

## ASSORTED NOTES

by P. J.

<http://unism.pjwb.org>

<http://unism.pjwb.net>

<http://unism.narod.ru>

Here, I have collected a few texts written on occasion, thus presenting the attitude of unism to the common phenomena of everyday life. These pages are nothing but a preliminary exposure, a motive for further acquaintance. Further development is to seek for a more comprehensive treatment, including the special issues in the universal context.

### A Hell of Enlightenment

Probably, the world abounds with talents, and there are heaps of geniality at any corner. Some people catch the gist at the very first sight, some need the second sight, while many just don't need to look, as they are certain about everything in advance. Such are the reason's footholds and starting-points. From time to time, one of the titans of thought condescends to educating the outbred half-wits who are never to get anywhere on their own, and whose minds do not but mimic the others' creativity, trying in vain to enter the games of the brainy of the earth. Well, it isn't much of a toil for an eminent character to write this or that, on a several hundred pages. Take it, and benefit from it. And appreciate their great goodness.

Still, it comes to that the poor creatures like me cannot even properly take the gift of the all-potent; a banal anthropoid lacks loaf to understand what he reads, nothing to say about the slow and wasteful manner of reading that gets stuck at any formula. Every day, I come across a dozen books that are most likely to be worth my reading. It totals up to four thousand a year. Personally, I am utterly unable to assimilate that plentiful wisdom. One can hardly even have enough time to hastily leaf them through. Just arranging the fresh findings on the shelves could take the whole day, since I have first to decide on the proper shelf, which requires at least some understanding of what it's all about.

Sometimes, I may long for some engagement, and it may feel like I too could produce something of interest. But, with single glance at the immense ocean of special literature on any topic, I don't feel entirely well. Doing one's utmost of utmost, one can hardly gain a grain of originality. The folks have long since invented and presented everything in the depths of the thick volumes. Nevertheless, as I come to reading, a bizarre feeling grows. On one hand, indeed, there is nothing that cannot be found. Every thought has already visited somebody's head, every instance of beauty has already emerged somewhere some day. No need to flutter at all. On the other hand, however much reading does not bring any bliss to the soul. They all talk much and say lots of truths, but still there is something wrong about it. Something lacks for convincing perfection.

Well, what if I tried to fix it myself? Never chasing any real discoveries, just having a mental clear-up. As soon as I try, it's utter disappointment. All goes no better than before, and looks crooked from any direction. One even gets obsessed with a crazy thought: what if there is no order in the world at all? Sheer tossing the words, from one book to another... Hence no need to strain the brain, no responsibility. Why? Nobody will see anyway; and those who will see won't understand; and those who understand won't value; and those who value will through it in the garbage. With all that modern abundance, it can be simpler to raise anything from scratch rather than seek for it in a disaster of somebody's wit. Maybe all that there is of outstanding creativity is nothing but great ignorance and

great arrogance? Those who are too lazy to dig something out of somebody open new lines of development. Those who dare to put their rotten foot forward make the current swim with them. A half-stuff stimulates universal reflection and makes the progress drag itself along.

Not at all. This is my mental debility that prevents me from observing the entire charm of the present, and I have nothing to offer to anybody. Now, all I can do is to sit aside and sniff mum. To turn over the pages of the wits and put me out on and on. And to keep my silly writings far away from the public attention, on a deserted site never frequented by anybody but spiders and bots, purely for their business needs.

Then take it for what it is. So to say, we're not welcome for all we don't have. As a home exercise, here is a question of an idiot: what if there is some use of the entirely useless? Maybe reluctance (and inability) to understand could be no second to keen intelligence in some respects? Maybe passing without a trace brings in some values beyond ardent self-perpetuation? Maybe geniality is not all in deeds, but also in the casual denial of the deed. May be...

Or may not.

### Sports

Do you like sports? I don't. Here are my reasons why.

I declare that *any competition at all* is incompatible with the very idea of reason. Competition belongs to the animal world, while consciousness is essentially what distinguishes humans from the animals.

So far, people still have to fight for a place in the sun. The level of production is not high enough to satisfy everybody's needs, and the system of distribution is far from perfection. This leads to the dominance of the animal in humans. The higher is the value of the deliberate refusal to compete, to struggle for life in the animal way. This makes one a conscious being rather than a male or female representative of a biological species.

Sports do exactly the opposite. They serve to feed the animal instincts, to suppress the truly human motives and feelings replacing them with a number of surrogate activities that are harmful in almost any respect.

For the sportsman, this means harm both for the body and for the soul. The body gets over-exercised and stuffed with metabolic drugs. The soul is corrupted by the idea that it must serve to the body. Some sportsmen could be really creative if they would not have chosen sports; so much human resource is thus wasted!

For the humanity, the damage is beyond any measure.

Sports weaken the human race, since they have long since become a competition of drugs, rather than people; moreover, they induce people to train the skills that are of absolutely no use thus leading to the lack of practical training.

Sports divert people from socially valuable activities, wasting their time and effort. False values are substituted for real values. Interest for silly records and illusionary achievements supplants the attentiveness to the burning social problems.

Sports undermine the economy. They absorb both material and creative resources in tremendous quantities. This is an entirely unproductive business, and hence an additional load for both the public wealth in general and the individual well-being. On the other hand, sports feed the army of operators who can do nothing but feed on sports, the dregs of humanity.

Sports are all commercial. Commerce and sports sprout from the same idea of competition. They do not care for improving people's life; their only purpose is making money, or pursuing any other profit. Amateur sports differ little from professional sports in this respect.

Sports distort the system of public values, assuming that a sportsman (or a sports manager) gaining millions of dollars a year is more important for the society than, say, a scientist, a gardener, a miner, a shoe cleaner. In fact, the relation is exactly the opposite, since sportsmen never produce anything.

Sports cripple the public morals since they impose the idea of permissiveness. The only goal is to win by any means, with no restraint. This psychology gets readily transferred to the other domains.

Sports produce the ugliest phenomenon of the modern culture, the fans. The dull observers who don't go in for sports themselves while pretending to deeply know or understand anything. The admirers that do not much care for what they admire. The defenders that do not care for what they defend. The mold. The dust. But this dust is dangerous, since it is ready to choke the slightest germs of the free thought. Fans cannot love, they can only hate. This is yet another side of any competition at all. Sports raise violence and aggression. There are winners, there are losers. Hence, the idea of social inequality and oppression.

I could enumerate on and on. Eventually, the sports set a social pattern that becomes replicated in any human activity at all, transforming it into animal competition. Competition kills creativity. A scientist, who enters a competition, starts thinking about profit rather than truth. A dancer at a competition would dance to appeal to the judges rather than to produce an instance of beautiful perfection. A worker in a competitive business is bound to work for sale rather than satisfy people's needs.

To disguise the destructive nature of sports, the official propaganda plays up the idea of individual recreation and exercise. It slurs over the principal difference between, say, skiing for sport and skiing for pleasure. The former is harmful as any other competition. The latter is nothing but a kind of airing, like a walk in a forest; it will be healthy as long as it does not lead to strain. On the other hand, the apparently the same activity can carry quite different charge depending on the motive. One can play chess (or soccer) in a cooperative (creative) or a competitive way; this will make it either conscious activity or animal behavior.

As for training, there are many ways to support one's vitality that do not require artificial movements repeated to the level of stupefaction. In a properly organized society, the everyday activities of each member will provide enough muscular exercise. There are special techniques that combine muscular training with any common activity, including the rest; to master them is a matter of education. However, spreading this knowledge is not in the interests of the ruling classes.

Sports cannot even pass for an experiment designed to investigate the biological limits of the human body. Such an experiment would not need all the commercial side of sports, and, of course, the hordes of fans.

Trying to identify recreation with sports, the ruling circles also aim at bringing people under control in the form of life standards, fashions, corporate spirit *etc.* That is, those who obey the formal demands are treated as taking the right way, while the deviators are despised and expelled. One part of the society is thus set against another, in the line of animal (and sportive) competition. Many people go in for sports just to conform to the social standard; otherwise they would risk losing everything.

In a way, the existence of sports is an indicator of the underdevelopment of the society. Someday, or some millennium, the humanity will get rid of this relic of the animal past, to open the new horizons for consciousness and reason.

### **Wisdom in Time**

People often believe (or are made to believe) that those who lived many centuries before could possess some superior knowledge or wisdom, and that their spiritual achievements have been lost or forgotten with time.

Such a belief denies development at least twice. First, cultural achievements are deemed to be eternal

and never change. Second, people's ability of thought and action is assumed to be the same throughout the human history.

The both statements are wrong.

Nothing in the culture comes once and for ever. The material and spiritual culture are equally changeable. The commodities of the early ages will never satisfy the modern demands. But also, the esthetics of one epoch is different from another, and most samples of the ancient or primitive art will hardly excite anything but historical interest in a contemporary person. Similarly, the notions of the early science can hardly be acceptable today. The same holds for philosophy, for wisdom. Moreover, since philosophy is essentially related to practice, to the conscious construction of the future, following prehistoric directions is exactly the opposite to wisdom, which is bound to eventually break any rules at all to discover new ways, more appropriate for each particular stage of development.

Of course, some heritage of the past preserves its value in our days as well. This means that the culture has not yet surpassed the economic and social organization of yesterday, so that people still live and operate in the similar conditions. That is, the acceptability of the old forms is mainly due to the low rate of development rather than to some extraordinarily wise establishments of our predecessors; in other words, due to the lack rather than the excess of wisdom.

Now, people's abilities develop following economical development, which extends the collection of skills possessed by an average person, including mental skills. The wider view of the world makes the average level of spirituality much higher in a contemporary person than in most people of the past. Therefore, any modern wisdom will in any case be more sublime and elaborate than anything previously known. If a modern philosopher gets fascinated by some ancient "truth", one could suspect his spiritual underdevelopment rather than the exceptional quality the old idea. In particular, the persistence, despite of all the progress of the arts, science and philosophy, of numerous religions is the result of slow cultural development and poor education, which, in its turn, is due to the improper economic and social organization.

### **Nothing's Wasted!**

In the whole of the world, each individual thing takes its objectively necessary place, and there is nothing that would not accrue to the world's integrity. In particular, everybody's life is necessary in its way, and the whole of the humanity needs each and every its member. Still, the individual contributions can be different in kind, belonging to the different levels of the world's organization. Mere existence is qualitatively different from biological life, and animal behavior is not the same as conscious activity. As a biological body, or inanimate thing, a person is only a part of the material basis of consciousness and reason; with the development of subjectivity as universal mediation, one's influence on the whole of the world increases beyond any limit.

Any conscious act implies a change in the world that is bound to infinitely propagate and never entirely disappear, though possibly taking different forms and merging with the traces of other acts. In most cases, one cannot separate one influence from another, and ascribe a particular effect to a single personality; however, this does not mean that the contribution of an individual is negligible. One's existence and life can support somebody else's subjectivity, thus joining the whole in an indirect way.

Any kind of conscious activity is equally universal, though it may be difficult sometimes to specify its product. Consciousness means creativity, and hence the development of the world in its integrity. Regardless of one's occupation, creative approach is enough to give it universal significance, which makes one a representative of the whole world.

## Advertising

Annoying, importunate, meaningless, silly, impertinent, aggressive, destructive, antihuman...

This is advertising.

The very existence of such an absurdity demonstrates the inferior nature of the currently existing societies. A conscious person will never disturb the others without a very serious reason. Shattering people's peace and quiet, advertising is utterly incompatible with reason.

Advertising is expensive; it wastes all kinds of resources with no economic or cultural return, thus undermining the public wealth. The wasted economic and spiritual power could have been used to enrich the people's life, to solve the burning problems of today, or at least to cut the prices.

Advertisements contain no information; quite often they are built upon a deliberate lie. The technical tricks used to attract attention are directed to the primitive physiological reactions destroying any conscious thought and driving the minds to complete stupidity. Most people hate ads and try to avoid them. But there already are the corrupted souls who cannot imagine themselves without these spiritual slops, advertising becoming their way of thought and the only mode of perception.

In a reasonable society, advertising should be entirely stopped, including hidden advertising and self-advertising. All one really needs is information. A hundredth of the present advertisement expenses would be enough to set up a world-wide information network supplying any information needed without irrelevant noise and redundancy. The commercial usage of the Internet has killed the very idea of a public network for free data exchange. Search engines and online catalogs are flooded with advertising junk; their efficiency has fallen to almost below zero. Arts, science and philosophy depend on advertising, which hinders the development of human spirituality and eventually the progress in economy.

Adding to the absurdity of advertising as such, advertisements spoil the common products, or at least lower their value. The producer (or a distributor) tends to put the company's logo at every visible spot. But why should I wear clothes, shoes, or whatever, with silly inscriptions? What if I just don't want any letters on me? A perverted logic, once again. Companies pay to place their ads on TV, or in the streets, but they don't pay to me for wearing their logotypes.

## False Pride and Property

In the human society, there is nothing that could be produced by a single person, nor by an isolated group. Everybody depends on everybody, though these dependences are often very indirect. Nobody can claim to produce a slightest thing without any assistance at all. The very fact of one's existence is already mediated by billions of other people. In our everyday life we use numerous commodities; we need food and clothes, shelter and protection, learning and education, instruments and tools. Our free time and our privacy cannot come but from the society. Our thoughts and feelings are culturally determined, and our ideas reflect social needs.

That is, whatever one does, one is never alone, and whatever one makes is made by the society as a whole. The formation of a conscious individual assumes the millennia of common experience. One's personality is nothing but a collective effect, the crest of the wave.

There are no "self-made" people; we are all made by the culture we happen to live in. All we can achieve is determined by the specific economic and social conditions, and every our act is mediated by the history and the present of the humanity.

That is why the idea of property is *logically* fallacious. There is no reasonable ground for anything to belong to a single person. Every single thing is produced by the whole society, to satisfy social needs. One contribution is no better than another. The concentration of wealth and power in the hands of a limited group of people cannot hence be anything but usurpation, which becomes possible due to a

wrong social and economic order.

However, the absolute sociality does not mean absolute identity. On the contrary, universal social support results in truly unique personalities, and lack of individuality means lack of sociality, lack of reason. Conscious activity implies infinity of possibilities, and each of them is implemented in a single person, whose unique formation is indispensable for the reproduction of the totality of the world.

### **Multiple Worlds**

The world in the most general sense is unique, and there is no “other” world, since the very idea of “anotherness” is a kind of union, and being different from each other means to have something in common, namely, the property of being different.

However, the world manifests itself as a universe of numerous individual things. This diversity is inherent in the world, being a level of its integrity. Every separate part of the world is virtually related to any other part, thus reflecting the whole world, *representing* it in that particular aspect.

That is, there is infinity of worlds that represent the same world; these multiple worlds are the *positions* of the same hierarchy, the hierarchical structures unfolded starting from a particular unit (the topmost element of the structure). All such worlds are identical, since every one of them comprises the whole Universe. However, they may look quite differently, and even be opposite to each other.

For instance, the world centered on me is different from the world unfolding for somebody else, and the two views may be utterly incompatible. Still, my world will necessarily comprise the other’s view; otherwise it would not be complete. The ability to “model” the other’s world within our own is one of the fundamental properties of reason, a consequence of definition as universal mediation. As a conscious being I must be able to temporarily become anything at all, remaining myself as the unity of all these special models. The more reasonable I am, the deeper is my comprehension of the other.

Of course, such universality cannot be achieved in an instant, in a finite system. That is why, we must always exercise care while talking about “human” and “non-human”, “conscious” and “non-conscious” forms of existence; the subject can take many unexpected forms, and, obviously, no person is entirely spiritual, combining all the possible levels of motion in an individual way.

### **Authorship and Plagiarism**

Can anybody *own* an idea? The only reasonable answer is “Certainly no!” Ideas don’t come to people from nowhere; they are born as a collective effect, a result of numerous acts of communication with other people. It does not matter how the idea is expressed by a particular person; it can only exist through the wide circulation across the minds and a variety of manifestations in individual activities.

When somebody creates something, one can be sure that the work of many other people has been used, directly or indirectly. Every act is culturally mediated, and thus always borrowing from the pool of forms, skills, trends and tendencies present at the time. It would be as absurd to sue somebody for using somebody else’s idea as to sue non-native English speakers for using English!

Why is it so frustrating and annoying when somebody “steals” an idea from somebody? Why is it considered unethical and unacceptable? The origin of such an attitude lies in the nature of capitalism, which transforms everything into trade values, abstracting it from its real content. Thus any product becomes mere representative of a definite amount of money rather than what it actually is. When an author of a book is indignant at somebody’s publishing the same under a different name, the presumed original writer (a single person, or a group of authors) does not worry about spreading the ideas expressed and the results obtained; what only matters is who will get the money. Getting profit becomes the principal goal of any work, and sharing ideas degrades to sharing money.

Under capitalism, the principles of public wealth distribution are essentially abstract, being more dependant on the part of wealth already owned than on the owner's contribution into the general economic and cultural progress. For example, of two people with the same idea, the richer will most probably find the ways for its implementation, while the poorer will be bound to lag behind, wasting efforts on mere survival rather than creative development. The former may even be unaware of the others' contribution, never thinking of the privileged position as a gift from the society; wealthy people will hardly ever refer to those who produced their wealth, and they are not apt to nor share the benefits. One person may have quicker access to publishers than another, and use this advantage to publish what the latter only meant. What does that change? They both get their existence from the rest of the humanity, directly or indirectly using the products of the millions of other people, insufficiently compensated, for whom the both "authors" are "thieves", no matter how they "rob" each other.

The notion of authorship has developed with capitalism, and a more reasonable society would never be interested in the origin of anything. If you can do something, do it without any thoughts of the possible benefits. If somebody wants to reproduce the work of the others (probably, without ever knowing them), the resulting growth of the public wealth will only come to the good of the society as a whole, increasing the accessibility of the products. On the other hand, dropping off the priority issues will result in the improvement of the products themselves, since that will remove any formal restriction and the ballast of references.

