities?']

The witness of a proposition or action requiring a very low probability threshold to be taken as true or consistent with reality. It would be absurd if there were more than one general definition of absurdity, but the perception of absurdity is subject to the data at hand.

//Science
The whole issue is that science is supposed to be separate from philosophy (it has a very defined method and criterion). I would say; science interpreted as philosophy is the opium of the suburbs.

//Language
I think there was a time when people cared for the preservation of language and despite losses in transcription/press/literature essential meanings were maintained. But in the postmodern midst language has become just another tool to condition minds, and clear our conscience.

A classic example is the denomination of sexual relations in human beings as "sex". To reduce the most powerful, intimate, and naturally life changing experience to a three letter word; you know there is something not right upstairs. Similar defecations have been committed with other three letter words.

"Real names tell you the story of the things they belong to in my language, in the Old Entish as you might say. It is a lovely language, but it takes a very long time to say anything in it, because we do not say anything in it, unless it is worth taking a long time to say, and to listen to."

//Offence
I think that the west has traditionally been raised to believe that prospective offence (while important; an ancient animalistic response that must be respected) should have no bearing on whether we conclude that a=b. Furthermore, the expression of such antisocial sentiments may be against our nature, however this does not mean it is either correct or prudent to restrict these.

Offence has traditionally been considered a direct consequence of trespass against others (manipulating someone for our own gain). Yet as the west has completely failed in this regard, and has taken it as their material right to manipulate people, with mass conformity to the tolerance of such manipulation, people have moved beyond evil and found new ways of taking offence.

If offence becomes predicated on the expression of a belief, it is open to extortion. A sophisticated three year old might wish to protect an ill founded meme of which they are utterly unable to defend by crying whenever another expresses something to the contrary.

//Assertiveness
People who are afraid of making enemies shouldn't be making a point.

It doesn't follow that people who are not afraid of making enemies should be making a point (ie any point they like). Rather, people who are not strongly convicted in the truth of what they are saying and the importance of what is being said (irrespective of people's reaction to it) shouldn't be saying it.

Unless of course an even smarter person walked into the room who knew they were the smartest. "Stupid" people generally don't claim to be the smartest, they just think everyone is equally disillusioned as themselves. Of course, it increases their effective reproductive fitness if they can bring everyone down to the same level.

//Compromise
I completely disagree with this approach [personOfOtherConvictions]. History will look back with favour on the champions, not the luke warm.

...

We shouldn't underestimate how many times that excuse has been used in history, and how many innocent lives were lost in the process.

//Relativism
The video is fine, but the sciencealert post about truth being subjective is categorical nonsense. It is a classic example of injecting philosophy into science (interpreting science based on wild philosophical presuppositions and then alerting people about your "science").

(NB some of the experiments quoted don't actually demonstrate the effects of cognitive ease; as they appear to be confounding trust - however the familiarity effect itself is probably robust).

//Tolerance
What is wrong with this statement?; We shouldn't do anything which might make someone feel bad.

Yeah our feelings are determined to a large (although non-exclusive) extent by our beliefs.

It is not a universal moral principle, it is an intersex norm (and stereotypically feminine with respect to direct consequences - probably for evolutionary reasons). Which begs the question, does a (nonprofessional) intersex environment discourage argument which is otherwise necessary to determine truth?

//Emotion
If it sounds right then it is probably good, if it feels good then it is probably wrong.

//Tolerance
Let it be

//Conformity
[in response to https://m.youtube.com/watch?v=MEhSk71gUCQ]

        What is particularly surprising about these studies is that they occur without any obvious conditioning. People's desire for social acceptance is so strong that they do not need behaviours to be punished/reenforced, merely modelled to them. Perhaps a child who had never experienced the social consequences of non-conformity (conditioning) would be immune to the manipulation.

        Or language/custom familiarity

The effect they are demonstrating (conformity) has been well tested in other contexts. I think this is an interesting variation on Asch/Moscovici; although I would want to see it replicated.

Nor do they call it "Christmas" for nothing.

//Imperfect world hypothesis
Medicine sees the human body as a problem, engineering sees it as a solution.

//Argumentative tactics (/Rules for Radicals)

While I didn't find anything obviously wrong with any examples Ben gave I don't think we should ever resort to old testament tactics (however apparently effective), as the ultimate good will always win. Using ad hominem as a rhetorical tool to illuminate another's non-argument appears to be loving however; and as [personOfSimilarConvictions] points out perhaps this was the moral framework provided.

Watching that so called minister and mother talk down Katy Faust is probably about the most disgusting thing I have seen in years. Again, evidencing why I have excommunicated the prostitution promoting ABC. I love the "American evangelical clap trap" ad hominem - the poor wretch couldn't hold himself back.

Yeah an eye for an eye is never going to solve anything; though I don't think Ben is advocating the principle. What seems to be implied is never backing down from a moral attack (with respect to safeguarding some truth). I thought I would give the whole ad hominem for ad hominem a go, and even that didn't seem right (however much I believe in the correctness of the wretchedness assessment; ie depression due to disintegration). Something in me feels the ultimate response in such situations is just to do what she did - smile and take pity on the sinner. Any suggestions?

//Anti-science claims

[Regarding https://mobile.twitter.com/theweeklytv/status/857190651896578048/video/1]

Conclusive papers?

Their best predictions/models perhaps - science of its very nature is revisionary

//Relativism

"For he who says that everything is true makes even the statement contrary to his own true, and therefore his own not true (for the contrary statement denies that it is true), while he who says everything is false makes himself also false."
-- Aristotle (Metaphysics)

---
https://philosophynow.org/issues/106/Theories_That_Refute_Themselves

---
The contextual key is "deals in";

Obi-Wan: I have failed you, Anakin. I have failed you.
Anakin Skywalker: I should have known the Jedi were plotting to take over!
Obi-Wan: Anakin, Chancellor Palpatine is evil!
Anakin Skywalker: From my point of view, the Jedi are evil!
Obi-Wan: Well, then you are lost!
Anakin Skywalker: [raises his lightsaber] This is the end for you, my master.

//Cognitive Bias
[Regarding https://www.facebook.com/photo.php?
fbid=10155318292047834&set=a.10155318291427834.1073741894.522192833&type=3]

I actually think that this applies to all cognitive biases; they exist for a reason (they are adaptive under limited computational resources).

//Conformity/Consistent minority
Note these two effects (techniques of persuasion) are real and are known as the consistent minority and conformity respectively, but I must admit I have never heard of a study where they have been used together (doublethink).

//Conformity
There was a silence. The old man did not move in his chair. At length Gandalf spoke. 'Hail, Theoden son of Thengel! I have returned. For behold! the storm comes, and now all friends should gather together, lest each singly be destroyed.'

Slowly the old man rose to his feet, leaning heavily upon a short black staff with a handle of white bone; and now the strangers saw that, bent though he was, he was still tall and must in youth have been high and proud indeed.

'I greet you,' he said, 'and maybe you look for welcome. But truth to tell your welcome is doubtful here, Master Gandalf. You have ever been a herald of woe. Troubles follow you like crows, and ever the oftener the worse. I will not deceive you: when I heard that Shadowfax had come back riderless, I rejoiced at the return of the horse, but still more at the lack of the rider; and when Eomer brought the tidings that you had gone at last to your long home, I did not mourn. But news from afar is seldom sooth. Here you come again! And with you come evils worse than before, as might be expected. Why should I welcome you, Gandalf Stormcrow? Tell me that.' Slowly he sat down again in his chair.

'You speak justly, lord,' said the pale man sitting upon the steps of the dais. 'It is not yet five days since the bitter tidings came that Theodred your son was slain upon the West Marches: your right hand, Second Marshal Of the Mark. In Eomer there is little trust. Few men would be left to guard your walls, if he had been allowed to rule. And even now we learn from Gondor that the Dark Lord is stirring in the East. Such is the hour in which this wanderer chooses to return. Why indeed should we welcome you, Master Stormcrow? Lathspell I name you, Ill-news; and ill news is an ill guest they say.' He laughed grimly, as he lifted his heavy lids for a moment and gazed on the strangers with dark eyes.

'You are held wise, my friend Wormtongue, and are doubtless a great support to your master,' answered Gandalf in a soft voice. 'Yet in two ways may a man come with evil tidings. He may be a worker of evil; or he may be such as leaves well alone, and comes only to bring aid in time of need.'

'That is so,' said Wormtongue; 'but there is a third kind: pickers of bones, meddlers in other men's sorrows, carrion-fowl that grow fat on war. What aid have you ever brought, Stormcrow? And what aid do you bring now? It was aid from us that you sought last time that you were here. Then my lord bade you choose any horse that you would and be gone; and to the wonder of all you took Shadowfax in your insolence. My lord was sorely grieved; yet to some it seemed that to speed you from the land the price was not too great. I guess that it is likely to turn out the same once more: you will seek aid rather than render it. Do you bring men? Do you bring horses, swords, spears? That I would call aid; that is our present need. But who are these that follow at your tail? Three ragged wanderers in grey, and you yourself the most beggar-like of the four!'

'The courtesy of your hall is somewhat lessened of late, Theoden son of Thengel,' said Gandalf. 'Has not the messenger from your gate reported the names of my companions? Seldom has any lord of Rohan received three such guests. Weapons they have laid at your doors that are worth many a mortal man, even the mightiest. Grey is their raiment, for the Elves clad them, and thus they have passed through the shadow of great perils to your hall.'

=== Child Abuse ===

//Roman Catholic child abuse

You do realise that what you have called child abuse is actually called homosexuality in other cultures? This wouldn't be a conflict of interest had you not been suggesting that their religion condone it. Otherwise, your example remains an inexcusable evil (in an organisation that has no excuse by any standard), but can't be used to make a point about the dangers of religion relative to secularism. It does however question the moral relativism of your analysis.

Also, it is implied that your model (secularisation of the golden rule) can overcome this tragic inequality and protect both women and children from exploitation. Given that child abuse and homicide is 40-100x higher in households without both genetic parents (the presence of a step parent), and that the current rate of sexual abuse in females is between 30% and 80% (depending on the environment), it might be worth providing a more comprehensive appraisal of the situation...

//Religious Leadership

... As you have previously identified [personOfOtherConvictions], the real problem with religious child abuse is that it is diabolical with respect to their belief system: it shouldn't exist at all. With respect to the homosexual abuse epidemic, compromises have been made in the past (especially during the sexual revolution) to initiates with addiction/affection disorders; apparently out of love. This is why "love" is cheap without morality (and prudence).

//Child objectification

https://www.change.org/p/annastacia-palaszczuk-the-premier-of-queensland-child-sex-dolls-are-not-a-game?
recruiter=154168030&utm_source=share_petition&utm_medium=copylink

---
I think it is less a question of how much one can misappropriate the scientific method, and more a question of whether one would be willing to leave their/a child washed up on a deserted island with a child pornography offender. No one has conducted a controlled longitudinal study on the influence of legalising virtual child pornography on contact child sexual abuse. Perhaps we should do what is done all the time (through the misapplication of the scientific method) and conduct the study on our entire population? By the time we are finished the definition of mental health will have changed (because the norm has to be healthy silly), and we won't even need the study anymore.

Here are some observations (from searching 'psychology "child pornography" pedophile');

Child pornography offending is a stronger diagnostic indicator of pedophilia than is sexually offending against child victims.
Seto, M. C., Cantor, J. M., & Blanchard, R. (2006). Child pornography offenses are a valid diagnostic indicator of pedophilia. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 115(3), 610.
Neutze, J., Grundmann, D., Scherner, G., & Beier, K. M. (2012). Undetected and detected child sexual abuse and child pornography offenders. International journal of law and psychiatry, 35(3), 168-175. [see emotional victim empathy deficits]

Between 5% and 95% of convicted child pornography offenders have or will commit a contact child sexual offence.
Eke, A. W., Seto, M. C., & Williams, J. (2011). Examining the criminal history and future offending of child pornography offenders: An extended prospective follow-up study. Law and human behavior, 35(6), 466-478.
Bourke, M. L., & Hernandez, A. E. (2009). The 'Butner Study' redux: A report of the incidence of hands-on child victimization by child pornography offenders. Journal of Family Violence, 24(3), 183-191.
Williams, K. S. (2004). Child pornography law: Does it protect children?. The Journal of Social Welfare & Family Law, 26(3), 245-261.

There is an association between child pornography consumption and self-report likelihood to have sex with a child aged 12-14, and likelihood to have sex with a child 12 or less.
Seto, M. C., Hermann, C. A., Kjellgren, C., Priebe, G., Svedin, C. G., & Långström, N. (2015). Viewing child pornography: Prevalence and correlates in a representative community sample of young Swedish men. Archives of sexual behavior, 44(1), 67-79.

Mixed (pornographic+contact) child abuse offenders have a higher risk than exclusively pornographic or contact child abuse offenders.
Seto, M. C., & Eke, A. W. (2005). The criminal histories and later offending of child pornography offenders. Sexual abuse: a journal of research and treatment, 17(2), 201-210.
Babchishin, K. M., Hanson, R. K., & VanZuylen, H. (2015). Online child pornography offenders are different: A meta-analysis of the characteristics of online and offline sex offenders against children. Archives of

Individual differences in whether child pornography results in cross-over (contact offences).
Quayle, E., & Taylor, M. (2002). Child pornography and the Internet: Perpetuating a cycle of abuse. Deviant Behavior, 23(4), 331-361.
McCarthy, J. A. (2010). Internet sexual activity: A comparison between contact and non-contact child pornography offenders. Journal of Sexual Aggression, 16(2), 181-195.
Beech, A. R., Elliott, I. A., Birgden, A., & Findlater, D. (2008). The internet and child sexual offending: A criminological review. Aggression and violent behavior, 13(3), 216-228.
Houtepen, J. A., Sijtsema, J. J., & Bogaerts, S. (2014). From child pornography offending to child sexual abuse: A review of child pornography offender characteristics and risks for cross-over. Aggression and violent behavior, 19(5), 466-473.

Group similarities between pornographic and contact child abuse offenders.
Neutze, J., Seto, M. C., Schaefer, G. A., Mundt, I. A., & Beier, K. M. (2010). Predictors of child pornography offenses and child sexual abuse in a community sample of pedophiles and hebephiles. Sexual abuse: a journal of research and treatment, 1079063210382043.
Webb, L., Craissati, J., & Keen, S. (2007). Characteristics of internet child pornography offenders: A comparison with child molesters. Sexual abuse: a journal of research and treatment, 19(4), 449-465.

Neutze, J., Grundmann, D., Scherner, G., & Beier, K. M. (2012). Undetected and detected child sexual abuse and child pornography offenders. International journal of law and psychiatry, 35(3), 168-175.
Reijnen, L., Bulten, E., & Nijman, H. (2009). Demographic and personality characteristics of Internet child pornography downloaders in comparison to other offenders. Journal of child sexual abuse, 18(6), 611-622.

Group differences between pornographic and contact child abuse offenders.
Webb, L., Craissati, J., & Keen, S. (2007). Characteristics of internet child pornography offenders: A comparison with child molesters. Sexual abuse: a journal of research and treatment, 19(4), 449-465.
Elliott, I. A., Beech, A. R., Mandeville-Norden, R., & Hayes, E. (2009). Psychological Profiles of Internet Sexual Offenders Comparisons With Contact Sexual Offenders. Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment, 21(1), 76-92.
Henshaw, M., Ogloff, J. R., & Clough, J. A. (2015). Looking Beyond the Screen A Critical Review of the Literature on the Online Child Pornography Offender. Sexual abuse: a journal of research and treatment, 1079063215603690.

//Roman Catholic child abuse
What has home insulation (whatever this is) got to do with the sodomisation of pubescent males? Has the media found a connection worth exploring? I agree that one is (must necessarily be) far worse than the other, but I also recognise that our society's response to the latter is a direct consequence of the formation of the Roman Catholic Church. For how long it will retain this response is unknown.

It is somewhat ironic to bring the heart into it, because it was the misapproximation of the heart that caused the influx of this perversion. Or if a more general child abuse response is being referred to, why be so specific (apart from saving oneself the trouble of having to respond?)

//Dawkins child abuse
I would recommend reading the book (the God Delusion; with your brains on of course) as it makes a lot more sense in context. At least a surface level reading of the text indicates that he is making a point about religion.

I am open to the possibility that "mild" (non-violent) tactile stimuli for pre-pubescent boys would not cause the same degree of harm as other instances of sexual abuse (for females, older males, with alternate stimuli, etc), as it may well not lead to sexual stimulation and therefore addiction. Conversely, showing a pre-pubescent male child forms of ostensibly sanctioned dehumanising material (pornography) might have more harmful consequences (there are records of this being quite damaging here in TSR articles).

Likewise, there are obvious psychological consequences of sexual violation on sense of determination/volition etc independent of affective sexual experience which should not be underestimated. Again, these might be more damaging for females (in this case being the more genetically vulnerable and therefore phenotypically "fairer" sex, rather than having any specific relation to stimuli).

I am somewhat concerned for Dawkins' failure to acknowledge/discuss these more general consequences independently. I might have excused a psychologist from this deficiency of analytical depth (they can after all only discuss so much evolution as their theoretically challenged ethics boards allow), but for an evolutionary theorist this is a pretty basic oversight. It might signify a devalument of free will that has occurred for him in the past.

Similarly, I don't mind him making the proposition that religion itself could be more harmful than the identified form of sexual abuse. Corrupt religion certainly can be very harmful, and this is a subjective assessment (until studied empirically).

What I am most concerned about however is Dawkins' implicit generalisation of the phenomenon across sex and stimuli, or his failure to acknowledge/discuss this. This confirms that his evolutionary reasoning is lacking, but moreover, that he may well have a disorder resultant from a failure to appreciate developmental and/or affectual differences across sex. An appreciation of or empathy of another's differences is critical in dealing with aversive behaviours (the alternative is repression, or moral regression; eg gossip). Likewise, failure to partial out a social ignorance in this respect might well taint his evaluation of religion or its feasibility beyond his culture. Such would prevent him from recognising religion as a universally engaged assimilation of philosophical truth (which is only diminished in sexualised/sexually obsessed, interpersonally ignorant cultures).

When it comes to the wholesale promotion of male pedophilia, I would be more concerned with its traditional (cf Ancient Greece) and contemporary advocates (taking child pornography rates as an indicator; independent of militia doctrine). In this respect, Dawkins' appraisal of exclusive homosexuality in Homo sapiens is probably his greatest inconsistency in application of evolutionary reasoning within TGD (or is otherwise indicative of his utter contempt for the process which he advocates created him). Moreover, it is categorically weird; a contextual anomaly where expressed, and signifies a possible attempt to shield himself from the logical consequences of rigorous scientific treatment. An honest analysis would have attempted to reconcile the exclusive homosexuality enigma with the homosexual child abuse he later discusses, rather than defending the abuse consequent of the disordering of the very process he exalts.

Likewise, if he were a little more open minded as to the philosophical interpretation of natural selection, and humble as to our computational understanding of the process (which is pretty much non-existent, to the extent where we cannot even verify whether it is Darwinian), perhaps he wouldn't feel the need to belittle child sexual abuse in an attempt to chastise a supposed God delusion. He might have even found some spare pages to demonstrate why religious belief were delusional rather than natural, as his colleagues tend to conclude (Bloom 2007). If he were even more adept at comparative delusion (aka philosophy) he might have discussed why his belief in himself is not delusional, and what empirical evidence do I have that it is not.

NB a non-surface level interpretation; his hatred of religion can't be reduced to his hatred of his child abuse by his religion.

//Religious Demographics

It is a sad but inevitable reality that people are unwilling to associate themselves with an institution invaded by evil. This is the same evil which presumes to take marriage as biologically mutable, and sexuality as a toy.

//Roman Catholic Child Abuse

... I think the media sensationalism could have been avoided if they were honest about the nature of the problem; both US and my own Australian research indicates 75% of the child abuse is by homosexual or sexually indiscriminate oriented offenders. And not clearly proclaiming the fact that sex identity (gender) is a consequence of being responsibility for the opposite sex has made conservatives (inc. many protestants) lose respect for them. Any concept of sex identity divorced from responsibility is disordered.

... Note I was referring specifically to child abuse committed by members of the Catholic church (and the target profiles of the offenders). My own analysis (April 2014) using data sourced from brokenrites.org indicated that 80% of alleged or convicted child abuse offenders in the Australian catholic church were either homosexually oriented or indiscriminate in their preference (n=333; 239 were exclusively involved in homosexual abuse, 56 were exclusively involved in heterosexual abuse, and 29 were indiscriminate in their choice). Likewise, the 2011 John Jay Report demonstrated that 80 percent of sexual abuse cases in the US Catholic Church involved abuse of post-pubescent males.

There is also an association between homosexual orientation more generally and child abuse;

1) Homosexual child abuse comprises around 30% of total child abuse, while male homosexuality (base rate) itself represents only 2-4% of the population.
Pereda, N., Guilera, G., Forns, M., & Gómez-Benito, J. (2009). The prevalence of child sexual abuse in community and student samples: A meta-analysis. Clinical psychology review, 29(4), 328-338.
    https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0272735809000245
Dunne, M. P., Purdie, D. M., Cook, M. D., Boyle, F. M., & Najman, J. M. (2003). Is child sexual abuse declining? Evidence from a population-based survey of men and women in Australia. Child Abuse & Neglect, 27(2), 141-152.
    https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0145213402005392
Goldman, R. J., & Goldman, J. D. (1988). The prevalence and nature of child sexual abuse in Australia. Australian Journal of Sex, Marriage and Family, 9(2), 94-106.
    http://psycnet.apa.org/record/1989-19287-001
Finkelhor, D., Shattuck, A., Turner, H. A., & Hamby, S. L. (2014). The lifetime prevalence of child sexual abuse and sexual assault assessed in late adolescence. Journal of Adolescent Health, 55(3), 329-333.
    https://www.jahonline.org/article/S1054-139X(13)00854-9/fulltext
McGee, H., Garavan, R., Byrne, J., O'Higgins, M., & Conroy, R. M. (2010). Secular trends in child and adult sexual violence-one decreasing and the other increasing: a population survey in Ireland. European journal of public health, 21(1), 98-103.
    https://academic.oup.com/eurpub/article/21/1/98/474261

2) Approximately 50% of institutionalised child abuse offenders are homosexually oriented or indiscriminate in their preference.

3) Homosexual child pornography engagement is overrepresented by a factor of 3-10x.
Neutze, J., Grundmann, D., Scherner, G., & Beier, K. M. (2012). Undetected and detected child sexual abuse and child pornography offenders. International journal of law and psychiatry, 35(3), 168-175.
    https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0160252712000192
    - 36% of people who view child pornography (detected and non-detected) are homosexually attracted, and 10% are attracted to both males and females (i.e. 46% of child pornography users are not exclusively attracted to females).
Seto, M. C., Hermann, C. A., Kjellgren, C., Priebe, G., Svedin, C. G., & Långström, N. (2015). Viewing child pornography: Prevalence and correlates in a representative community sample of young Swedish men. Archives of sexual behavior, 44(1), 67-79.
    https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10508-013-0244-4
    - People who view child pornography are 3.38x more likely to engage (/have engaged) in homosexual behaviour.

It is theorised that the association between homosexuality and child abuse relates to one aspect (contributing factor) of the underlying condition: a desire for power/domination/objectification/control, as realised through classical Greek/Roman homosexual relations. Homosexual relations are also discrepant with respect to the natural function of intercourse (reproduction), and necessitate hedonism (for at least one actor) rather than a mutual/simultaneous desire to please and honour the other person. A young male also does not exhibit strong male characteristics, and so has the capability of being treated (by a disordered individual's reptilian brain) like a female. For these reasons, it is not surprising that the object of choice is somewhat more arbitrary compared to that typically experienced within heterosexual relations.

The even stronger association observed between homosexuality and child abuse in the Catholic church is probably related to the fact clergy have been encouraging homosexually oriented individuals to enter their ranks (between 196x-200x) rather than critiquing the nature of the condition;

1) Natural function of exclusive homosexuality:
Exclusive homosexuality is evolutionarily non-adaptive. All things being equal; if exclusive homosexuality were 100% genetic, it would be a fatal mutation and die out. The underlying allele(s) responsible for its exhibition may however confer some other adaptive trait (e.g. the mother's fecundity). That is, the genotype is responsible for multiple independent (unrelated) phenotypes, some of which are adaptive and others which are not;
 Chaladze, G. (2016). Heterosexual Male Carriers Could Explain Persistence of Homosexuality in Men: Individual-Based Simulations of an X-Linked Inheritance Model. Archives of sexual behavior, 45(7), 1705-1711.
    https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10508-016-0742-2

2) Natural prevalence of exclusive homosexuality:
As predicted by evolutionary theory, exclusive homosexuality is extremely rare in the animal kingdom. As of 2015, exclusive homosexuality has not been observed in non-domesticated mammals. The only known mammalian species to exhibit this trait are Homo sapiens and Ovis aries (approximately 10% of domesticated sheep with a hypothalamic anomaly). Although this could pertain to an unrelated mutation, the preoptic area/anterior hypothalamus might provide an animal model for a sexually dimorphic nucleus in human beings (for male exclusive homosexuality);
Byne, W., Tobet, S., Mattiace, L. A., Lasco, M. S., Kemether, E., Edgar, M. A., ... & Jones, L. B. (2001). The interstitial nuclei of the human anterior hypothalamus: an investigation of variation with sex, sexual orientation, and HIV status. Hormones and Behavior, 40(2), 86-92.
    https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0018506X01916800

Roselli, C. E., Larkin, K., Schrunk, J. M., & Stormshak, F. (2004). Sexual partner preference, hypothalamic morphology and aromatase in rams. Physiology & behavior, 83(2), 233-245.

- "Recently, we identified a sexually dimorphic nucleus (oSDN) in the sheep preoptic area/anterior hypothalamus. The oSDN is larger in female-oriented rams than in male-oriented rams and similar in size in male-oriented rams and ewes. In addition, mRNA levels for aromatase in the oSDN were higher in males than in females and were higher in female-oriented rams than in male-oriented rams."

Roselli, C. E., Larkin, K., Resko, J. A., Stellflug, J. N., & Stormshak, F. (2004). The volume of a sexually dimorphic nucleus in the ovine medial preoptic area/anterior hypothalamus varies with sexual partner preference. Endocrinology, 145(2), 478-483.

- "Approximately 8% of rams exhibit sexual preferences for male partners (male-oriented rams) in contrast to most rams, which prefer female partners (female-oriented rams). We identified a cell group within the medial preoptic area/anterior hypothalamus of age-matched adult sheep that was significantly larger in adult rams than in ewes. This cell group was labeled the ovine sexually dimorphic nucleus (oSDN). In addition to a sex difference, we found that the volume of the oSDN was two times greater in female-oriented rams than in male-oriented rams. The dense cluster of neurons that comprise the oSDN express cytochrome P450 aromatase. Aromatase mRNA levels in the oSDN were significantly greater in female-oriented rams than in ewes, whereas male-oriented rams exhibited intermediate levels of expression."

https://academic.oup.com/endo/article/145/2/478/2499800

Poiani, A., & Dixson, A. F. (2010). Animal homosexuality: a biosocial perspective. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- "This makes O. aries (ram) only the second mammal known, apart from humans, capable of displaying exclusive homosexuality."

3) Natural prevalence of non-exclusive homosexuality:
Indiscriminate sexual relations are rife in the animal kingdom including among our close relatives (primates), so it is not surprising to observe such indiscriminate behaviour in human beings. But we also know that rape is common in the animal kingdom, so not everything that is observed in nature is good for a rational being to engage in (naturalistic fallacy). All candidate adaptive explanations of non-exclusive same-sex attraction are amoral (e.g. overdominance and sexual antagonism);

Hoskins, J. L., Ritchie, M. G., & Bailey, N. W. (2015, June). A test of genetic models for the evolutionary maintenance of same-sex sexual behaviour. In Proc. R. Soc. B (Vol. 282, No. 1809, p. 20150429). The Royal Society.

http://rspb.royalsocietypublishing.org/content/282/1809/20150429

4) The genetic contribution of homosexuality in humans:
The genetic component of homosexuality is relatively low (approx 30% in males and females; female estimations vary significantly). Compare this to the genetic determination of personality (each personality trait being 40-60%), and psychopathy (again approximately 50%). Meaning homosexual behaviour is no more genetically determined than agreeableness, neuroticism, openness, contentiousness, extroversion, or psychopathic behaviour. Note female bisexuality, while more common (~10% prevalence) than exclusive homosexuality in males/females (2-4% prevalence), appears to have a less strong (in some cases measured to be negligible) genetic component;

Eckert, E. D., Bouchard, T. J., Bohlen, J., & Heston, L. L. (1986). Homosexuality in monozygotic twins reared apart. The British Journal of Psychiatry, 148(4), 421-425.

https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/the-british-journal-of-psychiatry/article/homosexuality-in-monozygotic-twins-reared-apart/1143CF20F28736F4BC3721EFF151F4CA

- male homosexual monozygotic concordance rate: 100% (sample size = 1)
- Note the extraordinarily low sample size (1 pair of twins), but it is the only separated-from-birth twin study of homosexuality I have come across, so I have included it for reference.

Långström, N., Rahman, Q., Carlström, E., & Lichtenstein, P. (2010). Genetic and environmental effects on same-sex sexual behavior: A population study of twins in Sweden. Archives of Sexual Behavior, 39(1), 75-80.

https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10508-008-9386-1

- males homosexual behaviour: genetic effects explained 34% of the variance, the shared environment (e.g. parent/upbringing/? prenatal) 0%, and the individual-specific environment (e.g. having different friends at school) 61-66% of the variance.
- female homosexual behaviour: genetic effects explained 18% of the variance, the shared environment (e.g. parent/upbringing/? prenatal) 16%, and the individual-specific environment (e.g. having different friends at school) 64-66% of the variance.

Alanko, K., Santtila, P., Harlaar, N., Witting, K., Varjonen, M., Jern, P., ... & Sandnabba, N. K. (2010). Common genetic effects of gender atypical behavior in childhood and sexual orientation in adulthood: A study of Finnish twins. Archives of Sexual Behavior, 39(1), 81-92.

https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10508-008-9457-3

- males homosexual orientation: genetic effects explained 29% of the variance
- female homosexual orientation: genetic effects explained 46% of the variance

Burri, A., Cherkas, L., Spector, T., & Rahman, Q. (2011). Genetic and environmental influences on female sexual orientation, childhood gender typicality and adult gender identity. PloS one, 6(7), e21982.

http://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0021982

- female homosexual orientation: genetic effects explained 25% of the variance

Limitations of twin studies (genetic contribution determination) for reference;
- Twin studies cannot of themselves rule out a third variable (but still genetic), like physical attractiveness, adaptedness to exertion/fitness, or personality.
- In the case of non-separated (at birth) twin studies the confound potential is even worse, because visually and/or behaviourally (note appearances are strongly genetically determined, and personality is ~50% genetic) similar identical twins may be treated more similarly by their parents (shared environment) than visually/behaviourally discrepant non-identical twins. This is particularly pertinent for traits which have a low base (incidence) rate, because it is really difficult to obtain high enough sample sizes of separated twins who demonstrate such traits.
- Twin studies also can't rule out a prenatal hormonal (not necessarily genetic) effect. 75% of monozygotic (identical) twins share the same placenta, but ~0% (sometimes fused) of dizygotic (non-identical/fraternal) twins share the same placenta. This means that their shared in utero chemical exposure will differ depending on whether they are monozygotic or dizygotic.
- Even in the case where a genetic component of a trait has been identified (established), it doesn't necessarily mean that the trait (its propensity or existence) will be determined by the individual's genetics in every environment. This is because of gene-environment interaction (not to be confused with exclusive environmental effects which affect every individual of a species the same regardless of their genome). Some traits, despite being demonstrably genetically determined, will in many environments be largely (or even exclusively) determined by that environment - for example due to the presence of an environmental catalyst. To use a biological analogy; a DNA readout promoter/blocker. In reality this might be something more like education. Therefore, the absolute genetic component determination calculations (ie x%) are only meaningful for the environment of the population being studied. It might be that there exist (existed) cultures which are so different than ours (that in which the genetics of the trait is being studied) that the trait would never arise, always arise, or be entirely dependent on an environmental factor which is taken for granted as "normal" in our culture - i.e. be measured as 0% genetically determined in their own culture.

5) The prenatal (environmental) contribution of homosexuality in humans (/evolutionary byproducts):

The female index:ring finger ratio ("2D:4D") is associated with prenatal androgen levels and predicts sexual orientation. Likewise, prenatal sexual development could be affected by an maternal immune response;
Williams, T. J., Pepitone, M. E., Christensen, S. E., Cooke, B. M., Huberman, A. D., Breedlove, N. J., ... & Breedlove, S. M. (2000). Finger-length ratios and sexual orientation. Nature, 404(6777), 455.
    https://www.nature.com/articles/35006555
Blanchard, R. (2001). Fraternal birth order and the maternal immune hypothesis of male homosexuality. Hormones and behavior, 40(2), 105-114.

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/11811362_Fraternal_Birth_Order_and_the_Maternal_Immune_Hypothesis_of_Male_Homosex uality

6) The social (environmental) contribution of homosexuality in humans:
 - A study has found no evidence of an association between single parent/mother households and child sexual orientation;
Francis, A. M. (2008). Family and sexual orientation: The family-demographic correlates of homosexuality in men and women. Journal of Sex Research, 45(4), 371-377.
    https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/00224490802398357
 - Social/parental upbringing (e.g. emancipation, sex atypical treatment, dominant mother/submissive father environments, etc)?
 - There is an association between child abuse and sexual orientation;
Bramblett Jr, J. R., & Darling, C. A. (1997). Sexual contacts: Experiences, thoughts, and fantasies of adult male survivors of child sexual abuse. Journal of sex & marital therapy, 23(4), 305-316.
    https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/00926239708403934
    - Among adult male survivors of child abuse 14% perceived themselves as homosexual and 32% as bisexual compared to 88% heterosexual and 12% in a non-abused control group.
Sweet, T., & Welles, S. L. (2012). Associations of sexual identity or same-sex behaviors with history of childhood sexual abuse and HIV/STI risk in the United States. JAIDS Journal of Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndromes, 59(4), 400-408.
    http://journals.lww.com/jaids/Abstract/2012/04010/Associations_of_Sexual_Identity_or_Same_Sex.13.aspx
    - "Overall, 14.9% of women and 5.2% of men reported CSA. Among women, bisexuals, lesbians, and heterosexuals with same-sex partners had 5.3 times, 3.4 times, and 2.9 times the odds, respectively, for CSA occurring sometimes/more frequently (vs. never) compared with heterosexuals not having same-sex partners or attractions. Among men, bisexuals, gay men, and heterosexuals with same-sex partners had 12.8 times, 9.5 times, and 7.9 times the odds, respectively, for CSA." "A much larger proportion sexual minority women reported CSA compared with heterosexual women, with 43.5% of bisexuals, 38.1% of lesbians, and 28% of heterosexuals with same-sex partners reporting any CSA compared with 14.2% of heterosexual women reporting any CSA." "sexual minority men reporting more CSA than heterosexual men, as 19% bisexuals, 18.6% homosexuals, 19.4% heterosexual with same-sex partners, and 4.6% heterosexuals reported any CSA."

In terms of child abuse more generally, children who are living without one or more biological parents are 10x more likely to be sexually abused, 40x more likely to be physically (or sexually) abused, and 100x more likely to be murdered, than those living with both biological parents. This anomaly aligns with evolutionary theory (genetically unrelated offspring are discarded or killed by an incoming dominant male), but is often omitted by developmental/clinical psychology. Note all research conducted/published must pass ethical review boards, and political liberals (US) comprise 95% of the scientific community in the social sciences; this (a selection effect) explains why the clinical literature largely consists of a single narrative;
Russell, D. E. (1984). The prevalence and seriousness of incestuous abuse: Stepfathers vs. biological fathers. Child Abuse & Neglect, 8(1), 15-22.
    https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/0145213484900450
Finkelhor, D., & Baron, L. (1986). Risk factors for child sexual abuse. Journal of interpersonal violence, 1(1), 43-71.
    http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/088626086001001004
Daly, M., & Wilson, M. (1988). Homicide. Transaction Publishers.
Daly, M., & Wilson, M. (1988). Evolutionary social psychology and family homicide. Science, 242(4878), 519-524.
    http://science.sciencemag.org/content/242/4878/519

For reference, there are even more fundamental issues with psychological science pertaining to the methodology of measuring mental health. Currently it is measured (according to the DSM) with respect to social engagement/assimilation, but without reference to whether the society is healthy. So the declassification of traditional sexual disorders (for example, masturbation) could say more about the health of the society than the health of the individual. The NIMH is working on identifying biological/neurological dysfunction for all psychological conditions, like is expected from medical diagnoses. This should certainly help with the objectivity of the mental health classification system, but it is arguable that true health (optimum performance) can only be derived from cognitive and evolutionary theory; what human cognition is best adapted to. Cross-cultural evidence suggests that this might well be logically consistent behaviour (love, responsibility, virtue)...

=== Christianity ===

I actually think they are causally related. The desecration of the sacred makes it difficult to live lives intended for us, which makes us think there is something wrong with creation, so it has to be 6000 years old such that humanity can have altered it irrevocably. God certainly would not have created it in its current state. Accordingly evolutionary theory becomes a threat; even though a day is 1000 thousand years to the Lord and time is a physical construct experienced only by creatures within it. The laws of nature appear incompatible with our experience of God.

The problem is that so much so called "intelligent design" resides on a sola scriptura interpretation, when the biblical records are exactly what they are; records passed down by the church, for many decades orally, whose authority rest in a belief by the church that they are divinely inspired. The same church believed a lot more has been happening over the last 2 millennia, which has enabled integration of philosophical and scientific knowledge into its tradition, and the identification of saints applying their faith in contemporary society. A problem however arises if we believe the declaration of the canon was the last certain act of God. It leads to fundamental interpretations of all scripture whose parts appear to integrate together nicely (like the fall and redemption, often discarding those which do not enable a simple salvation formula, like the intrinsic connection between morality and knowing God), because scripture is believed to have been designed as a single package.

It has to say something big and revelatory, and must be studied. No longer is it read for what it is; finding the good in everything - even in that of the internal struggles of a much older and less enlightened civilisation (one which has experienced less grace). Moral precepts are ignored because they seem incompatible with sola scriptura (a loving God hell bent on handing out tickets to heaven surely wouldn't ask anyone to forgo a love of their own). Likewise, anything not explicitly discussed therein is devalued, and so we fail to notice the development of evils in our own society because they were implicitly taken for granted in scripture..

Furthermore, this interpretation fails to recognise that much of the first 10 chapters of Genesis are found in Mesopotamian mythology (separation of the waters, staged creation with stars serving to mark the seasons, mankind as servants followed by the rest of the gods, tree of life and serpent, loss of innocence, Noah and the flood, and the offerings of two brothers), albeit interpreted from a Jewish perspective. So what is so important is overlooked; the unique development of monotheism amongst a seriously pagan culture. It is not until the early 1st millennium when the moral standards of Judaism (and the contemplatives) finally gain popularity that civilisation starts to transform into Christendom.

The alternative is that everything is purposeful, even suffering. While the purpose of evil is to eliminate it. The construction of "Christians" out of a heretical Christendom is the easy option. It fits nicely into the framework provided 2000 years ago if we can ignore any intermediary inspiration or intellectual development. Christianity pervaded our culture for so many centuries that to give up on those whose parents have been less loyal in a society directed by the propagandist rather than its people and to view them as pagans is perhaps "an invention of the evil one". Yet the same disillusionment infiltrates the secular world. It is excellent that we have started to create new mythologies - but why is it that we interpret the dark arts as being a greater good than our inheritance. What has become of us?

Sacredness serves a function, and is for the most part a psychological one. Chastity is considered sacred because the consequences of taking it are life altering and irrevocable. Churches are sacred because they direct our minds to the excellence of God. Nature is sacred to the extent that it reflects truth and beauty untainted by the corruption of insolent power. The sacraments are sacred because they enable us to not only live but grow in a secular world. Likewise rituals are developed with respect to that considered sacred to direct our minds towards the ultimate good. Adhering to such beliefs and practices is not an end in itself. It enables us to function; not as animals but as human beings.

There may be problems with popular science's attempt to make philosophical claims (they are no better at doing this than anyone else), but this is not necessarily an empirical problem. The point of science is to assume the existence of and search for natural causes. It does not have the tools to investigate anything else. There would be a problem with the discipline if it did. For example, theorising about the existence of worlds that are by definition unobservable and therefore cannot be denied by observation.

which is why the second chapter introduces itself as an independent account..

Relationships which last longer than a night require a form of jealousy.

Joshua is a more likely candidate.

Just speculating here (it is difficult to comment from the inside and a biblical framework sounds realistic); Wouldn't a more general thesis see western development as a consequence of people respecting their ancestors. Given that morality only improves - it does not deteriorate.

---
1. "Morality only improves": Once a moral standard is established, it will remain in memory. Even in a broken world where people have lost respect for their mothers and forefathers, they who experience stories of the free times will idealise them, enabling an opportunity for redemption. There is no going back in this sense.

2. "It does not deteriorate": Any degradation or corruption of truth will be seen for what it is in the present light and never gain status as morality. Only freedom can be compromised, not morality.
3. "Western development as a consequence of people respecting their ancestors": If people's experience of (and therefore capacity for) morality only increases, then respect for ancestors/tradition should see cultural development. Nothing leant or experienced is lost, and every new good thing is integrated into one's existing framework.

I have referenced all the variables required to explain differences in cultural development under this model. Note this is not moral relativism, but a moderate incarnation of moral idealism. Whether some apparent moral development is merely a technological artefact is neutrally questionable, however it is argued that at least some moral development has occurred in human history, and that this (as mediated by respect for ancestors) is the basis for cultural development.

I am of the opinion when that when the underlying motives of moral corruption/degradation are exposed (rather than being hidden and left to be reinforced by people who call manipulative advertising a job; with people saying nothing with respect to evil and those constructs which protect it against our natural inclination to destroy it), there will be nothing left of the occlusion. Although more commonly seen as acceptable/inevitable (often mistaken as natural), liberal sexuality is only perceived to be moral to the extent to which it is being implicitly supported by those who suppose to uphold a moral standard while allowing the youth to be systematically interfered with. The Church is responsible for this in presenting Christianity as an isolated philosophy unreliant on (pre)historic moral standards (and at times even resorts to dehumanisation in the form of repressive doctrine when it is unable to reconcile what it thinks for no sound reason must be tolerated). This does not require compatibilism (the more general framework might), merely acknowledgment of basic evolutionary drives (which were capitalised on by some after being expelled by a psychology/society that was evidently in harmony with nature).

I will try to be a bit clearer [personOfSimilarConvictions] as I am certain this is more complex than social progressivism.

1. "Morality only improves": a culture's (perception of) morality can only improve.
- Whether there is an ultimate moral standard (in which case it is only a perception of moral development) is irrelevant to the argument.
- Furthermore, this is not saying a culture's morality will necessarily improve: a culture's (perception of) morality will not necessarily improve.
- the ability to create a moral standard in a culture requires that people seek truth (Aristotelian definition of man) and desire good.
- "it is argued that at least some moral development has occurred in human history": this model implies (albeit peripherally) that morality has at least one time experienced development (or has been experienced). When, how, and why this has happened is irrelevant to the argument.

2. "It does not deteriorate": a culture's (perception of) morality cannot deteriorate.
- this is saying that once a moral standard had been established (experienced) by a culture, the moral standard can never fall below this level.
- Accordingly, there is always a possibility of redemption (in cases of failure with respect to this standard).
- This is not saying the moral standard can't be occluded or misrepresented, in that it is subconsciously perceived to be something less than it really is.
- It is saying that no logical (explicit) argument can be made for the perversion in light of the knowledge possessed by the civilisation.
- This assumes that a trace will always remain of the moral standard in history/mythology.
- it also assumes that people become wretched when engaging in immoral acts (however they are presented).

3a. "Western development as a consequence of people respecting their ancestors. Given that morality only improves - it does not deteriorate" / "If people's experience of (and therefore capacity for) morality only increases, then respect for ancestors/tradition should see cultural development" /
"Moral development ... (as mediated by respect for ancestors) is the basis for cultural development": It is argued that cultural development depends on a culture's experience of (and therefore capacity for) morality; i.e. that cultural development is a result of moral development. (Furthermore, that this is mediated/facilitated by respect for ancestors; discussed below).

3b. "Western development as a consequence of people respecting their ancestors. Given..." / "then respect for ancestors/tradition should see cultural development" / "(as mediated by respect for ancestors)": Respect for ancestors enables cultural development and prevents cultural deterioration (because the moral standard remains openly declared).
- Moral development is not caused by respect for ancestors.
- Respect for ancestors is not the root cause of social development. Respect for ancestors enables social development by mediating the effects of moral development.

Note an example of social development is the enlightenment, renaissance, or whatever period of western development one happens to identify with. I happen to disagree with the speaker's claim that western development was optimised over the last 500 years or that it has anything to do with the reformation. I think its ~exponential technological development was/is a result of the steady development (and integration) of philosophy/science in Christendom. Respect for ancestors (tradition) built on a strong and popular moral standards. Furthermore, there was at least one development made that has been was associated with a rejection of a literal interpretation of scripture.

I think a certain level of (proscriptive) morality is the logical end of nature. The (prescriptive) moral standards being discussed here are not a (direct) logical product of natural belief however. Respect for ancestors is one such belief; it appears reliant on teleology (as are any non-utilitarian beliefs concerning a greater good bar irrational impulses)..

//Truth
The excerpt of the conversation with Pilate is the oldest physical record we have of the new testament (dating ~125). John appears however to be a proto-gnostic interpretation of events, in the sense that its ideas are not uniquely Christian (but shared by the Greeks). The idea for instance that man is defined by his desire for knowledge (Aristotle).

It does make little sense that people should be concerned about truth unless they have a teleological worldview however. I was thinking the other evening that the desire to have it both ways is the hallmark of relativism (belief in a special self not bound by nature with an unlimited set of rights, while ever inciting scepticism of absolutes).

And on what I consider a separate topic; there is evidence that "materialism" (as a philosophy of mind) is not anti-teleological in its conclusions; not even neutral in its conclusions, but positively teleological. This is not derivative from its implications concerning the development of the way in which our mind thinks (which should only be considered arational if one makes an additional assumption of universal meaninglessness). Rather, it is an implication of the redundancy present in the cognitive system (mental properties being un-required for the brain to function or evolve).

Yeah it's no problem [personOfSimilarConvictions] - you presented the standard gnostic thesis (although I would recommend reading the existent primary sources to better see what I mean). I would also suggest that Creationism is a misnomer (byproduct of people associating creation with revisionism rather than a single purposeful act). Likewise it should be clear that the statement is a critique of scientific reductionism as per the 4 points outlined (non-empirical multiverse, humanity's common belief in non-observables, observed probability versus philosophical randomness, non-physical abstract objects).

That is an interesting verse you have found; thanks for sharing it. Although I am not certain that (in the alternate context) unpleasant words can never be healing to the mind.

//Causal Closure / interventionism
...

Note a key component of the empirical method is repeatability (as you point out). Therefore such intervention (miracles) need not be measurable in the sense suggested here.

I don't think the story of Jonah is the best example of miraculous claims however. It is more of a story about providence (from memory).

...

Scientists generally pursue their enterprise under the assumption of methodological naturalism. This position makes no claim on universal causal closure, yet continually looks for natural causes for things. It is considered a fruitful approach because it encourages research, and past experience tells us that there is a high probability of discovering a natural law for currently unexplained phenomena (observables). There must (by definition) be a natural explanation for repeatable phenomena (unless the laws of the universe are contrived against us; ie change over time), and 'science' has become fairly confident in its ability to discover them. Although we needn't live in a universe where the laws are discoverable, we appear to do so.

Moreover, the laws of the universe needn't be deterministic, and there is strong evidence that they are not. Technically anything can happen in an indeterministic universe (what we traditionally consider miracles), with a finite albeit negligible probability of occurrence. I am not suggesting that this is a sufficient explanation of traditional miracles, however it is philosophically important to consider the kind of universe we live in.

Yet I think it is missing the point to read in contemporary reflections of extraordinary supernatural events into old testament stories (and such have nothing to do with external claims of divine inspiration). Again, I think this should be discussed in a separate thread tackling "less ad hoc" requirements.

***
I will pay all your living expenses if you can prove to me that Jesus got out of a grave. I will also pay all your living expenses if you can prove to me that you exist. This problem applies to all 'non-natural' phenomena and is the reason they are defined as non-natural. They can't be tested via the empirical method, which in this context should be noted to demand not only (the capacity for denial by) observation, but replication. In this sense I take [personOfSimilarConvictions]'s approach. Historical or experiential evidence count for nothing if we have a priori ruled out "miracles".

I also appreciate [personOfSimilarConvictions]'s assessment of the criteria for IBE. Of particular importance here is the "less ad hoc" requirement. Bayesian reasoning demands that our assessment of a hypothesis (evidences supporting it) be adjusted based on our confidence in our existing assumptions (for example, that people stay dead). I think it is worth starting a thread on this, because it has implications for religion in society.

***
There is a probability of anything happening. People who believe things don't deny this. I don't think faith would be considered a virtue if it were equivalent to certainty (it would just be the same as not being logically challenged). How can anyone be certain that their spouse loves them? Yet faith is precisely what love requires. All relationships are based on faith. We can't be certain anyone else exists, but our belief is formed based on what is most consistent with our experience. This is why contemplation and experience are so important on a journey towards truth.

The final extracardinal virtue is hope. This is our attitude towards things which are not presently in a right state, but might be. It stems from a faith in the objective worth of others. That all instances of love are effectious. That every lamp that is lit is seen.

This is something which can't be reduced to personal risk management, or even belief.

//Calvinism
Here are all the references to hell in the New Testament (these are also all the references to hell in the bible, being a Greek concept);

"Hell"

Matthew 5:22

But I tell you that anyone who is angry with a brother or sister will be subject to judgment. Again, anyone who says to a brother or sister, `Raca,' is answerable to the court. And anyone who says, `You fool!' will be in danger of the fire of hell.

Matthew 5:29
If your right eye causes you to stumble, gouge it out and throw it away. It is better for you to lose one part of your body than for your whole body to be thrown into hell.

Matthew 5:30
And if your right hand causes you to stumble, cut it off and throw it away. It is better for you to lose one part of your body than for your whole body to go into hell.

Matthew 10:28
Do not be afraid of those who kill the body but cannot kill the soul. Rather, be afraid of the One who can destroy both soul and body in hell.

Matthew 18:6-9
If anyone causes one of these little ones - those who believe in me - to stumble, it would be better for them to have a large millstone hung around their neck and to be drowned in the depths of the sea. Woe to the world because of the things that cause people to stumble! Such things must come, but woe to the person through whom they come! If your hand or your foot causes you to stumble, cut it off and throw it away. It is better for you to enter life maimed or crippled than to have two hands or two feet and be thrown into eternal fire. And if your eye causes you to stumble, gouge it out and throw it away. It is better for you to enter life with one eye than to have two eyes and be thrown into the fire of hell.

Mark 9:42-49
If anyone causes one of these little ones - those who believe in me - to stumble, it would be better for them if a large millstone were hung around their neck and they were thrown into the sea. If your hand causes you to stumble, cut it off. It is better for you to enter life maimed than with two hands to go into hell, where the fire never goes out. And if your foot causes you to stumble, cut it off. It is better for you to enter life crippled than to have two feet and be thrown into hell. And if your eye causes you to stumble, pluck it out. It is better for you to enter the kingdom of God with one eye than to have two eyes and be thrown into hell, where 'the worms that eat them do not die, and the fire is not quenched.' Everyone will be salted with fire. (see also 1 Corinthians 3:12-14)

Matthew 18:9
And if your eye causes you to stumble, gouge it out and throw it away. It is better for you to enter life with one eye than to have two eyes and be thrown into the fire of hell.

Matthew 23:15
Woe to you, teachers of the law and Pharisees, you hypocrites! You travel over land and sea to win a single convert, and when you have succeeded, you make them twice as much a child of hell as you are.

Matthew 23:33
Woe to you, teachers of the law and Pharisees, you hypocrites! You build tombs for the prophets and decorate the graves of the righteous. And you say, `If we had lived in the days of our ancestors, we would not have taken part with them in shedding the blood of the prophets.' So you testify against yourselves that you are the descendants of those who murdered the prophets. Go ahead, then, and complete what your ancestors started! You snakes! You brood of vipers! How will you escape being condemned to hell?

Luke 12:5
But I will show you whom you should fear: Fear him who, after your body has been killed, has authority to throw you into hell. Yes, I tell you, fear him.

James 3:6
The tongue also is a fire, a world of evil among the parts of the body. It corrupts the whole body, sets the whole course of one's life on fire, and is itself set on fire by hell.

2 Peter 2:4
For if God did not spare angels when they sinned, but sent them to hell, putting them in chains of darkness to be held for judgment

---
"Fire"

Matthew 3:10
The ax is already at the root of the trees, and every tree that does not produce good fruit will be cut down and thrown into the fire.

Luke 3:9
The ax is already at the root of the trees, and every tree that does not produce good fruit will be cut down and thrown into the fire.

Matthew 3:12
His winnowing fork is in his hand, and he will clear his threshing floor, gathering his wheat into the barn and burning up the chaff with unquenchable fire.

Luke 3:17
His winnowing fork is in his hand to clear his threshing floor and to gather the wheat into his barn, but he will burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire.

Matthew 7:19
Every tree that does not bear good fruit is cut down and thrown into the fire.

Matthew 13:40
As the weeds are pulled up and burned in the fire, so it will be at the end of the age.

Matthew 25:31-46
When the Son of Man comes in his glory, and all the angels with him, he will sit on his glorious throne. All the nations will be gathered before him, and he will separate the people one from another as a shepherd separates the sheep from the goats. He will put the sheep on his right and the goats on his left. Then the King will say to those on his right, `Come, you who are blessed by my Father; take your inheritance, the kingdom prepared for you since the creation of the world. For I was hungry and you gave me something to eat, I was thirsty and you gave me something to drink, I was a stranger and you invited me in, I needed clothes and you clothed me, I was sick and you looked after me, I was in prison and you came to visit me.' Then the righteous will answer him, `Lord, when did we see you hungry and feed you, or thirsty and give you something to drink? When did we see you a stranger and invite you in, or needing clothes and clothe you? When did we see you sick or in prison and go to visit you?' The King will reply, `Truly I tell you, whatever you did for one of the least of these brothers and sisters of mine, you did for me.' Then he will say to those on his left, `Depart from me, you who are cursed, into the eternal fire prepared for the devil and his angels. For I was hungry and you gave me nothing to eat, I was thirsty and you gave me nothing to drink, I was a stranger and you did not invite me in, I needed clothes and you did not clothe me, I was sick and in prison and you did not look after me.' They also will answer, `Lord, when did we see you hungry or thirsty or a stranger or needing clothes or sick or in prison, and did not help you?' He will reply, `Truly I tell you, whatever you did not do for one of the least of these, you did not do for me.' Then they will go away to eternal punishment, but the righteous to eternal life.

Luke 16:19-31
There was a rich man who was dressed in purple and fine linen and lived in luxury every day. At his gate was laid a beggar named Lazarus, covered with sores and longing to eat what fell from the rich man's table. Even the dogs came and licked his sores. The time came when the beggar died and the angels carried him to Abraham's side. The rich man also died and was buried. In Hades, where he was in torment, he looked up and saw Abraham far away, with Lazarus by his side. So he called to him, `Father Abraham, have pity on me and send Lazarus to dip the tip of his finger in water and cool my tongue, because I am in agony in this fire.' But Abraham replied, `Son, remember that in your lifetime you received your good things, while Lazarus received bad things, but now he is comforted here and you are in agony. And besides all this, between us and you a great chasm has been set in place, so that those who want to go from here to you cannot, nor can anyone cross over from there to us.' He answered, `Then I beg you, father, send Lazarus to my family, for I have five brothers. Let him warn them, so that they will not also come to this place of torment.' Abraham replied, `They have Moses and the Prophets; let them listen to them.' `No, father Abraham, he said, `but if someone from the dead goes to them, they will repent.' He said to him, `If they do not listen to Moses and the Prophets, they will not be convinced even if someone rises from the dead.'

Luke 17:26-37
Just as it was in the days of Noah, so also will it be in the days of the Son of Man. People were eating, drinking, marrying and being given in marriage up to the day Noah entered the ark. Then the flood came and destroyed them all. It was the same in the days of Lot. People were eating and drinking, buying and selling, planting and building. But the day Lot left Sodom, fire and sulfur rained down from heaven and destroyed them all. It will be just like this on the day the Son of Man is revealed. On that day no one who is on the housetop, with possessions inside, should go down to get them. Likewise, no one in the field should go back for anything. Remember Lot's wife! Whoever tries to keep their life will lose it, and whoever loses their life will preserve it. I tell you, on that night two people will be in one bed; one will be taken and the other left. Two women will be grinding grain together; one will be taken and the other left. 'Where, Lord?' they asked. He replied, 'Where there is a dead body, there the vultures will gather.'

John 15:5-7
I am the vine; you are the branches. If you remain in me and I in you, you will bear much fruit; apart from me you can do nothing. If you do not remain in me, you are like a branch that is thrown away and withers; such branches are picked up, thrown into the fire and burned.

Hebrews 10:26-28
If we deliberately keep on sinning after we have received the knowledge of the truth, no sacrifice for sins is left, but only a fearful expectation of judgment and of raging fire that will consume the enemies of God. Anyone who rejected the law of Moses died without mercy on the testimony of two or three witnesses.

2 Peter 3:7-11
By the same word the present heavens and earth are reserved for fire, being kept for the day of judgment and destruction of the ungodly. But do not forget this one thing, dear friends: With the Lord a day is like a thousand years, and a thousand years are like a day. The Lord is not slow in keeping his promise, as some understand slowness. Instead he is patient with you, not wanting anyone to perish, but everyone to come to repentance. But the day of the Lord will come like a thief. The heavens will disappear with a roar; the elements will be destroyed by fire, and the earth and everything done in it will be laid bare. Since everything will be destroyed in this way, what kind of people ought you to be? You ought to live holy and godly lives as you look forward to the day of God and speed its coming. That day will bring about the destruction of the heavens by fire, and the elements will melt in the heat.

Jude 1:7
In a similar way, Sodom and Gomorrah and the surrounding towns gave themselves up to sexual immorality and perversion. They serve as an example of those who suffer the punishment of eternal fire.

Revelation 20:14-15
Then death and Hades were thrown into the lake of fire. The lake of fire is the second death. Anyone whose name was not found written in the book of life was thrown into the lake of fire.

//Trinity
A communicative God must have a representation given that it created the only construct we have access to (physical reality). It could have any number of representations. The early Christian church came to recognise Jesus of Nazareth as a representation of God ('who do you say I am?'), while claiming that his coming was foretold by their own (Judaic) writings.

There is little evidence that Jesus was thought to have special (God) knowledge (eg 'only the Father knows what hour...'). This is not inconsistent with a physicalist position on mind; if the architect had decided to enter the matrix at some point in time (eg conception) then its knowledge would be bound by the brain it chose to be mapped to.

There is also little evidence that it was thought Jesus wanted to tell others he was God. He generally self-identified as 'the son of man'. He told people to keep quiet about his purported miracles, and explained the meaning of parables/teachings mainly to an inner circle. He spent most of his time ('active ministry') engaged in discipleship.

(Note if people find it confusing that "God was one of us"; one of the core ideas of Christianity is that human beings are made in the image of God and are designed/destined to be sons and daughters of 'the most high'. Therefore that we have the capacity to be like Christ; the faith to move mountains, the words to pierce hearts, the peace to end aggression, the light to shine on moral darkness, and the salt to prevent its infection).

The idea of 'the trinity' is an abstraction. The development of its theology is recognised by the Church and is documented in their archives (it is also evident in the gnostic texts). Although I have not studied its evolution, the early church came to believe that God is love (this is derivative from their belief in the passion of God incarnate). It follows that the essence of God is relational and his Consciousness is of a higher order.

We would perhaps sooner exploit our artifices/creations than die for them (see the hitch hikers guide to the galaxy's explanation for the creation of earth, or human treatment of lesser consciousness). And this is not assuming that they interpreted Jesus' sacrifice as the fulfilment of a death duty (but rather as an opportunity to know God and witness true freedom; freedom from error and forgiveness of ignorance).

Furthermore, they witnessed Jesus ('the Son') communicating with 'the Father', and believed that they had had some direct experience of the 'Spirit' of God. They saw God working in multiple ways, and through multiple beings. Three is the minimal number of entities required for a relationship that cannot be reduced to reciprocal altruism. It is also the minimal number of entities required to capture traditional Christian theology.

Belief is not reducible to opinion - some beliefs are true (for example internal existence). All are a probability assessment. The threshold one sets for any given faith is subject to risk management; is it worth taking the risk. What is on the table is our genetic code and our feelings. What most people in history have recognised is that these can't logically be prioritised.

Human beings fight over many things; respect, resources, values - but religious belief is not one of them. Religion facilitates systems of morality (morale) but is not the cause of war - even religion that commands violence is subject to reason (is moderated by the environment). People are motivated by the philosophy (ideals) engrained in their religion; honour, loyalty, justice, freedom (or in some cases power, sexual libertarianism). What they recognise is that we are all going to die and the question is how and for what cause. Most would pity a death based on a world view forged in a safe room where knowledge is constantly changing.

The risk of faith in regards to supernatural healing appears to be related to a specific interaction between science and religion that has existed for a very short time. Science and Health by Mary Baker Eddy (Christian Science) is worth reading as it gives some insight into the rationale behind the rejection of science in this matter. In any case the percentage throughout history who have held such beliefs in the inadequacy of medicine is negligible. It turns out the placebo effect (mindset) is extremely important in recovery (30-40%), which is why all medical research must use placebo conditions. There are even cases of surgery which I would argue should have used placebo conditions (I am not convinced of the specificity of their effect; chronic depression treatments).

That being said I agree that religion (like rock climbing) is dangerous. It has the potential to blind us from contemporary evil, create unrealistic standards, misdirect our priorities away from the moral worth of others, heighten conflict, inflict suffering. It should not be entered into lightly. It should be a natural component of a search for meaning or desire for support in one's conclusions. Likewise, the probability assessment of supernatural events upon which religions are founded is affected by our understanding of the lawful nature of the universe. I would argue this has caused a shift in our threshold for such faith.

Note I don't think trinitarian theology requires individual consciousnesses. One can imagine a single consciousness observing the same physical event from different perspectives at different points in its conscious experience (one of which having no memory of its observation of the event from an alternate perspective - having chosen to 'temporarily' forsake this by 'entering' our construct as a human being).

Although not in the context of divine consciousness, there is a great paper by Arnold Zuboff that David Chalmers recommended which discusses multiple observers; "one self: the logic of experience". The basic message is that there is no way of knowing whether our (human) consciousness is not one consciousness given that our feeling of it being individualised (us having our own separate consciousness) is a product of consciousness being mapped to brain processes which believe this. There is no way of knowing whether our conscious experience is continuous, because if we were say switching between bodies (our consciousness was being constantly remapped to a different brain at some new point in space-time every 5 'seconds' of our conscious experience), we would have no memory of this.

//Genetic selection
[in response to institutionalised celibacy for highly intelligent/cream of the crop possibly causing genetic loss in dark/middle ages]

I suspect if the Church had known about genetics they would have taken a slightly different approach. We don't have a right to interfere with nature. Mind you, such intelligence isn't the only trait worth selecting for. I would be more concerned about its effect on self control.

Finally, I agree that there are greater goods than procreation; but we should only ever sacrifice natural law for a good reason.

//Historical Jesus
I looked into the Richard Carrier theory earlier this year - specifically the claim that "the gospels" were a fictional grounding (the invention of an earthly history) of a celestial figure who was first claimed to live and die in the heavens ("the astral plane"). This celestial figure being claimed to have its roots in both the mythology of surrounding cultures (e.g. Egypt) and the Jewish sect of Joshua (aka Jesus). His astral passion was likewise supposedly envisioned (literally: by a vision) by Paul and recorded in his epistles ("my gospel"), before being embedded into the character we now know as Jesus of Nazareth (the traditional gospel accounts). I went through all canonical and non-canonical early church records, and conducted an independent analysis. I post my findings here, considering he (Carrier) seems to be making some SR appearances of late. In short, and from memory, I concluded that;

1. There is a discrepancy between the sacrificial Jesus figure referenced by Paul and the more general (philosopher/teacher/messiah/son of man/son of God/sacrificial) figure spoken about in the traditional gospels. This is self-evident from reading the New Testament through.
2. The non-disputed epistles contain no text attributed to Jesus (messages/teachings), other than 1 Corinthians 9:14 "In the same way, the Lord has commanded that those who preach the gospel should receive their living from the gospel", and 1 Corinthians 11:23-25: "For I received from the Lord what I also passed on to you: The Lord Jesus, on the night he was betrayed, took bread, and when he had given thanks, he broke it and said, 'This is my body, which is for you; do this in remembrance of me.' In the same way, after supper he took the cup, saying, 'This cup is the new covenant in my blood; do this, whenever you drink it, in remembrance of me.' [NB from a Christian perspective this says a lot for Sacred Tradition and the Eucharist, independent of the textual records compiled by the early church]. The disputed epistles contain some additional text which might be attributed to Jesus, although it is unclear; 2 John 5-6 "And now, dear lady, I am not writing you a new command but one we have had from the beginning. I ask that we love one another. And this is love: that we walk in obedience to his commands. As you have heard from the beginning, his command is that you walk in love."
3. Hebrews appears to be a record of early church development/establishment of the concept of the gospel. For example, it presents the Old Testament as the (a) gospel.
4. The first and second century non-canonical texts do not contain many references to crucifixion (only the Epistle of Barnabas and the Secret Book of James contain references to crucifixion). All the later (2nd+ century) gnostic gospels however contain references to crucifixion, apart from the Gospel of Thomas (which appears to be a collection of sayings, many of which are contained in the traditional gospels).
5. The sayings by Jesus in The First Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians are not attributed to any gospel - ie there is no evidence they were compiled at the time, in line with a Carrier theory of Christianity. It also contains a third, OT like saying attributed to Jesus; "Come, ye children, hearken unto Me; I will teach you the fear of the Lord. What man is he that desireth life, and loveth to see good days? Keep thy tongue from evil, and thy lips from speaking guile. Depart from evil, and do good; seek peace, and pursue it. The eyes of the Lord are upon the righteous, and His ears are [open] unto their prayers. The face of the Lord is against them that do evil, to cut off the remembrance of them from the earth. The righteous cried, and the Lord heard him, and delivered him out of all his troubles." "Many are the stripes [appointed for] the wicked; but mercy shall compass those about who hope in the Lord." The attribution of an Old Testament like saying is again in line with a Carrier theory of Christianity.
6. It is interesting that the Didache contains text which is ascribed to Jesus by the gospels (Mark 12:30-31, Matthew 5:43-48, Matthew 5:38-42, ~Matthew 5:25-48, Matthew 5:5, ~Matthew 25:1-12), but the Didache does not itself ascribe this text to Jesus (or a gospel). Cf eg, James also contains multiple messages which are ascribed to Jesus by the gospels (4:6, 4:11-12, 4:13-17, 5:1-6, 5:12), but does not itself ascribe this text to Jesus (or a gospel).
7. The evolution of the nicene creed certainly supports the theory. This is assuming one can establish that the original "apostles creed" (with all the old roman symbol material regarding a corporal existence; Pontus Pilate, Virgin Mary etc) was formulated after the first council of Nicea (~325). Although the old roman symbol is first referenced ~340, Irenaeus suggests its content is much older. But it is interesting to note that its rule of faith predecessor does not include reference to Pontius Pilate or a crucifixion (only the Virgin Mary).
8. There is little evidence from the earliest Pauline epistles manuscript (p46) that crucifixion (Crux) has been forged (ie added to the epistles while being copied), comparing P46 to the current/accepted version. However, it is worth noting that the next earliest manuscript of the epistles (P65; 3rd Century) excludes crucifixion reference Thessalonians 2:14 (despite including 2:1,6-13). P30 (3rd Century) also contains 1 Thessalonians material, but it does not contain any of the second chapter, and so cannot be used in this analysis. The next earliest manuscript of the epistles (P16; turn of 3rd/4th century) excludes crucifixion references Philippians 2:8,3:18 (despite including 3:9-17;4:2-8). More recent manuscripts containing the Pauline Epistles (references to crucifixion material) are dated to the 4th century.
9. I did find a reference in P46 that might suggest a vision of the crucifixion of Jesus; "Before whose eyes Jesus Christ was shown forth crucified?" (this is not expressed this way in the RSV or NIV; "Before your very eyes Jesus Christ was clearly portrayed as crucified").
10. Christ was crucified in an astral plane only for his followers to be crucified on earth? A belief system based on a concept of a more general astral passion would be easier to gain a following (given that this general belief system was popular at the time according to Carrier). Furthermore, Paul is talking about the 'cross of Christ' as if it is common to all the disciples' gospels at the time, and it is not just a feature of his (revelatory) gospel. For them all to have the same specific vision (/hallucination) of the passion appears unlikely, which is why under this framework (Carrier theory) I see a symbolic crucifixion being more easily shared/adopted by the church (especially if this general story was going around civilisation at the time anyway). By symbolic crucifixion, I mean; A horrific death which an author wouldn't go out of their way to describe/emphasise as crucifixion ("being crucified") except as a symbolic pointer to the event ("the cross of") under the assumption all parties know what it is referring to (an astral termination).

The theory however cannot be reconciled with;

1. Our earliest existent New Testament (P52; 125CE) manuscript explicitly references the trial of Jesus' by Pontius Pilate (John 18:31-33,37,38), where as the earliest existent Pauline epistle manuscript (P46; 200CE) is dated later. Such doesn't support a gospel confabulation hypothesis. Note P52 is the earliest copy of the gospels (also the earliest copy of any new testament material). The next earliest copy of the gospels (P90; CE175) includes the same content; John 18:36-19:7. P66 (CE200) includes pretty much the entire passion, death, and resurrection (John 18:1-40,19:1-42,20:1-20,22-23,25-31). Likewise P64+67 (CE200) includes allusions to his imminent death; Matthew 26:14-15,31-33. More recent manuscripts containing the gospels are dated to the 3rd century.
2. The Pauline epistles (including their earliest existent manuscript, P46) contain multiple references to crucifixion. 1 Corinthians (1:13, 1:23, 2:2, 2:8 [none in P46]), 2 Corinthians (13:4 [not in P46]), Galations (3:1 [not in P46], 6:17), and 1 Thessalonians (2:14 [missing P46 folio]). Colossians (authenticity disputed) also contains at least one reference to crucifixion (1:20?, 2:14?, 2:15). The Pauline epistles also contain multiple references to a symbolic crucifixion; Galations (2:20, 5:24, 6:14), and a more general "cross of Christ"; 1 Corinthians (1:17, 1:18), Galations (5:11, 6:12, 6:14), and Phillipians (2:8?, 3:18). The disputed epistles, (pseudepigraphical?) Ephesians (2:16) and Colossians also contain references to a more general "cross of Christ" (1:20?, 2:14?). Crucifixion references in the epistles are therefore not just symbolic. This specific form of punishment (crucifixion) seems inappropriate for an astral Passion. It is more likely to be referring to an earthly passion (and therefore earthly Jesus).
3. The Pauline epistles (including their earliest existent manuscript (P46) contain multiple references supporting an earthly Jesus; Galatians (1:13, 1:16, 2:7, 3:1 [not in P46]), 1 Corinthians (9:1, 9:14, 11:23-25, 15:3-9, 2:8 [not in P46 or later greek manuscripts]), and Philippians (2:8). The disputed epistles also contains some references; Colossians (4:10-11, 4:14 [not in P46]) and perhaps (pseudepigraphical?) Ephesians also (4:8-10; however the preferred translation is "depths of the earth" not "lower earthly regions").
4. The earliest (1st century) non-canonical texts (The First Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians, and the Didache) reference an earthly Jesus (ie, is not just an astral being). The First Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians references two passages contained in the traditional gospels; effectively Luke 6:37-38/Matthew 6:14,7:1, and Mark 9:42. It is not clear that Jesus is an earthly figure in the other non-canonical texts texts however (in the second century texts, only the Epistle of Barnabas and the Secret Book of James contain references to an earthly Jesus).
5. With all the heresies being documented around the 4th century (most of which have some scriptural basis, and so can't have been that heretical in comparison), why wasn't there a heresy devoted to the non-existence of a material Jesus (irrespective of his divinity)? Why was this "gnostic"/"docetist" heresy dealt with ~381 (340->450), after the arian heresy was dealt with ~325? Did the church think

perspectives on the divinity of the Christ were more important than his historical presence on earth? Or did denial of his earthly presence only become an issue later in time?