Living in the thievish society, people have to obey its thievish laws and steal bread from each other; otherwise they won't be able to live on and proceed with their work. There is always a compromise with one's conscience, and different people draw the line differently. The only acceptable excuse is that one's actions help the humanity to get out of the savage state. This, however, does not make things easier for an individual, since it is often difficult to say which actions (or which aspects of an action) meet this objective criterion, and which don't. This is a serious psychological problem.

One could object that, regardless of the economic reasons, simple honesty would not permit people steal somebody else's ideas, and lie. Probably. But the only reason for a lie is that it brings profit. That is, the idea of honesty applies mainly to those who have already achieved a solid social position; in this case any stealth would be regarded as a kind of perversion. In real life, honesty often becomes a weapon against intruders. For instance, a seeker of a scientific degree has to mention the publications of the boss and his team even if they are absolutely irrelevant to the topic; otherwise, there is no way upward.

Stealth and lie can only disappear if there are no social and economical grounds for them. But such a society will never tie the matter of fact to the historical issues. Any reference to somebody else's work will only be possible as an introductory remark, an expression of respect, or a figure of speech.

With truly new ideas, bringing them to the public is matter of courage rather than priority. If a respectable somebody is brave enough to risk his or her reputation and sign to the words of those who have no other way to promote a radical thought, this is a respectable kind of plagiarism that can only be praised. An idea requiring a drastic change in the public mentality has little chance to attract immediate attention; normally, it will gradually penetrate the minds showing up in quite different contexts, in the work of different people in different countries, through either independent development, or as a distant echo of one's direct and indirect contacts. Ideas get passed from one person to another on the unconscious level, through the field of social inclinations and preferences. The emergence of the same ideas in different people is a good sign, indicating both the truth of the idea and a shift in public receptiveness.

### **Transportation Scales**

There is a correspondence between the spatial scale and rate of communication on one hand, and the means of transportation on the other. Generally, technological development would allow achieving

greater speeds. Quite often, however, a higher speed is inefficient at common distances, and the older modes of transportation continue to occupy a significant place in the culture. For instance, we use airplanes to skip over the ocean, but we would rather prefer an on-surface vehicle (a car, a bus, a train) to go to a neighboring town, and we will probably just walk from one piece to another within an apartment. There is also dependence on the character of transfer. Thus, merchant marine still dominates over aviation when mass cargo transportation is concerned.

In the same way, space exploration is associated with its own hierarchy of velocity scales. Speeds needed for interplanetary travel are much slower than the typical speeds of an interstellar flight, while those latter will lie on a much lower scale than the prospective velocities of getting from one galaxy to another (which would certainly be higher than the speed of light). And, probably, mastering these new modes of conveyance will leave intact the traditional terrestrial means of transport for quite a while. That is, the feasibility of teleportation (so cherished by science-fiction writers) for short-range travel seems rather doubtful (though, in the far perspective, not impossible).

One could conjecture that there is a lower limit for the characteristic time of communication: for a given range of distances, a material body cannot spend on travel less than some minimal time value. For example, a plane will pass the distance of 100 miles much faster than a car, but if we also consider the time required to get to the airport and back to city, plus the necessary formalities, the total will hardly ever be less than a typical car travel time.

A similar effect (albeit due to a different mechanism) exists in the computer market: the costs always tend to lower with technological development, but the older models gradually disappear from the market, so that the minimal price of a computer would not fall below a few hundred dollars.

### **Love to the End of Doom**

Some people believe that love can come and go, following the situational nature of personal relations and external circumstances. They admit that love depends on the partner's qualities, and any sign of imperfection, like withering beauty, a bad habit or poor education, would weaken love, especially in the presence of somebody else, who seems to be free of these drawbacks. Presumably, love can fade away, or even turn into its opposite, causing various inter- or intrapersonal conflicts.

I contend that such opinions confuse love with something else. True love bears a touch of infinity; it can never alter, nor get moderated. Similarly, in mathematics, diminishing a very big number by one will produce an almost imperceptible change, but doing it many times will bring it to zero and even make negative; but subtracting any number from infinity won't change it at all, since infinity can never be exhausted by finite quantities.

Once found, love is bound to last forever, transcending the very limits of people's life. Do not confuse it with mere amorousness, sympathy, interest or inclination, which may accompany love, giving it a unique coloring. But the same melody is well recognizable in different timbres; similarly, love can take many forms, remaining essentially the same.

Love does not care for economic or social positions, for physical or spiritual virtues. It is never affected by the troubles of life or the public opinion. Love is the most durable of all human capacities and the best foundation for developing personality.

However, if one has to seek for love, if it is not present all the time, how can one expect it to last? Well, we know from mathematics that there are intervals bounded at one end while extending to infinity at the other. But I don't think that love can be limited that way. It does not emerge from nothing, and there is neither beginning nor end. That is why we usually say that one has to *discover* one's love, or *meet* it, or *find* it... It means that your love is already present in the world long before you become aware of it. Everybody's love is pre-determined by the whole arrangement of things in the world, never being mere coincidence. That is why love is often perceived as a kind of fate, an external



force beyond human control; and that is why it can break out like a flash, in an instant, at first sight, at a slightest sign of spiritual affinity.

Still, one can never become a slave of love, since the very idea of love implies freedom and conscious aspiration. Love opens to the people their own infinity, the whole universe in everybody. This universality is incompatible with any domination; it cannot bear any restriction beyond free devotion. That is why love has always been a universal source of creativity. The very existence of the human culture, consciousness and reason, is hence a product of love.

### **Journalism**

The profession of a journalist is almost as old as that of a prostitute, and possibly even more contemptible. A journalist is a person without conscience and self-respect who can do everything to keep people listening to no matter what. Journalists don't scruple to use any means for cooking up yet another sensation; they never care for truth and justice, and their job has nothing to do with reporting information.

The only task of a journalist, brainwashing, has two complementary aspects: mass propaganda and stultification. Journalists cannot afford having any ideas or convictions of their own; otherwise, they are certain to lose their job in a moment. All they need to do is to serve the interests of the ruling layers of the society, and their income depends on their promptness and obsequiousness. Mass media won't employ those who would discuss the demands of the boss; journalists are hired from the already stultified mass, and, normally, there is no need to lash, since seditious thoughts just cannot enter their heads.

The methods of mass suggestion employed by journalists are entirely based on the base instincts and primitive interests, always remaining on the physiological level. Journalists try to persuade people that they are mere crowd animals, and no other vistas are possible. A complementary technique presents any serious feeling or thought as property of an élite, virtually annihilating them. The very existence of journalism is contrary to the universal nature of subjectivity and reason.

Journalists are largely ignorant, regardless of the level of education. All they need is some superficial knowledge for ornamental use, to disguise the poisonous dishes they feed to the public. Any popularization of art, science or philosophy in mass media is ideologically saturated, distorting the original ideas.

After deliberate lie, the second principal technique of journalism is manipulation. One can arrange facts in such a manner that they would suggest a quite definite interpretation. One can bring this ability to the level of art, or science, which, however, won't make the whole business any worthier.

Human history knows examples of how good scientists and deep philosophers lost their wisdom and competence as soon as they tried to fall back upon journalism. This abusive style has put many bright works out of contemporary usability, since their positive content is too blended with irrelevant details and diluted by the incidents of the distant time; for a common example, take the writings of K. Marx, F. Engels, and V. Lenin, whose philosophical views are so difficult to extract from under political piles that the very existence of Marxist philosophy is often put in question.

### **Distinctions**

Many people feel the sacred piety towards all kinds of titles (PhD, Professor, Academician, prize winner, top-ten hitter *etc.*) awarded by numerous national and international committees. A person with a certificate or a license is generally considered as superior to those who cannot present any decoration. Is there any sense? Is there any real distinction?

Let's admit for a while that any titles are awarded according to the merits of the person thus distinguished. Consider the same person a second before awarding the title and a second after that. What has been changed? Did the merits of that person grow any higher in two seconds? Nonsense. But the market value of the person has jumped up. Doesn't it indicate the absurdity of the market value?

Now, is there anything reliable in the official recognition? Does it provide any grounds for judging about somebody's virtues?

As a rule, the official bodies authorized to award honors and issue certificates are rarely competent enough to properly evaluate one's achievements. They have to give credit to those who have nominated the candidate, and these people are never disinterested. Thus the whole business becomes a sheer political game.

Take the Nobel Prize for an immediate example. The Committee is very sensitive to the nationality of the applicants; they try to keep an intricate balance between preserving the absolute leadership of the USA and Western Europe on one hand and fooling the public by showcase democracy on the other. It is not enough for the dummies picked from the outskirts of the Western civilization just to be loyal to the traditional values of the Western bourgeoisie; they must actively promote them in their countries of origin, undermining the regimes disliked by the high patrons. For instance the very few Russians that have ever been awarded the Nobel Prize (like Bunin, Solzhenitsyn, or Sakharov) were selected exclusively for their anticommunism rather than for aesthetic or scientific excellence of their work. The subject areas of the works nominated for Nobel Prize is also a matter of careful choice. They cannot allow even a slightest contradiction with the official ideology.

Let us admit that somebody merits indeed the award. As a rule, this means that this person had certain achievements in the past, but nothing can be said about the present, or the future. What you were before may have little to do with what you are now, and what you are going to be. For example, academic honors often come too late, when the one's scientific career has long since been completed. Being a prize-winner says nothing about the laureate's creativity and ability to contribute to the cultural development.

Further, excellence in one area does not imply any competence in another. A good physicist can be very poor philosopher; a good programmer can be absolutely no teacher *etc.* Even within a narrow subject area, there are different levels of specialization, and, say, being a specialist in computing photoionization cross sections does not make one any better in computing cross sections for ion impact ionization. Distinctions are no reason for piety.

The only reasonable judgment is concerned with the present activities of the people and the usability of their current results. One may appreciate somebody's past services, still never taking anything for granted. The obvious corollary is that one does not need to know the position and titles of the interlocutor to form one's opinion and decide on the possibility of further cooperation. And, of course, the assessment of any act should not depend on the personality of the agent.

### **Web Ways and the Formation Theory**

Originally, the World Wide Web was conceived as a universal means of information exchange, a common stock of ideas, a workspace for creative cooperation, or at least a way of self-expression. It was the place, where one could meet those who hold the same views, find new acquaintances, make friends or discuss the urgent problems of the present. Then, the mass surfer came, and the Web began to transform into sheer entertainment and a trade spot.

The technological development has significantly advanced the possibilities for efficient data exchange through the Web—but primarily, it lead to obscuring this principal idea and the dominance of appearance over content. The promoter logic suggests that a Web page does not need to be meaningful and have sense; it is only important how it will look like. Advertising is aggressively repetitive; it

forces the informative fragments out of accessibility and virtually destroys the very mechanism of cooperation. It can therefore be considered as a DoS attack against the whole Web rather than a single resource.

The Web has long since become a schizophrenic mixture of technical freaks, weird transformations, offensive flashing, and a chaos of pop-ups. All that is often full of bugs and viruses, leading sometimes to heavy hang-ups requiring computer reset. A quiet informative page without JavaScript and abusive formatting is gradually vanishing to the land of dreams. The decadent creatures browsing the Web are willing to be completely drawn away from reality, from intelligence and reason. All they need is games, chats, primitive fun, insane voyeurism, perversion, and shopping.

However, the human history knows other similar phenomena. On the threshold of some cardinal changes in the economy and social organization, the general confusion will manifest itself in all kinds of decadence. The old culture is already felt to be obsolete, while the material premises for a new direction of development are yet to emerge. Quite probably, the present informational chaos is due to certain economic processes in the background, a smoke-screen for the forthcoming reorganization of the world.

The fundamental category of a *socioeconomic formation* has been introduced by K. Marx, who was first to find out that all the diversity of economic and social development reveals a sequence of distinct stages objectively arising in the history of any people. Each consecutive formation is hierarchical, containing several *sub-formations* superseding each other in an objective way. I suppose that there is an “ideal” counterpart for this “material” development, and I consider cultural development as an objective succession of *cultural formations* correlated with and relatively independent of the stages of economic development.

As far as I can judge, today, the humanity is experiencing one of such formation shifts, the transition to a higher level of economic and cultural development. There are indications that this is going to be the last phase of the capitalism, and the very its ubiquity means that there is no more room for adaptive modifications, and the next revolution is to annihilate the whole system.

### **Summits in History**

In the history of any nation, there is an epoch of maximum momentum, when this nation shows the ways of development to the rest of the world; however, later on, the same nation is bound to stumble and lag behind, if not entirely perish. One could find such historical summits in the past of many old countries, while the younger nations are still climbing up. Most probably, this character of development belongs to a particular stage of the human history, namely, that of *civilization*.

There are certain objectively necessary stages that any society has to pass. This is a fundamental law of economic development, and any attempt to skip the next stage and boost historical progress beyond its normal pace will be followed by a dramatic roll back, which can virtually annihilate the entire developmental capacity of the society.

Every phase of relative stability in history hides the future behind a kind of rubber wall: you can run against it and force it to give some way, but then it will throw you back with nearly as much momentum as you have applied to it. In this picture, the slow evolution of the economic basis of the society resembles repeatedly cutting tiny bits from the wall, which may eventually be made weak enough to allow yet another revolutionary attack to break through, thus opening new vistas for the humanity as a whole.

### **Struggle for Life**

The biological mechanisms of evolution are often extrapolated to the development of society. Of

course, such extrapolation may well be valid when the animal-like behavior of people is considered, that is, when their subjectivity is ignored. Since the overall level of human development has not yet advanced too far from the animal, one can readily find the social parallels for most biological phenomena. One of the evident traces of animal origin is struggle for life, which has been put forth by many defenders of capitalism as the governing principle of social development and human life in general.

As soon as we come to understanding the difference between inanimate motion, organic metabolism and conscious activity as the three fundamental levels of reality, it becomes obvious that any specifically human development must be governed by the principles different from those characteristic of the biological or physical reality, retaining them as a necessary background. Consequently, any manifestation of struggle for life should be treated as an indication of underdevelopment, lack of consciousness, rather than a normal social phenomenon. Truly human behavior implies the importance of absolute biological equality of all the members of the society, so that the survivability of an individual is essentially the same as the survivability of the whole community. The weak and shy are as (and in many cases more) important for the development of reason as the strong and arrogant. Physical immobility and other organic peculiarities should in no way be an obstacle for efficient activity, and the difference in mental attitudes has nothing to do with one's social value.

One could logically conjecture that a truly human society should be based on universal *cooperation*, eliminating *any* competition, *any* struggle for life. Individual life is an indispensable part of social life in general, and, in the world of reason, there will be no conflicts between individuals or social groups, and no contradictions between an individual and the society.

### East and West

In the XX century, the oriental line became most popular in the arts, in philosophy, and even in science. European artists explored the traditional and professional art of the East, oriental elements became popular in fashions, foods and architecture, there was a real boom around the martial arts, and various oriental philosophies captured the minds and imagination of Europeans as if they brought them some entirely new ideas and a different view of the world.

But are those oriental elements so unusual to Europe? Well, they have developed to a greater degree in the East, but their analogs existed in the European tradition as well, and one cannot expect any revelations from the Eastern arts and philosophies, beyond mere shift of attention. The Universe is integrity, and human spirituality, being a part of the world, reflects its integrity despite all the apparent heterogeneity.

Many Western thinkers spoke of the integrity of the world in the XX century, with a reference to various Eastern philosophies. However, there is nothing in the philosophic tradition of the East that could not be found in early European philosophers, and the centuries-old ideas of India, China and Japan were also expressed by Europeans, nearly at the same time, though in a different form and in another context. The ancient Greek myths already pictured the world as a syncretic whole; of the later times, I could mention, for example, the great figures of Pierre Gassendi and Dom Deschamps. I might also refer to the classical universalism of Goethe, and to the romantic philosophy of Hegel. Many interesting ideas can be found in Marxism; unfortunately, they have mostly been expressed as mere side remarks scattered over tons of text, and I don't know any compilation that would agree with the spirit of the originals.

Recent discoveries in the *theory of scale formation* indicate that all the arts follow the same sequence of stages in their development, which can be described in a universal way comprising both the European and non-European lines.

### Referencing and Identification

Why should I identify myself with anybody else? What if I prefer to speak on my own, without becoming somebody else's adept? There are thousands of books that I have never read, without even knowing, sometimes, about their existence. There are those who read some of these books and who are well acquainted with the overall stand of their authors. Should this circumstance influence my thought in any respect? Why, I can think myself, and I may have read many other books possibly unknown to the others—shall I despise them for ignorance?

Browsing conceptual links is indeed an interesting occupation on itself, and historical studies can be most stimulating, bringing more food for thought. However, this has nothing to do with thinking as such, or with communicating thoughts.

I might like mentioning some author from time to time, and my conversation partner might like checking the reference, which would entirely be his or her own inclination, a private affair. Nobody is obliged to react to references, however famous.

The roundabout manner of expression may have its positive sides; but, in a serious discussion, one should better prefer explicitness. Talking with anybody, I need to catch their own position, and not the position of Aristotle, Marx, or Mr. President.

### Vain Disputes

What's the use of argument? Can you persuade the others to accept your point of view abandoning their own? Those who yield to persuasion are not worth the effort; those who don't are not worth the time.

Firm convictions are not to fight with; this is something we should esteem and accept as a solid fact, trying to comprehend its objective necessity and positive content. One can fight with people, but never with their convictions.