I think it is fair enough to present new ideas here, even if they don't have historical evidence. Given the nature of religion, it is better to be open minded and throw ideas out there (while at the same time being prepared to counter them).

Honestly [personWithSimilarConvictions], I don't know the answer to this question. Perhaps if I read his book I would be able to infer how he treats the earthly Christ references in the Pauline Epistles and the 1st century non-canonical texts, but the one guy I know was surprised by the fact they even existed. Perhaps it is just another example of Christians making stuff up?

//Theism/Gender
I was engaged by two young men on the way to the supermarket this evening. They said they were conducting theological research, though in retrospect I am not sure how liberal they thought the definition of research actually was. Benefit of the doubt led me to temporarily think that (and openly query whether) they were perhaps analysing and recording my response to an unusual theological proposition. In any case, I don't mind - because I appreciate hearing about the mythological proposition of God the Mother. I was also thinking throughout that perhaps Raava had made too big a mark. They read Genesis 1:27 from an outwardly used but colourfully highlighted NIV translation ("So God created man in his own image, in the image of God he created him; male and female he created them"). Although I was not overly convinced by the biblical argument (I think there are better reasons to explain the plurality, such as the fact the Genesis mythology predates the biblical writing), I don't think there is anything which contradicts the idea (if "God the Father" is presumably not a man like God the Son, incarnate Jesus Christ, and God is spoken about in plural terms there may be a gender neutral or gender complimentary god head). After they had read this and asked me about the proposition ('have you ever heard of people speak about God as mother?' 'No, only in terms of the holy spirit perhaps being female', I replied) they gave me this..

//Slavery
I have to admit [personOfOtherConvictions]; this one's out of context. Paul also wrote; "There is no longer Jew or Gentile, slave or free, male and female." This is on par with some of the counter cultural associations made by Jesus in the gospel records. They certainly didn't create martyrs of the early church for endorsing slavery.

//Christianity
Note I had the same intuition as [personOfSimilarConvictions]; there would be no reason for anyone to document a criminal with only a handful of disciples. Whatever got passed on however had some effect.

I would have thought the last supper and the crucifixion would have been the most certain events associated with his life (the only events shared between the canonical gospels and the authentic Pauline epistles).

//Roman Catholicism
As a bit of a background on RC; the Church affirmed/defined the biblical canon in the Council of Rome (382AD). The NT material chosen was considered to be the best record available of the events attributed to Christ Jesus and his disciples. The Church is however an apostolic tradition not a book club. RC is certifiably not a religion of a book ("sacred scripture" is considered just one aspect of the magisterium).

It is however arguable that they respect the content better than many/most contemporary Protestant denominations. Such is a matter of interpretation - which they believe to be the role of the apostolic tradition. If one takes sola scriptura to be a divine principle (instituted by say Martin Luther), then they might seek to find summaries or formulae that do not exist and have never existed in the records. Examples of "sacred tradition" include the authors of the gospels (Matthew, Mark, Luke, John), although it keeps going for 2000 years.

//Hell
Actually, this is what it says:

"This is how it will be at the end of the age. The angels will come and separate the wicked from the righteous and throw them into the blazing furnace, where there will be weeping and gnashing of teeth."

Where do you get the "you must worship me" or "just in case you don't love him back" from?

What are you talking about [personOfOtherConvictions]? I asked you a question upon which two particular images you posted are founded.

...

Actually, hell is a greek concept.

//Christian virtues
Some may look on faith, hope, and love as sad relics of gullibility. It is true that they are by no means universal, and have even been hypothesised to be the most pitiful virtues of a lonely planet. Morality it seems does not require them. People may even have had an experience of the failure of such principles. Sure things didn't work out the way they expected, but who knows what might have happened as a consequence, and what still might be happening, or what will happen?

On your deathbed, would you be willing to sacrifice having made that honourable choice? A choice which was made in alignment with the highest principles (and greatest myth) ever known to mankind? That respected the prospect of an unknown god, and gave credence to the possible gift of freedom bestowed on its creatures. Principles which have forged our civilisation; our desire for adventure, knowledge, and perfection. Principles which are still associated with being in a state of grace, being sons and daughters of the creator

of the universe. Principles which are in alignment with what we know about nature, mind and morality. Would we like to hear stories about a civilisation (or person) that gave up on its founding principles? Or worse still, one who took those principles, rejected their author, and mangled them to a point beyond recognition?

//Passionate god theism

I think Dawkins in God Delusion and ergo atheist community have forwarded it (even [personOfOtherConvictions]/British friend threw it out there at one stage). Believing in one less god (or denying the existence of one less god). It is probably applicable to an isolated Abrahamic narrative (inc some fundamentalist forms of Judaism/Islam/Christianity), in that there is nothing in particular that distinguishes their passionate god from another/polytheist passionate god. However, Christianity was almost immediately fused with secular philosophy (and so was Islam and Judaism presumably; in fact our earliest surviving records suggest this had already begun to occur) - of which provide areligious definitions of the god head. These are not subject to the same criticism, and must be countered independently. (I imagine that this is what is being suggested by WLK).

Furthermore, one must ask whether these arguments were not inherent in the minds (logic) of those who founded their respective monotheism. They certainly seem apparent in the Christian archives; just off the top of my head; teleological argument Romans 1, cosmological argument John 1.

//God/Love

If God is love:

Interestingly, there are 4 definitions of love in ancient Greek; agape, eros, philia, and storge. Perhaps I should have been a little more specific; If God is agape..

Not exactly [personOfOtherConvictions]; God has only ever been defined as agape.

Of course, people like to make a god out of eros (and understandably so, being our strongest insatiable passion), but no one I am aware of has seriously proposed that the first cause of the created realms is eros. Eros leads to agape, and not the other way around.

//Jordan Peterson

There is a lot I like about Jordan Peterson, but what I most appreciate is his identification of meaning in life through suffering and responsibility.

Why is it that we idealise virtue / logical consistency? What conclusions can be drawn as to the nature of reality? This is where I think mythological deconstructionism runs short. As much as we appreciate the depth of truth contained within myth, there is more to mythology than psychological/social support mechanics. Mythology is a pointer to the rumination of something greater; a platonic ideal. It is the extrapolation of known and derived philosophical truths - an attempt to provide a rational basis for their existence. For this reason myth can reveal the ultimate truth, or at least our search for it. And why meaning encountered through problem solving falls short of human desire.

Creation is not a premise, it is a conclusion. Our logical/moral systems must be operating correctly to appreciate the spiritual plane, the risks it challenges, and the meaning it grants. For repentance leads to God.

//Naturalism/Christianity

While the argument against naturalism is completely valid (there is nothing in discovering natural regularity that guarantees natural regularity), I don't think one can reduce the Christian gospel to the last few chapters of "the gospels"; parts of which are known to have been added to the text (eg Mark 16:9-19), or to Paul's experience ("revelation") of it. The new testament gospels were written 30-70 years after the birth of Christianity.

Furthermore, the accounts recorded of the appearances of the risen Christ don't give the impression that he was in an entirely normal state - why make appearances and not stay around with his disciples? Likewise, if he wasn't in a normal state, they couldn't very well have recorded that he was because people still alive would have dismissed it. So there is nothing in the new testament (gospels/letters) which is inconsistent with a resurrection invention; or an inventive account of it. It could be that the gnostic heresies arose because the facts were very limited to begin with.

There are other reasons to be sceptical of the records; e.g. a whole lot of other people being raised to life on the same day (Matthew 27:52). Even in the (pseudonymous) canonical texts the resurrection of the body is not that evident, e.g. 1 Peter 3:18-19: "For Christ also suffered once for sins, the righteous for the unrighteous, to bring you to God. He was put to death in the body but made alive in the Spirit. After being made alive, he went and made proclamation to the imprisoned spirits to those who were disobedient long ago when God waited patiently in the days of Noah while the ark was being built". This is not disconcordant with the bodily resurrection being a transitional state towards heaven; "... it saves you by the resurrection of Jesus Christ, who has gone into heaven and is at God's right hand with angels, authorities and powers in submission to him" (21-22).

Yet this doesn't imply that it is necessarily false; by far the best witness of the truth of their message was their willingness to die for it, or to transform western civilisation for it. And a whole branch of Christianity doesn't believe that the written records encapsulate Christian tradition anyway; the emphasis on the canon (200-382AD) is fairly modern.

//Church

I largely agree with [personOfSimilarConvictions]'s analysis (we should never distort someone's message), however I think that religion should upgrade to cater for the creedless. Young people in particular need some place where they can hang out together with a focus on reality (rather than short term experiences); even engage in philosophical discussions and experimental meditation (or quiet prayer). Else religion is basically saying that it cares more for its specific beliefs than the future happiness of the population.

Specific religious beliefs might be aimed at the latter and not by intent against it, but it doesn't make them right. We shouldn't expect a population to take these well intentioned beliefs as true; making them a precondition to nourish their desire to be in a right relationship with God, the world, and others.

//Christianity

Christianity may well be the downfall of western civilisation.

=== Dehumanisation ===

//Dehumanisation

the question I ask is what took away the face?

The true evil of a fallen advertisement is that we are not free to tear it up, shout it down. The law protects the manipulation.

Any statement/message that is falsely proposed, ie any lie (or the material on/through which it is published) is not protected by law.

Discussing this amendment with [personOfSimilarConvictions] at the moment - criticism is welcome.

Under this system if someone lies the law has nothing to do with them (can do nothing for them or their message; it is not illegal to lie). If however you want legal protection of your message (say advertisement/trademark) then you need to be able to demonstrate that you intend to tell the truth.

One might leave the judgement to a panel of 5 year olds. Of course lying to children is the worst of crimes and is punishable by death. Then again if legal protection of your message is not worth that risk, then the message is probably not worth seeking/maintaining legal protection.

Discriminate vandalism can afford no punishment under the system (to ensure people are not discouraged from taking action against rubbish by destroying it). But repeated offences against legally protected ("validated") messages might result in them facing their accuser whereby they can discuss the truth of the message in person and on record in a court of truth (in which that is the only thing people are concerned about--not punishments or law-- limited to dealing restraining orders with respect to vandalism of said messages).

Obviously this paradigm leaves no room for lawyers who knowingly represent offenders.

These are all good criticisms. Insinuation or implicit messages cannot be protected unless they are first admitted to exist, but that would defeat the purpose since they would be even less likely to be validated. Deviant media masquerading an innocent message would still require validation for protection against vandalism.

This certainly has strong implications for capitalist/administrative systems reliant upon questionable communications. There wouldn't be many messages today that could be protected against vandalism. If there was any doubt as to the truth of a statement, it would have to be reworded/re-presented to maintain protection.

Dehumanisation only becomes nebulous when we admit the existence of artificial categories, eg "black", "gay" (with utmost respect to those women who bear the name, and those with children in marriage), even "male"/"female"; when used to the exclusion of mankind (cf. "feminism"). As long as people's genetic code and desires are not confounded with their humanity (which is respect for their person, not their physical nature or developmental history). Only artificial categories have special unnatural rights. In this sense one could theoretically still be "racist", "sexist", "paedophilophobic", "homophobic", "psychophobic", "sexualaddictophobic", "ageist", "obesitist", "disabilitist", and not dehumanise someone, because their beliefs regarding someone's physical nature are irrelevant; the only thing that matters is their beliefs regarding their internal nature (i.e. not an animal for consumption). Our predecessors would not have a problem with the concept, but they most certainly would have a problem with us.

Given the present circumstances however, it might be better to remove laws facilitating the protection of evil rather than creating new ones.

//Indecency

I don't understand the obsession with nylons, short skirts and bright lipstick. Was this not once the dress of prostitutes? Why would she want their power?

"because she knows there is a kind of power there and she respects it"

The problem with physical power is that it will fade; one will become a servant, a slave to this; forever unable to give another person the respect they need - because it has been distributed, shared, equal amongst the masses.

//Objectification

Take care to partial out environmental influences while reasoning

//Advertising
http://www.forbes.com/forbes/welcome/
"Hi again. Looks like you're still using ad blocker. Please turn it off in order to continue into Forbes' ad-light experience."

//Objectification theory (continued)

One must ask; why does the society hate itself? I don't think it is just academia, schools, and the media. Tolerance of dehumanisation leads to distrust.

I am actually suggesting that tolerance of dehumanisation leads to distrust of those who tolerate dehumanisation. I would argue that good homes are not a sufficient condition in such an environment. Nor is an objective education (although this again may be a great advantage). And it is not like anyone listens to the media anyway (although this may come from having a good education). Perhaps people don't have good friends? (and their capacity to be one has diminished). The most important factor in maintaining reason is an awareness of one's external and internal environment in my experience. And living a consistent life based on this awareness; calling evil for what it is, and putting the body through its evolutionary protocol.

//Objectification
Yes the author certainly has a problem.

I would actually argue the reverse; I believe that the author has a moral problem. He has confounded the tolerance of objectification of women in the media (which happens to be the source of impropriety, as unintentionally demonstrated by the author; because it more easily distracts the male's attention), with the inevitable manipulation of sexual attention (intentional or otherwise). One does not use one evil to justify another. But most males are so far gone (mentally addicted to/affected by objectification in the media/advertising/church) that they probably wouldn't even notice a normal woman's body unless she were naked and replicating the modifications/enhancements of the conditioned stimulus.

That being said, everyone (including males) have responsibility for their own morality; they can hardly pray lead us not into temptation if they are going to expose themselves to a situation where they personally might be (for whatever reason; out of their weakness or otherwise) tempted to dishonour another person by their thoughts. As for the specifics of the scenario; the eye level is of concern, because it suggests that they are voluntarily entering an environment where there is no option but to observe the sexually sensitive body parts of another person (fyi precoded human object recognition is based on shape recognition); and looking the other way while effective is not always respectful.

Critically, one must appreciate that sexual attention is mediated (albeit weakly) by perception of intent; so it is possible that one incorrectly infers impropriety for the wrong reason (past failures). Furthermore, as a male, our responsibility is to target the source of evil (and not people who may have been deceived by it). There are a hundred reasons why someone may (wish to) expose themselves that having nothing to do with impropriety.

[Not wanting to be teased (the wonders of the fashion god), wanting to excite drugged out males who are obviously unaware of their existence, making a statement against the male tolerance of objectification/use of women for consumption, that they have been used in the past and don't want that experience of having been shared to mean anything, that they are being used in their current relationship and feel insecure about themselves (wanting to make people smile and forget that they should technically be engaged by now), because they have unconsciously monitored the affect their body has on others and enjoy this (males get the same kick out of it in other ways; beware of the one ring), because they want to be an attractive and valuable object for their partner, because they are used to being with people who know them personally and unaware of the strong influence personality has on breaking the natural illusion of an object, because they really haven't thought about anything except what a magazine/media/friend/novel might suggest is normative, that they feel they have a responsibility not to compromise the group's security by suggesting others might be morally deficient, the proactive anticipation of another's tendency to consciously rate them/gaze at them makes them feel in control of an uncomfortable situation, because it can instantaneously fantasise the mind of a predator and can thereby protect them against any unwanted encounters, a natural desire to compete with others (including the media), recognition of a limited window of opportunity (while perhaps being unaware of the properties required to sustain long versus 12 hour relationships), to make their beauty or effort mean something in the absence of hope, etc. I could keep spinning these, but any girl would have a good and probably much better idea of the reasons why they do things].

There is also a case where freedom requires adjustments (or just plain stoicism), given that there are various activities (for example sport, dancing etc) that require engagement of stimuli (visual or tactile; for males and females respectively) which one would not normally expose oneself to. And all circumstances require a level of empathy for the different way in which their complement's brain has been wired over the course of 100s of millions of years.

Finally, there are some civilisations so far progressed that they have reached the point where it is nigh on impossible to avoid occasions of sin (even while wrapping themselves in positive technology). If this be the case, it is important to recognise this, and ask whether this is a good thing for yourself and others - particularly those who may not be so blessed as to have a relationship to (re)direct affections (lest they compromise a heart or a soul in the process). You may actually be called to make a difference. If so, I can guarantee however that it would have nothing to do with yoga pants (I have always wondered what these strange and not obviously humane things were; although I assumed that they would in some capacity facilitate sport); and probably more to do with the rampant "sex" "industry" that drives demand for sexual abuse (the tolerance of primary objectification; commercial dehumanisation). Between 30% and 90% of the female population has suffered from it (depending on the environment). While saying "it is me" is a nice theory for sexual immorality (it is so simple a 5 year old would get it), it is an example of where biblical fundamentalism can make someone blind to recontextualised evil (belonging to a sola scriptura camp where one joins words together like sin and evil to fit post hoc salvation formulae). It doesn't explain group variations in immorality to the point where an individual is now questioning whether it is even possible to live a life free from conscious sexual excitation.

//Fun (night life)
It is interesting to observe that leaders in Australian technology companies are desperate to obtain fun by drinking alcohol (and think fun is defined by; or worse still facilitated by it). I personally don't mind removing legal restrictions, but let anarchy take its course, and don't expect anyone to protect you who doesn't like the look of you. That is, if you are so insecure that you need alcohol to loosen up and attract someone for long enough to deceive them with your plastic life.

//Censorship

I have formally complained to my local library for advertising sexualised material on the front page of their overdrive account. I said that if they were not willing to recreate the scene at the front of the physical library alongside its existing advertisements then there was a problem. They initially interpreted it as a content censorship request but I made sure it went through to their management.

"I would also suggest that the library management ask themselves this question. Would the same advertisement be tolerated if the illustration was recreated by two people in the library entrance hall? Would the content even be chosen to be advertised in the library entrance hall? Why would it not be chosen, and which government law would have they broken by inadvertently censoring this respectable title? This same argument can be represented in more technical terms, but it should be sufficient to at least have the situation reviewed by your board."

Personally, if I were forced to respect dehumanising content by my employer, I would cite crimes against humanity, and find another occupation. If they weren't responding to reason, and I considered anyone else (in particular children) in danger of being compromised by the commercial "speech", it might even be worth publicising their collection list alongside the name of the organisation.

---
a) psychology (although I have generally gone with the "intentional misrepresentation of a human being").
b) so far, only governments, and companies of which I am a consumer.
c) I don't pretend to be a man of the people, just for the people (democratic thought is theoretical - a single individual can be right in a community of millions; which has been evident in the west since at least 350BC).
d) If they involved dehumanisation for payment then I would not compromise - unless I was willing to be charged as a conformist in a CAH court run by a moral nation which has surpassed our presently immoral society. However, a disclaimer might be a good idea for anything involving a spoken encouragement to dehumanise (no speech should ever be censored).

Ultimately, what is being asked here is whether a person can know they are right by assessing their own thoughts. I am of the opinion that people always act based on what they think is right (or will rework the evidence to this end): it is the only reason anyone does anything. Yet does this mean everyone is equally confident with their beliefs? Are they equally confident with their life?

Moreover, will they be equally confident on their death bed? With what they have by their own example taught others to do? Every civilisation in history has understood the nature of humanity and our inclination towards truth. The only society that has ever questioned the natural law is the sexually addicted mass we find ourselves in today.

I was once asked by a philosopher to imagine standing in the halls of Valhalla and looking into the eye of a perfect man. How long would that gaze hold? One could even think of her as the childlike empress; because children also have the innate capacity to detect moral falsehood (and admire integrity). We all still have this capacity, it just gets compromised by loss of innocence.

I posit that those who are least confident with their framework adhere to moral relativism because they can't make sense of the world. This is not inherently an intentional stance (bad/evil) - the information made available to them might be corrupt (cf propaganda); or they might lack the experience or the education to question it. But this does not mean that there are not others out there who have the experience and do not lack the education.

Newton rightly pointed out that "if I have seen further it is by standing on the shoulders of Giants". A lot of what people know does not come from their own deductions but is taught to them. The written word facilitated the accumulation of life long observations and deductions, to the point where a western citizen's mandatory education is the product of thousands of human lives of dedication to research.

Yet all knowledge is subject to distortion. It is the nature of the universe that information is incredibly difficult to create and incredibly easy to destroy. For every bit of information isolated within a system, many more bits must be destroyed outside of the system. It is here where archives become paramount to progress, and why anyone wishing to contemplate their own precision must study them.

To answer the question, I will first ask one which I have asked here before (TSR). Because until we have answered this question, I don't think we will properly grasp the weight of morality. Find an example of someone who has ever argued that a good thing is evil. Why can evil things be made out as good, but good cannot be made out as evil?

The reason is that good is truth, and light triumphs over darkness. Every civilisation that has attempted to deny moral truth has fallen. Likewise, those civilisations that stand today have evolved from civilisations that sought truth.

Now picture this. A young girl looks you in the eye. One is being asked whether their organisation should retain photos of her taken in a state she would not present herself in public - in exchange for finance. There is only one right answer. And whatever they say (or make themselves think) they will know that answer in their heart. Morality is a byproduct of our innate valuation of mind; and is only relative to the extent we do not perceive mind in others.

As a female knows the boundaries of her sensation, so does a male. The only difference is fortitude.

Morality is best taught by example. It cannot be forced on people. Nonetheless we have a responsibility to protect others against evil. To not act is be inconsistent.

//Objectification theory of progressivism
1. if the rejection of religion is responsible for social progress, then why is the divorce/marriage rate the same (similar) for Christian and non-Christian couples?
2. if metaphysical libertarian immorality is responsible for social progress, then why are there intergenerational changes in morality? (it is statistically impossible that a population of over 1 million has on average made more bad ML choices than the next)

---
hence the qualifier; similiar

It is referring to personal moral choices determined by libertarian free will decisions (as opposed to choices influenced by external environmental/social factors)

//Obscenity
[DHLawrence-pornographyAndObscenity-1929.pdf]

I completely disagree with his thesis. What is contained within this essay are the beginnings of moral relativism in western civilisation.

Critically, he argues that;
1. Conscious intention can be reduced to subconscious intention (which is illogical considering what these subconscious intentions have evolved to be)
2. Costs associated with marriage are equivalent to that of prostitution (our former prime minister Ms Gillard made the same claim during her education)
3. Ostensible purity and sexual disorder are equivalent ("the dirty little secret", "the grey ones", "the cloak of purity"...)
4. Meaning can be reduced to just mob meaning and individual meaning (it fails to capture objective meaning: that of concepts which exist independent of language)
5. The Victorian era was extraordinarily purity focused versus those before it (or that his enterprise will restore civilisation to its previous state)
6. That "genuine" pornography will inevitably remain undisclosed to the general public
7. The failure to censor all sensuality/sexuality (like "close-up kisses on the film") is hypocritical and justifies why all sexuality should be captured on the film
8. Discretion does not serve to honour sexuality but to debase it (make it cheap or something less than it is)
9. What causes sexual disorder is censorship; the mob's belief in obscenity

He does however make some realistic observations;
1. That modesty (implicit propriety) is equally important to explicit propriety
2. That genuine objectification operates off the illusion of sexual intercourse as something unshared between persons (mutual)

Some of these ideas (failure to appreciate the power and proprietary nature of the human body) have made their way through feminism all the way into popular children's literature (eg Allegiant, the chamber of secrets, etc). "Deus ex machina".

//Commodification
[in response to http://time.com/3444749/camille-paglia-the-modern-campus-cannot-comprehend-evil/]

I read this as the fact commodification of women cannot (solely) account for sexual assault. There are base instincts at play, which can be manipulated (capitalised upon) by culture, but will persist regardless. There is thus no way of creating a (secular) utopia by removing such impediments.

This doesn't appear to be an argument against such intentions. For a rational being to commit evil they must consciously deny some truth; in this case the intrinsic good of the sexual power of the opposite sex (which exists for the purposes of constructing/encouraging the construction of new life). This doesn't however imply we should tolerate an arbitrary level of manipulation of the base instincts of a human being (requiring increasing levels of top down control). Sexual commodification (visual or tactile manipulation) is thus just as evil as sexual assault.

(Note this explains why sexual abuse and assault are often conflated - in that this is a completely reasonable reduction in the context of moral responsibility).

//Violence against women
"Nothing but pieces of flesh to be destroyed" - although I don't have TV, and reject the ABC for its explicit normalisation of the commercial objectification of women, it is doubtful that TV or violence create this impression. Women (like men) become seen as pieces of flesh by being pieces of flesh - and although this occurs for a variety of reasons (and is recorded through a variety of media), all dehumanisation of homo vestiet is based on lie.

Regarding their more specific argument; if the author had read as much of a song of fire and ice as I had (around 3 chapters), perhaps they would never have bothered to watch the HBO series. Likewise, if they had had a clear enough conscience, they would have detected evil before ever having experienced the world, and been on their guard against it. They might even have created a theory to test; whether the psychology of their ancestors is not being twisted into a game to fulfil a much desired lust for vindication.

George RR Martin fails to create a secular medieval world. For no such world can exist; and our own is fading away (in possibly exponential decay). Consequently, the characters have as much depth of character as a modern (21st century) drone. Their interactions are alien, and their motivations fundamentally wrong. Such narcissistic reduction of man might last a few generations in a dopamine addicted fairy land devoid of any real faerie, but not one which is directly subject to nature. The ramifications for its fictional evaluation of women are truly awful; disgusting and base. It is like taking our fallen philosophy of ateleological, utilitarian sexuality, and then removing all artificial barriers against its logical fulfilment (a morally hypocritical legal system).

//
[in response to south Korean pop music propaganda to NK]

That is so wrong. Hasselhoff argues that Baywatch brought down the USSR. If this is the best the west has to offer in the way of argument; just wait and see how long it holds up for. When their TVs (imaginary stimuli) are gone, EMP has knocked out their exoskeletons, and they are left fighting [personOfSimilarConvictions] with a battle axe - the excitation ideology will fail, and they will have to find another principle on which to base a free society.

Emotion doesn't last - and it fades even quicker behind enemy lines. When they have deciphered the mechanism behind the effectiveness of your propaganda (and appreciated the consequences unravelling to this day; inevitable heartbreak amounting from reliance on rapidly expiring evolutionary opportunity), they are not going to take you seriously. I prefer Aang's method of conflict resolution any day. Tell a story about two children with a ball, and then go eat a custard tart.

Despite all the good intentions in the world, if you sacrifice the means all you are left with is evil.

//Normalisation of Prostitution

You know there is something seriously wrong with a society when it starts calling prostitutes "sex workers".

Regarding your definition of work: "An exchange of labour for money so as to live in a monetary world".

A criminal gets paid for collecting and/or fencing goods for their organisation. So a criminal has a job? If not, why not. Is it because criminal activity is illegal? What if the criminal activity weren't illegal?

A puppy dog cries every time we dignify prostitution, either directly or indirectly. The vast majority of prostitutes have been sexually abused; and the worst possible thing we can do for such people is to propagate its normalisation. Love means telling the truth - at any cost. Lies are the route of the coward, and they will always fail. People's entire psychology can become built on lies, and it is best to tear off the bandage fast and quick when faced with the choice. Every time we speak we are making a choice.

Raising participatory (or otherwise) dehumanisation is only lowering the good to its level. And one does not rework the language of their ancestors unless they think themselves better than their ancestors.

//Beauty

The problem with the modernist horde is not that it values beauty too much, it is that it values it too little.

//Pornography

Copying here a set of arguments titled "Pornography and the First Amendment";

The First Amendment reads:
"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances."

1. On what basis does the first amendment (freedom of speech) apply to pornography? Is their message that ineffable? The first amendment makes no reference to general expression (for example art); it only references religion, speech, the press, peaceful assembly, and petitions to government.

2. What would the writers of the amendment have to say? (At best their intentions had been exploited by lawyers; at worst hijacked by the unprincipled).

3. If a message cannot be put into words does it really exist (or is it really worth protecting under a constitution)?

4. Not all of what has been purported as capitalism is the free market at all, it is dehumanisation. To intentionally misrepresent a human being in the name of capitalism is no better than doing so in the name of nationalism, or communism.

5. If people stood up for this truth then they wouldn't risk being seen as hypocrites. Socialists would have no moral ground to stand on.

6. Civilisation is built on clothing: where prostitution (virtual or otherwise) becomes normalised, there is no future for liberty.

These are my arguments - feel free to counter.

          ---
          1. I completely reject the possibility of historical interpretation of a constitution (apart from the time in which it was created), and I think it is more than slightly concerning that all of these qualifications listed occurred after 1900. Why should precedent have any place in constitutional interpretation? The point of precedent is to allow evolution of law and constitutions are precisely designed to prevent evolution of law. If any changes are to be made, amendments should be proposed.

          The constitution should be interpreted literally, and if this means having to accept the reality that a population which will crush each other to death in the race to escape an imaginary fire is not worth saving, or must otherwise put some effort into finding someone guilty for murder for knowingly risking the lives of a group of people for no explicable reason (without any reference to free speech), then we should deal with it.

          Taking a constitution as up for interpretation might have all the good intention in the world behind it, but it is exceedingly dangerous. A society will reap what it sows. If it makes critical errors of judgment with respect to its forefathers no one is going to come and save it. More than likely it will get taken over by another with a moral high ground; one which has not become a protectionist state for mass dehumanisation. But unfortunately that ground may not be very high at all.

          2. It is quite a leap to go from ending slavery (and adding a provision which may not have been required if people had the same level of education about race) or extending the specific voting base to changing (reinterpreting) the constitution.

Going from freedom of speech to freedom of artistic expression might sound great until one recalls that individuals have quite enjoyed the artistry of experimenting on human subjects. And their subjects might have even enjoyed some of those experiments. As per my discussion with Paul, playing with such generalisations is a Pandora's box. It invites the state to making endless qualifications in a growing pantheon of restrictions; which will eventually contradict each other as is occurring now.

I will ask the question again more explicitly because it will never go away; what would the writers of the first amendment think now that it is being used to protect dehumanisation under the guise of artistic value; and that under the guise of speech.

The proposition that the writers were not infallible is granted, but it is equally worth noting that any changes we make (reinterpretations we assert) are equally infallible. Thus I am rejecting one such reinterpretation (and all others in the name of risk management and proper procedure) while specifying my reasons for the rejection. The only grounds for not paying even more attention to our modifications appears to be a blind progressivism. A more conservative approach (caution) may have stopped any such fallacies from arising to begin with.

3. Is the right to burn the American flag worth changing (reinterpreting) the constitution over?

4. Most people who support the practice of paying monkeys to dress up for sexual gratification do so in the name of the free market/capitalism (assuming they haven't been arrested by Peta). But dehumanisation is the same no matter which system of economics one adheres to.

5. Socialists with any moral fortitude detest modern day "capitalism" on grounds of sexual commodification, and I suggest that removing such commodification eliminates any moral basis to socialism. Paying people because they listened to the media (or procrastinated) rather than studying in a library while growing up is not exactly morally relevant; if anything it is criminal.

6. I was specifically referring to the normalisation of prostitution (virtual or otherwise). Prostitution may have existed in a large number of societies but in any of these where it became normalised (the norm) they had not liberty or a future; certainly not a future for liberty.

Thanks for all of the counter-arguments and references [personOfOtherConvictions].

The pinnacle case is Lovell v. City of Griffin (1938); extending "the press" to "every sort of publication which affords a vehicle of information and opinion". The fundamental limitation is that not all publications which afford a vehicle of information and opinion exclusively afford information and opinion.

Roth vs United States (1957) and Miller vs California (1973) were introduced to prevent this new freedom from implicitly extending to "obscene" publications, but it was unsurprisingly impossible to objectively define "obscenity". Instead of upholding the constitution (by only deeming it relevant to the publication of information/opinions), they extended it to all forms of media with some arbitrary (completely relative) qualifier regarding artistic or social value.

There is nothing good or moral achieved by upholding a right to the publication of such non-information, and confounding constitutional rights with a right to precipitate dehumanisation (rather than the right to discuss dehumanisation) damages the reputation and subverts the intentions of the constitution.

Since when did freedom of speech generalise to freedom?

Yes but a (freedom) implies b (freedom of speech) does not imply that b implies a. Enforcing freedom is fundamentally non-tenable; people's freedoms are inevitably going to collide (e.g. my freedom not to be insulted encroaches on your freedom not to insult), and the only way to resolve it is with relativism. This is why freedom of speech was constitutionally protected rather than freedom generale - they knew exactly what would happen if they started mandating freedom on par with freedom of speech.

[personOfOtherConvictions], I feel that your freedom of speech is violating my freedom to kill rapists. Now that is definitely not lawyer talk.

Yeah I might be happy to live in such a truly libertarian society, but is anyone else? Think of the bloodshed that must occur to restore order: elimination of all the dangerously immoral individuals until one is left with a cohort of what we hope to be human beings (assuming society doesn't rip itself to shreds).

Most civilisations in history were quite happy to wage wars to prevent their societies from devolving 5 million years (back to monkey world). I wouldn't classify their leaders as wolves. Similarly, I don't think our predecessors were morally obliged to request permission to eliminate dehumanisation. Furthermore, I don't think any true anarchist (libertarian) dreams of mass murder; they dream of a society free from the systematic safe harbouring of evil. When a government steps over the line of their job description (or in this case, constitution description: enforcing self-contradictory fantasies of absolute freedom), people can sit back and enjoy the slow ride to hell, or they can provide an argument. Although it seems you missed the point of the argument (universal freedom of will is impossible; hence the encoding of free speech) - which I guess is better than an outright dismissal of logic (lawyer talk) -on what basis would you classify the termination of sexual threats as mass murder?

I would emphasise here that homo spiritualis have evolved a concept of self-harm that not only concerns our body but our soul.

I am suggesting that there is no reason the US constitution should be subverted to protect pornography. Here is some clarification of the arguments;

1. I completely reject the possibility of historical interpretation of a constitution (apart from the time in which it was created), and I think it is more than slightly concerning that so many qualifications have occurred since 1900 (http://www.uscourts.gov/about-federal-courts/educational-resources/about-educational-outreach/activity-resources/what-does). Why should precedent have any place in constitutional interpretation? The point of precedent is to allow evolution of law and constitutions are precisely designed to prevent evolution of their law. If any changes are to be made, amendments should be proposed.

The constitution should be interpreted literally, and if this means having to accept the reality that a population which will crush each other to death in the race to escape an imaginary fire is not worth saving (or must otherwise put some effort into finding someone guilty for murder for knowingly risking the lives of a group of people for no explicable reason - without any reference to free speech), then we should deal with it. Is the right to salute or burn the American flag worth changing (reinterpreting) the constitution over?

Taking a constitution as up for interpretation might have all the good intention in the world behind it, but it is exceedingly dangerous.

2. What would the writers of the first amendment think now that it is being used to protect dehumanisation under the guise of artistic value; and that under the guise of speech?

The writers were not infallible, but it is equally worth noting that any changes we make (reinterpretations we assert) are equally infallible. Thus I am rejecting one such reinterpretation (and all others in the name of risk management and proper procedure) while specifying my reasons for the rejection. The only grounds for not paying attention to our modifications appears to be a blind progressivism. A more cautious approach may have stopped any such fallacies from arising to begin with.

3. The pinnacle case is Lovell v. City of Griffin (1938); extending "the press" to "every sort of publication which affords a vehicle of information and opinion". The fundamental limitation is that not all publications which afford a vehicle of information and opinion exclusively afford information and opinion.

Roth vs United States (1957) and Miller vs California (1973) were introduced to prevent this new freedom from implicitly extending to "obscene" publications, but it was unsurprisingly impossible to objectively define "obscenity". Instead of upholding the constitution (by only deeming it relevant to the publication of information/opinions), they extended it to all forms of media with some arbitrary (completely relative) qualifier regarding artistic or social value.

Again, there is a difference between creating amendments (eg the abolition of slavery - 13), or extending the specific voting base and changing (reinterpreting) the constitution.

Going from freedom of speech to freedom of artistic expression might sound great until one recalls that individuals have quite enjoyed the artistry of experimenting on human subjects. And their subjects might have even enjoyed some of those experiments. Playing with such generalisations is a Pandora's box.

Moreover, it invites the state to make endless qualifications in a growing pantheon of restrictions; which will eventually contradict each other as is occurring now.

4. Most people who support the practice of paying monkeys to dress up for sexual gratification do so in the name of the free market/capitalism (assuming they haven't been arrested by an animal rights group). But dehumanisation is the same no matter which system of economics one adheres to.

There is nothing good or moral achieved by upholding a right to the publication of such non-information, and confounding constitutional rights with a right to precipitate dehumanisation (rather than the right to discuss dehumanisation) damages the reputation and subverts the intentions of the constitution.

5. Socialists with any moral fortitude detest modern day "capitalism" on grounds of sexual commodification, and l suggest that removing such commodification eliminates any moral basis to socialism.

6. I am specifically referring to the normalisation of prostitution (virtual or otherwise). Prostitution may have existed in a large number of societies but in any of these where it became normalised (the norm) they had not liberty or a future; certainly not a future for liberty.

//Music industry sexual exploitation

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=AayL3AkLzsE

Although I wouldn't take this line myself (I think the sexual exploitation problem is inherently a pornographic one), a friend sent me this today regarding the role of philosophy; https://m.youtube.com/watch?v=LG1KRslp_jM
[https://web.archive.org/web/20171117011757/http://youtube.com/watch?v=LG1KRslp_jM]

//Modern Psychopathy
Perhaps if Stephen Paddock's psychiatrist had told him to stop using people as animals instead of giving him drugs a few lives could have been saved.

        I doubt it - not if it was done right and by a psychiatrist with integrity. People like this who use prostitutes need to be told they are fuckers, and to clean up their room and stop taking their shit out on young women (who have either been sexually abused or conditioned into use as token objects for cowards).

At least then the blood won't be on the hands of the health literature. It is dangerous propping up a broken system on drugs, and these guys should know better.

What a truly advanced and intellectually superior culture we live in where prostitution and masturbation are considered perfectly healthy activities, whereas having a conscience is not. I wonder how many lives are going to be sacrificed to the illusion of inconsequential immorality.

You can judge how well a psychological profession is doing at understanding mental health when you examine the rate of increase of mass killings of women in society.

Disregard for female life.

To kill a woman can never be neutrally immoral (missing the target) - it must be evil, because it goes against nature: even animals do not kill women. And this does not imply that whatever an animal does cannot be evil for a human being to enact - real systems (including moral ones) are more complicated that binary categories.

(Yes I am ignoring interspecies predation; humans eat female animals also). Notice how in reality your examples are hypotheticals; if they were to become a reality then this would imply the existence of an evil system; of which we should try to avoid at all cost. We (even by our negligence) would be responsible for the creation of such a system and thus the evil it manifests.

For a woman to engage in mortal combat they are presuming the moral high ground - because no moral man could intentionally kill her and would thus always be at a technical disadvantage. If a woman thought such a battle worthy and it was indeed worthy of her engagement then this would be a moral choice. More ordinarily, women fight back when they are attacked but do not initiate combat - because they understand nature and do not idolise the just war. As for an increase in violent attacks by women in society, this is further evidence of the existence of an evil system and a breakdown in the understanding of mental health.

Yet what is being discussed here are not the moral choices of women but of men (biologically determined intraspecies gender relations consequent the evolutionary value of female gametes over male gametes). The hypothetical nature of the scenarios presented in which a man is called to kill a woman expose the exception that proves the rule. Principles derive from nature, and the further we depart from them the more we risk imparting civilisation to evil.

It is an argument from nature and is not primarily economic. We have evolved to value female gametes higher not just because of their distribution/supply relative to male gametes but because of the resources sacrificed following their fertilisation (9+ months of reproductive opportunity, entire life of child welfare, physiological changes, psychological changes, etc). Male gametes are both plentiful and confer no such restrictions, meaning only few males relative to females are required to sustain a population. Thus males are replaceable with respect to the survival of the species.

Morality is a logical response to reality, and what has been presented is respect for and integration of nature. Contrarily, an economic/utilitarian judgement is based on outcome rather than principle; and notice how my reasoning is devoid of such pragmatism. Although good outcomes generally (some believe always; eg the neverending story, karma, theism, etc) follow good principles in the long run, and it is wisdom to recognise this, it is wrong to make moral judgements on utility to the detriment of principle (by definition). Biologically encoded values (for female life etc) are the result of an evolutionary process that favours survival, but what is being respected here is nature, not survival per se.

Human beings are rational sentient animals. A rational animal does not deny its roots but integrates its biological nature towards the good (right). The denial of biological reality leads to fantasy, and one must take responsibility for the evil that follows. Likewise, the denial of internal (human) reality by a rational sentient being has delusionary psychological consequences, which also manifest in grave evil, and represents this post's thesis.

Moral judgment cannot be reduced to that of biological adaptation (because rationality/logic has an external/abstract existence). Nor can it fall below its standard (necessary evil as discussed; the termination of females, the glorification of evolutionary disorders, etc. Note in accordance with theory exclusive homosexuality is extremely rare/erroneous and non-existent in non-domesticated mammals). Moral judgment can only ever improve with reference to new knowledge - it cannot deny some part of reality through which it emerged. Thus, although indiscriminate relations (rape, beastiality, sodomy, polyamory, selfishness, infidelity, child abuse, deception, dominance, masturbation, stimulation, etc) are natural occurrences in the animal kingdom - this does not make them right for a rational sentient being to engage in.

No the claim is that killing a woman is a necessary evil. Killing a man might well be evil also (eg murder), but it is not a necessary evil.

I am referring to my previous definition of necessary evil ("To kill a woman can never be neutrally immoral (missing the target) - it must be evil", "necessary evil as discussed; the termination of females.."). To kill a woman is necessarily evil, to kill a man is not (e.g. man slaughter, combat, etc). Your second interpretation although existent in the literature is a contradiction in terms; something can be necessarily evil (evil of necessity), but an evil cannot be necessary by definition.

Note there are two reasons why prostitution/pornography can be equated to treating women like animals; a) treating women like another species (dehumanisation type 1; turn a person into a thing/robot/meat), and b) treating women like how animals treat other animals of

their own species (dehumamisation type 2; turn a person into a non-agent). These are two distinct psychological constructs. The first pertains to a denial of human nature (sentience). The second pertains to a denial of human uniqueness (agency).

http://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/pornography

//Primary Objectification
[regarding https://mobile.nytimes.com/2017/09/30/opinion/hugh-hefner.html]

I think the point is that they didn't have very good fathers.

//Apparent Self-Objectification
Does she truly wish to be judged? I am not convinced.

//Abolition of Prostitution
IMG_1156.JPG / IMG_1162.JPG

---
https://nordicmodelnow.org
https://twitter.com/nordicmodelnow

---
http://www.9news.com.au/national/2017/08/22/09/35/sex-party-victoria-fiona-patten-rename-reason-party

=== Education ===

//Tolerance

I don't know if you have noticed but it is actually pretty difficult to counter [personOfSimilarConvictions]'s central thesis thus far. I suggest the only hope is to offer a better more elegant theory on why we have come to accept the second rate as good and normal. Establishing causality is a critical component of the enterprise and deserves serious attention (with so many variables and limited causal evidence what I am suggesting at present is the philosophical possibility based on known x000 year human standards).

Education comes in many forms. To what extent is our education in relativism intentional, and what extent is it derivative from a false premise - the fake christianity of tolerance (of evil)? For if we are told to accept anything as long as it doesn't physically harm somebody, what new framework must we uphold to reconcile the contradiction of psychological manipulation? Other than the denial of its existence (dehumanisation blind spots)?

I wonder how Experiment House is going?

//Religious Education

Is there a problem with people teaching about religion? I think you would have to start banning media. Everything good would be R rated.

//Education
I was thinking about this idea in terms of economies of scale: how would good schools benefit from a linear/proportional increase in funding with new arrivals. Would it favour particular school sizes? I gather that such a system would not only favour schools that have good teachers, but those with high volunteer rates and school fees. Public schools that relied on mediocracy would attract less students, and soon wouldn't be able to support their administrative overheads.

I don't see anything counter-productive with conspiracy theory. Motives should be so plain that the non-existence of conspiracies are self-evident. When people set out to destabilise ancient institutions I think it gives them some degree of credit to propose conspiracy (because the alternative is that they are incredibly stupid to take such risks with children).

What is far more dangerous are deeply ingrained self-propelling belief systems not recognised to be abnormal. For example, current views on the relationship between sexual morality and honour are so strange that any other culture in the history of the world would think we have lost the plot. In such cases the worst possible scenario is for everyone to become so afraid that they stop talking. It is when talk becomes confined to closed rooms that error is apparent.

While I like the observation of the effect of subtle changes, and think the defacto coupon system of education is brilliant, I don't think we should ever engage in tactics involving masked changes. I would sooner support open rebellion than resort to the same dirty methods of psychological warfare. This is why I think it is critical to keep speaking the truth.

//Dystopian literature
The rise of dystopian literature.

(Discuss)

(Why are young people attracted to the themes of vampires and dystopia?)

Rather than present a pure psychological hypothesis, I am going to forward a sociological account of an attraction towards vampires, zombies and dystopia. I am going to compare two theories of societal evolution discussed here (SR). Note that social theories are extremely difficult to prove, but they like all theory must be predictive, and their ability to explain new phenomena can therefore affect our understanding of the models.

Firstly, taking [personOfSimilarConvictions]'s proposition (and popular conservative analysis, as seen for example at heterodoxacademy.org) that "there is a vicious feedback loop between the academy, the school and the media". Intellectually corrupt academia, centralised education, and selective/biased media reporting might possibly be able to explain an attraction towards dystopian literature. But, if people were really being convinced by their politically correct overlords, wouldn't they be more attracted towards utopian literature? Especially the young, given that they are apparently far more supportive of the denial of free speech? So what is going on here? Furthermore, why is this attraction independent of political ideology, and what is the deal with the vampires and zombies? Is this just another case of a conforming young population looking for more excitement?

I suggest that there is only one theory that can explain both these trends (bar irrational conformist transmission and long evolved instincts). Objectification theory explains both our need for the deglorification of the physical, and a redemption of the system. Furthermore, this attraction should be more prominent for young people, because they are less committed to their inherited social values (whatever they tick in surveys). They are more adept at identifying intrapersonal contradiction, and are under less external pressure to reconcile it with their elders' utopia. Their world view had not yet been forged, and they need not maintain a guise of directing all their energies towards the society of freedom they are constantly taught still exists (or is only growing stronger).

---

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_dystopian_literature

//Education

The most important education for a child occurs around the age of 7 and I would say that in this sense education is critical.

Yes (in response to; is education not a commodity?)

I don't think education can be properly controlled by 'the free market'. Firstly, it requires an educated population to educate. The fact that even the private system is producing students in grade 8 who belong in grade 3 means that our society is failing to educate citizens consistently (holistically). Secondly, the majority of meaningful education is performed by parents, which is not controlled by a market (and parents are not sufficiently educated to instil a desire for truth). Thirdly, people don't appear (at present in the west) to be paying for education - they only appear to be paying for discipline (albeit a prerequisite to education). Fourthly, education has traditionally been a significant philanthropic endeavour (the exception being the sophists).

I am not sure if anyone wants commercial formal education - but if they did, it would only be because of a complete lack of faith in state or institutional capacity to educate. In such circumstances it may be best to let the system die a natural death. Furthermore, citizens certainly should not be made to compensate for a failure of irresponsible parents to educate their children (this is the realm of grace).

Finally, it is worth recognising that not all free markets involve commodities. Economists have mistaken what a truly free market is. It is not one which is protected by law, but by the will of the people - and if the people don't like it, they shall destroy it.

//Communism
The communists are taking over the USA tertiary system;

https://csl.uchicago.edu/get-help/bias-response-team
dos.uoregon.edu/bias
https://deanofstudents.umich.edu/article/bias-response-team
leadership.oregonstate.edu/diversity/bias-incident-response/bias-response-team
https://uni.edu/brt/welcome-bias-response-team
https://www.fairfield.edu/undergraduate/student-life-and-services/office-of-the-dean-of-students/bias-response-team/
http://web.uri.edu/brt/
https://www.uvm.edu/deanofstudents/bias_response_team
https://campus-climate.umn.edu/content/about-bias-response-team
https://www.facebook.com/UNCBRT/
bias.utk.edu/response/
https://students.wisc.edu/doso/services/bias-reporting-process/
https://studentlife.lafayette.edu/student-health-and-safety/bias-response-team-brt
https://students.vcu.edu/about-us/administration/reuban-rodriguez/dos/brt/
http://www.middlebury.edu/about/handbook/student_policies/community-bias-response-team-policy-
https://www.brynmawr.edu/bias-response/bias-incident-response-team-0
https://www.missouristate.edu/dos/268885.htm
http://cms.bsu.edu/campuslife/multiculturalcenter/biasresponseteam
http://deanofstudents.ucr.edu/emergencycrisis/hatebiasresponseteam/
www.juniata.edu/services/dean/biasresponseteam/
http://www.bc.edu/offices/diversity/compliance/hate-crime-conduct-proto/university-responses_.html
www.swarthmore.edu/public-safety/bias-response-team-members-0
reporthate.ucsc.edu/response-team
http://www.pacific.edu/Campus-Life/Safety-and-Conduct/Bias-and-Discriminatory-Harassment-Policies-and-Protocols/Bias-Response-Team.html
lowercolumbia.edu/diversity-equity/bias-response-team.php
https://inside.sou.edu/diversity/bias-response-team.html
https://lionsgate.tcnj.edu/organization/BRT
www.providence.edu/student-affairs/bias-response/Pages/bias-response-team.aspx
https://www.potsdam.edu/about/diversity/biasresponse
www.emory.edu/CAMPUS_LIFE/initiatives/programs_and_resources/birt.html
https://my.alfred.edu/brt
https://my.cedarcrest.edu/ICS/Current_Students/Center_for_Diversity_and_Inclusion_(CDI)/Bias_Response.jnz
https://www.cc-seas.columbia.edu/studentlife/bias/protocol
uomatters.com/tag/bias-response-team
www.emerson.edu/diversity/bias-response-program/anonymous-reporting
https://msp.unca.edu/bias-incident-response-team-birt
bias.unl.edu
uwf.edu/offices/bias-response
https://www1.villanova.edu/villanova/provost/diversity/report_bias.html
www.bucknell.edu/biaspolicy
www.smcm.edu/campus-rights/bias-incident-response
https://www.uwlax.edu/conted/hate-bias
https://www.smith.edu/about-smith/diversity/policies/bias-reporting
https://www.nebrwesleyan.edu/inside-nwu/diversity-and-inclusion/bert
www.unco.edu/biasresponse
www.bellarmine.edu/studentaffairs/bias-ireporting
https://www.gvsu.edu/bias/members-of-the-team-against-bias-4.htm
www.sonoma.edu/biasresponse
https://studentaffairs.duke.edu/bias-response

campuslifeanddiversity.vassar.edu/birt
www.nyu.edu/biasresponse
www.umatter.ufl.edu/stopbias
https://www.skidmore.edu/bias
www.providence.edu/student-affairs/bias-response/Pages/bias-response-protocol.aspx
https://hr.cornell.edu/diversity/reporting/bias_response.html
https://studentlife.osu.edu/bias
https://studentaffairs.usc.edu/ssa/bias-assessment-response-support
https://www.elon.edu/biasresponse
http://www.nau.edu/bias-response-protocol/
https://www.montclair.edu/student-development-campus-life/oed/bias-response-taskforce/
http://www.sonoma.edu/biasresponse/
http://www.housing.ucsb.edu/judicial-affairs/bias-response
https://www.susqu.edu/about-su/bias-response
www.colby.edu/deanofthecollege/whatistheresponseteam
www.smcm.edu/inclusion-diversity-equity-initiative/bias-response
https://msp.unca.edu/bias-incident-response-team-birt
http://www.stonehill.edu/offices-services/intercultural-affairs/bias-response-protocol/
http://www.cwu.edu/diversity/bias-response-plan
https://apps.carleton.edu/campus/dos/initiatives/bcrt
inclusion.olemiss.edu/birt
evergreen.edu/studentaffairs/biasincidentprotocol
http://www.babson.edu/about-babson/diversity/Pages/bias-incident-response-policy.aspx
http://www.simmons.edu/about-simmons/administrative-offices-and-services/public-safety/bias-response-protocol
http://www.myacpa.org/docs/bias-incident-prevention-and-response-protocol-final-approved-2-14-14pdf
https://www.dartmouth.edu/~opal/act/reportbias.html
www.northwestern.edu/inclusion/respectnu/reporting-bias-hate-incidents
diversity.utexas.edu/ccrt
http://www.dickinson.edu/info/20227/popel_shaw_center_for_race_and_ethnicity/1844/bias_education_and_response_team
https://www.wright.edu/student-affairs/student-resources/bias-related-incident-reporting
www.uky.edu/counselingcenter/bias-incident-response-services
www.montana.edu/biasreporting/BIRT.html
www.xavier.edu/dean-of-students/About-the-Bias-Advisory-Group-Committee.cfm
deanofstudents.calpoly.edu/content/BIRT
louisville.edu/biasresponse
http://www.goucher.edu/student-life/equity-and-identity/center-for-race-equity-and-identity/bias-education-and-response-team
dos.uconn.edu/bias-incident-protocol
www.clemson.edu/inclusion/oie/biasprotocol.html
https://www.uc.edu/inclusion/bias-incident-response-team.html
https://studentaffairs.indiana.edu/dean-students/incident-teams
www.unomaha.edu/student-life/student-safety/help-myself/bias-hate-support.php
http://www.depauw.edu/studentacademiclife/campus-safety/bias-incident-resources/role-of-the-bias-incident-response-team-birt/
https://www.wells.edu/student-life/campus-safety/bias-incident-response-team
https://deanofstudents.arizona.edu/about/bias-incident-reporting
www.oneonta.edu/bias
https://www.framingham.edu/the-fsu-difference/inclusive-excellence/bias-education-response-team/index
https://www.stmarys-ca.edu/student-life/your-safety-resources/bias-incident-response-team-birt
http://academics.lmu.edu/diversity/reportdiscriminationbiasincidents/biasincidentresponseteambirt/
https://www1.villanova.edu/villanova/provost/diversity/report_bias.html
https://www.uab.edu/studentaffairs/biasreporting/bias-incident-response-team-process
reportbias.wfu.edu/university-response/bias-incident-report-team
www.rochester.edu/college/bic/bias-incident-response/incident.html
https://www.pugetsound.edu/about/diversity-at-puget-sound/bias-hate-education-bert/
commonground.richmond.edu/contact/bias-incidents/index.html
www.gettysburg.edu/about/offices/college_life/srr/srr3/response/index.dot
www.du.edu/equalopportunity/bias_incident/index.html
www.snc.edu/diversityaffairs/biasincidents
www.plu.edu/birt
www.umass.edu/umatter/bias
https://www.bradley.edu/campuslife/diversity/incident
https://www.washington.edu/raceequity/updates/bias-reporting-tools
www.northeastern.edu/oidi/compliance/bias-protocol
jkrt.sdes.ucf.edu/bias
http://yalecollege.yale.edu/campus-life/cultural-affairs-centers/intercultural-affairs-council-iac/iac-biasassault-reporting-and
www.sdce.edu/organization/birt
reportbias.ucsd.edu
https://epress.earlham.edu/diversity/ec-bias-response-protocol
https://www.hamilton.edu/offices/dos/bias-incident-and-hate-crimes
student-affairs.buffalo.edu/judicial/biasguide.php
https://www2.clarku.edu/offices/campussafety/bias-protocol.cfm
http://www.ccsu.edu/diversity/biasPlan.html
http://www.napavalley.edu/President/BIRT/Pages/default.aspx

@[personOfOtherConvictions] - there has been a well documented liberal/conservative bias amongst US academia/academics for some time, but this does not mean they have been actively suppressing alternative opinions (or creating systems to enable this).

As much as I respect traditional Chinese culture, I think their sample case provides a great guide to communism and philosophical dictatorship;

https://www.edx.org/course/introduction-mao-zedong-thought-mao-ze-tsinghuax-10610224x-2

Reporting on aversive speech is straight out of 1984. (@[personOfSimilarConvictions]; This is where I draw the borderline between socialism and communism).

I think he had a lot of good ideas (regarding commodification/self-identification with commodities), but as is so often the case was corrupted by the one ring when he made a god out of eros. I think that he could have been a great force of good in the world if he didn't turn to using the world (the marginalised etc) to his own ends.

=== Energy ===

//World Energy / Nuclear Fusion
Note solar power is just secondary fusion. Any energy solution needs to be economically competitive for developing nations. It doesn't matter what rich nations implement. If we envisage an equitable future with every second African family owning a sky car, we need to invest in R&D. Even Lockheed Martin has a fusion program.

Note that most countries (and companies) don't have the funding required to research and develop controlled fusion. It is much easier to build a hydrogen bomb. This doesn't excuse us from communicating and demanding what is possible (and inevitable). If anthropogenic climate change really is a dangerous issue (or even if it might be dangerous issue, as most researchers tend to think), and people are considering anything but nuclear, then environmental stability is a lost cause. Moreover, if we aren't developing the necessarily solutions now (i.e. now), then things are only going to become more difficult. Decreasing emissions (or lessening the increase of emissions) is ridiculous - it can't solve the problem. If the current models are accurate, then we need to aim for zero emissions globally.

The point about rich nations is that they will only consume a minor proportion of global energy needs while the developing nations develop, and therefore what they chose to do with their money is irrelevant (apart from R&D). Renewables are only competitive in rich nations because rich people like to spend money thinking that they are helping the environment. Most such investments are made based on the principle that people will pay more to be clean (exceptions perhaps for isolated areas with an expensive grid; but this isn't going to be the case in the highly populated developing world).

//Energy
The Spanish coastline is desecrated by windmills - but personally I can suffer the environmental damage until commercial fusion goes online.

//Tidal dam
Based on their website, I would assume it would produce 320x14= 4480MWh per day (14 hour operation). This probably requires cutting in half as it is not always going to be providing energy at the right time of the day (night). Still, it is only an order of magnitude different than your figures [personOfSimilarConvictions] (feel free to clarify).

More the merrier reasoning is indicative of taking the peripheral (as opposed to central) route. I would see it as an instance of the cognitive bias towards argument quantity.

I agree that without providing an efficiency curve it is impossible to know the energy output over time. It seems doubtful that they are going to maintain a consistent efficiency over a 14 hour period, and they may well have been quoting the power at peak (rather than mean) efficiency. If this is the case, and we assume that it operated on something like a solar power plant efficiency curve (3.5-4 MWh per peak MW output per day), then over a given 6 hour period it would provide on average 320x4/(24/6)=320MWh of energy, and your extrapolations would follow exactly.

Basically, there is no way of knowing whether it would be worth throwing 1b or 100m (if anything) at this project based on their website. You would just have to hope that the politicians have more information than we do. I wonder how many renewable projects advertise junk statistics?

//Nuclear energy
Countries that run nuclear fission have high speed rail networks - they recognise that clean energy is only a problem for bad engineering. The time and effort spent globally on energy/climate environmentalism should be costed. I guarantee that if this were spent on controlled fusion research instead, we would have to find something else to feel moral about.

(The obvious solution is to build a wire connecting one side of the sunny earth to the other..)

@[personOfSimilarConvictions], @[personOfSimilarConvictions] - it was a joke.

[personOfOtherConvictions], as I previously suggested; I think this 'all part of the global solution' hypothesis however popular is an artefact of an established cognitive bias in the context of persuasion (believing that multiple positives; ie argument quantity, in any way takes precedence over argument quality). Can anyone actually back it (a global non-nuclear equilibrium) up with data? Assuming that one wishes to obtain zero CO2 emissions and not kill all the poor people (or deprive them of a future)?

//Energy (Coal replacement technology)
Or could the money that would otherwise be spent on gas be used to fund an actual solution?

//Energy
Actually clean water will be the least valuable commodity in the future, followed by clean air. Desalination and terraforming will be standard (although most of it will probably involve injecting green house gases into the atmosphere rather than extracting them; once the anthropocenic fantasy ends and we enter the next ice age).

The only benefit I can see investing in low tech renewables is that they take heat out of the environment, but even this could be regulated in the short term (<1000 years) by simple weather control systems; reducing the primary atmospheric green house gas: H_2O. And none of this technology is going to be running off windmills, nor are aircraft carriers or aircraft.

This was written under the assumption that water might be the most appropriate green house gas for the purpose.

//Hydrogen fuel cells
I am not sure if one of the underlying themes of the article makes any sense;
"The resource-poor nation is seeking to fill an energy gap left by the closure of its 54 nuclear reactors after the 2011 disaster at the Fukushima nuclear plant"
"As the world looks for alternative solutions to using fossil fuels to power our vehicles and homes, hydrogen fuel cells could be one solution. "
The creation of hydrogen gas requires energy.

//Energy
The only problem is that sky cars don't run on battery.

=== Evolution ===

//Gender bias in conflict

Women are worth more than men (from a natural perspective)

//Darwin/evolution versus scientism
I am not sure if "darwinism" does credit to Darwin though [personOfSimilarConvictions]. It is categorically false to reduce evolution to adaptation, and philosophically questionable to reduce evolution to non-teleological causes. Furthermore, it is ethically questionable to reduce morality to observables (the naturalistic fallacy). I don't think Darwin would have adhered to any of these assumptions; but you already know this. It is as bad a misnomer as "creationism".

//Biological Determinism
An introduction to biological determinism -

Genetic determination of a trait is often calculated using twin studies. Genetic contributions are measured relative to those of the environment (e.g. society). Twin studies consist of both identical (monozygotic) and non-identical (dizygotic) twins.

In a simple ("ACE") model, the correlation (r) of a measured trait between two persons (their phenotype) is subject to the similarity of their genotype (how much genetic material they share), along with;

A) the heritability of the trait,
C) their common/shared environment, and;
E) their unique environment

A high correlation (r) of a trait means that both persons either exhibit it or do not exhibit it, and a low correlation means that it is completely random as to whether they both exhibit it. The unique environment (E) has the potential to significantly affect the correlation of the trait between the persons. The shared environment (C) does not have the ability to significantly affect the correlation between the persons. The heritability of any trait will vary on its own accord (some traits are completely determined by the environment while others are almost completely hard coded, e.g. eye colour), but the capacity of the heritability (A) of the trait to affect the correlation will depend on how much genetic material is shared between the persons (e.g are they identical twins, fraternal twins, siblings, cousins, etc). The total contribution of all components to the correlation will (by definition) never vary, and so in this model A, C, and E can be set to equal 1 (ie, A + C + E = 1).

It might now be worth imagining some specific trait, say extraversion.

1. The correlation (r_MZ) of the trait between monozygotic (MZ) twins in a family is adversely affected by E) only, their unique environment. This is the case because their genetic material is identical, and they are assumed to share a common environment (home). Note this is mathematically equivalent to saying that the correlation is wholly determined by A) the heritability of the trait and C) their common environment, as E = 1 - (A + C). Therefore, we set r_MZ = A + C.
2. The correlation of the trait between dizygotic (DZ) twins is similarly determined by A) the heritability of the trait and C) their common environment, but they only share 50% of their twin's genetic material, and as such we set r_DZ = 1/2xA + C.

We can now solve for A, E and C. Assume a study has been conducted on a large sample of twins and both r_MZ and r_DZ have been measured.

i)
r_MZ = A + C. (1.)
C = r_MZ - A

r_DZ = 1/2xA + C (2.)
C = r_DZ - 1/2xA

Substitute 1. rearranged into 2. rearranged;
r_MZ - A = r_DZ - 1/2xA
r_MZ - r_DZ - A = - 1/2xA
r_MZ - r_DZ = 1/2xA
2x(r_MZ - r_DZ) = A
A = 2x(r_MZ - r_DZ)

ii).
r_MZ = A + C (1.)
r_MZ = 1 - E
E = 1 - r_MZ

iii)
A + C + E = 1
C = 1 - A - E
Substitute in ii);
C = 1 - A - (1 - r_MZ)
C = - A + r_MZ

The total genetic component (heritability) of the trait is A. In the case of extraversion, this is commonly measured to be approximately 0.5 (50%).

When interpreting heritability estimates from twin studies an important factor one needs to consider is the gene-environment (GxE) interaction effect. The realisation of a genetic predisposition in one's phenotype is subject to their environment. For example, heritability (genetic component) estimates of IQ are usually quite high (e.g. 0.8), but in low socioeconomic environments they can become negligible.

//Creationism
[note the reference to visible objects beyond 10000 light years away;]

In the southern hemisphere you can see the large and small Magellanic Clouds by eye.

//Biological Evolution
The observable evidence for biological evolution (change of kinds) is the fossil record. There is also extremely strong evidence from the behaviour of animals (take for example clothing differences across gender; respecting reproductive system dominance - only in a pretentious or scientifically confused civilisation would we presume to think that clothing was purely arbitrary and served no humane purpose). Likewise, there is strong evidence in the way in which biological organisms are constructed at a molecular level (reuse of code/systems). A classic example of this is the fact every cell of the body contains a replica of the genetic code required to construct the entire organism (this would be redundant from a non-evolutionary engineering perspective).

The precise mechanism of macro (interspecies) evolution is however unknown. We should not be so confident in the specifics of the process as the fact it occurs. Anything else is either ignorance or a bluff in my opinion. From a computational perspective random mutations of code that allow for a viable incremental transition from a less developed to a more developed organism is extraordinary (nothing like this exists in contemporary artificial languages). Although biological evolution almost certainly involves random mutations between viable organisms (unless one believes in divine intervention at multiple times in history while god is attempting to get the product right), the way in which this is facilitated by nature is unestablished. I am of the belief that there may be some kind of adaptation within the structure of <=1BYO DNA that allows for rapid interspecies/macro evolution (note for example research in epigenetics and evodevo are only in their infancy).

In any case however, biological evolution (at the rate we observe on earth) is likely to be the exception rather than the rule. It is arguably more probable that we are living in a universe (with the necessary/fine tuned physical parameters) in which only 1 organism has evolved to a state where it can contemplate its existence than in a universe in which 2 or more organisms have evolved to contemplate their existence. And although the precise probability calculation depends on the mechanics of the universe generation mechanism (including perhaps the generation mechanism of the generation mechanism), the number of universes being generated, the scale of our universe, etc, the general principle of successful evolution exclusivity holds.

Note astronomy and geology are exceptional sciences in that traditional scientific experiments (manipulations) cannot be performed. This is a consequence of them involving spatial and temporal scales much greater than what what is necessary for traditional experiments to be performed.

It is important to recognise however that if these temporal scales were not real, then we wouldn't be able to observe half the light of our galaxy let alone that from the rest of the universe (as it would not have reached us). Furthermore, what we know about cosmic evolution is solid - and so a universe with cosmic evolution and not biological evolution would be somewhat inconsistent. Either we are living in a universe whose laws are conducive to the evolution of life on earth, or one in which life on earth is an artificial post hoc construct (and if this were the case, how would we know that we weren't constructed by aliens?) I prefer the semitic myth over the modern reactionary non-evolutionary account.

//Biological Evolution (continued)

The basic idea behind naturalism is that the laws of nature combined with a sufficiently large and old universe facilitate the formation of a physical system capable of natural selection (reproduction and inherited variation). Moreover, the laws of the nature must facilitate the formation of a system capable of encoding the incremental transition (mutation) of viable organisms. Why a universe would exhibit such laws is unknown; but it is unanimously agreed there has been some form of anthropic selection.

Although the definition of information varies, most would consider a genetic system to encode information. So at which point would you argue that a mind is required to produce information over and above lawlike processes? The formation of natural law, the formation of a genetic system, or the formation of information within a higher order system (brain)?

They require a mind to have the capacity to arise, a mind be encoded (according to their specific forms), or a mind to be interpreted as information?

The idea behind Darwinian evolution (natural selection) is that a mechanism is provided whereby complexity can increase. In combination with a yet to be discovered genetic construct (DNA) and the assumption of a universal common ancestor (whose probability of formation increases with our estimation of the size and age of the universe) the method is complete. Whether this is the method implemented by nature is an empirical question, but there is strong evidence for it (the fossil record, microevolution in rapidly reproducing organisms, etc).

Furthermore, evolution (generale) is the only empirically testable theory of biology (ie can be denied by observation). It just so happens that such experimentation takes hundreds of thousands of years to perform for our more recent hypothetical ancestors. Being empirically testable doesn't make it the only possible alternative however, just the only one capable of being taught in a science (as opposed to a philosophy) class. I wouldn't be opposed to anyone teaching the principle behind ID detection in a more general information theory (/engineering) class, but I would be very wary of its robust application to biological constructs at this stage: Not a lot of peer reviewed literature (by independent researchers) exists as far as I am aware. I have never even heard of it outside of religious affiliated organisations; it is not mainstream. It doesn't make it wrong however, just difficult to teach at a school level (perhaps even impossible for those without a tertiary education in all of the relevant disciplines).

A fundamental issue in the empirical investigation of natural history is that we haven't decoded the genome - we haven't even started to understand the instruction set (we just like to manipulate things and see what happens);
" A few years ago, when scientists announced that they had decoded the human genome, there was tremendous publicity and even a White House ceremony."

This doesn't make any sense;
"LAW: The second possibility is the most common view among scientists today -- that life arose by natural forces within the constituents of matter itself. Life arises automatically whenever the right conditions hold. Does this explain the sequence in DNA? The answer, again, is No. Why not? Because lawful events act in regular, predictable, repeatable patterns..."

This again is a false argument. Information can be defined as something which can be represented in multiple mediums, however just because information can be represented in multiple mediums (eg 5 apples, 5 ticks, 5 pictures) doesn't mean an instance of this information has been designed;
"The realization that life is about information completely turns older arguments about evolution on their head. Why? Because information is independent of the material medium used to store and transmit it. In a book, the words are printed with ink on paper, but they could also be written with crayon or paint or chalk, or even scratched into sand with a stick. The message remains the same, no matter what you use to write it. And the obvious implication is that the message was not created by the matter used to write it."

I doubt Davies would have been making this point (he is an advocate of the above rejected LAW method);
"As astrophysicist Paul Davies says, 'Trying to make life by mixing chemicals in a test tube is like soldering switches and wires in an attempt to produce Windows 98. It won't work because it addresses the problem at the wrong conceptual level.'"

This is correct;
"In a letter published in Nature, another scientist says the same thing from the opposite direction: 'Even if all the data point to an intelligent designer, such an hypothesis is excluded from science because it is not naturalistic.'"

Personally I think evolutionary theorists need to understand the evolution of information within the genetic construct (incremental representations of viable organisms). This is a phenomenon unheard of in artificial code (as far as I am aware). This is only going to happen though once we have started to decode the genome. I am taking about real deterministic decoding here (formal algorithms). If it was discovered that the genetic construct of this universe only supported the evolution of a particular prototype (body plan) then it would certainly favour ID (however it would remain untestable as a scientific hypothesis; multiple philosophical explanations could be provided: back to the multiverse).

One thing I like about this article however is the observation that our teaching of natural history will affect (colour) our approach to other disciplines. This is pretty important to recognise and should be taught as such.

Regarding the first quotation; doesn't make any sense is perhaps a little harsh - but this is my impression of the pick and choose (all or nothing) interpretation of evolutionary theory exhibited here. The "lawful" (encouraged by physical law) formation of a first common ancestor (single cell precursor - whatever it happens to be) along with a genetic construct does not preclude natural selection operating on this system (basic life) to create the specific DNA sequences we are more familiar with. Any precursor would have been wiped out (eaten) by its more successful children - and there is unlikely to be evidence of it on planet earth. The operation of the precursor "organism" (/chemical arrangement) needn't require a specific DNA sequence (or a particularly long one; one which would be unlikely to form on its own accord in a finite universe).

I may add some more commentary on the other quotations later. Did you understand the last two paragraphs?

Regarding the first sentence of your last paragraph - this is interesting, but I would like to see a practical example of its application to modern science. As far as I am aware everyone in their discipline adheres to methodological naturalism - either that or they are hypothesising pseudo scientific theories (or not discussing science). Can you please elaborate here?

Regarding the last two sentences - I completely agree. Random chance in the context of a scientific observation is precisely that (a statement regarding the probability of observing something) - it doesn't preclude another (eg formal) cause.

Introduction:

Whether or not science is classified as religiously neutral here is dependent on whether it hypothesises something different to some (claimed) religious doctrine. I agree that in this sense science can't be religiously neutral.

The introductory thesis that "science" must be modified to account for a prior religious beliefs (or implemented independently by religious believers) appears to follow from a lack of conviction in the truth of those religious beliefs, or confidence in their alignment with nature. I assume this to be the case because no explanation is provided for the modification. Contrarily, this would be a very good reason not to modify "science". Note I am quoting science here because I do not believe the scientific method can be either modified or reimplemented.

1. Moral theory:

The first section is a fair critique of a particular instance of bad science (projecting one's philosophy into science with arbitrary notions of rationality). The correct inference in a scientific (evolutionary) context is to conclude that there is an ancient part of us that seeks to maximise our reproductive fitness - not that obeying this instinct equates to rationality. Rationality involves acting based upon known facts; and it is known that there is more to reality than observables like genetic propagation. In fact, the late homo sapiens is programmed to believe this. Rationality must therefore be a response following from a unification of all known facts (philosophical framework).

"And even if we do say that Simonian science isn't really science, nothing substantive changes; my point will then be, not that religious considerations bear on science properly so-called, but rather that they bear on what is in fact called science, which is a very important, indeed, dominant part of our intellectual and cultural life."

- This should be reason enough to critique such scientific efforts, not to avoid them. Religious persons should be using their training in abstract thinking and moral clarity to help these poor outspoken scientists out, not give into their bad logic by assuming it can't be countered with a single sentence (like has been exhibited in this article). They should state the facts clearly and unambiguously; if they think an ostensibly scientific work is base and non-representative of human psychology - they should let them know that they need to try harder. Furthermore, they should be identifying good science and aligning with this.

"From Simon's perspective, it is altruism that needs explanation; from a Christian or theistic perspective, on the other hand, it is only to be expected that humans beings would sometimes act altruistically. Perhaps what needs explanation is the way in which human beings savage and destroy each other."
- Granted; our creation myth certainly affects how we analyse things.

2. Evolutionary theory:

"A Christian therefore has a certain freedom denied her naturalist counterpart: she can follow the evidence where it leads."
- how is taking a lack of evidence for a particular evolutionary mechanism (say the formation of the universal common ancestor, or the mechanism behind rapid macroevolution) as evidence for a non-evolutionary myth following the evidence where it leads? It just demonstrates bias. I think there must be some important details of nature facilitating the high rates of macroevolution observed on earth (or even the possibility of macroevolution itself), and in this sense I disagree with Dawkins et al. that everything is sorted, but I don't therefore reject the theory. There are way too many observations that fit an evolutionary picture that are unexplained by a non-evolutionary one. (The phenomena remains unsaved as it were).

"Now again (as with Simon) we might say that strictly speaking, when these people make such declarations, they are neither speaking as scientists nor doing science. They are instead commenting on science, drawing conclusions from scientific results--conclusions that don't follow from the scientific results themselves, requiring extra and extra-scientific (perhaps philosophical) premises. Perhaps this is true, although it has become increasingly difficult to draw a sharp line between science and such other activities as philosophical reflection on science. Whether or not what we have here is science strictly so-called, however, isn't really the important question for my present purposes. Whether or not what we have here is science or only parascience, we have deep involvement with the spiritual struggle Augustine points out."
- this paragraph identifies the core issue (the definition of science), although I don't think an adequate response is proposed.

3. Cosmological theory:

A multiverse is not a scientific hypothesis (it is a philosophical one); as it cannot be denied by observation.

Conclusion:

All three examples provided are not scientific hypotheses; 1. presumption of the rationality of selfish behaviour, 2. presumption of the ateleology of evolution, and 3. multiverse theory.

"Alternatively, we could perhaps think of parts of science--sociobiology, for example--not as attempts to provide a true or correct explanation of human behavior, but as efforts to see how far we can go in explaining human beings and behavior while appealing to nothing beyond what the naturalist is prepared to appeal to. In this case our efforts would be hypothetical rather than categorical."
- I see much of modern cosmology this way. I don't mind people theorising whatever they like, however what needs to be proclaimed is a clear definition of science. Scientists who want to push the boundary for the sake of metaphysical naturalism should be (and are being) identified as amateur philosophers.

Of the three instances of information referenced;
a) I don't believe that mind is necessary to initialise the physical laws of this universe because they can be explained through an unconscious anthropic selection process (a sufficiently large and/or eternal multiverse). However, I think design (teleology) is consistent with the data (the fact the universe has a beginning/Big Bang), and is the simplest (most elegant) explanation based on the available evidence (inflationary theory is a post hoc attempt to explain natural order, and has not been successfully tested to date).
b) I am agnostic as to whether mind is required to produce the specific forms of life exhibited on earth. I take them as products of natural selection, however natural selection may be operating on a very specific genetic construct with a limited range of viable pathways (blueprints that can be incrementally encoded and selected for).
c) Mind is clearly required to perceive order and interpret it as information.

I believe that mind is required to explain design. I don't at present believe that physical (observable) reality can be inferred to be designed in of itself (although this is consistent with the data). Design however is the only viable explanation of the non-observable properties of the universe available at present: 1) panpsychism suffers from the combination problem and non-reductive physicalism implies a redundant alignment/correspondence between arbitrary subsets of the physical universe and the mental properties of an arbitrary set of individuals. 2) objective reason must be assumed an emergent property of the universe. In this respect I agree with Thomas Nagel, however I am not currently convinced of the possibility of an unconscious teleology.

I am less concerned about how selective pressures might favour a particular trait, or the probability of the mutations occurring to achieve it, but why the genetic construct necessarily supports the encoding of that trait via a minor (incremental) change to the organism's code. If it didn't then evolution wouldn't get very far. Natural history strongly suggests that it does however.

I don't think this demonstrates design, as the same philosophical multiverse can be invoked to explain a universe containing the fine tuning necessary to achieve this. Still, it confirms my agnosticism with respect to the necessity of design in explaining the properties of our physical universe. I don't believe this to be the case, but I don't know this not to be the case.

Furthermore, it is worth noting that time here (in an empirical context) is just another physical dimension, so this is not a factor in my analysis.

"The blind watchmaker" - we cannot make this assertion (or we will have no evidence for it) until we know precisely what forms and evolutionary pathways our genetic construct supports.

---
http://www.nature.com/articles/srep04256?WT.ec_id=SREP-20140311

[The problem with contemporary naturalism (often mislabelled "science") is not materialist philosophy of mind (physicalism), or even ontological materialism (metaphysical naturalism), but literal materialism (eliminativism in thought, word, or deed). Literal materialism prevents the establishment of sound philosophy as it takes for granted the emergence of mind from matter (or ignores it completely). The most severely affected will deny internal existence altogether.]

//Artificial insemination
I am unable to express my views on this matter in a way which would not cause significant discomfit to anyone even contemplating the rights of an individual that has had an unknown woman or acquaintance impregnated.

An action is not justified based on the effort they made, their own desires, or even the desires of the victim.

And in this case the victim is led to believe they will be a parent of a child with their partner - which is a lie (nature thinks otherwise). Those choosing to adopt a child must realise they are stewards.

They also have the prenatal environmental influence of their mother, not just their genetics. A child is naturally drawn to those who they share their code with, and to deny a child such an opportunity on the basis of a parenthood fantasy belongs to another world. Giving your genetic code is pretty much the definition of parental responsibility - nature demands it, and so has every stable civilisation in history. Those who seek to denormalise this are faced with a 100x child homicide and/or sexual abuse rate to reconcile with their emotion driven world view.

Moreover, we should respect the parents of an adopted child; at least they didn't kill them.

//Human engineering
The key principle to recognise here is that evolution is self correcting - natural selection does not allow for errors. If there is an error, it will not survive. The only reason phylogenetically old diseases (eg cancer, death, etc) remain is because they are either a) adaptive or b) do not interfere with the evolution of the organism.

The question is therefore whether a society allows error to be naturally isolated or interferes with nature to contaminate the gene pool. Forging mutants which would not exist in the absence of such engineering, and risking the existence of the species in times of disaster (extremely low population).

As those civilisations that paid attention to their survival (or more specifically, their nature) are the ones that survived on this planet, those collective species which pay attention to their survival are the only ones which can survive in this universe. The rest will die out in mass extinction events.

Case a) the genes which prevented procreation in low tech environments and would otherwise have died out 100000 years ago were allowed to live on.
Case b) resources devoted to creating and supporting artificial addictions could otherwise have been spent on preparing the species for survival.

Furthermore, it is important to recognise that while a human being's sense of self as an extraphysical being has philosophical and moral implications; it also serves an evolutionary purpose. It only exists because it is adaptive. The species which respects itself to the point of considering themselves above physical (observable) reality has a competitive edge. It has reason to believe it should survive to the detriment of those species which do not possess such a self concept. So even the worship of mind to the exclusion of its natural purpose is misguided.

It is actually making no claims about social darwinism - in fact I don't support this theory either (because non-hamiltonian altruism is open to exploitation from within). Rather, it is stating the fact that those species which don't adhere to nature (the natural paradigm) and take survival seriously get wiped out.

Furthermore, it makes the observation that physical mind evolved for purpose of survival, including those systems which support self-concept (theory of mind): belief in self as an extraphysical being. Such belief (the model encoded by a brain) can be considered (and in this context is) independent of the existence of extraphysical mind/emergent mental properties (including its philosophical/moral implications). The point made is that the glorification of the belief in mental reality to the exclusion of its natural purpose is erroneous.

With regards to the second point made; it is true that the moral law is not necessarily conducive to the propagation of one's genetic code (and higher order morality based on teleological assumptions is typically defined in opposition of individual survival). But it is entirely consistent with the survival of the species.

Furthermore, the fact that our (intra-species variable) genetic code gets cut in half every generation via sexual reproduction should be indicative to an intelligent being in an advanced civilisation that there are better ways of ensuring one's genetic survival than adhering to long evolved instinctual heuristics (although neglecting these heuristics will prevent any further evolution/adaptation of the species based on natural selection). Again, morality is not in opposition to nature (the natural paradigm).

Likewise, the natural law is based on encoded beliefs in the high valuation of mind. Although this can't account for high level morality (self-sacrifice: putting another's life/progeny of zero genetic/kin relationship above one's own), it is entirely consistent with nature for a human being to value its neighbour equally. Again, morality is not in opposition to nature (the natural paradigm).

Finally, teleological conclusions of the valuation of virtue in of itself (high level morality) are a consequence of beliefs encoded in us by nature (extraphysical mind), and so even high level morality is not opposition to nature.

Regarding the third point made, although neuronal learning (or any sufficiently advanced intelligence) allows for arbitrary information to be encoded, the blank slate hypothesis is patently false. 80% of genes are active in the human brain. There is no reason for functions to be encoded which serve no adaptive purpose, however every function which reliably facilitates the survival of a species (of a determinant sex) will be encoded. Thus concluding that a social propensity is a learnt behaviour does not mean that every social propensity is a learnt behaviour. It simply means that the propensity has (had) no consistently advantageous purpose. Idealisation of the brain's plasticity for lack of evolutionary imagination (Darwinian consciousness) may be motivated by a failure to appreciate the precise conditions in which the species (of a determinate sex) has evolved. Nonetheless primates are characterised by their long education/nurture and so dynamic learning of one's specific environment plays a critical role in their development.

Regarding the first point: I am not positing the existence of group selection for precisely this reason; it contradicts natural selection at a gene level. Furthermore;

1. just because adherence to survival is a necessary condition for a civilisation (or a species on an arbitrary planet) to survive, does not mean a) it is adaptive (encoded), or b) is a sufficient condition for its survival. In fact, there is strong evidence that systems of truth (philosophy/religion) and societies which seek these out survive secular cultures hell bent on dominance. Likewise;
2. adherence to survival (or more specifically nature) is not equivalent to being (or happening to be) the strongest/dominant civilisation.
3. adherence to survival is certainly not equivalent to adhering to a particular strategy (eg hawk/dove).

What was stated were facts (preconditions of survival), not morality. An individual or society might decide to act in accordance with the survival of their civilisation or species, but such ostensibly altruistic decisions are unlikely to be adaptive (encoded) for the aforementioned reasons (group selection is open to exploitation). Nonetheless, evolution consists of more than adaptation (ie byproducts), and nature consists of more than physical processes (eg mental properties). Thus reason can align with nature without neglecting morality (whether it be the natural/moral law, or higher order morality).

Regarding the second point, this is in a sense a time frame argument. If a civilisation were to sacrifice a more true and eternal principle on the basis of short term gain (population maintenance), the survival value of the decision is questionable. More relevant to the argument however; if a civilisation had no respect for its survival (eg no cultural norms, defence, education, etc), then it would not have survived. Moreover, if a species wastes time within an anthropocene and does not prepare for the next significant challenge then it will not survive.

//Sexual selection
http://www.nature.com/nature/journal/v522/n7557/full/nature14419.html

---
Summary; this research indicates that sexual selection prevents the accumulation of deleterious mutations

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sexual_selection

Note the study only used inbreeding in the final stage of the experiments to measure the reproductive fitness of (deleterious mutations existent in) the population. After 10 generations of inbreeding the populations that had evolved in a low sexual selection environment become extinct (due to the activation of its recessive deleterious mutations). After 20 generations of inbreeding the populations that had evolved in a high sexual selection environment were still alive (meaning they had less deleterious mutations). The sexual selection manipulations were achieved through an initial 50 generations of breeding in high sexual selection or low sexual selection environments. Two experiments were conducted, each testing a different measure of sexual selection. One used high versus low male:female population ratios (NB gender is not symmetrical and therefore high male:female ratios exhibit higher sexual selection). The other used forced monogamy (predetermined couplings rather than natural selection).

Sexual selection will minimise their accumulation (as compared with an asexual population) but deleterious mutations will exist. It can however be inferred that domesticated environments which deter sexual selection (through flattening/communal social norms) will risk the accumulation of deleterious mutations. Furthermore, only mutations that wholly prevent reproduction are guaranteed to be eliminated from the genome (assuming their recessive alleles are not coupled with the activation/expression of probabilistically more advantageous genes; of which I don't know the stats, this is purely theoretical).

For the purposes of understanding sexual reproduction, it is worth exemplifying a deleterious mutation. [Assuming it doesn't confer significant advanatage to an independent phenotype] Any genetic component of exclusive homosexuality will naturally die out after x generations given that it prevents reproduction. It is the definition of a genetic error in a sexual population: it is not something like cancer or disease that prevents reproduction after a certain/average age, but it wholly prevents reproduction. However, in the case of human society social norms have for thousands (if not tens/hundreds of thousands) of years encouraged people to marry and procreate (irrespective of their natural dispositions; which include lethal mutations). This explains why the only mammals to exhibit exclusive homosexuality are domesticated (it has to date been recorded in sheep and humans). Likewise, the only reason exclusive homosexuality (its genetic component) will continue to survive in a sexual libertarian society is through the unnatural production of children (IVF).

//Conservative/Liberalism (genetics)

The issue with twin studies is that they can't of themselves rule out a third variable (but still genetic), like physical attractiveness, adaptedness to exertion/fitness, or personality. For reference, studies show a positive correlation between conservatism and sport engagement (so it is a potential third variable).

In the case of non-separated (at birth) twin studies the confound potential is even worse, because visually and/or behaviourally (note appearances are strongly genetically determined, and personality is ~50% genetic) similar identical twins may be treated more similarly by their parents (shared environment) than visually/behaviourally discrepant non-identical twins. This is particularly pertinent for traits which have a low base (incidence) rate, because it is really difficult to obtain high enough sample sizes of separated twins who demonstrate such traits. This is not the case for liberalism/conservatism however, as most of the population align to one view or the other (the study quoted in the video therefore non unexpectedly referred to a separated twin study).

Twin studies also can't rule out a prenatal hormonal (not necessarily genetic) effect. 75% of monozygotic (identical) twins share the same placenta, but ~0% (sometimes fused) of dizygotic (non-identical/fraternal) twins share the same placenta. This means that their shared in utero chemical exposure will differ depending on whether they are monozygotic or dizygotic.

It is also worth noting that even in the case where a genetic component of a trait has been identified (established), it doesn't necessarily mean that the trait (its propensity or existence) will be determined by the individual's genetics in every environment. This is because of gene-environment interaction (not to be confused with exclusive environmental effects which affect every individual of a species the same regardless of their genome). Some traits, despite being demonstrably genetically determined, will in many environments be largely (or even exclusively) determined by that environment - for example due to the presence of an environmental catalyst. To use a biological analogy; a DNA readout promoter/blocker. In reality this might be something more like education. Therefore, the absolute genetic component determination calculations (ie x%) are only meaningful for the environment of the population being studied. It might be that there exist (existed) cultures which are so different than ours (that in which the genetics of the trait is being studied) that the trait would never arise, always arise, or be entirely dependent on an environmental factor which is taken for granted as "normal" in our culture - i.e. be measured as 0% genetically determined in their own culture.

This is merely critiquing the assertiveness of the claim (it is not rejecting the possibility). Personally I think the coevolution of directly competing survival strategies is overrated (for example moral intuition theory, R/K selection theory etc). A species which did not coevolve such strategies but converged (or had begun converging) on a singular adaptive solution would be a more efficient organism in my opinion. Likewise, the possibility of such strategies being exclusively activated in cultural subgroups (or coopted in the evolution of a hominoid over such phylogenetically negligible time periods) is unlikely. I think it is easier to explain the phenotypic divergence (cons/lib) based on the existence of truths which are emphasised and/or subverted by environmental stimuli (such as the creation of a behavioural norm which has for 1 billion years evolved to indicate sexual presentation - and the cognitive dissonance consequent its contradiction with cultural standards of proprietary/morality). Haidt (2007) observes that although all 5 moral content categories are unanimously shared cross-culturally, they are limited to just 2 in WEIRD (western educated industrialised rich democratic) 'liberals'. My own research theorises that this division pertains to self-directed versus other-directed morality. To put it simply, respect for the soul.

//Evolution

Let there be

=== Feminism ===

//Feminism

This article pretty much proves [personOfSimilarConvictions]'s theory. Full on witchery is going on. Yet I can't help but perceive that even behind all of this there is a hurt person. Perhaps if we can address that people won't be so easily fooled?

While gender reductionism may well represent the most vocal sector of the feminist movement, I suspect it does not represent many of whom sympathise with their movement. It may be difficult to articulate their frustration (and reconcile their abuse without sacrificing their concept of man), but it doesn't mean their intuitions are unfounded.

... could you maybe give an example of where men can't think women are attractive (or feminists who claims this)? Would this be acting in a way that implies a woman is attractive (or different)? I would argue such a proposition is artificial; the underlying message is a) don't objectify us, or b) I don't trust your chivalry. Women attempting to reverse engineer the male mind when there is a whole lot of evil floating around is bound to result in confusion - it makes it impossible to uncover anything certain but our animal nature.

These relate to some alternate interpretations (and may be irrelevant) but I will mention them anyway;

Humans have a number of instincts, but we can't reduce our natural affection for the opposite sex (in this context appreciation of beauty) to objectification (consciously focusing on another's body) or the desire to reproduce. To think someone is attractive is different than intentionally absorbing someone's physical beauty in isolation. The only human form of 'finding another attractive' (outside of a sexual partnership) is if such physical attraction is simultaneously experienced with personal attraction (technically this is modesty, or a precondition thereof).

There is also the belief that men won't naturally objectify a presented object (and not just cerebrally); that such a response (arousal) has been socialised (or conditioned by pornography or patriarchal society). This appears to be more of a gender specific disparity in human experience. It also seems to relate more to third wave feminism; in that (conversely) our tolerance of presented objects is dependent on the consumption of primary objectification, thereby enabling use of the ring in public (empowerment).

I don't know how wage equality is anymore real than interpersonal equality - in fact interpersonal equality (how we treat anyother person) I would argue is the only real form of gender equality mandated us humans. The other is dependent on technology/resources.

//Female Covetness?
Women are not satisfied with their bodies because men do not respond naturally to their beauty. It is natural and good for a female to expect attention and awe (particularly during her younger years) - without the need for objectification/enhancement. We have evolved for 4 billion years to be able to detect the necessary parameters of physical attractiveness, and no society has come close to impeding this except our own. By objectifying females in the media, western corporations have successfully distorted male attention, while creating a market of entirely useless products for long term relationships.

//Violence against women
I don't understand why this would be considered a specifically feminist ideal [personOfSimilarConvictions] (if a feminist ideal at all according to some implementations). Violence against women is an extremely important issue in the contemporary west, however to assume that it has always existed in the same form is pure conjecture.

//Feminism
I view feminism as a natural byproduct of (human response to) society and its technology:

1. One aspect of the movement is a response to the tolerance of prostitution, commercial objectification, and sexual use.
2. Another aspect appears to be a byproduct of the availability of contraceptive, domestic, and workplace technologies.
3. Yet another aspect appears to be a byproduct of the experience of sexual assault and/or abortion.
4. A final aspect (although there may be more) appears to be product of experiencing capacity for intellectual and physical equality (minus physiological and chemical differences).

Furthermore, all of these aspects appear to provide some level of positive feedback. I wonder what it would look like in a world that was not evil, but which had the same level of technology.

If that information is correct then she was indeed sick (conversely, Mary Wollstonencraft made sense). Yet the sexual libertarian atmosphere of France was a product of the tolerance of prostitution and commercial objectification. The dissociation of female sexuality from nature was inevitable.

Too often feminists claim credit for things that were occurring on their own accord. Women did not leave family life because of their movement; the sad reality is that no one wanted them. By arguing against family life they were vindicating their increasingly redundant status. Had there been no moral ground to oppose the system (commercial objectification/sexual use), it is doubtful the change would have progressed in the same manner.

Right now we find ourselves in a ridiculous scenario where not only intellect (and physical capacity) is equated but emotion. There is a complete failure to comprehend the 1 billion year old disparity in the subconscious drives of sexes. And there is only so long you can play with nature.

//Gender equality political interventions

I think she is right. If we are going to start paying people to have their children minded (which is by the way another ingenious way to destroy families before they are even conceived; like paying people to get divorced, or encouraging people to kill their first born daughters), why wouldn't you give it to everyone who is having their children minded?

>> But how would that promote gender equality [personOfOtherConvictions]?

//Social security
I think one of the underlying issues identified by the article is that people regularly have children outside of a covenant relationship meaning it is very difficult for the more responsible parent (usually the mother) to both provide satisfactorily for their child and seek paid employment. The question remains then to what extent is the government encouraging or contradicting sustainable relations between males and females. It would be a lot easier if we lived in the "feminist" (socialist) fantasy world of affective equality, or if we could naturally read each other's affections. Most previous generations have relied on culture and tradition to learn these relational requirements, thus providing the necessary respect to maintain commitment.

//Gender equality
Why is it that only the most immoral individuals dictate affective equality between men and women? Could it be that they stand to gain something from the suppression of a sex's feelings? A surplus of young women moralising sexual freedom and the manipulation of nature? A sedated male population posing no threat or competition?

//Domestic Violence / Christianity

It would have kind of ruined the propaganda piece had they quoted any one of the passages in its entirety;

Ephesians 5:22-33;

Wives, submit yourselves to your own husbands as you do to the Lord. For the husband is the head of the wife as Christ is the head of the church,his body, of which he is the Saviour. Now as the church submits to Christ, so also wives should submit to their husbands in everything.

Husbands, love your wives, just as Christ loved the church and gave himself up for her to make her holy, cleansing her by the washing with water through the word, and to present her to himself as a radiant church, without stain or wrinkle or any other blemish, but holy and blameless. In this same way, husbands ought to love their wives as their own bodies. He who loves his wife loves himself. After all, no one ever hated their own body, but they feed and care for their body, just as Christ does the church\u2014for we are members of his body. \u201cFor this reason a man will leave his father and mother and be united to his wife, and the two will become one flesh.\u201d This is a profound mystery\u2014but I am talking about Christ and the church. However, each one of you also must love his wife as he loves himself, and the wife must respect her husband.

Colossians 3:18-19;

Wives, submit yourselves to your husbands, as is fitting in the Lord. Husbands, love your wives and do not be harsh with them.

1 Peter 3:1-7;

Wives, in the same way submit yourselves to your own husbands so that, if any of them do not believe the word, they may be won over without words by the behavior of their wives, when they see the purity and reverence of your lives. Your beauty should not come from outward adornment, such as elaborate hairstyles and the wearing of gold jewelry or fine clothes. Rather, it should be that of your inner self, the unfading beauty of a gentle and quiet spirit, which is of great worth in God\u2019s sight. For this is the way the holy women of the past who put their hope in God used to adorn themselves. They submitted themselves to their own husbands, like Sarah, who obeyed Abraham and called him her lord. You are her daughters if you do what is right and do not give way to fear.

Husbands, in the same way be considerate as you live with your wives, and treat them with respect as the weaker partner and as heirs with you of the gracious gift of life, so that nothing will hinder your prayers.

By sexist do you mean a belief that the sexes are different and these differences should be respected, or that one sex is better than another? If the former, what evidence does the ABC have that a belief in sexual equality will stem domestic violence, or if the latter who are these stakeholders?

To think that Christianity or church attendance is responsible for domestic violence is categorically misguided. The only reason we have chivalry and freedom is because of the ideas inherent in religious detachment, or in our history, those of the Church. Replacing them with a steady diet of sexual addiction and its post hoc moralisation of equity is fundamentally flawed. The sexual objectification normalised by a secular egalitarian narrative of like desires and responsibility is far more dangerous a phenomenon than a belief system which recognises difference in motivation and physical function. "Egalitarians" are the ones who are happily engaged in the exploitation of a market of young females deluded into a belief of sexual liberation which will not adversely affect every remaining day of their life (whether by pregnancy, loss of virginity, or simply the sharing of their bodies with strangers). Concordantly, egalitarians are the ones who have no problem sharing female bodies with strangers. Likewise, it is this failure to move beyond symmetrical two dimensional categories epitomised in Marxist constructions like "racism" or "sexism" which will pit abortive homicide against domestic violence.

The interaction of low IQ and exposure to socially disparate ideas produces domestic violence, in the same way the interaction of low IQ and the second amendment produces homicide. It sets a dangerous precedent to make free speech responsible for the intelligence of its audience.

In an attempt to appease Islam and its Quranic dictation, the ABC has mistaken statistical extrapolation for coherent argument, anecdote for evidence, patriarchal fantasies for truth. I have no problem critiquing the Christian Church (whether Protestantism for its biblical "literalism", or Catholicism for its socialism), but at least get it right. Criticising counselling or susceptibility to a partner's charisma is one thing, criticising a belief system is another.

A prominent university once made a claim to a discovery which was since demonstrated to be explainable in terms of the environment; but was never retracted because it hadn't been proven false and was still a possibility. This is the very definition of academic dishonesty. It is no surprise that their evidence directly contradicts their thesis.

Although one could no doubt locate some individuals who would blame their domestic violence on some vague interpretation of the bible, there are serious reasons to be sceptical of even this more moderate claim. Not only was there no attempt to quote the sources in context, there was no consideration of report bias. Someone charged with domestic violence would be motivated to report that they attend church once in a while ("infrequently or never"), they might even go to church once in a while to vindicate themselves. It is called moral licensing.

A child's likelihood to be abused or murdered (stats combined) is 40-100x higher when living without one or more biological parents. The presence of a step parent is the single highest predictor of child abuse.

//Domestic Violence / Christianity

Note I think ISIS is an invalid analogy - one would have to imagine Christian groups forming devoted in part to the infliction of violence against women. The reason this doesn't happen is because domestic violence is not a philosophically or historically Christian phenomenon. The fact there may come a time where the general population is so sexually sedated that the only persons ever to experience actual marital contention are Christian is irrelevant.

Ok I understand where it is coming from. Imagine a criminal who went against the teachings of their organisation - is it profitable for the organisation to take responsibility for the criminal? Only if the organisation were complicit in the crime. In the case of Protestantism there is no central authority so it is pretty arbitrary to make this claim (given the lack of shared/scriptural dictation, and emphasis to the contrary). Perhaps it could be made to people who have a belief in the platonic concept of a "body of Christ", specific denominations with empirical evidence demonstrating a higher incidence of domestic violence than the general population (apparently none at this stage), or specific churches that have been purported to have issues with counselling potential victims/perpetrators.

But the formation of a secular media campaign against evangelicalism or Christianity generale is really weird. It sounds like something only Rita Skeeter would do. Imagine living your entire life under the watchful eye of big brother, who has special standards for special groups (lets forget about those step parents shall we; the Marxists kind of need them if we kill off marriage and replace it with the state). What a horrible, demeaning existence. I would rather take my chances with a society that is reliant on good will, cutting off all who do not adhere to public moral principles. Its safety would be greater than one in which only the most cunning pose a threat. Furthermore, the media are notoriously bad at framing problems in a realistic and productive manner. Exemplified by their representation of Roman Catholic child abuse as a general pedophilia problem rather than a homosexual one (which they arguably created themselves by taking pity on the disordered and accepting them into their ranks).

Imagine basing your entire thesis on the opinions of a male called Steven Tracey. I think it is more probable that the guy has suffered a serious disconnection with the male populace so as to entertain (even fraternise with) dehumanising patriarchy theories. If the patriarchy fantasy were correct, and marriage were just another tool of male dominance, why weren't women dispensed with after they had fulfilled their child rearing activities?

Feminists really need to come to terms with the fact that their theoretical abilities are substandard. Even if we eliminated all normal functioning intersexual relations ("patriarchy") then what is going to happen? You wouldn't have any men left. Just a load of dribbling 5 year olds who get cookies or zapped every time they consider stepping over an arbitrary line. I am not saying this because they have nothing to offer in terms of illuminating natural technological barriers, but before they consider sabotaging a scientific discipline they should perform a comprehensive risk analysis.

Analysing the consequences of a "Words of God" reading into the Christian archives is a distinct and more productive line of analysis. No doubt you could generate a destructive interpretation by glorifying a few sentences (as you could with about any document).

Something which might be worth looking at also is the case where an adherent to Christianity had chosen to marry a non-adherent and win them over by their example. In such cases acceptance of domestic violence would necessarily be their choice. Yet in such cases (if existent) why exactly are they both going to church, or if they are how representative are they of that church?

//Men's Rights

Thanks for sharing this [personOfOtherConvictions]. The Red Pill is a great movie - I didn't know what an MRA was until a day ago. While I think "feminism" (at least the modern day version; I don't have a problem with people showing how good they are with words and action) and male rights are an unnatural enterprise doomed to fail - it is worth listening to everyone. The fact these entities exist suggests there are problems which require fixing.

//Child care
I think she is right. If we are going to start paying people to have their children minded (which is by the way another ingenious way to destroy families before they are even conceived; like paying people to get divorced, or encouraging people to kill their first born daughters), why wouldn't you give it to everyone who is having their children minded?

If sexism is assuming that the two human sexes are different when they are not, sexlessism is assuming that the two sexes are the same when they are not.

--- [NOTUSED]
>> But how would that promote gender equality [personOfOtherConvictions]?

//"Mansplaining"

I think it is natural to project issues with particular individuals onto a group, particularly when we feel the group should be internally responsible for educating its members. As for comprehending the dilemma in the abstract/personal this would be worth a study but good luck getting it past an ethics review board..

On what basis would one assume that an interviewer who enquired further into a female applicant's tech skills more than that of a male has a subconscious belief that men are better coders than women? This seems to be an assumption which fits a socialist narrative (belief in gender prejudice) rather than a necessarily valid one. It is possible that they ask this simply because it is more probable that a woman would not have the equivalent skills. That is, the distributions of male and female tech leaders differ (see James Damore thesis). Whether this probability assessment is accurate for a given advertised position is unknown. For example, it might be that only exceedingly good females would bother applying - in which case it is a poor inference. Alternatively, if the tech component was only auxiliary to the job, or there were another component of the job in which females are known on average to outperform males, then it might be a good inference.

I think socialists need to learn to dissociate a male propensity towards being a jerk (eg asking a question disrespectfully, or making blanket assumptions out of a desire for power) in a sexually saturated society from irrational judgement. Confounding the two (above: a does not imply b, a implies b) only serves to perpetuate the underlying psychological need of feminism: the desire for rational men. Special treatment (including inexplicable wage gap conspiracies) only confirms discriminatory narratives. The ability not to perceive prejudice in a group based on individual experiences (of mistreatment) is highly relevant here.

This seems reasonable [personOfOtherConvictions]. But what do we do about situations where someone makes an assumption that a person of gender x knows more than they know about something? Biases develop for a reason; they are heuristics to expected behaviour. To correct such might actually be presumptuous on part of the agent (projecting their world view of equal motivations across gender).

Note I was responding to your suggestion regarding calling out "mansplaining" in general (taken as; making assumptions that people of gender x don't know something when talking to them). One can only make such corrections if they are supported by statistics (regarding the probability of someone of gender x in a specific environment knowing something), and the decision to intervene is not dependent on the agent's world view (theories regarding gender). I wasn't however considering factual corrections - factual corrections should of course be made, irrespective of their context. I would be interested to know who exactly is saying that men are better coders than women. Their motivations for engaging in the industry might differ, thus creating different population level male/female distributions of coding ability. But this will again differ depending on the specific subfield - there appears to be a female engagement bias in natural language coding for instance.

=== Freedom of Speech ===

//Freedom of speech
(No idea who this person is). People should say whatever they like and it is up to others to prove otherwise. What is immature in conversation is personalisation, or more generally in communication: manipulation.

It is hypocritical to tolerate dehumanisation and disdain negative (or more precisely controversial) opinions. In fact it is a nice way of avoiding any real moral responsibility for anything actually important. Go plant a tree, turn off a tap, and forget the fact that your nation is exporting demand for under age prostitution.

Love thy neighbour, not every single person one has ever heard about (the issue is responsibility). But until one has a grasp of hatred of error, one should not look too favourably on their own capacity to love.

Cockroaches are highly resilient and are about the only creatures to survive a nuclear war. Of course it could all be wrong (I think in most cases people are generally attracted to the location they wish to immigrate to), but trait survival is an interesting hypothesis for immigration. There have been studies conducted looking for individual differences in immigrants (versus those who remain at their homeland). In fact, we would expect to see them in the British colonies (for the descendants of free settlers).

//Freedom of speech
Desire for free speech is proportional to personal morality.

//Freedom of speech
Political correctness = sophism

I agree with this [personOfSimilarConvictions] but I don't think most people who are engaged in PC are bought over; they are just maintaining their credentials in a culture of fear. If the tide turned they would soon renounce (/deny) their position. Practical (pragmatic) compromise to not upset the political baby. Hence the sophism.

People don't celebrate ridding human beings of 70 years of life. People don't celebrate denying a pregnant woman an institution of security. People don't celebrate the disintegration of a culture their grandparents fought to defend. They are just making choices based on a belief that other people are sensitive and will be wrongly discriminated against (dehumanised) without affirmative action. Oblivious to the evil which causes such dehumanisation (because this is protected under the banner of tolerance). But the reality is that you can't force equality - you can only observe it. The engineers know this; which is why they want people to shut up. And while many engineers are aware of the ring of power, they are not willing to denounce it. A few even will use it, and these grow bolder every day.

But is it correct to shut down conversion out of the prospect of someone being victimised? Anything can be used for evil, even freedom of speech. I think the issue is about priorities; a significant (potentially politically influential) proportion of the population no longer prioritise freedom. What does it take to make someone lose faith in freedom? I argue that the west has fallen the ring of power; they have accepted it, and in doing so themselves have lost control. People who control others end up being controlled, and there is a lot of collateral damage. The injustice likewise spreads, as people take out their pain on others rather than the source. Having lost faith in themselves (their own moral integrity) they lose faith in freedom.

//Law (continued)
The issue is fundamentally one about freedom of speech; they could be talking about anything it doesn't matter. It is extremely dangerous to deny freedom of speech; people are often exterminated as a consequence (socialist Germany, socialist Russia, and now in the west; we take them out before they can talk). Being civil and lawful is a nice ideal but it is not and has never been the mandate of a moral human being.

...

Defence has traditionally been the core purpose of the government; laws are created for the lawless.

//Free speech (continued)

I agree with 1 (respect) and 2 (free speech), however I think the remaining rights are either redundant or can be made to contradict each other/themselves (depending on their interpretation).

3. what if one's priorities involved the sexual targeting of young women on a weekly basis? (cf 1)
4. redundant (1)
5. what if one is paying for the sexual exploitation of a man, woman or child? (cf 1)
6. redundant (2)
7. what if one's emotional protection involved the suppression of free speech or the compromise of another's emotions? (cf 2, 7)
8. what if someone's own supposedly happy and healthy life came at the expense of another's (or respect for them personally?) (cf 1, 8)

I think 1 (respect) used to be instilled in society; either in law (such as prohibition of prostitution) or in martial law; people would duel it out. But now it has been largely lost and replaced with hundreds of weak ethical/tolerance principles. When an error is introduced into the logic of any system, the number of laws required to compensate for this error (prevent the system collapsing entirely) multiples rapidly (cf Occam's razor). However I think it is likely that any contradictory system will collapse eventually. Our own current system will collapse unless 1 is restored. This is a central argument for the elimination of the tolerance of prostitution (virtual or otherwise), besides the actual (/exponential collateral) damage it causes people.

Furthermore, it is recognised that even 1 (respect) and 2 (free speech) can be made to contradict each other (although they don't of necessity). This however is a price that must be paid for freedom (within a secular society). A level of anarchy will always exist with 1 and 2; but the stronger that 1 and 2 are upheld the sooner it will dissipate (as people argue it out). Therefore, laws should never be introduced to contradict either 1 or 2 (even if they are designed to attempt to create balance any such attempt will fail). Hence, talking about the subhuman wonders of prostitution (virtual or otherwise) should be tolerated, but any attempt to disrespect a human being in such a way should be met with resolute confrontation. The basis of civilisation is not tools or agriculture, but modesty (respect) - and although disrespect may be inevitable, any civilisation that uses this as an excuse to tolerate it will fall.

I think this might be the difference between being respected and treated with respect

...

[regarding Propaganda]
Australia is well past a safeguard against propaganda. The best hope for sanity is the removal of restrictions on freedom of expression. This means the end of the protection of public messages. Any message which does not facilitate a space for debate should be open to "vandalism".

//Political correctness
Political correctness is not an insult, it is a comment on the submission of reason to conformity.

Maybe, but that sounds like a weird use case. An observation of political correctness is not designed to manipulate anyone, it is stating a fact.

Referring to the settlement of Australia as invasion has an undertone of political correctness based on what is trending to become politically correct at this point in history. It logically follows from politically correct positions if it is not of itself yet politically correct. This however seems to be an outlier rather than a norm (it is a clear case of cutting off your foot that you are standing on, and the present generation is not yet willing to make the final step of moral relativism).

Someone could say that it is politically correct to talk about the fashion gods that take a women's body, share it around with every last male, and when their time is up find that they no longer possess any desirable quality - but they would be wrong. Someone could say that it is politically correct to declare our civilisation by far the worst offender of crimes against humanity; where we systematically target and subject women to dehumanisation, and half of our population is addicted to this fantasy - but they would be wrong.

Someone could say that it is politically correct to talk about the details of homosexual relations (or have it visualised on screen by an American picture corporation) - but they would be wrong. Someone could say that it is politically correct to talk about exclusive homosexuality in the context of evolutionary error - but they would be wrong.

Someone could say that it is politically correct to talk about the consequences of liberal immigration on cultural or racial diversity - but they would be wrong. Someone could say that it is politically correct to comment on the immorality of moving to a civilised country without any intention on learning or speaking its language, while its ancestors worked (and some still work) tooth and nail to bring the land into production - but they would be wrong.

Someone could say that it is politically correct to make the observation that not all sports are inherently conducive to the evolutionary value of the female body - but they would be wrong. Someone could say that it is politically correct to talk about the inherent divisiveness of giving the vote to an individual rather than the family - but they would be wrong. Someone could say that it is politically correct to comment on the universal suitability of occupations that require making enemies on all sides - but they would be wrong. Someone could say that it is politically correct to comment on the universal desirability of positions that require devoting one's entire life to thought (rather than communication) - but they would be wrong.

Someone could say that it is politically correct to talk about the maturity of artificial insemination or its evolutionary consequences - but they would be wrong. Someone could say that it is politically correct to talk about the preconditions of abortion and our social responsibility for the termination of hundreds of millions of human beings - but they would be wrong.

It should have been predicted that an Orwellian society will come to classify its opposition as Orwellian.

//Freedom of speech
There is a fundamental difference between freedom of speech and freedom of action and for this reason it is freedom of speech which is constitutionally upheld. Freedom of action is technical anarchy. While I don't think anarchy is necessarily a bad system (it is more human and has benefits such as preventing the harbouring of evil by corrupt systems), it is not endorsed by any (many) current states for a variety of reasons.

Likewise, there is a fundamental difference between limiting someone's freedom to act and forcing someone to act against their will (religion, beliefs etc). Classical liberals generally disdain the latter, but will at times uphold the former (with respect to some theoretical moral protection). Socialists generally think that forcing people to act is ok when done in some theoretical interest of society (for example when redistributing other people's income, which a classical liberal will reserve for philanthropy).

Defining someone as a murderer is not necessarily an attempt to shame or silence another person, it could just be an attempt to state a fact. A significant proportion of citizens believe in the authority of truth and will respond to it accordingly. Likewise, calling a person who disagrees with popular media opinion a white supremacist, sexist, or bully could also be an attempt to state a fact.

People in power share a unique responsibility, for which some authors have declared their life is on the line. The public will therefore be inclined to cut to the chase and express themselves more fervently with respect to the actions of leaders.

//Freedom
[in response to question: 'what is freedom for you?']

Freedom from trespass (manipulation), but higher than this is internal freedom (freedom from instinct and using others). I also believe in proactive or purposeful freedom - taking evil down at its core (wherein truth always prevails).

I agree that the freedom denied by administrative solutions can come back to bite us. As an administration continuously implements more and more policies and controls, natural checks and balances are compromised. People increasingly rely on an artificial entity to make moral decisions for them.

Moreover, governance harbours evil: the law protects arbitrary constructs that tick bureaucratic boxes, and whose activities haven't had some special law made against them. This enables its slow and steady infection. It would otherwise be eliminated by the populace within 24 hours. The question is, what would a moral citizen do if they had freedom.

For how long has western civilisation believed that you can throw money at anything and it won't come back to destroy you? Why do we now have such blind faith in a market that one is willing to grant it protection against rebuttal? Why is public speech granted based on payment? Or is it only the corporatised scientists who appreciate the full spectrum of communication? Is it because it has granted us great riches that we can ignore its cost to the innocent? Or shall we continue to lock up the bewildered consumer after they have made their kill? Perhaps we should take away their weapon and shove drugs down their throat?

//Torquemada
[Torquemada's Law: "When you are right, you have a moral duty to impose your will upon anyone who disagrees with you." - Alan L. Otten; 1977
Torquemada's Law: "When you are sure you're right, you have a moral duty to impose your will upon anyone who disagrees with you." - Robert W. Mayer, Champaign, Illinois; AO]

While I cannot find a reference to Torquemada actually saying this, I have no doubt he supported the general idea.

As phrased, the statement could be true if imposition of will is interpreted as merely speaking one's mind (although any such interpretation would probably be a post modern artefact).

Likewise, the statement could be true if being absolutely sure one is right is limited to moral (as opposed to cultural or religious) certainties. An artefact of morality being objectively grounded in nature (the encoded belief in mind) is that moral propositions can be made against evil (contradiction), while moral propositions cannot be made against good (truth). If you are not convinced of this, try it yourself. Try condemning something true and innocent. Evil doesn't even bother trying (although it will often reframe things as corrupt to condemn them - in which case certainty levels drop rapidly). Generally, it attempts to present a lie as being true.

About the closest reference I have found to the statement is; "When you are right, you have a moral duty to impose your will upon anyone who disagrees with you". Which is true in its context (being right with regards to a moral obligation). If people didn't exercise such prudence then a society would end up tolerating mass dehumanisation when it involved imposing their will on powerful individuals who disagreed with them. Just because a principle is badly implemented (as in the case of torturing non-heretics - people who would otherwise pose no risk on the maintenance of innocence), or taken out of context (to suggest it is limited by epistemology or its implications can be taken as immoral), doesn't mean we can't gain value from it.

//Law
Law is built on principle. Once principle is removed, law becomes tyrannical.

It might help referencing an ostensibly tyrannical principle such that it can be discussed. To save time skip anything that is technologically dependent (in which case we would find that it is not a principle at all but an implementation of a principle). Likewise, it would be worth adding some commentary on why you feel justified in reducing the concept of principle to an instance of "a principle"; because (although it might be appropriate in some contexts) it is not clear this maintains the meaning of the proposition.

> ---
> Is this tyrannical?
>
> ---
> What if the small number of people were right, and the large number of people were wrong, indifferent, or appreciative?
>
> ---
> Or do you mean how in terms of to what purpose or by what method?
>
> ---
> I think the term benevolent dictator is appropriate here.

That is an excellent question indeed - do feelings equal reality?

[in response to "I don't think that we can substitute any other principles other than justice as a basis for law and avoid tyranny. Can we?"]

> ---

"Many that live deserve death. And some that die deserve life. Can you give it to them? Then do not be too eager to deal out death in judgement."

I don't think it is healthy to think that the law can achieve justice. A belief in justice as administered by human law only works in a theistic society (where it is viewed as cooperative to a greater justice). An atheistic society can become delusional thinking that it can use the law to rectify every perceived natural injustice (attain equality).

I find it very difficult to believe our present legal system delivers or attempts to deliver justice. The legal system in the west has become something one plays around with using lawyers (something one uses to achieve an end, often now an ideological end). Even the constitution has been ripped apart and played with by sick corporations. People use the law (and its arbitrary immoral enforcement within a police state) to justify any number of deviances. Thus I see the law as currently fulfilling a limited (and rapidly depleting) preventative/deterrence role.

I don't see a legal system as being necessitated on justice, but on morality. The purpose of law is not to deliver justice but to protect the dignity of its civilians. Until it is recognised (once again) that the law has no authority outside of the moral domain, I don't see the system improving to a level where it can be taken seriously (with respect to justice included). Furthermore, a belief in natural/supernatural justice is something common to almost all society. Without the recognition of higher systems of justice an attempt to deliver it by a set of rules (or a so called Justice) is a hopeless venture.

Let me exemplify a tyrannical legal system. An enterprise decides that it is their corporate right to dehumanise a female while providing her with the funding necessary to obtain a college education (in God knows what). Thus they suggest that the first amendment is applicable to not just speech but to systematic misrepresentation (because it was so obviously relative to the artistic standards of the culture in which it was created). Now a male having been inadvertently primed with his singular evolutionary goal becomes addicted to the fantasy of its fulfilment. His society however doesn't support the illusion consistently (but doesn't reject it either - in fact it acts as if having such an addiction is normal). So he arrives at another country and permanently destroys the life of a child/young woman (the less cowardly addict might attempt to destroy the life of an individual closer to home). This is what is called demand in economics, and supply falls by the wayside without it. At what point exactly is justice delivered? Even if they caught the predator and sentenced him to death it is not exactly going to make up for his actions (it might serve an important deterrence role), and killing the addict without appreciating the nature of his addiction isn't exactly delivering him justice either. In any case the legal system is failing to protect the dignity of its civilians - and is invalid. Moreover, the legal system is in fact facilitating the evil - and is tyrannical, because the original manufacturer would have been torched to the ground without it.

What exactly is just about forcing people to commit child sacrifice? Democracy is no safeguard against systematic dehumanisation. We are just as likely to dehumanise people when it is convenient for us to do so.

There can be no justice without morality. A moral legal system knows its limits; but it also recognises that contradictory laws can never subsist. If any law in place prevents the moral action of the people, then it must stand aside. I am not suggesting a choice between a moral and an amoral (neutral) legal system, but one between a moral system or no system at all. What is dangerous is not the risk of a corrupt system, but the worship of human authority.

The issue I have with reducing law to justice (apart from the fact I think justice in the context of law is both peripheral and impossible; especially in a secular society) is that barring entities who use the system to their own ends, the most unjust laws are caused by an amoral desire for justice (the philosophy of why can't we all have the blue texta).

As [personOfSimilarConvictions] suggested, people have extremely different ideas of justice. Conservatives (and people of non Western-Educated-Industrialised-Rich-Democratic societies) value harm, fairness, purity, ingroup loyalty and authority (both internal and external qualities), whereas liberals primarily value harm and fairness (external qualities). People's ideology determines their sense of justice - even those who outright deny the existence of morality (these are in fact are the biggest victims, and take arguments made against their ideology very personally). Surely the morally silent social justice parade should have raised red flags.

Thus I am suggesting that law should not even be touched by someone without a strong moral conviction (integrity), and should be completely open to override in the event that it is. Likewise, if a law inadvertently prevents the moral action of its people (for example, to take down a dehumanisation factory), then it needs to step aside.

I don't think it is necessary to describe an example of forced child sacrifice. This is the advantage of morality being absolute and not relative. Moral incursion is self-evident in the light (once it gets past the ad hominem doorway of conscience suppressing irrationality). If a ghost told me it was right to tolerate evil, I wouldn't believe them.

I think the issue contested here is that no one seeks to dehumanise themselves, people which do are manipulated into doing so. Generally this involves physical abuse of some kind (often at a young age). The fact of the matter is that it is not natural, nor is it natural to talk about it like dehumanisation is a personal choice. It has never been. It is one's fundamental right as a human being to not tolerate evil in their vicinity. There is no manhood, no religion that has ever demonstrated tolerance of violation as a virtue.

Moreover, it is not dehumanising to remove a person's option to be exploited. The consequences of which will affect their entire life. Tolerance of prostitution for example is an extremely recent invention. This has done wonders for the psychology of its citizens. Imagine telling an 8 years old girl that they think people should have a right to sell themselves/be bought and nobody is allowed to do anything about it under threat of arrest. It is ironic that the most progressive nations are attempting to deal with the problem (while the self-proclaimed conservatives continue to compromise to the point of irrelevance). No civilisation that enforces the contradictory education of its people will survive.

While there is nothing wrong with outlawing evil (like has effectively been done by Sweden et al in this respect) I am not here suggesting it. I am suggesting that it should not be protected by law. If law is now conceived so arbitrarily (unprincipled) that it harbours evil then it should be immediately rejected, or at the very least ignored.

It should also be evident from past discussions that I don't follow a binary categorisation of evil as vice. I have argued that this is an artefact of sola scriptura/reformation theology (the founder never threw everything into the same category).

Although I know nothing of the legal framework of the Amish, I suspect that they would immediately reject any attempt at using their law to protect the actions of a wolf or false teacher of younglings.

"the presupposition of a legal order where a criminal law is in operation is naturally that the crimes that are committed are recognized as such and assigned a penalty. But what a crime is can never be inferred from the legal order; rather, it comes from ethics in general."
(Eric Voegelin, Hitler and the Germans)

//Law/Freedom
I think that if we find ourselves defending scoundrels then we are not fighting for freedom - we are fighting for a police state. Only in recent history have scoundrels been allowed to go unhindered by the public. People need to stop worshiping the law. The law only exists for the immoral, and when we cease to recognise this we become pawns in 1984. It was only 60 years ago when nice law abiding citizens let their neighbours be systematically led to their slaughter - has history taught us nothing of the impermanence of law?

//second amendment
I think that unrestricted gun laws (like suicide rates) provide a good indicator of how healthy a country really is.

//Conservative/Liberalism (division)

I think the west needs to consider dividing their societies up into moral conservatives and progressives. People should be free to move between them so long as they abide by their constitutions (and one has not yet installed an iron curtain). We can see how long their money lasts for when all crime, taxation, law, and welfare is a result of immorality (bar defence). More critically however, we can prevent the subjugation of children to propaganda. The most dangerous of which is that men and women's affections are symmetrical. At what point does one draw the line for tolerance of evil. I think responsibility demands consideration of sunk costs.

//Nazification

I am led to sympathise with individuals defending others from charges of imaginary antisemitism - however we should never risk the freedom of speech of individuals on account of the struggle against analytically challenged nazification.

//Free speech

...Yet there is nothing ironic about enacting violence to prevent a group of persons from speaking or assembling. This is formally known as terrorism.

//Free Speech / Terrorism

Copying here a proposition titled "terrorism as defined by the threat to free speech":

Any entity (be it not for national security) that threatens freedom of speech is a terrorist organisation.

(Speech is taken here in its most general literal sense to mean the transmission of words by any medium).

Precisely. Yeah I think this is one of the most general but most overlooked cases of terrorism. Ad hominem.

(Obviously the mainstream media and European countries who are shutting down free speech need to take long hard look at their game plan before getting destroyed in the philosophical arena).

I don't think you are going crazy at all [personOfSimilarConvictions]. Although I prefer this stronger definition (I think it better captures the concept of terrorism), there is the possibility of a recursive interpretation and therefore self-contradiction.

The definition could be constrained to a weaker form by adding a qualifier; apart from the speech itself - allowing for vilification and the suppression of speech by speech. Ie; "Any entity (be it not for national security) that threatens freedom of speech (apart from by the use of speech alone) is a terrorist organisation". But you should be able to see the problems created by adding this qualifier. What does one mean by speech alone? Is this speech in exclusion to performing actions necessary to initiate that speech? Or if the alone (exclusive) condition is not added, what if the action used to prevent the speech just happened to involve speech but was more prominently using another method such as physical force?

Alternatively, the definition could be constrained to the weaker form by adding a qualifier; by physical force or threat of physical force. Ie; "Any entity (be it not for national security) that threatens freedom of speech by physical force or threat of physical force is a terrorist organisation". The problem I see with specifying the type of action necessary to prevent speech (eg violence) is that it doesn't capture alternative means of achieving the aim of suppressing speech (eg financial punishments, threats of court, etc). Likewise the condition "threat of force" could also be read to contradict the statement also if the threat involved speech.

This is why I did not attempt to specify a weaker version incapable of self-contradiction. Perhaps someone can think of a way of rewording it to avoid these issues?

Thanks [personOfSimilarConvictions] I like this; I think replacing threatens with prevents really helps to articulate the weaker form of the definition.

I am trying to get to the deeper principle here but I appreciate the reasoning for drawing this line. I think by discovering the quality of terrorism we may be able to see what it is made out of (what resides at its core), and therefore stop the journey in its tracks early before it metastasises to more severe forms.

For the weaker form of the definition, it has been suggested that the word 'threatens' be replaced with 'prevents'. Ie; Any entity (be it not for national security) that prevents freedom of speech is a terrorist organisation.

//Communism / Political Correctness
In my study of communist societies, I came to the conclusion that the purpose of communist propaganda was not to persuade or convince, not to inform, but to humiliate; and therefore, the less it corresponded to reality the better. When people are forced to remain silent when they are being told the most obvious lies, or even worse when they are forced to repeat the lies themselves, they lose once and for all their sense of probity. To assent to obvious lies is...in some small way to become evil oneself. One's standing to resist anything is thus eroded, and even destroyed. A society of emasculated liars is easy to control. I think if you examine political correctness, it has the same effect and is intended to.
-- Theodore Dalrymple

=== Free will ===

...

Any defensible model of free will requires a 2 layer system; an agent and something producing conflict in the decision making process (eg base desire). Note I am presently agnostic on the nature of free will.

Compatibilist free will assumes the compete system is deterministic (or indeterministic but determined by the laws of physics alone). It claims however that we can still have an experience ("illusion") of free will assuming that the agent is rational.

Incompatibilist free will (metaphysical libertarianism) assumes that the laws of physics are not deterministic and that the agent is not bound by them. Such typically invokes but does not require substance dualism. I proposed a decade ago that physical indeterminism (intrinsic quantum uncertainty in the system) could provide a conduit for free will decisions even if the mind is represented in (ie not independent of) the brain. However this is only possible if such decisions are limited to simple binary cases (acts of conscious will power with respect to the negation of a base desire). This model is echoed in Libet's "free won't" and Robert Kane's powers of will thesis.

Regarding the presupposition of physicalism being a circular argument [this pertains to Lewis' argument from reason, in that a system cannot rationally deduce that it is irrational] and genuine rationality requiring a level of freedom (in the metaphysical libertarian sense) [this is another argument by Lewis against naturalism; this I dispute here], I would say; not unless rationality is imposed on the system (ie a portion of it representing the agent is designed to be rational).

It doesn't follow that mind is the brain anymore than smoke is the fire- no (I agree), but if its functioning (irrespective of qualia) is defined entirely by nature, then a level of equivalence is implied. Reductive physicalism asserts a type identity relationship (1-to-1 mapping) between brain (neural properties) and extra-physical mind (mental properties). Based on what we are learning about neural networks and the connectivity of the brain, this model is waning in popularity (pop philosophers and scientific communications in the media aside). Property dualist non-reductive physicalism asserts that extra-physical mind supervenes on neural activity (physical mind) and that they are both reflections of the same substance (a philosophical concept; not matter). Or (rejecting physicalism) there could be a non-cartesian substance dualism at work, with extra-physical mind being just connected (mapped) to a particular body for a particular period of time. I have no problem with these last two models.

I am interested to hear your arguments in further detail. I recognise that I am disputing one of Lewis' arguments against naturalism here.

I will also add; I think there is good reason to believe that the functioning of our mind is defined entirely by nature (ie operates perfectly according to natural law; though is not necessarily exclusively determined by nature if natural law is indeterministic). The reason for this has been well articulated by Dennett. If epiphenomenalism is true, and there are mental processes which are byproducts of (as opposed to being supervenient on) neural processing (ie their functioning is not represented entirely by neural processing), then how do we know about them? Or more precisely, how do we remember them? We would have to assume that one or more memories are non-physical (as opposed to being physical and extra-physical), and that these memories interact with our brain (ie can modify/break natural law - quantum indeterminism doesn't support information transfers). Such is equivalent to cartesian substance dualism (interactionist dualism).

I think the terminology is just an artefact of the development of the philosophical literature. "Physicalism" is not suggesting that physics as currently (empirically) understood can measure mental properties (even if they are assumed to be "identical" to neural properties). Or if people think this is a possibility, they are grossly mistaken.

It should really be called "naturalism" (not to be confused with methodological or philosophical naturalism). I don't infer false motive; with materialism being the antithesis to both cartesian dualism and idealism (and the material being more abundant than the mental and perhaps therefore a better representation of a common substance). Any examination of the development and maintenance of the concept (including its present use) should not however rule out the possibility of a philosophical naturalism bias; people stretching material things beyond their scope, a lack of experience in scientific inquiry, an attempt to capture a hope of science one day defining the observer, or a semantic trick to nullify the hard problem of consciousness.

As far as I am aware classical interactionist substance dualism (cartesian dualism) does not suffer from overdetermination but actually provides a function for mental reality (in that it causes the brain to function rationally/freely/etc). Non-reductive physicalism (property dualism) does however suffer from overdetermination in that mental properties are causally redundant (the physical system/brain behaves perfectly without them).

Perhaps you are referring to overdetermination with a semi-cartesian interactionist substance dualism - one in which mental reality is given a small causal role (say libertarian free will) despite the brain being assumed to operate quite well by itself. Note the elimination of overdetermination from property dualism (non-reductive physicalism) was seen as an additional benefit of the metaphysical libertarian free will model I proposed earlier (ie will power operating on an indeterministic physical system).

Ultimately however, overdetermination is only a problem for people attempting to formulate a consistent world view without teleology. Overdetermination is highly suggestive of design. This is why I have in the past suggested that atheism should really be considering classical interactionist substance dualism (cartesian dualism) if they wish to justify their beliefs. More specifically; a coevolution of the physical and mental system under a modified panpsychism. I am no longer suggesting cartesian dualism for atheism however based on underdetermination; but it leaves me without any options to help out atheism on this matter of overdetermination. If anyone has any ideas let us know.

The closed system assumption is a strong argument against interactionist dualism (coupled with an increasing understanding of the number of mental processes represented in neural circuitry). There is also the issue of underdetermination (previously discussed); if an independent mental substance interacts with a physical substance, then what defines what and how it thinks? It would require another set of laws to constrain the boundaries for an appropriate set of thoughts.

If the contents and laws of thought are determined by physical law (non-cartesian), then the choices available the soul are limited to informationally raw probabilistic mental processes (or random/third party disruption; which can't be of any practical use to personal freedom although such represents more than one type of metaphysical libertarianism). The reason for this being that all thoughts occurring in the formation of the choice are defined by the system (and can't have any influence on the disruption, else this disruption is effectively redundant as it was determined as being necessary by the system and may as well have been enacted by the system itself). The only informationally raw probabilistic mental process I know of is will power (volition). This is functionally equivalent to the free will model I proposed based on property dualism.

The extent to which mind represents an independent substance here is limited (being compatible with property dualism); although it doesn't rule out the possibility the sentient entity could be reconnected (mapped) to an arbitrary CNS. Furthermore, I wouldn't classify non-cartesian substance dualism as interactionist dualism, even if it enables genuine libertarian free will; as interactionism typically involves information transfers. Finally, the rationale behind the metaphysical libertarian model I proposed; with will power acting on the intrinsic indeterminism of the physical system rather than physical law being disrupted by the will (power), is that disruption requires an additional set to rules (laws) to define which physical laws may be disrupted by the soul, and where and when they may be disrupted (as opposed to these rules being built into the indeterministic two-layered system). Likewise, the impending decision of the soul must be represented externally and then imposed on the system (as opposed to being part of the system). It is true however that the argument against external interference is only strong to the extent to which we see the universe functioning on its own accord (eg evolution).

Note it is also possible that the observer (mental properties) serves to collapse the probability wave function - in that physical reality remains undefined without the observer. This is standard Copenhagen interpretation of quantum mechanics. This would solve the problem of overdetermination for non-reductive physicalism, but I can't reconcile this scenario with philosophical naturalism. Such a simulated universe seems contrived. Mind would have to be seen as a predetermined end state of the evolution of order in a multiverse; in that it is a fundamental property of the unobservable, higher order laws of nature (those which map qualia to neurological processes, the sentient entity to a particular CNS in space-time, etc). The observable laws of nature (including biological evolution) would be the system around which the minds of an infinite set of sentient entities (gods if you will) are defined. Invoking infinity in nature (as opposed to mathematics) has its own problems however, not to mention the number of additional responsibilities attributed to nature in this model (defining red as opposed to blue including the perceived nature of all sensations, maintaining a vector of sentient entities, running a simulation and coordinating the probability function between successive observations, etc; all while nullifying evolution as a philosophical justification for creation given the general end state of matter ie sentience is already determined).

The soul does the "choosing" (exerts their conscious will against subconscious desire): a single substance represented by both indeterministic physical law and emergent mental properties. The ability of one soul to exert more will power than another in any given circumstance (ie under the same internal and external conditions) is questionable however, and appears to depend more so on the strength of reason to resist (including past experience, fitness, health, etc). This is why I am currently agnostic on metaphysical libertarianism and a practical compatibilist (influenced by the neuroscience also). But when it comes to interpreting evil, I do not make any assumptions.

//Free will

It's Ok [personOfOtherConvictions] I think we all get it. While hell is not associated with original sin in the gospels, nor salvation with a transaction, nor the good news with a sacrifice, I recommend that we start a thread on free will. It is long over due for other reasons, if not your criticism of the consistency of a collection of stories written over centuries about the first and only monotheistic deity to have impacted our history (while respecting the authority of the Christian church in your choice of records, and the authority of a random monk in their interpretation). Hopefully this sounds like a good idea to you also.

The parable of the new toy.

I see amongst me no box labelled "The New Toy", I see nothing but a stack full of old toys. Immediately, the youth recognises something lying on the ground. But how can this be true, it is such a common thing. Even other cultures speak of this toy. Mythologies have been developed around this toy; the return of the toy, the lost toy, the last toy. But it is so small and inferior, and smells like hay and dried blood. Surely, if the author so loves me he would create a big toy, and a powerful toy, and a strong toy, and an obvious toy. We would all love him and worship him. And there would be peace on earth.

Every time he presents his caretakers with an old toy, they sit down to examine it.
"See here, it is not that bad. In fact, it is actually pretty good.."
Yet he throws it away, and exclaims, "But where can I find a new toy?" "Here, is this", picking up another small object, "a new toy?"
Again he throws it away and reasserts his intentions for the new toy. He feels that they all have become so accustomed to their old toys that they seek not the new toy.

One day, they came to him and asked; "Please describe this toy to us, for it seems to change upon your circumstances, and prevent the very good you desire."
They showed him the catalogue from yesterday. But he said that he was not interested in such things anymore; he wanted something new.
They replied, "This seems very dangerous indeed. If we gave you that of your own free will you might become lost, and never find your way home again."
And so at this incredulous insult, he left to find the new toy.

The quest for the new toy began. He began to search the four corners of the earth. Every last toy store on the planet. Often he saw something in the window, or heard something being said, which reminded him of something he had always enjoyed, but the novelty alluded him. Out of the corner of his eye, he thought he saw a cat's tail, or a thimble full of star dust.

One day, he met an old man on the road, whom he questioned about the new toy.
"Well I don't know anything of a new toy as such, but I can tell you something about an old one."
He had become so tired on his quest that he had hardly the will to reject the man's offer. His silence was taken as indicative of approval.

"This toy has never failed on its own accord, it has suffered no damage of its own making. The only thing that has ever harmed this toy is from without, for this toy was given to all..."

When the old man had finished telling the story, the young man asked, "But even if anyone found such a toy, how would anyone know that they had found it? What sign would they look for?"
The old man replied simply, "They will know when they have found the toy."
Seeing the doubt in the young man's eyes, he proceeded; "Would anyone believe if the author did tell them? Nay, I doubt they shall be relying on his own word for it."

Before leaving, the man hesitated and said one last thing.
"They are not asked to do anything. Only what is right."

This thread discusses metaphysical libertarian free will. Metaphysical libertarianism is the standard (folk) philosophical definition of free will, at least in the context of religion. It advocates that human actions are not predetermined by past events, and that there is always a possibility for a human to make a 'choice' otherwise (with respect to some default/alternate outcome);

1. It can explain overdetermination/redundancy in nature; i.e. it provides a purpose to mental existence (noting that under the standard materialist paradigm, the brain is assumed to function and evolve perfectly fine without the existence of mental properties)
2. It is also required for theologies involving eternal consequences (assuming the god distances itself from invocations of sadism)
3. Some argue that libertarian free will is a precondition for reason (e.g. C.S. Lewis)
4. There may be additional arguments ([personOfSimilarConvictions]/others please elaborate for us if you get time)

Although 2. is not something which can be discussed here in any detail, it might solve some philosophical issues (e.g. the problem of evil). It is not something which can be demonstrated by reason alone however (in my opinion). Likewise, there are reasons to doubt 1. In any universe in which functionally sentient beings (that can contemplate their existence) have been selected for, mental reality requires a substrate to provide the laws by which that mental reality operates, and this may as well be the physical substrate. Furthermore, there are reasons to doubt 3. Supernatural reason is unnecessary in a world which has been designed to forge reasonable beings (i.e. reason is an emergent property of nature). I am however unable to extend this counterargument to non-teleological frameworks (as there is no reason to assume such a world has evolved beings capable of reason, and therefore no reason to trust one's own analysis of the evolution of the world). All of these points however are open to rational debate.

From the outset, I will declare that I am a practical determinist (compatibilist). Metaphysical libertarian free will is not necessary for my working philosophy. However, what will be presented here is (largely) an introduction to why on multiple grounds such a determinism cannot be demonstrated.

I will therefore be ignoring compatibilist free will. I won't be discussing evidence for mental determinism in depth here. It might be worth noting that no research to date (2014) has demonstrated that we are obliged to follow (not free to deny) an impulse. Unconscious signals cannot (yet) be used to accurately predict our conscious decisions, but there is reason to believe that this might be possible in the future. Compatibilism is supported by contemporary models of the brain as a modular system (see the neuroscience of free will). If the mind is represented in the brain (in the sense of software running on a computer; a very imperfect analogy), then even the unconscious processes involved in impulse control might map to deterministic ionic flow (as opposed to any physical indeterminism discussed below). It should be noted however that despite being deterministic (for all intensive purposes), compatibilism generally assumes a two layer system. As such, it can offer a "free will" of sorts. A (rational) conscious layer operating on top of an (arational) unconscious layer. This however is an illusion of free will by metaphysical libertarian standards. Under compatibilism, decisions are made entirely on logic/reason (or lack thereof).

[ML1] A first candidate metaphysical libertarianism is based on classical 'dualist' philosophical of mind. If one maintains interactionist substance dualism (see Cartesian dualism/Descartes), then metaphysical libertarianism is true by definition. Substance dualism has its own problems however. a) Firstly, it requires physical law to be broken to enable interaction between independent mind and body. b) Secondly, the laws of mental thought in physically independent mind remain undefined. The problem of free will may have only been pushed back one layer (think multiverse for an analogy). As such, this model may represent only surface deep metaphysical libertarianism (without free will). It should be noted however that a) is not a problem which can be demonstrated by natural science; the universe may not be a closed system.

[ML2] A second candidate metaphysical libertarianism is based on physicalist philosophy of mind. It is important to note here that 'physical' in physicalism is a philosophical concept, and is not the same as 'physical' in empirical science. Assuming here a popular embodiment of physicalism; non-reductive physicalism (or a compatible version of property dualism), one can then begin to approach the problem of a well defined metaphysical libertarian model. See previous SR threads for more information on physicalist philosophy of mind, and why this choice has been made. Non-reductive physicalism assumes that mental reality (properties) supervenes on (completely maps to) physical reality (neural properties). That is, there are no mental processes which do not have a representation in the brain.