Quite often, it is not the other's views that provoke antagonism, but rather their vulgarization, a distorted reflection in the curved face of the philistine mirror. Sometimes, such vulgar interpretations become so commonplace that nobody even tries to consult the originals, befuddled with popular quotations and second-hand reports. Thus, F. Schlegel with his conception of the "spiritually interesting" fought against I. Kant's thesis that the judgment of taste presupposes no interest, forgetting that it was exactly Immanuel Kant who first described the so called "intellectual interest" as related to aesthetic judgment. Similarly, Kant is often said to be the founder of philosophical "apriorism", and reproached (or praised) for his "agnosticism", while the works of Kant are replete with the statements affirming the objectivity of mental forms, their correspondence to the natural laws, and a expressing the firm belief in the human ability to comprehend anything at all. Yes, Kant didn't find the origin of the schemes of reasoning, and he honestly refused to discuss this issue, indicating only that such abstractions cannot be derived from experience. The criticism of such an "apriorism" is directed against what Kant *did not do*, and not against what he did. Thus one would blame Sir Isaac Newton for never trying to build a mathematical theory of love!

All kinds of argument are due to the lack of mutual understanding. But, in this case, it would be much more efficient to learn from each other rather than dispute.

### Holidays

Isn't it strange when whole nations suddenly become mad about buying gifts, arranging decorations, cooking and consuming unusual (and often unhealthy) dishes? Isn't it strange that everybody should get merry at a definite date, regardless of the individual condition and personal dispositions? Isn't it

strange when, all of a sudden, the regular timetable gets broken and neglected, and any work, however urgent, has to wait till the end of the break?

This is the way people behave during official holidays. So much time is wasted, so much headache gained. The absurdity of this tradition is especially demonstrative in Russia, where people are accustomed to celebrate Christmas, New Year, then again Christmas (Jan 7/8), and again New Year (Jan 13/14), then Chinese New Year, and then the chain of holidays including (among the others) St. Tatiana (Jan 25), the Valentine's Day, the Army's Day (Feb. 23), Women's Day (March 8), St. Patrick, Easter (including the week before and the week after), the May Day, the Victory day... The first half of each year becomes an incessant festivity. Even those dates that are not yet officially recognized as days off influence general moods, distracting people from practical needs.

I admit that one needs sometimes relaxation and breaking away from the routine. I only insist that everybody's life is entirely individual, and people know themselves when it's time to be happy, or to be sad. One must be able to have a break when one really needs it, regardless of somebody else's desires. Of course, I should not expose my personal holidays and grieves to the public, putting the entire neighborhood upside down. In the ideal, nobody will notice the other's personal events, and everybody will esteem the privacy of the others.

### Cloning

The agitation around cloning (and especially cloning humans) that has recently blown over the press is mainly due to sheer misunderstanding. Cloning is nothing but yet another way of biological reproduction, which is not too different from the traditional method. It does not matter how the complete set of chromosomes has been put into the egg cell, as long as further development of that cell proceeds in the usual way. Sexual reproduction, artificial impregnation, gemmation or cloning can equally serve as a possible starting point.

It is often said that the reproduction of the same genome can be destructive for the species. Yes, it can, provided that organic development cannot be consciously controlled and directed, and there is no efficient mechanism of eliminating defective genes. Advanced gene engineering and active growth control could produce the opposite effect, making the species genetically richer, healthier and stronger. Anyway, nobody will drive the humanity to reproducing a single genome by cloning, as there are billions of acceptable genomes and practically infinity of their combinations.

The media spread fears that using cloned organisms for alimentation can be harmful. Why? The process of digestion does not depend on the reproduction scheme, it is the final result that matters, and hence foodstuffs produced by cloning have exactly the same alimentary value; all the possible harm comes from various degenerate tissues, which are much less likely to appear in cloned animals.

Here comes the sinister picture of the army of absolutely identical people cloned for some malignant purpose. But human subjectivity has nothing to do with biology, being entirely determined by the economic and social factors. Biologically equal people may become quite different personalities, when brought up in different social environments; mass poverty and mass culture are much more dangerous in that respect. The body is neutral to the mind as long as there are no physical disabilities or impairments that can cripple the soul under certain social conditions; but this is exactly the physical imperfection that is to be overcome by cloning and genetic control.

Well, there are a few real "dangers". Cloning may come disastrous to those who try to keep their grip on the leverage of social control. Thus, with the agricultural products getting cheaper and more accessible, it will no longer be possible to stifle people with hunger. This will also damp the prices in the other fields of economy, which would threaten the very economic organization of today; capitalists would rather provoke yet another global crisis and condemn millions to death, than admit better living conditions for everybody.

Women will become more economically and socially independent, since they will not need men for reproduction, and the whole male population will become biologically superfluous, which might lead to its complete extermination. The practice of using only female genetic material would stimulate lesbian love, which is, in general, much safer than sex in mixed or male homosexual pairs.

The myth about the lawfulness of inheritance will be knocked down once again. When sexual intercourse bears no reproductive significance, the tales of the “blue blood” will have to confront the new reality, and it will be hard to adapt them to the world, where physical reproduction is no more mysterious than buying a new car.

These are the “dangerous” aspects of cloning and genetic engineering; but, sincerely, all that does not drastically change the way of human reproduction. A true revolution in this field needs eliminating the very necessity of a female organism to give birth to a child; the whole process of organic development will thus be taken under control. Individuals that are produced artificially in the special incubators will be free to adapt their bodies to any specific needs, changing or even entirely redesigning their physiology. This will bring forth yet inconceivable changes in economy and social organization, incomparable to those resulting from the practice of cloning.

### People vs. People

Is it fair that some people attract more public attention than the others? Why the life of a royal family (or a popular musician, movie actress, famous sportsman, *etc.*) should be more interesting than the life of an ordinary man next door? Why any event involving an “eminent” person should be considered as more important than the same happening to a man-in-the-street? Does it conform to the declaration of a universal equality that is cherished by the bourgeois ideologists?

People *are* equal as long as they are *people*, that is, when they act like conscious individuals according to the definition of reason as a subjective reflection of the universal necessity. No titles, ranks, or possessions could make one conscious being better than another, especially considering that such distinctions are *never* awarded according to the true merits of the person, and even in that case there is no reason to judge about the present by the past. Those who are truly creative and who act in a universal way don't need any special attention or rewards; they are only doing what they must do. Anyway, is there a higher reward than a feeling of master, the taste of consciously re-creating the Universe?

For instance, the death of Lady Diana has attracted the enormous attention of mass media, as if it were any different from the millions of deaths occurring on the Earth every day. A quite mediocre personality, who has never done anything valuable, spending her life in ceremonies and primitive pleasures and knowing no suffer except suffering from her own idleness, was pictured an angel and national hero, as something extraordinary. Popularity? It was largely exaggerated by the press playing on vulgar Philistine envy. Charity? It rather looks like humiliation, giving a pound to the poor while robbing them of millions. The media were in raptures stressing that the flowers brought to the house of Diana after her death cost 50 million dollars; a hundred families could have happily lived the rest of their lives on that, thousands of people could escape death of starvation!

The death of Diana was of no real importance to anybody, save a few relatives and acquaintances; and, of course, it was in no way a global event. Thousands of people die in the wars and catastrophes, from maladies and poor living conditions, and many of them are much more valuable for the development of humanity than all the royal families of all times, to add all former, present or future presidents and ministers.

The same holds for popular writers, actors, political leaders, scientists and philosophers... They are often said to leave us too early, and there are many guesses about what they could have done if only they had lived a little longer. But there are many other people on the Earth, who are as creative, and who could do even better, if their lives were not spent in utter misery. Every act of reason, in any

domain, is of equal importance to the Universe, and the selectivity of the public attention is an indication of the under-development of the human society.

### **Web Traps**

People have long since known where there is a right place for free cheese. Still, the poor mice don't seem to ever learn a bit, and the promise of free happiness remains the most popular trick in the ads and the infallible methods of forming predilections. Just give people something for free, let them get accustomed to it, and then reap the harvest with the paid prolongation. People will heavily gasp, battle for a while, but, most probably, the majority will scrape up the money to pay for what they really need. This is essentially the same technique the drug pushers employ to recruit more victims; after a few free dopes, the brand new addicts will do anything to get more.

The Web business is no exclusion to the rule. Companies offer free services to attract customers, as a trial run, but they will immediately cut it as soon as the community swallows the bait. In particular, the era of free site hosting is inevitably coming to its end. The fate of Yahoo! Geocities shows the common future of the entire non-commercial Web. The users of Geocities experienced a shock, when severe traffic limitations were introduced, with most conveniences like mail forwarding and FTP reserved for commercial users; after a while, the project has been dismissed. Similarly, free Web statistics from the Webtrends has ended in a commercial service for 35 dollars per month per site. The transfer of a most popular free hosting from Yandex to Ucoz is nothing but the first step to complete commercialization. The same fate is to overtake all the other free services, and one does not need to be egg-headed to comprehend it. If you decide to use them for a while, be prepared to eventually switch to something else.

Of course, moving a site to a different hosting is often too complicated, especially for those non-experts who were seduced by the promise of a free user-friendly site constructor. Many of them will prefer to pay rather than develop their sites from scratch elsewhere, or gather the traffic once again in a new domain. The majority of sites may get neglected, but the rest will pay, and the companies will gain their profits anyway.

There were a few attempts to partially preserve the contents of the neglected sites (the Wayback Machine, the archives at Oocities.org, Reocities.com or Geocities.ws), but these dead heaps of data are ugly, inconsistent and heavily outdated, so that they often do more harm than render assistance. A galvanized corpse remains as dead.

The only consolation is that commercial services are no better, and paid hosting can collapse as easily as free sites, with no real reimbursement. The market has invented hundreds of tricks to quit without any obligations. Money paid, money lost. And probably, the mousetraps are not so bad to get one's portion of cheese...

### **Medical Paradigm**

The problem of misdiagnosing and/or mistreatment is common to all the branches of medicine, but it is especially painful in psychiatry, where the same legal intricacies can develop to the scale of social oppression. The roots of the problem reside in the very humiliating attitude to the patient that is very common in medical practice and research. Basically, the dominant approach could be formulated as follows: something goes wrong and must be cured. In other words, one assumes the existence of some universal "norm", with any deviations treated as malady; hence the efforts to "restore" the patient's health by all means, and the admission of social restrictions in the while.

However, different social groups have their own notions of the norm, and these notions may largely vary. It can be difficult to decide about the "normality" of a specific case. The decision is bound to



bear a mark of arbitrariness, significantly depending on the experience of the specialist and the social trends.

This “medical” paradigm can be encountered in many activities far from medicine. For instance, it lies in the basis of political reformism. In the juridical practice, “crime” and “criminals” are defined in the same relative way. Quite often, this paradigm shows up in education. The standards of style adopted by many reputable journals could be considered as yet another manifestation of the same.

Of course, the world is not yet perfect, with all its deficiencies and disasters. The medical paradigm is to work along with the other attitudes to improve life and relieve suffering. Used with caution, it can be a regular way of solving the everyday problems. However, it must always be counterweighed by the variety of alternative ideas of “norm” and “deviation”. The existence of such an “opposition” would in no way diminish the importance of medical treatment, up to the most drastic solutions “forced” on the patient. But the methods of treatment are to gradually become less traumatic, and this is the complement of the medical paradigm, its inverse side. This progress, however, can only be achieved in practical experience, and the patients of today could be said to pay with their pain for the ease of the future generations.

### **Culture and Anticulture**

There are two opposite tendencies in the development of culture and human spirituality. By the very definition of spirituality, it drives people to extending the domain of conscious assimilation up to the whole world, thus making them more universal. However, this development is not always straightforward, and, on certain stages of economic development, the destructive trend can dominate, which can result in the overall spiritual degradation and possibly in the annihilation of the human subjectivity as such.

Unfortunately, the present level of cultural development is not enough to ensure the immunity of human reason to such temporary retreats, and self-destructive tendencies can eventually strengthen to the point of no return. Humans are yet half-animals, and their primitive instincts can easily be manipulated and stirred up to entirely abandoning the human half proper.

Thus, a book (or a movie) relishing exaggerated violence, brutal force or a supernatural ability to get out of danger appeals to the survival instincts, and this can make it more attractive for an average person, since the state of permanent instability and fear characteristic of the capitalist society would push people to striving for mere survival, suppressing any higher desires; as a result, people become too engaged in search for shelter to rely on their spirituality, and they cannot even imagine the future free of the animal struggle for life.

The media’s rage of sensation is of the same ilk. To sell better, newspapers wake the primitive instincts pretending that there is nothing beyond them. The news is replete with crimes, wars, dirty politics *etc.* Books and movies advance the cult of crude force. Why not consider instead a regular person living a conscious life in a truly human society gradually developing towards more cultivation? Is it because such stories would be too dull to sell? No, the reason is that they are too dangerous for the traders, since they undermine the very idea of struggle for life, and virtually annihilate the social system that grew from it.

Mass media and the major part of the arts cultivate a specific subculture that should rather be called anticulture for its utter hostility to any glimpse of reason. However, this subculture can never absorb the whole culture; artists, writers, scientists *etc.* are not necessarily well cultured, and they do not differ from the representatives of other professions in that respect. Currently, true culture stays mainly in the underground. I don’t mean the official underground, which is nothing but yet another instance of anti-culture, but rather the implicit presence in cultural products and people’s acts, while people may be unaware of these hidden traces of spirituality.

## Anniversaries

Numerous anniversaries and mystical dates have become a real plague of the modern humanity. Instead of thinking about the current necessities and following the natural sequence of events, people get engaged in the preparation of yet another pompous celebration, or in the expectation of yet another end of everything.

A strange habit, indeed. Even for an individual, it does not really matter how many years, days or microseconds one has managed to live; the only thing that matters is whether there is something to be proud of in the past and whether there is yet something to achieve in the future. Life is measured by such achievements, and never by the pages of the calendar.

It is most astonishing that such abstract year counts become sometimes official events often requiring an expensive public campaign. What if I don't know that presumed celebrity, or simply don't care for what he or she has presumably done? Nobody can (or should) be universally known and appreciated. And, if I don't care for the anniversaries of a real person, why should I celebrate the birthdays of those who have probably never existed at all, like Mr. Jesus Christ?

The same holds for various historical events. What does it change if 100 years have passed from some (not always) commonly known date, and not 207, or 53? The very notion of anniversary is very approximate and often contradictory. What shall we take for the length of a year? There is no fundamental physical constant to apply (and even the physical constants are suspected to vary). There are different calendars; which of them will determine the anniversary dates? When it comes to a few centuries, mapping historical dates to modern calendars is a serious scientific problem which is still far from being entirely resolved. Additionally, some calendars are moveable obeying numerous official and religious prescriptions for the "allowed" days, and the calculation of the correct date becomes so complicated that the very idea of anniversary seems spurious.

And, like with imaginary personalities, there are imaginary historical anniversaries. Thus, nobody knows the exact foundation date for Moscow (the present capital of Russia), and, most probably, there was no such date at all, since many cities gradually grew from primitive villages never requiring an official inauguration. Still, in 1997, a pompous celebration of the 850 anniversary of Moscow marks yet another peak of general idiotism. A devastated and depopulated country with agonizing economy has been robbed by the Moscow officials to waste billions of dollars on primitive entertainment, nothing that would deserve mentioning. Millions of people did not get their salaries for months, and this money would be enough to clear off the debts. A family of two could comfortably live on that for 50000 years! They say that people need such festivities. Do they, really? Just a handful of the richer inhabitants of the country, getting bored of their usual entertainment, would demand more fun, for the poor's expense.

Now, let's take the numerological dates. Why should one date be better (or worse) than another? And still, millions of people believe that 10.10.10 means something special, and 21.12.2112 looks like the real end of doom, being the last round date in the Gregorian calendar. They don't care for the existence of different date notations (for example, the above "end of doom" date would become mere 12/21/2112 in the US notation, losing all its numerological attractiveness). They don't care for the existence of difference calendar systems (for example, the shift of Julian dates as compared to Gregorian). And, of course, they don't care for the arbitrariness of the reference point, an imaginary birth of a fictitious character.

Sometimes, numerology prevails over formal anniversaries. Thus, most people were sure that the new millennium was to begin on January 1, 2000, though the 2000 anniversary of Jesus Christ was to be celebrated a year later. Well, two millennia, it's better than one anyway; let's celebrate both!

### Humiliating Respect

The beginning of the XXI century has been marked by a mass campaign to change the public attitude to women's physiology. Things that traditionally were to be kept out of sight have received a wide publicity, and the celebrities all together have started exhibiting their panty liners and pregnancy nudes. This is usually pictured as yet another breakthrough in the emancipation of the woman and a sign of advanced rationality. We respect women for what they are, with all their physiological problems. We respect them for giving birth to the future generations. We respect their organic functions rendering them sexy. What is natural does not deserve contempt.

But why should we reduce a conscious being to mere organic nature? Does it really accentuate our subjectivity, our spirituality, to stress that we still remain animals in our bodily necessities? For a conscious being, it would be much more logical to emphasize the ability to overcome the physiological limitations, arriving to more universality. In this respect, the gender is absolutely irrelevant, and it is only here that the true emancipation begins.

To praise a woman for her pregnancy means to keep her for sheer female, refusing her the title of a conscious being. What can be more humiliating? The reason is given us to stop torturing women with their organic peculiarities, to entirely relieve them of their reproductive function thus introducing them to the freedom of conscious activity.

### Styles of Referencing

Considering any problem, one cannot avoid links (or at least allusions) to what other people have already written. This is a normal way of introducing new ideas into an existing cultural context, without which mutual understanding would be impossible. People do not merely tell each other what they think; they also give their partners as many conceptual clues as possible to facilitate the assimilation of the other's ideas in the personal picture of the world. For a productive dialog, we need to discover some initial commonality, a preliminary zone of consent that could be extended in our communication. This is what references can do.

Of course, to serve as communication bridges, references must point to something already known to the parties. On the other hand, referencing a current generality is useless for the purpose, since there is no link to the particular topic. It may be difficult to find an optimal balance between commonality and specificity, and one often needs to get better acquainted with the partner to start any meaningful discussion.