Under non-reductive physicalism, if one makes an additional assumption of physical indeterminism (see interpretations of quantum mechanics), then such intrinsic probability in nature might correspond to the self-determined feeling of various mental processes. One candidate mental process from which free will might arise under such a model is the act of will power (or volition) with regards to some existing desire. Note importantly, such a model of free will does not allow for a new decision to be generated (genuine inspiration/creativity), only the negation of an existing decision/desire. Similar to the compatibilist model outlined above, this model of free will requires a conflict between conscious (rational) desire and subconscious (arational) desire. One might then ask, what determines the decision in such a model? It is the (supposedly irreducible) conscious volition of the agent. It requires that the agent be

designed to be free, and mental reality itself (including its mapping to the indeterministic physical substrate/central nervous system) be designed to enable freedom. Every choice made by the agent is no different than any other choice (under the same internal/external circumstances); it is just as difficult. There is always a probability of success and always a probability of failure, and the only thing determining this outcome is the agent's will power. Robert Kane proposed the same model.

This second candidate model has its own problems. a) It assumes that the neural circuitry involved in volition is sufficiently unstable to be affected by physical indeterminism (sensitive to quantum effects and chaotic amplification). No suitable structures have been identified (e.g. Paul Davies), although there are some biological processes small enough to be affected by (specifically) quantum processes. Work continues, particularly along the lines of quantum computation (e.g. Penrose/Hameroff). b) The self-determined feeling of various mental processes might be an illusion, and there is some evidence for this (see again the neuroscience of free will).

The only option for metaphysical libertarian free will under philosophical naturalism is a form of substance (interactionist) dualism in which independent mind and brain co-evolve. They both require to have an evolutionary purpose, otherwise the free will is (both evolutionarily and anthropically) redundant: it would never be selected for in a multiverse.

I don't know anyone else who has proposed such a model. It invokes speculative inter-dimensional interactions of which there is no evidence for. There are some positive consequences in its favour however; a) it provides a mechanism to speed evolution along (as opposed to everything being completely dependent on mutations and the fine tuning of the genetic construct), and b) it provides a purpose for mental existence (assuming the problem is not just pushed back another layer). It probably is best classified as epigenetic scifi. I thought it might represent a possible candidate for a rational atheism in 2013, but gave up on suggesting this and reverted back to suggesting the standard emergent properties picture. Although evolutionarily redundant, at least emergent mental properties are selected for in a multiverse (ie they are not anthropically redundant).

Philosophical naturalists generally explore compatibilist options, although there are enough unknowns to stay open minded in my opinion (e.g. the standard Copenhagen interpretation of QM places the observer at the centre of reality - physical interactions remain undefined until measured). I personally am agnostic on metaphysical libertarianism (and therefore live as if compatibilism were true). Yet this is not necessarily a rational option for philosophical naturalism. The problem is that if one assumes reason is an emergent property of this universe (on top of redundant mental properties), then their world view becomes increasingly teleological.

Physical randomness is precisely what a 'natural' ML free will requires (as opposed to a supernatural/extra-dimensional interactionist dualism involving an independent mind with an independent will that does not have representation in this universe). It is a (reductive) fallacy to reduce physical randomness (observed probability) to absolute randomness. It commonly occurs in public explanations of biological evolution. (I know that you are not making this error [personOfSimilarConvictions] and have other reasons for preferring supernatural rather than subnatural interfaces).

Based on what we (think we) know about nature, ML2 is more probable than ML1. Moreover, ML1 likely just pushes the problem of free will back another layer. Any ML requires a two layer system; one of which is indeterministic, and this may as well be the physical construct (in my opinion). I would only suggest ML1 for philosophical naturalism (as it provides for the possibility of a coevolution of extra-dimensional mind and matter).

I completely disagree with Dawkins on the simple mind hypothesis. The brain has evolved to support logic processing (independent of adaptive biases in reasoning). To this end, there is a lot we can do which cannot be conceived in our 4 dimensional experience (e.g. mathematics). We should have a full human connectome in 100 years (or sooner if appropriate investments are made), and we will know precisely how deterministic the brain is.

There is nothing inherently linking ML to design;

Compatibilist: Why are you making this decision?
Libertarian (ML1): Because I chose to.
Compatibilist: Yes but why?

Compatibilist: Why are you making this decision?
Libertarian (ML2): Because I put in enough effort.
Compatibilist: I am not convinced your conscious effort drove the outcome.

ML might require design (ML2 certainly does, and ML1 probably does also; without serious speculation). But this does not imply that design requires ML. Eternal consequences might require ML (2). Likewise, philosophical naturalism might require ML (3). Are there any other (4) specific arguments for ML? Of course without ML one must ask; if the purpose of mental existence is not to interfere with nature (1), then what is the purpose of mental existence? (Is it not to interfere with nature?)

Note ML is not required for external influences on the universe (particularly the case with universal physical indeterminism), only for exclusively mental influences on the universe. And this is not suggesting that external interference is indicative of design, it is merely distinguishing non-determinism from ML.

[personOfSimilarConvictions] I think the distinction I am trying to make with ML2 is that the entities will power need only correspond to "probabilistic events in order to use randomness as an explanation". Therefore one only needs to identify the neural circuitry involved in volition and see if it is affected by physical indeterminism. This is the only empirical requirement. Of course, it is a necessary but insufficient requirement for ML2 (there are philosophical/teleological requirements also). While I am not advocating for ML2 here, we don't know enough at this stage to know how mental processes are represented in the brain. It is almost certain that they are distributed across multiple regions (circuits), which of course increases the possibility of chaotic amplification. But as you confirm, this is all speculative at present (no evidence or even theory remains standing to my knowledge). I am mainly highlighting that ML2 is more probable than ML1 based on existing empirical knowledge, inferences, and assumptions. Your criticism definitely applies to "centred accounts" of ML however (which is a formulation of ML I have ignored in this presentation - see the plato.stanford.edu article).

Although I should have better appreciated its context (as a defence of ML1), the reason I commented on the evolutionary mind insert (there is much debate in the literature as to the degree to which this shapes thinking and society) is that it affects our ability to conceive (and reason correctly about) abstract concepts such as ML. What we must understand when it comes to our universe, is that evolutionary pressures haven't just shaped an intelligent monkey, they have specifically endowed our species with self-reflective cognitive abilities enabling it to comprehend its existence (or what it thinks is existence; there is no way of proving extra-physical self-awareness, one can only speak about the model/representation the brain has of an extra-physical self-aware being). Anthropic reasoning is just as predictive (and therefore useful) as evolutionary reasoning in this context. And it is premature to deny reason based on evolutionary observation (it cannot be done). Evolutionary thinking has its place in empirical science (in fact all human psychology must be brought back to some evolutionary adaptation or artefact - resulting in atheoretical constructs when it is not), but it really needn't be emphasised in philosophy unless there is a specific problem it affects. Our living in a 4D universe is not an evolutionary constraint per se.

Note my first comment is critiquing the claims;
"I feel like there are two satisfactory conclusions..."
"Many combat this deterministic worldview by pointing out that..."
My second comment (relating to design) was critiquing the claims;
"As for your second comment, I agree in a probabilistic sense: ..."

As per my discussion with [personOfSimilarConvictions], the same ML2 mechanism (will power/volition) could be operative within an ML1 substance/interactionist dualism (back a layer). We could label this formulation candidate ML12. In my opinion, this level of complexity would be redundant; given that non-reductive physicalism and physical indeterminism suffice (ML2). There may however be other reasons for maintaining substance/interactionist dualism.

This distinction certainly touches on ML2. In ML1 the selection mechanism is undefined (what free will is acting upon; it just assumes that an independent mind interacting with brain has this capacity). ML2 defines the selection mechanism (will power/volition acting between rational/reason and irrational desire) and takes the simplest possible philosophy of mind supporting this mechanism (non-reductive physicalism with physical indeterminism). An independent mind is not required (substance/interactionist dualism): the mind can have a representation in the physical universe (neural connectivity and functioning). The (probabilistic) laws of the physical universe define the operation of mental processes: another extra dimensional/supernatural substrate is not required for this purpose. The agent mapped to a brain can direct the outcome of certain mental processes (in cases of a conflict between rational/reason and irrational desire) based on its strength of will. The same selection mechanism defined by ML2 could however be operating within a substance/interactionist dualism (back a layer), as per our discussion.

Note the property dualist/non-reductive physicalist view does not imply determinism (and it supports ML2 in principle). For ML1 we would expect to observe constant and informationally rich interactions (non-quantum interference), and this is definitely something which can be ruled out by observation. ML2 as an active mechanism in all decisions involving will power is also something which could be ruled out (as it depends on the stability of the relevant circuitry). However, if the universe is indeterministic, the possibility of rare or irregular ML2 can never be ruled out. Determinism as a philosophy (irrespective of its relationship to the human mind) is something also which can never be demonstrated.

This is a good point about the difficulties in mapping ionic flow in the brain. Although some level of disturbance is inevitable, I think the axonic/dendritic/synaptic mechanism is (in general) macro enough to allow probing without destroying the computation. The problem applies also to observing indeterministic effects real-time (this is effectively impossible due to the uncertainty principle; however we can infer the probability of such events occurring in a given system).

I don't deny that a property dualist/non-reductive physicalist position is based on traditional naturalism (everything has a natural cause, as opposed to everything does not have an extra-natural cause). And methodological naturalism is in itself a form of future proofing (apart from being a historically reliable paradigm). Likewise, a default implementation of compatibilism is definitely based on more assumptions than can be successfully argued. Furthermore, I don't deny that traditional theism favours ML, although I am not entirely convinced things work this way (even for those crimes associated with eternal consequences).

Just to clarify [personOfSimilarConvictions], the reason I say I take compatibilism as a working model rather than ML is that compatibilism places greater responsibility on my actions rather than others choices. I am agnostic, and don't rule out the possibility that people can make critical failures of will (irrespective of reason).

On a more abstract note; being agnostic on a system actually places as much if not greater responsibility on our respect towards the hypothetical system than is generally attributed to such a stance. It is like saying, well I might have loving friend, but I think I'd rather just ignore the possibility and not honour them. With respect to ML, this has implications for my analysis and communication of the possibility.

Now there are some propositions which should perhaps be greater affirmed/emphasised than others (for example the morality of suicide). The decision must come down to risk management (in this context, love). It also depends on their logical coherence, or the incoherence of a belief system in their absence (which I don't believe to be as strong an argument for ML as others).

Moreover, it so happens that I don't believe this is the best approach in communicating the possibility of libertarian free will, irrespective of its potential consequences. It relates to the very nature of the concept (free will). Some (if not all) of the greatest evils involve cohesion and manipulation (irrespective of how much good we think we are achieving by them). Moreover, there is evidence that if this is a teleological universe, then freedom is a big part of the game plan. It may even be the meaning of life.

//Interactionism
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=nRSBaq3vAeY

While I will be awaiting its independent replication, this is definitely worth tracking. They appear to be observing a small level of decoherence of the quantum system (~1% in double slit fringe intensity), and this may have been what Chalmers is highlighting in his

comment regarding alternate interpretations. The effect (if real) may therefore not be a product of extraphysical consciousness, just the fact the quantum system is more strongly interacting with its environment (in this case the complex system/measuring device of the human brain).

[personOfSimilarConvictions] I was attempting to encourage a cautious approach, but appreciate the enthusiasm.

It is important to acknowledge the difference between partial collapse and full collapse (some people switch the emphasis here and call this "minicollapse"). Partial collapse being the reduction in the susceptibility of the wave function to measurable quantum interference (ie increasing the probability of its classical "normal" interaction as opposed to one of the infinite possible interactions that might proceed due to its wave nature).

It is known that partial collapse is caused by quantum decoherence (interaction/entanglement of the quantum system with its environment). Partial collapse is therefore (amongst other circumstances) facilitated by experimental measurement, as any form of measurement at the quantum level must interact with the system. This is known as the observer effect; not to be confused with what is discussed regarding sentient observation below.

An example being; how does one know where an "electron" (its probability wave) is (and at what velocity it is travelling - ignoring momentum here)? Apart from giving the obvious answer (you can't, quoting Heisenberg's uncertainty principle), one can try. In doing so one must fire another particle at it (typically a photon), but in doing so the electron must be disturbed (and one doesn't know exactly how much by because the photon itself is acting as a probability wave and is interfering with the electron). As it turns out, assuming quantum coherence is to be maintained (ie the experimenter wishes to obtain a double slit interference pattern), the degree of uncertainty in this disturbance corresponds precisely to the uncertainty in position which would otherwise allow the experimenter to know which slit the electron went through.

Regarding the second form of collapse, we don't know what actually collapses the waveform entirely (ie what rolls the dice - makes the superposition of probability waves decide on a definite outcome; ie turns the abstract wave function into a classical "particle", which is say measured by a photodetector). The Everett many worlds interpretation posits that there is no final collapse; every possible outcome is realised in an infinitely diverging parallel universe (not to be confused with a cosmological/inflationary multiverse). Another interpretation (de broglie-bohm) suggests that we have got the physics wrong at a fundamental level; the physical universe is in fact deterministic, but there are hidden (unobservable) variables directing the pathway of the ostensibly probabilistic wave function. Ongoing experimentation continues to decrease the possibility of hidden variables.

A historically common albeit controversial position, often misconstrued as the Copenhagen Interpretation, posits that the observer is responsible for the final collapse. As far as I gather however the CI never claimed that the observer is responsible. Rather, measurement is held responsible, but it is left undefined what this "measurement" consists of.

While I don't adhere to his philosophy of mind (idealism), I think this guy appears to know enough of what he is talking about and is conducting exactly the right experiments to test it. He is not proposing a mechanism, just a dependency (association) based on an anomaly in our understanding of the universe (how and why the wave function collapses). I agree that there has probably been a confound (vibrational in the case of 2 metre informed meditators, and perhaps something else over the Internet - not testing the flash user interface doesn't look particularly good in terms of experimental rigour).

If it does turn out that the effect is real (independently replicated), I think that alternate non-sentient interpretations would have to be considered. Even the fact the presence of an observer might prevent the system from behaving in ways that might destroy the sentient being or its alignment with the universe (taking a multiworlds approach in which sentience follows the dimension in which physical law doesn't collapse in on itself). Decoherence over these distances would be just as wild a possibility.

I didn't see whether he tested the presence of a participant instructed to read a book 2 metres away from the setup, or play an internet game - these would have been interesting controls.

The problem for naturalism is that if there is no such interaction, then there is no reason for sentience to exist (emerge). So if I were bent on metaphysical naturalism (and logically consistent) I would be wanting to research the possibility. Physicalism (without any attempt at grounding emergence in nature; eg panpsychism) is a fundamentally teleological world view.

While I completely disbelieve in an interactionist picture of the world (substance dualism), and more so interactionism at a distance (outside of the CNS), I don't have a problem with people thinking about this stuff for a number of reasons. Firstly, science is about admitting what you don't know and it is not the realm of science to dictate philosophical world views (especially those most conducive to productive scientific enterprise - physicalism).

Secondly, I don't think what we do know necessarily suggests we have a complete picture (there might be some more serious revision coming up); take for instance the fact our best models suggest that 95% of our universe is made out of stuff that has a gravitational effect but otherwise no interaction with what we do know. In the case of dark matter, we can directly observe its effects by gravitational lensing of distant clusters, or in the rotational velocities of spiral galaxies.

Thirdly, there is not a more teleological (and deistic) world view where sentience magically emerges, aligning to highly complex ionic systems. For absolutely no purpose, conferring no advantage on the species. Any serious metaphysical naturalist should be looking to ground sentience in nature, and it turns out that only most liberal philosophers are doing this (eg Chalmers, Nagel). The most extreme ones (eg Dennett, and to a lesser degree Dawkins, not to mention the pop cosmologists who act like philosophers) continue to push the all that naturalism requires is an infinite number of universes bluff.

//Interactionism / Philosophy of mind

It is important to distinguish between interactionist philosophies of mind (classically cartesian dualism, but possibly idealism) and interactionism more generally (that of a closed universe/intervention with respect to creation). Note intervention is interpreted here as a

modification of the system at a point in space/time observed from within (it is not a comment on the sequence in which these adjustments are made by its source).

Regarding interactionism more generally, I agree that it is intuitively easier to accept human reason (and therefore any conversation that follows like this) if there has been theistic intervention - to ensure that emergent life is acting in accordance with a set of seemingly unencoded rules of reason. Nonetheless, I don't think that theistic intervention is a necessary condition for human reason, and there are good reasons to suggest it may even be counterproductive. Similarly however, I argue that one can only be reasonable (determinist or otherwise) under the condition of natural teleology (minimally, some form of deism/pantheism).

(1) Firstly, like morality, invoking an interactive personal God doesn't actually help, as an interactive personal God could be just as irrational as a non-interactive impersonal god, and no more likely to dictate the 8 right paths than to engrain them within nature itself. Morality is nothing other than a logical response to truth. Human reason may therefore be an emergent product of the physical laws including their bias towards the conditions for natural selection (under the constraints of our particular H-C-O-N generating, T-A-C-G life encoding universe).

(2) Secondly, while the proposition that intentional design requires intervention (directing every lighting bolt as it were) is a common position amongst atheists and so called creationists, it is not a universal position. Evolutionary theists/teleologists believe that the laws of the universe naturally facilitate the emergence of some design goal (in this case, a rational creature), one or more of which are endowed with sentience. One could use the word soul here at the peril of the attention span of your atheistic audience, but it is really just specifying the absence of the philosophical zombie state. Nothing in the laws of nature (as currently understood) describe to which systems (ionic or otherwise) are mapped sentience, nor the details of sentient properties. We have already covered the problem of qualia in depth (what is blueness? why is it not redness?). [See "What is it like to be a bat?" by Thomas Nagel, or you will hear any good philosopher make references to the problem].

(3) Thirdly, when one studies the principles of design within human society, any complex system is developed through evolutionary iteration. Spontaneously generating a completed system is rare, and generally implies the product is complete and no longer being designed. There is evidence that human freedom is participatory in our design, or at the very least necessary for our design (and observable intervention would in fact prevent such freedom). In a universe that does not evolve yet had a beginning, would we truly be free to honour the source?

(4) Fourthly, even if there were evidence for intervention, this would not necessarily give credence to an external creator, or an external creator as God. If it were found that our system appeared to have been manipulated over time, it would appear as though we were living in an artificial post hoc construct. We might consider ourselves just as likely to have been created by aliens or an unwise demigod.

(5) Fifthly, there is no precedent on which to believe in creationist interactionism (this is not really an argument, just an appeal to ancient wisdom). The second chapter of genesis is an explicitly separate account from that of the first chapter, and neither are literal accounts. There is also no evidence that the judaistic creation accounts are anything other than a monotheistic compilation of mesopotamian mythology. The first account explicitly declares that the world as we know it was not created in a day, but evolved and that this evolution was continuously evaluated (it also happens to align unusually well with what we know of natural history, but this is probably just a massive coincidence). I have previously outlined a number of mythological themes present in the second account (the origin of sin is the desire for knowledge of good and evil [#1], the origin of sin is the deception of women [#2], woman is derivative of man [#3], life (Eve) comes from the ground (Adam) [#4]).

(6) Sixthly, if intervention was present, how would we know for certain that the universe had a beginning? Would we still be able to observe the first light from its creation? Intervention does not necessarily reflect well on the ingenuity of the creator or the expected maturity of its audience.

(7) An evolved creature is extremely resiliant and adapted to their environment (the body's ability to self heal is oft overlooked by the medical minded). Interactionism defeats the purpose of evolution. Interactionism removes responsibility and self-determination. It is a great excuse to do nothing about evil. Contrarily, evolution provides complexity and purpose, challenge and the possibility of virtue.

(8) We don't actually know to what extent evolutionary products are independent of the blue print. Until controlled experiments have been conducted (or the genome is decoded) we will not know how many alternate (incrementally viable) pathways were/are available.

Regarding interactionist philosophy of mind, I reject cartesian (substance/interactionist) dualism (ML1) based on the problem of free will. In all following respects, metaphysical libertarianism operative on property dualism (non-reductive physicalism) seems the more likely candidate (ML2; powers of will/free volition model). However, metaphysical libertarianism may be an unnecessary complication altogether (saving only the phenomenon of eternal judgement theology). Compatibilism (mental determinism) may be the most likely picture of "free" will.

(1) Firstly, metaphysical libertarianism based on substance dualism (ML1) pushes the problem of what causes the decision back a layer (it doesn't solve the problem).

(2) Secondly, any free will system requires two layers mapped together; one of which is indeterministic, the other of which is volitional, directing only the probabilistic outcome of the "lower" layer. We already know of two such layers (physical reality and mental reality).

(3) Thirdly, the process must be extremely simple, based on a simple yes/no response (otherwise it requires unspecified backend systems to cater for the complexity of the process). The only simple yes no response available (known) is volitional with respect to the conscious effort required to reject a conflicting desire in favour of predetermined reason.

(4) Fourthly, based on what we understand of information processing in the CNS, substance dualism seems obscure. We would observe the storage of self-referential memories through the breaking of physical law (eg "I remember seeing an apple"). Considering that under cartesian dualism the "I" is independent of the physical system, it must be processed by independent mind and written to memory whenever it is explicitly accessed by the output system (speaking/writing).

(5) Fifthly, there is no clear alternative on which one might desire to base a decision other than reason (logic is deterministic). A substrate would have to exist to facilitate this, encoding rational thought processes (and this may as well be the physical system/brain).

Finally, there is a difference between epistemological reason and reason itself. In an evolving non-interventionist universe, we certainly cannot be sure that every thought we have is reasonable (only that human reason is possible, being the final cause of physical creation).

Why are objects that follow natural law incapable of being correct or incorrect? Sentience appears to follow natural law but that does not mean that it can be reduced to natural law.

Non-reductivism is a serious problem for atheism, but it is not a problem for teleology. It is the reason that physicalism is inherently incompatible with atheism. The good philosophers know this (and are attempting to come up with naturalistic models that might actually work), while the outspoken few who think that Consciousness Explained is an accurate title for a book in the 21st century continue to push a dead horse.

I will start by first impressing upon the fact that time is a physical dimension, and our perception of it (like space) is completely relative to our frame of reference. Evolution is creation, it is just occurring at a different rate than we would expect. There is nothing special about the universe developing systems that happen to correspond to (act as a substrate for) non-physical objects like reason, sentience, and morality.

Teleology is not a philosophy that requires defending, it is in fact the default position shared by every society not addicted to sexuality that has ever existed. The only reason our own is still alive is because of contraception. Sexual addiction is unsustainable. What has instead been sacrificed is reason. Our ancestors were not religious because they couldn't see some galaxies, or know the power of the sun, they were religious because they were seeking to reconcile known truths. Including their own sentience, morality and reason.

Any system requires laws to define the mechanics of how it operates. In the case of physicalism (the core philosophy of mind without the confound of naturalistic assumptions), physical reality is considered to be the substrate which defines how a mental system operates in this universe.

A substrate could be seen as something of a framework (compare the hardware/software model of consciousness - but this is an extremely loose analogy and breaks down in a number of important ways).

We are the fortunate generation - we get to see creation in action. If we look up into the night sky we can see the entire thing played out, right back to the time of first light. If we turn on an analog tv we can even see this light as a percentage of the static (having been redshifted into the microwave with the expansion of the universe). Our ancestors speculated about creation based on reason, but they didn't know about it.

This depends (under physicalism) amongst other criteria on whether the physical universe is deterministic. There is a possibility of libertarian free will, although as I have suggested above I am not entirely convinced.

If it is not caused by the system's failure to reason (coupled with its environment; including developmental conditions/education), then it is caused by a failure of will to accept reason over some conflicting desire at one or more points in its life. The first is describing compatibilistic (deterministic) "free" will, the second is describing a particular form of metaphysical libertarian free will (ML2).

The second [personOfSimilarConvictions] (I am referring to physicalist models of free will here - not ML1).

Regarding your first interpretation, note it is possible that some break might occur that has nothing to do with free will but which results in an intergenerational failure to reason, but it doesn't make sense as to why this would be allowed to occur. A systematic failure to reason (apart from ML) is more likely due to a natural instability or evolutionary incompleteness of the system.

What precisely do you mean by influence? One can create an algorithm (or law) using any number of component functions. The algorithm needn't interact with its subcomponents, in fact it doesn't make any sense to propose such.

As noted in past discussion, I think that the argument from reason is sound, but not as Lewis presented it (it doesn't have anything to do with metaphysical interaction).

I have been assuming that interaction implies cause and effect. If it only implies grounds and consequence (without cause and effect) then I would see no reason to deny such interaction. Take for example morality. Morality (consequence) is based on the belief that sentience is valuable (ground), but it is not (under physicalism) dependent on a causal interaction between sentience and the brain.

The physical substrate does not (under a physicalist framework) require to be acted upon to bring its effects into agreement with the higher law. Take for example the reasoning of a child. Through experience (including education; which is arguably experience stored over multiple generations) the child may come to reason in accordance with the higher order principle of logic, and any other number of axioms. There are a few exceptions worth noting; a) under ML2 sufficient will power is required to sustain reason in situations of conflicting desire, and b) one might discuss external influence in the context of demons or avatars (rather than free will).

The grounded belief is (under physicalism) represented by physical reality (particular neural networks), and so can't cross over physical reality and begin a cascade of causes.

Either coincidence or destiny yes (barring ML2). Note I am not proposing reductive physicalism, where mind can be reduced to physical reality, only physicalism - where mind functions in accordance with physical reality. The soul is assigned to a particular physical entity (along with its experience).

It is fair enough to argue the non-existence of a physicalist libertarianism, it depends how you define physicalism. I am only using the term to represent the core philosophy of mind. A mental system which is behaving in accordance with indeterministic physical law (where the indeterminism is mapped to volition; ML2) is still a physicalist system. What needs to be presented is an alternative free will system (the details of an ML1) that is capable of providing any more origination/freedom. I have reason to believe this is impossible.

There are a few other possibilities as I see it;
3. (compatibilism) physicalism is true, the laws of the universe facilitate the construction of systems (brains) that do correspond well to the realm of conscious reasoning, but their alignment is dependent on the (intergenerational) experience of the individual.
4. (ML2) physicalism is true, the laws of the universe are indeterministic, and they facilitate the construction of systems (brains) that do correspond well to the realm of conscious reasoning, but their alignment is dependent on the conscious will power (effort) of the individual.

Although the assertion does little to demonstrate the preservation of human reason, I think it is worth being open to the possibility of compatibilism (irrespective of the philosophical issues with ML discussed above).

By truly awful, is it that the moral onus is less on the sick retard (or potential psychopath) and more on the clear minded to speak truth and encourage others to do so? Anyone can behave irrationally if they like and reject their responsibility, but does anyone truly want to behave this way? And if they do so, will they become anything other than a wretch (the addiction to power/cowardice paying for itself in penance)?

I don't think it is necessary to inspire people with the freedom to reject their desires, only the capacity to understand them better. I admit that (to avoid such truly awful implications) it is necessary to believe that people are fundamentally good; given a minimum experience of truth that they will make the right call. This however is not a problem for me because evil is a lie.

People are either generally bad or generally stupid. Although (as I have stated on multiple occasions) I am agnostic with respect to ML, I have no problems believing the latter. If I were an ideological enemy of a Calvinist (which I am), it would not be because they thought that the universe were deterministic (which I don't), but because they thought that people were fundamentally evil.

Furthermore, I am completely open to the possibility of ML, if only for the maintenance of our (western, arguably Christianised) interpretation of choice. However as I have discussed above, such choice remains ill defined - not just because of the problem of origination (which remains), but more fundamentally, with respect to the logical basis of the free decision (and therefore the necessity of the freedom).

Finally, I see no purpose in deifying human reason (beyond the capacity to share in the abstract object), when it is our complexity and propensity to err which makes us human. It may even be necessary for creativity. It is certainly necessary for descriptive morality (there being right and wrong), and by implication, virtue. We may not have the capacity to act reasonably under all circumstances, but this does not prevent us from avoiding occasions of error.

For reference, there is a second kind of influence not discussed (which doesn't meet the criteria for interactionism; either the formal criteria or that defined here) which pertains to creation* but like ML2 operates on the intrinsic indeterminism of the universe. I will classify this as OS2 (for open system). Unlike OS1 where creation is modified on one or more occasions (or ML1 where a physically independent mind interacts with the material world), OS2 doesn't require interaction to enable third party influence. I was catering for this possibility by restricting physicalism to its core+ philosophy (of mind) - in that there is no break down of physical law. This says nothing for higher order explanations of observed (empirical) probabilistic outcomes.

* one must think outside of their temporal box to appreciate creation as continuous. Take for example the cross-cultural phenomenon of prayer; such need not be considered effective based on an interventionist model (in that a deity forgot something and needed reminding). Rather, the system might be designed to execute according/with respect to the prayers of 'the faithful' (for a hypothetical good universe favours truth, and will tend to affirm those live in accordance with it by their karma).
+ To reiterate; most relevant philosophical categories; naturalism, physicalism, materialism etc confound closed system assumptions with their core philosophy/thesis on nature.

It is difficult to identify the precise extent of the awful implications suggested here of compatibilism without further elaboration. It has obvious implications for the criticality of education (C1; already discussed, with an example of effective encouragement) and teleology (C2; already discussed; human beings must naturally seek the good - cf Aristotelian definition of man). There are however some additional constraints posed on reality by this position.

It is often claimed that if there is no ML free will the creator (if existent) is evil, or more commonly; that ML free will is a resolution to the problem of evil. The creator can remain good while the problems arising in the immoral interactions of human beings are a sole consequence of their volitional failure(s). Although I am not advocating compatibilism in this thread I will however defend it.

(C3) Firstly, such immoral interactions need not be intentionally planned, merely allowed to exist under the pretext that they are necessary for some greater good (or as I have argued, any real good/true virtue at all; as is also the case in the eastern philosophy of yin and yang).

(C4) Secondly, it is important to recognise that compatibilism is not a thesis on physical determinism, but rather the irrelevance of physical determinism to free will. It is possible that nature is moving towards a final cause of reason (/morality), even without such being programmed into the laws of nature (cf C2).

(C5) Thirdly, most (poly)theistic accounts of creation describe some form of afterlife judgement, and it is the purpose of such judgement to correct injustices. Many see this as an extension of the process already occurring on earth (eg purgatory/penance). Yet it is only the

advocates of eternal judgement theology who appear to rely on ML in the justice of such a procedure (without resorting to weak clay analogies).

"Father, forgive them, for they do not know what they are doing."

Compatibilism is determinism with respect to free will, but it is neither physical or theological determinism.

ML is possible, and I certainly respect that possibility. Likewise, I appreciate the traditional picture of human freedom you cast. But the philosophical evidence for this possibility is another matter, and appears to require as you suggest an acceptance of epistemological limitation (be it out of reverence or otherwise). Miracles it seems are neither necessary nor sufficient to enable ML.

The universe could be indeterministic, but human beings might still not have libertarian free will. a) Their actions could be entirely reducible to indeterminism at the quantum level - ie random - without free will having any specific relation to such indeterminism (this should be contrasted with ML2). In this case human will can be considered deterministic with respect to the laws of the universe (their decisions being reducible to such). Alternatively, b) neuronal information processing might be occurring at such a scale that human will is for all intensive purposes deterministic. In both cases, human will is considered deterministic, while physical reality remains indeterministic. Compatibilism only asserts that physical indeterminism is irrelevant to free will; ie their actions are a) no less deterministic than the rest of the universe and entirely reducible to those indeterministic laws, or b) for all intensive purposes deterministic.

Theological determinism is of course another matter and is entirely independent of physical determinism. A deterministic universe is not necessarily predestined (its evolution could be a chaotic artefact), although it could be, and an indeterministic universe might be predestined (in that the observed probabilistic outcomes are selected by an omnipotent third party), or it might not be. Likewise, theological determinism is independent of metaphysical libertarianism. This starts to get more technical, and depends on definitions which are not shared consistently across the literature (so I will avoid them here). Human actions could be intentionally predestined to occur (negating ML), or while knowing the outcome of their free decisions they might be allowed to occur (cf providence). Alternatively, human will might be entirely independent of its source, although it is difficult to conceive of a metaphysical libertarian system without some form of teleology.

Regarding the epistemological problem; its influence here is negated by the assertion (assumption) of their alignment, being a/the final cause of physical creation (an alignment between neuronal information processing and higher order logic/abstract object). One can only assume that their thought processes are reasonable and proceed thereafter. This assumption of course denies the possibility of concluding an arrangement (philosophical framework) which negates the rationality of such thought processes (ie cannot provide a reason for them being reasonable). Furthermore, although it admits the possibility of mental error, it (by its assumption of an alignment) allows for the (retrospective) identification of those errors. Likewise, one can be sure that their error correction is not subject to the same degree of error based on the assumption of the alignment. Everything is contingent on this assumption (irrespective of their world view).

Epiphenomenalism states that there are entities which do not have a physical representation but are merely epiphenomenon of a physical state (typically consciousness). But if this were the case, the physical system would have no knowledge of its consciousness (and there would be no memories of self-referential states; eg I remember seeing the red apple). This is essentially Dennett's argument. One could construct an epiphenomenalism where qualia are considered to be epiphenomena (because they have no basis in physical law as presently understood), but these are typically considered to be mental properties supervening on physical states (under non-reductive physicalism). What exactly are you comparing epiphenomenalism to?

> ---
> Note Jaegwon Kim has actually argued that there is no such thing as a non-reductive physicalism on the basis of causally ineffectious/irrelevant mental properties (in that it does indeed reduce to epiphenomenalism). This is the problem of overdetermination.

> ---
> That mental properties serve no physical/causal purpose (which cannot otherwise be explained by physical properties themselves) - this is precisely the claim of physicalism. The physical representation of consciousness would almost certainly serve one (it is adaptive for an organism's brain to view it self as a cognitive agent). Likewise, mental properties might serve a philosophical purpose (anthropic selection, teleology, ML2, etc).

The primary opponent of physicalism (substance monism type A) of course consist of ML1 (substance dualism). Pan(proto)psychism is somewhere in between - in that physical reality cannot exist without mental phenomena. Likewise, idealism (substance monism type B - including scenarios where consciousness collapses the probabilistic waveform) suggest some form of causal role for mental reality.

> ---
> That is all essentially correct, although a) in the case of deterministic teleological physicalism, there is a wind direction, and it could be considered to be the best story ever told (although a story involving metaphysical libertarian freedom might be even better; ML1/ML2). b) In the case of ML2, which is almost certainly a form of nondeterministic teleological physicalism (it is hard to imagine a non-teleological ML2 universe), although mental properties serve no physical purpose which cannot otherwise be explained by the physical properties themselves, the observed probabilistic (indeterministic) outcome of physical events remain undefined (undetermined by the physical construct). Mental properties could therefore serve a philosophical purpose and causal purpose in the context of the greater (non-physical) reality. In a physical (empirical) context however, causality is completely satisfied by the probabilistic natural law. c) As discussed previously, contrary to the lay popularity of materialism, atheistic physicalism is unlikely.

> ---
> So translating: if we take the term "physical" in lay terms (disregarding its formal empirical qualifier), then under ML2 (a special case of non-deterministic physicalism), as opposed to compatibilism, mental properties could be considered to serve a causal purpose in physical reality. Under this model they allow the "free won't" of Benjamin Libet or the "free volition" of Robert Kane; the rational rejection of an impulse. Perhaps then the boat adrift in the wind analogy would be less appropriate.

Regarding the traditional picture of freedom you have cast, these are my present thoughts. The one who sees people as fundamentally bad will opt for control and manipulation. The one who sees people as fundamentally good will opt for freedom - believing that given the right information (and experience of its reality) they will make the right decision. Rather than resort to lies and manipulation. On this basis, I do not yet see that socialism follows from compatibilism. Again, I deeply respect and admire (am attracted to) the world you paint.

//Socialism
[Regarding https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7eOABsNAU8o]

That is a really good argument for metaphysical libertarianism.

It is worth contrasting this model to teleological compatibilism; a system designed to learn to reason, where an ought/should (prescriptive morality) is merely the logical choice. Like non-teleological compatibilism, such does not withstand the socialist implications highlighted by this analysis; although it places a greater emphasis on education (of truth) rather than conditioning (of the machine).

---
a) Why would you take personal offence at an argument made against a philosophy (or a definition of heresy)?
b) The proposition that a lack of a father figure distorts a child's ability to thrive is a statistical argument, and it is very well supported across a variety of measures (apart from the occasional artificially selected sample of same-sex adoptees/surrogates).
c) TSR is not the place for information censorship; regardless of its emotional consequences.
d) Did anyone argue that privilege by birth is not at all correlated with success, or is this a straw man? The more interesting question is the average number of generations one must recede before they become practically uncorrelated, and whether the ancestors would have worked as hard knowing that the state would redistribute their descendants' inheritance to people who are less likely to capitalise on the wealth.

//Free will/morality
Although I recognise that origination is a serious philosophical problem, I don't think compatibilism necessarily undermines moral responsibility;

1. Firstly, what can be the basis of a right decision if not logic (which is a deterministic process).
2. Secondarily, sin has consequences; indulgence often produces some initial pleasure/relief but it will always be followed by wretchedness. People will feel guilty for having gained some pleasure at the expense of another, whether or not they recognise it (cognitive dissonance). This is as opposed to feeling guilty for having made (ML1) or having failed to make (ML2) a metaphysically libertarian decision.
3. Classical metaphysical libertarianism (ML1: cartesian/substance dualism) doesn't explain the system which enables origination; it pushes the problem of free will (like mind) back a layer.
4. Modern metaphysical libertarianism (ML2: non-reductive physicalism/property dualism in combination with physical indeterminism: "free volition") explains free will by assuming mental properties (typically rational volition/effort against some primal desire expressed by the reptilian brain) direct the indeterministic physical substrate by either collapsing the probability wave representing specific brain function or determining its outcome. Yet such doesn't explain why the probability wave function representing certain neuronal networks are under effect by mental agency and not others, nor does it explain the particular decision (level of will power). The entire metaphysical system (physical+mental) would have to be preprogrammed that way. But given biological evolution, the induction of a specific program at a particular time in history (which can only operate once the system has reached an extreme level of complexity; ie has a prefrontal cortex) seems ad hoc. There is no evolutionary advantage to the introduction of such a process because it by definition cannot direct nature beyond what can already be described by the probabilistic laws of nature. This should be contrasted with something like extraphysical consciousness (mental properties) - which doesn't need an evolutionary advantage and can emerge (or be capable of emerging) at a relatively low architectural complexity, or logic/reason (see compatibilism) - whose emergence has a definitive evolutionary advantage.

Both 1. and 2. appear to require teleology to be efficacious in human psychology (as does any viable form of metaphysical libertarianism: ML1/ML2). Note I don't formally subscribe to compatibilism as a philosophy (I am agnostic to the nature of free will). For evil to retain its potency metaphysical libertarianism is required, although provisional judgement could still be passed and justly accepted under compatibilism (including theological justices like purgatory). Likewise, general case immorality (moral error) and evil can still be defined without metaphysical libertarianism, wherein moral error is any conscious or unconscious error of judgement (sin/missing the target), and evil is the conscious rejection of truth (acceptance of a logical error).

As discussed in the past, I think there is a difference between a) defining morality without reference to teleology based on philosophical assumptions we (have evolved to) take for granted; eg logic, self existence, other existence, etc, and b) rejecting teleology by asserting positive atheism, which undermines the integrity of one or more of these assumptions we take for granted.

=== Gender ===

//Gender [20July2016a]

Where are the fathers? This is a genuine question - I am interested to know the statistics.

...

Transgenderism demonstrates disrespect for women (in that it does not appreciate their physical and psychological labour).

If gender is a social construct, then what precisely is transgenderism?

If only feminism had stuck to its original aim (the elimination of sexual objectification), then perhaps we would not be in such a muddle.

...

The fundamental issue here is that the DSM is atheoretical. Basically, invented by an association of professionals on the basis of what they think will help people and their society. This model only works in so far as one assumes that their society is healthy (arbitrary assumption). The NIMH seek to base mental health diagnosis on nature (physical abnormalities), in the same way that medicine is. Of course, while decreasing false positives/increasing true negatives, this will also decrease true positives/increase false negatives (until technology becomes sufficiently advanced to detect the underlying phenomena).

I have no problems with people arguing that gender is a social construct so long as they understand gene-environment interaction. It probably is (and more so for women). All evidence however (cross cultural) suggests that it is a stable equilibrium. A byproduct of hormonal dispositions, sexual orientation, and physiology interacting with moral/social responsibility (others of same or complementary disposition).

It is highly unlikely a male without masculinity would have evolved (given the selection pressure for males is much stronger); thus male identity is probably a direct consequence of hormonal injection. Although various forms will be exhibited: gentleman, opportunist, meatman; they are all dependent on the same instinct. The instinct is just controlled (top down) to different extents. The primary aspect of femininity essential to female evolution is the desire to nurture children - but this bears little on their everyday interactions. Their general interactions (gender identity) might therefore be dependent on the male environment and society in general to a greater extent than males.

One must ask; what happens to gender identity when sexual instincts are confined to private fantasies? And where these fantasies are being actively administered to the male population. It is pretty obvious that diversity will surge.

Next, what does this say for "transgenderism"? (nb transsexual is more accurate because they are generally not happy with their biological sex). If someone says they don't feel like a woman what does that mean? If they are referring to the social stereotype of femininity then there is not a chance there is a physical basis to this belief/feeling. If they are referring to the female sex then it is highly unlikely an organism has evolved the ability to feel like another sex (any discrepancy would be an error - as seen for example in hermaphroditic androgyny).

The same issue applies to homosexuality. As evolution would predict, exclusive homosexuality is incredibly rare in the animal kingdom (and non existent in non-domesticated mammals). The only natural variation in sexuality is indiscriminate sexual relations.

Reading the transactivism article, I decided to verify the 5 sources quoted by the author purported to support the claim that hormone therapy helps. I actually don't have time to conduct metaanalyses on Saturday afternoons so this was rather rush. It is possible that the literature quoted here is non-representative of transgender hormone therapy research, but if it is then our state of the knowledge of its psychological consequences is non-existent. The author cites 5 papers, generated by 3 independent teams of scientists. Not one study used a placebo hormonal replacement treatment, so it is impossible to distinguish the effects observed over that of a placebo.

http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24275005
http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23574768
http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24281571
http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21699661
http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19040622

...

Father? Based on the stats, they must either suppress the expression of true feelings, leave/hide as a consequence, or be paramount to the development of manhood in the absence of male siblings (competition).

...

Just make sure it is not one of those dodgy therapeutic/surgical studies that didn't use a control condition (let alone double blind administration)

//"Guys"

Say what?

...

I am interested to know [personOfSimilarConvictions] - what do you use in mixed company as a ~ gender neutral plural second person object?

> ---
> Thanks for the advice - this might be useful.

> ---
> I think I often use everyone.

...
If a male is being gay without good reason then there is reason to call it -certain presentations are incompatible with the natural environment (and nature deserves respect).

> ---
> In contemporary western society there are numerous reasons why someone might act gay and it is quite possible that none of them involve having an innate prenatal disposition towards same sex attraction (although they might interact/be exasperated by such). The most obvious candidates are being a jerk or sexual addict.

...
A point cannot be made without offering a solution - [personOfSimilarConvictions] suggested one..

> ---
> Yes but did he suggest that or did [personOfSimilarConvictions] suggest that?

> ---
> Cool. I make this distinction because it is important. It appears to be the difference between arguing and whining. Whining involves giving nothing but rebuttals, whereas arguing involves proposing mechanisms by which things might occur. Morrison might well be offering solutions but it is not evident from the article.

I wonder who invented the idea that the male and female identity are distinct entities and one is not in someway derived from the other. It is certainly not evolutionarily (or even biblically) sound. There is a natural reason why the masculine pronoun can be used to identify a collection of humans and the female pronoun cannot. This is about the only thing I appreciate about the blatantly divisive title of "feminism".

That said there may be better ways to call a group of humans (other than man), or to address a group of humans (other than guys).

> ---
> It is not surprising that a hypothetical spiritual body takes the feminine pronoun.

> ---
> Note everyone and ladies and gentlemen doesn't work in the presence of just one male and one female. Also, ladies and gentlemen, boys and girls, fails to capture situations where there is just 3 such types of person present.

> ---
> You both, you all?

//Gender
[in reponse to https://www.acpeds.org/the-college-speaks/position-statements/gender-ideology-harms-children]

I thought this was a superb review of the literature. I haven't read anywhere near as many articles surrounding the issues as the author(s), but I came to the same basic conclusion regarding the importance of environment interaction.

Content I didn't understand;
- "The more carefully researchers map these constellations.." (p24)
- "This finding suggested that boys who are sexually abused may be more likely to establish both heterosexual and homosexual relationships." (p48)

Content I found questionable;
- I don't understand why the author(s) having questioned the validity of a unified sexual orientation construct, persists in using suggestive categories (eg "gay", "lesbian"). I don't think this is scientifically productive, and is quite possibly an exercise in social appeasement.
- "The twin studies reviewed earlier may shed light on the role of maternal hormonal influences, since both identical and fraternal twins are exposed to similar maternal hormonal influences in utero. The relatively weak concordance rates in the twin studies suggest that prenatal hormones, like genetic factors, do not play a strongly determinative role in sexual orientation" (p37). It is possible that twins (even monozygotic twins) could be differentially affected by maternal androgens (as evidenced by localised influences observed in animal studies). In this case the hormonal affect would not be picked up in the "genetic" contribution of the twin studies. This process is referenced elsewhere in the article; "Segal speculates that each set of twins may have had uneven prenatal androgen exposures" (p99). Likewise, monozygotic twins generally share the same placenta (unlike dizygotic twins), so what is being picked up in the differences between MZ and DZ twins as a product of "genetic" uniformity could actually be a product of the similarity of the prenatal environment.

Content I particularly appreciated (some theories I have thought about in the past);
- "One needs to bear in mind that identical twins typically have even more similar environments early attachment experiences, peer relationships, and the like than fraternal twins or non-twin siblings. Because of their similar appearances and temperaments, for example, identical twins may be more likely than fraternal twins or other siblings to be treated similarly. So some of the higher concordance rates may be attributable to environmental factors rather than genetic factors" (p31).

- "These gene-environment relationships are complex and multidimensional. Non-genetic developmental factors and environmental experiences may be sculpted, in part, by genetic factors working in subtle ways. For example, social geneticists have documented the indirect role of genes in peer-aligned behaviors, such that an individual's physical appearance could influence whether a particular social group will include or exclude that individual" (p33).

Additional content I found questionable (which references a more fundamental issue);
- "It is the nature of the struggle that defines the disorder, not the fact that the expressed gender differs from the biological sex" (p95). I don't think it is possible to define order/disorder based on a struggle (symptom) that exists in a particular culture, without reference to nature. Medicine is based on culturally independent abnormalities, and so should clinical psychology. The fact this may be difficult does not excuse us from the scientific task at hand.

//Gender identity

I don't usually use gender specific pronouns when referring to gender neutral entities in formal writing, but they can be used to make a point about asymmetries. Things don't have to be symmetrical to be complements, in fact it is the nature of complementarity that they are not. There is a reason why females can perform prototypical male behaviours without losing their identity; eg leadership, but males cannot perform prototypical female behaviours without losing their identity; eg non-symbolic bodily decoration. It is because woman is a superset of (is derivative of) man.

Moreover, this is not just a cultural artefact. It is a consequence of how gender identity has been encoded. There was arguably less evolutionary pressure for female identity to be selected for (as their selection for reproduction and the success of their offspring were not dependent on the maintenance of a predefined female identity in their environment of evolutionary adaptedness). Consequently, female identity is not genetically determined (and is somewhat independent of the interaction of sex hormones). The development of male identity is however dependent on the interaction of specific androgens produced by their bodies as determined by their sex. A male cannot go against this biological nature and retain his identity. For this reason, a morally corrupt female is still a woman (unless perhaps it involves killing offspring), but a morally corrupt male is not necessarily a man.

Recognising asymmetries is not just an academic exercise in exclusion. They are important because they neutralise lowest common denominator categories created by philosophical dictatorships like communism/socialism. Examples include racism, sexism, ageism, sexualityism, religism, genderism, etc. Treating people with dignity and respect does not imply what is commonly referred to as "equality" (relativism and therefore same treatment of differences/"diversity"; differences which have no purpose and can serve none outside of the Marxist machine).

It is discussing asymmetries in nature, explaining a recent use of gender bias in TSR language (which deserves independent discussion);

1. it explains why prototypical feminine properties cannot be extended to males without risking their identity (eg beautification), but prototypical male properties can be extended to females without risking their identity (as their identity is environmentally dependent; critically, on the existence of a man).
2. to this end it is a critique of feminist theory in that it explains how what is commonly referred to as gender equality is a misappropriation of the female psyche (their environmentally dependent identity) to males.
3. It explains why female gender identity (woman) can correctly be considered a superset of male gender identity (man), given that all further specialisations of gender identity are culturally dependent (not genetically encoded).
4. it explains why male pronouns are traditionally used to denote human beings (being the more general class).
5. It explains why the Hebrew and English denotations of sex are not arbitrary.
6. It explains why the common proposition that some male is not a man can be an accurate description, while the proposition that a female is not a woman is not. Female gender identity, again being environmentally dependent (with the possible exception of child murder). The statement might be true for some or most culture (based on an interaction of their hormonal development and their environment), but this identity is not innate or universal.
7. Finally, it discuses why recognising asymmetries in nature is not a trivial exercise or one concerning meaningless exclusion. It discusses the importance of recognising asymmetries, in that they contradict modern socialist assumptions dictated to the populace.

The evolutionary argument is based on the concept of the environment of evolutionary adaptedness. Traits can only be encoded if there is selective pressure on them. Male psychological traits (aggression, independence, etc) are strongly selected for as males who do not possess these will not reproduce in their natural environment. There is an excess of male gametes in sexually reproductive species, and not all males need reproduce to satisfy the maximum reproductive capacity of the population. Female psychological traits (apart from offspring caring behaviours) are not strongly selected for as females will be selected for reproduction by their male counterparts regardless of their possession of these traits. Reproduction requires highly valuable female wombs (and eggs); months of their reproductive opportunity. Thus, their psychology (in particular gender identity) bears little on whether they will reproduce.

One can also frame a genetic argument (although it is somewhat weaker/more speculative). There is no XZ chromosome in humans. There is nothing innate which prevents a woman from being a man (in terms of identity). There is however something innate which prevents a man from being a woman; the XY chromosome. Birds however have an XZ ("ZW") chromosome, so according to the hypothesis, one could argue that there is nothing which prevents a male bird from identifying as a female. Wobird is the more general class. It is not coincidental that many male birds adopt offspring caring responsibilities (~85% of bird species). Likewise, it is possible that stereotypical sexual dimorphism does not work too well amongst birds, as an aggressive male bird would not come off too well after a fight (even if it won: not being able to fly because it lost a few feathers).

//Gender identity
It is worth noting that physical capacity is not equivalent to gender identity (although it may interact with the environment to create/reinforce it).

Gender identity is generally considered to be a psychological construct. The correct language is ordered/disordered (sex discrepant) gender identity. Contrary to atheoretical clinical psychology (including the DSM-V classification paradigm), an illness needn't be able to be cured for someone to have one. Many illnesses celebrated by modern psychology are a byproduct of an emancipated, sexually addicted society (for example masturbation). Nor, contrary to Marxist (or extreme carebear) philosophy, does it mean that we should treat people the same, as though they had not an illness.

//Gender
I don't think we can comment on its normality until a thorough investigation has been conducted into the kinds of family environments in which children experience sex asynchronous gender identity. Making the assumption that all parents are good is probably as arbitrary as defining mental health to include conscious fantasy.

//Social Constructionist Extremism

https://medium.com/@Cernovich/full-james-damore-memo-uncensored-memo-with-charts-and-cites-339f3d2d05f

---
https://m.youtube.com/watch?v=TN1vEfqHGro

Note my initial thought was that CEO Sundar Pichai was either a) reinforcing the stereotype or b) confirming the biodiversity thesis by firing James Damore for risking hurting a delicate group's feelings (belief system). Now I suspect he might genuinely care about irrational discrimination against underrepresented minorities (at least to the extent that he doesn't want to get sued for appearing otherwise), but is somewhat slow to grasp who they are (the high GI population who aren't afraid of threatening ideas because they recognise that argument and democratic agreement are mutually exclusive concepts). The overrepresented minorities are the ones who get communist hit squad articles written on their behalf by basically every MSM outlet in the known universe.

//Feminism (antinatural social constructionist extremism / post modernism)
[regarding picture of laughing stalin with respect to Google goolage]

https://assets.documentcloud.org/documents/3914586/Googles-Ideological-Echo-Chamber.pdf

Here is my take on gender differences in personality: these differences are primarily a byproduct/epiphenomena of innate evolutionarily programmed differences in motivation, although;
- they do interact with society and are reinforced through norms (social construction)
- they might be directly coded genetically to some extent

        Steven Pinker gender differences;
        https://m.youtube.com/watch?v=9PaL5FW5src

Post modernism and marxism;
https://m.youtube.com/watch?v=wLoG9zBvvLQ

=== Marriage ===

//Marriage redefinition

Although I don't think a positive argument is required (the burden of proof rests on those risking modification of the millennia old institution), what I don't understand about marriage engineering (apart from the fact it would sooner generalise to more culturally diverse practices like polygamy), is that the institution would not exist without the physical and psychological changes implicated by the procreation of a child. It is not simply a wealth redistribution centre, a romantic venture, or a social recognition tool. Why would we wish to equate such with the life transforming decision made by our mothers?

Could we help make something virtuous by redefining marriage?

Marriage would not exist without women; the permanent physical and psychological sacrifices she makes in giving herself to their child, the capacity for mutually loving and honoured sexual relations, and the natural requirements for human life.

Humans celebrate their morality. Monkeys celebrate their sexuality.

//Marriage redefinition

I suggested to a friend on Sunday that the Church should have nothing to do with the government contract.

The institution of marriage is not based on photographs of people.

Nor is it based on a book..

Neither is it based on a god, or a culture.

[reply to proposition: "We were all humans until race disconnected us, religion separated us, politics divided us and wealth classified us."]

Yes, but we are also animals. In nature, the fulfilment of these desires have irrevocable consequences. And up until 50 years ago, they weren't just psychological. Remnants can still be found today in toxic waste bins. This is why traditional morality concerns itself as much about a person's mind as their behaviour. It is why societies have independently developed an institution associated with motherhood. People's experience of true men (and true barbarism) confirmed in them the suspicion that they are special. That the mapping between their experience and the collection of star dust representing their experience is not encoded in this physical universe; that there is something more.

//Marriage redefinition (continued)
"Three is a crowd, four is cosy"
(Perisher Ex, ~1990->~2000)

//Marriage redefinition (continued)
If the persecution gets any worse they might... I find it a lot more unpleasant living in an addicted culture that wants to think evolution explains everything except for "sex" and female orgasms. No ceremonies for women. We don't think their sacrifice is that important.

//Homosexual Liberation Manifesto

...I fail to see anything gay about this. Why not call it the confused penis manifesto?

"But gay liberation does not just mean reforms. It means a revolutionary change in our whole society. Is this really necessary? Isn't it hard enough for us to win reforms within the present society and how will we engage the support of straight people if we get ourselves branded as revolutionaries?

Reforms may make things better for a while; changes in the law can make straight people a little less hostile, a little more tolerant - but reform cannot change the deep-down attitude of straight people that homosexuality is at best inferior to their own way of life, at worse a sickening perversion. It will take more than reforms to change this attitude, because it is rooted in our society's most basic institution - the Patriarchal Family.

We've all been brought up to believe that the family is the source of our happiness and comfort. But look at the family more closely. Within the small family unit, in which the dominant man and submissive woman bring up their children in their own image, all our attitudes towards sexuality are learned at a very early age. Almost before we can talk, certainly before we can think for ourselves, we are taught that here are certain attributes that are 'feminine' and others that are 'masculine' and that they are God-given and unchangeable. Beliefs learned so young are very hard to change; but in fact these are false beliefs. What we are taught about the differences between man and woman is propaganda, not truth.

The truth is that there are no proven systematic differences between male and female, apart from the obvious biological ones. Male and female genitals and reproductive systems are different and so are certain other physical characteristics, but all differences of temperament, aptitudes and so on, are the result of upbringing and social pressures. They are not inborn.

Human beings could be much more various than our constricted patterns of 'masculine' and 'feminine' permit - we should be free to develop with greater individuality. But as things are at present, there are only these two stereotyped roles into which everyone is supposed to fit and most people - including gay people too - are apt to be alarmed when they hear these stereotypes or gender roles attacked, fearing that children 'won't know how to grow up if they have no one to identify with', or that 'everyone will be the same', i.e. that there will be either utter chaos or total conformity. There would in fact be greater variety of models and more freedom for experimentation, but there is no reason to suppose this will lead to chaos.

By our very existence as gay people, we challenge these roles. It can easily be seen that homosexuals don't fit into the stereotypes of masculine and feminine, and this is one of the main reasons why we become the object of suspicion, since everyone is taught that these and only these two roles are appropriate.

Our entire society is built around the patriarchal family and its enshrinement of these masculine and feminine roles. Religion, popular morality, art, literature and sport all reinforce these stereotypes. In other words, this society is a sexist society in which one's biological sex determines almost all of what one does and how one does it, a situation in which men are privileged and women are mere adjuncts of men and objects for their use, both sexually and otherwise.

Since all children are taught so young that boys should be aggressive and adventurous, girls passive and pliant, most children do tend to behave in these ways as they get older and to believe that other people should do so too.

So sexism does not just oppress gay people, but all women as well. It is assumed that because women bear children they should and must rear them and be simultaneously excluded from all other spheres of achievement."

"That is why any reforms we might painfully exact from our rulers would only be fragile and vulnerable; that is why we, along with the women's movement, must fight for something more than reform. We must aim at the abolition of the family, so that the sexist male supremacist system can no longer be nurtured there.

WE CAN DO IT

Yet although this struggle will be hard and our victories not easily won, we are not in fact being idealistic to aim at abolishing the family and the cultural distinctions between men and women. True, these have been with us throughout history, yet humanity is at last in a position where we can progress beyond this.

Only reactionaries and conservatives believe in the idea of 'natural man'. Just what is so different in human beings from the rest of the animal kingdom is their 'unnaturalness'. Civilisation is in fact our evolution away from the limitations of the natural environment and towards its ever more complex control. It is not 'natural' to travel in planes. It is not 'natural' to take medicines and perform operations. Clothing and shoes do not grow on trees. Animals do not cook their food. This evolution is made possible by the development of technology - i.e. all those tools and skills which help us to control the natural environment.

We have now reached a stage at which the human body itself, and even reproduction of the species, is being 'unnaturally' interfered with (i.e. improved) by technology. Reproduction used to be left completely to the uncontrolled biological processes inherited from our animal ancestors, but modern science, by drastically lowering infant mortality, has made it unnecessary for women to have more than two or three babies, while contraceptives have made possible the conscious control of pregnancy and the freeing of sexuality from reproduction. Today, further advances are on the point of making it possible for women to be completely liberated from their biology by means of the development of artificial wombs. Women need no longer be burdened with the production of children as their main task in life and need be still less in the future.

The present gender-role system of 'masculine' and 'feminine' is based on the way that reproduction was originally organised. Men's freedom from the prolonged physical burden of bearing children gave them a privileged position which was then reinforced by an ideology of male superiority. But technology has now advanced to a stage at which the gender-role system is no longer necessary.

However social evolution does not automatically take place with the steady advance of technology. The gender-role system and the family unit built around it will not disappear just because they have ceased to be necessary. The sexist culture gives straight men privileges which, like those of any privileged class, will not be surrendered without a struggle, so that all of us who are oppressed by this culture (women and gay people) must band together to fight it. The end of the sexist culture and of the family will benefit all women and all gay people. We must work together with women, since their oppression is our oppression and by working together we can advance the day of our common liberation."

"COMPULSIVE MONOGAMY. We do not deny that it is as possible for gay couples as for some straight couples to live happily and constructively together. We question however as an ideal, the finding and settling down eternally with one 'right' partner. This is the blueprint of the straight world which gay people have taken over. It is inevitably a parody, since they haven't even the justification of straight couples - the need to provide a stable environment for their children (although in any case we believe that the suffocating small family unit is by no means the best atmosphere for bringing up children.)

Monogamy is usually based on ownership - the woman sells her services to the man in return for security for herself and her children - and is entirely bound up in the man's idea of property; furthermore in our society the monogamous couple, with or without children, is an isolated shut-in, uptight unit, suspicious of and hostile to outsiders. And although we don't lay down rules or tell gay people how they should behave in bed or in their relationships, we do want them to question society's blueprint for the couple. The blueprint says 'we two against the world', and that can be protective and comforting. But it can also be suffocating, leading to neurotic dependence and underlying hostility, the emotional dishonesty of staying in the comfy safety of the home and garden, the security and narrowness of the life built for two, with the secret guilt of fancying someone else while remaining in thrall to the idea that true love lasts a lifetime - as though there were a ration of relationships and to want more than inturned emotional exclusiveness of the couple which stunts the partners so they can no longer operate at all as independent beings in society. People need a variety of relationships in order to develop and grow and to learn about other human beings."

Anti-naturalism is just as evil (and anti-teleological) as materialism. Theism without respect for creation is antithetical.

The belief that morality is supernatural is based on an incorrect reduction of nature to base desires (this is an artefact of cartesian dualism). Homo sapiens has developed natural immaterial beliefs (the belief in transcendent or supervenient mind: its own and that of like others). The truth of these beliefs cannot be demonstrated by nature but they are encoded nonetheless. To act in opposition to these is thus acting against nature.

The irony is that sexual pride exonerates base desire while rejecting nature. Such is retarded no matter what philosophy of mind one adheres to. The only exception are those who deform teleology towards their own insecure ends. The seed is the same no matter where is falls. The reality is that there is no such thing as sexual pride, there is only sexual responsibility. Immodesty is an abomination.

//Homosexuality
I don't think anyone has a problem with homosexuality, apart from the way its exclusive instantiation in homo sapiens has been framed as an identity category as if it were a natural phenomenon. They do however have a problem with publicising predatorial behaviour as acceptable (even glorifying it). SBS were publicising this despicable nonsense long before homosexual matrimony was even conceived of in the public mind. Literally 10000+ year old "sexual" behaviour which would make our primitive ancestors cringe; and probably most of the animal kingdom also. Which is actually completely non-sexual behaviour that happens to be associated with sexual interaction in a perverted mind. If anyone is going to push this crap as normal then they are going to have to defend it. And to personalise an issue such as the redefinition of marriage to sanctify this pitiful abuse of sexuality is not on - regardless of who pays you.

If I am going to redefine burial (to include people who aren't strictly dead at all), and claim that anyone who thinks otherwise has some kind of mental health or care bear tolerance issue, I should expect to see a backlash. Even if my expectation of burial equality was purely implicit. I have never known [personOfSimilarConvictions] to be purposefully antagonistic - just extremely intelligent. And he has no idea how valuable his forth rightness can be. If it makes someone feel uncomfortable then this just what free speech does. If someone wants to feel good, then suppress free speech and have someone repeat back to you whatever is going to cause you the least social incursion, and place the least demands on your integrity. What a wonderful world we live in where the ability to raise a family has become determined by the willingness to condone dirt.

And I have no mercy for the ABC either - as I have stated here (SR) before, after they normalised prostitution 10 years ago I gave up on them. People need to raise their standards - if they ask why they find themselves living in wonderland they needn't look further than their tolerance of evil.

//Marriage redefinition

[marriageMinusDivorceRateCentredOnSSMlegislationDate.pdf]

[marriageMinusDivorceRateCentredOnSSMlegislationDate.png]

//Marriage redefinition
[in response to article showing a lesbian feminist stating that their true goal is to rid the world of marriage]

Someone must have gone through some serious pain to want to remake the world in their own image.

//Marriage redefinition
These were the fallacies I identified;
1. Assuming that we should do something because it will make us successful (pragmatism) - the classic counter argument being evil.
2. Assuming that correlation implies causation - the classic counter argument being the presence of a third variable. For example company size and therefore a) a higher probability of capturing mental illnesses, b) being a potential target of belief victimisation: being victimised for one's beliefs (for example by a third party socialist), or c) or being forced to follow more elaborate HR protocols by an ostensibly legal system.

Like [personOfSimilarConvictions] I am also sceptical of the basic finding; what is the research they have conducted to demonstrate that company success positively correlates with sexual behaviour worship? Did they partial out monopolistic or exploitive activity? And what about other metrics like company productivity, creativity, economic value, or employee happiness?

//Marriage redefinition
Changing a 2000+ year old institution based on a 50% majority opinion is pretty weird. And shouldn't married persons be the ones to decide what happens to their institution?

People think marriage is a right when it is a responsibility. It is founded on a natural inclination towards infidelity and the recognition that fidelity is necessary for civilisation (for non-contracepting females; because the evolutionary consequences are mortal, and humans more generally; because the psychological consequences are mortal). Fidelity is not valued in Homo sapiens because it is easy or fun, it is valued because it is difficult and contradicts long evolved instincts. Likewise, fidelity means loving and caring for another person and so excludes sexual use/disrespect. People who want to divorce themselves entirely from nature and start playing games with critical institutions should start naming their daughters bob and fred. I guarantee that there has been little evolutionary pressure to encode female gender identity beyond nurture and assimilation, so the only thing stopping them is respect for human nature and its requirements.

//Marriage redefinition
This article is so tragic I find it difficult to even like your post. Marriage has nothing to do with love per say and everything to do with the right expression of love. Opposition to the glorification of sodomy has nothing to do with restricting love and everything to do with the humanitarian consequences of placing their sexual organs in arbitrary entities (and vice versa). Could there be a better definition of sexual objectification?

One could perceive it as the natural consequence of the "professional" normalisation of masturbation. Screwing with your own body is one thing, screwing with another's... Is that what we call fashion? Freedom of the press? Freedom of speech? Every action has a reaction.

At the end of the day confusion can only be claimed where there is ignorance; but the conscious rejection of truth, beauty and goodness is evil.

Based on what we know about the vulnerability of the earth to its external environment a rational being would have to be suicidal to voluntarily normalise sodomy. This needn't be a metaphysical claim; all one needs to do is to picture the next major apocalypse (of which we are due) and the inhabitants of our fragile planet: their respect for nature at the moment of impact. Morality (sexual or otherwise) is not inherently supernatural; it all comes down to whether we are acting consistently with reality. Addictions are not real.

//Marriage redefinition

I agree that religion should drop state marriage entirely and if necessary create their own legal contract (based on some form of prenup), although I would advise against legal arrangements for intelligent conservative couples. By conservative, I mean one that has a coherent theory for why everything their ancestors did was good intentioned and purposeful (for those ancestors who themselves respected their predecessors).

This does not however imply that a human being should agree to a redefinition of marriage. We have a responsibility to the women and children in our society regardless of their beliefs. The state is going to run out of both stealable and borrowable money soon and they won't be able to support all the single mothers or their children's education. Likewise, there is the critical psychological requirement of not confounding natural human sexual relations with immoral ones; lest we jerkate our civilisation.

I would be happy to concede something like this (notionally bless sodomy for the emperor) if I thought it would stop there. The reality is however that the incursion is just going to get worse. This is the only reason marriage is even an issue (apart from the desire to kidnap or synthesise children). These people are evolutionarily sick, and those who can't recognise this won't stop until they have everyone accepting their sickness. For men it is often an addiction of the sexual nature. For females it is often a traumatic response to use/abuse (including the interaction of objective beauty and commercial objectification) and the subsequent assimilation of desire for love/acceptance. There is evidence of both genetic and hormonal factors to the evolutionary disorder.

Personally I don't mind people encouraging the loving expression of LGTBHOSVBJSU dispositions (classification scheme irrelevant), so long as we recognise and continue researching the reason for their existence. For example, natural genetic/hormonal variation and 95% of men being wiped out in the last millennia, abuse, etc (exclusive homosexuality in homo sapiens shouldn't be accepted lightly, and the anomaly must be discussed freely). What cannot be tolerated from a moral perspective however is sexual perversion: the diabolical consummation of disordered sexual desire. The natural consequences of sin being depression and the desire to police thought.

With respect to communication with emotional proponents of marriage redefinition, I recognise that it is extraordinarily difficult to reason with people who can't detach argument from emotion. There is nothing wrong with stating a fact or logical derivation passionately, but one must remember the root of passion - which is the Roman cross; self sacrifice. Sentimentality in males is a modern phenomenon; I have only ever seen it surface in morally questionable individuals, being traditionally reserved to specific genre. I have no recommendations for communication with such people, apart from forthrightly denying every last appeal to relativism. Likewise, although historically normative, I can't recommend any workarounds for sentimentality in females (who have either an innate adaptive bias towards empathy, or cannot risk the biological consequences of displeasing a threatening outgroup by making an appearance of being unkind to an analogously weak entity).

Imagine if the AMA director's developmental psychology professor jokingly retold the story of her single mother child telling her what he wants to do when he is a mummy when he grows up, while simultaneously making the claim that there is no evidence of lower outcomes for adopted children of same sex-couples; only evidence to the contrary. Had they conducted a political orientation analysis of the relevant ethical review boards leading to the publication (or otherwise rejection) of the research, it would be clear why the literature comprises such statistical aberrations (sample/construct measurement bias). It might even explain why their professor's 5 year old boy wants to be a mum.

//Perversion Normalisation (/Marriage redefinition)

[regarding: http://www.abc.net.au/triplej/programs/the-hook-up/a-beginners-guide-to-blowies/8664374]

I haven't even read it.

Note carefully the provocation of fear; it is so obvious it is surprising the propaganda even works.

The ABC - Australia broadcasting communism

The only way they can gain acceptance is by normalising their perversion.

//Marriage redefinition

... marriage evolved to protect women and children. Only a narcissist could conceive otherwise.

The alternative is to grant protection to the state. This is how police states are born.

//Marriage redefinition
Personally I think the pope and the bible are in league together to create anti-christian teachings on sodomy. What we really need is a group of people who have followed Jesus Christ from day one (let's call them "apostles") who pass on his spiritual and moral teachings through one holy catholic and apostolic church, confirmed in them by the holy spirit; who being the only real infallible guy around can't get things wrong - which means that the teachings won't change over time and warp into crazy religious theories about it being problematic for marriage to be consummated by anal penetration.

A communion of saints - what a great idea. Next time I am tempted not to sabotage a religiously trained elected leader with my communist broadcast corporation, I can just refer back to st Smoopath and how he loved trading virtue for popularity.

//Marriage redefinition
It will come to pass that they discover both zoophilia and pedophilia to be naturally occurring sexual dispositions. In the case of pedophilia its origin will be confirmed to be something like 100% genetic/prenatal hormonal. Moreover, once one has tasted human blood, they can't go back (sexual conditioning is the strongest positive stimulus conditioning available to carbon based life) - and so even if a proclivity towards exclusive zoophilia/pedophilia is found to be socially conditioned, it will be incurable. Likewise, it will become increasingly difficult to measure their negative social consequences (eg harm to animals or other humans) as society becomes more and more corrupt (base). What will stop an atheoretical mind from considering such conditions ordered, and to claim any opponents zoophobic or pedophobic? Even virtual pornography can be stimulating for the brain.

To consider a human being physically perfect is playing with fire. Civilisation stands on a knife edge, and that knife edge is called reason. For one to disrespect nature (evolutionary order), there is no reason for the universe not to take them out. In fact by its very nature, it will take them out. Only the 0.001% most successful organisms survive. Homo sapiens is child to a single mother, and father. This is the nature of natural selection; adaptive mutations can only occur once, and for a new species to evolve, all others must fall.

What kind of a polyamophobic bigot discriminates against happily copulating human beings. It is by far the most natural environment for children. Even Bonobos don't stick around. Stalin told me while reading his bed-time story about democracy and the wicked Fascists who eat babies and steal sledge-dogs that natural Order is Serotonin. He even quoted Guru Jesus; "God is love", which means our god of choice must love sex so much that our children would be certifiably blessed just to be inseminated into a happily loving family where their parents screw around all day - or better still get adopted and used as toys in Queensland. Yet why throw in anecdotes when children living without both biological parents are 30x more likely to be abused! Oh the joy to come; the freedom, the equality gained just by removing puritan constraints on the kinds of disorder we should be fearful of! As a matter of fact I am surprised that if we just add a few more parents (or swap a few here and there) nature would even notice; it is not like we have evolved to care about biological families or anything. Genetic familiarity is so tiresome and disturbingly black and white, the sooner we breed it all out the better - time to spread that seed!

OK, well, you think I am being a little too optimistic? I admit Stalin may have changed his mind only yesterday, and will change it again tomorrow - but that is the inevitable machine of confor.. wait no, progress (-- Radicals aren't conformists, I really need to re-read that rule book for heaven's sake). And the only real progress is moral progress. This is the one thing feminist dance theory knows for certain can change in our patriarchal universe of sexually selective hate facts. But for the less forward thinking types, I did some actual research to make sure we are on the right track. I conducted a study yesterday and it suggested that such children were extremely maladjusted and confused, but when I conducted a study today (after I told them all they were all polyamophobic based on my theory of evolution by artificial selection; in which anyone who doesn't agree with my manipulations of human nature is paranoid), I couldn't measure any noticeable performance difference from the rest of my experimental lemmings! Why study hard when you can screw the whole world with such easy science! Remember, an ethics committee wouldn't be complete without inviting the male lions, elephants, and sea lions. Just make sure when you invite the primates, be sure to avoid the old male humans - those ones they used to call "men" - I hear they have long discovered a way to live in harmony with nature that doesn't involve reducing family to Serotonin parties.

This post is dedicated to Muhammad and his 6 year old wife. By continuing on the narrow and difficult road of sexual liberation we should be about to renormalise 9 year old consummation before civilisation collapses (or Keynes runs out of other children's money). At least we will give them no logical grounds to reject virtual pornography of their choosing. Godspeed.

The communists don't mind if you bow before Caesar and submit yourself as a minority. But unlike the Romans, even if you do so - if your thoughts don't align with their asexual utopia, in due course you will be exterminated by the state. They are already taking people's income and livelihoods away for their treason. The next logical step (as observed in more progressed regions) is to silence the dissident, and throw them in prison. The acceptance of a higher order reality beyond that of state sponsored hedonism cannot be tolerated. They seek to protect the health of the addict by pretending that their addiction does not exist. For this reason the first evolutionary disorder to be declassified and celebrated was masturbation, and the condition they are most afraid of is mastophobia. They know that a moral generation will not submit to the debasement of nature under a centralised power. They cannot let go of the ring, and in their closed minds and weak will all they see is people's struggle for it.

//Marriage redefinition

... Marriage equality constitutes a person's ability to marry an opposite sex individual; that is the definition of marriage. Sodomising marriage and claiming that individuals or societies who do not accept its desecration are somehow promoting inequality or illness is of

itself inequitable. Whatever a statistically favoured low GI social scientist might claim (this is not an ad hominem), the very real possibility remains that mental illness will ensue when a homosexually oriented individual comes to an appreciation of the objective depravity constituting their act of using another human being. And it doesn't matter what they call it (sexual intercourse, marital consummation, etc) or how they say it (with rhymes or smiles), it is not going to help their brains reconcile the fact that they are fucking around on the graves of their ancestors, silencing those with a clean conscience, while trivialising every pregnant mother who has ever existed and will ever exist on the face of this earth.

//Marriage redefinition
I think they should spin off a society for high risk traders. Meanwhile I will retain the position that the institution of marriage has more to do with a) the physical, psychological, and social consequences of pregnancy (coupled with a i) rapidly diminishing sexual market value function and ii) maximum reproductive output, unlike males who have evolved to impregnate hundreds of women across their entire life), and b) the right of a child to a mother and father.

Nature is to be disrespected at one's peril. If there is one thing we know from history it is that inefficient societies get replaced. Assuming those maintaining the economic wasteland don't stop paying for other people's immorality (who need to maintain a fresh supply of young women by discouraging them from marriage, murdering anyone who might compromise their figure, and proliferating pornsec to reduce competition).

//Marriage redefinition
Here is a definition of mental illness which is not dependent on the whims of a sexually addicted priesthood; one needs laws to make people treat them special because they can't mount an argument for why people should do so.

When the inefficacy of the law comes to light, disallowal of argument is the next logical step for the disordered individual.

        One should be wary of advice given that will guarantee the speaker an income

//Marriage redefinition
[regarding INSERT link to abc.net religion 'marriage equality' logically incoherent article]

If a car breaks down, does one turn it into a caravan?

//Marriage redefinition
An introduction to priming.

Priming corresponds to the process by which our brain responds differently to new stimuli based on exposure to some previous associated stimuli. It relates to how neural networks are wired/activated.

In experimentation, it is a method commonly used to manipulate human behaviour towards some predetermined outcome. For example, if one wished to conduct a survey while biasing the responses to a particular option "yes" favoured by a particular group often identified as "gay", one could include the following language (emboldened):

Open today.
Have your say.
Have your say...
and do it today!
Don't delay!
Mail it back today.

Note the eight forms of priming;
1. ensure that all emboldened text rhymes with the proponent ("gay") of one's desired option.
2. ensure that all emboldened text is expressed in such a way as to convey the meaning of the stereotype adopted by the proponent (rhyme/happiness).
3. select a prose that matches the stereotypical nature of one's desired group (immaturity).
4. select a font that highlights the letter corresponding to one's desired choice ('y'), and add this letter multiple (8) times in consecutive words (including the last letter of every sentence).
5. ensure that the only/majority of letters to spatially (vertical) deviate from the emboldened text correspond to one's desired choice ('y').
6. include a word ("say"), which when the envelope/letter is opened/read upside down spells ("yes"), and add this to the last word on the line such that it is read first (if there is not a spare line available delimit the word with blank space; "...") .
7. convey a sense of action (urgency; "don't delay"/"do it today!") which corresponds to the desires of the proponent ("change").
8. engage with the participant (rather than letting them answer the survey by themselves).

One might also include the letters corresponding to the alternate choice in the first word ('n'/'o') of each line, such that this can be used to justify one's methods when questioned in a court of law. Likewise, one could ensure that 50% of the population is repeatedly exposed to the desired choice at every street corner of their capital city. And if one really needed to avoid central (systematic) processing on behalf of the participants and activate peripheral cues (heuristics), they could select a stimulus that everyone likes (colour), and tie this stimuli to their message (through repeated conditioning).

It might be equally worth discussing scientific rigour, but I will save this topic for another post.

        [regarding https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=J94uO-urSTg]

Now that is a novel thought; imagine teaching people about how they can/are manipulated rather than manipulating people.

//Marriage redefinition [20November2017a]
Is the Australian broadcasting corporation's audience expected to find straw men funny, or that they like the councils of the two biggest cities in Australia containing nearly one half of its population are being paid by the voters (with money extracted at the point of a gun) to tell them how to vote?

1. That modesty is antithetical to Australian values. Given a) weddings are predicated on modesty, and b) this has been the norm for its entire non-pornographic addicted history I wonder who is being more consistent.
2. That amish, nuns, or religious conservatives represent those opposed to the definitional change. (NB there are some who would duel to the death over the honour of such persons, and one on principle shouldn't take a lady in vain. Accordingly, one would only get away with this on camera; they would be stared down otherwise).
3. That they don't have an argument for why the institution of marriage inherited by the west as exclusive between men and women should be preserved. For example, a) the right of a child to its biological mother and father, b) the right of a mother to a specific institution of protection with respect to the biological, social, and psychological consequences of pregnancy (one which doesn't involve stealing other people's money or forcing the country into debt through old age pensions), etc.
4. That abolishing marriage or redefining it (or the rapid switch in advocacy between them) does not concern one's own business.
5. That simple adjustments imply moral equivalence (such as 'the other way around'); when this in fact is the nature of evil.
6. That sodomy as implied has the same mutuality of love as humane sexual relations. I wonder how many active homosexual men or women have they actually known, to the extent of discussing such matters honestly (perhaps they need to develop a true friendship with someone).
7. That the transaction of goods and services between citizens is relevant to the forcing of citizens to perform such transactions under the point of a gun. Some people would feel morally adverse to selling fertiliser to a terrorist, regardless of the existence of laws encouraging them not to.
8. That the transaction of goods and services is relevant to the rejection of someone's advertised goods and services in favour of new ones (for example the construction of birthday cakes for human beings, or wedding cakes for men and women - as defined by the artist; that adopted by the west over the last 2000 years). Again, forcing them to comply at the point of a gun.
9. That the target audience would be expected to modify their behaviour in response to such threats (that they have the integrity of a pragmatist).
10. That the target audience is unopposed to any further consequences of the diabolical modification, such as the reckless abandonment of institutions on which our civilisation was built (globally, and within a 5-10 year period).

I was under the impression that this guy was relatively intelligent, so perhaps it was supposed to be comedy after all. I have to admit, I am not always good at identifying humour.

//Marriage redefinition
It is worth noting however that evil is the corruption of good. If one is not going to get it right, it can be better not to try.

    Yes I agree that we should never compromise on our principles, and I had no intention of denying this - thanks for adding the qualifier (perhaps I should have myself). But in the decision leading to the acceptance of a greater principle not already adhered to (eg German reunification, priestly celibacy, etc) we need to only undertake such idealistic ventures if we are not going to pose a risk to others.

//Marriage redefinition
Personally I can't stand these backward, regressive Christian folk. Here are seven really good reasons for polyamory;

1. Polyamory is the historical Judeo-Christian norm, and we rejected Church authority because we all love the bible right? At least the Mormons glorify their bible and haven't bought into this whole farce of an authoritative Christian tradition. We all know the canon was magically decreed in the 4th century by God (the followers being so morally inept they couldn't possibly have preserved the gospels by word of mouth for a century, or knowledge of the right one for three centuries).
2. Jesus never spoke against polyamory - sure you might say he seemed to have a thing for Adam and Evan (The New Safe Translation), and a thing against remarriage to 7 women or men, but you really need to read into things more. We will never get our post modern art degree at this rate. This is as bad as thinking that giving your daughters away to prevent the sodomisation of a stranger says something about sodomisation. Exactly what do we think a bible story is, a hyperbolic lesson, mythology? It is time to start rejecting conformity where it counts.
3. Polyamory is demonstrably natural. Homo sapiens and our closest relatives (the chimps) are a polygamous species... And we should all strive to nourish our primitive reptilian brain structures as much as humanly possible. Neo cortex is an offence to progress; they really need to have a word to those biologists and get that discriminatory name changed. I am feeling triggered by its microscopic aggression already.
4. Look Jesus wants us to love everyone whatever their predicament or personal taste. If 85% of a Christian population is addicted to pornography this is a sure sign we entering a new era of self respect, self control, and self actualisation. Just look at how nice everyone is. What better evidence is there of our alignment to the truth of Jesus Christ than the fairy floss flavoured fruit it brings forth.
5. You think that children need two parents? They have two parents. The more the merrier. There has been numerous psychological studies showing that children with three to six parents are no worse off that children in single parent households hand picked by polyamorous experimenters in our present age. Who knows what they would have been like in a society 10 years ago, but the point of a psychological literature is not to identify stable universal human traits independent of social conditioning, but to make everyone feel good in the here and now. The Uniconsensus Psychological Association (curtesy of its associate director and womens fashion pioneer Hugh Hefner) has even stated that polyamory is a natural form of sexual expression - good for them. I mean they could have actually provided some evolutionary evidence for it, but we wouldn't want them to draw too much attention to nature would we. They might actually have to think about what it says on the topic of mental health. Something other than just keep masturbating (.. unless you think it is starting to be problem, in which case we should probably have told you earlier; but we need to guarantee ourselves a job right? Imagine the reduction in demand if people were encouraged to be moral and told yes the world is complicated but it was their own damn fault for screwing up; and to start thinking about a better game plan over a 25k run or dance routine). At least they said the correct thing, the one we all wanted them to say - no need to lift a thing.

6. Or that women need to be respected and loved by a single man; that this tradition must be set apart (made holy) by society for their own protection and that of society? I thought we gave a fatal blow to this delusion in Canada a decade ago. Ok fair enough I know that they won't release their marriage or divorce statistics, and it requires writing 50 personal emails to 15 individual provinces to get enough data to form a rough estimate of whatever the hell transpired. It is not like they didn't care about marriage enough to keep recording it the year after they liberated it now did they. Marriage rates are going down everywhere, what are we to expect; that freeing marriage from its equality denying past would actually help marriage? The purpose of marriage is to make 5% of the population feel better about themselves for having perverted fantasies.

Besides, women are no less capable of finding a life long husband at the ripe age of 35 than anyone, whatever their gender that day. Men love marrying old girls - if France isn't a testimony to what a sufficiently progressive seduction is truly capable of I think that we all need to move on and get on the right side of history. Why wouldn't a guy just want to stick around and enjoy every last minute of their non-binding celebration of unbridled sexual attraction? In any case it is about time we added on a few new ones. As for those happily married women who remain obstinate against the continuing (and increasingly consistent) redistribution of their sacrament, what we really need to do is to start making them feel immoral for their attachment; we shall call it "their dirty little secret".

7. The average male currently envisages sleeping with around 30 young girls a week. Sure polyamory might not be on popular demand now, but we have a large appetite to fulfil. The mental health prospects for withdrawal are not looking good by anyone's standard. Even the hate mongering conservatives are starting to worry; remember, these were the equality deniers who fought against harmless virtual child pornography.

//Marriage redefinition

Everything she said is running through my head. People are not trying to shut down others' feelings, they are just against the institutionalisation of perversion. There is nothing sacred about this. Once one form is institutionalised all hell breaks loose;

1. The desacralisation of the biologically unnatural life long commitment for which marriage was created. To sustain a relationship beyond its evolutionary favourable state (peak fertility) and provide for its dependent women and children requires dedicated social norms (institutions). Historic societies whose couples failed to maintain these commitments could not compete (because of the surplus of unwanted single mothers it created) and were accordingly wiped off the face of the earth. We know this because male-female marriage is a culturally universal phenomenon.

The only reason western society is not already suffering the consequences for disrespecting the institution (to a catastrophic level) is because of a) socialism and b) immigration. Yet a) socialism is in fact destroying the nation; not only by deincentivising entrepreneurship (capitalism), but by bleeding the wealth of future generations. The majority of governmental systems are designed to deal with the problems inherent to the destabilisation of the family including single mother children: police, criminal law, civil law, welfare, etc are only required for immoral citizens. Likewise b) foreign investment and the continuous injection of new workers who do not need to be educated is only a patch up solution (assuming they are skilled). It is taking the best minds from their country of origin (thereby delaying or preventing its development), and rapidly diminishes the culture of the target nation (resulting in destabilisation and furthers the challenges of functional family).

Note there are other consequences and mitigating factors not discussed, and there are more problems with western civilisation than the breakdown of the family and the rise of socialism (of which I would argue are more fundamental, eg the tolerance of dehumanisation). This does not however imply that we should fail to protect marriage when threatened (even if only at a symbolic level; given that state sanctioned contracts whatever they are called are not marriage).

2. the inevitable silencing of those who may wish to discuss the nature of the perversion in all its inhumane detail, and not partake in its acceptance.

3. the damage such individuals are doing to themselves (which for females can comprise an extremely volatile psychological state, having being deprived interaction with a genuine male). Happiness can only arise from morality, for whenever darkness is brought to light wretchedness will follow. Pretending to sanction perversity cannot help this; it will only make the pain worse when its disordered nature is brought to light.

Personally I think people have had 10 years to speak the truth in respect of marriage and homosexuality in prototypical kindness and patience. But the idea that love (including kindness) is never harsh or disciplinary is patently false. Even in religious literature this can be inferred to be false; it is taking a concept to the extreme without respect of context. When the integrity of an ancient institution faces a direct threat - people have no choice but to speak directly and plainly.

Only those who have failed to act previously in the matter should fear retribution - because they might rightly be identified as hypocrites should they raise their voices now. For such an obvious matter however maybe the onus is not on the conservative to proactively counter evil ideas. Yet in any case this is precisely all it takes for evil to prevail. Perhaps these people need to deal with the past, and look at what has gone wrong (my hypothesis: the tolerance of dehumanisation).

Furthermore, people shouldn't project incompetence (lack of foresight or prudence) on those who have acted forthrightly and adamantly, in prototypical kindness and patience, in defence of an encroaching parasite. For this reason I reject all allusion to contradictory methods, particularly here in the TSR where there has been little of such on either side of the debate. If anything the failure to uphold the precedent of argument and reversion to ad hominem has fallen squarely on the revisionist.

I have no contention with a leader driving out merchants from sacred ground. Sometimes this requires speaking the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. If anything I would advise that people make an effort to double check their ad hominems, whether they be presenting/responding to arguments of individuals here or elsewhere.

//Marriage redefinition

p1/2: There is a difference between forcing someone to comply with a majority belief (or a politician's pipe dream) and measuring a majority belief. The article pertains to the former.

Respecting freedom of speech is not the same as believing that truth is democratic. Someone can respect another's freedom to say what they think but not their right to sodomise marriage.

p2: "Immoral" is not a matter of opinion and a vote cannot 'handle' morality. Systems of government dictate law independent of universal morality. Where they do not align, such systems are evil.

p3: The strong positive correlation identified by the article between governmental institutionalisation of sodomy under the guise of marriage and a citizen's loss of freedom of speech with respect to such behaviours is not an example of cherry picking.

p5: Why would marriage "evolve into something different" and "require updating" if human nature were not changing? "If Mars is struck by a massive asteroid" it will indeed be a different Mars; but the definition of planet remains the same. The question is what was that asteroid?

No doubt human nature appears to be changing. We are becoming like animals, unable to rule our estranged passions. We exalt them above our mothers themselves. But why compromise a sacred institution to reflect this? Why not identify why human nature appears to be changing and do something to fix it?

An addict controlled by their passions is always an addict controlled by their passions unless they can gain an understanding of their addiction. An PTSD patient controlled by their fear is always a PTSD patient controlled by their fear unless they can obtain catharsis. A mental patient with a disease that encourages the formation of a false belief regarding the purpose of an internal organ is always a mental patient with a disease, unless they can find a cure (of which there may be none).

Note it is evolutionarily doubtful human nature is changing over 100 year time scales (perhaps 1000 year time scales); meaning the apparent changes observed are a result of the interaction of nature and its environment ("nurture"). Furthermore, I would argue nature doesn't have a definition for marriage, humans have a definition for marriage which corresponds to nature. Nature doesn't change and neither can this definition.

It would be valid to create another word to represent the distinct concept; "frarriage" (the commitment of an eternal or otherwise easily escapable bond with an arbitrary entity). KH VIII should have created his own definition also.

p6/p7: People's adherence to an ideal or a principle has nothing to do with the definition of the ideal or principle.

p7: One can indeed sodomise their marital partner (there are in fact a whole variety of ways to distort humane sexual interaction), but this does not mean that marriage can be defined by its desecration.

//Marriage redefinition
If a person is forced to adopt a state sanctioned marriage over a private union this will be the final straw. All those who have voluntarily been granted power by the populace need to know this now. We are not going to comply. A government can't pretend they have unlimited rights to manipulate their citizens - because they don't and they never have. The moral law rules the universe, and tyrannies are but a leaf in the wind. Even by peacefully (non-objectingly) living in a society that has institutionalised sodomy we are giving notional support to dehumanisation.

=== Morality ===

//Nihilism

Nihilism is not compatible with moral fortitude. So it can be destroyed by a simple act of good will.

Not directly related to the conversation, but I think the outcome for civilisation (with respect to an increasing reliance on secular philosophy) depends on whether God is the premise or the conclusion. There is a difference between rejecting the notion of God (which places constraints on a theoretical framework) and simply not introducing him.

The fact people are aligning themselves with atheism doesn't mean the outcome is necessarily determined by this alignment. If this was the only factor at play then nihilism would most certainly follow (as it does logically). But even the fact half way houses exist means people haven't thought things through properly and are operating on multiple contrary grounds. This is the way evil works. Taking something good, twisting it around and calling it something better.

//Utilitarianism (Singer)

... It was a great evening, and a very informative discussion on effective altruism. The only arguments given against his specific recommendations for reducing global suffering (e.g. GiveWell/The life you can save/etc; which he acknowledged) were the potential for challenging national administration top down, foreign trade adjustments (e.g. removing US agricultural subsidies which harm third world produce competition), a greater emphasis on artificial contraception, and perhaps local capital injection. Yet he gave some good positive arguments for traditional charitable approaches also; such as seriously increasing the probability a child will be educated within their community, and its direct and calculable benefit. He also spoke very critically of the Australian government's reduction in foreign aid (although stating the effective altruism movement is not dependent on social policy, and acknowledging national bias is just something which has be worked around). Personally I see the utility of extranational altruism as being heavily dependent on the capacity of the 1st world to develop long term sustainable solutions (such as nuclear fusion, automation, etc) despite its implications for the balance of resource consumption in the short-mid term. I certainly do not agree with the idea of engaging in arbitrary wall street activity for the purposes of charity (a scenario justified in the presentation), or monopolistic behaviours for that matter - but this relates to utilitarian fundamentalism.

I certainly retain my respect for both his consistency of character, and sentience central conceptualisation of morality (something I am researching privately). However I am no more predisposed to utilitarian models based on either a) an overweight quantification of suffering (we may as well let anyone who is ever going to suffer die; disabled or otherwise), or b) the absence of deontological limits (absurdities follow like justifying the act of killing children; including healthy innocent third parties - a scenario justified in the presentation). I think utilitarianism is a very appropriate approach for positive ethics (altruism), yet its application to ethics universally is questionable. This relates to proscriptive versus prescriptive morality, and its relationship to beliefs regarding natural order (which are in turn based on those engrained in us by nature; belief in sentience). For example, that we can never know the outcome ("the greater good") and should not take the risk. Furthermore, if we see very young children as sentient (as Peter Singer does) then a far more humane approach is to eliminate the cause of the suffering rather than the entity which suffers (or one which does not).

Personally I see the borderline between national and international charity weakening, with the emergence of the internet and the various charitable projects enabled by it (e.g. the creation and distribution of open content - including encyclopedias, textbooks, lectures, news, etc, and the creation and distribution of open software - including productivity, administrative and educational tools). From even a naive utilitarian perspective it certainly does not make sense to be funding the development of content and software for a locale when such can be distributed internationally for essentially the same cost. I am presently looking into the feasibility of establishing intermediary charities associated with funding such projects.

... I attended a Peter Singer presentation last week (after been given tickets) discussing effective altruism - which is not necessarily pure utilitarianism but may provide some allowance for deontological limits in one's philosophy. In his presentation however Peter Singer openly declared his willingness to personally kill a hypothetical child to bring peace on earth (qualified by the assumption that no more children would ever suffer in this way again). It appears that pure utilitarianism is evil- unless someone has an argument to convince me otherwise. I personally don't mind discrimination in the provision of positive life saving health services (e.g. with respect to critical disability at birth), if they are based on both natural/physical and spiritual opportunity (e.g. value the money required to maintain such disability over a lifetime better spent on saving a non-disabled child from sexual abuse). If it comes down to making calculations based on suffering alone (without any deontological limits with respect to how we treat life in the calculation), then we open the opportunity to negative health services (e.g. killing a disabled child). Furthermore, if they do not quantify life (irrespective of suffering) then such calculations will even risk third parties who may never experience suffering (e.g. killing a healthy child). If suffering was the only basis to making a utilitarian choice then we may as well kill everyone (to put them out of their current or potential misery). Utilitarianism appears appropriate to positive intervention, but should never be applied universally.

//Ethics

What on earth is 'the Bible' and on what basis does this collection of books gain authority if not by the Christian church? Many religious collections internally claim divine inspiration, but this is not one of them. It is a record of events occurring decades, centuries, and in many cases millennia after they are purported to occur. It cannot be used of itself to demonstrate moral universals. It may contain revelations of extraordinary self-sacrifice, sainthood and martyrdom, but such can hardly be expected to be followed by a secular world...

What I am suggesting here [personOfSimilarConvictions] is that the form of "morality" espoused by Jesus Christ (and mirrored to an extent by specific religions) is not universal, and a society cannot be wholly based on it (if it did it would be a Church). It may well be absolute (and universal in another sense), but it is not something which will necessarily develop in a (stable) culture on its own accord. The moral philosophy inherent in Christianity and other religions and philosophies is however indicative of a natural morality. It could be a matter of degree, but I think the data better fit a categorisation ("enlightenment").

Morality can only be evolutionarily adaptive to the extent that it ultimately obeys Hamilton's rule. No doubt this includes social contract theory and various forms of altruism. Over the last decade there has been a literature developed around the idea of universal (cross-cultural) morality being an adaptation. Yet to take this account seriously one needs to assume the conscious rationale for performing moral acts is invalid (ie respect, love, etc of a conscious entity). It is also highly dependent on observations of the connection between emotional expression and moral responses (anger, contempt, disgust), and hasn't properly considered the possibility that these basic instincts, while adaptive in of themselves, are not socialised to accommodate higher order moral principles (principles which better represent what we call morality). This is why I argue that universal morality is better seen as a cognitive byproduct of systems which are themselves adaptive (eg sense of self, theory of mind), although there are no doubt various biological drives encouraging the survival of our genetic material.

With secular morality (ethics) one can only encourage someone to be good based on the proposition that they will be happier, or that they will be seen as mentally confused (self-contradictory) to behave otherwise. It is therefore restrictive and doesn't cover some of the concepts introduced by religion (in particular that of genuine non-hamiltonian self-sacrifice). But this is not to say such concepts are unnatural or incompatible with our nature as human beings.

Any action based on the belief in the sanctity of mind whether good or evil is a moral act. From another's perspective (or that of an absolute prescriptive moral code) it may well be immoral, but it was done based on some moral rationale or the corruption thereof. More importantly, in the context of this argument, the mere fact people make such a classification (they identify a moral domain), and make it cross culturally, demands an explanation. This has been primarily a matter of philosophical discourse, but recently attempts have begun to provide also a scientific explanation (description). The propensity to confound these explanations in no way serves the interests of the public. Likewise, the fact empirical research of "morality" fails at present to properly distinguish between moral and amoral acts (confounding the content of an act with the motivation upon which it is based) doesn't mean that one cannot or will never find a natural analogue (physical representation) of morality on earth. In fact, we find a natural analogue of spiritual concepts and people act based on their belief in spiritual things all the time. Their entire life is based on the belief in their own existence and that of others. It is (evolutionarily) programmed that way. The unprejudiced extension of mind is certainly not innate, and in this sense it is not entirely natural (albeit logical). Yet instances of deviation from the rational projection of one's self belief (dehumanisation) generally only occur when it is genetically beneficial to think otherwise, or in the absence of good evidence for their having an equally valuable mind. Furthermore, morale is a similarly 'natural' phenomenon, and the failure to capture (or even recognise) it by a literature says more for the distribution of researchers than it does about nature.

When discussing nature, it is important to distinguish between adaptations and byproducts, and I am arguing here that "morality" (as observed) constitutes the latter.

...

In an ideal world, why would we need to discover a natural conduit for morality, or examine nature for ulterior reasons, only to discover it?

For reference, this is how I see morality functioning at a physical level (disregarding any absolute or prescriptive moral code);

- Morality as a meme (consciously sacrifice reproductive opportunity for an ideal) - non/anti-hamiltonian (specific religion/philosophy)
- Morality as a byproduct (respect shared reproductive opportunity based on belief in common sentience) - ahamiltonian (cross-cultural)
- Morality as an adaptation (maximise reproductive benefit to genetic material) - hamiltonian (cross-cultural + cross-species)

I have been discussing with a friend that with respect to the Greeks' derivation of an unknown God (and I emphasise here God not Bad), one could potentially have a secular ethics with seemingly religious levels of self-sacrifice. Yet this morality could not be disentangled from its pseudo religious basis. Will come to this in the Socratic dialogues..

I argued that there are a number of secular motives for ethical behaviour, all of which are restricted by the desire for happiness. Firstly, in most societies law is created such that the probability of the overall happiness of an individual is dependent on them acting to certain ethical standards (social contract theory). Likewise there may be adaptations that encourage ethical behaviour (eg affective empathy). Furthermore I proposed that physical moral models can provide a secular motive to act morally (ethically). Acting in line with pre-existing beliefs (of the existence and value of sentient beings) can enable greater consistency of character, and therefore happiness. Finally I suggested that these beliefs (or the ability to develop them) appear to be engrained in us, and are not just a question of socialisation or our environment; meaning a human being is naturally/logically inclined to act morally (given enough experience, and although probably not obtainable over a single lifetime, in time society will develop the moral law, and the individual will appreciate the value of this teaching where it has been granted consistently).

There were however a number of observations seemingly unexplained by purely secular models; concerning not that of genetically beneficial or neutral self-sacrifice, but that of genetically detrimental self-sacrifice (like allowing oneself to be killed without offspring, close relatives, or tribe to benefit from the act, under the belief that it is simply the right thing to do). Both genetically neutral and detrimental choices cannot be directly determined by nature, and they must be a result of either an evolutionary byproduct or socialisation. Furthermore, genetically detrimental choices require a strong motive to counteract natural impulse, and it is not clear the simple byproduct model proposed above is sufficient. It is however possible the beliefs necessary for making such choices (e.g. belief in the gods/divine providence/karma) may be supported by those engrained in us by nature (belief in the soul).

Something [personOfSimilarConvictions] questioned a while back was the moral basis of choosing not to sacrifice a life to save 5 lives without invoking an external moral law (or authority). Deontological judgement (ie based on principles like never killing innocent

persons) can't be favoured over utilitarian judgement (ie doing the greater theoretical good for the most people) without either; a) an assumption of a higher power or b) irrational (purely emotive) judgement. Deontological judgement that contradicts utilitarianism either is irrational or based on a belief that we can never know the outcome ("the greater good") and should not take the risk. This suggests that a complete system of ethics (and therefore quite possibly morality) is dependent on supernatural belief...

//Atheism

"9. There is no one right way to live."

Number 9 is a classic - on this basis we should just disregard everything said

//Self sacrifice
I don't think Socrates considered it self loathing when he went to his death (or at least Plato would not have us believe this). Boethius likewise gives an account of his physical sacrifice (http://www.gutenberg.org/files/14328/14328-h/14328-h.htm).

//Hate
[in response to; "God prefers kind athiests to hateful Christians", see Proverbs 6:16-19]

God doesn't hate anything.

The reason I am suspect of this message is that man's creep back to the animal kingdom is and has been predominately due to a lack of hate.

Note one shouldn't mistake evil for animal behaviour. Animals don't hate, and neither do they have the capacity for evil. Although some of their behaviours would be considered evil in the context of civilisation, they have no awareness of the consciousness of others and so make no compromise with regards to it. What society witnesses today (and similar societies before us) is not some devolution towards history, but devolution towards prehistory. We are losing awareness of the internal nature of ourselves and others.

The advancement of civilisation requires more than just hate and its refinement. But no such weak claim of civil regression is being made here. What is being suggested is civil abolition - the threatening of society itself. A community which has ceased to function based on a conviction of morality, but is sustained only by fantasy and the fulfilment of impulse requires reclassification. Such has never been conferred the title of man.

//Morality continued (moral relativism)

Feel free to counter this [personOfSimilarConvictions] - this is my impression of the concept:

One can't make their own morality. Morality is by definition assumed to be universally applicable (this is different than being absolute, binding, or prescriptive). One should be talking about a social norm, or "whatever I want", perhaps even ethics, but not morality. Of course, one can study/observe people's opinions of morality across cultures (descriptive/empirical "morality"), but if one concludes that their differences outweigh their similarities (ie there is no common ground or grounds), one can't therefore advocate the existence of multiple moralities. They have to give up on the concept all together - and assume they are just observing social norms, or conclude that their own society is in some way special.

//Morality continued (enjoyment)
http://www.forbes.com/forbes/welcome/
"Forbes quote of the day: "To enjoy and give enjoyment, without injury to yourself and others: this is true morality"

Yeah the quote is purely coincidental. However, although I may disagree with the author (the way in which the definition is framed is suspect with regards to relativism), I don't disagree with the statement. I don't think it depends on the definition of injury or enjoyment - but rather that immorality results in injury and morality results in enjoyment. There is no such thing as a joyful necrophiliac (or alternate).

I would argue that human appetites are not a good standard for enjoyment... Even secular philosophy (Aristotle) suggests that an appetite taken to the extreme is disordered. Some religions argue that happiness can even be found to the exclusion of natural appetites, or that our natural appetites will be satisfied if we seek first greater desires of the heart.

Is revenge sweet?

//Evil
Every conscious good has an evil alternative.

Every truth that is a conscious creation, discluding (this should be a word) natural objects like trees or a flowers. I presume that there are no evil trees or flowers. Although we certainly have the schema to imagine one (and will find such things in mythology). Examples of conscious goods (grammar taken from Aristotelian philosophy/translations thereof) include thoughts/ideas and actions.

Again, I am using the definition of good here as something that is in alignment with (consistent with) reality (not a distortion, corruption or contradiction of truth), and evil as a conscious contradiction of truth. One can therefore classify the statement as a tautology; albeit

non self evident, because we rarely consider such categories. Human beings are not motivated to see things in terms of truth and error, we are motivated to see things in terms of what we want and what we don't want (particularly short term goals/long evolved instincts). And yet we can only find happiness and fulfilment in truth (this is an artefact of having both a high intelligence and a theory of mind). Unlike our predecessors, we are programmed to believe in non-physical things, and so can't be at peace until we have made sense of them (with our entire being).

Anything that is consciously misaligned with good is evil. (Note here I am not presenting this as an opinion, but rather as a definition). Mythology that includes evil can still be good.

Note I am not suggesting here that conscious good/evil are products of ML free will. They might be (a) products of ML, (b) products of external influence on the system, or (c) necessary consequences of the system. I am taking an assumption of logic and its representation in the human mind. A human can therefore maintain a concept/intention which aligns with reality, or which contradicts reality. Examples of increasing generality include conscious contractual error (assuming the contract were aligned with reality; for example a belief in the equal value of persons or their commitment), conscious moral error (making a judgment based on the inconsistent assertion that another person's consciousness was not as valuable as one's own; however valuable one consistently perceives this to be), or conscious philosophical error (performing an action or setting a goal inconsistent with reality; which could also be classed as a conscious moral error, unless one were absolutely convinced of the logical impossibility of theism and all reason led to this conclusion). For reference, unconscious error (or mental error more generally) could be classed as sin/failure, but this category is not being discussed here (and its terminology avoided to prevent theological sidetracking).

The statement ("alternative") is not asserting a causal possibility (ML free will), but a logical possibility. Assuming that (a) ML did not exist, and (b) there was no ordered state of nature (humanity) in which evil did not occur, this wouldn't make the statement false, it would only imply (c) that evil was a necessary part of the world (or for theists; that God created evil).

Some (e.g. Aquinas, although his view on compatibilism is ambiguous) assert that human will is both contingent upon God, and created such that it is directed towards good (reason). I think a theistic compatibilist must ask themselves, if evil is not contingent upon God, has there been any disruption to the natural order which enables it? For example, the introduction of a social virus.

There may be more arguments you have made that I have missed - I would appreciate it if you could repeat/elaborate on them; thanks.

//Evil
I would say it is entirely indicative of a spiritual war when those engaged in evil are convinced they are doing good. They feel convinced that compromise (contradiction) is good; because their identity is so messed up. The idea is to accept a lie, and think this is an ok option (preferably that it is normal). Take any of the modern compromises; mass prostitution (50+% male pop), mass rape (30% female pop), mass sexual abuse (50+% female pop), mass murder (50% pop), and when this fails to satisfy, one can always purchase a young slave overseas while justifying that they have no money. Once a society comes to normalise dehumanisation, its standards then adjust to cater for that norm; making it exceedingly difficult to live independently (especially when manipulation towards the norm is enforced/protected by law). Likewise people's views are aligned to (biased towards) their perceived norm (it is easy to test this experimentally).

//Error (sin)
I don't think it is worth limiting such advice to people of a particular faith, as anyone with a brain will want to avoid error. People are attracted to others who avoid error.

Human disposition towards error is a complex phenomena, and I actually think there are lot of factors at work (the most deceptive being with evil, the active/intentional contradiction of truth). There are also many forms that human error can take. There are therefore a lot of methods to deal with it;

- contemplation is extremely important, but is of limited use for some problems and in circumstances. Sometimes truth necessitates action.
- one needs to be aware of both natural limitations (cf modesty) and those which are developed through our interaction with our environment (conditioned associations). Likewise, triggers can be both internal and external.
- although excessive exercise can apparently be risky (CS Lewis), it is actually the most productive/natural method of discipline. One should be aware of the constraints the body has been designed (has evolved) to deal with - it is actually quite unnatural to live in a perfectly sterile home with an unlimited food supply. With respect to training the body however, one should never use anything for evil. I believe that this constitutes the greatest risk of exercise.
- there are other methods of discipline which do not involve exercise (for example kneeling)
- sleep is critical. Be aware of the subconscious; it is most active in dream state, but these desires don't belong in the real world. The less sleep one has, the closer this part of us is to the surface of our mind.
- unintentional exposure to temptation is where prayer (especially learnt prayer) can be extremely effective.
- we have a responsibility to avoid temptation in the first place. This is not easy in various western environments at present. However, there are various tools and protocols that can be used to limit the probability of distraction. Adblocker for males, avoiding complementary fake (e.g. emotive) stimulus for females. Don't visit any physical or virtual locations/people that are uncomfortable or annoying (unless the discomfort exists for a good purpose).
- any exposure to truth can counter error. For example, communication with other people. Consider also other mediums (literature, video, etc).
- apparently chocolate works against the dark arts.
- although I recommend reading LOTR rather than watching the movies, there is an important scene from ROTK not found in the book about just letting go.
- one should be familiar with conceptions of free will and shouldn't limit their world view to a particular model. Belief in metaphysical libertarianism might actually help sometimes (in particular ML2; the relevance of will power in determining physical outcomes). For example, in critical situations; where reason has been forged, but the circumstance (or inclination) cannot be avoided. However, I would recommend never to become reliant on ML (it is dangerous to play with fire). If a rational reason cannot be conjured for acting in truth (cf compatibilism), then this actually highlights a problem, and possibly a cause of failure.
- don't risk letting others fall on your account (don't lead others into temptation). This is critically important in positions of leadership.

- contradiction is the forerunner to sin. This is not a coincidence with sin being error. Avoid contradiction. Even humour if necessary; humour for the sake of humour, especially humour at the expense of others. Avoid all contradictory behaviours or states (e.g. implicit dishonesty, pride). This probably involves avoiding trash / fake stimulants also (for example emotive music for the sake of emotive music; such music may have a time and place).
- do not dwell on error (it cannot help anyone by worrying about anything).
- take error seriously. This is where the general concept of penance is important (this is not about making things right or forgiveness but is about committing to improvement). There have been some who would rather die than give incense to a false god.
- forgive others (for they know not what they do).
- don't believe what everyone tells you. Believe what your heart tells you, what inspires you, what you idealise. One can identify truth by reflecting on those moments where they felt most elated and light. Likewise, one can identify error by reflecting on those moments when one felt most sad and dark.
- recognise that some cultures are more infected by some sins than others, and that no sin is healthy.
- the prayer explicated by Jesus Christ in the New Testament (less so the amalgamation used by various traditions) is also targeted against temptation and evil.
- don't rely on oneself for everything; recognise innate weaknesses and take help from others. There is so much good available to us through nature and technology (perhaps even beyond).
- don't ever compromise (risk error for something/"a greater" good).
- don't blame yourself for being hurt or abused by others; learn to dissociate this from one's own error (e.g. accepting an invasion of privacy/trespass; letting it direct your mind or behaviour).
- there are 1000s of years of tradition developed by saints to this end. People have studied the dark arts to save others from wasting time making mistakes. Seek and you will find.
- take ownership: people may actually have more trouble than you and may need your help (especially younger people).
- consistency has the opposite effect of contradiction.

//Law
We shouldn't do things because they are illegal or legal. We should only do things because they are good. One must ask themselves, how am I helping other people by taking a particular drug. Am I inspiring young people to be free, honourable and great future partners, or dependent on substances?

Of course it might be good and virtuous to obey a just law, but obedience should never be the motivation for our actions. Blind obedience leads to tyranny, and the proliferation of evil.

//Rebuttal of claim that purity is outdated

There is some great philosophy in this movie (more so in the movie than in the novel). I like in particular the idea of a recursive story (which is different than that of an eternal story). The essence of this proposition is contained also in a conversation between Frodo and Sam in The Lord of the Rings.

Empress: "He doesn't realise he's already part of the Neverending Story."
Atreyu: "The Neverending Story, what's that?"
Empress: "Just as he is sharing all your adventures, others are sharing his."

Yet I didn't post these references to discuss philosophy. One instance of truth can shatter a billion lies.

//Morality (continued)
Perhaps there is a common discrepancy between finding happiness and aiming for it. However I think it depends on the level of contemplation with respect to what makes us really happy.

//Asymmetry of good and evil
["you can't make someone think something good is evil (only the reverse)" continued;]

All supposed instances of making people think good is evil involve misrepresentation - whereby one forms a concept not about a true thing, but about an imaginary thing. This is why the concept of a Jew needs to be made ugly and stingy before its supposed representative can be terminated. It is why racial imperfection needs to be proposed before extermination can begin.

But what extremists (whether the modern materialist or the branded terrorist) fail to recognise is that behind every good (ie true) and powerful lie there is truth. No one could be convinced otherwise. Take for example white (or black) supremacy; it might sound like a pretty bad idea (with a 0% truth component), until the equalists have their way and there is no race left on earth. Or the glorification of natural selection; it might sound like a pretty nasty idea (with a 0% truth component) until the human race gets wiped out by a virus, or our natural instincts revolt.

Furthermore, the only way to defeat evil is to identify the truth within its philosophy, bring it to a light, and illuminate the error. What people have been made to think is good is in fact a conscious compromise of truth, that has been suppressed for lack of a right alternative (or in the case of metaphysical libertarianism; for lack of will power and fortitude).

//Virtue (disposition)
Disposition towards virtue is ordinarily built based on hardship (force), most (or the most critical) of which occurs when one is very young. Therefore, I would argue that there is no single answer to the problem. It also depends on whether we can distinguish internal (I) from external (X) virtue. A is by definition more externally virtuous (X) than B, at least in the context of courage.

If man A is naturally inclined to act that way from birth (out of some gift from nature or nurture; without ever facing internal struggle in this respect), then he could possibly be considered less virtuous (I) than man A who has struggled to obtain this outward virtue (X). It might depend on their response to hardships in general (as opposed to the specific hardship of which one has an advantage with respect to). Likewise, it might be that no one is genetically gifted with respect to all virtue (X), as some predispositions may counterbalance others. If

however it is possible that someone (A) is more predisposed to virtue (X) in general than another (B), out of nature or nurture (and irrespective of internal struggle), then it is possible that this is in itself provides no reason to consider him to be more virtuous (I).

Likewise, if man B is naturally inclined to act that way from birth (from nature or nurture), but has rejected all instances of internal struggle to overcome this limitation in his development (whether out of metaphysical libertarian free will or determinism), then he could possibly be considered less virtuous (I) than man B who has continuously attempted to overcome this limitation (but failed).

Therefore, although I would suspect that man A is more likely to be more virtuous (I) than man B (based on the known dependency between external virtue and past struggle), I don't think it can be answered with the available information. This dilemma appears also to relate to the problem of judgement. There are so many variables (free will, determinism, nature, nurture) that we can only judge action (not the soul).

//Secular ethics
I think it is a pretty good outline, but the key point missing from the presentation is that we don't know (or cannot know) which organisms are sentient; and hence which will experience pain (cf philosophical zombie). The presentation assumes that mental properties are a natural phenomenon - which is fine, but it either spells dishonesty or ignorance not to declare this assumption. Likewise, it assumes a late emergence model (in which trees are not sentient; only those organisms with 573+x fully developed synapses, where x is a function of the average time it takes someone with a good lawyer to decide to kill their child, and 573 is an arbitrary number). Again this is fine, but to not declare this assumption probably means that they are taking western teleological assumptions for granted (and need to familiarise themselves with naturalistic models of mind; which are far less discriminatory).

Interestingly, I was thinking about asking "are atheists vegetarians?" today, which of course I didn't - but it is somewhat appropriate.

An advanced cerebrum (/prefrontal cortex) is probably not necessary for sentience, and even if it were it wouldn't imply it. If we look at the theory of mind of children and other cultures it is pretty expansive - and for this reason alone it is worth taking seriously. Then again we have evolved to eat meat, and so I think animal equality is less of an issue for people with teleological philosophies.

//The just world fallacy
The just world fallacy is the greatest excuse to perceive one's convenience as good rather than evil.

With regard to the wretchedness of the wicked - I completely agree with this observation, but I would have said that the world is good rather than just. Everything evil in time gets converted into good. The just world fallacy (as I meant here) is believing that one's actions or being will necessarily be rewarded in kind, or more generally that injustice is prevented by good intentions. For example the trust given by an innocent to an exploiter.

//Love
Love never dies.

It is quoting the lady Maria Teresa somewhat out of context, but I think the reference you have found could be the original. I am mainly concerned about the truth of the literal proposition; that an instance of love never dies (it is only transformed).

Is this love being transformed into fear or is it attachment?

When love is referring to an act not a disposition, can the effects of the act ever disappear?

So will the effects of the act die with the recipient? Or will it necessarily produce more acts of love?

He doesn't realise he's already a part of the neverending story.

I think perhaps I write in an open ended style when I am genuinely interested to see what people think of an idea. Thanks for indulging my curiosity.

//Absolute morality

There still could be an absolute moral principle which holds regardless of circumstances, for example loving thy neighbour or creator.

---
only a sith deals in absolutes

Anakin, Chancellor Palpatine is evil.
From my point of view, the Jedi are evil.
Well, then you are lost.

Interesting. I liked both of the lines; they occur in the same extended conversation and point out the subtlety of moral absolutes. Objective morality exists, but this does not mean we should deal with others in absolutes (like drawing and enforcing arbitrary lines/laws). The law is created for man, not man for the law. Yet this does not mean we should not declare evil for what it is.

//Morality

Morality is action or will in accordance with truth (logic). A proposition is either concordant with reality or it is not. A god cannot instil morality by a command (because a command could theoretically either conform with or contradict reality). Yet their a) existence or b) intention influence reality because they a) comprise and b) create reality respectively, thereby influencing morality. Furthermore, their a) existence or b) intention might influence our knowledge of reality, thereby influencing our knowledge of morality.

But it is not logical for said psychopath to expect their deficient experience of reality to correspond to reality.

Logic is a prerequisite of truth (something cannot be both true and illogical). Similarly, very few truths are known without application of logic. Those which are are known as axioms. Furthermore, the accordance of action and will to reality is arguably more dependent on logic than knowledge (given human frailty). Therefore for practical purposes (assuming human experience is fairly uniform) truth here can be taken as logic. As [personOfSimilarConvictions] points out however, the formal argument asserts that morality is action or will in logical accordance with truth.

So in everything, do to others what you would have them do to you, for this sums up the Law and the Prophets.

Is it just coincidental that cross cultural moral law (natural law) can be reduced to a golden rule? Does the moral law of "loving one's neighbour as oneself" or "loving one's creator" not predate its revelation? There is no logical reason to take one's own concerns above another's, all things being equal. Moral commands are just verifications of facts pertaining to logical actions and will.

But to you who are listening I say: Love your enemies, do good to those who hate you, bless those who curse you, pray for those who mistreat you. If someone slaps you on one cheek, turn to them the other also. If someone takes your coat, do not withhold your shirt from them. Give to everyone who asks you, and if anyone takes what belongs to you, do not demand it back. Do to others as you would have them do to you.

//Morality

Titled "Why is human life worth more than animal life?";

Is human life worth more than animal life? If so, why would human life be worth equal to a more intelligent, more sentient machine?

Ok cool - you are all offering teleological explanations for the proposition. Are there any non-teleological explanations?

Arguing that humans have choice presupposes design - ie teleology. I have ignored the supply and demand commentary as it is economic and non-absolute; it is equivalent to saying that humans are more valuable because they have been evolutionarily programmed to believe they are more valuable.

Speech is not necessarily an argument. Without clarification I might define it as ateleological

---

The concept of speech (as opposed to the contents of a spoken phrase) sounds like it might require design. It certainly requires logic and this logic to be embedded in the system that instantiates the speech.

These utilitarian calculations are interesting. Are you suggesting that we should kill (or let be killed) a human being to save a more intelligent more sentient machine, or 50 puppy dogs? If not, why not?

Are we saying that there is no objective way of valuing human life without invoking teleology (design)? That the only standard available is the utility (economic) judgement of one or more Homo sapiens existing on a planet at an arbitrary period in time?

In the context of valuing life hypotheticals are often forwarded concerning the willingness to kill (or let be killed) a to save b. The classic example being the trolley problem. So another way to look at the problem is in terms of utilitarianism/deontology. Should we kill (or let be killed) a human being to save a more intelligent more sentient machine, or perhaps 500 puppy dogs? If not, why not? Is there a non-teleological explanation for not doing so?

I made no claim to the contrary. Ascribing economic value is another matter.

The fundamental difference between economic and non-economic (philosophical or ontological) comparisons is that economic comparisons must be made with reference to some agent or agents performing the evaluation. Non-economic comparisons are discussing the absolute nature of things (x is y because z). I would never introduce economic comparisons into a philosophical discussion unless there were a specific reason for doing so.

Economic comparisons might provide information regarding how a group of people might behave at a particular point in time with reference to some phenomenon, but they will never determine how a person should rationally respond to some phenomenon. Of course one could assume that rational human behaviour involves both a utilitarian judgment and one which can theoretically be monetarised according to a common currency, but these are just arbitrary philosophical assumptions. An example of non-economic value judgment in human psychology is sacred values.

Although it is not evident that value comparisons require quantification (comparisons are by definition qualitative), not all quantifiable value comparisons involve willingness to exchange (engage in a market).

Someone might value b as a scared value and therefore not be willing to exchange it for any economic return. Yet, although b is literally "priceless", it is not necessarily beyond measurable value as two sacred values can often be exchanged (say b and c).

Likewise, there are differences pertaining to utilitarian judgment and deontological judgment. Someone might value 5 x's more the 1 x, and 10 x's more than 5 x's, but not be willing to exchange x (risk the death by way of action) for any number of x's.

As for an absolute standard by which to judge value, I am open to the possibility of a non-teleological basis for pinnaclising human beings in the universe, but am yet to receive one. Even if (according to the weak anthropic principle) we were the most advanced natural species that would likely ever evolve in this universe, there would be no obvious reason for placing our existence on par with a more advanced and sentient artificial offspring. Such would require believing a) that mental properties are only assigned to sufficiently complex organisms to begin with (ie Homo sapiens/spiritualis), or b) that vegetarianism is the only moral choice. But why would either of these be the case?

More fundamentally this is not actually a moral problem, it is a logical problem. Morality is only used to identify the discrepancy. Can there exist a property which differentiates human beings from other animals which cannot differentiate human beings from a more intelligent and sentient being? (Without appealing to teleology).

In this context it doesn't matter whether sentient computers can exist or not, they are just a hypothetical entity used to make a point. Likewise in this context it doesn't matter if materialism (as a philosophy of mind) is true or false, the question is only relevant to presuppositions of materialism. I was working off the assumption that it is pretty obvious that a non-materialist has no problem with teleology and therefore arbitrary delineations of being/value within nature; and the target audience is certainly materialist.

The underlying question is whether any of the properties that differentiate humans from animals cannot also differentiate humans from more intelligent and sentient beings. The question of whether these distinguishing properties exist on scales is essential to the problem. Without invoking teleology, what reason do we have to believe that they don't exist on scales? Ergo, what reason do we have to believe that we should not surrender arms upon confrontation with a more advanced being (apart from our own subjective desires and preprogrammed motivations)?

//The mean (ethics)
https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/aristotle-ethics/#DocMea

//Morality/evolution
Note one cannot use reason to reject reason, either in the general form (objective truth) or the specific form (ie ones own adherence to reason). Therefore, using the presumption that one is a monkey to justify their unreasonable behaviour is immoral - ie illogical. As previously argued, there is no reason to treat another (including feelings/needs/etc) any different than one would wish ourselves to be treated, all things being equal.

For a physicalist (philosophy of mind), the underlying psychological substrate which is shared by the "man" and his harem is called self-directed theory of mind. His human brain is naturally driven to value (and protect) this hypothetical mind because it a) has been (evolutionarily) programmed to do this, and b) is encouraged to do this socially (develop self-concept). It is difficult to estimate their relative contributions (nature/nurture) because conducting a controlled experiment with infants would be highly unethical (and new borns are known to die in such circumstances). Likewise, it is called theory of mind rather than knowledge of mind because its non-corporal existence cannot be verified with the empirical method (ie it is a philosophical belief). The physical system would operate identically regardless of the truth of this belief in an internal existence/experience/awareness (see machine intelligence or philosophical zombie).

Yet he is also capable of (in fact is positively wired via simulation circuits to) project this construct to like others. This belief that others think/perceive like us is known as other-directed theory of mind. It can be tested in 5 year olds based on the presence of second order beliefs (I think that she thinks x). Again, there are likely to be both nature and nurture contributions to the development of this projection. In the literature it is not even necessarily considered a projection from first principles (self-directed ToM), although I would dispute the possibility of an independent emergence for a number of reasons;
1. The relative complexity of the constructs; SD ToM is simpler than OD ToM.
2. OD ToM follows logically from SD ToM and the empirical observation of behavioural/visual similarity between self and other (although this is not strong evidence in of itself because SD ToM is also logically reinforced by OD ToM).
3. The superior survival advantage of an organism that has come (whose brain's model of self has come) to instinctively perceive and value itself (model of self) as a non-corporal entity/agent. Believing that others have a mind appears rather to confer a disadvantage in many circumstances (depending on their closeness of kin/shared genetic material).

Humans are rational creatures, and they can't escape this rationality - the only option they have is evil; the intentional rejection of truth: the unreasonable denial of reason. They can also behave automatically like any system without thinking things through (ie sin/missing the mark more generally), but only until their irrationality has been questioned.

//Morality
I came to the same basic conclusion as Lewis presents here in that morality is reason (and therefore both rational and objective).

(Although this is probably just semantics; what he calls "practical reason" I would probably call wisdom - something more than just morality: the implementation of knowledge including morality).

I really wanted to share this video to the greater secular community, but having watched it a few times I held off this for two reasons;

1. He doesn't make clear that there is a difference between a) something being a result of evolutionary physical processes and therefore random in an absolute philosophical sense (ie ateleological), and b) something being the result of evolutionary physical processes and therefore purposeful in an absolute philosophical sense (ie teleological). These are both philosophical claims which have little to do with science. a) seems only necessary if all of the following are true; that i) something different could have been generated by such evolutionary processes, ii) these different outcomes could not be decided between (selected), iii) these differences had a relevance to the system beyond natural individual differences (e.g. variability in the shape of a tree or face), and iv) reductive physicalism is both a viable and correct philosophy of mind (ie sentience is not mapped to the physical system - thereby defining its experience, but equivalent to the physical system).

'After studying his environment man has begun to study himself. Up to that point, he had assumed his own reason and through it seen all other things. Now, his own reason has become the object: it is as if we took out our eyes to look at them. Thus studied, his own reason appears to him as the epiphenomenona which accompanies chemical or electrical events in a cortex which is itself the by-product of a blind evolutionary process. His own logic, hitherto the king whom events in all possible worlds must obey, becomes merely subjective. There is no reason for supposing that it yields truth.'

- The first use of the word "by-product" pertains to a philosophical claim that mental reality has a correspondence to physical reality (i.e. physicalism/property dualism): "Thus studied, his own reason appears to him as the epiphenomenona which accompanies chemical or electrical events in a cortex".
- The second instance of "by-product" refers to an empirical/measurable process: "chemical or electrical events in a cortex which is itself the by-product of a blind evolutionary process".
- Measurable processes (stochastic or otherwise) say nothing of the purpose behind them (Aristotelian final cause).

2. I don't think it can be demonstrated that the maxims of the natural law (intuitive though they are) cannot be proved from a more basic principle. I would argue that they are not "axioms of practical reason", but conclusions of practical reason.

'All idea of "new" or "scientific" or "modern" moralities must therefore be dismissed as mere confusion of thought. We have only two alternatives. Either the maxims of traditional morality must be accepted as axioms of practical reason which neither admit nor require argument to support them and not to "see" which is to have lost human status; or else there are no values at all, what we mistook for values being "projections" of irrational emotions.'

Lewis himself provides a sufficient basis for their derivation: 'He will say, for example, "We must abandon irrational taboos and base our values on the good of the community" - as if the maxim "Thou shalt promote the good of the community' were anything more than a polysyllabic variant of 'Do as you would be done by' which has itself no other basis than the old universal value judgement that he claims to be rejecting.'

Rather than taking the Golden Rule as an axiom, I would consider it derivative from already accepted truths (both philosophical and empirical). Why should one treat one's own encoded respect for self any different than other's encoded respect for self, all things being equal? Therefore, it is only logical to treat others how we ourselves would wish to be treated (for a given circumstance; taking into account differences in kinship, locality, etc).

Because there is no logical reason not to.

There is a difference in the cucumber analogy because one's treatment of self is based on a principle (self respect), where as one's consumption of cucumber is not. If however one's consumption of cucumber were based on a principle (e.g. I as a human being need to eat cucumber for my dignity and well being), then there would be no reason to a) deny one's own consumption of cucumber or b) not extend this requirement to another human being. In the same way, if one's treatment of self is based on a principle (the property of self respect), and this property is shared by multiple entities, then there is no reason to prioritise one's own self-treatment, all things being equal.

     Alternatively, if there is no logical reason not to treat another how they themselves (you) would expect to be treated [my previous comment], why would one (you) not treat another how they themselves (you) would expect to be treated? (i.e. why would one (you) treat another different than how they themselves (you) would expect to be treated)? There is by definition be no logical reason for doing so. The only logical option is to treat another how they themselves (you) would expect to be treated. This has been derived based on the original claims: (1) the only reason that they themselves (you) treat themselves (yourself) or expect to be treated in a certain way is because of an encoded respect for self. (2) Yet this encoded respect for self is shared (apparently) by all human beings.

     Note there is another question raised, although I am unsure if you were asking it: Why should one treat our encoded respect for self the same as another's encoded respect for self? Because all evidence suggests that these are the same (one person's respect for self is no different than another's respect for self), all things being equal. We can assume this based on the inference of their shared basis in nature (brain), although there may be other (non-materialist) grounds for assuming this to be the case.

     There is also a further question raised, although I am unsure if you were asking it: a possible distinction between a logical imperative and a moral imperative. I would argue that there is none.

     Note I completely agree with the first three/four sentences based on the following: "Rather than taking the Golden Rule as an axiom, I would consider it derivative from already accepted truths (both philosophical and empirical)."; where empirical in this context is 0) the observation that we behave the same as others - and philosophical includes 1) the acceptance of our belief in our self worth (axiom) and 2) the projection of that self worth to others who we observe to behave the same as us.

Notes;
0. Empirical truths rely on axioms inherent to the scientific method (sensation pertains to an objective reality, causality, logic, etc).
1. from a non-reductive physicalist (materialist) perspective, this belief is both biologically programmed and metaphysically true (ie the physically encoded belief in mental reality and its worth is mapped to mental reality and its experience of self-worth).
2. Although other-directed theory of mind (the belief that others have minds like our own) is intuitive and developed by age ~5, it is technically not an axiom because it can be rederived from (0) observation and (1) self-directed theory of mind (the belief that we have a mind).

I don't understand the last sentence in the context of the argument. If there are grounds (reason) to treat others how we ourselves would expect to be treated, all things being equal (2), and these grounds are derivative from the grounds we ourselves treat ourselves respectfully (1), then there is by definition no logical reason not to.

One could reject all grounds for treating themselves respectfully, and then claim there is therefore no reason to treat like others respectfully, but in order to do so requires the rejection of reason: it requires treating oneself special for no reason. Likewise, in order to have a conversation requires an acceptance of reason, so this case is only relevant to an emotion driven animal. Of such I would argue none yet exist, although the abolition of man indicates that this possibility shouldn't be ruled out (for my part I couldn't see a better way to achieve this than the tolerance of dehumanisation: treating human beings like stock animals for sexual gratification).

Here is a possible taxonomy;

i) logical/moral imperative (positive/exhortation):
- there is reason to do x
- there is no reason not to x

ii) logical/moral imperative (negative/prohibition):
- there is no reason to do x
- there is reason not to do x

iii) logical/moral judgement (wisdom generale):
- there is reason to do x
- there is reason not to x

iv) emotional judgement:
- there is no reason to do x
- there is no reason not to do x

examples;
i) e.g. treating another how you would expect to be treated, all things being equal
ii) e.g. treating another different to how you would expect to be treated, all things being equal
iii) e.g. the trolley problem (utilitarianism/deontology)
iv) e.g. selecting a red (versus blue) icecream

The intellectual nightmare of rejecting human reason;
https://m.youtube.com/watch?v=oyzSrtr6oJE

"Galain said nothing, waiting for Tomas's next command. Though Calin was Warleader of Elvandar, Tomas had assumed command of the forces of elves and dwarves. It was never clear when captaincy had passed to him, but slowly, as he had grown in stature, he had grown in leadership. In battle he would simply shout for something to be done, and elves and dwarves would rush to obey. At first it had been because the commands were logical and obvious. But the pattern had become accepted, and now they obeyed because it was Tomas who commanded."

=== Mythology ===

//Myth
To one who said that myths were lies and therefore worthless, even though 'breathed through silver'.

Philomythus to Misomythus

You look at trees and label them just so,
(for trees are 'trees', and growing is 'to grow');
you walk the earth and tread with solemn pace
one of the many minor globes of Space:
a star's a star, some matter in a ball
compelled to courses mathematical
amid the regimented, cold, inane,
where destined atoms are each moment slain.

At bidding of a Will, to which we bend
(and must), but only dimly apprehend,
great processes march on, as Time unrolls
from dark beginnings to uncertain goals;
and as on page o'er-written without clue,
with script and limning packed of various hue,
an endless multitude of forms appear,
some grim, some frail, some beautiful, some queer,
each alien, except as kin from one
remote Origo, gnat, man, stone, and sun.
God made the petreous rocks, the arboreal trees,
tellurian earth, and stellar stars, and these
homuncular men, who walk upon the ground
with nerves that tingle touched by light and sound.
The movements of the sea, the wind in boughs,
green grass, the large slow oddity of cows,
thunder and lightning, birds that wheel and cry,
slime crawling up from mud to live and die,
these each are duly registered and print
the brain's contortions with a separate dint.
Yet trees are not 'trees', until so named and seen
and never were so named, till those had been
who speech's involuted breath unfurled,
faint echo and dim picture of the world,
but neither record nor a photograph,
being divination, judgement, and a laugh
response of those that felt astir within
by deep monition movements that were kin
to life and death of trees, of beasts, of stars:
free captives undermining shadowy bars,
digging the foreknown from experience
and panning the vein of spirit out of sense.
Great powers they slowly brought out of themselves
and looking backward they beheld the elves
that wrought on cunning forges in the mind,
and light and dark on secret looms entwined.

He sees no stars who does not see them first
of living silver made that sudden burst
to flame like flowers bencath an ancient song,
whose very echo after-music long
has since pursued. There is no firmament,
only a void, unless a jewelled tent
myth-woven and elf-pattemed; and no earth,
unless the mother's womb whence all have birth.
The heart of Man is not compound of lies,
but draws some wisdom from the only Wise,
and still recalls him. Though now long estranged,
Man is not wholly lost nor wholly changed.
Dis-graced he may be, yet is not dethroned,
and keeps the rags of lordship once he owned,
his world-dominion by creative act:
not his to worship the great Artefact,
Man, Sub-creator, the refracted light
through whom is splintered from a single White
to many hues, and endlessly combined
in living shapes that move from mind to mind.
Though all the crannies of the world we filled
with Elves and Goblins, though we dared to build
Gods and their houses out of dark and light,

and sowed the seed of dragons, 'twas our right
(used or misused). The right has not decayed.
We make still by the law in which we're made.

Yes! 'wish-fulfilment dreams' we spin to cheat
our timid hearts and ugly Fact defeat!
Whence came the wish, and whence the power to dream,
or some things fair and others ugly deem?
All wishes are not idle, nor in vain
fulfilment we devise -- for pain is pain,
not for itself to be desired, but ill;
or else to strive or to subdue the will
alike were graceless; and of Evil this
alone is deadly certain: Evil is.

Blessed are the timid hearts that evil hate
that quail in its shadow, and yet shut the gate;
that seek no parley, and in guarded room,
though small and bate, upon a clumsy loom
weave tissues gilded by the far-off day
hoped and believed in under Shadow's sway.

Blessed are the men of Noah's race that build
their little arks, though frail and poorly filled,
and steer through winds contrary towards a wraith,
a rumour of a harbour guessed by faith.

Blessed are the legend-makers with their rhyme
of things not found within recorded time.
It is not they that have forgot the Night,
or bid us flee to organized delight,
in lotus-isles of economic bliss
forswearing souls to gain a Circe-kiss
(and counterfeit at that, machine-produced,
bogus seduction of the twice-seduced).
Such isles they saw afar, and ones more fair,
and those that hear them yet may yet beware.
They have seen Death and ultimate defeat,
and yet they would not in despair retreat,
but oft to victory have tuned the lyre
and kindled hearts with legendary fire,
illuminating Now and dark Hath-been
with light of suns as yet by no man seen.

I would that I might with the minstrels sing
and stir the unseen with a throbbing string.
I would be with the mariners of the deep
that cut their slender planks on mountains steep
and voyage upon a vague and wandering quest,
for some have passed beyond the fabled West.
I would with the beleaguered fools be told,
that keep an inner fastness where their gold,
impure and scanty, yet they loyally bring
to mint in image blurred of distant king,
or in fantastic banners weave the sheen
heraldic emblems of a lord unseen.

I will not walk with your progressive apes,
erect and sapient. Before them gapes
the dark abyss to which their progress tends
if by God's mercy progress ever ends,
and does not ceaselessly revolve the same
unfruitful course with changing of a name.
I will not treat your dusty path and flat,
denoting this and that by this and that,
your world immutable wherein no part
the little maker has with maker's art.
I bow not yet before the Iron Crown,
nor cast my own small golden sceptre down.

In Paradise perchance the eye may stray
from gazing upon everlasting Day
to see the day illumined, and renew
from mirrored truth the likeness of the True.
Then looking on the Blessed Land 'twill see
that all is as it is, and yet made free:
Salvation changes not, nor yet destroys,
garden nor gardener, children nor their toys.
Evil it will not see, for evil lies

not in God's picture but in crooked eyes,
not in the source but in malicious choice,
and not in sound but in the tuneless voice.
In Paradise they look no more awry;
and though they make anew, they make no lie.
Be sure they still will make, not being dead,
and poets shall have flames upon their head,
and harps whereon their faultless fingers fall:
there each shall choose for ever from the All.

It is a poem written by Tolkien for Lewis, entitled Mythopoeia

//Genesis Mythology #0
I always find this interesting, not that I take mythology literally;

14 Ba start of time
4.6 Ba nuclear fusion begins in the sun
4.4-3.8 Ba formation of ocean (earth cools to support liquid water)
500-360 Ma Atmospheric Oxygen 15%, atmospheric temperature current+10dC (water vapour is correlated with temperature)
363 Ma seed-bearing plants and forests soon to flourish.
360 Ma Land flora dominated by seed ferns.
280 Ma seed plants diversify
225 Ma First teleost fishes (most living fishes are members of this group).
140 Ma Angiosperms (fruit)
280-100 Ma Atmospheric Oxygen peaks at 35% then starts to steady towards 21%, atmospheric temperature current+4dC
55 Ma Modern bird groups diversify (first song birds, parrots, loons, swifts, woodpeckers), first whale (Himalayacetus)...
20 Ma First giraffes, hyenas, bears and giant anteaters...
6.5 Ma First hominins

https://en.wikipedia.org/\u2026/Timeline_of_the_evolutionary_his\u2026
https://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/Origin_of_water_on_Earth
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Atmosphere_of_Earth
https://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/Geologic_temperature_record

//Genesis Mythology (continued) #1
If a parent knows their child is going to misbehave, do they ask them to behave anyway?

//Error (sin) / Genesis Mythology (continued) #2
The origin of sin is the desire for knowledge of good and evil.

(NB This is actually a general observation, and not a comment on history).

And if God is dead, where does this non-teleological mind come from? Fod? Evolution doesn't require emergent properties. This forum is awaiting a positive thesis for atheism. Perhaps you can provide one [personOfOtherConvictions]? Feel free to start a new thread.

Note the observation that sin is a product of the desire for knowledge of good and evil is not a commentary on theism. It is proposing that irrational selfish behaviour including its habituation starts from a desire to know what is good and evil. Good is that which is consistent with reality. Evil is that which is inconsistent with reality - for example, using other people to our own ends. Evil does not apply to non-human animals because they don't think that they are special (or it would if a. they did and b. they were). Special refers to non carnal existence (emergent mental properties). Evil is by definition the corruption of good (it requires one or more true beliefs to contradict).

[personOfOtherConvictions], you are mistaking Nietzsche's definition of good and evil for good and evil. If someone defines x as y, and another as z, the authority of the definition doesn't depend on whether it is formulated by someone called Nietzsche. Not everyone supposes that good and evil (morality) are derivative from "God" or the gods, or that this implies they are without objective ground.

Take for example the observation of a chair. One doesn't say the carpenter exists therefore my observation of the chair is real (not just in my mind). They first observe the chair, and then suppose that someone made it. The objective status of the chair (not just a random collection of particles) can be argued to come later in the argument, but the category holds regardless.

This is true [personOfSimilarConvictions], but is irrelevant to claims of making (unusually) theistic assumptions.

I can appreciate the proposition that good and evil does not exist in the sense that a chair does not exist, but there is nothing specific about good and evil that is dependent on God (without ML). Evil operates contrary to the truth of God's existence, in the same way it operates contrary to all other truths. Furthermore, if categories are meaningless without God, and God is dead, then the conversation stops here.

"Existentialism" is confused to think that its philosophy of "objective meaninglessness" (a meaningless world) does not extend to its assertion of meaninglessness. If I were to take the claim seriously, then I should not think that it has any meaning whatsoever. Assertion of relativism is what is called talking oneself out of a conversation. Communication requires acknowledgement of absolutes. At a minimum, this includes the axioms of reason (in particular, the non-physical abstract object logic).