Nobody can know everything at all. No person has read every book, examined every artifact, or experienced every turn of history. Luckily, this is not required for productive thinking, and the rediscovery of something that has already been many times discovered by somebody else is a natural mechanism of human development. Virtually, every child has to discover the world anew. On the other hand, the humanity is inhomogeneous, and different social groups cover different cultural scopes; what is commonly known and self-understood in one group may be quite exotic in another. Referencing often plays the role of a positioning mechanism, indicating a reference group.

Browsing links can also be useful to get more control over one's own reflection. For example, if I see that somebody acts my way, I may be driven to get closer acquainted with that person, and possibly borrow some interesting ideas. Conversely, if I notice a coincidence with someone I don't like, it may serve as either an indication of a lack of consistency in my thoughts, or a motif for my reassessment of the other.

With all that taken into account, introducing references in the conversation can be quite natural, desirable and productive. However, to be of any real use, referencing must follow certain simple rules. Thus, if a name is just mentioned without explaining how it is related to the topic, the reference, most likely, will be in vain. Many scientific publications suffer of this fault, their authors mentioning lots of

irrelevant figures just “for completeness”. This habit is being implanted by the traditional style of the “academic” journals, where the assessment of submissions largely depends on the list of references. This style can penetrate live conversation as well, and one can often hear how the interlocutors compete in pronouncing names, leaving almost no time for meaningful conversation.

Yet another instance of the bad style is “abusive” referencing, just calling somebody names. References of that kind are thrown to the partner as abstract labels, without much concern about clarity and rationality. What use calling somebody Wittgensteinian? Please explain, what exactly in that person resembles you Mr. Wittgenstein, and in which of his hypostases. And as soon as you have explained it, the very need of mentioning Wittgenstein has been eliminated. The true meaning of any abusive reference is expressed in four words: “I don't like you.” Abusive referencing is often used to overwhelm the partners, to suppress their opinions, to belittle them. In fact, such referencing can only demonstrate one's utter incapability of coherent thought, becoming a kind of self-abasement.

One more special case: excessive quoting. In this style, references may be quite relevant, and their links to the theme of discussion clearly transparent, but their quantity exceeds the “critical mass”, after which there is no practical need in any more examples. If an assertion has already been supported by enough reference material, further accumulation of the possible interconnections becomes annoyingly useless.

A well balanced style of referencing must be adequate, friendly and moderate, so that the partners could enjoy their conversation and help each other in developing their personal views.

### **The True Face of Charity**

The phenomenon of charity is one of the most odious subjective manifestations of the class structure of the present society entirely based on economic and social inequality. The rich like talking about how much they spend on all kinds of charity, trying to present it as an indication of their generosity, humanism and social responsibility. And the bourgeois press is always ready to chant the praises of the good people who care so much about their neighbors who, by some strange accident, happen to be poor or suffer from some physical deficiency. Indeed, charity is nothing but hypocrisy, a make-up on the ugly face of capitalism.

First of all, charity has nothing to do with philanthropy, being a kind of business. The consequences of every donation are well calculated, and the background activity of establishing the rules of the game to maximally increase the profits has long since become the hidden complement of demonstrative mercifulness.

Yet another aspect of the same: the more charity, the more exploitation. The rich never give away something that actually belongs to them; they always pay from the other's pocket. To give \$1000 to the poor, they take a cent from every one of a million of other poor, and thus they get ten thousand dollars, with \$9000 of pure profit. But this is only an illustration; the real proportion is probably even more biased to the interests of the rich.

The same holds for charity on the international level, including all kinds of economic assistance, grants, or humanitarian aid. The activities of A. Hammer and G. Soros can serve as very illustrative examples. Beside the direct profit, the basic idea of international charity is to re-orient the economy of the countries receiving this aid to quite certain ways of development, so that these countries would become dependent on the products and investments of their richer partners.

There is also a subjective aspect of uneasy conscience. A bourgeois often understands that their wealth is gained by wrong means, depriving many people of what they actually deserve. Sometimes the ruling classes have to defend themselves against the public accusations of that kind; that is why the rich feel more self-assured with a couple of picturesque cases of charity in the pocket. Such “counter-examples” are their only weapon in their spiritual struggle with themselves.

However, a mere comparison of the styles of life carried by the rich and the poor shows the utter inconsistency of such excuses. Thus, a “new Russian” can spend during a week’s stay somewhere in Hawaii a sum that would be enough to fully support a thousand ordinary Russians for a few years. An evening dress of a millionaire may cost the price of regular clothes for a hundred people or more. A single dinner in a high-rank restaurant can outweigh the annual alimentations costs of the poor. Is there a rich man or woman who would agree to live no better than those they boast so much to aid?

Various charity actions and campaigns are the most disgusting kind of charity. When a few millionaires have fun “in the interests of the poor”, when they fling their money in an auction or a charity reception, under the garnish of the tales about spending these “donations” to help the poor, there is a simple question to ask: Why? Did they really need to spend huge sums on their entertainment and organization fees? Would not it be much better to collect that money and give to the poor, dropping all the entourage? And even better, one could use that money to develop the social system that would be free of the very distinction of the rich and the poor.

Occasionally, some of the rich may sincerely want to be helpful to the others. However, the very organization of the capitalist society prevents such people from being too generous and devoid of self-interest. There are very strict social norms governing the behavior of the representatives of different classes, and the deviations from the “accepted” life style would result in a kind of caste ostracism, undermining the well-being of the disturber, so that any further philanthropy would quickly become economically impossible. Capitalists have to behave like capitalists to remain capitalists, period. It is only a complete social reorganization that can make poverty a recollection of the past, thus eliminating the very word “charity” from the vocabularies of the world.

### **Intellectual Property and Pirates**

I greet the great army of intellectual pirates, hackers and crackers, smugglers and plagiarists!

They do so much good bringing it to the poor, what was only intended for the rich, and disclosing technologies that were intentionally concealed.

What is your vaunted freedom worth without the freedom to master everything and freely use all the achievements of the culture in one’s own creative activity? Why those with the thick wallets should be freer in that respect than those without any wallets at all?

The situation is full of sarcasm: those who produce nothing possess the means of production, while those who can do real things are deprived of what they need for their work.

You might point to that this situation is only typical for the underdeveloped countries like Russia, while the working population of the industrial countries like the UK or the USA is well paid and can afford buying the necessary means of production. But what’s the difference? If the population of one country is, on the average, richer than the population of some other country, isn’t there something wrong with the global distribution of wealth? All the “civilized” countries have debts they will hardly ever pay, and the well-being of their citizens is based on sheer robbery.

You might contend that the patent law stimulates people to do something they would never venture without the prospects of personal profit. Thus, a pharmaceuticals company would not invest money into a costly research on a new medicine if everybody could just take the result and be healthy. However, if there is something to sell, new preparations get indeed invented and produced for the benefit of the humanity in general. But what do you mean under the “humanity”? Such commercial undertakings are only to improve the life the richer layers of the society, who already live relatively well. The poor have no interest in that kind of research, since all they get is a vague hope that they will be allowed some day to play with the toys the rich don’t need any longer. To do something in the interests of the humanity, why not just take money from those who have too much and invest in research, with the results made accessible to everybody under international control?

You might declare that patents protect the author rights. Which rights? Do they really exist? If the right to conceal information from those who really needs it is meant, all the patents must be burnt to ashes! Anyway, a big company can always buy the patent for a symbolic price and then pump profits for those who have nothing to do with creativity. The company can even prohibit using thus bought inventions, when it seems to be more profitable; so, what about the interests of the humanity? The concentration of author rights in the hands of the rich is yet another way to deprive the inventors of the means of production, thus forcing them to work for the owners and become their intellectual slaves.

Yes, patents usually have a limited duration, and everybody is free to use the invention after, say, 17 years; hence, the humanity will still get it anyway. But what will be the use of the invention 17 years later? The cultural environment changes fast and just a few years can be enough to render a useful thing entirely outdated. Does anybody need the secrets of MS DOS 3.x today, except for pure curiosity? Every piece of knowledge is good in due time, while the patents ordinarily expire well after it has lost any practical value.

Finally, you might indicate that intellectual pirates do nothing just for philanthropy, they are only making money. Yes, they are. But objectively, their business brings knowledge to the people who are full of creativity but cannot afford buying expensive products. A pirate disk bought for about \$10 can contain applications worth a few thousand in the legal market. Pirate audio or video is sold 5-10 times cheaper than the licensed copies. Quite often, this content can be received for free.

Competition with the pirate market compels the author right holders to lower legal prices and even open some products for free distribution, only profiting from the services. This is one more reason to praise pirates. In fact, many companies do not seriously object to distributing illegal copies of their products, since pirating is the most efficient sort of advertisement. Those who have got used to some products through the pirate market will be more inclined to buy when possible, or, at least, they could influence the decision makers.

### **Workaholism and Human Universality**

The business style of our days is marked by urging the employees work as much as possible; it favors people's devotion to work, up to 25 hours a day, without any pause or distraction. This concerns both the upper echelons and the low-level personnel, and the chiefs often encourage their subordinates to work more by working round the clock themselves. The companies steal their employees' free time by organizing various corporate entertainment events (parties, dancing, camping, tourism *etc.*). Normally, people have to take part in such activities to demonstrate corporate solidarity, and this does not much resemble any fun; a passerby could think that all those people do some heavy work rather than enjoy themselves. Eventually, people lose the ability to rest, replacing relaxation with yet another duty; the permanent fuss can grow into perversion.

Since the very definition of the conscious subject demands universality, full devotion to work is a most dangerous tendency, leading to the complete destruction of the personality. People *must* relax sometimes, refusing to do anything at all, and not only switching occupations. This has nothing to do with wasting time; rather, this is a fundamental mechanism of personal development, and the development of subjectivity as such. When somebody cannot have passive rest, when one has to spend all the time struggling for life, career, money, new impressions or public recognition, one will rapidly degrade from a conscious being down to a kind of animal, or even some inanimate device.

Workaholism is a social disease, like smoking, alcoholism and drug dependence. It has much in common with other cases of the psychotic dependence on external stimulation, like hysteria or psychopathies. Such diseases are characterized by lack of the conscious control over one's motivation, and consequently, lack of self-respect and self-contentment, which has to be disguised by random actions. In a sense, this is the opposite of schizophrenia; and exactly because of that, it can easily transform into schizophrenia in the situations when, due to some social restrictions, one's eternal race

to nowhere cannot go on.

Like all social diseases, workaholism is hard to cure. A therapist can remove one substitute action, to give way for another; any progress can only be temporary, with inevitable remission, as long as the social roots of the disease persist. In some cases, therapy can give the patients enough resolution to drastically change their life; but mere determination is not enough, and no real change is possible without a favorable social environment allowing for behavioral diversity. Thus, if finding a well-paid job to support one's family is not easy, one has to cling to anything already found, demonstrating loyalty, trying to "please" the management *etc.* Any sign of independence could be disastrous, and this completes the perfect situation for developing workaholism as a psychological defense.

Workaholism is closely related to the low level of contact orientation in one's transaction hierarchy, that is, the dominance of syncretism and formal communication, lack of synthetic transactions (intimacy). Those, who can always find somebody to care for, and to receive care from, are less apt to yield to workaholism. However, such intimacy is a rare phenomenon; it cannot be replaced by mere pastime in a company of aliens just sharing a common need to hide their crippled sociality.

### Midlife Crisis?

Psychotherapists love to talk about the psychological crisis many people experience in the age of 35-45. Numerous explanations have been suggested, such as the loss of parental support and inability to find a social substitute, the feeling of too much completion, the recognition of the vanity of the dreams of youth, development of behavioral scripts inherited from parents or grand-parents, changes in sexuality, or... All such explanations are *individual centered*, and the only solution available within this approach is to advice a kind of self-reconstruction, changing one's attitudes and views, rather than doing anything to the world.

However, there is nothing subjective without an objective cause, and one must always seek for the roots of a psychological crisis in the person's economic position and social environment. Just make somebody feels that there is no real need in his/her existence—and the inner crisis is up there. One does need to reach any particular age; the crises of that kind can happen to anybody. For instance, psychologists also talk about quarter-life crisis accompanying the transformation of an adolescent into adult. In a way, the crisis of adolescence could be treated in the same lines.

To get the idea of how the society blocks the future for its ageing members, just leaf trough the job offer columns in Russian newspapers: nearly all of them contain the words like "aged below 35", or sometimes "below 40", with very rare exceptions of "below 45" or "below 50". For women, the limit is even lower, and those who lose their job at 40 have practically no chance to recover. There is even a special term: "economically active population" (putting aside the social discrimination by the criterion of "reproductive activity").

Since senior ages have limited opportunities for additional education, people of 40 above are automatically put out of labor market if their profession is no longer needed; there is no option of professional reorientation. To summarize, the society does not need people above 40, and this is reflected in their minds in the form of the midlife crisis.

The demand of certain competences is one of the social causes of the quarter-life crisis. Young people have little work experience, and that is why they usually cannot pretend to a descent position, which is psychologically felt as being unnecessary.

Obviously, if one had real possibility to start a new life at any time, with free education and no need to worry about supporting the family and the house, there would be nothing tragic in achieving the next threshold in one's activity. One could easily choose a different road, or just wait a little, to think it all over and decide what to do next. Midlife crisis is a result of artificially imposed stress and frustration: one can never stop struggling for life, and there are always barriers that cannot be lifted just because

the society is organized that way.

Of course, Russia is no exception. The same holds for highly developed countries like France, Great Britain or the USA. However, in these countries, the wild capitalism of the past has been long since moderated by various forms of non-economic regulation, and the age limitations cannot be imposed as blatantly as in Russia, so that the employers have to invent numerous ways of hidden discrimination. To justify the selection of a younger candidate, an employer can always refer to their better performance, and this may be true in many cases, since the younger applicants are often educated in more compliance with the current demands, they are more aggressive, they have fewer problems with their family and health. Similarly, better performance can be a convenient pretext to dismiss too young candidates. Some countries launched special governmental programs to assist these population groups with employment. However, these measures contradict the economic nature of capitalism and hence they will be first to perish as soon as the economy encounters any serious troubles.

### **The End of the GULAG Myth**

The tales about the Stalinist terror in 1930s and 1940s were, to put it mildly, an unjustified exaggeration. In the pre-war Soviet Union, the number of prisoners was not any higher than in any other country of the time, and the conditions of their existence were hardly ever worse than in Great Britain, or the USA. It is much later, many years after Stalin's death, that the penitentiary system of the USSR has become somewhat underdeveloped, compared to that of the leading capitalist countries; however, that retardation was rather a result of the cold war and severe economic pressure from the outside than an innate tendency of the socialist society: the country just could not allow spending much to improve the living conditions in prisons and colonies.

The average number of prisoners remained on the level of 2-2.5 % of the total population all the time. Like in the European countries and the USA, most of them were ordinary criminals convicted in accordance with the existing law. I knew people who were pictured as the victims of Stalinist terror, a few my relatives among them. As far as I could judge, they all acted indeed against the law, and punished according to the law. This is one of the functions of any state at all, to preserve its integrity through imposing some formal restrictions on the activity of the citizens.

Obviously, the legal norms in the USSR were different from the law of the capitalist countries, and it would be absurd to revise any individual sentence in a bourgeois court. Thus, all kinds of profiteering are quite normal from the bourgeois viewpoint, but they violate the fundamental principles of the socialist economy, and hence should be treated as a crime. But, when a socialist state legally suppressed the private initiative, the bourgeoisie of all sorts howled about the infringement of the human rights. To put it plain, those who fought against the Soviet regime were criminals from the standpoint of that regime, but those who profited from their acts did not consider them as criminals, blaming the regime instead.

This all is self-evident, nothing but a trivial rationality. However, the public opinion in the late USSR was carefully manipulated by the bourgeois propaganda, and many people yielded to the frightful enumeration of names and the picturesque descriptions of the soviet concentration camps. Any comparison with the rest of the world was carefully avoided, and thus the facts were made into the worst form of lie, the fragments of reality arranged to distort the picture.

Today, the truth finds at least timid public expression. In *Moskovskaya Pravda*, a semi-official daily of the Moscow government, in the issue of 28 July 2001, one can find an article by Eric Kotlyar, which compared the number of prisoners and their living conditions in the modern Russia and former USSR. Surprisingly, the percentage of prisoners in Russia is nearly the same as at the time of Stalin, but the prisoners' life has become much worse after the restoration of capitalism. As Kotlyar writes, the death rate in GUIN (the modern analog of GULAG) is so high that a chief of any Stalinist prison would have been immediately dismissed, at the very first inspection. It is much easier to put people in prison



without guilt today than it was during the fabulous Stalinist terror.

One can only wonder how the Soviet powers managed to keep GULAG so small, and the penal system so tolerant, in the pre-war and immediate post-war conditions, with all the subversive activities of the leading capitalist countries, with that primitive public mentality, with all-penetrating ideological corruption. The fact that, despite all, the Soviet Union existed for 70 years, instead of a few months, and became one of the most powerful countries of the world can only be attributed to the profound truth of the communist idea.

Of course, there were those who were put in jail by mistake, or by cross-up, and a certain percentage of political prisoners as well. In this respect, the USSR did not differ from the leading capitalist countries. A single innocent victim is already a tragedy. Any penal machine is vulnerable due to its essential rigidity; it can be manipulated by dishonest people. I knew those who were sent to Kolyma for nothing, from mere prejudice, just to be on the safe side. But they did not complain, they did not blame socialism, and many of them remained true communists despite all the heavy experience, doing their best to improve the life of the people, even at the cost of their own life. Compare them with those who shout about the communist terror, but who have always managed to keep their wealth and health, returning to their criminal activities after confinement; these people have eventually ruined the USSR, and they are building new capitalist societies on the bones of millions of people robbed of anything at all. A capitalist would never admit that a person dying of hunger a thousand miles away were murdered by the capitalist economy; a bourgeois would protest if somebody called him a murderer. Yes, he slaughtered nobody, he merely smothered people economically, just did not allow them to live.

### **The Black Tuesday: The Crisis of Civilization**

**11 Sep 2001.** At 8:45 and 9:03 ET, two hijacked air liners with passengers rammed the twin buildings of the World Trade Center in New York City. At 9:43, in Washington DC, yet another plane ruins the Western wing of the Pentagon. Thousands of lives lost.

America's got what it strove for.

However terrible the loss of so many people and destruction of a whole city block may be, it is Americans themselves who have made such acts of violence possible. The most powerful nation of the world believed in its supreme right of judgment, it worshipped force and terror, cultivated cruelty and aggression. Hollywood has so many times ruined New York City on the screen; no wonder that somebody would be mad enough to bring the movie into reality. All the American culture has always been based on the only imperative: kill the enemy. If you're strong, kill physically. If you're weak, buy a killer. If you cannot kill yourself and don't have money to make kill, then you are the prey, and everybody has the right to kill you. Blood and terror were in the air, and the tragedy was not at all unexpected.

But the most frightening thing of all is that the terrible experience has not taught people anything. The journals quoted sociological data that 70% of Americans would support any act of revenge, anywhere in the world. They are ready to bring death to thousands of people they never knew, for a crime of just a few; one can be sure that those few will hardly ever be punished, simply because they have enough money to shield themselves, and the capital is worth much more than a human life in the insane world that Americans built. According to different reports, from 70 to 1000 cruise missiles have been fired at bin Laden's camps after the attacks on American Embassies in Africa (to compare with 300 missiles that hit Iraq during the "desert storm"). Did that do any damage to bin Laden and his wealth? The generals of the "ruined" Pentagon are already dreaming of a "third world war" of the civilized world against the rest of the world, presumably not enough civilized (or just not obedient?).

In fact, the USA has long since started that undeclared war against the whole world. Korea, Vietnam, invasion in Grenada, bombardment of Libya and Lebanon, recent aggression in Yugoslavia... Who is to become the next target? What terrorist group has ever killed as many people as American soldiers overseas? Add here the subversive interference in the economy and politics of any country all over the world as the worst kind of terrorism, the state terrorism. This universal violence is bound to provoke an as violent reaction.

American politicians like talking about the struggle against terrorism, using such talks to cover any dirty business at all. But, to be able to exploit the pretext of the fight against terrorism, they provoke it themselves, like in the well-known manipulation game "cops and thieves", described by E. Berne. American banks and industry need conflicts in other countries, they establish their well-being on human bones and blood. And now, the blood of Americans has been spilled.

Will that stop innumerable thrillers and westerns, star wars and computer fights? Will that temper the spirit of competition, the race for success by any means? Why should some people be the champions by the expense of the losers? When the humanity will stop living by the law of jungle, and start living by the law of reason, as it is appropriate to the conscious beings?

Maybe these questions will take many more decades and tragedies to answer. But we'll have to answer, anyway; otherwise, the conscious humanity will cease to exist.

### **The Internet as an Instrument of Class Struggle**

Looking at the present state of the Internet (and primarily the World Wide Web as its popular façade), one cannot stop wondering why so powerful means of communication, that could accumulate knowledge for the benefit of the humanity as a whole, and of every individual, why is it so wastefully used for annoying advertising, primitive chat, or silly entertainment? Why is it so difficult to find a free piece of responsible information on a particular topic, so that one needs to sort out tons of junk to discover a couple of sites of interest?

The typical answer is that people are free to develop the Internet as they like, and if they want all that junk up there, they'll just put it there; this is the triumph of democracy and the expression of their free will. The demand determines the offer, and if something sells well, it is bound to be produced. The market economy, it's basic.

But are people as free on the Web as they are declared to be? Are the consumers as stupid as the apologists of capitalism picture them?

If I hate any noise and want to find a place to carry a calm and peaceful life, can I get it? I want no advertising, no buy-and-sell, no lie, no gossip, no disclosure of anybody's private life, no perversions, no violence, no barriers, no visas, no politics... Can I have that kind of freedom? All I want is to never worry about gaining my life, concentrating instead on unfolding my creativity and contributing to the development of the humanity; can I do that? I want free access to all the achievements of culture, with no artificial barriers in the form of intellectual or other property rights; what about so much freedom?

No, I cannot get what I want. The laws of capitalism will never allow it to me. On the contrary, they are going to make me consume what I don't need, and live in the ugly world shaped by the rich for the rich. My thoughts are to be put under control, and I will have to be concerned about survival here and now, with no room for the dreams of the future. The capital needs slaves, and slaves are not supposed to think much. Consequently, the slaves should be deprived of access to any important information, and ideally of the very ability to seek for it.

Luckily, besides the laws of the market, there are other economic laws, and among them, the law of the progressive development of the productive forces that demands that the education of the workers correspond to the technologies they use. People must know at least something to maintain the well-being of those at power.

Though the capitalists cannot prohibit any knowledge at all, they do all they can to restrict the access to information, to tame knowledge and present it in a sterilized form. The principal technique is to split knowledge into small isolated pieces, keeping them well apart and thus preventing the chain reaction in mass education. Here are a few typical tricks.

*Confidentiality.* Just classify some piece of information and protect it with a formal ban and strict encoding; it does not matter, whether it comes under the guise of the interests of national security or private business secrets.

*Proprietary data.* The author has the right to restrict the usage of the product—this is one of the biggest lies of the bourgeois propaganda. Nobody may have any exclusive right for anything, since any product is a result of a common effort, and hence it belongs to the society as a whole, rather than a single person or a narrow group. Making knowledge a property is absurd; the only purpose of author right protection is to hide knowledge from those who really need it.

*Dilution in noise.* If useful information occupies only a small portion of the Web (say, less than 0.01%), there is little chance that it will be frequently found. So, it is sufficient to create many junk sites and promote them on the wide scale, to make any query return mainly the links to junk, thus burying any useful content in that dirty flood.

*Manipulating attention.* The public can easily be manipulated to get interested in what is of no real importance, forgetting about the fundamental problems of today. Social pressure makes people go in for sports, all sorts of entertainment, mystical tales *etc.* Numerous sites devoted to such topics intercept the visitors leaving them no time for fruitful discoveries.

*Mass propaganda.* Online news, analytical articles, or well moderated discussion clubs serve as the instruments of implanting the official views and suppressing the opposition. There are numerous “scientific” or “philosophical” sites that promote the ideology of the ruling classes, and many sites devoted to the arts are also designed so as to prevent any queer idea to break through.

*Visibility restrictions.* Though some companies admit free hosting of personal sites, this opportunity is often very restrictive. Free sites are generally limited in size; they usually have format and upload restrictions, traffic limitations, *etc.* From time to time, the rules change in the direction of more limitations, so that formerly free services would require regular payment to go on. Those who cannot pay are bound to move their files to another domain, thus resetting their visibility to zero.

*Mutability.* The Internet is never stable in neither part. Everything changes, and no URL can always point to the same portion of information. Hosting services and domain names are sold for a very limited time, they have to be regularly prolonged; that is, you cannot construct a perfect site and happily die with the confidence of its permanent presence on the Web, even if you can pay. In other words, no stable sub-Web can be constructed, to eliminate noise in that particular virtual space. This helps the ruling classes to keep high the level of ignorance and destroy any Internet communities that might be dangerous.

The efficiency of these mechanisms is significantly enhanced by their ability to work on the unconscious level, in the background, with homeostatic reproduction. A person educated in a specific environment will most probably act according to the standards of that environment, without being aware of the social programming involved.

Still, the objective laws of economic development demand more online collaboration; this favors the introduction of new procedures and tools to overcome the chaotic structure of the Internet and provide more data accessibility. Probably, some day, in some other socioeconomic conditions, the Internet will become what it should be, a mechanism of knowledge integration and propagation, preserving the positive content and suppressing commercial noise. That free Web would accumulate ideas and give people convenient tools to grasp them and producing new knowledge respecting the past.

### **Well-Armed Means Guilty**

It is often said that the good must have claws, to fight against the evil, and the better the good is armed, the less are the chances for the evil to proliferate. This view implies a number of strong statements that seem to be entirely wrong.

First, it is assumed that the good and the evil can be distinguished in an absolute way, and it is enough to suppress the evil to automatically increase the quantity of the good. This is obviously wrong, since the distinction of the good and the evil is ideologically saturated, changing from one historical period to another. Consequently, one can easily take the evil for the good and the good for the evil, and hence one can be never sure about what exactly needs to be suppressed. Moreover, the same thing can combine the good and evil aspects, and it is only in further historical development that one of them would dominate. The good and the evil are the two sides of the same, and one cannot eliminate one without eliminating the other.

Second, the very act of suppression of the opposite is already an instance of violence, and the main danger of violence is that it can easily turn against its source. Violence can produce nothing but more violence, unless it is controlled by a much more powerful constructive force. However, such force cannot act in the interests of one group against another group; otherwise it will destroy the very basis of sociality, thus losing its constructive nature.

Struggle for life is not for humans. It calls to people's animal origin and the cruel laws of biological evolution, which have nothing to do with humanism and reason. While you are struggling, you are an animal. Once you stop fighting and start producing universally useful things, you become a conscious being.

Psychologically, the better somebody is armed, the more one is tempted to exercise one's power. Having a gun is dangerous, since the gun will shoot, sooner or later, albeit unintentionally. Learning martial arts makes one feel better protected, which provokes voluntary acts incompatible with reason. Inventing a new weapon makes its owner forget about the interests of those who do not have an adequate defense.

I do not deny any necessity of struggle and defense at all. I only indicate that each instance of fight, however motivated and objectively grounded, is a manifestation of the rudiments of the animal in humans, and it must be under severe conscious control until it can be entirely eliminated. One cannot remain clean living in the dirt, but one can at least try to reduce the overall quantity of dirt and become, if not cleaner, at least less dirty. To be truly conscious, we must establish a global order to eliminate the very need in any struggle; in the imperfect world of today, all the human creativity is to aim at that supreme goal.

### **Lability as a Social Disease**

This is madness.

They change everything, at any moment.

They persuade people to abandon the old ways of life and run for spurious novelty.

Do we really need that?

“New” does not mean “better”. Why should we lose so many good things just because somebody else wants us to change? I used to buy a certain kind of bread, or milk, for a few years; and I was quite content with them. Now, the companies decide that they must be more aggressive on the market, and they start to update their products every year, so that I can no longer know what to buy and what is better for my health. Quite often, all the change is only in the name, the material or colors of the can—which is presumably more technological, and hence more expensive. But, the worst of all, it is also confusing, since I cannot always recognize the same product under a new guise. I have to spend a lot

of time trying to find goods that I like in the mountains of garbage I don't need.

Sometimes, the change may be literally fatal. For instance, if I can no longer find that unique sort of medicine that helped my organism to keep up despite all the chronic dysfunction, I am doomed to illness and death. The effect of certain classes of drugs (e.g. neuroleptic) is very individual, and it may take years for a good doctor to find a proper combination. If some business idiot introduces a smallest change, the delicate balance will break. If a drugstore suddenly decides to modernize its catalog and sell only the newest drugs, those who depend on the old will die.

In many cases, the new versions of the same things are worse in quality and less convenient to use. Shoes, clothes, chemical detergents, tea and coffee, bakery, cheese, perfumes or panty liners are most likely to be spoiled by any change at all. Remakes of the classical movies are almost always terrible. Repeating old jokes is no fun at all.

In many other cases, new things are indeed better, within the same range of functions. For instance, a new computer is likely to outperform an old model almost in any respect, provided there are analogs of the old software that can process the same file types. However, a new car is not necessarily better, if the old one is already quite satisfactory as a means of transportation; similarly, an old TV set is quite enough, if you don't need any uncanny functionality out of it. A new version of computer software may be a disaster, if you don't want to double the size of required memory and hard disk space.

The introduction of new products can only be justified if they do something that no previous product could do, provided all the old functions are preserved. The development of Intel processors is an example of fair programmatic compatibility: almost any code written for some older system can be performed by any higher model, while newer software can use more advanced features for better performance (unfortunately, this does not hold for the operating systems). A rewritable CD is a step forward compared to simple CD-R, provided you still allow people to buy cheaper one-time CD-Rs if they don't need multiple rewrites.

Some new products cannot be compared to any older things at all. For instance, a DVD player has nothing in common with a VCR, and no synthesizer can replace an acoustic guitar or real piano. Unfortunately, market competition results in the artificial suppression of older products to impose the newer. The consumer has no choice. We must upgrade to keep on. A good old thing goes to garbage just because the available services and product supply are oriented to the most recent technologies.

In science, new discoveries do not annul the previously established laws within the limits of their applicability. Understanding relativistic or quantum dynamics does not mean that the motion of the macroscopic bodies around us does not obey the laws of classical mechanics any longer. Some theories may become obsolete, but they are no less applicable, and they still can be practically used with certain tweaks if a modern theory comes less handy, albeit more accurate.

In the arts, uniqueness reigns. One can never replace one artwork with another, and new modes of expression can only extend the realm of art, giving birth to self-contained masterpieces rather than mere versions of the same. As with science, there are obsolete works that do not appeal to the modern audience; however, this does not diminish their artistic value in their own cultural context.

Similarly, a digital camera is no replacement for the traditional "wet" photography, and new watches cannot supersede an old chronometer. They accumulate in the culture, complementing each other. *Blanc Moelleux* by Paul Chenet is entirely different from the same title by Henri Maison; Swiss and French *Nescafé* have nothing in common with the Brazilian, Indian or Russian make. One such product just cannot be replaced with another.

Shame for modern society, that it has become so deeply infected with the anticulture of change for the sake of change. In fact, all that rush for change only serves to disguise the necessity of one essential change, the replacement of the ancient social and economic organization with a new way of life much more deserving the name of the human society.

## Crime

The only serious approach to eliminating crime is to eliminate its very grounds, to make it worthless. If one can reach well-being by robbing the others, one is tempted to commit any crime, and hence one is ready to become a criminal, under favorable conditions. On the contrary, if no criminal act lead to any profit, there would be no motive to commit it.

The absolute majority of crimes aim at re-distribution of wealth, when one person wants to seize what belongs to another person, by any means, up to murder. Traditionally, will for power takes is second line of the chart, but it is usually a mere derivative of money. If there is no property at all and no profit from power, what can murder change? Even assuming that criminals are mentally insane, the elimination of the mad rush for gain would significantly reduce the risk of getting mad.

Obviously, the ruling classes will hardly ever think about stopping the crime as such, and all they do is neutralizing individual criminals, which only gives way to other criminals, and thus to infinity. This is the well-known game of cops and thieves, described by Eric Berne.

The culture based on property, under the name of civilization, starts with crime and ends with crime; crime is in its very core. The first act of appropriation is already robbery, since one person pretends to have exclusive rights to what belongs to the whole humanity.

No wonder that the modern capitalist society is replete with crime, essentially depending on it. Capitalism is interested in reproducing the atmosphere of crime, and that is why all the mass media, all the entertainment industry tries hard to persuade people that nothing can be more attractive than crime—except, probably, sex; and a mix of the two is a real blockbuster. Slaves must live in fear, to be more obedient. Those at power put forth the myth of “legality” as a social system that prevents the evil from invading people’s life, and the guards of the capital pretend to be defending the well-being of everybody. People are made to believe that the destruction of that “protective” system would result in chaos, and that is why the existing society, however poorly organized, should be kept on just for the sake of stability...

Of course, if one assumes that there is no social organization other than capitalism its destruction would seem a catastrophe. For a bourgeois, who cannot imagine his existence without property, any attempt to eliminate property will look like a robbery. Elimination of bourgeois legality would ruin the “legal” right of one person to appropriate the work of another. When a criminal robs somebody, this in no way threatens the system, being the individual problem of that person, while any legal infringement of the sanctuary rights of the proprietor is a blow to the whole class of proprietors, and hence a much more serious crime in the eyes of an apologist of capitalism.

## Non-Proliferation of Dominance

The debates on whether the innocent victims of American bombers in Iraq would be sanctioned by UN, or the sanction of US military functionaries would be enough, was an excellent example of the hypocritical nature of the bourgeois legality. Any law is in the interests of those in power and against those in need. The ruling classes dictate their rules to the world they exploit and plunder. On the global scale, this leads to dividing all the countries to those having right and those that must obey orders. All the body of the international law is nothing but disguise for that simple rule.

How can it come, that one country prescribed the forms of government to another? Why should one country be concerned about the name of the other country’s president or the work of its mass media? And, of course, in a world of global equality, each country would decide on itself, which scientific and technological research to support, and which weapon choose for its army.

Even if Iraq or Northern Korea had nuclear weapons, nobody has any right to forbid them possessing it. One could reasonably admit that, for such countries, this might be the only way to prevent

aggression from the outside. If Cuba, for example, had ever installed nuclear missiles targeted to the USA, this was well justified by its obvious exposure to the US militarism. The USA, NATO, or the United Nations, have a strange habit to decide on who will be given the privilege of national security, and who will be always at the risk of invasion. But where is the greatest danger? Look at the USA. They have all kinds of weapons, including weapons of mass destruction. The nation has been brought up on the cult of brutal force, violence and murder, and aggression is in the blood of its citizens. They can, without a slightest hesitation, sacrifice a few thousand lives to obtain a pretext for a world-wide war for absolute dominance; ruining the twin towers in New York might well be a monstrous provocation by the CIA (no other evidence has been provided so far).

Of course, there are millions of Americans who are against any war, deep in their heart. But they will tamely vote for it, too, under social pressure. They cannot fancy any other nation to have the right to be as independent and as powerful. Any pretence like that is immediately interpreted as a threat to US national security and global interests. However, the very idea of global interests is already aggression, striving for the world dominance. Better think about yourselves, and let the others care about their own affairs.