You have interpreted good and evil as "God inspired", and this appears to be your original argument for their nullification via the Death of God (and my assumption of theism). I have rejected this claim.
- All objective truths require grounding in absolutes (if they are not primitives themselves). Depending on the number and connectivity of these truths, teleology may be the most rational explanation (e.g. "the source", "Fod", or "God"/traditional theism). Absolutes that are highly embedded within nature are denied by positive atheism (NB positive atheism is not the same as a simple absence of theism; the technical term is "gnostic atheism"). This includes emergent properties such as objective morality, objective logic, mental properties (extra-physical sentience/qualia), and objective categories (for example chairs). But there is nothing specific about good and evil in this context. We may as well be talking about the denial of chairs, experience, or existence. Positive atheism represents a serious threat to a coherent existentialism (including the power to do anything). The only thing it appears to empower is irrationality.
- I interpreted 'near universal intuition of objective duties and values' as being a logical byproduct of preexisting beliefs (for example the worth of self, and similarity and therefore worth of others). There is sufficient evidence of cross-cultural moral values, and this is not disputed in any empirical literature. Examples include harm, fairness, loyalty, and purity (except for cultures with high rates of pornography, including the last 20 years of our own).
- I am glad that you acknowledge the concepts necessary for conversation. Yet we can't both disagree with absolutes ("nothing is absolute") and "rely on certain absolutes to carry on this conversation". It is like saying, let us pretend that a = b, now if b = c does a = c? I am happy that you don't think only certain absolutes exist however (those necessary for reason), because this would sound contrived.
- NB no one here is asking atheists to prove God doesn't exist. They may be asking atheists to provide a positive thesis for existence however. Ie, start explaining stuff. It is all well and good to make arbitrary claims about the death of God when it suits us (or the context), and no one is going to take the claim seriously anyway without an accompanying argument, but at the end of the day the theist is the only one offering an explanation for things at present. I have suggested something to get started on: the hard problem of consciousness (and will grant an infinite eternal multiverse uncut by Occam's razor - just so we don't waste time articulating previous arguments).

[personOfOtherConvictions], this is how I read it. You interpreted good and evil as a) a theistic assertion of objective good and evil, b) based firstly on the claim that good and evil are "God inspired" (hence your reference to Nietzsche). When it become apparent that you were dealing with something a little more nuanced, you backed up this argument by c) claiming that absolute categories (absolutes) do not exist with positive atheism. This is a separate argument but I granted it; if good and evil cannot be objectively defined, then neither can chairs or people. They are merely categories. It doesn't stop us talking about them however.

Here is another quote from Nietzsche which was being thrown around last week; "Fortunately, I learnt, in time, to separate theological from moral prejudice and I no longer searched for the origin of evil beyond the world." (Genealogy of Morals 1887)

I did however assert that the categorisation process itself is necessary for conversation ("if categories are meaningless without God, and God is dead, then the conversation stops here"). The point about categories here is not a linguistic issue (e.g. whether something is called a "chair" or "table" or whether they serve a particular functional purpose). It refers to whether categorisation itself (the process) is meaningful. For example, if someone observes something called a photon or a quark. Are these meaningful categories, or are they just a matter of taste? If categorisation is entirely relative (and has no objective ground in reason), then nothing can be said about anything. On this note, I implore you to consider again the assertion that "relativism is true". [personWithSimilarConvictions] has a thread on the logic of this statement.

Here is the argument again for consideration by people;

"The origin of X is the desire for knowledge of Y and Z... Note the observation that X is a product of the desire for knowledge of Y and Z is not a commentary on theism. It is proposing that irrational selfish behaviour including its habituation starts from a desire to know what is Y and Z. Y is that which is consistent with reality. Z is that which is inconsistent with reality - for example, using other people to our own ends. Z does not apply to non-human animals because they don't think that they are special (or it would if a. they did and b. they were). Special refers to non carnal existence (emergent mental properties). Z is by definition the corruption of Y (it requires one or more true beliefs to contradict)."

Note the thread is not discussing absolute good and evil any more than it is discussing absolute chairs or people. It is making an observation of the relationship between three variables. Their definitions have been provided.

Good and evil can't be singled out as concepts dependent on God. We have to give up on all absolute categories, not just the ones we don't like. In any case the absolute status of a category is not the topic of the discussion.

There are fundamental assumptions required by reason (and therefore communication) and a thesis based entirely on subjectivity needs to be reconsidered (cf logic of categorisation, irrespective of the significance of the categories generated). This again is a separate topic but it has implications for the existence of existentialism.

I also refuted the claim that good and evil are "God inspired" or of an external/theological origin of morality (this is a valid interpretation of Nietzsche, and required addressing).

//Error (sin) [continued: part 2] / Genesis Mythology (continued) #3
The origin of sin is the deception of women.

Firstly, it relies on a semantic distinction between sin (moral failure) and evil (intentional contradiction of truth), which appears to have become lost ever since a doxology was interpreted as being part of the prayer recommended by he-who-forged-the-west.

Secondly, it relies on a hesitancy not to race head first into the realm of literal mythology whenever one finds a correlation in terminology or themes (such as "sin" or "origin").

With that being said there is a third option; that the deception of women is evil, and it from this that sin originates. I am not going to explicate any details of the process, but in the semitic myth it involves passing on a delicious piece of fruit.

It is worth asking oneself, how are women deceived? Women themselves can answer this question. One method might be to compare a set of wise old women to wretched old women. Likewise, to determine the effectiveness of the circumstance in generating sin one might examine a correlation between the contact men have with such deceived women and the sinfulness of men. Of course, a correlation can't confirm causality, but it provides an interesting basis/incentive to pursue the proposition further.

No I wouldn't have added the qualifier 'old' if I wanted to make a simple reduction between being deceived and being wretched.

So your analysis raises the question; is the deception of women intentional? If for example someone makes another person uncomfortable by encouraging them to act in a way which they would not otherwise act in public (without the intention of being presented as an actor), while paying them 'sufficiently' for their discomfort, and if necessary making the whole process as wild and morally irrelevant as possible, is this a consequence of the agent belonging to some scale of general depravity, or have they stepped over a line? The line being conscious intent to deceive, or more generally: the conscious rejection of the truth of their internal being.

//Genesis Mythology (continued) #4 (see also "Gender")

Woman is derivative of man.

There is a reason why women can perform advantageously male activities and wear advantageously male clothing (eg calculate the statistical probability of a modest pants design across all possible geometries) without losing their womanhood while men can't do the opposite. Therefore, if a society were to advance in domestic or contraceptive technology, then we would expect to see an asymmetric convergence of gender roles.

Evolutionarily speaking, in terms of reproductive fitness (partner selection) a man's identity is far more important than a woman's identity. Therefore, there is less evolutionary pressure for a woman's identity to be genetically encoded. Thus, we would expect female identity to be proportionally more socially encoded than male identity. Only once homo sapiens became monogamous could female identity be selected for (NB I have always rejected the claim that homo sapiens is a naturally-in this context genetically-monogamous species). Although I haven't studied this, I would hasten to guess that the activation of male identity is mediated biologically by the release of testosterone.

OK try this [personOfSimilarConvictions]. Gender category 1 magically appears and gender category 2 magically appears. Gender category 2 is designed to suppress people in gender category 1 because they are bad bad people. The human brain is blank slate that magically appears, and although sexual reproduction has existed for a billion years this exerts no influence on the formation of gender categories 1 and 2. Oh yeah, and a friend tried to explain gene-environment interaction to me but it didn't make much sense so they must be social constructs. And of course, anyone who thinks otherwise must be exhibiting some form of repressive sexism.. Also, I am pretty sure that current brain imaging technology lets us see how the brain is wired (why would we want to invest in a human connectome technology when we can fund students to remove people we don't like from universities?) Finally, I read the bible and I was tragically disappointed to find out that males don't have one less left rib - I mean it is so obvious when I read it; the only difference between males and females is that males have one less left rib. And because female identity is so socially malleable (dependent on the male environment), this must mean that male identity is equally malleable.. Why wouldn't it? They just magically appeared in the first place didn't they?

//Genesis Mythology (continued) #5
Life comes from the ground.

It is worth checking out the Hebrew for Ground and Life..

//Myth
Fiction (low truth) - carnal
Fiction (high truth) - myth / "high fantasy"
Non-fiction (low truth) - wrong/weird
Non-fiction (high truth) - ultimate myth

//Sinful nature / Genesis story

I think the general idea of a lie propagating throughout civilisation and being undone through an incredible act of sacrifice (by the natural effect witnessing such has on people) is sound. It follows from the same message (gospel) proclaimed by its archetype; that moral truth is self-evident when we shine a light on it. In this sense the (judeo-)christian myth is very believable.

Of a programmer demarcating an avatar and entering their program, in principle this would be just as believable. However, I don't think every aspect of our universe suggests this. While it (and theism more generally) coincides with the (prospective) discreteness of the physical system, the indeterminism of the physical system, what we understand of non-physical mind (as redundantly mapped to physical mind/brain: the processing of information/organisation of energy by the laws of nature), how we are (evolutionarily) programmed to believe in and value non-physical mind, and the necessity of a correspondence between absolute logic and its physical

representation, the scope of our universe as presently observed indicates that if there is a programmer, they have more subtle intentions in mind (freedom).

=== Philosophy of Mind ===

//Categories
The category k can be recognised by a neural network.

For an artificial neural network the input is probably just a 2D array of luminance values. The recognition requirements (object recognition algorithm) are stored within the connections between the neurons (how these are weighted relative to each other). Each layer of the network is capable of computing a different function (eg contrast detection, edge detection, xy symmetry, etc). The neurons themselves are binary operators (fire, not fire), with some particular pattern of firing at the output layer representing the successful detection of k (as opposed to another letter, or no letter).

For a human neural network there is probably no dedicated k network (although there might be; as we generally only directly probe animal neurons and it is doubtful that even an alphabetically trained monkey would develop a similar concept of k). The model a human has of k would likely be based on preprocessed image properties (like the examples given above) used in arbitrary (multiple) visual recognition tasks (eg dog recognition). Although the more semantically deep; ie image independent (based on ideas rather than a prototype picture of a non erect beast with 4 legs), the less likely the brain relies on visual information over contextual information in its judgment; ie prior knowledge of the scene (eg park where parks typically have dogs). Even k recognition would even be optimised (sped up) based on prior knowledge (eg of having focused on paper where paper typically contains letters).

How the brain's ability to compute an observation of k maps to our subjective (internal) concept of k is an open question - although evidence suggests that any recognition task relies on large networks being activated in a unique way (and so the mapping is probably very complex and incapable of being represented by reductive physicalism). They can for example determine what you are dreaming about by analysing the pattern of neural firing across regions of the brain using fMRI and machine learning. This is of course assuming that you have previously sat under an MRI machine and had it scan you while you look at a thousand images which might occur during a subsequent dream, and that you have now decided to sleep in the machine.

//Nominalism / absolute categories
I was going to make this comment on nominalism a while back, but it happens to be directly related to the rejection of absolute categories.

"... To reduce the Tao to a mere natural product is a step of that kind. Up to that point, the kind of explanation which explains things away may give us something, though at a heavy cost. But you cannot go on 'explaining away' for ever: you will find that you have explained explanation itself away. You cannot go on 'seeing through' things for ever. The whole point of seeing through something is to see something through it. It is good that the window should be transparent, because the street or garden beyond it is opaque. How if you saw through the garden too? It is no use trying to 'see through' first principles. If you see through everything, then everything is transparent. But a wholly transparent world is an invisible world. To 'see through' all things is the same as not to see."
(CS Lewis, The Abolition of Man)

It is still on my list of things to contemplate..

//Philosophy of Mind
[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=gNZhk_bDicA&app=desktop]

[personOfSimilarConvictions], don't mind me just repeating things you already know; but this is my full response. Note most points I make don't contradict what the speaker is claiming in their given context; I have just added them for clarity (as to what a non-reductive physicalist generally believes).

- only eliminativists/functionalists claim that consciousness/soul is physical according to the empirical definition (most scientists believe it is "physical" in terms of the philosophical position physicalism). An inability to express this distinction certainly does not help.
- only reductive physicalists (or eliminativists/functionalists) claim that consciousness is a brain state; not many neuroscientists will reduce consciousness to a neural state (despite it appearing that way based on the language they use).
- scientists talk about "consciousness" or "states of consciousness" in terms of the neurological substrate or functional representation of philosophical (extra-physical) consciousness. As empirical science can only talk about observables, there is no ambiguity when the term is used this way in the literature. There is only ambiguity when it is used outside of the literature (in the public/media). Particularly when communicated by a scientist promoting their own philosophy of mind. The nomenclature is however incompatible with some philosophies of mind; in particular substance (cartesian) dualism. This limitation is not considered a problem for the sciences however since methodological naturalism presupposes that we should try to find a natural basis to all phenomenon (and therefore that consciousness may have a physical substrate/correlate, and that whatever consciousness that can be observed is the only consciousness of interest to them).
- [11:00] scientists don't derive physicalism (the philosophical position) from neurophysiological experiments exciting neurons associated with memory. They are making a judgement based on what we have learnt regarding the modularity of the brain (eg based on brain damage/mental illness dissociations).
- [25:40] the speaker is correct to suggest that the laws of physics as currently defined do not necessitate philosophical (extra-physical) consciousness. But they do however necessitate physical consciousness (according to the current paradigm); ie the neurological substrate of consciousness. It is possible that extra-physical consciousness "emerges" as a byproduct of the evolution/existence of particular complex arragements of matter in space-time; but the basis for this emergence is not presently understood. We have not even begun to address this issue. Some philosophers like David Chalmers attempt to encourage the community to do so. Some use variations of the anthropic principle to avoid the question entirely (only conscious beings can perceive a world therefore they have to exist from their perspective and nature must facilitate such). Of course there are also a minority (eliminativists/functionalists) who attempt to define the problem out of existence.
- [30:00] the 3 arguments given against reductive (type) physicalism are sound (see "what is it like to be a bat?" by Nagel). We may however be able to derive all necessary information about a conscious system (eg bat) to understand it with just two assumptions; a) physicalism and b) that the mapping between extra-physical consciousness and its neurological substrate is consistent between

creatures. Of course we are still attempting to derive the neural correlates of consciousness in humans at the moment, so it will be a long time before anything like this can happen.
- [34:40] - human consciousness may require a CNS (physical substrate) but this does not imply all conscious systems require a CNS
- [36:00] I would argue that conscious states are likely to be "physical" (in the sense of supervenience) based on the following logic: any conscious entity (like us) requires rules which govern both what and how it thinks. These rules may as well be those found in nature (although there are likely to be some which cannot be identified from our perspective; given that we exist within our universe- ie those which map a neurological state to the experience/qualia; our experience of green/sweetness/joy/etc).
- [38:00] I think non-reductive physicalists (property dualists) would have no problem with the concept of extra-physical consciousness (mental properties) being housed by a soul. In that there is a definite entity which experiences its world and nothing in the physical universe (as presently understood) necessitates its existence. But they most certainly would have a problem with the concept that a soul animates the body (note under physicalism, the body operates perfectly according to the laws of physics; the soul/observer is redundant/"overdetermined").
- [40:00] the argument from indivisibility is sound (as above).
- [43:00] the argument from hypothetical bodily independence is sound.
- a discussion of free will is warranted and deserves its own thread. I will however quickly summarise my understanding of the issue below.
- under physicalism prayer could be conceived as a pattern of neural activity (in that it is assumed to be correlated with such). This is an example of where the speaker's specific claim in its given context does not contradict a general interpretation of the science (but perhaps a bad communication of the science).

...

//Qualia
What is blue?

Ah but I am asking you adults, not your children

I like the way the question has shifted to what possesses the quality blue from what defines it.

The only presumption is a desire for truth

> ---
> That is probably the definition of revealed truth, but not all truth is revealed; some is derived.

[personWithSimilarConvictions] - so if there were no blue objects, would blue not exist? Otherwise I am not satisfied with that definition.

> ---
> Note by 'definition' (defining blue), I am not referring to assigning an experience/category with a name, but describing what that experience/category is and why it exists as we perceive it.

(Empirically however, that is likely how our brains categorise it. Note the question is not restricted to measurement - it is asking about the experience mapped to the category not the observable process of categorisation).

Treating "colour" as a component of the electromagnetic spectrum definitely belongs to the empirical ball park. And not even the psychological ball park - as the categories we classify colour (eg yellow) are a function of the EM sensitive RGB cones (and the physical/neural substrate of this function is still being investigated - it is more complex than first order wavelength opponency). However, it is worth asking the question "what is it like to be a bat" in the sense that there may be other colours (/sensations) that exist which we do not ourselves experience. Of these (and any other colours which are not presently perceived in objects real or imagined) a definition should be forged. But for the time being let us define blue.

"There is a culture in Africa that has no word for blue."

> ---
> Just thinking about this - if it is true that they [Himba tribe] do not perceive blue as independent from green (although I doubt this based on common circuitry) then this may well be a byproduct of the colours they are exposed to. If they have no experience of purple then they would not know its "connection" to red; meaning blue being an extension of the green construct would make more sense.
>
> Note the sensation of purple can be triggered through 2 independent scenarios; a) a combination of red and blue light, and b) the exposure of high frequency "blue" light (violet). The reason these seemingly distinct scenarios trigger the same sensation (or cause the same neurons to fire) is because the red cone is bimodally sensitive to low (red) and very high (violet) frequencies. [Consequently, red+blue and high frequency "blue"/violet both stimulate the red and the blue cones, and our brains therefore interpret them as the same colour]. This is actually an example of a derived truth (it can be deduced by logic).

> ---
> "Or, more accurately, they probably saw it as we do now, but they never really noticed it. And that's pretty cool." The ability to distinguish between stimuli (and detect stimuli within a scene) can be trained. Having a word for a stimuli cannot be a precondition for its perception (otherwise the word would never evolve), although it can certainly bias us towards training to perceive it. I still think the purple theory is worth testing (it cannot have been a very popular colour). Thanks for the article [personOfSimilarConvictions].

I was avoiding the shades of blue tangent (but thanks for mentioning this [personOfSimilarConvictions]; all colour exists on a continuum).

To save time we should skip circular definitions also. Eg "blue is a colour. A colour is something which appears different depending on the neural activity of the brain of the observer - it can appear blue, red, green, or some combination thereof."

    [personWithSimilarConvictions], note I don't think this is a sufficient approach to reaching a definition because it leaves blue in its tracks (ignores it) by saying "The picture you imagine in your mind as the colour 'blue' could easily be the same thing that I imagine when I see 'red' - but that does not actually matter much". It may not matter much in terms of the physical operation of a human being (in fact it doesn't and by definition cannot matter at all), but philosophically it is critical (cf qualia; https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Qualia). Only if there were an infinite pool of possible colours (unimagined by any one observer, and randomly assigned) would this be justifiable. Furthermore, this approach (sensation being reduced to the categorisation of stimuli) fails to differentiate between different forms of sensation (audio, visual, tactile, etc), or provide an explanation of their individualisation/uniqueness.

"Blue is whatever you percieve it to be"

    No relativism allowed here mate either

"Interesting....i see too there is a language in Brazil without numbers."

    It is important to distinguish between numerical comparison and enumeration/counting ability; which are believed to be innate and learnt respectively. Such tribes can still distinguish between numerical quantities but they don't necessarily have words to describe numbers above 2/3/4, only for approximate numerical quantities (some, many, etc). The same limitation has been observed in preverbal children and tribal aborigines. It appears that humans naturally perceive number on a logarithmic scale (as opposed to a linear scale).

I would think a complete definition should attempt to answer or at least reference the following anomaly; why do we perceive objects categorised by our brain as "blue" as blue and not as red?

[personOfSimilarConvictions] - why would we perceive the colour blue and not red (or green) when the neural networks corresponding to the recognition of "blue" are activated? What determines this?

    What part of the brain [personOfSimilarConvictions]? Why would the "blue" network produce an experience of blue and the "green" network produce an experience of green?

[personWithSimilarConvictions] - our being trained to distinguish a particular colour is likely independent of the unique experience of that colour. For example, the tribal africans would likely still see blue as blue; but be less able to detect it within a scene, or perhaps it might be closer to green but still be a shade of blue. In any case, the question remains; why do we see that which our brain interprets as "blue" as blue and not red (or yellow, or orange, etc)? Note if the tribal africans are still causing trouble; the same question can be asked of green. Ultimately we cannot know what existential colour another person is seeing, but for the purposes of the exercise, let us assume that we all see what we call "blue" as blue (it invokes the same chromatic experience).

Under the standard paradigm the subjective perception of blue doesn't cause anything - the brain functions perfectly according to the laws of physics. Our brain may contain associations (both innate and learnt) between the processing of colour information (what it categorises as "blue") and its emotional subsystems, but these operate independent of the observer. Our experience of blue is believed to be mapped to the category "blue" retained and processed by our brain, but one could equally imagine a human system without any such internal experience (p zombie). If the experience of blue is not necessary for the physical system, then it is not defined by the physical system.

More precisely ~450nm light is necessary to the system - which is categorised as "blue" by our brains. It is important when reading a scientific article to make this distinction (especially if it is introduced into a philosophical discussion). The precise experience of that "blue" light for any given observer is presently unknown (it might appear a different colour completely to another person). Although for the purposes of the discussion we are assuming that it does not.

The spectrum we see is a function of RGB intensities (retina cone sensitivities).

The retina of course is sensitive to intensities in:
1. Long (L cone) wavelengths (~Red),
2. Medium (M cone) wavelengths (~Green),
3. Short (S cone) wavelengths (~Blue).

Visual property detection in general (including colour, contrast, motion detection) is performed via 'receptive fields'; which are neural subnets that detect local variations in information (whether raw physical information like light, or preprocessed information/neuron activity). These receptive fields operate (on each other) at different layers in the network and at different resolutions. They can be empirically confirmed or identified (ie mapped to particular stimuli in the outside world) by directly probing neurons with electrodes. The basic principle of receptive fields relevant here however is the property of 'opponency'. Opponency basically occurs when one thing is

often subtracted from another to create another thing, noting that subtraction (difference detection) is close to the simplest mathematical function imaginable.

The perceived colour space (including the magnocellular and parvocellular connections between the retina and V1/primary visual cortex) are sensitive to intensities in:
1. (L+M) (this axis goes from darker to lighter: ie luminance information),
2. (L-M) (this axis goes from Redish to Greenish),
3. (S-(L+M)) (this axis goes from Blueish to Yellowish)

This explains why there are a disproportionate number of uniquely perceived "colours" (like orange and yellow) around the high wavelength region (between red and green). That is my theory anyway (without researching it).

Likewise, it is important to recognise that the same information can be represented in multiple ways. Another classic example is the YCbCr versus RGB colour space. It is like changing the 3D/spatial coordinate system from cartesian to spherical and vice versa. It doesn't effect our ability to represent the information. (More abstract examples include encoding, encryption, or lossless compression; the same information can be represented in extremely different ways, but without losing anything).

//Philosophical Zombies / made in the image of God;
I had the impression that the image of God analogy was used to specifically reference the non-observable qualities of observers.

The qualities that make us human are entirely non-observable. We cannot observe thoughts, emotions, etc or their qualia. We infer their existence in others based on the projection of ourselves (our own internal experience when we exhibit the same external behaviours, expressions, or brain states). And this is not just a mental exercise, we are wired for these simulation processes.

//Mind
1. The mind might be a perfectly ordinary "part" (emergent property) of the brain
2. We assume that it is (based on observations of determinism and/or lawful causality in nature, and the hope of doing any productive science related to cognitive processes now and in the future).

Note an error was made in the first paragraph [personOfSimilarConvictions]; defining consciousnesses as subjective experience and then claiming that the purpose of consciousness was physical/evolutionary (adaptive advantage of sense/model of self). Only with an empirical definition of consciousness does that claim follow. Just because one assumes that P is mapped to M (ie physicalism) does not mean that M can be explained in terms of a P event. This is just a circular argument; one can't prove their axioms using them.

Based on your (in my opinion correct) explanation of physical (ie observable) consciousness, it would have been appropriate to define consciousness as an empirically testable model (such as the information processing facilitated by the brain representing the belief in or model of self-awareness/subjective experience).

[personOfSimilarConvictions] that doesn't require establishment - or shouldn't require establishment. Any ambiguity in the matter amounts to a monumental failure in the definition of physical in either higher order (eg psychology) or more rudimentary (eg philosophy) fields.

I think the subtle nuisance here is the use of state. Although without a phil background it is pretty unhelpful to talk about equivalent mind/body states (it is a philosophical assertion and should be explicitly stated as such in any public report of a scientific finding). A brain state can be considered equivalent to a mental/psychological state (under physicalism), however the properties representing this state (physical/mental) may be fundamentally different.

Epiphenominalism is not well represented at present based on the inability for a creature to store self referential memories in the brain (I remember when I saw the apple). It is thus generally rejected by contemporary philosophers - I haven't heard a counter to Dennett's argument. Alternatively, under a more weak form of epiphenominalism (which Kim says is equivalent to non-reductive physicalism), a set of physical events can be said to represent a mental state.

Although you are probably comparing epiphenominalism to Cartesian dualism here, note obviously that physicalism doesn't generally argue such a kind of causation either (that mental events non-redundantly cause physical events). The only POM (philosophy of mind) group who argue that first person consciousness has a function on physical reality are indeterministic non-reductive physicalists (ML2; eg Robert Kane), or substance/Cartesian dualists (ML1).

[personOfSimilarConvictions]: reductive physicalism (type identity relationship between mental/physical properties) is rejected by contemporary neuroscientists (and most philosophers) based on our understanding of how information is represented distributively across the neural substrate. The only real contender is eliminativism/functionalism (pretending that our qualitative experience of mind is an illusion).

Going from an observable to a non-observable emergent property is a qualitative leap. The former properties can be reduced to the physical substrate whereas the latter can't without an explanatory framework (eg panpsychism). Hence, non-reductive physicalism.

I actually disagree with that interpretation of the phone (its software) [personOfSimilarConvictions]. If the argument being made is that mind is required to infer meaning then this applies to all levels of observation (from physical/quantum, binary, to algorithmic). The key point of difference is that between information processing (hardware and/or software) and non-observable mind (mental properties).

Joseph Tagger: Can you prove you're self-aware?
Will Caster: That's a difficult question, Dr. Tagger. Can you prove that you are?

(In order: substance/Cartesian dualism, epiphenomenalism, psychophysical parallelism, non-reductive physicalism; a common form of property dualism).

//Insight
I am pretty sure this is what Eric Voegelin would argue - I am unsure of the origins of this philosophy however (causal phenomenological insight).

From a non-reductive physicalist perspective insight could be taken as a probability assessment based on evidences - and as such, that it has a physical correlate which is represented in the brain. Like any other information processing this wouldn't require mind (mental properties). Likewise, the feeling of insight granted from a fruitful experience of reasoning would not be any more special (mind determined) than any other conscious experience (qualia).

Genuine secondary creations may require a form of causal phenomenological insight however, but I am not presently convinced (as I am unconvinced that phenomenological reason is causal). That said, there is no reason why a conscious being should have observable access to the substrate of their mind (for the physicalist this is the physical world/brain), and so substance/interactionist dualism is an entirely valid position (at least theoretically).

//Philosophy of Mind
Titled 'The dependence of mental reality on a substrate',

An argument for ontological materialism as pertaining to philosophy of mind (i.e. naturalistic physicalism);

1. Assume that there must be some substrate which defines a) when mind emerges (mental instantiation) and b) how mind operates (mental laws).
i) This needn't be the same substrate in both cases, and ii) we needn't have access to it (the substrate would operate perfectly according to its laws of nature regardless). What philosophical evidence do we have that i) it is the same one, and ii) we have access to it? Note the only substrate we have access to is the physical substrate.

ii) Why should a sentient being have access to the stuff (substrate) from which their mind arises (a) and which defines how mind operates (b)?
2. Mind (by definition?) requires access to an objective reality (operates on some sense data).
3. We infer that the substrate controlling how mind operates (b) is the physical substrate (brain), which we by definition have access to.
- Therefore we may well have access to the substrate which defines when mind emerges (a) also.
- And it may well be the same one (i).

i) Why should the substrate from which mind arises (a) and which defines how mind operates (b) be the same one? (evidence #2)
4. We infer that the substrate for the operation of mind (b) evolved according to the laws of nature.
- Therefore the substrate from which mind arises (a) may also have evolved according to laws of nature.
- And it may well be the same one (i).

[assumptions are enumerated]

//Philosophy of Mind

Titled "Why am I me and not you?";

Why is my experience of existence mapped to physical entity x and not mapped to physical entity y?

Physical properties are uniquely assigned because they are part of a bigger indivisible system. Are we suggesting that mental properties are also? The problem is that to suggest some substances don't have mental properties but others do is to introduce differentiation - and there must be a reason for this differentiation.

To interpret "you" or "me" as a physical entity in this context is to assert an unnecessary reduction which avoids the question. Perhaps I could be you (rather than me) if indivisible centres of awareness are randomly assigned to physical entities. But we must then ask what determines the mapping?

Does the universe itself (nature) generate a set of discrete instantiations of sentience? Then why would a new one be created? Why not use the same one? (This is Arnold Zuboff's argument). Is the fact we don't have any memory of alternate references of experience (like we don't have memories of our infancy) a sufficient argument?

In order to analyse a phenomenon one has to not make any implicit assumptions regarding it. For example a) reductive physicalism (which few adhere to as although mental properties may be mapped to physical properties they are not reducible to physical properties given how information is distributed across neural networks), or b) "emergence by necessity" (the assumption that mental properties just appear given a sufficient level of physical complexity - like when a machine declares itself to be conscious - without explanation).

"Ghost in the machine" could be interpreted to mean anything from substance dualism to property dualism to simulation theory so I can't recommend the phrase here. Max Tegmark (an "informationism" architect) does however recommend the book/film when discussing simulation theory in the context of numerical simulation of physical systems and VR. In terms of property dualism, I figure it is more probable than a ghost without a machine, a machine without a ghost, or a machine with 73 ghosts.

---
but what if I were you and you were me? What part of reality would differ to accomodate for this fact?

What if you died and they reconstructed you? Would it still be you or would it be someone else?

Try to imagine variations on this scenario (from Zuboff's "one self: the logic of experience");
- what if I added an additional 795739528073 atoms to its neocortex?
- what if I created two identical copies of the reconstruction?

(But would you experience reality through him?)

What we want to know is that final change to the reconstructed physical system (e.g. x neural connections) where you no longer experience reality and someone else does. Because if there is such a change it implies something determines when a new instantiation of sentience is assigned, and if there isn't - that we live in a pantheistic world.

With respect to finding out how the brain works, I agree that this is an extremely worthwhile enterprise for a number of reasons (in fact so important that a significant proportion of all research should be directed towards the human connectome). But assuming we found out how it works, and it behaved according to the known laws of physics (or any others discovered within the existing paradigm), mental properties could confer no advantage on the physical system. Nor could we ever know for certain which systems exhibited them. So it begs the question, what are they there for; and why would they be restricted to such complex information processing systems? Perhaps they are an inherent property of all matter/energy and consciousness exists in gradations, etc.

Furthermore (although this is getting increasingly off topic), I hope you appreciate that we have just defined a method to resurrect a body, which moreover according to the materialist framework will be the same person. It is fortunate the laws of nature are so fine tuned as to necessitate an infinite multiverse. Because with an infinite multiverse there are going to be an infinite number of exact copies of our bodies anyway. So let's put all the sola materialist assumptions in the box and see what we get; resurrection of the body, reincarnation, and life after death.

Wait, what? Is there an error somewhere? Was it perhaps the assumption that design optimisation can't involve evolution based on a simple algorithm and unlimited computational resources? (Cf planet earth from the hitch hikers guide to the galaxy). Maybe it was realism itself and we are living in a simulation? (Cf discreetness/quantisation of nature + indeterminism). Such would concord with the assumption that we are reasonable creatures; but it doesn't explain the source. I do think it therefore worth promoting open mindfulness. For the sake of science it is profitable to assume that all reality will ultimately be accessible to it - but should we be projecting this ideal as a philosophy?

//Philosophy of Mind
https://www.ted.com/talks/david_chalmers_how_do_you_explain_consciousness

---
Here is a copy of a recent article I wrote titled "The problem of evolutionarily irrelevant strong emergence";

1. We can't measure sensation (mental properties themselves). We can only measure a) the neural correlates of what we presume to be sensation or b) self-report of sensation. Our inference of sensation/sentience is based on the logical extension of our personal belief/experience of sensation to like organisms, machines, etc. but there is nothing in the known laws of the universe which define their nature/qualia (eg the redness of red) or when they emerge. I think we need to clarify this concept of "empiricism" to the audience (which is really the combination of the epistemological primacy of sense data and non-reductive physicalism). There is nothing faulty/incoherent with non-reductive physicalism, however it is critical to distinguish such from the concept of empirical observation (measurement).

2. This distinction prevents us falling prey to the kind of positivism which purports that everything accessible to us is accessible also to the empirical method. Physical is by definition (in physics) what is empirically measurable, and there is therefore a significant proportion of known (inferred) reality which is formally non-physical. Under the philosophy of "physicalism" however (which is somewhat of a misnomer according to the definition of physical), we assert that all of our experiential reality (mental properties) are mapped to physical reality (observables). There cannot be any phenomenological experience which is not grounded in nature.

3. Furthermore, this distinction prevents us from automatically assuming that materialism (non-reductive physicalism) is a satisfactory ateleological philosophy of mind. Under naturalism, a physical system evolves perfectly according to the laws of nature. Therefore, ostensibly emergent mental properties are redundant (see Jaegwon Kim on non-reductive physicalism; in particular his thesis on overdetermination). The organism (including its central nervous system) functions perfectly according to the laws of physics (be they deterministic or indeterministic) without any unnecessary strong emergent phenomenon. Strong emergent properties are qualitatively distinct from physical emergent properties (like crystals) in that they cannot be empirically observed.

Joseph Tagger: Can you prove you're self-aware?
Will Caster: That's a difficult question, Dr. Tagger. Can you prove that you are?
(Transcendence, 2014).

The apparently arbitrary assignment and nature of mental properties (evolutionarily irrelevant existence; our brain functions and evolves perfectly fine without them) leads most contemporary/secular philosophers of mind to argue either a) eliminativism, b) 'informationism', c) panpsychism, or d) simulation.

a) Eliminativism: that mental properties (or their perception of physical non-reducibility) are an illusion. Yet assuming that we take both our internal sentience (existence/experience) and our extrapolation of this sentience to like organisms as true (although such cannot be

empirically verified), what is its basis: why does it exist? Informationism, panpsychism and simulation attempt to explain why some systems (peculiar subsets of the universe in space-time; eg human CNS, Pentium III, etc) have this apparently emergent phenomenon.

b) 'Informationism': That mental properties are the natural product of complex arrangements of matter/energy above a given threshold of complexity (sentience is just as if not more fundamental than observables; in that the universal system "knows they are coming"). Informationism assumes that mind is the inevitable outcome of the arrangement of matter/energy in sufficiently complex states. Such however requires nature to be geared towards the creation of sentience, and is as such not indistinguishable from pantheism.

c) Panpsychism: That all physical entities have (the capacity for) associated mental properties. There is no distinction between physical and mental substances, though unlike physicalism the material does not take precedence over the mental. Panpsychism asserts that consciousness is an inherent property of all particles (energy/matter) in the universe. Panpsychist models are however not without their own limitations. Apart from their animistic inelegance (hypothesising sentient rocks for instance), nothing in the laws of nature define which systems (collections of particles in space-time) should combine to form complex indivisible centres of consciousness like you or me (the Combination Problem).

d) Simulation: That the material world as experienced by us is not the underlying construct of mental existence but merely the designated method for generating its experience. Simulation (like substance/Cartesian dualism) pushes back the problem of the underlying construct/laws of mind to another universe. This philosophy of mind has elements of theism (alien gods).

3. There is also another critical although somewhat unrelated limitation in the positivist analysis. Although one can observe a consistency between nature (regulated behaviour or causality) and logic, one cannot use nature to formally derive logic. This is a circular reasoning fallacy. One must assume reason as an axiom in order to make/process our empirical observations (follow the empirical method). For this reason logic (like mathematics) is declared to comprise non-physical abstract objects.

It is important to note that mental properties are not the same as physical (empirical) consciousness. Imagine a computer with a model of self (physical consciousness). It acts like an intelligent conscious being and its CPU (brain) and speaker (mouth) inform us that it is self-aware. We can measure this model of self and how it has been encoded in the computer ("I", "HAL", etc). Yet we have a choice (or must come to some philosophical conclusion as to) whether to believe that this model of self corresponds (maps) to an internal reality, or, conversely, whether it is merely a software program telling us what it has been programmed to tell us.

In the case of mammalian/human evolution, I think it is very likely that physical consciousness evolved for the purpose of enhancing the species' survival (ie it is adaptive, as opposed to being a byproduct, as referenced by [X]); but this says nothing of the reality of internal existence. Mental properties are functionally and therefore evolutionarily irrelevant from a physicalist perspective. The central nervous system of homo sapiens is declared to operate according to the laws of physics, and such laws only reference physical (eg neuronal) properties. A substance dualist could argue that mental substances (and their properties) serve some biological function, but Cartesian dualism has many problems not worth examining here (eg interactionism).

Mental properties are a sentient being's internal experience of objective/physical reality (this 'stream of consciousness' will include things like the smell of a particular flower or the colour of a particular region of one's field of view). Our own mental properties by definition can be observed (sensed/felt) by us, but;
1. We have no direct access to another being/machine's mental properties (and we only have indirect access if we make some philosophical assumption about their correspondence to observables; eg physicalism).
2. Mental properties cannot be measured (empirical observation). One cannot measure or confirm the existence of one's own or another's internal experience using the empirical method. In regard to [X]'s analogy, (under physicalism) our brain will encode some representation (through its neural networks) for this colour or smell, and this can be measured.

As you point out all human sensual experience (under naturalism) corresponds to a heavily processed reconstruction of reality (including object recognition, motion detection, categorisation etc). When the creature is in a "conscious" (aroused) state this experience is generally derivative from some external reality, but it all nonetheless corresponds to physical reality (the neuronal processing of objects, concepts, etc). Note even in our dreams/hallucinations/thoughts (internal verbalisations) one is still experiencing physical reality. It just so happens that the part of physical reality being experienced doesn't correspond to any reality outside of the organism itself.

The empirical method (measurement) doesn't need to be conducted by a sentient being (one could imagine an intelligent non-sentient machine deriving many truths about the world using the method and then stating its conclusions in a text box). This is the advantage of the method; it is entirely objective (based on its assumptions). One could argue that the Copenhagen Interpretation of QM suggests that measurement might require a sentient being however (many have). Taking its proposition of denying local realism, and then making the additional assumption that the wave function collapse occurring during measurement is caused by sentient observation. (Note this has got nothing to do with 'the observer effect'; the physical consequences of measurement on a system). Many however suggest that the wavefunction collapse during measurement is not a product of sentient observation, and suggest various alternate conditions for its collapse (for example decoherence and a spontaneous "minicollapse"). Likewise, even if sentient observation were required for measurement (and the outcome of reality itself/the collapse of the probabilistic wavefunction into a definite solution), it would be difficult to argue physicalism (given the primacy of mental reality; something akin to simulation theory). It does however solve the redundancy problem.

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Principle_of_locality#Copenhagen_interpretation

---

The scientific method requires empirical measurement and such measurement has no access to mental properties (it therefore cannot use them per say). Measurement only has access to physical properties (eg the state of a particle, neuron, etc). Under physicalism such physical properties are assumed to correspond to mental properties - however one would struggle to find a neuroscientist (speculating about philosophy) who adopts reductive physicalism (a 1 to 1 correspondence between mental and physical properties) based on how information is distributed across neural networks. Most physicalists uphold non-reductive physicalism; specifically the thesis of supervenience (that there cannot be a change in a substance's mental properties without a corresponding change in its physical properties), or attempt some form of eliminativism. Under the peculiar form of the Copenhagen Interpretation discussed, measurement requires mental properties but it does not use them per say (it still has no access to them).

This is correct. Not only is the empirical method inherently probabilistic (one can only conduct an experiment so many times to rule out anomalies; hence its determination of p values against a null hypothesis), but it is based on philosophical assumptions which are inherently unprovable (ie axioms). More generally, these include the validity of logic, the existence of self, the validity of mental properties to capture/experience a "real" (objective/physical) world etc.

The empirical method is based on an assumption of causality in the measured system; it was not designed to vindicate philosophers of the existence of a causal relationship between their personal experience of reality and reality itself. In fact, this relationship will vary heavily due to subjective biases (psychophysics). One does therefore not conduct experiments using subjective measurements (unless the underlying construct is difficult to measure otherwise; eg in psychology, in which case any differences between experimenter ratings must be considered systematics to be partialled out).

To quote the Lady Jessica from the Children of Dune; "All proofs inevitably lead to propositions which have no proof! All things are known because we want to believe in them!"

I completely agree this under the assumption of the existence of mental properties and their correspondence to physical properties. If an internal mental reality exists and has a relationship to the actions of the organism, then we would expect this internal reality to accurately represent external reality in a successful species.

Note in the case of psychophysics (eg rate how hot your foot feels on a scale of 1 to 10, is the horizontal rod longer than the vertical rod, rate how green the apple is, etc) one is not empirically measuring mental properties, one is measuring self-report (beliefs/conceptions) of mental properties. Under physicalism, the creature has evolved to believe in and value mental properties (the existence of "itself" as an observer/sentient being), but the reality of this encoded belief is irrelevant to its evolution - it only need be adaptive or otherwise a byproduct of related physical processes. a) One could say that the individual participants of the experiment are "measuring" (or classifying) their mental properties under the assumption of a correspondence between mental and physical reality. b) Likewise, one could say that the experiment is "measuring" mental properties under the assumption of a correspondence between the mental and physical reality of the participants. c) Furthermore, one could say that the experiment is "measuring" the participants' internal experience of this (non-empirical) "measurement" process (a) under the assumption of a correspondence between the mental and physical reality of the participants. But in none of these cases has empirical measurement of mental properties occurred. The only thing which has been empirically measured is self-reported beliefs of an organism.

An example of empirical measurement is a system that detects and counts the number of specific objects moving across a specific region in space-time. One could employ either machines or humans to do this task (both will be imperfect at the task, and must be calibrated/taught accordingly). But at no time is one empirically measuring mental properties. Likewise, one could obtain/measure self-reported experiences and propose a direct correspondence between what is seen (eg specific colour of a specific region in their field of view) and what can be independently verified (eg specific neurons being fired), but this is not an empirical hypothesis. It cannot be denied by observation and the prerequisite of empirical science is that one can at least in theory devise an experiment which would demonstrate the hypothesis to be false. Even if one conducted the analysis on themselves (took as true their own self-reported experience) no one else could independently verify it. Yet just because a proposition cannot be empirically verified, it doesn't make it a bad assumption. Such assumptions are necessary for things as simple as respectful communication (and others like logic are necessary for any form of communication).

(Under physicalism physical consciousness is encoded in the CNS; there is no need for any prior causation. [personOfSimilarConvictions] - are you referring to non-physical consciousness, or perhaps to another philosophy of mind?)

(I think you may have misinterpreted my definition of "physical consciousness"; "a computer with a model of self", as applied to a human being. I completely agree with your assertion regarding mental properties).

(ie the model of self may well have a survival advantage)

(One could imagine a skynet with a model of self versus a skynet without a model of self. The skynet with a model of self is going to have a higher probability of wanting to protect its circuits because it believes in more than just its circuits; it believes in the existence of "itself" as a non-physical being. Whether or not that self actually exists is irrelevant; it is another question entirely).

[Continued:]

I meant that the question is irrelevant with respect to the evolution (survival) of the system. As you point out, if there is such a correspondence between mental and physical properties (as most contemporaries would agree on), it is extremely philosophically relevant.

This is why philosophers debate the preconditions for strong emergence; when does it occur. Do mental properties just magically get assigned to complex carbon organisms in some primordial garden (as David Chalmers asks pointedly in his paper "panpsychism and protopanpsychism"), or is there a fundamental but presently unknown relationship between their apparent emergence and the underlying physical system (b, c, d). Perhaps we should start to question the existence of mental properties given their empirical irrelevance (a), etc.

What we are debating here is the fundamental point of the argument. From a scientific perspective, the only thing that is relevant to the evolution of living systems are entities which can be measured using the empirical method. If the physical (natural) laws are deduced(/inferred by induction) based on these empirically observable properties, then there is no reason to assume the existence

of any other phenomenon (non-observable properties; ie mental properties) as necessary for these processes to occur. Thus the amazing physical process (neural network processing/program) known as "physical consciousness" which enables the organism to survive in increasingly complex and threatening environments bears no weight on the existence of empirically non-observable properties (mental properties), and therefore their relevance to its evolution.

Under the assumption of physicalism (a common type of substance monism) some substances pertaining to living systems (which for the purposes of the argument I will add are arbitrarily delineated subsets of space-time) have both physical and mental properties, and so one could declare the mental properties relevant to the degree that they are associated with particular parts of these natural systems that are known to evolve (which for the purposes of the argument I will add are also arbitrarily delineated subsets of space-time; neural architectures). This apparent arbitrary delineation of these apparent (under the assumption of physicalism) emergent properties makes philosophers ask what defines such delineation and the preconditions for mental existence. Is it perhaps information (b) - the fact that certain parts of the physical universe are highly complex and process a lot of information? Etc. To put it another way, there is no functional difference between AI that are programmed to have a self but don't and AI that are programmed to have a self but do (where their programs are identical).

The "conscious ego" may be described in a specific scientific literature, corresponding to a precisely defined empirical construct (such as a tendency for the humanoid organism to exhibit the behavioural symptoms of self-awareness, volition etc). It may even refer to an internal philosophical consciousness, under the assumption of a correspondence between physical and mental properties as is commonly the case in post-behaviourist eg cognitive psychology (assumes that internal consciousness/experience is an emergent property of information processing in the brain). The existence of philosophical consciousness (mental properties) is however outside the scope of science to defend. We might use the empirical method to discover very similar living systems to ourselves (singular) which exhibit very similar patterns of information processing, and philosophically deduce that these probably also exhibit mental properties, but the question is ultimately irresolvable (at this stage of our understanding of the universe; within the current paradigm).

Decoherence depends on the environmental exposure of the quantum system (reduction of the probability of encountering inadvertently measured phenomenon or particles interacting with such inadvertently measured phenomenon). The level of decoherence experienced by a particle upon measurement will depend on the degree of information gained with respect to its momentum/position and the degree to which they constrain its possible pathways. For example, relative to the position and width of two slits through which the wavefunction must pass; if the measured position/momentum of the "particle" enables the experiment (or experimental measuring device <- undefined) to eliminate the possibility of the particle travelling through one of those slits, then it will be considered to have decohered. But if there still exists uncertainty in this question, the level of decoherence experienced by the "particle" during the measurement will be a function of this uncertainty. With no decoherence due to measurement (ie a complete failure of measurement) or external/environmental interference, the "particle" will behave according to its wave properties and proceed to pass through both slits simultaneously before interfering constructively/destructively with itself and collapsing to a definite state (at some other experimental measuring device such as a photodetector). The position at which it will be measured can be estimated statistically based on the probability wave function. For classical (large) phenomena like neurons, although they do interfere with each other, the level of decoherence observable by existent measuring devices is negligible. But this does not avert the problem of what causes the minicollapse (to a definite rather than a probabilistic state; even if that state were almost so certain to be definite).

We all know that if some random guy aligns to a perspective it doesn't make it their perspective. If one looks at the founders of quantum theory; they were all discussing this possibility (the role of the conscious observer in measurement) back to the days of Schrodinger's cat. The problem is that nothing within the Copenhagen interpretation defines what collapses the wavefunction in its totality (irrespective of decoherence; such final collapse being coined "minicollapse" in the context of decoherence). It is also the reason why many physicists (speculating about philosophy) take seriously apparently less intuitive QM interpretations (like Everett's many worlds). Furthermore, it is a reason why some were keen to bring back a deterministic interpretation (De Broglie-Bohm). It is an example of a philosophical anomaly.

I agree with a lot of what you are saying here. The problem of not knowing 'how it works' is equivalent to raising explanations for why it appears to work the way it does under the assumption of naturalistic mind (at least a-c).

The issue however with equating strong emergent phenomena (mental properties) with weak emergent phenomena (like wings, crystals, neurons) is that weak emergent phenomena are reducible to the physical construct. Only with a platonic outlook does one even believe that wings exist, as something more than ("over and above") the underlying physical system. With enough computational resources one could simulate the emergence of wings from the laws of physics and some initial conditions.

Yet regardless of their platonic/nominalistic outlook, there is a qualitative difference between a network of neurons firing and one's sensation of lavender. Even with enough computational resources, one will not necessarily be able to simulate the emergence of the sensation of lavender from the laws of physics and some initial conditions (it depends on the preconditions of such emergence). This is why philosophers don't take for granted that the 'how it works' explanation will belong to the same category of explanations (weak emergence) that derive atoms from subatomic particles, molecules from atoms, life from molecules, complex life from living cells, computers from complex life, and self-referential computers from their less intelligent or adaptive predecessors. Weak emergent systems may be supervenient on their substrate but this does not imply that every supervenient system (like naturalistic mind) is weakly emergent.

The question of whether the emergent property of wings exist, or the emergent property of a self-referential computer exists is relevant to evolution, but the question of whether the machine (organism) is self-aware is not.

I agree that if we could find out what were possible within the constraints of nature we could know what were inevitable - but the problem is that we do not know what is possible. We don't know the preconditions; as you point out we can only guess at them at this stage. Furthermore, discovering (guessing) that a phenomenon is inevitable given its environment is not an explanation (pertaining to internal consciousness, this is an example of the misapplication of the anthropic principle). One must still explain (eg provide some naturalistic explanation for) for why the neuronal-mental correspondence/mappings exist (hence a-d). What are the prerequisites for sentient beings - perhaps there are 5 identical sentient beings for every CNS, perhaps there are zero sentient beings for every CNS, perhaps there is one? What in nature specifies the rules, because the current laws of nature (physics) make no reference to such phenomena.

[Why can't mental properties be reduced to physics?]

Because mental properties have no functional impact on the system. If one considers natural law (physics) to be a complete description of the behaviour of the universe (a prerequisite of naturalism), then only physical properties can affect the evolution of the system (eg neuronal/ionic information processing, genetic code, etc): non-physical properties by definition cannot.

[How should we know that mental properties will not necessarily emerge from a computer simulation?]

The point is that we don't know. The fact we don't know something means that we must consider all the possibilities. And if it so happens that a i) complex organism or ii) computer simulation of a complex organism can produce emergent mental properties (although we will arguably never be able to demonstrate this under the current scientific paradigm; see transcendence quote), then we must ask why. Does it just happen magically because it was designed that way (teleology), or is there some fundamental reason for the emergence (eg b, c).

There is nothing wrong with making arbitrary philosophical assumptions in science - people do it all the time (eg methodological naturalism, non-reductive physicalism, etc). It would be very difficult for science to progress without these. But it is not the job of philosophy to make arbitrary assumptions and then make no effort to ask why these are being made. The reason there is so much variation in historical/intercontinental philosophical thought is because people are not ideological in their beliefs and are willing to question the reason for their assumptions.

Perhaps there are reasons for making such assumptions however? The problem is that a blind adherence to inherited western materialism is not a very good one - because it emerged from teleological thought. I gather that we are trying to produce systems of thought that are not dependent on teleology.

... I was not describing any theistic positions in this article (as they are not ateleological, contemporary or secular), however the infusion of the subject (soul) in a primordial garden is actually described by Chalmers in one of his papers (to point out the inconsistency/arbitrariness of strong emergence under an atheistic physicalism). It is cool that you picked that up.

The physical system is defined based on the influence of physical properties, therefore under a closed universe (e.g. naturalism), mental properties can have no influence on the physical system (like any other non-physical property). Under non-reductive physicalism (supervenience), even if one were to suppose that mental properties could influence the system (they had an appearance of influence), they could have no influence which could not otherwise be explained in terms of its physical properties - therefore they are redundant (overdetermined).

- Informationism (b) provides one method in which mental properties could have no influence on the system but be affected by the system; there being some feature of universal law which necessitates that they arise given a given level of local physical complexity.
- Panpsychism (c) provides another method in which mental properties could have no influence on the system; there being no material substances - only hybridised quiddities (which exhibit both physical and mental properties), the laws of the physical universe are governed by a subset of the features (physical properties)
- Teleology provides another method (they were designed that way).

//Reason
A copy of a comment on reason:

What I find fundamental about reason is that in order to speak about it one must assume that they are reasonable, but an assumption of their reasonableness (under physicalism) requires the physical construct to have evolved reason - the processing of information according to the rules of logic. Therefore, any communication is reliant on the assumption that our particular universe evolved in such a way that reason (conformity to logical rules) would be adaptive for the organism.

=== Politics ===

//War

If a country is going to lose their morality while fighting a war, how do you tell which side is good and which side is evil?

We certainly have a natural desire for violence (which is greater than the desire for sexual relations; enabling it to function as a precondition), but I am not sure if we have a natural desire for death. There might be evolutionary adaptations favouring the triggering of a war consciousness (the love of war), but it seems (for example) most of the heightened experiences presented could be attributed to misassociation of arousal. I would have thought the prevalence of team sport is the best evidence for a war nature (not Jihad or 20th century conflict); but in my mind team sport (and likewise war) is an ordered, human, reduction of the natural desire to fight (without M60s). And what goes on off pitch is almost entirely contextual (even if the emotions are being connected; especially the easily sexualised fight or flight response, and any subsequent need for purpose).

//Government

Although I will stay clear of the context of the conversation, I don't think there is any mandate for a government to enforce Christian virtues of self-sacrifice. They (like any nation) are obliged to implement moral policy, but when we expect another person or nation to engage in self-sacrifice; this may well be evil. It is rational to expect people not to be prejudiced where there is no reason to be, and in this sense social justice has its place (in tearing down constructional evils that feed off a police state). And it may be wise to encourage people on a personal level to love others. But forcing religious grade morality on people is quite possibly a very bad move. In our case it may have already backfired.

//Systems
The problem with any system (including the current one) is that they create artificial boundaries. They interfere with human nature. Thereby you end up terminating half your population because they, being so addicted to their systematically protected stimuli, have forgotten what a reproductive part is.

//Australian Broadcast Corporation

I don't watch TV or anything but it is a serious problem if the ABC is admitting bias (irrespective of the problem inherent in a biased organisation not admitting bias). In this respect I will go with [personOfSimilarConvictions]'s suggestion until they they work out who they are.

Adding now some personal experience, as I believe it is sufficiently justified to do so. Reflecting upon this further, I have refused to watch the ABC for the last 10 years (even when I had a TV) - and it has not just been my dislike for sly interviewing and fear monkeys (the psychological mechanism behind disrespect for nonconformism; easily primed). It has been the case ever since they normalised prostitution on the Australian Story 10 years ago.

//Socialism
http://www.churchmilitant.com/news/article/norwegian-govt.-seizes-5-children-from-parents-for-alleged-christian-indoct

---
And something I wrote yesterday which seems appropriate:

Socialism is not justice. Socialism is a twisted form of religious virtue. Morality is loving our neighbour (perhaps even our enemy). Morality is not making others love their neighbours and enemies.

Justice can only be granted by freedom; not economic systems. Any system that prevents humans from acting to destroy evil quickly and decisively is doomed to fall apart. The same applies for regulated "capitalism" (socialist protection of public advertising).

//Australian Refugees
It would be better if the church would risk their legal neck for something that is obviously morally wrong as opposed to something which might be. The purpose of offshore detention is deterrence; to prevent more people from coming half way across the world to seek asylum/other (and potentially losing their lives in the process). Moreover, it is important to recognise that sexual predators are exactly the kinds of people we don't want entering the country (12+ out of a thousand is not good enough). However, they should do whatever they feel is right: returning alleged rape victims or other women/children to their perpetrators is not a wise decision. Hopefully it will set a precedent for moral authority.

//Capitalism
The Internet was originally intended to be commercialisation free. I don't think there is evidence that commercialisation creates a better Internet. Perhaps the one exception is post-ICQ social media; but this relies on centralisation/monopolisation anyway. And there is Google perhaps, but there is no evidence that this has improved with increased commercialisation (I have been using ?complete=0 for the last 5 years, and have had to spend a lot of time challenging other annoying features). The documentary also fails to identify the fact the first world is living off the low labour costs of other countries, and it doesn't account for growing deficits (Australia practically lives off its natural resources). Most importantly, it ignores the fact that we outsource the cost of a lot of our more fundamental problems (sexual slavery).

The free market is a good thing - the problem is manipulation. Therefore capitalism is only good in so far as there is liberty. If capitalism denies individuals freedom of expression and replaces it with the freedom of "expression" (lies) of corporations then people will continue to fight against it (albeit with repressed rationale). It is good that the documentary made a distinction between corporatisation and capitalism however; monopolies are a bottleneck for a free market (especially when they are granted by the government; both hard and soft infrastructure).

As a general thesis: I don't think information flows well with corporate or government control. In everything we must always find the mean (everything has a place). But it is clear that human beings are not designed to be commercialised. Therefore individual liberty must always be placed above corporate or institutional liberty.

//Australian Broadcast Corporation
I think it is fair enough to describe a show that normalises brothel ownership as socialist - in that it doesn't distinguish between right and wrong, and brings everything down to the lowest common denominator. Yet it is interesting that such mimics the symptoms of extreme capitalism.. the commercialisation of everything and everyone.

The ABC are experts in fake neutrality (or at least they were when I stopped watching them 10 years ago). The only emotion that ever gets expressed is with regards to "harm" domain morality.

//Politics (the Australian Delusion Party)

I love the "evidence based" ideologies which would fall apart within 24 hours of the unavailability of contraception. Evidence based for an animal perhaps, or the progression towards one.

However, it is a pretty useful guide on party policy (partialling out the opinion) - it saves me the time I don't have to identify the mapping between policy and their arbitrary representatives.

//Politics (Liberal)

I think indiscriminateness is a great thesis on the modern Liberal. I still think however that it is more fundamentally a moral problem; blind indiscriminateness is consequentially (having failed) the devaluation of the reason/judgement/will power/morality necessary to overcome personal temptations towards our lower, primal nature. Cognitive dissonance which will ultimately lead to wretchedness and evil (conscious contradiction of truth) if left uncorrected.

There is however worth noting a difference in natural motivation and therefore moral prerogative of the sexes. Females are inclined towards reconciliatory and harmonic action (non-discrimination), where as males are motivated towards independence and discrimination. This is a direct byproduct of the conditions necessary to maximise our reproductive/genetic success in the natural environment (evolutionary fitness). As such I think any (eg political) analysis should be moderate in recognising both similarities and differences; that require assimilation and discrimination respectively.

Notice how the Liberal use of the word discrimination has a specific context, and how this maps directly to that of other-directed harm. Such encapsulates Liberal morality (the conservative valuing both spiritual self and other-directed harm).

I actually think it is a positive feedback loop. Moral failure leads to a devaluation of those philosophical beliefs necessitating moral behaviour, and vice versa.

//Politics (Progressivism)

[Regarding this proposition; To anger a conservative, tell him a lie. To anger a liberal, tell him the truth. / To anger a conservative, tell him that truth does not exist. To anger a progressive, tell him that truth does exist.]

I think that if they are framed in terms of moral conservatism/progressivism then the statements are true. All real progress is a consequence of technology.

//Politics (Race)
The black shooting hype (or at least how it has been presented in the media) appears to be a variation of the base rate fallacy.

//Politics (Nazi propaganda)
I didn't find it that disturbing. Implicitly educating children in the normality and equality of oral sexual activity is however disturbing. The greatest evil is the fall of the greatest good.

//Politics (gun law)
While I think guns are a primitive weapon, a country which experiences destability due to the availability of firearms has got more serious problems.

//Politics (Socialism/Capitalism)

This is right after Constantine - it is possible that socialism works within religious communities/societies, but in a secular world..?

I think it is important to recognise issues within capitalism also; free market extremism can be equally corrupt (commercial dehumanisation). For example, her position on republicans (libertarians) not being allowed to take a stance on the inappropriateness of using sexual body parts in commercial ventures is disjointed (which probably comes from having studied in Las Vegas; the path to evil begins with tolerance).

In my view there is no such thing as a socialist or a capitalist war. It is all just driven by morality. The moral side will win no matter whether it is conservative, progressive, totalitarian, or (classical) liberal. The only question is how many lives will be destroyed in the process. Socialism may happen to be inherently immoral as a political system, but that does not make capitalism of necessity any more moral.

Perhaps an over simplification, but I think it works as a general theory (it has the greatest explanatory power). According to the theory, socialism is seen by its citizens as having moral authority based on the progressively corrupt implementation of capitalism. Rather than address these issues (and cast the ring into the fire of mount doom), an ineffective and artificial patch up solution is created by the west (socialism, national or otherwise) while the ring will continue to destroy them from within. Evil societies are not sustainable (history demonstrates this; there will always be freedom fighters). However, we should avoid the backslide of a civilisation towards evil at all costs; because every life counts.

No private enterprise has social responsibility, but they do have moral responsibility. People can stop purchasing their product if they think they are not as socially beneficial as their competitors.

So oligopolies/monopolies which a disillusioned consumer can buy shares in are as crucial an issue as government funded propaganda? I agree that competition is required for economic efficiency, but to position economics above the principle of not using taxes to influence the population's psychology would be missing the point of 1984.

//Politics (government/liberarianism]

I think an appropriate role of an elected government is to stop people from being exploited (assuming the people want to have a moral society without dehumanisation), or if they are unwilling to do this they should let the people have free reign on such exploitation (remove laws protecting the advertisements of corporations).

Being paid the market price is however not exploitation. There is no moral reason why a low demand worker should be treated as something other than a low demand worker. Being low demand is a function of many things, but the primary cause is hereditary (education). People need to take responsibility for their progeny (including the viability of dependencies).

I would speculate that the minimum wage is related to welfare payments (which I will tentatively argue here should not exist) - in that there would be no reason to work for something less than one is earning by not working. I think [personOfSimilarConvictions]'s idea of a food(/shelter) safety net is sound. In any case, something is required to cater for the sexual artefacts of our irresponsible predecessors (who did not respect human nature and its origins, but instead took the ring of power to their peril). In general however, intervention is the role of philanthropy not government. Furthermore, if a government happens to think it is in its best interests economically to pay off potential criminals with welfare then their society has already failed. It is fundamentally immoral.

There is nothing wrong with natural selection - we are psychologically wired for it. Monarchies are the natural system of government and democracy is the experiment (take this as a fact not a judgement). One must therefore consider the consequences of when we don't let natural selection play its course. We for example might end up normalising the education system based on the lowest common denominator. Rather than research being based on reason, it might become based on ideology. It might nurture itself into thinking it is healthy to play with 4 billion year old instincts so long as we tell people off for not sympathising with objectively unattractive rejected individuals (who have turned to communism for comfort).

There are other reasons why a minimum wage should be reconsidered - to prevent third world servants from being employed into positions to which an artificially high demand native no longer has the dignity to accept. In any case, there will come a time when such unnatural disturbances will be corrected. With the rise of automation, people will either be educated and productive in a real sense (creative) or unemployed.

If people feel they are being "exploited" (underpaid) by being paid x they can leave. And if they were being "exploited" by being paid x the company will suffer because it won't be able to find a willing replacement (they won't be as good, or the cost of retraining will be too high). Morality is extremely important (to look after employees) but it doesn't need to be mandated - the free market corrects for this. Paying people for fun is not always good economics (business model); and if they are in a competitive environment they will likely go under. If a company wishes to engage in philanthropy then this is their choice.

I think the main issue people foresee with a free market is that once a person has lost their job they won't be able to find stable employment again. But should anyone want to work for a company that doesn't want them there? It is possible that bad management of corporations (or expectations of fluidity) can create a disincentivised labour market. But this again is where welfare can be counterproductive.

There perhaps needs to be better ways for good people (and therefore workers) to always obtain employment - rather than selling themselves (which is not particularly moral). This is where something like a safety net with mandatory employment for able persons might fit in; although in the present age it should become increasingly easy for employers to identify such persons. The same principle applies to political leadership (why vote for someone who desperately wants to gain votes when you can vote for someone who doesn't particularly care if they are there so long as the job gets done).

---
http://i.imgur.com/PYwoyiv.gif

//Politics (Western civilisation)
I think it is perfect. Western civilisation is presently characterised by pride. Societies don't generally get past this point (there is only so far self-absorbed progress can take you before it caves to reality).

Notwithstanding the Aristotelian mean or eastern balance

I don't know how exactly this relates to the education thesis, but I was thinking today that perhaps the difference between liberals (US) and conservatives might be driven by the form of discipline provided at a young age. With the way in which parents deal with conflict amongst peers. The conservative child being told to do the right thing regardless of the actions of their peers (and punished accordingly), and liberals being judged based on the amount of fairness they exhibit (perhaps even rewarding retribution in the most progressive affirmative action driven cases). The question being, which form of education is ultimately more beneficial for the child in dealing with human beings as an adult. With the universe being a difficult unfair place and people admiring and seeking virtue in others regardless of their circumstances.

//Politics (decentralisation)

Copying here part of a conversation I had over SMS 7 days ago;

Another solution might be decentralisation. Giving people the opportunity to live in the kinds of societies they want to live in. You can't make laws that people disagree with - this just constitutes tyranny. If this is starting to occur then it means there are too many laws - something has gone wrong - the system is unstable.
There is a great reference from the hitch hikers guide to the galaxy
"Arthur and Ford arrive on a vast spaceship carrying a team of frozen hairdressers and management consultants who, according to the ship's captain, are going to colonise another planet"

I should add that the only thing I think a federal government is needed for is defence.

//The lowest common denominator [a commentary on socialism]

The lowest common denominator can be used to reconfigure a set of two or more incongruent rational numbers (fractions) such that they can be combined to produce a rational number. Does one take the lowest common denominator and attempt to combine the rational numbers or does one declare various rational numbers irreconcilable? Moreover, what if the standard of a set of rational numbers decreases and they become less and less congruent (requiring a greater and greater common denominator)?

- If one supposes that there is image value in the problem, it would certainly help to visualise a set of two or more rational numbers.
- Any problem is limited by the time and resources required to solve it, and so a solution is not inevitable.
- It is correct to infer that combination excludes more complex operations which are not encapsulated by the concept of combination.
- The standard of the set is an evaluative judgment which serves some use in lateral applications of the problem, but it can be inferred that this pertains to congruency, and that this pertains to the size of the LCD required to combine the set.
- the size of the LCD certainly has some visual effect (image value), but it also (in context) maps to an increase in the complexity of the LCD determination.
- It is worth noting that not every rational number is a fraction.

Although I see no reason to limit the schema to a particular application, this was the original motivation for developing it; Those seeking to reengineer society based on the lowest common denominator should have an appreciation of the complexity of the problem it poses...

Congruent/incongruent (like standard) is an evaluative judgement based on the context of the LCD calculation problem (and serves some use in lateral applications of the problem). A set of rational numbers with denominators which are either identical to each other, divisible by each other, or small, could here be classified as congruent. Congruency speeds up the process of calculating the LCD. Ultimately, a set of integers (or fractions whose denominators are 1) are the easiest to process; so a set with a large number of integers pertains to a highly congruent set.

//Russia
His response is definitely more levelled than anything ordinarily produced by our democratic system.

//Moral ownership and politics
In a sufficiently socialist nation, separation must occur to prevent ownership of evil.

//USA Presidential
If what you suggest is true [personOfOtherConvictions], on what basis would you suggest that someone (for the last 100 years) accepted their government?

[personOfOtherConvictions], I was referring to your claim that "Most of it is just normal politics. Manipulation of the media and the public, lies about intent, and taking money from anyone who has an agenda. I guarantee is the same thing as every other candidate for the last 100 years." If fraud is just normal politics, why should anyone accept their ostensible democratically elected leader?

And you maintain that every candidate in the last 100 years has engaged in fraud? (For example, systematically manipulating polls and infiltrating rallies).

OK, so it is supposed that every successful American candidate of the last 100 years has engaged in fraud. Do you really think that a free people can be controlled by threat of a sword by a fraudulent syndicate?

So not only is it supposed that every successful American candidate of the last 100 years has engaged in fraud, but that the entire American population (presumably for the last 100 years) has been enslaved through propaganda. I think this is to avoid the very real possibility that not all (if any) successful candidates have systematically manipulated the populace to gain power, and that their population has not been universally enslaved. Which leaves open the question as to on what basis would a free people under the reign of a fraudulent syndicate accept the authority of their government?

[personOfOtherConvictions], you have shown a graph containing numerous people few of whom I recognise - probably because it is not representative of the last 100 years of political candidature. If you wish to make a claim that the fraud witnessed in the ostensibly democratic party is representative of the last hundred years then you need to back it up.

The novel is titled 1984 and pertains to a particular Party who wish to indoctrinate a revisionist picture of history. Furthermore, they manipulate language to achieve this goal. It favours the relativist pushing nonsense to bring everything down to the lowest common denominator rather than analysing the specific nature of events.

One method of demonstrating your claim might be to give evidence of the occurrence of similar events discussed in the article (beyond referencing the Internet), and then reasons for why every candidate for the last hundred years should have been equally likely to engage in such deception. Active poll manipulation, the employment of vigilantes to disrupt rallies, and the use of media syndicate relations (including the siphoning of debate questions) to gain power are some examples I have referenced. There are also apparent criminal offences involving direct lies to the public/investigators.

Yet irrespective of the validity of this claim, and assuming that we take the entire population not to be enslaved, there remains the core dilemma. On what basis would a free people accept the authority of their government?

It is difficult to argue that we have come full circle when you have failed to answer the same question (presented with ever generous clarity) four times. Furthermore your reference to being forced to accept the opposing candidature expose a degree of utilitarianism. Only utilitarians are forced to accept outcomes. Only utilitarians accept the lesser of two evils.

Nothing comes from an acceptance of a corrupt system, and of this you have made a worthy claim. However I implore you to reconsider your approach. By avoiding tough questions and resorting to crowd control, you only make the next generation vulnerable. For there will come a time when a free citizen asks the question: on what basis should they accept the authority of their government, having now been instituted by a fraudulent syndicate.

And so on this basis you would have the entire (successful) American candidature for the last 100 years locked up or otherwise charged with criminal offences, distorting polls, siphoning debate questions etc? You must understand that this is a big claim if you are not willing to substantiate it.

Regardless, there remains the core dilemma; on what basis would a free people support their government, having been instituted by a fraudulent syndicate. Because the free citizen who is not so easily subdued will in time ask it, and the moral responsibility for the correction that must follow will fall on those who failed to act. It might be that those who questioned the entire 20th century political system were indeed leading their contemporaries towards truth, or as Orwell would have us believe, that this was just another lie of the Party.

//USA Republicism
[in reponse to article on Republicism]

"They've gone back to the old formula that lost them the last two presidential elections.
LEWIS GOULD, PROFESSOR IN AMERICAN HISTORY"

This is the kind of logic I would expect from an ABC article - base policy on what people want.

"'What you're seeing right now is the last vestiges of the fight of the Republican Party against the New Deal and against the Republicans who accepted the New Deal,' Richardson says."

Obviously.

Perhaps they could have provided some analysis on the difference between slavery and redistributing someone else's money? People seem unwilling to take responsibility for the education of their progeny. This in itself is a good reason for monetary inequality. Without the natural consequences of failure, the system breeds victimhood and a lack of confidence in truth.