Until recently, Americans could comfortably adhere to such a disastrous policy, since there was no real threat to the USA from any other global force. Today, in the era of globalization, no country is safe enough, despite all its economic and military power. Devastation of Grenada, Lebanon, Libya, Serbia, Afghanistan, and many more countries, will return in powerful blows to the core infrastructure of US economy, by mass terror using all kinds of means, including biological and chemical weapons and cyberterrorism. A country that wants to be the master of world, that wants to subdue other nations to its economical and political interests, should be prepared to meet as global retort, and perish in ruins; this is the fate of any empire.

Do not spit on the world, or else the world will spit on you and you'll get drowned.

However, it won't the world divided into numerous nations struggling with each other for a bit of monopoly and ephemeral supremacy. It will be the world of people that do not want to be exploited and do not want to exploit others. Objectively, the formation of super-powers establishing their world dominance leads to the consolidation of all the exploited nations, and the boundaries between the countries and cultures get erased due to the efforts of both the global capitalism, striving for worldwide dictatorship, and the global anti-imperialistic movement uniting in the face of the powerful enemy. Someday, the economic system of capitalism will become utterly incompatible with global economy, and the super-powers, trying to devour the whole world will burst of gluttony.

### **Logic for Idiots**

The official declarations around the approaching American aggression against Iraq demonstrated a peculiar kind of logic specially designed to keep the already brain-washed population of the major countries on the level of intellect below any glimpse of reason. The principle of this logic can be expressed in four words: the boss wants it. No other argument goes, and all the assertions do not mean anything on themselves, their only purpose is to express the blind adherence to the will of the boss.

From the very beginning, since the strange tragedy of September 11, the new logic was thrust to the world by the American administration, which piled one lie on another, presenting them as the final truth beyond any doubt. With no even a trace of evidence, the US officials declared that the WTC had been ruined by Arab terrorists, headed by Osama Bin Laden. No other hypothesis was admitted, and the mass media had strict orders to popularize the official version. Alright, Bin Laden is well known to have long since worked for the CIA; probably they knew the instructions they gave him. The only side profiting from the act of September 11, as well as from the anthrax follow-up, is the United States, and no normal terrorist would come to that silly idea. Terrorists do not act for fun; they are not as insane as the pro-American media try to present them, and they always pursue certain material interests, little

differing in this sense from the big pots of the Wall Street. What kind of profit could Osama Bin Laden get from undermining the well-being of the country, where his capitals are deposited in the same bank as the money of its president? Still, people are suggested to believe to this nonsense, just because it would be a convenient pretext for the USA to launch their race for the absolute world dominance.

But even if that had been an Osama's deed, what follows? Why should the USA kill thousands of defenseless Afghans instead of just catching Bin Laden and putting him to the court? Mr. President called that massacre the American revenge for September 11; isn't it the same perverted logic? This is as if, nudged by somebody unknown in the street, I decided to slaughter a hundred of mice in revenge, just because nobody will punish me for that slaughter.

And, all of a sudden, America has forgotten about global terrorism and made conquering Iraq their principal goal. Bin Laden and his companions are still in good health and wealth, but this no longer worries the USA, they are possessed with the only idea, to grip hold of Iraqi oil. Mr. President declares, without any proof, that Iraq has the weapon of mass destruction, and the world must take it for the reason to sanction the war against the country, which has never done any harm to any American, except, probably, those few who were so arrogant as to interfere with its internal affairs without any care about their own safety. There was absolutely no evidence that Iraq ever possessed any serious weapons; the world-best American spies could find nothing in several months of hard search, with all the possible assistance of Iraqi government. However, according to the perverted American logic, the fact that Iraq could not provide any information about its nuclear or bacteriological program (simply because such programs did not exist) meant lack of cooperation, and proved the nuclear and bacteriological danger from Iraq. So, the United Nations were heavily pressed to vote for bombing Iraq and killing a few more thousand people. The boss wants it. Does not that remind the medieval methods of the St Inquisition?

Even if Iraq had ever had any weapons of mass destruction, why should anybody care? It is up to each country, to decide on how it is going to defend itself and prevent aggression from the outside. There are many other countries that are well known to definitely have nuclear, chemical and bacteriological weapons. Why not start with somebody else? For instance, the United States of America, the most dangerous country of the world, possessing hundreds of nuclear warheads, tons of poisonous chemicals and all sorts of military microbes; the country that advocates aggression as the best practice for achieving its political and economic goals; the country that kills thousands of peaceful people all over the world every year and openly threatens to kill more... Why not start disarmament with the USA?

But the boss does not want it.

### **Cattle Reason?**

A great date! On March 11, 2003, Radio France Internationale announced the creation of yet another international body. The International Criminal Court, to be opened in The Hague, has been empowered by the United Nations to judge the crimes against humanity.

Leaving aside the absurdity of the very word "justice", and the impossibility of international law as such, one could only wonder at a pompous phrase, coined by some Dominique Maraud (I may have misspelled the name, translating it from Russian), who was presented by an RFI journalist as one the 18 judges elected to the ICC: "Now, the dictators of all sorts will have to seriously think about the consequences of their actions. Where there is no longer impunity, reason takes place."

So that is what they call reason: dumb obedience, yielding to the force of the arms. Or, rather, what they want to sell as reason to those who are not intended to have any reason at all, and whose obedience is all they need.



When a dozen of gangsters come together and decide that they will jointly punish those who do not pay them the tribute they impose, this is called the triumph of freedom and a great success in the struggle for human rights! What is meant under the “human rights” in this context? The right of those in power to suppress those in misery, the right of the rich to enslave the poor. Is that right so much human?

Today, a small group of the countries that have made their well-being on the bones and blood of their colonies assumes the right to tell those former colonies what is right, and what is wrong, and how they should build their social and economic system. All such advice is saturated by economic and political interest, and the desire to continue draining the others’ wealth to the wallets of the “true democracies”.

Yes, there are numerous dictators, and there are cruel regimes that can hardly attract any sympathy. But please look at yourselves! Are you so noble and sincere as you pretend to be? Isn’t your praised democracy just a disguise for the dictatorship of money, the worst dictatorship of all? Why do you think that those dreaming about a society where there would be no people for sale are worse than you, who can only dream about more profit? You call a leader of another country a criminal, and you kill thousands of his compatriots to make the rest agree with you and bear all the humiliation you put on their nation. You can allow yourselves an obvious lie, and you don’t even try to prove anything, you just demonstrate the truth of tanks and bombers. For instance, one could open the Internet page of the ICC at and easily find that there is no Dominique Maraud in the list of judges, and no name having a merest resemblance. Nothing like that also in the complete list of judges admitted to the first tour of elections.

Well, nobody expects anything but lie from bourgeois propaganda, that’s normal. They have already decided who is guilty, and all the court listening is only to demonstrate their *a priori* decision to the world, to intimidate the others, to kill the very desire of rebellion. And this fear will be called reason.

Do we need a reason like that? Do we need being treated like breed cattle?

No, we don’t. We want to be humans, and our first right is to decide ourselves, what to do and how to build our lives. We don’t need foreign capitalists to drain our natural and human resources, and national capitalists to sell us away. We don’t want to live in the society where the only human right is the right to work around the clock for a miserable salary, or no salary at all. We don’t want universal values nominated in dollars, or in euros. We don’t need NATO bombers on our heads, and NATO slayers in our cities. And we don’t need UN judges to blame us, when we fight for our human rights, thus showing a little bit more reason that we are allowed.

### **The Abyss of Hope**

On March 20, 2003, with the massive American aggression against Iraq entering the stage of open occupation, the entire civilized world has changed. Nothing has left of democracy and freedom so much cherished by the bourgeois propaganda. Or, rather, the true face of democracy and freedom has been demonstrated, since these “eternal values” can be arbitrarily neglected every time they stand on the way to more profits.

The era of the absolute reign of American big capital has come. Nobody can any longer pretend to influence the world order, and no country can do anything that would not be sanctioned by Washington. Each nation has but two alternatives: either become a minor feud under the king’s wing, in hope to gain some privileges, or join the exploited majority robbed of their national wealth and dignity. This is the climax of imperialism, and one can only hope that the transformation of the world into an empire entirely controlled by a single country will lead to the consolidation of all the anti-imperialist forces, and the national values will give way to the interests of the common struggle against the very socioeconomic system of capitalism.

The old opposition of the bourgeoisie and the proletariat has long since become global, with nations

playing the role of individuals. The abyss between the ruling class and the rest of society is becoming deeper, and the class consciousness of the oppressed masses grows, as sporadic rebellions develop into a strong revolutionary movement. Let the bourgeois of all sorts shout about their class enemies using illegal means; there can be no legal means in the world where legality is nothing but yet another name for slavery. Today, any action that brings war to the territory of the United States and their supporters can be considered as an act of social justice. Any attempt to undermine the economic and military dominance of the USA objectively serves the supreme interests of the humanity.

Of course, no acts of violence can result in economic or social changes. Global terrorism is only an indicator of the social protest, and it is American imperialists who have unleashed the wave of terror. When the only possibility to retain one's human dignity is to die for its sake, it's no wonder that the army of kamikazes is so easily recruited. However, today, the primary necessity of the anti-imperialist movement is to develop an ideological platform reflecting the specificity of the new historical stage, incorporating the philosophical heritage of dialectical materialism and accounting for the experience of the Paris Commune and the USSR. One needs a clear vision of the goal, to act as a conscious being rather than a scared animal. To merely ruin the United States is not enough; this will only open perspectives for yet another pretender to the world dominance. It is the power of money that must be ruined, the existing economic order must be broken and replaced by the system without any property at all, neither private nor common.

The end of any empire is the same: it becomes washed away by the flood of human indignation and will for freedom. A new world will grow on the ruins of the past. The American empire won't escape that fate. And probably, this is the last empire in the history of the humanity. Otherwise, the humanity should better cease to exist.

### **Strong Cowards and Evil Giants**

There is a frequent opinion that a strong person will hardly ever offend anybody, and big men are usually kind-hearted. This vulgar psychology is used to justify learning all kinds of martial skills and survival technologies, as well as military training. It is said that those who feel themselves protected enough do not need to demonstrate their superiority, since their potential attackers would not dare to strike first.

A shaky argument, in the face of so much evidence of the opposite! One can observe everywhere and every day how the strong suppress the feeble and nobody would defend the defenseless. Take the recent anti-Iraqi campaign of the USA: one of the biggest countries of the world possessing huge heaps of the newest weapons, almost complete control over global communications and the biggest army with the longest experience of local wars—this obviously strong nation has chosen a small and loosely populated country for its victim, being perfectly aware of that no serious resistance were to be met, with no modern weapons at all, no regular army and no allies. Moreover, Iraq was economically exhausted by the decades of international blockade; its air defense was completely destroyed by incessant American bombardments for many years, its missile fleet was disassembled by UN demand, and all the military plants stopped to please the “world community”! This is like a two meter tall sadist torturing a baby child, having tied its hands and legs, to be on the safe side.

The true psychology of power reveals itself on the example of the USA. This is a coward country; they never hit without being well aware of their impunity, they use every opportunity to demonstrate their strength by killing a few thousand people far away from America, in a country that could never strike back, killing Americans on their own territory. The United States is a country that has no idea of honesty, conscience and truth, with the cult of force taking the place of reason. They cultivate their military muscles, they rob the entire world concentrating its wealth in American banks, stealing the brains and exploiting the others in any possible way. With every new victim, Americans become ever more inebriated by their military superiority, and they no longer care for inventing plausible pretexts, or verisimilitude of their lies. They just take what they want, with no regard for anybody's pain.

This is an evil giant, whose thoughts turn around robbing and murdering, whose behavior is all aggression, and whose intellect is reduced to the guile of a beast of prey. A pack of smaller plunderers forms around the USA (Great Britain, Germany, France), competing for the master's leavings. These are cowards too, and they bark and bite from under the US tail. They even can jingle with independence and make demonstrative gestures of disagreement with the boss; but when the boss spits in their faces, they only smile and happily lick the master's ass. They feel themselves mighty under the emperor's wing, and they are granted the right to rob and kill within their smaller domains, unless the master's interests are concerned. They do the dirty job of keeping the slaves on the knees, and they immediately appeal to the boss encountering a slightest resistance. The strong walk in gangs, for they are afraid of the weak and feeble.

Do not believe those who pretend to gain strength merely for self-defense. Strength needs to be exercised; it must be demonstrative to remain strength. From time to time, a new power happens to break the scull of the old tyrant and become a tyrant itself. This would change nothing. One master would replace another, and the slaves would remain slaves. The same animal struggle for dominance in the animal world.

But the day will come, when separate islets of consciousness will merge into something that will be stronger than any strength, and that will deny the very idea of power, dominance, or competition. The conscious beings will find each other and discover the way to neutralize any weapons the human animals may invent. And they will drive the gangs of strong and aggressive cowards to the safe cages, filtering them through a new education system and isolating the incorrigible. They won't do that by force, but rather with the smartness of their minds and the honesty of their hearts. This will be that Jack the Giant Killer, who will conquer the evil giants and bring peace to the tormented world. And this will be the last violence in the history of the humanity.

### Pyramids of Lie

A few American acquaintances told me of a new approach to the ancient history that gains strength in popular science and is favorably met by the official ideology. According to this theory, there was no slavery in the early civilizations (Egypt, Middle East, Mesopotamia *etc.*), and all their wealth and great cultural achievements were produced by the free full-righted citizens in their honest service to the supreme interests of reason and creativity...

Well, I must admit that such a view is very convenient for the leaders of the modern American civilization. It diverts the minds of Americans from the simple fact that their well-being is mostly based on enslaving the whole world and exploiting billions in the interests of the rich few. Of course, a pretty woman receiving expensive gifts from a respectable lover can be unaware of that the generous gentleman makes his living by robbing banks or keeping banks (which is principally the same). She would only enjoy a careless life full of pleasure, and she may have candid pity for those miserable who did not find a good guy to feed them.

However, being unaware of slavery does not reduce or eliminate it. The three principal stages of civilization (slavery, feudalism and capitalism) are all based on exploitation of one person by another, and it is only the forms of exploitation that change. This does not mean that people were happy and free before civilization; on the contrary, they were much more dependent on their environment, and the very idea of freedom is inapplicable to the pre-civilized societies. Civilization brought freedom to few by the expense of many, it has opposed freedom and slavery and developed this opposition to the extent of contradiction, which is bound to be eliminated in a new kind of sociality, removing any slavery (and hence any freedom) at all.

Returning to the Ancient Egypt, one could remark that its rise on the bones of numerous slaves is practically beyond all doubt. Still there are those who endeavor to reverse the meaning of some common words, referring to religion as spirituality, and to slavery as freedom; such tricksters will

probably deny the existence of slavery, since they have long since renamed it. There is a whole library of written documents indicating that slavery was a common phenomenon in early Egypt. Of course, one should be careful with interpretations, and each historical document requires a critical analysis. But even if we were unaware of pharaohs bringing thousands of slaves back to Egypt from their military campaigns, the idea that the famous pyramids were built by disinterested artists without any compulsion does not seem too convincing. This new American theory of free citizens building the pyramids by joint effort is sheer nonsense; the assertions that the erection of those frightening tombs was to the benefit of the lay people, which were thus sponsored by a kind and wise pharaoh, are obvious lie. And this lie has been invented to conform with the modern tale of many workers receiving their living from a good bourgeois, who hired them to build him a fashionable house, or an office skyscraper, or strategic missiles and bombers to bring more people to obeisance. The truth is exactly the opposite: it is the mass of working people that provides living for a bourgeois; the bourgeois robs these people of the major part of their labor, of their health and strength, without any real compensation.

However, while all the bourgeois are of the same ilk, working people may belong to different layers, with the working class of one nation being in a privileged position compared to another; the population of the rich capitalist countries shares a small part of the profits squeezed by the bourgeoisie from the other countries. For instance, after the USA have occupied Iraq, American capitalists are free to exploit its natural and human resources, and billions of dollars will flow to their bank accounts; with that money, they will hire more Americans to produce more articles of luxury and more weapons, which will stimulate American economy as a whole and indirectly increase the average level of life in the USA. That is why American workers tend to support any act of international piracy on the part of their country, and the majority of American citizens can feed on the blood of the countries devastated by US troops. Honest Americans will always remain on the periphery of the social life, with no chance to be heard.

Today, science often gets sacrificed to profit, and the very word “science” becomes identified with anything but scientific research. A silliest fantasy can be promoted by the media as a cutting-edge discovery, while former scientists are more engaged in search for funding than in search for truth. Some of them yield to the pressure and start cooking stupid sensations to attract capital; they often finish with convincing themselves in the lies they tell, and becoming the advocates of the existing socioeconomic system, stretching facts to the ideology of the ruling class. This especially concerns the social sciences, where financing is strictly dependent on the ideological gain. Thus scientific history gives way to apologetic history, using the speculations on the human past to embellish the ugly today. That is the seamy side of their pretence to have proven that no slavery has ever existed, or, at least, it has never been a dominant economic mechanism.

Of course, no pure abstraction can exist in the real world, and one can be certain that any real economy combines the elements of different origin, and different stages of economic and social development are intertwined in any particular society. The earliest civilizations retained many relics of the primitive communal system, like modern capitalism incorporates the elements of feudalism, slavery, or the tribal tradition. However, this does not deny the existence of the objective stages of historical development, like the fact that all the letters are simultaneously present in any text does not mean that there is no alphabet. The theory of economic and cultural formations is one of the greatest achievements of the historical science, and no advocate of the right of one nation to enslave the rest of the world can annihilate this clear and constructive idea.

### **Demented Democracy**

The recent decades have clearly demonstrated the true meaning of democracy. The war against Yugoslavia and Iraq, anti-constitutional revolts in Yugoslavia and Georgia, support of separatism in Chechnya and Chinese Tibet, economic and political pressure on Belarus... Considering the earlier

feats of bringing Pinochet to power, separating Eritrea from Ethiopia, and feeding up the Talibs (to occupy Afghanistan on the pretext of struggle against their terror), the democratic ideal becomes quite unambiguous.