People who pay for private tuition are not learning anything more special than in state environments. They are paying for their children to be disciplined. State educators can't provide the same level of discipline because they can't command respect. They can't command the same level of respect because they have not the same standards of morality (or are being restricted by lowest common denominator regulations).

Meddling with nature might look good on your social report card - but it is not and has never been the call of moral philosophy. Those who respect and integrate natural authority are in effect paying for their children to be taught to not blame anyone but themselves. To focus on morality and not their rights.

The entire police force and legal structure is an artefact of bad parenting. Our only right as a human being is to not be lied to or violated, and these have become the least protected principles in a society built on irresponsibility and manipulation.

//Capitalism
There are worse things in the world than bankruptcy. The basic idea under capitalism is to build a better product. That said capitalism has its own flaws (real moral ones). But the complement of capitalism is not socialism, it is philanthropy.

Socialism poses a significant moral threat because people are inevitably forced to fund evil projects.

//Compulsory voting
The wonders of a compulsory voting state - you have to ban people who might take advantage of the fact half the population has no idea who (let alone cares who) they are supposedly voting for.

//Conservatism
I think the incest background strikes to the core of the issue. If the conservatives got it right then there wouldn't be any moral ground for communists to stand on. Likewise, if the monarchs got it right there would be no need for democracy. There is not enough light.

//Industrial Tax
Interesting that given 3 options of tax increase to accommodate your budget, you chose industrial (what would Will Wright think?)

//Right Wing
Actually they prefer the term left.

Only those who wish to use words to ignore having to forward an argument.

//Employment law
These communists have no idea. What if someone doesn't want to be discriminated against by their religious employer on grounds of an active adulterous relationship? Exactly where does the state's incursion on religious liberty end? Rest assured, I think a large proportion of the sanctification elite would have no problem inventing a mental disorder for people averse to "sexual freedoms" that they have deemed scientifically verifiable healthy behaviours.

It sounds like the social engineers are applying the same kind of relativistic interpretation that was used to twist the constitution into protecting obscenity in 1957 (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Roth_v._United_States; "applying contemporary community standards"). Some perverts might have been able to gain a foothold for evil by arbitrarily extrapolating constitutional rights, but what they have yet realise is that if they impinge upon the constitution there will be full out war.

//Genetic engineering
Patenting genetic code in the 21st century is like patenting some hack someone has found for the 4GB binary distribution of a closed source operating system.

//USA political candidature
https://www.buzzfeed.com/lesterfeder/this-is-how-steve-bannon-sees-the-entire-world

---
"The media bubble is the ultimate symbol of what's wrong with this country. It's just a circle of people talking to themselves who have no f***ing idea what's going on."

//USA political candidature
IMO he needs to read the Quran before dismissing cultural risk management, get out more (men will say things without caring how people might misinterpret them - especially when they are being challenged by an emotional/phobic audience), and perhaps marry an Ethiopian (not that there is anything wrong with that) before commenting on implicit racism, but in general he seems to present a reasonable analysis.

I often wonder whether it is even worth explaining to people how fanatical the media has become, when it is so obvious.
Perhaps we would be better off with the media continuing to live in their own little world? In any case I wrote this last Sunday;

What is sad is that behind all the blatant media bias there may actually have been some real moral calls being made (based in a reality of hard yakka and not some utopian pipedream), but as the boy who cried wolf determined...

//National sovereignty

Borders create competition, competition creates performance, performance creates wealth.

Think of a quidditch competition with just one house, a United States with just one state, or a Europe with just one kingdom

> ---
> That is why the assertions are not mandatory (must create; an A->B implication). One way of critiquing the proposition would be to find instances of wealth without performance, performance without competition, or competition without borders. Although the assertions are not exclusive either (is exclusively created by), if there is indeed a high probability of an inverse implication (B->A) then this would signify the existence of a meaningful relationship.

> ---
> - A wealthy inheritance requires past performance.
> - Even philanthropic performance requires a motivation to excel (and in this respect compete). Can labour without such a motivation (eg communism without the instillment of excellence) deliver performance?
> - while it is possible that competition can exist without preexisting borders (boundaries) between people, such divisions certainly support a motivation to compete. That is nonetheless an interesting observation regarding art.

The relations take into account the existence of borders in the law/protocol which divides one corporate entity (/business unit) from another, one family from another, etc

> ---
> No just fences separating people.

> ---
> Add chastity and proprietary to the list.

//Victimism
Somewhere along the line these guys have lost the plot. They need to stop enforcing socialism (equal opportunity is not a moral obligation), and get a job. If they can't find one because their society is too irrational to employ them then they need to create one and demonstrate just how wrong they are. All this presumptuous talk does is undo the good work of the indigenous heroes - and makes people start to believe that some races really are stupid (so much so that they need nannies or the police to look after them).

The same applies for gender socialism also - in case you were not sufficiently appalled by the insensitivity of this response.

Basically it comes down to means and ends - you can't achieve a good by ignoring the means. There is a place for meddling, and it is called religion. If one wants to force their beliefs on others at least be honest and declare a fatwa (or start a private email server and ignore the FBI; and no I am not vindicating anyone). The majority of people in human history haven't thought that their predecessors were ignorant suppressors, they just recognised that the technology of their day did not allow the same kind of freedom they share.

If there is any morality in race (which I doubt) - it owes to the preservation of the dominant race (or the natural leader in its context; the same applies to culture). I wonder how certain they are that races are genetically equal (or the evolutionary irrelevance of crossbreeding) - risk management would suggest letting nature take its course. Of course, if nature is your playset (and you can do whatever you like with it so long as you look after the trees), then perhaps there is no perceived risk to manage.

(Thought I would just read through the comments before posting; and the only thing I can add to the conversation is libraries).

Imagine educating people from a young age that they are (under)privileged. I can't think of a more insane thing to do. Or is this the kind of reeducation that only some citizens must receive? Is it like the sexual reeducation they receive in their state philosophy ("English") class? One can create psychological problems simply by supposing their existence.

It is interesting how the revisionists measure equality and privilege (how they define discrimination). What is their baseline? Is a deaf person who receives exorbitant amounts of attention and training discriminated against when they are laughed at for being pretentious or aggressive? Is the immigrant who receives the riches of a toiled soil and cleared land discriminated against when they are treated like a privileged agent? Or is a minority race discriminated against when they are less accepted in marriage (there is more intraracial genetic diversity than interracial diversity, but this doesn't mean race is not an indicator of genetic similarity and therefore a potentially rational basis for discrimination). Is a person discriminated against for being payed less for on average producing less, working shorter hours, or having spent less hours in training before being employed? Should we expect people to go against their nature?

You would think that the genetic elite who are discriminated against by their misfortunate class or wealth would be most justified in advocating socialism. Yet it is invariably the childhood outcast and physically unattractive who uphold socialism - being in most debt to rules that control the discrimination of their peers. It is much easier to explain socialism by natural selection than any system of ethics. It is not the desire for equality that drives them, it is the desire to obtain unnatural but evolutionarily advantageous outcomes.

There is nothing wrong with informing people of the similarities between them (or better still evidencing this), but to force them to behave like robots is strange. I am not aware of any traditional religion or philosophy that has sought this end, and I think it is more likely that the communist growth is not an advancement of humanity but rather a hijacking of the devastation of morale caused by the tolerance of the debasement of nature.

//Industrial tax

Although I don't believe in corporate or income tax etc (a simple 50+% GST on all end user transactions wired instantaneously would give the accountant brains something useful to do), collecting natural resource royalties should be as simple as creating a table like this; https://useiti.doi.gov/how-it-works/revenues

//Left/Right

Ideological progressivism is literally the disrespect of (or at best ambivalence towards) ancestors.

My immediate response; is it because they don't want to be right? "Left" movements (e.g. Marxism) seem to want to do everything but. It is a lot of work creating a house, being responsible for one's descendants, or adhering to western moral standards. And creating socialist utopias while eliminating respect for creators or natural order is at best amoral. Note the so called "extreme-right" (e.g. national socialism) has less to do with the traditional "right" (monarchism or religious conservatism) than standard conservatism (progressive reactionary). Yet it is not clear that such "leftist" movements can be reduced to the cause of sexual freedom (eliminating barriers to access for genetically superior mates), as traditional hierarchies and the free market (taken to the "libertarian" extreme this is another misclassification of "right") have equal capacity to enable this. Socialism may be a symptom rather than a cause of sexual libertarianism; the loss of internal virtue and psychological dependence. In the case of ideological "feminism" (as opposed to 'natural' equalities created by reproductive controls); cognitive dissonance at the incompatibility of their personal history (or those of their friends; including affectional development) with traditional social hierarchies.

I can think of another reason why people are left by the left for no apparent reason. I will call it the insecure appeasement theory of the socialist politik. What do open borders, social security, and a paranoid poppy cutting media have in common? All these polices act as appeasements to threatening outgroups and discipline ingroups who do not toe the line. One has to at least maintain a pretence of being nice if they are to maximise their chances of genetic survival in a threatening world. Make love not war.

One could think that all of the hundreds (thousands) of rapes that are occurring in Sweden by migrants are caused by mental illnesses like ADHD. Or they might actually recognise that multiculturalism is a problem but are willing to tolerate the collateral because they want to maintain the pretence of being nice - by any means necessary - in the hope of being treated nice. For the greater good. This is where classical left "tolerance" breaks down - the phenomenon only extends as far as you are tolerating attacks by threatening outgroups. People who do not pose a direct physical threat (eg moral/religious conservatives) are dismissed and ostracised (if not exterminated) because they threaten the be nice narrative. Everyone must play by the lowest common denominator.

The problem is that the be nice narrative only appears to operate when one's knowledge of humanity is constrained by 20th century thought. As soon as one endeavours to encounter a civilisation that does not adhere to sexual flooding (by reading a book or experiencing a subculture), they realise that the be nice narrative is superficial (prototypically childish) and only works on people who are as emotionally shallow (and psychologically dependent) as themselves.

//International Poverty
I think the evaluation is wrong for the most part (cause/correlation fallacy). Furthermore, an adoption of this kind of deterministic mindset is probably the greatest threat facing the development of such nations;

1. A concept of corruption presupposes morality, but the problem with such poor counties is that they don't have histories of philosophical development instilling a mythos which enables neutrality and discipline.

2. The idea that atheism leads to wealth is weird; the development of the first world occurred in a heavily religious and teleological environment. Rather, one should look at the contents of specific religious beliefs. Some have even changed over time (e.g. emphasis on work ethic or social justice), accounting for changes in productivity. As noted, first world foreign debt is currently on the path towards modern Greece - although this has probably more to do with socialism and immorality than atheism per se.

3. I thought geography is the one factor identified here with a fundamental influence on wealth. But it hasn't always been this way, and it is certainly not universal. Our first anthropocenic technology grew out of some of the most desolate regions on the planet. Some of the driest cities on earth have been the richest - they built aqueducts and were big on trade. In general, harsh climates facilitate innovation (evolution).

If one wants to identify causal influences on wealth then they should examine either a) how countries have become rich, and b) how countries have become poor. The answer to b) is economic socialism, and the answer to a) is morale.

//Socialism/liberty
One cannot use a good intention to justify an evil (forcing someone to do something). A person's right to interfere with another human being extends only to prohibitory morality. The alternative is to make them your slave. While there is nothing inherently wrong with serfdom (people choosing to live/work in another's country according to the wishes/plans of the king/queen), a democracy whose representatives attempt to implement this against the will of one or more members of the community is by definition tyrannical.

The only just exception is national security, but even this must be invoked with caution (for example, visiting the Tower of London one might be informed that one or more of KHVIII's wives were imprisoned/terminated for the purposes of national security). One might present other exceptions like taxes, but in reality it is only moral to give people the option of doing/paying such (if they wish to obtain the relevant services in return; roads, social security, police, firefighters, government, etc).

//Socialism
Jubilee refers to a religious tradition within a religious community, but on the topic of imitation of Christ there is more than just poverty available.

//Socialism
I agree that this dimension of power is far more informative than the traditional left/right dichotomy (which despite having some evidence in the scientific literature suggests that state power is inevitable). There is however another dimension which is perhaps less relevant to the near universally unconscientious world we find ourselves in but nonetheless I would argue even more important than power; that of morality. While democratic republics are an ideal system, there is little historic evidence they are stable, and like all others rely on the morality (and wisdom) of its populace.

Alexander Fraser Tytler;

"A democracy cannot exist as a permanent form of government. It can only exist until the voters discover that they can vote themselves largesse from the public treasury. From that moment on, the majority always votes for the candidates promising the most benefits from the public treasury with the result that a democracy always collapses over loose fiscal policy, always followed by a dictatorship. The average age of the world's greatest civilizations has been 200 years. These nations have progressed through this sequence: From bondage to spiritual faith; From spiritual faith to great courage; From courage to liberty; From liberty to abundance; From abundance to selfishness; From selfishness to apathy; From apathy to dependence; From dependence back into bondage."

From this perspective, the association between monarchy and totalitarianism implied by the unidimensional spectrum of power is misleading. A monarch is no more controlling than an infinitely regulated bureaucracy (as is a meek but powerful horse). In either one must give homage to the state religion under threat of imprisonment, or address another by their chosen title under threat of imprisonment. Likewise in an unnatural state, the religion is invalid and the titles are unearned: one can face imprisonment for any number of inventions of the imagination.

Monarchy is closer to anarchy; families accumulate resources and those resources become their kingdom. There is always the possibility of a despot, but there is reason to believe this is not the historic norm. The worst forms of "monarchy" appear when there is a) a state attempting to gain power, or b) an an individual attempting to overthrow a state. But (a) when the state has been granted power through a commoner parliament this is technically no longer a monarchy. Likewise (b) a self-installed dictator or his children is not a monarch. Threats to power by unnatural entities appear to bring out the worst in human beings.

This principle applies more generally. Unnatural systems imposed on others for whatever reason don't seem to work. The most extreme example being communism. A less obvious example; the formation of a republic through theft/vandalism of property. Morality is the key to civilisation, and in this respect I would consider it the unidimensional factor of choice, if political systems were to be rated on one dimension.

Why is prostitution, and female body sharing more generally, now so high as to the point of being normative when the explicit purpose of individualising the vote was to protect women from lifetimes of objectified misery and reliance on other people's resources? Or further still, what evidence is there that a non-meritocratic democracy actually works when the majority might just vote to have a minority give them resources until the country is ruined? There is nothing fundamentally good about an amoral system, whatever its structure.

Thus I don't think power is the best factor on which to define a political spectrum, but morality; where morality is subject to nature. Yet in a world with few great moral houses and near universal depravity (it is ironic that religious societies are morally superior by orders of magnitude), power is perhaps the best dimension on which to differentiate existent political systems. For this reason also, the only moral state available to us has minimal governance - one where people have the freedom to take down immoral entities.

From a letter to Christopher Tolkien (29 November 1943);

"My political opinions lead more and more to Anarchy (philosophically understood, meaning abolition of control not whiskered men with bombs) - or to "unconstitutional" Monarchy. I would arrest anyone who uses the word State (in any sense other than the inanimate realm of England and its inhabitants, a thing that has neither power, rights nor mind); and after a chance of recantation, execute them if they remained obstinate! If we could get back to personal names, it would do a lot of good. Government is an abstract noun meaning the art and process of governing and it should be an offence to write it with a capital G or so as to refer to people. If people were in the habit of referring to "King George's council, Winston and his gang", it would go a long way to clearing thought, and reducing this frightful landslide into Theyocracy.

Anyway the proper study of Man is anything but Man; and the most improper job of any man, even saints (who at any rate were at least unwilling to take it on), is bossing other men. Not one in a million is fit for it, and least of all those who seek the opportunity. And at least it is done only to a small group of men who know who their master is. The mediaevals were only too right in taking nolo episcopari as the best reason a man could give to others for making him a bishop. Give me a king whose chief interest in life is stamps, railways, or race-horses; and who has the power to sack his Vizier (or whatever you care to call him) if he does not like the cut of his trousers. And so on down the line. But of course, the fatal weakness of all that -- after all only the fatal weakness of all good natural things in a bad corrupt unnatural world -- is that it works and has worked only when all the world is messing along in the same good old inefficient human way. The quarrelsome, conceited Greeks managed to pull it off against Xerxes; but the abominable chemists and engineers have put such a power into Xerxes' hands, and all ant-communities, that decent folk don't seem to have a chance. We are all trying to do the Alexander-touch -- and, as history teaches, that orientalized Alexander and all his generals. The poor boob fancied (or liked people to fancy) he was the son of Dionysus, and died of drink. The Greece that was worth saving from Persia perished anyway; and became a kind of Vichy-Hellas, or Fighting-Hellas (which did not fight), talking about Hellenic honor and culture and thriving on the sale of the early equivalent of dirty postcards. But the special horror of the present world is that the whole damned thing is in one bag. There is nowhere to fly. Even the unlucky little Samoyedes, have tinned food and the village loudspeaker telling Stalin's bed-time stories about Democracy and the wicked Fascists who eat babies and steal sledge-dogs. There is only one bright spot and that is the growing habit of disgruntled men of dynamiting factories and power stations; I hope that, encouraged now as 'patriotism,' may remain a habit! But it won't do any good if it is not universal.

Well, cheers and all that to you dearest son. We are born in a dark age out of due time (for us). But there is this comfort: otherwise we should not know, or so much love what we do love. I imagine the fish out of water is the only fish to have an inkling of water. Also we have still small swords to use. 'I will not bow before the Iron Crown, nor cast my own small golden sceptre down.' Have at the Orcs, with winged words, hildenaeddran (war-adders), biting darts -- but make sure of the mark before shooting."

([personOfSimilarConvictions] I think you anticipated my objection).

=== Racism ===

//Affirmative Action (critism of racial difference recognition / "whitesplaining")

I think that we should all notice other people with glasses. People who do not enact such humane affirmative action measures are clearly demonstrating optics-spanning.

//Racism (Australian Aboriginal)
Basically there is an educational fallacy at work. If someone thinks it is correct to steal a wallet from a teenager driving them and their mates to and from an event then they shouldn't pass primary school. Regardless of their race (or history). Education without discipline is an interesting exercise; we are the great experiment.

Furthermore, it is very easy to create psychological problems by pretending they exist. I agree with [personOfOtherConvictions]; everyone loved Cathy Freeman. Although anyone not inclined to marry a person of an opposing skin luminosity is technically a racist (pretty much everyone is; if they weren't then intracultural races wouldn't last very long), real "racism" (which should probably be called whiteism, or if you are a feminist, blackism); the treatment of another human being as less than human is the exception in our culture and has been for a long time.

People need to stop defining themselves by their race; the interracial genetic variability is less than the intraracial genetic variability (apparently). Illogical biases are easy to rid of. But once a bias becomes rational (people feel that another group is wasting their time, or irrational things are being imposed on them like apologies for introducing clothing - or the genocides of an historic culture that thought they were racially superior) then biases can very easily become ingrained.

I have never heard about this AFL player - there used to be some really good aboriginal AFL players. But if this comment was made by a child on the basis of a socialised antagonism with a race, those people bringing up the past need to ask whether it would have happened had they not brought it up.

Finally, irrational biases can't be eliminated by affirmative action - such is contradictory. If one's hypothesis is equality then that needs to be one's strategy - this basically means disregarding race entirely in decisions and not talking about it anywhere including in the law. There are always going to be insecure people who want to create unnatural categories, but this is just something which can only be solved morally. It is best just to ignore it. We can have confidence that the temperance of the founding exemplars who taught us just how human we all are will ever outshine the hypertension of the less educated generations.

... just seeing some guy (or girl) live does more to correct irrational biases than any discussion of them...

The reason that this is even an issue at this point in time is because the moral justification of colonisation has been nullified by the degradation of our culture. If I had my culture wiped out and replaced with one that would soon become an evil mess I would be pretty annoyed. Those compromising their principles (and those of their neighbours) should be apologising to the natives.

//Nazism
I have read enough of Mein Kampf to know there was more than scape goating behind his mission. The fascists were largely a reactionist movement against the oncoming tide of moral corruption. They had seen it coming and sought to halt it by force. The minorities who were viewed to destabilise their civilisation took the brunt of this correction protocol. Being caught up in the Arian myth (eugenics was globally popular at the time) and in an effort to the deter the weak willed west (who needed alliances to defend themselves), they implemented mass exterminations. Of course, we could pretend they had no moral purpose outside of majority protection and grievance, if it made it simpler for us. The nature of evil is that being the corruption of good, it requires good to begin with. If we cannot learn from the motives of Hitler, Bin Laden, a serial killer, or even a child abuser (and not just reduce them to deterministic propaganda for our own utopia) then chances are history will repeat itself. Moreover, we should be ever vigilant, and wary of the possibility that the Republic has become the very evil we have been fighting to destroy.

//Affirmative action
The only racially discriminate behaviour I can identify is the fact there was an indigenous computer lab. In this sense everyone who didn't speak out against this and request a "white supremacist computer lab" could correctly be defined as racists. "Stopping segregation with segregation" is not only racially neutral, it is a completely valid argument. It is sad that Australia has been wrapped into this cowardice. They really should be requesting millions in compensation, considering it appears they actually took their valuable time out and went to court. A free citizen has no obligation to do so.

I think it is reasonable that someone bred on affirmative action when waking up to the reality of equality could experience serious trauma. If only someone could inform them that the social engineers who invented this diabolical nonsense had way too much time on their hands as a result of an overfunded university system. The longer they stay on the drip the longer (by probability) it will take for us to say see a respected prime minister of some aboriginal descent.

//Racism
[Regarding #SayNoToSegregation]

There is something eerily familiar about the bus. Furthermore, it tastes better when the white and milk chocolate are separated. I wouldn't consider that a joke, I would consider that a fact. If there were no unconscious bias then we would all be brown (homogeneous) within two generations.

//Affirmative Action

Prof Robert Lekachman: "... the problems have been of long standing in our society. The remedy of affirmative action is a novel one. The University of California when it presented an affirmative action plan proposed to make about half a dozen women and blacks full professors in about twenty years as I recall the program."

Dr Thomas Sowell: "There were various fractions of people who would become things in various period of time... Various fractions. They would add 3.5 more women and things like that and I was always fascinated; I had some suggestions to the people I thought would be right for the point five but these suggestions were not well received."

Dr Thomas Sowell: "It is fascinating, I see this happening in all sorts of issues from Federal Reserve policies on across the board that you say this here is this wonderful program and it will do wonderful things and the burden of proof is on others to show that it will not do those things and no matter how long it's been going on it's never long enough. If it failed there just wasn't enough commitment, the budget wasn't big enough, should have had a larger staff, wider powers. But there is never any sense of a burden of proof on you to say when you've made this change that has caused such [inaudiable] in this country, and has gotten people at each other's throats including people who have been allies in the past such as blacks and the Jews - there is never any sense of a need for you to advance the empirical evidence to support what you've been doing."

Prof Robert Lekachman: "On the contrary Doctor Sowell I'm perfectly willing to have other people collecting empirical evidence - that's not my bag - but I'm perfectly happy to subject the affirmative action policies to reasonable statistical evaluation given a sufficient period."

Dr Thomas Sowell: "Well what is a sufficient period. You said for a bit, and now we talk about a sufficient period and I have difficulty with these - well what temporal units that we talking about? Centuries? Decades?"

Prof Robert Lekachman: "Well I would think of 20 to 25 years is a reasonable period because we're talking after all among other things about the progress of just hired law firm associates up to the grandeur of partners and so on.."

Dr Thomas Sowell: "Wait most blacks are not about to become law firm associates. The real problem is the kid in the South Bronx well has a tough time getting his first job as an unskilled worker because the employer is scared to hire him because if he doesn't work out and he fires him he may have to deal with the NAACP, with the EEOC and God knows who else."

...

William Buckley, Jr. (host): "It is also true that after the war there were nine percent black teenagers unemployed now that figures more like forty percent and that's supposed to be after 40 years of progress under your system."

Prof Robert Lekachman: "Unfortunately not under my system because we lacked the time fully to sketch my utopia..."

-- 1983

//"White Privilege"
The evidence suggests that "outside" (state) help has been a systematic failure. We can't engineer human beings; playing god with other people's money is fundamentally immoral and is doomed to fail. If people wish to help others they should engage in philanthropy, charity, philosophy, or sport.

...

If someone really wanted to help 'black' people (or any other underperforming demographic), they would stop third world immigration. The democrats have been importing slaves for far too long, and we should give their country of origin a chance to develop (stop taking their best people and breeding with them).

With 25% of the US female population on antidepressants (soma), and an 85% male youth pornography addiction rate, I think it is safe to say that the need for artificial birth control has more to do with control than birth. It would seem we need to rediscover the benefits of apparel.

http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/1753-6405.12678/full

---
I think one will find that 'white privilege' is a self fulfilling prophecy. The state of various democrat run cities strongly supports this.

The same will necessarily occur for other artificial concepts. Take for example 'male privilege'; the only thing it has created is mass prostitution and antagonism between the sexes. Sure males might seem nice and somewhat indifferent to being branded privileged if they can mentally access 20 young women a day (the human vision system operates primarily on contrast/shape detection so the quota needn't even be pornographic). But utimately, if one tries fighting nature they are going to lose. In this case 1 billion years of evolution (as opposed to something like 40000 years of evolution with respect to race). People are not going to conscript women to fight in wars. Contrarily, technology might enable a significant level of real equality, but this doesn't involve imposition.

Now assuming that a demographic has no intrinsic (genetic) properties biasing their performance in a given environment. This assumption is theoretically weak based on what we know about biological evolution but we can go with it for the sake of the argument. If the demographic is performing poorly, what is the most moral course of action?

1. Identify a better performing demographic, take their money by force, and redistribute it.
2. Tell someone to go to a library, and if they don't listen it is their own fault for failing and they must take responsibility for their actions.
3. Force someone to do their homework, and if they don't obey, make them do twice as much after school (iterate ad infinitum).

1. Socialist
2. Libertarian

3. Conservative

The problems with socialism (1) are as follows;

a) The two known (empirically observed) indicators of economic performance are 1. general intelligence and 2. conscientiousness. The genetic contribution of these traits is typically measured to be 70% and 50% respectively. Private schools aren't particularly special; it is known that intrinsically bright students do well regardless of education quality. The primary difference they provide is discipline (the emulation of conscientiousness). A fear of national socialism appears to have made people afraid of conservative education, but the problem isn't discipline, it is socialism.

b) Turning people into victims is counter productive. (Privileged compared to what? Living in Africa? The outback? Being an eunuch slave in the Middle East? A foot soldier? An unproductive farmer?) The only people it benefits are elites who head up political parties which rely on buying votes by taking and redistributing money. There is no evidence socialism works. Historically, it has resulted in something like 90% of all systematic exterminations in the 20th century (national socialism and communism combined). This is no surprise, because feelings are only weakly (and oft negatively) correlated with facts. Redistributing other people's money might have all the good intentions in the world, but it just provides an incentive not to work (overcome the underlying problem). The same applies for other constrained-market policies like minimum wage and HR (an incentive not to employ). Contrarily, a free market provides an incentive to work for oneself and one's children.

c) Assume an individual representing an underperforming demographic is "given" money, what is the probability that they will make an equally fruitful investment? Similarly, to what extent is group based discrimination (eg discrimination based on race/gender) dependent on some arbitrary bias ("racism"/"sexism"/etc) and not the average performance of the group? It is economically rational to discriminate against an individual who is known to have a lower probability of delivering economic value in a given environment; whether through quality, initiative, hours worked, dropout, etc. Even if this performance difference is a social construct.

d) At a more fundamental level; ends don't justify means. Who is going to "give" them that money? It is moral to prevent people from acting immorally (prohibition), but one can't compel people to act morally (altruistic obligation); this requires forcing a world view on another person. It doesn't matter how logical that world view might be, forcing someone to be altruistic is internally inconsistent (illogical and evil). Even if one's world view was exclusively darwinian (the ring of power), why should they dictate and not another - what makes them a better dictator?

=== Relativism ===

I found the reviewer's conclusion a bit shallow (on behalf of his mother, our forefathers, and those around him who have put in some effort), although I understand why he might feel that way. The reality is you make your own reality (and sometimes it involves having to do something extraordinary). If you think the universe is cruel and purposeless it most certainly will be. Still contemplating the need to do something if the universe is purposeless..

//Scepticism

Scepticism of any form of conditioning is necessary. Scepticism regarding absolutes is ungrounded.

//Relativism

I recently had a conversation about similar proofs (in this case recursive sentences). In order to resolve the dilemma I argued that statments are either a) nonsense, b) false, or c) true. I would consider the statement "Absolute truth does not exist" to be an example of a.

If absolute truth did not exist then nothing could be properly said about anything. I appreciate [personOfSimilarConvictions]'s approach, as you can prove absolute truth exists according to your existing assumptions (i.e. that you believe in it).

"The only absolute truth is that all other truths are relative" assertion is equally as fallacious as it is again taking for granted logic as an absolute truth.

I highlighted that the argument demonstrates that we believe in absolute truth; it need not be interpreted as a proof of absolute truth. Without the assumption of absolute truth, there is no point communicating, as communication relies on propositional logic.

=== Religion ===

//Morality
If the traditional motive for morality was religious beliefs regarding the afterlife, why did the church bother torturing people?

//Temples
[personOfOtherConvictions] I am liking that earlier one of yours because there is a serious gap left over when traditional religious beliefs have been rejected by the populace - people would probably like to still have some place where they can rock up in peace and quiet and reflect on life the universe and everything without having to commit to any particular doctrine or mythology .

//Faith
Interesting - but if faith isn't a game, then what is? It is perhaps the ultimate game - it doesn't exclude anyone and you bet your life on it. Some even claim that you bet your eternity on it.

//Religious morality
The issue is that they think people have been brainwashed by traditional religion. But the fact of the matter is that it is very difficult to determine who has been brainwashed in a society approaching 80% dehumanisation engagement.

I think there is evidence that dehumanisation enters religious teaching (repression of societal experiences), and religion itself can propagate dehumanisation. As for its scriptural basis, this is questionable (it depends on its interpretation; although I am not defending it here). And regarding unrealistic guidelines - effectively this comes down to moral standards. If the same guys had been writing this in the year 2015 what would they have been talking about? I doubt for example that they would have been decrying the moral inflictions of a modest community - they probably would have been critiquing the source of contemporary immorality (tolerance of dehumanisation).

//Creation (Personal God)

The hide and seek analogy is quite illuminating.

But in the interests of giving a potential creator a fair trial, consider the following;

- any evidence of "intelligent design" in observables would create immediate scepticism with regards to the primacy of their creator. We would thus anthropomorphise them as an alien demigod, and continue to seek answers regarding the ultimate First Cause.
- if they wanted their existence to be self-evident they could just position a big sign in the heavens stating "Hi I'm God - I made you all". But this would admittedly be quite lame (not to mention exacerbating).
- it is possible that they wouldn't want to bias the teleological inferences of one generation over the next.
- freedom requires choice of belief.
- adventure requires a search for meaning ("wouldn't want to spoil the punch line").
- journeys are often just as important as their destination.

The question I ask is whether there is realistic alternative for a theistic universe? (Case 1)

...

If God wanted to say hi It would be pretty easy right? Just print in the night sky a big permanent hello; "Hi I am God, I made you all" - see case 1.

        Instead all we see is starlight, galactic redshift, and the CMB. A big permanent sign that the universe had a beginning. Would a steady state universe with clear indications of biological engineering would be more convincing of theism? No - anyone worth half their weight would infer alien origins. A "creationist" universe is exactly the kind of universe in which atheism would thrive.

---
a) Assuming metaphysical libertarian free will (ML) exists and was created, evil happens because people give into irrational desire (and the consequences propagate throughout society).
b) Assuming ML does not exist (cf compatibilism) and determinism was created, then evil happens due to natural instabilities in the physical system. Evil happens for the same reason people suffer and die; because it enables the existence of higher order experiences (the noble truth; Buddhism, yin and yang; Taoism, Cardinal virtue; western philosophy).

The first is an argument from freedom, the second is an argument from experience.

If God exists and blowing the trumpet isn't their kind of style, what kind of style is it?

//Religion
[responding to proposition: religion is evil]

While I agree that religion is often evil (and the greater the good, the greater the possibility of evil/corruption) - I don't think the religion is evil picture is the whole story. Religion is a byproduct of our natural tendency to respect and perceive consciousness. This should point to the fundamental truth religion attempts to reconcile with reality. It is also why we find the hard problem of consciousness discussed

last in the God Delusion (being the basis of religious belief). There is nothing inherently illogical with such philosophical extrapolation, although our knowledge of evolution suggests this speculation might possibly be mistaken.

Any productive assessment of the matter requires a consideration of multiple philosophical variables, including the noble truth of suffering (case 1: yin and yang/cardinal virtue), the existence of physical law (case 2), the combination problem (case 3: the mapping of phenomenological consciousness/mental properties to neural processes), and non-physical abstract objects (including their emergence within physical systems, eg logic). I don't think metaphysical naturalism is impossible, I just don't think we have the confidence to make religious claims in its favour. In particular, while I respect Dawkins' earlier scientific works (the selfish gene), I think he struggles to paint a self-coherent picture of what it means to live in accordance with our knowledge of nature. The most he seems to offer is Darwinian consciousness - but this is a paradigm not a theory (a framework by which we postulate and explore theories of reality). Unlike theism, atheism is not a positive thesis on existence and must provide one.

Furthermore, any empirical theory needs to make testable predictions, so while multiverse theory is interesting, it is presently philosophical (and may remain so). Likewise, although it is a necessary requirement for atheism (to explain the fine tuning of our universe's parameters), it has limited utility in solving any of the aforementioned limitations. The best it offers is in the way of case 2, in that by not being able to observe it, it might not have a beginning.

With regards to the specifics of religion, monotheism was a significant improvement over the polytheist practices of the time. The Jewish law was remarkably moral compared to the practices of their neighbours (even though it, like its mythology, is arguably derived from Babylonia to some extent). Likewise Islam was radical for its time and location; giving female infants a right to life (see the Quran). Buddhism was a substantial upgrade over the palace life. And in Christianity, it was said that there is neither Jew nor Greek, slave nor free, male nor female.

Slavery predated monotheism, and we are still trying to get rid of it. It just keeps appearing in new forms - the number of western males who live by the perpetual slavery of hordes of virtual women is astounding. Our culture suffers from mass sexual addiction; so even the males have become enslaved to their desires (in addition to those women and children who have been commercially exploited for their beauty). Freedom from material addiction has traditionally been the preface of religion, and it is not surprising western psychology is trending back to its prehistoric impulses. I am not even certain if it would be respectful to our ancestors to consider its progression as matching precivilisation. There are however a variety of non-human species whom we are regaining an affinity with.

While morality is arguably natural (like religion, a logical consequence of engrained belief in the value of mind), religion offers meaning and purpose - a reason to be human beyond the sheer logic of it all (self-consistency). This is why high level morality (abnegation) is often religious.

Religion is not overly concerned with basic/natural morality (apart from that which is technologically independent: precepts required by all societies). It is traditionally concerned with extraordinary morality. To interpret x000 year old documents as a moral handbook for an arbitrary era is missing the point. The most such can demonstrate is that bible worship is an artefact of the reformation.

However, it is likewise missing the point to reject x000 year old moral standards - morality can only improve; its demands on virtue can only increase. It is fanciful to reject the presuppositions upon which their morality was defined (respect for nature - a consequence of teleology), while pretending to respect the original authors. Paralleling this, I find some modern incarnations of naturalism disturbing. They are not based on nature at all, they are based on hedonism.

While I don't assign to the opinion that moral objectivism is a consequence of religion, one must ask ourselves the consequences of positive atheism - what this means for our respect for and adherence to natural truth (including morality). Who become the gods? What does it mean to be godless? And on what basis does one then advocate adherence to the moral law.

Finally, I should again emphasise that religion is founded on honouring the possibility of a creator; or those upon whom our existence is contingent. And in this sense it is a fundamentally moral response.

//Anthropology of religion (/animism)
[In response to observation of extensiveness of human religious history;]

I think the anthropological conclusion here would be that people tend to raise mind above observable reality.

Nothing demonstrates that this is a faulty assumption. Its present reduced prominence in western literature is an artefact of methodological naturalism - scientists (rightly) don't carry through this assumption for human minds because to do so would make it impossible to study them. But to generalise this assumption to all possible mind is classic non sequitur. It is as arbitrary as assuming that computers can never gain consciousness or that all possible universes must follow our same basic laws. We can't pick and choose when and how to generalise a phenomenon because we think that we are the gods.

Furthermore, we know that this assumption is not an artefact of psychologically intuitive substance dualism (children's default philosophy of mind) because many if not most historic religious cultures believed in the human soul being tied to the body.

Finally, why would one assume that gods go by the same name when they have been independently derived?

//Religion Tax
I think [personOfOtherConvictions] was asking whether there was a reason why religious organisations should be tax exempt. It doesn't require a motive to ask such a question.

I think the original tax exemptive law was created because law makers (and their society) believed that civilisation was built on supernatural principles. In fact there is no evidence that a society can subsist without them. Our current society is evolving rapidly, and it is far from clear at which point it will regain equilibrium. Or what would happen to it if it suddenly lost its stimuli. From what I have read there is no need to generalise the definition of religion to account for its legal intention. It should however be recognised that positive atheism asserts a supernatural principle (of the totality of nature) and respective organisations adhering to this belief should therefore be classified as religious.

I imagine that the law also takes into account more pragmatic aspects; such as the proportion of non-governmental secular versus religious charity.

//Atheism

[personOfSimilarConvictions] - [personOfOtherConvictions] is right about the burden of proof requirement in the context of the original claim here. However it is worth noting that there is more than one kind of atheist; one who simply does not believe in a deity, and one who claims that no deities exist. The latter must argue their claim (if they wish to convince anyone of its truth).

The scientific evidence issue however requires another thread in my opinion. Setting a standard of scientific evidence for supernatural belief is actually pretty arbitrary - and has been discussed here in the past. Non-empirical philosophical propositions (by definition) cannot be demonstrated by the scientific method. And this is leaving aside completely the issue that nothing can be strictly demonstrated as true by induction (given that it relies on causality/determinism, one of the assumptions of methodological naturalism). I do however agree that knowledge about nature can influence our probability assessment of the truth of philosophical propositions (with the help of occam's razor).

A classic example of this limitation which I use often is the belief in non-physical (extra-physical) mind; such cannot be demonstrated by the scientific method. We can infer by observation (the empirical method) that an organism has a highly intelligent brain (physical mind) running some great software (information processing/executing some logic based on some input to produce some output). We can even infer by observation that the organism has a model of its own sentience (self-awareness). The model of self it contains may even represent something extra-physical (ie the non-observable subject we are all evolutionarily programmed to believe in as "I"). However, the scientific method cannot demonstrate the truth of this belief - whether the brain's model of self corresponds/maps to an actual (emergent) sentient being (mental properties). As far as the method is concerned we might all be philosophical zombies. Generally however (especially in psychology) we project the assumption of extra-physical existence (based on our programmed belief) into the science, and we therefore take it for granted that we all exist (ie every like healthy awake brain also has a unique subject/observer mapped to its neural processing/information). And this is not a bad assumption, just one that cannot be demonstrated empirically. (In fact it is a necessary assumption for a physicalist - whether reductive or non-reductive: there is no reason for them to trust their own conviction of their existence over another person's conviction of their existence because they have a prior taken it for granted that their own conviction is a product of their brain and they share such a brain with the other person).

Likewise, a theist can believe in a god without claiming that there is a god. The west has been taught however that those who believe in things should be willing to give an account for their beliefs. Perhaps it follows that those who do not believe in things are not encouraged to give an account for them. Therefore, if a dialogue is to pursue, the theist can either a) provide some evidence for their belief, b) ask the atheist to demonstrate that there is no god (for the sake of their own intellectual rigour; but without presenting such an exercise as a necessary condition on which to win an argument), or c) identify a non-theological belief an atheist holds which they are willing to claim as true and ask them to give an account for this; continuing the process right back to first cause/principles.

([personOfSimilarConvictions]: "Why is absolute proof needed to prove that God exists when Atheists have trouble proving he does not" / "It's not up to atheists to prove there's 'no such of something'. When asserting a claim the burden of proof lies with the person making the assertion". If the original contention had been phrased as "Why is absolute proof needed to prove that God exists when Atheists have trouble explaining existence in the absence of a god" then there wouldn't be a problem).

Cheers personOfOtherConvictions - I generally avoid using the gnostic terminology because a/gnosticism of itself means something different in the context of ag/nostic a/theism; that is why I prefer "positive atheism". There is a thread way back that got slightly derailed by someone having a problem with me defining good and evil that discusses this ("The origin of sin is the desire for knowledge of good and evil").

...

The parable of the bridge

There once stood a bridge built with wood from its natural environment. Trees grew through it. Their roots became mingled together. If one looked closely at its foundations, they could see generations, perhaps even centuries of construction. It was an ancient bridge, it was an old bridge, it was an unsafe bridge. So many people had lost their lives when crossing that bridge. For where it went nobody knew, and few had time to care. What had such speculation cost them but for lives, lives that could have been spent in enjoyment - In peaceful harmony - In bliss. A specialist assured them that they had theories about how to build another one; it wasn't a 'hard problem'. The activist soon became friends with the specialist - he had complete confidence in his loyalty (and quoted him 8 times in his proposal). All they had to do was raise bridge consciousness. So the people got together and decided that the time of such treason was over. They celebrated when they had finally destroyed the bridge.

...

When making a decision between two explanations one can't just critique one of the possibilities. The reason being that if one explanation is found to be improbable in of itself, the alternative might be even stranger.

Case 1:
It is often argued that what we know about our universe is incompatible with theism. What would a theistic universe look like?

Case 2:
Theism is a positive thesis on existence (not just physical existence). Atheism is a rejection of that particular thesis. What is an alternative explanation for known reality?

Case 3:
If theism is not true, and the modality, intensity, and time flow of qualia we experience is arbitrarily selected, how many centres of consciousness in the multiverse should we expect to exist that experience a perpetual (for all intensive purposes eternal) stimulus (eg pain)?

For reference, if non-material consciousness is an emergent property of complex physical systems (brains), then our universe knew we were coming. Such systems are believed to operate and evolve perfectly on their own accord - in accordance with the laws of physics - without the need for such redundant extraphysical properties. This is why some of the best philosophers postulate panpsychistic models for atheism (eg Nagel, Chalmers). Meanwhile, those who have difficulty contemplating philosophical zombies are left befriending and indoctrinating the activists.

//Secular church proposition

If people are going to be given an opportunity to stay in touch with a higher order of existence in the current (modern) sceptical age, I think that something quite controversial should be introduced. It could be called a rock up and chill out with existence building. It retains structural designs from existing religions (which are built to direct the mind to a higher place). Every religion, non-religious organisation, or individual interested in seeing people come to an objective understanding of their place in reality through reflection and contemplation would be encouraged to participate in the maintenance of these structures. If you have ever been to a Shinto temple you would probably have a feel for the kind of setup being proposed here. Or if you have ever been to a prayer room in an airport before (without the emphasis on/presuppositions of prayer).

This is aligned also with the idea of worship (giving worth to that upon which our existence is contingent). Worship need not occur out of certainty, it can even be a natural response to the possibility of a free universe (for example when one looks up at natural starlight; seeing not just those stars but one's relation to them). People are however unable to give (be encouraged/supported in giving) such worth (above their immediate contacts) because they are being told that they must believe certain doctrine to engage in worship (for example, belief in a deity), and the probability threshold for accepting such doctrinal notions has effectively increased. Bayesian reasoning demands that our assessment of a hypothesis (evidences supporting it) be adjusted based on our confidence in our existing assumptions, and we have become increasingly accustomed to naturalistic explanations being provided for phenomena. This is a thread addressing "less ad hoc" requirements (and their implications for religion in society).

Finally, I realise that many religious might object to this proposal on account of such freedom leading civilisation back to animism. But this I don't have a problem with. Because even animism is a more logically coherent world view than atheistic materialistic naturalism. Based on what we understand of physical law (the current physical paradigm), materialistic naturalism is a fundamentally teleological (theistic) position. It is clear that people need to spend more time contemplating (their evolutionarily irrelevant) existence such that they can be brought to an understanding with modern philosophers on this matter (and appreciate their reasoning). Furthermore, it might help atheists realise why it is so difficult for their philosophy to progress beyond shutting down random god theories (specific theologies). That they commonly reject the best (albeit incomplete; cf the combination problem) and only exclusively naturalistic (ie atheistic) explanation of known reality discussed in the literature; panpsychism.

This is not about religion (certainly not specific religion), it is about recognising and appreciating first principles. The fact these concepts may seem religious is an artefact of material addiction.

It is important to note that while reasoning is affected by our confidence in our existing assumptions, in the context of making practical or moral decisions (wisdom), it is moderated also by tradition. In general, the challenger of tradition must provide the stronger claim, because the conservative has evidence that their system of belief is sustainable (it has and probably will not result in the destruction of their civilisation). Similarly, we can't pretend that one generation (or the next) is exceptionally ingenious because they have developed a habit of spilling an extraordinarily high amount of sperm into a cup.

//Atheism (continued)
[10 atheism arguments;]

To summarise;
1. Children who suffer and die are more innocent than adults who suffer and die; innocence is dependent on the use of other people, and this is evidence that humans cannot understand god.
2. Human suffering is unreconcilable with a loving creator because morally challenging explanations are unloving (Do you think that these Galileans were worse sinners than all the other Galileans because they suffered this way I tell you, no! But unless you repent, you too will all perish. Or those eighteen who died when the tower in Siloam fell on them, do you think they were more guilty than all the others living in Jerusalem? I tell you, no! But unless you repent, you too will all perish).
3. A god who creates a space-time construct cannot also define a plan based on what a free willed entity (presuming that they can create such a being) would choose in one or more circumstances.
4. Being called a liar, ignorant, a liar, a child, dense, or trash cannot be a blessing.
5. Morality being inherent within you (having a basis within nature), influenced by society, and handed down from the outside are mutually exclusive prospects.
6. If god cannot in fact defeat a liar then he is not omnipotent.
7. There is no scientific evidence for god.
8. Anyone who suggests that masturbation might be immoral forfeits the right to comment on the sanity of anyone else's ideas.
9. Real life doesn't involve bitterness, sweetness, and poison.
10. There are thousands of sects of religion and they all believe in sola scriptura.

BTW, 5 is the relevant contradiction for this thread ("If you are not going to take scripture at face value, then you are admitting that your morals are inherent within you and influenced by the society around you, not handed down from the outside").

And yeah, if it is not obvious, only one of these is not a fallacy.

//Ghosts
If we define a ghost as being part of the physical universe, then I think what he is saying follows (omitting the possibility of localised extra-dimensional interactions). Would a lot of people who believe in ghosts see them that way?

//Religion
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Gobekli_Tepe
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Nevali_Cori
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ataturk_Dam

//Atheism
Atheists tend to be dictators because they have no reason to trust other people.

But I do trust people she replied. Well then, you are not really an atheist.

It is not a statistical argument, it is a derivation from first principles (grounds and consequences). Atheism asserts that human psychology is a product of random forces, so people may well be behaving erratically; certainly without any absolute direction or purpose. Faith in others is therefore irrational, and as such will tend to be limited.

Theism (or teleological deism more formally) have a deep trust in the human soul, believing in a redeeming principle whereby a human seeks the good, though oft in ill forms. This is prechristian Platonic thought. Western culture still retains this, but the majority of so called atheists have yet to let their philosophy mature. The most noble being the nihilist, but even they have no reason to trust in the rationality of their thoughts.

//Atheism
[NB implied contradiction; not referring to self as animal but as a human]

What do atheists talk about around a campfire?

So by the look of things, not how to be better animals?

=== Sexuality ===

//Indiscriminatory sexual desire as mental illness

... However this specific example involves a clear instance of mental illness (despite the atheoretical DSM classification upon which it is currently based). Irrespective of the validity of including mental artefacts in nature, it is unnatural to favour an infertile individual when a sexually mature member of the opposite sex is equally (albeit fantastically) "available". One can perform experiments on mutated fruit fly to modify their sexual preferences. Otherwise the closest examples we have in the animal kingdom generally involve indiscriminatory behaviour in the absence of sufficient alternatives (especially in cases of exclusion by a dominant male, rape and "orgy" - whatever that means exactly). The only direct correlate in mammals being low brain mass sheep.

But what if someone is truly "non-exclusively attracted to boys and girls of all ages"? Surely indiscriminatory sexual behaviour is natural? It might be under certain conditions. But in the natural world they would be bashed to death. So if we are going to deviate from nature generale, and invent something like society, it better be for a good reason. Otherwise we might find our psyche is not naturally predisposed to tolerate the misappropriation of 4 billion year old instincts, that which has never found favour in natural history. And if one society is too drug addicted to recognise its predicament, it will not be too long before another does.

//Homosexual conformance (being banned from military for speaking against personnel participation in homosexuality parade)

This confirms my faith in the para (Ellie Linton).

In the meantime, I thought of a way to increase the maturity of regulars - say mandatory hydrogen bomb testing?

It is not as simple as mere exposure; the affect of exposure is dependent on perception of intent (and in this case therefore quite likely intent itself; unless of course they don't expect anyone to be physiologically aroused by their activities). Assuming this theory is correct, it is going to take a long while for the research to develop (start dealing with these most basic psychological questions), and an even longer time for the legal system. In the meantime something has to be done to stop this corruption of the law - if people do not have the freedom to speak against such things, what freedom is there left in this country?

//Nature of Homosexuality

Using a theological argument against the arbitrary use of body parts is pretty lame

---
Are you familiar with O. aries (physiologically speaking)? Or perhaps there is another mammal?

Until we have an argument we should refrain from perverting biological evolution towards political ends. It made us - creatures who perceive themselves as spiritual beings (observers). This prevents the consideration of arbitrary sexual relations like rape and child abuse as conducive to our nature.

... note you have insisted that biological evolution favours human homosexuality, but are yet to reference a physically normal mammal that exhibits exclusive homosexual behaviour (besides I presume the homosapien). Furthermore, cross-cultural studies are only valuable to the extent that they confirm long term exclusive homosexual relationships, and can't be used to make an argument regarding biological evolution without first partialling out social and cognitive artefacts.

I am sure every society has had some level of acceptance of prostitution also, but this doesn't make it a moral universal.

I think some of your other arguments are reasonable. To an extent this is a question of semantics - religious institutions don't necessarily accept secular (and other religious) marriages.

A penguin is not a mammal.

Masoud, A. I. (2012). Evolution and homosexuality: A review. age, 15, 6.
"Sheep (Ovis Aries) have attracted so much attention in that some rams appear to have an exclusive homosexual orientation"

Roselli, C. E., Larkin, K., Schrunk, J. M., & Stormshak, F. (2004). Sexual partner preference, hypothalamic morphology and aromatase in rams. Physiology & behavior, 83(2), 233-245.
"Recently, we identified a sexually dimorphic nucleus (oSDN) in the sheep preoptic area\u2013anterior hypothalamus. The oSDN is larger in female-oriented rams than in male-oriented rams and similar in size in male-oriented rams and ewes. In addition, mRNA levels for aromatase in the oSDN were higher in males than in females and were higher in female-oriented rams than in male-oriented rams."

Roselli, C. E., Larkin, K., Resko, J. A., Stellflug, J. N., & Stormshak, F. (2004). The volume of a sexually dimorphic nucleus in the ovine medial preoptic area/anterior hypothalamus varies with sexual partner preference. Endocrinology, 145(2), 478-483.
"Approximately 8% of rams exhibit sexual preferences for male partners (male-oriented rams) in contrast to most rams, which prefer female partners (female-oriented rams). We identified a cell group within the medial preoptic area/anterior hypothalamus of age-matched adult sheep that was significantly larger in adult rams than in ewes. This cell group was labeled the ovine sexually dimorphic nucleus (oSDN). In addition to a sex difference, we found that the volume of the oSDN was two times greater in female-oriented rams than in male-oriented rams. The dense cluster of neurons that comprise the oSDN express cytochrome P450 aromatase. Aromatase mRNA levels in the oSDN were significantly greater in female-oriented rams than in ewes, whereas male-oriented rams exhibited intermediate levels of expression."

Poiani, A., & Dixson, A. F. (2010). Animal homosexuality: a biosocial perspective. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
"This makes O. aries (ram) only the second mammal known, apart from humans, capable of displaying exclusive homosexuality"

What do you mean by 'gay'? There is around a 30% genetic component of exclusive same sex attraction.

Eckert, E. D., Bouchard, T. J., Bohlen, J., & Heston, L. L. (1986). Homosexuality in monozygotic twins reared apart. The British Journal of Psychiatry, 148(4), 421-425.

Långström, N., Rahman, Q., Carlström, E., & Lichtenstein, P. (2010). Genetic and environmental effects on same-sex sexual behavior: A population study of twins in Sweden. Archives of Sexual Behavior, 39(1), 75-80.

Alanko, K., Santtila, P., Harlaar, N., Witting, K., Varjonen, M., Jern, P., ... & Sandnabba, N. K. (2010). Common genetic effects of gender atypical behavior in childhood and sexual orientation in adulthood: A study of Finnish twins. Archives of Sexual Behavior, 39(1), 81-92.

Burri, A., Cherkas, L., Spector, T., & Rahman, Q. (2011). Genetic and environmental influences on female sexual orientation, childhood gender typicality and adult gender identity. PloS one, 6(7), e21982.

//Clinical Psychology

By demonstrable, I assume you mean demonstrated... I doubt the act of paedophilia has scientifically demonstrated negative effects on the agent (although there is a growing literature regarding its effects on another person). To achieve this one would need to conduct a controlled study which would be highly unethical. In fact I doubt most immoral acts including incest, rape, masturbation, etc have negative effects on the agent which have been scientifically demonstrated. I am not saying this is impossible (in fact I think in the future it will likely be achieved), but in order to do this one would first need to define a standard of mental health which is not relative to the society conducting the research. Physical health is easier to define being cross-cultural (the genetic differences between persons being minimal enough to provide racially invariant treatments).

//Homosexuality

Sexual desire is not equivalent to lust (lust is necessarily conscious, sexual desire is not necessarily conscious). We all have unconscious sexual desire (hence wet dreams). I have also heard that looking at someone lustfully implies conscious intent to lust - although I have never been entirely convinced of this argument. The viewpoint that lust is inevitable is quite likely an artefact of living in a highly sexualised society.

Note if one claims that religion was a necessary evil they are going to have to be a bit more specific. I don't think the Sith or the Jedi were a necessary evil. In terms of the Judaic-Christian tradition and the context of the discussion, non-heterosexual male and female arrangements were outlawed from the time of Moses (or at least by the time when his story was written).

Laws by their very nature do not take into account individual differences in propensity (for example one cannot plead innocence to murder while under the influence of alcohol). If they did they would not be very effective (people would justify their deviation based on their circumstances, and may even plan to do so).

Nor is it correct to extrapolate an instance of religious failure to religion in general, or necessarily even a specific religion. It is like saying all males are bad, or all females are bad. It is amazing how many males and females are convinced by these generalisations, and how difficult it is to convince them otherwise.

Finally, it is not evident that religion is necessary for moral or social progress; perhaps people just genuinely concluded that there is more to life than matter and it was worth honouring the possibility of the gods. Or that the utilitarian prospect of risking a few of their more vulnerable members to abuse by areligous predators for the sake of hastening a minimal faith belief system (moral code) was not an option, and they made a deontological investment in otherwise useless ritual (that happened to be very difficult to get rid of). Furthermore, the dark ages are not traditionally viewed as a necessary pathway to social/moral enlightenment.

No, I do not see any obvious connection between religion and evil; apart from the fact religion inspires morality, and the greater the idealism, the greater the fall. In any case this topic best be discussed in a separate thread.

Yes I am definitely interested in seeing these studies. There is a known correlation with birth order (in terms of number of older brothers), which is suspected to be biological rather than social. I have however never seen any evidence for a conclusive/consistent biological marker for exclusive homosexuality. The genetic component of exclusive homosexuality in males is approximately 30% (recent studies with sample sizes > 1000; for bisexuality it is lower, and it differs between the sexes), meaning the remaining contribution is either post natal environment or prenatal environment. They therefore suspect that 'being born that way' (if this is more common than genetics can account for) may be a function of hormonal/chemical exposure in the womb.

For comparison, eye colour is around 90% genetic, IQ is around 70% genetic, psychopathic traits are around 50%, and personality is around 50% genetic. Note it is important to recognise gene-environment interaction for any trait. Genetic contribution can only be measured for a given (average) environment (eg western society). If the environment is "insufficient" in some way many traits will exhibit no genetic contribution (for example IQ in low social economic environments, statistically).

The only other mammalian species to exhibit exclusive homosexuality apparently has a brain abnormality. One area - tagged the 'ovine sexually dimorphic nucleus' is smaller in exclusive homosexual male sheep than in heterosexual male sheep (of which there may be an analogue in humans; INAH3 - https://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sexually_dimorphic_nucleus). This probably has influenced domestication arguments for the phenomenon (although I have never heard the research referenced in this context).

The development of sexuality in human beings is an extremely complex and sensitive process (bisexuality in females for instance is unstable). I (like most researchers in the field) suspect there is a role played by both genetics and environment.

However, there being a genetic component to a trait doesn't mean this trait is normal or ordered. Down syndrome is a classic example of a natural but disordered state. Who knows - it may play a role in the evolution of the species yet, but we don't redefine fundamental purposeful institutions within our society to accommodate these variances. I think what we are witnessing with "state marriage" is an artefact of mental health being redefined to accommodate increased sexualisation (critically masturbation) - without any attempt at cultural critique (or awareness). The advantage of medicine is that normality is not a function of one's society (only one's genetics) - meaning health is much easier to identify.

What is even more critical here however is the children. What we observe is the homosexual child abuse rate for males being disproportionally higher than the heterosexual child abuse rate (given the base rate of homosexuality). Homosexual child abuse is around 30% (of heterosexual child abuse), while homosexuality itself represents only 2-4% of the population. Likewise a simple analysis of sexuality in incarcerated child sex offenders is not encouraging (I have heard that homosexual attraction may be something like 50%). Until this anomaly has been resolved there is no reason that children should be subjected to unnatural family arrangements. Unfortunately, there have been cases already of adoption failures in this regard (Queensland homosexual couple using a child as a toy). The catholic church has rightfully rejected homosexual entrance into the priesthood at present, and its welcoming of the sexuality was arguably a failure (the ratio of homosexual abuse is nearly 3x higher than heterosexual abuse in this institution).

[I have just read the 2015 paper; it provides interesting molecular confirmation of a genetic component to male homosexuality; in line with my understanding of the status of the research. It is important to note however that the effect size is small; far too small to gain any insight into the sexual orientation of an unborn child. It also appears to be approaching marginal significance based on their discussion (had these regions not been previously identified they would have had less confidence in their find). Likewise the regions they identify are broad - covering multiple genes - which is function of the analysis used and the complexity of the trait. What I find disturbing however is that the two regions they identified on chromosomes 8 and 23/X are connected by the researchers to two competing hypotheses for homosexual orientation; the sexual antagonistic hypothesis and the sexual dominance hypothesis (It raises a flag when theory is confirmed by any result). Furthermore, neither hypothesis accounts for the (purported) exclusive nature of such homosexuality in males.

One thing this paper makes me ponder about however is this; if there is such high variability in non-hetro sexual orientations (LGBTQQIAA) - as the research continues to confirm - on what basis can these be considered anything other than noise? Or in the language of the particular manuscript, stochastic variation? It appears that there is a disconnect between trying to make people feel safe and reality].

(Note the nearly 3x higher is a conservative estimate. The institutional homosexual abuse rate was 5 times higher in the analysis I conducted; with 333 alleged/convicted abusers).

//Homosexuality (continued)

Yes fish don't have to give birth to live young, and are oblivious to the sacramental nature of labour. Yet there are other aquatic creatures which know the true meaning of sexual libertarianism; so it is a difficult choice.

...

That is a very good rationale for liberalism. I think you would find that conservatives typically align to the position that one can't actually find happiness or peace through the fulfilment of certain dispositions however. It is a question of whether one can find happiness through sexual interactions which are not intended to honour another person. Of course, such interactions are becoming very mainstream nowadays (between males and females) - but there is no evidence that we are happier. Certainly we have become addicted, and will put on an awkward smile in public, but happiness eludes us.

...

This is a classic straw man - no one is saying that it is immoral (a sin) to be attracted to an arbitrary object. Even if one is responsible for that condition (eg lax sexual standards/respect for mothers, etc, as opposed to having been used, genetically inclined, chemically induced, or artificially nurtured), having a particular disposition is not immoral.

It is however rational to suggest that such a disposition may be disordered. It is part of growing up to recognise the limits of nature. Exclusive homosexuality is the very definition of an evolutionary error (disordered state). The only reason the trait survives is because it is not so exclusive as we currently make it out to be. It cannot survive in a species indefinitely (although surrogacy and child architecture will certainly throw homo sapiens a curved ball).

Furthermore, society is not some equalist construct where everything and everybody is made equally valid. Sacraments exist for a reason; the protection of those who sacrifice their lives by committing themselves to their young. It is not viewed as disadvantageous for a potential male partner to have multiple offspring, but for a potential female partner to have prior commitments, this limits her capacity to provide for a genetically relevant child (as opposed to the genetically irrelevant step child). There are some things money can't buy.

I will however discuss a morally relevant issue. Engaging in perverted (fake) interactions has traditionally been seen as immoral in the west. Yet this is not some theological power game. It is argued that such behaviour cannot make you or anyone else happy. Because as soon as it is placed in the context of the real world (the light) the fantasy will die with pain. And all that will be left is a broken heart, and a virtue that could have been.

This analysis does not offer any solutions to the paradox of disposition however. What if someone's happiness were contingent on them being with another in sexual intimacy? If this were the case it would be difficult to see the moral precedence of dignified sexual relations.

Yet it is the nature of error that everything is interconnected. That western civilisation is no longer upholding the chastity of its youth is a serious problem for us all. (It is for example impossible for philanthropic entities to argue for abstinence versus the distribution of contraceptives to young teenagers while advertising floods them with lies and primes them for sexual interaction). We will be watching it

play out over the century. Wretchedness has the habit of eating up everything around it till there is nothing left but instinct, self, hatred of others, and irrationality. Although I don't think this is relevant to the issue, an alternate interpretation of such a cartoon is that if you keep fighting your conscience by attacking the weakest argument then it will eventually go away.

There is no debate about restricting marriage (another classic straw man), but there is one about redefining marriage. In any case marriage is none of the government's business, and appealing to issues of date is nothing but conformity (cf integrity).

Again, there is no debate about restricting children (yet another classic straw man; there appear to be a lot of these), but there is one about artificial insemination. The more important question is whether anyone will want to have children with theirs when they know they have been genetically modified. Because rest assured they will know. Any engineering of the gene pool will be traced.

//Veganism
The title makes more sense with the original abstract (http://fap.sagepub.com/content/20/1/53.short). Yet in my experience, the night beach activities of Byron Bay can be astonishingly heteronormative, just not for human beings.

//Sexual Responsibility
I am going to introduce a concept of sexual responsibility. Being that our sexuality is not for ourselves but for the opposite sex. One could attempt to deny this responsibility, but they would be rejecting nature and would ultimately struggle to find to peace with reality. This philosophy is notably therefore not a consequence of teleology, but of more direct experience.

Because human beings are not identical, but physically complementary (asymmetrical), we cannot live consistently without respect for the nature of the opposite sex. Both sexes have internal demands, and these demands are either respected (good) or ignored (evil) by the opposite sex. For a male this is to live at peace with its community (which requires work of some form or another, and potentially genetic sacrifice - depending on its evolutionary fitness). For a female this is similarly to live at peace with its community (which requires genetic sacrifice with respect to innate expectations of an evolutionarily ideal mate, and potentially work). Sexual responsibility therefore arises in how one facilitates (or otherwise hinders) these demands in our complement.

Civilisation is built on sexual responsibility, and like other important rituals (eg clothing), it is so taken for granted that it is never discussed. This does not however mean that it is not wise in a rapidly progressing society to take check and analyse it. I posit that the west has rejected its sexual responsibility (in the normalisation/tolerance of prostitution) and so has come to experiment with self-gratification.

//Sexual liberation

        What loop holes - there are no reproductive consequences.

        Why not above the rug, or in an American picture (rather than HBO)? Why cannot someone look into another's face and proclaim how cool they are for masturbating? Are these intuitions just artefacts of a bigoted age, or are they rational conclusions based on truth/nature? Could it be that city folk have become indoctrinated into a fantasy by constant violation of their sexual worth and need to get out more? Could it be that our imbalance would be the laughing stock of all previous generations, and every stable culture on the planet?

Obstinate aversion to non-reproductive incest is the prototypical example of moral dumbfounding. However I don't believe in moral dumbfounding - people who cannot articulate their moral reasoning are not necessarily devoid of rational principles (and acting on irrational evolved intuitions), they just don't have the education to analyse them. We are not taught to recognise our assumptions - the belief in and value of a non-carnal emergent mind.

Why does progress consist of imitating the animal kingdom (when we are not idolising evolutionary error)? It is more likely that we have become out of balance. I think the best model for this subhuman extremism is addiction.

//Natural law
Reading that article made me momentarily speculate that affairs might be illegal in Victoria. A "married" (according to the state) individual had "incest" (according to the state) with her "step-son" (according to the state). What the moral progressive doesn't appreciate is that artificial categories are meaningless when it comes to human psychology. The traditional definitions were grounded in nature (genetics). The statistics back it up with group differences of two orders of magnitude in child abuse (including homicide).

//Estranged sexual attraction
[in response to an article specifying how a mother has come to be attracted to and enter into a relationship with her estranged son]

It is a good test of the exotic becomes erotic theory of sexual attraction.

//Exclusive homosexuality / Good and Evil

This is an important logical fallacy (3b), and I think it very relevant to both naturalism and the asymmetry of good/evil;

1. A is good.
2. Exclusive B contradicts A; thus, for a rational being to engage in exclusive B, it is evil (b).
3. Non-exclusive B does not contradict A; thus, for a rational being to engage in non-exclusive B, it is good (b).

Take A to be nature for example (1). Any rational contradiction of truth is evil (2b). But this does not imply that all rational participation in this truth is good (3b) - as not all truth belongs/pertains to the actions of rational man. Only if man were a god would all truth pertain to his actions.

Here is a related logical fallacy (3a);

1. A is good.
2. Exclusive C is not of A.
3. Therefore exclusive C contradicts A (a); thus, for a rational being to engage in exclusive C, it is evil.

Things don't have to be of the same nature (2), eg natural with respect to nature (1), to be logically consistent/coherent (3a). Take the supernatural, or morality, for example. They may however be considered 'natural' (or of the same nature) in that they do not contradict each other or the greater metaphysical nature in which they reside. Our nature includes supernatural beliefs which support (are logically consistent with) moral behaviour.

//Progressivism
[personOfOtherConvictions] are you demonstrating that progressives seek enabling laws regarding sexual actions and restrictive laws regarding non-sexual actions?

If laws should enforce perceived reasonable ("acceptable") moral standards, and reasonableness is defined by what "at large is agreed upon by society", what if the society had become accustomed to dehumanisation? Isn't this just a pathway to conformity?

Wouldn't a simpler, more elegant hypothesis simply be an addiction to sexual empowerment, which otherwise makes people psychologically weak and socially dependent?

//IVF
Note people who can't procreate are not parents, and they don't require artificial insemination to have a child because they can't have one. One of them might wish to join their gametes with those of a third party in a laboratory and then arbitrarily select one of these combinations to be implanted in a female (surrogate or otherwise), in a society that doesn't see anything wrong with flooding the human gene pool with engineered mutants (not the result of natural selection).

//Homosexuality
https://psyarxiv.com/hv28a

//Homosexuality
Why would anyone want to be so conformist as to laugh at the (supposed) author of a proposition out of context, from which its original meaning cannot be confidently extracted?

"I don't like them putting chemicals in the water that turn the frickin frogs gay. Do you understand that? [Hits table with notes] [inaudible] crap. I am sick of being social engineered it's not funny".

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fgKvl5VQVkY

Chemical induction is an interesting theory for the prevalence of exclusive homosexuality in homo sapiens - a rational human being might try and find a better one (considering that they personally wouldn't have evolved otherwise; every human being in existence is the direct consequence of an uninterrupted billion year history of their ancestors engaging in heterosexual behaviour, which is by definition not exclusively homosexual). The search might begin by looking at exclusive homosexuality in the animal kingdom within a scientific journal, because the last I checked the nearest non-domesticated relation (ie ignoring low brain mass male sheep) is not even a mammal.

Furthermore, exclusive homosexuality in males is estimated to be 10-30% genetic (in females estimations vary). And the existence of this modest component assumes we can rule out;

a) egalitarian treatment of monozygotic twins by parents (i.e what we calculate to be genetic is actually a product of their parents treating identical twins the same as each other). Note the base rate of homosexuality is so low none of the studies used to calculate genetic contributions of homosexuality involve separated at birth twins. I know of only one exception to this; an experimenter recruited cohort uncovering 1 monozygotic exclusively homosexual male pair, from which limited statistical significance can be derived (https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/3730708).
b) that the monochorionic placentas of monozygotic twins (who are measured to have a higher concordance with homosexuality than dizygotic twins) receive a higher exposure to sexual orientation significant in utero chemicals than the dichorionic placentas of dizygotic twins. Note there is a 3/4 probability that monozygotic twins share the same placenta (i.e. are monochorionic) versus a ~0% probability for dizygotic twins.
c) that the populations under study are living in societies so WEIRD (western educated industrialised rich democratic), that without such environmental effects there would be minimal exhibition of the trait (ie. the genetic contribution measurement would be close to or equal to null): see gene-environment interaction.

Thus, if we are to exclude environmental models of exclusive homosexuality (e.g. lack of fathers or maturity/moral discipline), then the vast majority of male exclusive homosexuality has to be chemically induced and prenatal.

All in all, I found his comment somewhat more insightful than the mimetic propaganda.

=== Story ===

Chapter 1:

We could remember those trees as we passed them. Not exactly the greenest in the world - Australian red gums. The sun setting just four days ago before the dust cloud rose. Engulfing the atmosphere in an eery haze.

It was not planned to be a long trek. Just over the other side of the great dividing range. The stars out there were brilliant.

Our party negotiated the traffic well on the way in, taking the less driven road. There was nothing on the wireless - no sign of problems outside. Sure they had ramped up the Gestapo crap - but we could all see through it. A few kids at school bought into it, generally the loners and only children - but the teachers had so little credibility now days. Only last Thursday they made us recite the five principles of optimum masturbation as part of our mental health class. Jonathan asked me about this - I told him to go fuck himself.

The wind blew stronger, it was a storm coming. Flashes in the distance so faint they looked like torch light.

We were planning to visit relatives and we thought we may as well. They had properties out further west; perhaps it would be clearer out there. I had only ever known happiness in the country. The snowies and the outback - it was as if nature were arbitrating us on its own.

This was the day before the comms went out. Silence. We were no longer receiving the national broadcast. Emily was so worried about it yesterday she started crying about being contaminated.

And now I'm stuck here under the tent cover not daring to touch the pouring rain. They are all asleep I suppose.

Emily was good at English, Jason at history, Clare at science, and I was well good at Math. Not that I studied. Addition wasn't helping though. There was no one left willing to fight us. Our cities were practically internationally owned anyway. The state controlled everything, but not the investors.