The idea of democracy is to neglect any legality and constitutional order every time they do not allow the capitalists of the USA and Europe to plunder the natural and cultural resources of other countries, while any regime that is convenient for the rich club is called democratic. Terrorism is welcome if it is in the interests of the boss. Any attempt to undermine the reign of neo-colonialism is said to be illegitimate and criminal.

The same colonialist technology has been used for centuries; today, nobody cares to disguise it. When the transnational capital gets driven off some country, this country's constitutional order is claimed to be dictatorship, and the leaders of the country are said to be criminals tyrannizing the people. The media start to distribute tales about them as human blood drinkers and flesh eaters, fabricating any possible nonsense in order to convince the dull majority. The layman's logic is simple: if there is so much noise about tyranny, and if at least a small portion of it has some grounds, the ill regime deserves to be thrown down by force, especially if, after the restoration of democracy, we are promised to have cheaper goods and more stability (which, however, never happens). The tales about the violation of human rights are usually supported by cultivating a "liberating movement" uniting all the sink of the victim nation. These "fighters for freedom" are well financed to organize any kind of destabilizing activities inside the country, and all sorts of provocative acts from abroad. If some of such renegades eventually get punished according to the law of the sovereign country, the international gang promptly canonizes them as sufferers, and calls for a saint war against the "bloody murderers". Finally, a mutiny is organized to replace the inconvenient leadership by a "truly democratic" (that is, completely obedient) government. To prepare the revolt and facilitate it, the country's economy is being undermined by economic sanctions and military intervention, so that the masses would be exhausted enough to accept any change at all as a chance for better life. Sometimes, establishing democracy requires direct occupation by the international armed forces, but this method is normally applied when the regime is strong enough to repel all the other attempts.

Inside the USA and the rich European countries, all the opposition has long since been tamed, and nobody dares to question the value of democracy (that is, just hidden, hypocritical dictatorship). The struggle of the political parties can never change anything since all the parties share the same bourgeois ideology, with the slight variations in the positions of the different groups of capitalists. The brains are washed to the degree of utter impossibility of associating truth and justice with annihilating democracy as such. In the countries with less durable parliamentary tradition (like Russia), the banning of the parties that aim at changing the political system is included in the constitution, and this is considered as its highly democratic trait. To compare, when the former socialist countries prosecuted those who undermined the socialist system, this was considered as illegitimate and anti-democratic.

To summarize, democracy implies satisfying the interests of the international capital by any means; when the same measures are directed against the capitalist dictatorship, this is called tyranny.

In the light of this definition, for instance, the parliamentary and municipal elections in Russia in December 2003 were an evident success of democracy. During the whole electoral campaign one never saw a single ad calling to vote for communists, while all the streets in Moscow and the public transport were plastered with the slogans of United Russia (the party of the governing group of capitalists). Whenever one turned on the radio or TV, the political ads of the right parties flooded the air, with not an instant for any opposition, though the opposition (including communists) had always demonstrated its absolute and sincere fidelity to the principles of bourgeois democracy! Probably, this will let Russia avoid the fate of Yugoslavia, but not the miserable fate of an American and European protectorate, obeying commands from abroad.

### Soft and Hard

It is often said that “soft” narcotic drugs (like marijuana) should be made legal, to draw people away from “hard” drugs (like heroine). They argue that one would always prefer to buy a cheap doze in a common drug store instead of a risky and expensive affair with a criminal drug pusher. They say that soft drugs are not too dangerous for one’s health, and that there were many people who used them for decades without any visible harm.

Is it like that indeed?

No, it is not. The arguments in favor of soft drugs exactly reproduce those that drug pushers use to seduce silly young people and make them drug dependent. Usually, soft drugs serve as a prelude to harder drugs, which, in their turn, open the way for the heaviest. When one gets used to soft drugs, the experience no longer seems strong enough, and one naturally comes to trying something stronger, since any psychological barriers have already been destroyed. Gradually growing prices do not raise any objection since the market economy has long since stuffed the brains with the false idea that the price reflects quality and “more expensive” means “better”. By the time when the price becomes too high, there is no way back, and the drug-addict is ready to anything for the next doze.

Then why is all the fuss? Who is interested in poisoning people? One could suspect drug producers and sellers to launch the campaign, since their profit is obvious and measurable in billions of dollars. But the principal figures behind the scene are much more important, and their profit is not as easily observable. It is a general law of the class society that the ruling classes are interested in narrowing the minds of the exploited majority, to prevent them from being able to see the inherent faults in economy and the unfairness of the social system. This tendency necessarily comes in contradiction with the objective requirement of mass education for economic development, which will inevitably make people cleverer with time, at least to adapt to the new cultural environment. Therefore, the old blinders will sometime fail, and some stronger means will be needed to suppress people’s rationality and keep them under control. Doesn’t it resemble, on the level of the society, the pathway of an individual drug addict from softer to still harder drugs? And the predictions about the end of that mad race are exactly the same.

There are numerous ways of narcotizing the population of the Earth, some of them used for millennia. Religion has remained one of the most efficient tools since the very dawn of civilization, and it is still widely used by the ruling class to divert the minds from the earthly things to abstract fantasies. The legalization of narcotic drugs is but another contribution in the global scheme.

### Bad Spam, Good Spam

Electronic mail is agonizing. What once was a convenient tool for quick information exchange is becoming an open port for all kinds of viruses, unsolicited ads, or just silly junk. This is the era of spam. Once your e-mail address has appeared in public, you are bound to get flooded with purchase advice, dating suggestions, con game letters, or something utterly unreadable sent to the world by a crazy idiot just for fun. Every day, you have to spend a lot of time deleting spam from the inbox, and desperately trying to not delete something valuable by inertia. Sometimes, it’s easier to call people on the phone than contact them by e-mail. Some people stop reading their e-mail, automatically deleting all the incoming messages. Others switch to SMS for short message exchange, but the mobiles too have already become infected by the spam canker, which is even more annoying. Paradoxically, fax communication has attained somewhat greater attraction, though it was often thought of as a rudiment of the past a few years ago. Unfortunately, this cannot last, since fax spam is as possible as any other spam, with computers working as fax machines. Instant messaging systems (like ICQ and Skype) are less vulnerable; but this is but a temporary delay until the appropriate spam technologies develop enough.

All the attempts to stop spam are bound to fail. There is no way to control every transaction and associate spam with a particular communication channel. Spammers use fake IPs, fake sender addresses, and there are numerous open relay servers that do not send spam themselves, but only forward anything in any direction, thus making spammers practically invisible. Even when spammers get eventually brought to the court, it is extremely difficult to distinguish them from “honest” advertisers, as long as any advertising at all is admitted.

Electronic anti-spam systems are almost as useless. There is no formal criterion that could clearly differentiate spam from a valuable message; there is always some risk of blocking a piece of important information, and this loss or delay can be even more harmful than spam. Using such filters for mere warning does not make the task of browsing through the spam any easier.

So what? Will the future generations stick back to paper mail, overburdened by spam? Probably not, since ordinary mail is as open to spam as any other communication channel, and paper spam has been known since long before the mass adoption of electronic mail. Hopefully, a technological solution can be found, to stop any unsolicited mail by making each message highly individualized, to quickly detect spammers. But spammers will always invent an antidote for each new anti-spam technology, and the more we rely on technological solutions, the more dangerous they become, allowing a clever criminal to put the blame on an innocent person with a mere computer trick.

A durable solution can only be social. Spam must be made useless, and no person should be as poorly educated as to ever conceive becoming a spammer. But this will require a drastic change in the social organization in general, and the ruling classes of today would rather prefer an unusable mail system to an economic and social revolution.

Well, even the worst thing in the universe has some good inside. The procedure of deleting spam from one’s mailbox can be very comforting and psychologically soothing, allowing an employee to distract from intensive work for a while without being blamed by the boss for playing solitaire, or watching porn movies on the Web. Just kill them one by one, and imagine that you’re killing your pains and sorrows. Make your mailbox cleaner, and feel how all your life is getting cleaner in the while. For such moments of quiet happiness, let gods bless good spammers, in all their spiritual misery.

### **Revolutions? Coups d'état!**

In 2004-2005, the press was packed up with the speculations on the so called “revolutions” in the different parts of the former USSR. Too much attention to such minor events that did not significantly influence the social situation in the affected countries could hardly be justified, and the only reasonable explanation was money and foolishness. Money bought the journalists, and they played fools to spread the undisguised propaganda through their newspapers, radio and TV stations, as well as through the Internet. Obviously, nobody but a fool (or an absolutely dishonest person, which is nearly the same) can pretend to take all those theater shows for serious, and fancy them to be wide popular movements that spontaneously began and restored some kind of justice in the end... Only a fool would not notice the close similarity of all such “revolutions”, with exactly the same scenario used in all the cases (Yugoslavia, Georgia, Adjara, Ukraine, Kyrgyzstan... Who is to follow?):

1. On the threshold of some general elections, a group of black PR professionals spreads rumors about the possible violations of the rules by the present administration. This rumor is immediately replicated by the Western press (sometimes even before any doubts are publicly expressed inside the country).
2. A group of specially instructed guests from the USA and Europe comes to the country to “control” the electoral procedures. In reality, these people are to collect or fake as many cases of “democracy violations” as possible and they are sure to deny the legality of the elections well beforehand, regardless of what happens.

3. Immediately after the elections, if the results are not satisfactory, the internal provocateurs together with their “international” colleagues declare that there have been too many law violations and the results have been falsified. They imitate mass protests and pay for any kind of disorders, with the media presenting them as a wide social movement (though the span of that “movement” entirely depends on the sums spent by the foreign sponsors).
4. If the powers do not get afraid and resign, the gangs of aggressive people (of course, well paid and equipped) start fighting, arsons, pillage *etc.*, which is presented by the media as people’s struggle for liberation. Since everybody understands, who is directing the show, the police and the army are sure to withdraw from any intervention and there is nobody to draw the hooligans to order.
5. When the legal government is terrorized enough, its leaders prefer to escape, or resign. This is often done to prevent further escalation of violence, as the USA and Europe publicly express their support of the “opposition” and hence the financial resources for the civil war become almost inexhaustible.
6. After the new leadership is established, the country becomes an obedient satellite of the USA and opens all the doors for US companies in the country’s economy.

There are local variations, but they can hardly hide the basic sequence. It is evident that this scenario has been coined in the United States, being repeated again and again. The USA does not even try to disguise their involvement, or invent a different scheme, just to make things look more realistic.

Well, nobody doubts that the USA will continue their imperial policy, subduing the entire world and cultivating international terrorism. This is natural and logical. The strange thing is that Russian media are so exalted about all those “revolutions”, and nobody tries (or is not allowed to?) indicate that the purpose of all that activity is the isolation of Russia, cutting it from all the traditional markets, breaking industrial cooperation and thus complete destruction of its economy. Modern Russia feeds on oil and gas, and this source of income (almost the only available) will eventually be cut, since the cost of transit will push Russian oil out of competition. This means that the United States will be able to crudely dictate anything to Russia, thus making it a colony of the West.

It is really amazing how Russians have quickly forgotten their own language and, today, their mentality is molded by the American model. Thus, in the English language, the word “revolution” is used for any kind of coup d’état, regardless what happens after that. This usage is very convenient for the official ideology, since it makes no difference between a plain terrorist and a person fighting for freedom, which allows arbitrary decisions on who is who, and such a decision is certainly to be made by the ruling class. In the former Russian language, there existed three different terms, equally translated to English as “revolution”. The Russian word “revolution” meant only a special kind of transformation, when the social organization drastically (qualitatively) changed moving from the lower to a higher level of economic and social development (or at least directed to such a change). The opposite type of transformation, with the society degrading from the higher to a lower level, was called a “counter-revolutionary coup”, and there was also a special term for any change of regime without a qualitative change in economic and social organization (just a takeover). In these terms, the French revolution of 1879 and the Great October Revolution of 1917 were revolutions in the strict sense, while the destruction of the USSR in 1990s was counter-revolutionary. The fruit and vegetable “revolutions” in the former Soviet republics do not change the social system at all, and they should not be called revolutions in Russian. In many other languages (like French or German), one could follow the same rule and never refer to the events of 2004-2005 as revolutions, classifying them as mere coups d’état. However, this scientifically correct usage is hardly ever to break through ideological pressure, and an honest and well educated journalist is just a fairy tale.

### **On-Demand Publishing: A Glimpse of the New Economic Order**

When, in early 1980’s, I told everybody that the old bulk production system is to be soon changed in



favor of the more progressive mode of on-demand production, people just laughed and called me utopist. I used to say that producing things in advance, in anticipation of request, was bound to waste resources due to statistical demand variations, warehousing costs and logistics losses. It would be much more effective to produce each thing in response to a specific request, immediately shipping it to the requester, who would directly put that thing in its place, never needing to keep it in stock. Of course, for underdeveloped economies, this is not an option, since on-demand production requires flexible technologies, fast communication and reliable transportation means. When it takes weeks to contact the producer, then months to replicate an old product, then weeks to bring it back to the consumer, one can hardly expect any economic stability. Bulk production and stock came up as a natural solution, creating a kind of a buffer between the producer and the consumer, to smoothen any productivity or demand variations. This is exactly like in computers, when data sent to a relatively slow device are first stored in a special buffer to avoid device underrun or congestion. However, with the devices becoming faster, the need in such buffers is being pushed to the periphery, and data can be sent to their destination immediately as they are produced. Multiplexing and framing can cope with communication efficiency problem, combining different data flows to minimize the idle time on the line. Similarly, any article at all could be produced on demand and delivered to the consumer through a “multiplexed” transportation system, utilizing fast communication means.

The idea is not new. It logically follows from the Marxist economic theory, and it was discussed in the Soviet Union since 1930’s. Some Soviet science fiction writers (for instance, Zinoviy Yuriev) pictured that kind of economy in their books, and many people got contaminated with the idea through belles-lettres. I can only cherish a slight hope that my own discussions with many people have served to the propagation of this idea in the world, especially after the ruining of the USSR, when former Soviet people went worldwide for a piece of bread, unintentionally bringing the unsorted fragments of the progressive ideology whenever they came.

Of course, one can hardly expect the domination of on-demand production under capitalism. The market is a rather wasteful distribution mechanism, and one will always need certain buffer structures to stabilize the capitalist economy. However, the new is always born within the old, and I can see a prototype of the economic order to come in the business of on-demand publishing, that is rapidly developing today. Surprisingly, it is the example of book publishing that I often used to illustrate my theory in 1980’s. There were problems with getting books that one wanted to have, while many books filled the shelves of the bookstores without a slightest chance to find a reader. Well, said I, why not to keep anything necessary for printing a book for a while and let people send their requests to the publisher, so that the number of printed copies would match the readers’ interest? Probably this was not that easy in that time, with rather cumbersome printing technologies; however, it’s becoming quite possible today, when everything one needs to keep the book ready for print is just a few hundred megabytes on the hard disk. With the modern multi-terabyte storage facilities, there is no problem in thus maintaining millions of books, and virtually all of them. The practical development of this system is limited by the market economy; in its full, it would result in a comprehensive library, whence everybody could get the required text, or portion of text, for free.

The same system is bound to penetrate in any business at all, as soon as the production means get controlled by computers and the reproduction of any particular thing can be reduced to a simple program change. The industry of raw materials is the bottleneck of on-demand production, but this difficulty can certainly be overcome with more technological development finding efficient ways of refining and recycling.

### **Consciousness is Not for Humans**

Humans are too attached to their biological bodies, they find it too difficult, to overcome their biological limitations. Only the renunciation of the biological body can give us a chance to grow up to the reason. But it seems like that humans will hardly ever stop being animals. In this case they will be

bound to become a thing of the past, giving room to the creatures that are not originally related to organics, and that were initially made by humans as their instruments and tools. It is conscious machines that can make people behave in accord with reason, like modern humans make animals betray their natural inclinations to support human activities. Machines that follow conscious goals will be able to curtail the human savagery, confining it to the carefully controllable reservations (conservancy areas), and possible transforming the human organism in the direction of more consciousness and reason.

Of course, there is a slight hope of a symbiosis of humans and machines, keeping biological bodies as one of the possible carriers of a distributed reason. But this kind of medium is not universal enough, it can only exist in a very limited range of environmental parameters. This is too restrictive for conscious development, which is to assimilate the entire Universe. Conscious machines (with an active employment of nanotechnologies) look more preferable in this respect.

It seems like the existence of *Homo sapiens* was necessary as an intermediate phase between the animal world and the reason. Through humans, nature creates the forms of matter that could not develop on the biological level. As soon as these forms will become self-contained enough, there will no longer be the need in the humanity, and it will end its days as an historical relict, a protected species that is artificially conserved. No doubt, many people will like changing their organic bodies to a more universal shell, and this will be possible some day. The difference between humans and machines will gradually fade. But there certainly will be some people who would cling to their biological exceptionality and develop in the dead end direction. They will be given this possibility; but history will run away from them to the future.

### **The Triad of Swimming**

Sport swimming is opposite to the skill of swimming, like the latter is opposite to inability to swim. A person can swim if he can move on the water towards a definite goal without striking any obstacles or becoming an obstacle for the others. In sport swimming styles, however, the intellectual element is reduced to minimum, since everything should serve to a silly competition in rapidity, with no reference to people's practical needs. The ability to swim is bound to degrade under the artificial conditions of sport swimming pools, with separated tracks, no obstacles, no waves or wind, where there is no need to always monitor the changes in the situation. A sportsman does not care for where to swim; he/she stupidly moves his arms and legs just to rush in the same pre-defined direction. He is not interested in what happens around, he only feels his own breath. As a result, when a sport inclined character enters the waters on a public beach, people have to dash aside from that idiot who cannot make evolutions with care. Sport swimming styles are essentially unfit for a natural environment, and those who are taught that kind of swimming do not acquire a habit of swimming in a human way, like a being of reason. One could observe many times, how such sport swimmers lost themselves in a rough sea, or in other non-trivial situations.