(Why am I talking about school in the past; we are all doing this now).

We had heard stories about this sort of thing. Ever since the Second Korean War. The New Conservative movement (the last one got shut down) was always spreading rumours of a separation. Though it was supposed to have been a democratic process. A way to cut a deal with the terrorists and to satisfy the masses. The parliament wouldn't have a word of it though. They weren't even nationalists, the US (United Socialist).

Mandatory news reels from the social media corporations of course confirmed the voice of the parliament. They were mandated to espouse peace. The only media left daring to cause offence were printed; AWPs not sold but stuck up on side walks (the only place they could withstand being torn down). Still no one trusted the media anymore. Ever since the incarcerations began and they didn't lift a finger to object them. We all had relatives involved, well apart from those without family. Some of us celebrated when a distant cousin was caught inflicting EI (emotional injury); and most of us said so - but I didn't really believe them.

The boys with fathers were the worst. Always causing the most trouble. My brother Sebastian was one of them - although they didn't know this. I kept telling him to be silent. I keep.. A crack of thunder. Something in me jumps.

Single mothers are the social ideal I recite; submissive servitude in gratitude to the state.

Was that peace for good reason? The blood toll was too high already, and only grew. I remember reading an Alternative Wall Post by a fanatic who was worried about the national debt. What can they do when the value of money was dictated entirely by its perception of value. What would they do if this faith were to suddenly risk being compromised, how would they stop a collapse?

I used to think Sebastian was involved in AWP. I remember watching a video on the encrypted channels. There was this guy like old in his thirties talking about what he called "philosophy", although it sounded more like the hate science of evolution. He said that males were naturally like this, independent and charismatic, but were suffering from an addiction. That they didn't really want girls who showed off their bodies but that this was the only way they could gain their attention for long enough to disrupt their desire for the next hit.

I am starting to get tired now, and I need to save battery. We used too much on the wireless and they didn't tell us anything.

Chapter 2:

I woke up to a deafening boom followed by a roar. We still couldn't see further than about 100 metres, but it didn't take much to recognise this as a military jet; at its speed and apparent altitude. I had seen fighters pass through here before when I was younger, but I don't think they were ever this loud.

Clare was already up when I dragged my gear on and tied my shoe laces. At least the rain had stopped. She was still looking upward. Slightly despondent. I am not sure she even noticed me, although her body reacted when I zipped up the over sheet.

Emily must have slept in, as she was sharing with Clare. Although Clare seemed to change the most - becoming even more quiet than usual, I was disturbed more by Emily. She appeared happier than her usual self; but I suspected this was a response to the breakdown or whatever. No one would (or wanted) to talk about it. Most of us had been through this before, with the incarcerations. It was like you once had a heart for your country, and then you just don't care.

We were a bit different than the other groups in our grade in that we all had parents, and this meant families, histories. Not all of them would say the Prayer of Progress at assembly. My uncle gathers that it was designed to break down what he called RfP (respect for

persons) in favour of respect for state beliefs; respect for socialism (RfS) as it were. But my parents kept telling me to ignore him - that he is going to get us all in a lot of trouble.

Hate speech was still officially defined in terms of denigrating persons or groups, but the groups they cared for became increasingly artificial. Whatever identity someone chose, it couldn't be denied them - unless it were the dominant race, religion, sex, gender, or orientation, etc (this is what they often call racism, religism, sexism, cisism, heteroism - one can never be sure what exactly they are talking about; therein lies the trap). There was also a thin line where if you made too much noise this quickly encapsulated anything that conflicted with the ongoing social construction. If they feel threatened by someone or their beliefs they will invent a new word.

Of course, you could denigrate anyone who criticised the system, in fact they suspected you immediately if you didn't play your role in the public persona executions. The radical would be brought before the social justice court, and then in a symbolic gesture of love they would all turn their backs on the dissident, before escorting them off to Primary School X.

People once had an uprising to the hate policy: "demonetisation" as it was first called. It was a reaction to the great prophetic failure of the United Socialist predecessor known as the true news syndicate. I know my parents think this was a loss to freedom of speech (the deprecated first amendment) but I can't really see why; they could still speak after all. First they took out Germany - that was easy; these guys were still wallowing in nationalised guilt; and nobody wanted another reason to be made feel guilty. Spain was dead and kicking by the time the classical homosexuals had taken over of the Roman Catholic Church. Likewise most of South America. The few remaining countries who resisted became hot beds of third world trafficking. They still needed a market for the politicians and government employees who couldn't quite get enough NLP (new world pornography). It was their civil right after all to a surplus of simulated under age presentations. Contraceptives and sex contractors had to be provided to all productive government officials, and anyone resisting this health requirement was labelled a far right extremist.

Jason once did a history search of what "far right" actually meant, and it appeared to mean something different every year it was referenced. He did however receive an automated response directing him to the proper use of school resources, with a reminder that further infringement of his IT privileges would result in a suspension of indeterminate duration. In the mid 20th century it meant something about the Nazi party (although the words "national socialism" had been erased from the archives). In the early 2000s it meant something about hating choice ("the abortion of little annoying meat loafs"), then by 2010 about limiting immigration ("inclusion is union, diversity is strength, but do think twice about maintaining a race"), and then from 2015 about gender discriminate marriage ("religious marriage has been declared homophobic by 9 out of 10 certified health practitioners").

This was the start of the conservative resistance. Legally sanctioned violence arose with ANTIFA vs United States, and conservative protesters had been subject to state sanctioned attacks for years, but no conservative had ever conducted a counter insurgency. (The police stood aside whenever a peaceful assembly was bombarded and could therefore be argued to be no longer constitutionally protected). They had around 70 dissidents imprisoned in Australia at the time, and the break out was targeted and decisive. They only captured around 30 of them again, but this was when they first declared the Conservative Movement illegal. It was deemed a threat to national security, although by this time almost 15% of public property and 30% of private property was overseas owned; so it was hard to tell which nation's security it actually threatened.

I don't think the guys like me writing so much - it makes them feel left out. But there is a real possibility there are not going to be many libraries left so I better start recording now. Only private servers have uncorrected copies of the internet (the bots are relentless in their editing), and these are the most vulnerable to EM.

Chapter 3:

There were definitely scavengers about. I heard possums last night. But the reason I am not feeling well today is not about our depleting supplies.

I can't believe what he said. It was like he had gone crazy over night. Sam had complained that he did all the firewood collecting, and Jason and us were like, wow, isn't that amazing (it is not like we don't all make an effort in everything). I feel the classes had finally got to him. Every time we made a "discriminative initiative" without consulting an equity committee it was labelled a micro aggression by the central monitoring system. All class activity was live streamed to the US servers and had social justice detection algorithms applied. On the surface of it, the conditioning didn't seem all that harsh. It was executing with the nicest of language;

"Well I am not sure if you noticed, but our systems indicate that there is an 87% probability you forgot to say thank you to your work partner for performing a gender stereotypical task, nor offered to take the lead next time round". I laughed when it should have said 'sex stereotypical', but suspected they were still trying to work that out. If gender is based on what you feel like on a given day, and has no natural relationship with sex, then they can't very well tell you what gender you are.

If you fought the system however, you quickly learnt the meaning of prejudice. Some tried to play it in the early grades, but it didn't go well for them either. They never seemed to get the higher grades, even when final grades were randomly distributed based on the "equal attendance means equal outcome" statute. The only reason we ever knew how well we were going in something was when we helped each other out. With homework for instance. Clare studied on top of this but it was strongly discouraged to prove yourself too competent at a given subject. I gave up altogether as every time I studied the teachers gave me suspicious looks (not all of them, not the best ones; the ones I liked).

We hear the private schools really struggled to equalise their grades, and new penalties were being applied. Their school fees would reimburse the government for having to create ever more elaborate schemes to cut down the tall poppies. These were deemed dangerous, not because they were bright ("the US admires intelligence"), but because they always for some strange reason appeared to attract extremism. "The government in its wisdom believes that they are high value targets for far right propaganda, and takes pity on the wayward student. We never let a student down, and Primary School X is a testimony to that".

At higher levels I was told there is basically no room for error. Expulsion from university was a common everyday practice, expulsion from high school practically unheard of. Those who did not abide by the ethics of the tertiary institution were terminated without refund. And the higher one climbed the educational ladder, the more loops they had to jump through. A professors tenure and title would be stripped for two or more rejections of a research proposal by an ethical review board. Ethical review boards consisted of fully qualified and US-SJ certified administrators of the system. The basic philosophy of societal justice is that EI equals falsehood (we learn most of this in English). Any research that could cause emotional injury to a participant, researcher, or journal reader is deemed ethically unjust

(EU) - or in extreme cases, propagating an inequitable independence narrative (IIN). IIN offences are subject to Primary School X, where as EU offences recommend just tertiary level reeducation. I have never heard of an EU offender reattempting a tertiary qualification however. In fact I have never heard much about what happens to EU offenders at all. Or whether anyone actually employs them.

The first EU offenders were singled out for public displays of EI - generally on second generation internet media platforms. (This is where the encrypted channels arose). Although they mainly consisted of scientists and engineers, there were a rare few from the humanities who took a bullet, as the AWP recorded it (they were basically all social outcasts according to the true news syndicate, even bound to make such expressional errors by their incompetence, if not down right malevolent). Philosophy and the human sciences were a real problem to begin with, because they suggested that there might be truths inherent to nature which could not be redirected to more equitable outcomes. But this just meant they needed to create higher ethical standards.

The camp fire glows orange as a few red coals come to life. I hear Clare and Jason talking about moving out in a few days. But I don't know how we are going to come to a rational conclusion when we can barely see a thing. Perhaps this is for the best.

Chapter 4:

It has been 3 days since we left our hold.

Taking most of our belongings we washed in the river and piled up my car. The provisionary display panel still visible though plastered in a combination of thick dry mud and grass.

On the road out to the highway we barely passed another vehicle. I tried flashing to one and slowed down to invite a conversation, but they wouldn't respond. In fact they accelerated right pass us in what vaguely felt like shock.

The dust made it difficult to see, but we were desperate to get some answers. We stopped in at the nearest town but it too felt empty - the servo was closed shut as were all the shops. Nobody was on the streets, and we thought it best to just keep on going.

The next town was different. Entering it we saw a crashed police car and some teenagers holding rifles behind a barricade of tires. Glistening against the earth red mist, their armament shone a mystique of fierce independence. Again I tried to stop but they mounted the wreckage and took aim as if to warn us. It was probably best just to get out of here.

It wasn't long before the warning returned. For the second time we heard the sound of jets, and a flash lit up the dust as if to light it on fire. 10 seconds later the car jolted and an incredible shock wave passed through us. I felt the chassis beginning to lift off the ground when it subsided. I could hear nothing. That was definitely a nuke. I panicked; shit we should not have come this way- now we're all irradiated. I did some calculations; that was no more than 9ks away. Yet no one would be delivering a heavy payload on a country town. That is max 100 kilotons; with a blast radius of 3km. We would have taken some neutrons from the ignition but as long as we get out of its wake we should be fine, for now.

Clare suddenly interjected; we've got to get off this road. "If that last town was hit, then we can be sure as hell Everton will be also, if it has not been already". She was right; and we can't risk driving into the aftermath of another nuke. I didn't want to tell the others (although I think Clare knew); we had been mexd (mutagen exposed), and couldn't risk another dose.

I wasn't familiar with this area; but it was definitely farmland. Although the haze had started to lift, we still couldn't see further than about a kilometre. I started looking for a turn off. If it is sealed, it should take us a few km of course, and perhaps, who knows, there is another way round. In any case we've got to find a hard copy of a map. With the wireless offline we had no internet access, even here in semi-civilisation.

Sam was talking to himself and Emily was visibly distraught, but I didn't want - couldn't afford - the negative energy to get to me. It was still daylight and I was pleased we had made it this far inland. If we are experiencing problems out here, then we sure as hell would be closer to the coast. It had only been 6 days since the comms went out (7 since the dust cloud rose); if it were an invasion how on earth had they got here this quick? It must be an air assault with minimal ground deployment (there was not a chance an invading force could mobilise within a week). I was really thankful we had the cloud cover. And I tried hard not to question this.

Although Jason trusted our judgement, Emily and Sam were like; "what are you doing Sarah?"

I pulled a hard right onto a narrow country road. It was sealed and of reasonable quality; so based on the straight line ahead of us I estimated it could get us some more, needed distance from the fire storm.

Emily was getting car sick (again; probably more than just the car). We pulled up at what looked like a small church with three 4wds parked outside. Rural enough to be safe in my opinion.

Walking inside the low wooden door it occurred to me I hadn't been in a church for a long time. Overhearing hushed but tense, rapid voices we silently made our way to the back pew.

A small crowd of peasants had congregated at the front of the sacristy, with what looked to be a paster of some kind. They stared intensely at us, and realising we were teenagers went back to their meeting.

"We should give in now. God knows we have tried. All the blood, we need to save the children. Look at these poor young ones - their clothes are so.."

"Surely they will take pity on us. The quotas were good two years ago, and the year before that - but we had the drought last season. Aunt Iva is kind; surely she will understand".

"Look no one is coming to save us. It is our fault we are in this mess to begin with. We had the prophecies but we failed to listen."

"Lord have mercy on us", the Reverend cried.

Jason cleared his throat. "We have been out of town for a week and need to know what is going on".

The group stared inwards at each other.

"Perhaps if we brought them an offering".

"An offering?"

"A peace offering".

"Look we all know what happens to traitors. They go in there and they never come out the same again".

Clare looked at me as if to signal a retreat. We backed off; and three seconds later Jason got the message. "Praise be the Great Provider", he bowed. Stepping backwards, he turned, clasped his hands, and trailed us slowly through the exit.

I told the key to open all the doors and we jumped in the car. I had heard about fanatics in school, but I had no idea. I didn't really believe the stories.

***
I look over my shoulder, throwing down my wireless.

"What was that Sarah?" I hear Sam asking.

I thought I heard something.

"Never mind."

=== Teleology ===

//Naturalism

I am going to present an account of nature; but from a slightly different angle. As an introduction to this review, it may be worth watching Master and Commander. This is not meant to contradict [personOfSimilarConvictions]'s trace of naturalistic reasoning, but perhaps complement it. I think this may relate to a weaker (non-reductive) position when he speaks of grades of naturalism, as he is primarily addressing philosophical naturalism (eliminativist or otherwise). There is reason to believe that if one maintains this latter philosophy, and parlays with positive atheism, they may ironically make themselves a god, or whatever subjective utility demands. However, there remains a question as to what one can discover in nature without making such an assumption, and how this might direct our philosophy.

Although socially dependent, human genetically endowed emotional systems have developed to support the precursors of empathy at age ~2 (the recognition of others emotions). Similar networks are capable of supporting representations of subjective existence by around age 4 (theory of mind). We believe in internal existence, and yet the reality of these beliefs are entirely inconsequential to both the functioning of the brain (according to the current paradigm/physics) and the evolution of the organism. These beliefs however have implications;

1. We may logically extend such belief in mind to others, based on observed regularities (cf variations in dehumanisation based on perceived similarity)
2. There may exist logical consequences of maintaining such beliefs, such as the assignment of moral worth to self and other

Furthermore, the identification of such an arrangement in nature could have more general consequences for philosophy;

3. There may exist other supernatural realities which have a physical representation, such as morality, or understanding
4. There may be reason to attribute such universal alignment to an unknown god

---
Perhaps later I will expand but for now I will just add something to 4. that was intentionally left hidden. I also think we can infer the likely properties of this god from those intrinsic to this world.

If there is no evolution, there is no quest
If there is no death, there is no brothers and sisters
If there is no struggle, there is no virtue

... I seem to have made a few theistic assumptions in the above deliberation, but these are open to debate (and perhaps others wish to critique them?). Some people might ask why a creative process would ever involve an evolution. This is a very good question, of which some commentary has already been made here (by a Stanford academic). If we wished to tackle this problem systematically, and that of teleology more generally, I might recommend some new material for an introduction; Prometheus (RS; although others might have a very different approach). It is also worth noting our inherited, Judaic mythology (and their inherited mythology) involves the very same anomaly. Man was created last. Another question to ask when critiquing teleology is, what is the purpose of original sin (why do we have the propensity to be selfish?) - why would a creation have the capacity to be evil embedded in a part of their very nature (and why is such transferred socially)? A related question to be asked of teleology is why is there death? Why is death a natural part of this universe? You might make a connection with some past poetry here. From the other side of the problem, I might ask whether biological evolution (or indeed an infinite multiverse) is a sufficient explanation of human existence. And when considering specific monotheistic accounts established in history; if creation is maintained by a creator, in which avatars are established to enable some relationship with or manifestation thereof, what does our knowledge of an evolved brain say for the meaning of such a God? Finally, I see there being a question of primitives (what constitutes the most basic form of existence) and abstract objects (logic, math).

As per the schedule, there is the question of the sufficiency of nature. This is not strictly a naturalist argument, just a philosophical annotation. But it is probably the most important philosophical annotation you will ever not hear in the present age. Does a multiverse need us, does evolution need us, do our brains need us? Note many may try to avoid the question by assuming it presupposes substance dualism (but that would be a grave mistake). Alternatively you might find it irrelevant to your world view. But to a true naturalist (including the self-proclaimed rationalist) it is critical. Physicalism assumes that the observed is independent of the observer (irrespective of their mapping). Hence the observer is not needed by our universe. The technical name for the problem is overdetermination.

//Sacrifice (and suffering)

This is something thoroughly unscheduled I assure [personOfSimilarConvictions]. I wish to explore the concept of sacrifice generally, and am going to forward the position that all sacrifice (including ritualistic sacrifice) benefits the sacrificer. This process does not occur through a transaction; from one physical loss to another gain (although often presented as such, and accepted at a surface level). Neither does it provide any transactional benefit to the object of the sacrifice; the fulfilment of law or the payment of debt (again, often presented as such).

Rather it is suggested that sacrifice enables spiritual growth. It also helps those witnessing the sacrifice to see the non-physical truth of the agent (respect them and the nature of the construct in which they reside). Such a process may in effect (either in retrospect or be foreseen to) enable redemption or salvation, but any higher order account of the sacrifice cannot be separated from the underlying mechanism.

This is related to a previous argument; the necessity of a predisposition towards vice (selfishness) for virtue, but is not strictly dependent on it. It does however operate on the same assumption; that suffering is necessary for the development of character.

//Suffering
Isn't it strange how religions seem to find purpose in suffering? Now that is a mental exercise.

//Evolution

In a universe that does not evolve yet has a beginning, would we be free to honour the source?

I am really referring to cosmic and biological evolution in this context (although your line of thought is quite interesting). It is indeed worth asking "Why would a lack of evolution alter our ability to honour anything?" but I recommend first analysing the hypothetical with respect to freedom.

---
a universe in which teleology was obvious - physical states existing with either a) no physical explanation of how they came to exist, or b) no anthropic purpose (cannot be explained via a selection effect)

There may however be a more fundamental problem;

2. How would we know the universe had a beginning?

And; 3. How would we know the universe was made for us, and that we were not designed by aliens? (or take the logic back a few millennia; a demigod)

//Sin (not necessarily evil)

Can you have virtue without a predisposition towards vice?

What value is there in the behaviour of a child which is programmed to be virtuous?

I would not disagree there is great value in formation... but is it the same thing as being genetically programmed to act in such a way?

//Arguments for compatibility of our universe with theism by imagining a different ("perfect") universe

Here are the set of arguments;

1. Evolution / Freedom
"This interface was made by God(TM). If you prefer green to orange, stand on one foot. For more options, click your fingers."
"Centre of the universe"
"Don't panic, universe stops here"
"Made by God"

2. Action / Communication
"Don't forget God loves you."

3. Suffering / Love
"Little Angels Reproductive Centre"
"Well that was easy".
"I love you Mummy".
"Oh no! I have forgotten its name."

4. Evolution / Redundancy
"GRK - God repair kit"
"It's broken again"..
"Apparently they considered something called evolution..."

5. Complexity / Purpose
"Are you telling me that there is nothing to do in this universe?"
"Well, they didn't want to make it too complicated for us."

6. Desire / Quest
"So no one here has ever had an argument?"
"No why would they? There is nothing we have that we don't want, and nothing we want that we don't have... Well, there was once an argument about what it means for something to be unanswered, but since no one has ever encountered such a thing, and we all had enough flowers that day.."

7. Temptation / Virtue
"That was really good of you Tom."
"Actually, it wasn't that hard."

8. Death / Life
"But what happens when there are too many old people?"
"Ah, the earth just expands you see."

This is the feeling I get yes.. Perhaps they have a better model?

//Arguments for compatibility of our universe with theism (continued)

Imagine a universe where you can look up into the night sky and see its beginning.

The ultimate irony is that we can look up into the night sky and see its beginning.

Yet we are so betrayed by evil that we hate nature and can't see that the universe is fundamentally good. Where every physical defect presents a challenge for virtue (not the glorification of imperfection). Where every moral incursion presents a challenge for redemption (not an opportunity for tolerance and despair). What was once the conclusion of a good education has become its premise.

Imagine that there was a God and they finally graced their creation with irrefutable evidence of its creation. Those who were theist turned mythical literalist. Those who were agnostic turned atheist. While a select outspoken few proposed what any greek child could suggest; that one can explain anything by positing an infinite number of things. Moreover they insisted on their certainty of this ingenious theory when they were yet to explain the single biggest problem of existence: mental reality.

One can take an infinite number of random combinations of physical and mental events and state that our existence is inevitable. Alternatively, one can take an infinite number of random combinations of physical laws and state that the evolution of our physical existence is inevitable. But to claim that the most complex subsets (end states) of this physical existence happen to map to the mental existence of a set of unique sentient beings is a complete anomaly. The only non-teleological hope at present is found in panpsychism (upgrading qualia to quiddities: making sentience a fundamental property of the universe). But this still suffers from the combination problem.

So is this some great exercise in apologetics? In my world view, no one could or should care less about persuasion. Truth doesn't require advertisement. (I am even open to the possibility that one day a new physics will emerge that can put an end to teleology). But I do care about people wasting time on account of evil, and taking potentially dishonourable courses of action; when it is in my capacity to suggest otherwise.

//Arguments for compatibility of our universe with athiesm (size of universe)

This is a very good question for theism [personOfOtherConvictions] (especially if you are referring to an apocalyptic faith or a chosen race, as opposed to a species who might have a natural desire for adventure in a new land), but one I can only answer by considering the alternative [see "Arguments for compatibility of our universe with theism"].

I think this is why people believe in intelligent aliens; we naturally want to anthropomorphise the void. We have evolved to see sentience in things (including places we can't see). The question we have to ask is, which instance of anthropomorphisation is more rational? Or do they both operate from the same presumption? What I have presented here (and your other thread) is an application of anthropic reasoning to indicate that they might. This leads us to consider the meaning of emergent properties - because the evidence suggests that we take them for granted.

This is a nice visualisation; note the areas which 'haven't been mapped yet' are occluded by our galaxy. "An infinite scalar fractal series of embedded boundary conditions from the infinitely large to the infinitely small" - where does this come from?

Here is some nice software to go exploring in the local universe oneself; http://www.shatters.net/celestia·

Note the reason I ask is because it sounds made up. Fractals are useful for explaining order in chaotic systems, but our universe is far from chaotic. Its parameters have been selected for the emergence of life; more specifically, functionally sentient life. It is one giant manufacturing machine for the conditions necessary for the evolution of life. Every layer of the system functions towards this end. And this explains not the coincidental mapping between the most complex state produced by the system (the humanoid brain) and mental properties themselves (the observer). It is worth watching (or reading) Human Universe, while being critical of the philosophical conclusions (thinking about them for oneself).

The association between our visible horizon and the planck length is not simple. One is a limit based on our particular 4D coordinates in the universe (and its expansion rate); and provides a snaphsot of the first free light in the universe that was produced around us. This light has expanded from the visible to microwave spectrum over the last 14 billion years, and its spatial distribution is believed to reflect quantum fluctuations in the very early universe, when its contents approached planck scales. The other is believed to represent an intrinsic limit in measurement, and relates to the quantisation of energy in the universe (including the real boundary condition; physical indeterminism). One can think of our universe's energy being digitised. And they say nothing about infinite scales of space. It sounds like something out of Matrix Revolutions. As profound as simulation theory is, the fractal scaling component is speculation. Time is no longer assumed to be infinite since the 1950s; big bang theory/experimentation put an end to miscellaneous assumptions of a static universe. And we can make no judgement on the contents and topology of the universe beyond (outside of) our visible horizon, apart from the fact isotropy measurements in the CMB indicate that it likely continues beyond our horizon for a significant distance.

Furthermore, it has been argued that implicit associations between universal scale and atheism are immature at best, and exasperating at worst. Would it be more comforting to think that a theistic entity put a big sign saying "End of universe" at our nearest supercluster? Or a smaller version written into the fabric of the cell nucleus? Perhaps one can measure the scale of a feeling and complain that it is too small? These are questions worth considering, and I hope you appreciate the formal criticism [personOfOtherConvictions].

//Creation (mathematical construct)
[In response to proposition; our universe is a mathematical construct:]

A physical (ie observable) universe may be a mathematical construction, but reality consists of more than a physical universe.

Non-observable reality consists of more than just a speculative multiverse.

Non-observable reality is not only the realm of explanations, it is the realm of beliefs. Human beings operate on the belief in non-observables every day. Take for instance a mother's belief that her child (or husband) is aware and is more than just a complex machine. The fact the development of these beliefs may be encoded in us (from a young age; 3-5 yo) does not take the content of these beliefs into the land of empirical science.

//Creation (Simulation Theory)

Someone actually asked me about simulation theory a week ago (regarding what appears to be the same Elon Musk interview) and this was my reply;

I won't give a probability assessment although I personally like simulation theory; it explains the existence of sentience. Sentience ("mental properties") is apparently redundant (according to the current scientific paradigm); it is not necessitated by the laws of physics, or the evolution of a highly intelligent visibly self-aware agent. Likewise, it not known why particular subsets of our universe in space-time (neural activity) produce these "emergent" mental properties. This is known as "the hard problem of consciousness" (as opposed to the easy problem of a brain evolving a model/representation of a sentient being in accordance with physical law; cf "philosophical zombie").

The only viable naturalistic explanation of the hard problem of consciousness at present is panpsychism or panprotopsychism (mind is in all material/physical things). This however suffers from "the combination problem" (why the hypothesised sentience of physical/mental elementary particles - ie "quiddities" - would combine to produce the much more complex sentient experiences known to us: those mapped/aligned to the brain activity of a complex carbon life form).

It is worth pointing out that simulation theory suffers the same issue posed by all teleological (design) theories; in that life has evolved from a very simple state (Big Bang). Such evolution would be unnecessary in a simulation/design unless a) the creator had some purpose for the created beings that involved leaving their own existence undisclosed (eg freedom), b) the creator were testing (experimenting) with the creation of sentience from scratch (cf hitch hikers guide to the galaxy), c) the creator wanted to demonstrate to their creation that they were not an alien (demigod) living inside the same universe (cf Prometheus), or d) the creator wanted to demonstrate how intelligent they were based on the elegance of physical law. Note the naturalistic contender here is the weak anthropic principle; the assumption of a multiverse with variable physical laws.

Note there are good physical reasons for believing in simulation theory; indeterminism and the discreteness of nature at a quantum level. Someone even proposed a test for it a while back; http://arxiv.org/abs/1210.1847.

---
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2KK_kzrJPS8

A very poor version of idealism, or a very modern version of theism? The simulation needn't be a video game.

I am aware that his idealism is theistic, but it is only one possible theistic model of reality. Simulation theory does not of itself propose an infinite regress, although it can be extended with the notion. I think classical idealism is interesting, but no more so than simulation. Simulation also makes more sense in the context of avatars.

(Thanks for the link [personOfSimilarConvictions])

//Creation (multiverse theory)
I like the way it has gone from multiverse to multiverses. Technically, every induction is a belief, especially for non-empirical theory. Likewise, all deductive reasoning is based on axioms, which are beliefs.

//Naturalism

Richard Dawkins is aware of the limitations of non-teleological interpretations of nature - or at least was when he wrote the Selfish Gene. He defers the anomaly of mental properties to the philosophy department.

...

I am going to throw in a plug here for non-reductive interpretations of nature. A physical system might respond deterministically in response to its environment. It might even be observed to be statistically random (whether intrinsically indeterministic in the case of quantum theory or just plain chaotic). But this does not mean the process should therefore be interpreted as being a product of its circumstances, chance, or blind luck in a philosophical context.

The emergence of logic, morality, or apparent consciousness in a physical system might correspond to objective logic, prescriptive morality, or a subject's actual awareness. In the case of consciousness, we all believe this to be the case. Even approaching the belief from a scientific perspective (as opposed to the philosophical, "I think, I am", perspective), eliminativism is unnatural. We have been (evolutionarily) programmed to believe in our extraphysical existence; our brain retains a model of a self aware sentient being to which it assigns the category "I". And only the rare yet disproportionately outspoken philosopher would beg to question the validity of this belief (dressing up atheism is so much easier without qualia). It thus doesn't take a great stretch of the imagination to speculate the existence of other higher order correspondences in nature.

Cheers [personOfOtherConvictions]:

In the second paragraph I make the point that everyone is programmed to believe in non-physical (extraphysical) existence. I use the word physical in the strict empirical sense of observables (as opposed to the philosophical sense of physicalism; which despite its name is not in fact an assertion that everything is physical; rather that all mental events map to physical events). Therefore, this definition of physical categorically excludes mental properties (the subject).

By other higher order correspondences I am referring to the possibility of observed (physical) systems mapping to non-physical objects, such as objective logic (as opposed to just a convenient/advantageous way for an organism to process information), absolute morality (as opposed to just the altruistic interactions we observe cross-culturally; byproducts of evolutionary adaptations), or extraphysical consciousness (as opposed to just the neuronal processes we observe, from which we believe emerges such internal awareness).

In the first paragraph I am making the point that even though a physical system is observed to behave in some causally dependent way (whether according to deterministic or indeterministic law), it does not mean a process can be reduced to these laws (and said for instance to be a product of its circumstances or chance/blind luck). There might be another explanation (see Aristotle's four causes).

That is correct [personOfSimilarConvictions] - I adhere to non-reductive naturalism (not metaphysical naturalism).

---
https://vimeo.com/169044817

//Creation
Unless this god was made in this universe, we can rest assured that we will never find observable evidence for it. Any empirically observed phenomenon is by definition part of our universe.

Philosophically we might be led towards a certain conclusion about non-observable causes of physical existence, but the qualitative nature of axioms almost certainly rules out any accurate quantification of statistical probabilities. It would still be a very useful exercise however, if only to establish precisely all the variables required to be accounted for by an existential framework.

I thought the general point raised by the author about first cause is an important consideration (apart from being age old). Big Bang theory is not and has never been a default naturalistic hypothesis - and they had to modify the cosmological principle to account for it. Steady state theory is the default naturalistic theory (because it doesn't require accounting for any miscellaneous circumstances like beginnings which only religious minds would - and did - postulate).

Multiverse theory is required to provide a naturalistic explanation for the constraints of the laws inherent to our own universe, and recent formulations have become popular in the atheist community because they can be constructed to be eternal in both directions (ie no singularity). However, not everyone shares the optimism; because they a) are not inherently empirical (cannot be denied by observation), and b) do not necessarily provide a better explanation of our own, observable universe than simple non-inflationary models.

Furthermore, 1. postulating the existence of a reason for physical existence is one thing, 2. postulating the existence of a reason for non-physical existence is another thing (redundant sentience not required by fully operational brains or biological evolution according to the physicalist paradigm), and 3. postulating the existence of a reason for the mapping between certain subsets of our own universe in space-time (ie neuronal functions) and discrete centres of consciousness is still another. Traditionally these have been called souls, but in the physicalist era they are better known as mental properties (and are oft referenced with respect to their qualitative nature/qualia).

Finally, a framework can't be formalised without allusion to non-physical abstract variables (eg logic); as without their assumption (including their realisation in the physical world) no enquiry could ever be conducted. Circles are real.

//Lewis on naturalism/morality

Although I agree with 95% of what Lewis argues here, when I first read AOM (confirmed by my second reading now) I noted that he makes a few miscellaneous assumptions here;

1) that evolutionary processes are philosophically (teleologically) random
2) that a physical basis for morality cannot also imply a non-physical (or objective) basis

These reductive assumptions cause him to overlook another possibility. Alternatively, assume a) that there is a correspondence (mapping) between physical reality and mental reality (ie non-reductive physicalism/materialism). And b) that the objective basis for morality (natural law) is the value of consciousness (non-physical mind). If human brains (physical mind) have c) an encoded belief in the non-physical mind of an agent (ie they contain a model or representation of a non-physical agent), d) an encoded high valuation of this agent, and e) are naturally inclined to perceive mind in like others; then morality has a physical basis. Of course, this can't take one from an is to an ought, however to act immorally would be to act inconsistently.

> ---
> Thanks for the feedback [personOfSimilarConvictions].
>
> Causal closure is not an assumption of physicalist philosophy of mind - this is a byproduct of the confounding of philosophies (this often happens when things get too close to the admission of non-empirical realities - I think it is some kind of protection measure; it happens far too often than can be accounted for by reason alone).
>
> Non-reductive physicalism does not negate free will - in fact it provides a model by which metaphysical libertarian free will may actually be possible (ML2). Only with compatibilism is morality counter-intuitive (but I admit this is a significant problem for compatibilism).

There may be interactions occurring between an independent (substance dualist) mind and body - however the number of interactions required to account for the storage of self-referential memories (e.g. "I remember seeing that") are too great for them to remain unnoticed by increasingly complex functional imaging technology. The encoding of an independent mind within the memories of the physical brain requires the transfer of information between non-physical and physical reality (they cannot be accounted for by quantum interactions and so require the breakage of physical law). I admit that this is probably beyond the limit of current technology to detect, however what we (think we) understand about the modularity of the brain (from a systems/computational point of view) appears to suggest a physicalist philosophy of mind...

The only ought that can be derived is that which is in alignment with nature (our known reality = observed/physical reality + observer). If it (say a command by a deity) weren't in alignment with nature then we would have a moral obligation to ignore it. In this context obligation is not necessarily prescriptive (an imperative ought), however we couldn't act morally if we enacted it.

Of what value is a command in itself? What if their (demi)god were evil (actively contradicted nature)? Why ought a child obey their parent? What if their parent were evil?

Our greatest prerogative is to act in accordance with the order of nature (the natural law). The only law worth following is one that is designed to be good and enable good. Good is that which is true and consistent with reality (truth).

Adding a further assumption of f) teleology (design) provides an ought, in that creatures ought to respect nature (creation).

(It is important however to recognise that f is technically not equivalent to the absence of 1; not making an assumption is not the same as making an opposite assumption).

The only moral duty conceivable is to act in accordance with known reality. However duty (an imperative ought) requires an assumption of teleology (f); that our belief in and high valuation of consciousness is intended (designed/purposeful). I have suggested that we would not be morally obligated to obey a command that contradicted known reality. Therefore, objective morality cannot be reduced to command (obedience) - and it must depend on natural law (and its teleology).

Furthermore, f is not a random assumption, it is derivative from a.

//Metaphysical Naturalism

Naturalism must reconcile the subjective consciousness of the individual (which is redundant from a physical perspective; the brain operates perfectly fine without it according to the current paradigm).

Animism (formally panpsychism) is the logical conclusion of metaphysical naturalism. Once contemporary atheism (self-proclaimed rationalism/positivism) has rid itself of embedded theistic assumptions (magical emergent mental properties that do nothing from an evolutionary perspective, speciesism, birthism, etc), we will start to see the return of animism. This is assuming that there is not some paradigm shift in physics (or theism can once again provide more than just theoretical ie moral evidence for teleology).

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Animism
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Panpsychism

Responding to your comment [personOfSimilarConvictions]; 'the circle is almost complete'.

Yeah, this was certainly being implied. However, there will always remain a memory of a time when civilisation not only had cardinal virtue (which is not opposed to any such agnostic philosophy, being inherently desired and only compromised by lie), but faith, love and hope.

Anthropologically speaking, these don't appear naturally. These greater virtues are those that cause mountains to move, hearts to change, and journeys to endure. They are like a candle that shines all the more bright in times of persecution and despair. The offspring of apocalyptic theism. Some things change, but other things last an eternity.

Once a standard has been set, it cannot be forever lost. Take film for example (probably literature also, though I don't read enough modern fiction to be certain - in general the children appear to get all the best media while the adults are left with second hand words that sympathise with their deviance). There will remain an archive of good movies that if watched, can light a spark in the darkest of dystopias.

If one starts to see random weird crap being publicised, they should read the signs and know that all hell is about to break loose. But once it has broken, what signs are there to read?

Note I would only qualify a cyclical analysis by suggesting that memes can be powerful, so powerful that we are convinced materialistic naturalism is a coherent atheistic position; that they will be embedded in the mythology of our descendants regardless of how real we can enact them.

//Simulation theory

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=wgSZA3NPpBs

[personOfSimilarConvictions]:

Well firstly, I am not sure if a turtles all the way down scenario is possible; considering that the simulation capacity at each level should reduce. However if such a scenario were possible, then we are dealing with an Occam's razor context (cf infinite multiverse; if an infinite number of worlds exist then the details of any one of them is meaningless and doesn't require an explanation because it will happen anyway).

Is there a particular part of the presentation which makes this claim? Note, as Chalmers highlighted, we cannot disprove that we are (ie prove that we are not) in a simulation (and more generally in science, one does not set out to prove negative hypotheses - "there are no dogs in space" - one only rejects null hypotheses in favour of positive hypotheses). Such has no bearing on the ability to prove (obtain evidence for) us being in a simulation; the positive hypothesis. This was one of the overinterpretations in the article.

Nick Bostrom's argument (22:40) is that because our universe with its effective laws of physics has the capacity to contain super computer universe simulations, it is probable that the majority of minds in our universe (at some point in time) will be simulated rather than not. Therefore, he concludes that we ourselves might be one of those simulated minds. (As far as I am aware, a hierarchy of simulations is not proposed by Bostrom, but by Tegmark, in order to illustrate the fact that there is a potential flaw with the argument by following its claims through to self-contradiction, or in this case paradox). The counter argument (26:00) given is that Bostrom's argument is fundamentally invalid because in order to know what kinds of minds are more common you need to know what the actual laws of physics are (ie the physics of the basement level, or in my opinion; the effective laws of physics of the level above us). Since that, if we are in a simulation, we don't have access to these laws, we can't predict the probability of us being in a simulation (based on this line of reasoning alone). These are purely philosophical arguments, and have no relation to observable evidences for numerical simulation.

It is worth noting also that simulation (like multiverse theory) is not an empirical hypothesis. It cannot be denied by observation. This however doesn't stop us from obtaining observable evidence for it (observations which are consistent with the philosophical proposition). Therefore, in a scientific context, the existence of one or more specific signatures of numerical simulation can be hypothesised and tested.

[personOfSimilarConvictions]:

I like the fact you have suggested here [personOfSimilarConvictions] that abstract objects are not specifically a problem for atheism, but for metaphysical naturalism (ontological materialism) (given that non-theistic and "natural" teleological models - including deism - attempt to account for natural order).

Note Chalmers did imply this limitation in simulation theory - he is just being openly optimistic in discovering a natural basis to consciousness; which might - although won't necessarily - apply also to a simulated system (eg in the case of functional/information processing paradigms). This should be distinguished from being religiously optimistic on the matter (like the majority of his public contemporaries).

[personOfSimilarConvictions]:

I agree that science ceases to support the probability of metaphysical naturalism the more we appreciate the lawful nature of the universe. However, advocating a young earth creation seems pretty arbitrary. Half of our galaxy (including every other galaxy in the universe) would have to be simulated.

[personOfSimilarConvictions]:

[personOfSimilarConvictions], regarding 3, you are reiterating a second overinterpretation in the article. Chalmers is merely highlighting that a significant proportion although not all characteristics traditionally assigned to a theistic deity are necessitated by simulation (omniscience, omnipotence, not benevolence), he is not making a personal claim.

//Evolution
Evolution is a form of procedural generation

https://vimeo.com/164608063

I think it depends on how good the algorithm is - in the case of cosmic/bio evolution; the capacity to generate any number of worlds/creatures.

There is definitely something special about an intentional touch. This is evident in artificial worlds - highly refined artwork displayed with low spatial/colour resolution (pixel to pixel design) can outshine the most modern of virtual environments - irrespective of tessellation, texture quality etc. Ultimately, this may relate to appreciation of human effort and perception of social engagement (with the author). The same applies to hand crafted narratives. We are interested in hearing stories created based on real world experience - as ultimately, we are interested in understanding the real world.

Yet artwork is by no means the deciding factor in creativity. Despite all the intention in the world abstract art can look terrible. Artificial stories can be really bad. So much of what comes from sketch work derives from the stochastic patterns of the brush. Natural beauty using simple rules can provide serious competition (eg fractals, ocean waves). Likewise, an extremely simple scene (for example a transparent cube) can look amazing when rendered under realistic lighting conditions (raytraced).

//Evolution (as a numerical simulation/computational solution to a predefined problem/goal)

If you wanted to create the optimum system, what approach would you take?
a) create an algorithm that can converge on the best solution

b) outsource the task to a god
c) have a spark of intuitive genius and create your product in one day
d) deny the existence of formal cause and find a "task" that doesn't rely on the capacity to act purposefully

---

One of the pitfalls of gravity? It depends on the goal of the system.

Yes, and one's decision on what constitutes optimum performance will certainly affect the system being constructed.

(One can assume that the person creating the system has a goal).

//Evolution (as a numerical simulation/computational solution to a predefined problem/goal)
The solving of any sufficiently complex problem (or the creation of any sufficiently complex system) through the use of unlimited computational resources is indistinguishable from nature.

     It is actually commenting on the false dichotomy of teleology/naturalism, and suggests a final cause of cosmic and biological evolution (the solution of some complex problem, or creation of some complex system; eg intelligence).

     Note I have clarified (edited) "with" with "through the use of", which may not be obvious for those less familiar with the various ways problems are solved/systems are created (in this case computationally/numerically, by converging on an optimum solution using an iterative algorithm like survival of the fittest - rather than say, analytically from first principles, or experientially based on known exemplars, etc).

     An example of a sufficiently complex problem is intelligence (or system; an intelligent agent).

     This theory actually suggests that machines will not take over the world, because a) the computational resources required to create them (a more advanced intelligence, using an alternative computational substrate: silicon/transistors) exceed those required to create their creators, and b) the creators are embedded within the same computational framework that was used to create them [they themselves]. Assuming c) that a numerical solution to the creation of the creators was necessary (it cannot be solved or improved upon by analysis/heuristics).

//Evolution
How to build a computer. First you buy a box, then you insert a power supply. A computer can't live without power, it can't survive without power, it certainly can't replicate its code without power. A motherboard (and associated circuitry) should facilitate any rudimentary comms with other low level systems. Next, you attach some devices to detect and receive input (such as a camera, microphone, disk drive, or touch sensitive pad). Then you insert a cpu (central processor unit); a cpu is required to process information from its surrounding environment and make a decision. Then you upgrade its memory - both long (HHD/SSD) and short term (RAM) memory will seriously enhance the computational capacity of the computer (offline storage and executive processing). All such upgrades will increase its performance and therefore value in a competitive market. Finally, you might add some software - software develops over time and evolves with each parental generation of programmer. Some software has bugs, other has viruses. Society largely controls the quality of software being written for the computer, although various functions are hard coded, being critical to the functioning of the system (including network interaction).

That is a perfectly valid limitation. And the eye effectively is the brain. One could instead insert a GPU at this stage, which is capable of performing inverse graphical operations, and the camera eye at a later stage of development.

[in response to ..."without some sort of writable or rewritable memory the computer borders on being a glorified clock performing the same finite function ad infinitum"]

     ---
     yeah it is somewhat bacterial

[in response to "..and then, you talk to it about its dreams and aspirations.."...]

     There is definitely something missing from the material description

//Teleology
Everything has a function

The claim can be made under an evolutionary paradigm, but under interventionist creationism it seems contrived; what function does death or some insanely effective virus play for example? I think interventionist creationism is ateleological (else it requires a demigod like Melkor for the disruption/disordering of a good creation). What was once considered to be the province of demons (or supernatural justice) is now known to be a natural byproduct of the physical system.

If we maintain interventionist creationism, then we are tempted to perceive purpose in error (disorder) where there is none but the strengthening, refinement and evolution of all that is good (order). Systems designed to uphold the good become subject to the whims

of the ages, and are desecrated at the alter of self-perceived carnal perfection. Likewise, this dissonance causes us to reject the necessity of moral order in moderating carnal order - because we are seen as physically perfect.

A free will (ML2) based on the combination of physical indeterminism and volition/will power is non-interventionist (physicalist) and attractive for this reason.

That might be like a development kit and the final product. The final product is the garden, and the development kit is the evolutionary simulation required to design the system. If you are not happy with the final product and desire more knowledge you can order the development kit instead. But then you find out that the system has already been optimised (barring all the new mods you have been trying out and can't seem to get rid of); it just makes one come to an appreciation of the choice (the necessity of virtue/will power) inherent in the final product.

I haven't studied this; but for medicine I would hasten to guess it involves strengthening of the immune system based on the perception (false detection) of success with respect to their survival/reproduction goals. For mental disorders like depression it is probably related to change in thought patterns (cognition); being indicative of the underlying cause of the problem. That is, thinking they suck (or detecting that other people think so), with the body/brain reacting to this evolutionarily suicidal inference by making them feel bad so they go and do something to improve themselves rather than crying, attacking/using others, cutting themselves, or taking cognition modifers (drugs).

Under physicalism, mental states are supervenient on physical states (ie mental properties are mapped to physical properties in one "substance"; there cannot be any mental properties that are not mapped to a physical property).

Under non-reductive physicalism the mappings are undefined, and mental reality is therefore "non-reducible" to physical (empirical) reality, although there is only one "substance" (substrate). Technically this substance cannot by definition be "physical", because the word physical only pertains to empirically observable - ie physical - properties (not anything else like mental properties or abstract objects). Physicalism in the context of robust philosophy of mind is therefore a misnomer (arguably consequent of naturalistic presuppositions and idealism with respect to how far we will be able to stretch the empirical paradigm in the future). It is really just a "substance monism" where the physical takes precedence (note non-reductive physicalism is a property dualism). This substance can only be considered "physical" in a philosophical (non-scientific) sense, and to the extent all mental properties are held to map to physical properties.

This confound is less critical however if one argues reductive physicalism. Reductive physicalism is a special case of physicalism where mental properties are "type identical" to physical properties (every unique mental property is identical to a unique physical property). This philosophical position is rare based upon what we know about how information (physical thought) is distributed across neural networks.

=== Terrorism ===

//Terrorism

You can't defeat something while it has the moral high ground. There might be places where the religion is oppressive - but they don't advertise prostitution on top of taxis. I remember watching an American documentary fail to determine why the 9/11 terrorists visited Las Vegas before their attacks. It didn't even cross their minds. Had they read the Quran they would understand. And this is not saying the Quran sanctions terrorism as a form of war.

An Islamic terrorist doesn't play by the same rule book. They don't care about death. This is pig ridden weakness. They are told at times to protect life, to not kill unnecessarily, but never is such proclaimed at the expense of Allah, the most merciful. They wrongly equate the evil of our culture with our education, our freedom. They misassociate our tolerance with our compliance. There is only one humane solution to this problem, and this is to demonstrate once again the morality of the west. The others involve mass re-education programs, or wading it out in blood; our soldier's blood, our children's blood, until the meme perishes (and if you have read Dune it might be a while).

... I also follow some other Jewish/Islamic customs (not for reasons that have anything to do with religion, but if you are serious about reading the Torah and Quran I would recommend them), so I felt pretty comfortable there. Although such a crowd in no way represents the population being discussed here (and in the media), our world view must be able to reconcile it. Extremism is not the exception, rather it is the rule - we the western educated industrialised rich democratic nations are the exception. Just because people think beheading is an appropriate form of punishment doesn't make them less human. Our ancestors had similar forms of corporal (and capital) punishment; even private schools had it in the 90s, and they were no less moral than us. That is their rules, and they know them (for the most part). They don't have the freedom to behave immorally in their culture (to trespass another), but this can hardly be considered an end game - whose great quest is this? Taking civilian hostages (what we call terrorism) is however objectively barbaric, and in order to resolve this we need to determine why it is occurring at the turn of the 21st century.

For our part, Christ (along with some eastern contemplatives) brought the moral law to a new level; he said he who has no sin cast the first stone. Go and sin no more. A challenge was given to the Jewish people to take the next step. I would recommend watching the Passion of the Christ without thinking about theology; pretend there is no theology; what do these words mean? One guaranteed method of maintaining a 100 year long war is to create safe categories like monster, silly, fundamentalist, nutter. And not even in grievance over another's immorality, but because of an inability to assimilate a natural albeit violent response to the perception of immorality. This is exactly the time when Christianity is needed most, and a chance for Faramir to show his quality. Moreover, it is a reminder (perhaps even a warning) for Christianity to remember its roots; unless acknowledging our sin there is no point touching spiritual morality (in fact there is reason to believe it is dangerous to do so). This includes contextualising sin out of existence or pretending that rules that applied then do not apply today. Why do we tend to look outwards without looking inwards - what has become of our own culture? For what I saw advertised on my journey home this evening was by far more evil than anything in present culture, or has ever existed in this world.

Yet neither should we pretend that the west is wholly evil, that the seed that was planted can not be revived. Some believe that a spirit of God has worked consistently throughout history. Many emphasise that none on earth are born without the desire to become children of the most high (our desires are fundamentally good when properly examined; for evil brings nothing but wretchedness, and I might add here; contradiction). Still much of which I would still hold as good and true in this world has no more survived the onslaught of this age.

I am not sure if I would classify myself as a humanist, more a naturalist, but it should be clear what this means (based on its initial reference). It is interesting that the classics devoted a virtue to the ability to integrate information; not to despair or retreat into relativism, nor to take one truth without another (to deny the natural, human, or eternal)...

Perhaps we have become the most backward culture to have ever existed. And the only thing standing between us and hell's gates are a few good women. Sure we sacrifice a few virgins at the alter - what does it matter?

We don't stone women. We should all give ourselves a pat on the back for not being like bad old Saudi Arabia. Perhaps we should start more posts articulating how good we are. Jesus would be very happy with us. No he wouldn't. We track down women and use them, expose them. "You hypocrites".

The problem ... is that you appear to be arguing a straw man (I know you are not of course). Perhaps you can find a quote which implies the laws in Saudi Arabia are good? Some points I made originally which people may have found confusing; extremism should not be equated with terrorism, one's rules do not make one less human (nothing can; although I might add law happens to be a reflection of humanity and the desire for justice), our western ancestors had corporal/capital punishment yet they were no less moral than us (this is not a comment on the validity of their law), the decision to follow a set of rules does not of itself imply barbarism (it depends upon the aim), and forgiveness is not an end into itself.

... I thought her white (pink) head scarf was unnecessary, which she wore at all times (even inside), but it is interesting retrospectively to note how little attention I paid to her physical beauty, only her character (which also appears to have been the impression which lasted). Of this, like in our own heritage, you can imagine someone defending to death. Thus Aragorn for the first time in the full light of day beheld Eowyn, Lady of Rohan. For some reason body of lies also comes to mind.

In my comments I was expanding upon the original argument however. I was suggesting that although terrorism is barbaric by all civilised standards, it is perhaps not just something to do with them, but something to do with us. Sin of omission is most pertinent in cases of dehumanisation.

(In case people are interested in saving lives; https://www.change.org/p/mercy-for-andrew-chan-and-myuran-sukumaran / http://mercycampaign.org. This service appears yet to be properly extended to cases in Saudi Arabia; or there is some kind of nationality bias).

//Crusades

I haven't watched the video, and have probably ignored around 2 or 3 sporadic references to the crusades here, but it is worth noting the rationale provided for the war. The holy sites, relics, and pilgrimages were being compromised. I think (in general) they would have had a lot more respect for the crusaders than the modern misrepresentatives of Christianity.

//Islamic terrorism

...

I am not convinced a violent reading of the Quran is stupid or extremist. I always recommend that people read it themselves (and preferably the entire bible also for comparison). The calls to violence do necessarily condone contemporary terrorism however (out of a context of war). This is where interpretation comes in. The issue with the Quran is that it can be interpreted to explicitly condone (command) the induction of "terror", unlike the bible. As such, I don't think the problem is simple.

The government appears to have been given a responsibility to protect its citizens (defence), especially in terms of voluntary immigration. That said, I agree that there is good within all religions, and we shouldn't suppress the beliefs of Australian citizens.

I have stated that I disagree that a violent reading of the Quran is extremist. Nor would I claim that it is fundamentalist. I referenced the bible because you mentioned the KKK. A violent reading of the bible is in my opinion extremist (or more likely "false"; I can't even think of a single reference commanding the audience to be violent, and it is written like a story; not an instruction set). That said, I disagree with a violent reading of the Quran, but this is irrelevant. Likewise, what the Islamic world thinks of it is irrelevant. The point is that it can be interpreted as such without necessity for extremism, stupidity, or fundamentalism.

I think if we took the majority of Christian scholars at their word, we would think that Christians who believe that Jesus Christ rose from the dead and confess his lordship are doing a really good job at following him... We wouldn't however tag those who believe otherwise as stupid, extremist, or fundamentalist (not unless we were one of those Christian scholars ourselves, or indoctrinated by them).

***
One imaginary religious text states;

"Strike fear into the heart of your enemies. Yahweh is most merciful."

A second imaginary religious text states;

"God struck fear into the heart of their enemies. Yahweh is most merciful."

Is it strange, barbaric, fundamentalist, extremist, or stupid to think that the author wishes their audience to strike fear into the heart of their enemies? Of course, respecting the author (or their wishes) is another matter entirely; and this could certainly be judged as strange, barbaric, fundamentalist, extremist, or stupid.

Which religious group (with their corresponding religious text) do we think is going to exhibit a higher percentage of "terrorism"?

Does this imply their religion is evil? Not necessarily.

Does this imply we should generalise all religions into a simple category (to save us the trouble of having to read any primary sources which might affect how we approach individual religions and their relationship to our society)?

***
Is Islamic terrorism unrelated to Islam? I would be interested to hear an argument presented in favour of other factors. Are these particular muslims the most oppressed people on earth? With the self-righteous conquistadors needing some beheading and sexual repossession to set things right?

It might help to take a step back from the recent invasions to 9/11. Before the US could be accused of anything but trading oil. I don't dispute there are other factors which interact with their traditional religious teachings (ie spectacular violence is only observed when the environment conflicts with their religious practice). But to claim that these other factors operate independent of their specific religion is pure conjecture given the Quranic text.

Furthermore, I am certain these interacting factors are primarily moral rather than financial or territorial. We have a responsibility to not engage in crimes against humanity ourselves, and our inability to model an uncorrupt alternative to the post-Beduin moral enlightenment endowed by Islam has dire consequences for civilisation. It is sad that the moral standards of the west can once again provide this ancient system of morality with morale (the higher ground). Try reading the Quran in Las Vegas. Or at least while abstaining from pork and alcohol. Because until we commit to understanding the psychology of the Islamic terrorist we may as well be fighting the fremen.

***

I think in general this is a very insightful commentary. I would argue that his (second gen American/US accent commentator's) thesis on Islam's perspective of the US is incorrect however. Reading the Quran answers this. For example, there is no evidence that the 9/11 hijacker Mohamed Atta visited dehumanisation manufacturers in las vegas.

To answer this, I will firstly state that unlike the commentator, I don't think 'moderate' Islam is a misinterpretation of Islam. It might be a very good, creative, and integrated/evolved interpretation, but it is not therefore false. Likewise, it is important to recognise early Islam for its good also. Muhammad's Islam may not have reached the moral heights of Christianity, Greek philosophy, or even Judaic culture ('2500 year old' reference), but the Quranic law introduced by Islam was a massive improvement over the Bedouin morality of its time/locale. Furthermore, its advocacy of prayer, charity, and devotion are superior in many ways to other religions. Next, I wish to distinguish between Islam and fake alcohol drinking Islam (no offence; but this is not a valid interpretation of the Mohammedene tradition).

With respect to fake Islam, I don't think people who have succumbed to a secular western lifestyle would necessarily have an opinion on the west different to the west itself. With respect to moderate Islam, I don't see any reason why they would view western decadence any different to active reincarnations of early islam (those which invoke quranic combat methods including terror, and perceive themselves to be at war). This perception by Islam of the modern west I will now define here.

To obtain an understanding of the psychology of a religion it is important to study its founding scriptures. This principle applies here, and is especially important if one wishes to understand how another person interprets your own culture or belief system. While western 'materialism' (sensualisation) will be seen with pity by most cultures, Islam perhaps would stand out in its abhorrence of the Capitol. It is reasonable therefore to view Islamics (including moderates) as feeling they are endowing upon the west a serious blessing when/as they bring about Islam (submission to Allah). It is difficult perhaps to grasp this notion without reading their scriptures (and respecting their dietary customs) however.

This general feeling of disgust however is not something which will drive a person to target civilians in a vain attempt to suppress the infiltration of that culture in their homeland. What is required is a combination of factors; firstly they must perceive themselves to be in the same circumstances as the original audience of the manuscript (war). Secondly, they must be given explicit instructions (commands) on the use of terror in such circumstances. Thirdly, they need to be sufficiently disconnected from reality (or indoctrinated as it were) to maintain the will to keep "fighting". Fourthly, they must witness specific violations of humanity which motivate them (justify their intentions). This is only possible in a society which has degenerated to the status of animal; exhibiting prehistoric, prehuman levels of morality.

Some material I wrote earlier this weekend which seems appropriate to this interview;

"Islamophobia" is a sociological construct introduced in the 90s. To claim that "fear" of Islam is in some way irrational is insane.

1. Valid interpretations of Islam (literal interpretations of their core religious text) are incompatible with the west (particularly a morally corrupt west)
2. Islam therefore needs to take responsibility for those factions which interpret their texts in violent ways; either argue with them and create internal standards of interpretation, or take ownership and declare that their religion is currently incompatible/unsafe with/in the western environment. Playing the 'they are not Islamic card' is irresponsible and nonsensical.
3. Islam needs to be open about the intentions of Islam (submission to Allah) with those apparently tolerant societies they are immigrating to. They have a right to know, even if they are still working on their homework.

Likewise, the west should primarily be looking inwards, not outwards;
1. The morally responsible response to someone hating you is to ask why. Why at this time in history do they hate us so much. Is it our freedom? Have we been free for a long time, or were we just suppressing people of different genders and race for the hell of it? (They should have tried that sexual revolution thing before the advent of artificial contraception).
2. The west shouldn't be using religious variation (as product of immigration) to suppress their constitutional heritage (including free speech).
3. It is reasonable to adjust immigration policy (permanent residency/citizenship) until such issues have been resolved.

NB I can't help those who wish to confound a concept of dislike of a person with fear of a tradition with an irrational fear of a tradition. These are three distinct concepts; and I pity the emotional mess required to combine them. I can only imagine what those poor old spiders are saying; "you've got nothing over us".

Note the last paragraph of the first comment is discussing the difference between moderate islam and reincarnations of early islam. It presents an analysis on the conditions necessary for Islamic terrorism. This analysis follows from the observation that reincarnations of early islam are a recent phenomenon but western freedom is not a recent phenomenon.

One should take care not to confound freedom with tolerance of dehumanisation. One is good, the other is evil. But it is the nature of evil that it is highly connected to good (this is how fundamental lie operates). Evil is the corruption of good; without good there is no evil. It is not our job to place economic systems (economic idealism) above humanity. This relates to personal responsibility; proscriptive vs prescriptive morality. Socialism (and most use of the phrase social justice) is likely to be the corrupt version thereof. A fake moral responsibility (easily shot down) distracts us from our actual moral responsibility. To defend the weak against abuse; and yes the diabolical industry preys on the weak (they have already been used earlier in their life, dishonoured by an absent father, or hunted down for their beauty).

The last paragraph of the second comment is discussing phobia and arachnids.

//Islamic terrorism

Iv got no problem with the language I just don't understand the argument. A culture whose women are led to emotionally protest something other than the right to decapitate baby girls is less backward or insanely stupid than our own? We don't even let 1/4 of our population protest; we take them out before they can, or we take photos of them so they can't. And another quarter can protest all they

like as long as they make themselves available for consumption at a young age (by which time they will have given up wishing to protest anything of substance). All while we assume that the other half are still not mature enough to respect their independence (and so they must flaunt their reproductive features), or moral enough to respect their beauty (and so they feel immodest in honouring their own body).

Fundamentalist Islam is reactionary against the morally corrupt west in the same way I would argue that fundamentalist Christianity is. They are both recent phenomena in the present era, and they are both [are] based on reason (safety). Although I believe there is a humane way through it, it is important to check those utopian presuppositions, and look where you are going.

With absolutely no context, I was operating on the assumption that they were a group of Muslim women in their homeland protesting against honour killings or the like (say more autonomy). Otherwise the use of women makes no sense whatsoever (it is extremely uncommon for Muslim women to protest publicly so it would be strange to show such women protesting without men regarding a common grievance). In any case the classification of fundamentalist Islam as better than a nation that engages in systematic virtual prostitution/rape and maintains sexual abuse rates up to 90% in its most liberal colleges is erroneous. Good children get taught not to compare 2 wrongs but fix those they are responsible for. We can't just go around telling people to be better, we need to set an example (consistency). Nor can we force people to act selflessly, as they will come to disrespect their oppressors.

...

The problem may lie in the assumptions embedded within the analysis. What if terrorism is not a problem from outside (extremism) but from within? What if it is a natural response to inconsistency? It is worth tracing history back a few centuries to ask which societies feature terrorism, and which do not. A society that feels the need to control people probably has some problems [worth] looking into.

...

[in response to the claim that higher kill rate terrorist activities are more attractive to Islamic terrorists:]
Not when you get the opportunity to take the eyes out of the infidel.

[in response to the claim that willingness to self sacrifice is the cause of Islamic terrorism:]
Yet this is the basis of high level morality

The modern progressive doesn't mind killing innocent civilians - so long as it doesn't have to face its victims in this world (displaying ahistoric emotional cowardice, they can rationalise away another's soul with their just world fallacy).

There is more humanity in the anarchy of the hood than the cold and calculated systematic slaughter of inconvenient children, or the reduction of women to their capacity to distally trigger the same stimulus experienced by our ancestors during genetically successful sexual intercourse, which has through natural selection since been encoded into every cell of our body.

...

As religion is a matter of interpretation one can say some religions are less compatible with their society (more dangerous) than others, or that their traditional texts call their audience to violence, but there is nothing necessitating the admission that a particular religion is in of itself problematic (apart from honesty; which may well be lacking - ie, in the case where someone privately thought this to be the case but did not admit it).

Yet an existent society with high levels of education that experiences these kinds of events has got more serious problems than religion. There is something fundamentally sick about a society where someone feels morally justified to wipe out its population. Religion just intensifies morale (or warps it - it doesn't create it out of thin air): you can't make someone think something good is evil (only the reverse).

//Islamic terrorism

I have absolutely no problem with people banning immigration on whatever grounds they like, but to limit free speech is exceedingly dangerous. It implies that you can't win an argument.

Any limitation of free speech is just one step down the line towards tyranny.

The fact these people are being convinced of such radicalism suggests an argument is being lost outside the mosque. Regardless, this is how the Islamic terrorist will interpret the restriction; that their overlords can't win an argument; that they can't take self criticism, vindicating their rebellion. It will only go underground; there is a lot which can be said without saying things directly. Furthermore, the majority of effective sermons almost certainly do not make explicit calls to arms, so the practical implementation is ill determined. The only way to implement the ideal is to ban the Quran (whose direct interpretation is more dangerous than any sermon).

The fact of the matter is that things should never have been allowed to get this far - mindless immigration is the cause. Limiting freedom of speech is not the solution. Wait and see what the precedent can accomplish.

I have no problem with people taking out potential threats, but this is not what the law is for. Intelligence monitoring is irrelevant (contemporary monitoring only exists because there is freedom of speech, and child abuse is not speech). In my opinion sex offenders should be shot. What law are you going to find to suppress my right to say that?

If there is a problem then it should be engaged with and dialogued with; defeated by reason. If this can't be done (or won't be attempted) then there is evidence of a deeper problem. For in all evil there is good; for it is from good that evil comes. The animal is neither good nor evil; it is just selfish and base. Even in the psychopath there is good, and oft a history of abuse. It is the responsibility of the adult to

find that good and illuminate it, not to interpret their behaviour as causeless. For if not the acts will just reoccur, and the suppression will vindicate the zealot, knowing that their cause cannot be countered with words, only by force and emotion; the animal's tools of manipulation.

For what will happen when we start to restrict every dangerous message? Should we ban the hunger games? Fight club? Perhaps we should reduce risk by placing every teenage male without reason to be particularly social in a box, where they cannot physically harm another person. We might even be able to reduce the harm experienced by economically disadvantaged females (preferably in the third world) by paying them to share themselves with such men? Yet we should have gained enough insight into the effects of dehumanisation in the Second World War not to replicate it in every household of the west. Those who talk about banning speech but not dehumanisation are lost, and they will never find peace, neither for themselves or their civilisation.

Now all of this might seem academic. Surely it would be a lot easier just to restrict a few sermons. Job done end of story. That would perhaps work for a lesser cult, but we are talking about a 1400 year old religion. Anyone who has read the Quran with a clear head will know that secular pretense is in direct violation of the prophet. And for the western politicians who are too lazy and overconfident to read a religious text, wait and see the outcome.

Anyone seriously considering limiting freedom of speech at this point in history should write a 5000 word essay on jar jar binks. I wouldn't object if they had to deport every Mohammedan to the 4th generation. There are right ways of solving problems and there are wrongs ways. And the wrongs ways always appear easiest. But never work. Sure we might get a few nice clerics to smile for the media gods, but the terrorist victory goes on your permanent record. And when they have finished rounding up the last confederate of your police state, and the screams are heard in every last cell - what were you thinking?

They had a chance to get their game together and solve their terror problem, and no one has a right to immigrate anywhere (expat). If a group is a demonstrative threat (incompatible) then they shouldn't consider their accomodation (provisional citizenship) permanent. They might be permitted to stay out of grace but this is not a moral obligation. This has nothing to do with what people say it relates to what they do (if there there wasn't a language or education barrier then you could argue you are limiting speech by not accepting people arbitrarily into your country - but this certainly is not the case).

Personally I wouldn't recommend deporting anyone. We (the west) have been given the opportunity to correct things - and another one might not come along again until it is too late. I don't view Islam as a threat (but recognise that a moral progressive most certainly should view it as a threat). What has been identified with respect to immigration is the only prudent alternative (to facing the reality of dehumanisation) available. Limiting freedom of speech is like laying down a minefield and waiting for your children's legs to get blown off.

If anyone was ever looking for evidence that progressivism requires legislative restrictions to freedom, this is it.

//Terrorism Commentary

[regarding http://www.theaustralian.com.au/business/media/abc-boss-michelle-guthrie-demands-apology-from-quadrant/news-story/650c4c93197c40c61f333d434b7ea0bb]
http://www.smh.com.au/national/quadrant-editor-issues-unreserved-apology-to-the-abc-over-sick-and-unhinged-article-20170524-gwch1q.html

"He said he was making a rhetorical point about the absurdity of a suggestion by one of the panelists on Monday night's program that accidents involving refrigerators kill more people than terrorism, and what he saw as the ongoing refusal of ABC commentators to acknowledge the true causes of terrorism." - seems valid, why apologise?

---
1. This point is not relevant because truth is objective. It is irrelevant who says what, only what is said. Propositions cannot be exchanged arbitrarily...
2. Each of those ~42 criticisms appeared relevant to an institution which cannot represent the arguments of a population who are forced to pay for it.
3. The proposition was rhetorical - even sophists understand rhetoric enough not to take offence at it. A primary school student is capable of inferring that no one is wishing evil on anyone. Merely that people do a better job at thinking before talking. Because if they don't more people may well die. And a failure to heed to correction implies responsibility - the blood will be on their hands. No mature (or sober) adult cares what they feel when analysing propositions.

No [personOfOtherConvictions] it is rhetorical; the amendment is just a little more obvious for the less adept audience.

I personally don't care what a senator thinks (unless they have an argument), and involving the federal police in an effort to suppress freedom of speech demonstrates an intellectual dishonesty. If one is not willing to stand by their views and take responsibility for their consequences then they shouldn't be expressing them. The more one crawls toward their superiors to fuel their ad hominem, the higher the price owed for their negligence.

The hysteria demonstrates that you don't need terrorism to incite terror into the abc - they are already drugged up on the terror naturally consequent of personal immorality; which is why they will never understand terrorism.

(As per 1 projecting the rhetorical proposition to arbitrary institutions or persons is invalid. Had they shared responsibility for future terrorist activity then it might serve some rational purpose).

//Left-wing terrorism
I think the USA had a chance to call out domestic terrorism at Berkley (twice) but failed. What we saw in Virginia was the inevitable result of the consistent denial of a citizen's constitutional right to peaceful assembly. ANTIFA has been initiating violent attacks on US citizens for months. White nationalists are becoming radicalised (supremacy) and militantised in response. I would argue the MSM holds responsibility for its failure to report on and condemn leftist terrorism.

Trump's response appears not to be politically useful but civilly necessary. If he had criticised only the white nationalists (whose constitutional peaceful assemblies are been constantly attacked), he would be risking the start of a civil war.

This does not imply that what was carried out was not an act of terrorism (although it might better be described as an act of psychosis; there currently been no evidence of terrorist motive, eg rocking up to another person's legally certified demonstration and attacking people). There has been a lot of terrorism going on and not all terrorism involves running people over with cars.

This is a potent example of where doing and saying nothing can be catastrophic.

I think it is a reasonable hypothesis to assume what resulted was facilitated in part by white supremacism, but as for it being an act of 'white hate', many of the people slaughtered were white. Anyone sufficiently radicalised (unaware of and therefore unsympathetic to the ignorance of their opponents, or propagandised to believe things of their opponents which make them liable to attack; eg nazification) will carry out terrorism.

David Duke's claim that they (white supremacism) got Trump elected is just that; a claim. Their immigration policies happen to align - and it is in his interests to seek presidential support. There are apparently a whole lot of different white nationalist groups (represented in Virginia and elsewhere) who have little to do with him or national socialism.

It is sad that the left still think that dangerous ideas can be stopped by shutting people up. Ideas must be discussed freely and without fear of persecution. And white nationalism is not a new one. Deplatforming is both a communist and fascist ideal, but not an American one. About the worst thing you can do for someone psychologically is to apply contradictory standards.

Regarding Ivanka's initial response (condemning hate), I believe her intended meaning was correct; encouraging people not to hate others is good and true. But it is equally valid to claim that encouraging others not to hate things is wrong. One can only love truth if they hate error.

Regarding her latest response; saying that "racism, white supremacism, and neo nazis" have no place in America - I think the antiracism claim is valid for one of its many definitions (if we took it to its extreme we should expect a uniformly brown populace by 2100), and I completely appreciate her affront to national socialism (antisemitism), but overall I would say the message lacks insight into the fundamental problem: discrimination based on belief.

The only humane solution to a surge in domestic terrorism is to a) do something about the media before they start a hydrogen war (forget about a civil war), and b) start labelling terrorism objectively. I would strongly advise against pushing a movement underground.