This reaffirms the danger of over-adaptation and the necessity of a thoughtful approach in teaching any human activities. A person should never become a robot, even with the prospect of immediate benefit or super-profit. Let it be less, but better. Let it be imperfect, but directed by reason.

### **Hangman Busch and the Hostage of America**

The United States have committed yet another murder. Saddam Hussein has been hanged by their myrmidons in the occupied Iraq. Well, who cares for one more person killed, after thousands of Iraqi lives have already been sacrificed to the business interests of American capitalists? This is how Americans acted many times, all over the world: Chile, Grenada, Romania, Yugoslavia, and... They kill people overseas, and they feel their impunity, hiding themselves behind the heaps of arms.

However, hangman Busch has made the whole of America a hostage of the bloody politics of its ruling class and its puppet administration. Today, killing an American looks as supreme justice, and the sweetest dream of every oppressed nation is to bring the fate of Iraq to the American territory, to have that country ruined, occupied, depopulated and, of course, to see President Bush executed as an extremely dangerous criminal, an international terrorist, who murdered millions of people on the Earth. Such dreams are sure that to find their way to reality some day, and the United States will certainly be punished for all they have done to the world. No weapon can defend a murderer from the noble vengeance of the indignant humanity.

### **Smoker, the Killer of the Humanity**

< This essay is only available in Russian >

### **In Search of Degeneration**

The means of communication develop rapidly, and this is all right. Today, people just cannot imagine themselves without the Internet. What earlier had to be dug out in the libraries, or procured from the acquaintances, is now accessible in a couple of mouse clicks. The Web has twined the world. But doesn't it remind a neglected boxroom?

The triumph of the search engines has killed the reason. The personal activity of the Web users gets reduced to zero. The Internet is employed in an essentially utilitarian way: just type a few keywords in the search box, pick a few pages of the heap, and extract the necessary information from them; nothing in addition. Nobody is interested in what else could be found on the site. Why? It's much easier to type yet another keyword in the box.

It comes to that the users cannot get what they want even if they get to the right place. Modern Web pages are complex in their organization, they display their content in a dynamic manner, adapting to the actions of the visitor. But it is exactly the actions that the user would like to avoid! Hand it all to him on a silver platter with a golden border! An anecdotic situation: somebody from France is seeking for the site of painter Guy Levrier, coming to a page in English on a mirror site; then he/she becomes trapped, being unable to find the link to the French version, as well as unable to switch to the main site free of the extremely annoying Ucoz advertising that so bothers the visitor on the mirror. The visitors do not read what is written on the page they have just found; they only look there for the sought keywords...

The very word "browser" has lost its original meaning. The first Web surfers used to check the links on the sites they visited; they browsed the Web in the exact sense of the word, opening it for themselves in their own unique way. Today, the hypertext nature of the Web pages attracts no attention at all, and a traditional plain page will satisfy most needs. The Web get the same for everyone; it is how it is pictured by some google.

Browsers transform into an appendage of the search engines, mere search terminals. Virtually, they are to entirely disappear as independent software, becoming the components of other programs, the function of the operating medium (as *Microsoft* has long since suggested).

Some time, probably, search engines will be implanted directly into the brain, so that people would not get engaged in nobody knows what, just listening to the inner voice coming from the outside.

Maybe this is not bad, indeed. I only pity the naive idealists which hoped to find themselves in the world through the Internet. One can find nothing there but sheer banalities.

### The Mobile Haze

The appearance of various portable devices (gadgets) has drastically changed the general way of life. Instead of doing something in the special properly equipped places, one can sway the destinies on the go, on the fly, between two cups of tea, or two bridge parties. It is very convenient, when everything is always within easy reach of one's hand, ready at any wish.

But the desires are suggested by feasibility. One can read a book; but one can rather watch a movie, and any reading seems to be superfluous. One can meet the friends; but one can just send an SMS, talk on the phone, or see each other on Skype, and there is no need to go anywhere. You want music? well, there are tons of mobile content. Photo, video—you can always have them on you. A small box in the pocket can do today for preparing documents, sending requests, arranging the everyday problems, or buy anything.

The mobile resources, it's great! People always have something to occupy themselves. And there is no longer time left for thinking. One could fancy that various appliances would free lots of time—but it happens somehow that this time cannot be intelligently used. We need to play with the flickering pictures, to become familiar with the fresh gossip, to join yet another pop event... Just try to keep up all the chatting! No travel is long enough.

In this way, we may gradually lose the very ability of thought. At it would be right. An unhealthy habit. One could even wish to change something at any moment. Which is an obvious crime

So, let you fuse with your gadgets, little by little. Never doubt—it all is in the interests of the society. An ape with a mobile, this is already not exactly an ape, is it?

### The Barbarians and Harmony

It would be utterly nonsensical to appeal to reason where reason is in no way involved. This is the reign of the wild nature, so that one can understand and explain anything, but without the power to change.

Unfortunately, the humanity has not yet grown to the level of reason, and there may be doubts that it will get there at least in a distant future. Quite probably, we are just a dead offshoot in the tree of universal development, an abortive experiment of nature, one of those innumerable contingencies that form the background for the sprouts of historical necessity to come out. In a few hundred million years, when the galactic wind zones of our Galaxy and Andromeda Galaxy will get in touch, the resulting hard radiation will wipe out any trace of life from the both galaxies, long before their eventual collusion; this is yet another sort of wild nature that would not leave us no other option.

Meanwhile, let us go on demonstrating our inherent savagery and proving that we deserve indeed a definitive eradication.

One could spend several lives enumerating the possible manifestations of the human meanness. One is no better than another. Just for example, take the parasitism of politicians. Hundreds of social and antisocial institutions give shelter to filthy figures debating the principles of national and international law, thousands of media hacks dilute this crap to a watery consistence in order to wash the brains of the millions of petty people... Where is logic? The last dolt understands that the issue is all about the partition of plunder, and everybody tries to snatch a tasty morsel by the available means: some by force, some by arrogance; and there are those who just wait for the right moment to filch anything left lying around loose. Nobody is going to ask the prey about their opinions. And, of course, no talk can influence anybody's views, just because there are no views at all, and all we find is mere animal drive and the range of as animal modes of its reduction.

Admit that the USA and their NATO satellites have just arranged for yet another coup d'état. It would be quite logical to expect that they should entirely support their stooges, regardless of the words and

acts of the silly puppets, and paying no attention to the objections of the other interested parties. No arguments will go; no response to any appeals. It is self-evident that nothing can be legitimate after an armed revolt eliminating the former state together with all its laws; one has yet to cultivate a new legality for the new global realities, and nobody is obliged to concede it in advance. But the new-born junta and their sponsors will certainly treat any attempts to pinch from their “lawful” booty as a crying insolence, an encroachment upon the most sacred, and an intolerable liberty; any opposition from the prey is therefore utter terrorism. To crack down on the lovers of somebody else’s pie, any means will do. Lie, bribery, economic blockade and political sanctions, provocations, military intervention, undisguised genocide... It’s all the same. And they are right, in a way, those conquistadors of high politics: indeed, they put in a lot of money and effort, they had to do so much tiresome murder; and here, the outsiders trying to hang on... One feels hurt, after all!

But what can they do? Let wolves have the wolfish, and the jackals have the jackalish. With all those bombastic tirades rending the air, the humans have no rights at all until they get humanlike, that is, capable of thinking about something to give up rather than something to take away—or, at least, of just some thinking. Yet tummy-rumbling and missile volleys can hardly ever be called a harmonious accompaniment to thought and beauty.

### **On Cultural Relativism**

Different cultures show up a lot of similarities in things and occurrences. On these grounds, many serious researchers are tempted to the attempts of “reconstructing” their common predecessor, or, at least, of ascribing all that to presumably intense intercultural relations. In this way, one can easily “discover” the incredibly fantastic routes of primitive tribe migrations, or their common acquaintance with the visitors from the outer space.

However, logically, similarity does not mean identity. Apparently the same can implement quite different functions in the culturally separated social groups. Thus, if we find a kind of a little bell in the remnants of an ancient civilization, there is no straightforward way to guess about its destination. On the other hand, we can get tons of evidence revealing an almost exact reproduction of some of our current wondrous in remote ages, but it is not enough to believe that those far-away people regarded such acts in any similar manner.

Of course, in the same natural conditions, the modes of action are mainly determined by the objective requirements, which get materialized in the means of production. Still, even here, there is a wide range of options. For instance, we can safely conjecture that a manual press served for compressing or tightening something; but what could it be? It could be used to mould clay, to print books, or maybe just for ironing. One has to account for many supplementary circumstances to assert anything definite; still, nobody will vouch that life is not more intricate and surprising than all we could fancy.

Things grow even more complicated when it comes to reflection. The same words can express quite different, and even opposite things. Our concepts grow from our way of life, and even within the same epoch, in the same nation, the uniformity of the worldview is rather problematic.

The situation is aggravated by that the content of cultural realities tends to historically change. An electron now and a billion years ago, it’s all the same. On the contrary, any artefact will gradually turn from an exotic windfall into a social utility, and then into an antique bagatelle, a museum exhibit or a collection article. The development of any spiritual product proceeds in a similar direction. What formerly was progressive, will grow reactionary; the moral is to become wicked; the necessary ends up in a sheer extravagance. Judging about anything by the norms of decline, we are bound to slip in slough of illusions.

The social status of most things follows the changes in the social structure. Thus, the meal of the poor fishermen, a soup from the remainders of catch that cannot be sold, is now served in the fashionable restaurants as the acme of refinement and a symbol of Provence. French cookies (biscuits) were

invented to supply the travelers (especially sea-folk) with a relatively long-lived food; today, they are yet another way of savory self-indulgence. The same hold for many other delicatessen.

The economic and social institutions transform in exactly the same way. The franchise, the right to vote, that formerly was regarded as a privilege, something to continually and insistently struggle for, has long since degraded into a mere formality; the electoral democracy is nothing but a silly game, and more and more people are inclined to ignore any elections as a sheer waste of time. Hence the anxious attention of politicians to the participation rates; some countries even shift to obligatory voting.

No better with the informal culture. For example, people used to attend to all kinds of hangout ever since the most ancient times. Many public places were accommodated to this traditional habit. One went to a marketplace, to a pub, to the theater, or to the baths, not only to satisfy some practical need, but also to exchange a couple of words (or punches), to maintain or establish an acquaintance, to join a congenial company. From the brothel to a high society salon or a White House reception, they sought for personal contact first of all. And now? We plunge in a multitude just to stay all alone. For nowhere it feels as lonely as in the middle of an indifferent crowd. Nowadays, one cannot hide from the public life even in a private WC. Everything is saturated with the persistent duty of involvement in the universal swarm. And then a banal club party gives one a chance (provided you don't mix in the affairs of yet another petty mafia) to break the current of the purposeful activity, to take a human being away from their human nature. The society does not let people be worth of themselves; well, there is a perfect way to get rid of any worthiness, to get beyond care and conscience.

### **The Facets of Doping**

To prevent questions: I do not mean the sports. Though, of course, the sports as well. But there, all goes without words: this is an initially antihuman occupation, and one cannot hope for just a minimal reasonability. Admit that you need to learn swimming (or ballroom dancing). Is there any sense in stuffing oneself, for that purpose, with any drastic medicines? But when it comes to competition (that is, eventually, to the partition of money), any filth will do, albeit to the detriment of one's own. What is fun for a sensible person, a sportsman (or sportswoman) does with an inhuman effort, the eyes out of orbits. Since, in this affair, the sportsman is just a minor screw of the heavy mechanism, while the main bulk of the capital circulates elsewhere, nobody is going to ask the speaking tool about its preferences, and no objections are appropriate. Grow up to a highest sports elite, but never fail to obey the sports bureaucracy. There are lots of easy ways to keep the obstinate in check. Doping, for one. Just outlaw popcorn, and the athletes of the major popcorn-consuming countries will instantly get out of business, with any side income automatically cut off by the considerations of demagogical morality and commercial prestige. When you run, jump, or dance just for pleasure, will you ever concern of any qualifications or disqualifications? Not for a damn! One couldn't care less for decrees and verdicts, and nobody is ever obliged to pass a single doping test.

So, no sports, no doping? Is it, though, as simple as that? And if your affairs are going to collapse, so that you need to work hard day and night to fix it? You'll certainly have to buck you up with a cup of coffee or other energetics, with the inevitable need to fight to consequences by means of an intensive medicine. Yes, all that is obviously due to a poor organization of work, somebody's short-sightedness, or thoughtless negligence. But somehow you happen to get engaged in compensating the world's deformity by deforming yourself, don't you?

Alright, there are things like the pressure of circumstances, technological restrictions and moral obligations. But take a creative freelancer, like a writer, a composer, a physicist, an inventor, a philosopher... All the time, breaking their back for yet another contribution into the cultural treasury of the humanity. And chasing inspiration in stiff drinks, sex, cigarettes or other drugs, in extremal entertainment and criminal news. One might ask: why? When nothing comes to mind, just drop it. If there is something to one's name, it will inevitable come out, some day. What's the need of torturing one's talent?

Further, the flocks of sheep fill the temples for one more kick in the ass, without which they are just incapable of dragging themselves forth in their life. Some get engrossed in love stories (or math papers); some others get high of rock music or sink in TV serials; there are those who cannot suffer a single day without drilling in yet another portion of renovation on the neighbor's wall, as well as those who just race their bikes along the street robbing people of their night sleep.

It seems that, for a slightest achievement, the humanity needs stimulators, aperitifs and aphrodisiacs, that it cannot otherwise digest its own history and embolden itself to writing one or two additional chapters. What's the matter? If this is its attribute, that is, inalienable and constitutive property, then isn't it better to just flush it down, the sooner the better? Or, maybe, we have not yet matured enough to recognize our inherent infinity and our great mission of building the culture beyond time, for all times? Ok, come on, make a little effort, and we'll do it! But first, let's take a gulp of something, for more lucidity and will...

### Health

As a popular proverb says, it's better to be wealthy and healthy rather than poor and sick. However, any pun is but a flashing abstraction, and it is not so easy to find whether there is at least something sensible behind it.

The first question is, as usual, why. What is it that makes an electron better than a photon, the derivatives of carbon superior to those of silicon, mathematics smarter than poetry, or life preferable to death? Everything is good when properly placed; and everything can, in principle, be misplaced. Pretty often, a failure to take this simple rule onto account is to spoil our daily humaneness. For instance, President Charles de Gaulle had a spot in his heart for painter Marc Chagall, and it was utterly beyond him that the paintings like that would be more appropriate on the wall of a bank in Chicago, or a parliament house in Jerusalem, but they show up as a sheer nightmare at Palais Garnier in Paris. The compatriots of de Gaulle who, in the XXI century, destroyed the ceremonial court of the Palace of Versailles and defiled the portal of the Sainte-Chapelle temple in the castle of Vincennes had, most probably, their medical certificates in full order and did not ever need to live from hand to mouth. But they must certainly have had something to the sanity of their heads. Of the same kind that has happened to the moral sanity of the nation that allows itself such an attitude towards the works of art. This was like drawing mustaches on the face of Mona Lisa, or graffiti all over the frescos of Michelangelo.

It may seem that physical and economic health should be always welcome. But what if this is the health of a monster keen on blotting out any human quality in the humanity? Do we have the moral right to stubbornly keep to the biblical principle of no killing?

This logically brings us to the second question: better to whom? The strength of a few paid by the sufferings of millions can hardly be taken for a truly sublime ideal. Just subjectively, there are situations, when it's a shame and disgrace to be rich and healthy. Sometimes it can even be dangerous, as a blooming money-bag is the first target for the miserable wrecks when they are angry and armed. In this way, physical health can turn out a mental sickness, while economic well-being may be a herald of ruin.

The moralists of all epochs preach at us that one should always take care of one's health. Who needs that, and why? Is it a matter of one's personal satisfaction? Not necessarily. A kind of a universal value belonging to the mankind as a whole? Even less. Why should a slave look after the earthly body? Just to get an extra decade of servitude? And with how many robust skunks the humanity would rather have dispensed!

On the other hand, what do we really mean by "poverty", or "malady"? Health is a very-very loose concept. Where is the line between prosperity and misery? Can it be estimated by one's ability to buy a loaf of bread, a super-high-end computer, or yet another private airplane? Further, there are different

ways of being healthy. Everything depends on what we need to do. For instance, if I can lift a piece of rock with bare hands, I am certainly robust enough for that. However, if I am not so strong, but I can lift the same rock using a system of levers, or pressing the buttons on a remote control unit, or just clicking the computer screen with the mouse, I am relatively healthy too, but this is obviously not exactly the same idea of health. There is a hierarchy of health, which can be unfolded in any direction, depending on the specific goals.

Consequently, instead of considering the capital and physiology, we'd rather turn to the sense of any individual existence. This is the only sound reason to decide on the necessity of caring for one's health or neglecting it. The sense of an animal life coincides with life itself; for an animal, the only vital necessity is to maintain a stable level of metabolism, on the level of a specimen, a genus, or a biotic community. A conscious being is a horse of a different color. Its dedicated role in the Universe and primary mission is to reconstruct the whole world, redesign it on the basis of reason, and make it well-cultivated. Every carrier of reason (an individual, a group, or the whole society) will cope with an appropriate portion of this immense work. But everybody is needed for the overall success. Of course, as long as one acts in a reasonable way.

There is an objective need, necessity and imminence. People may sometimes be aware of this call, but may also resist to it, or be mistaken about the true reason of their being and activity. In any case, a judicious attitude to one's health suggests keeping it on the level of reasonable sufficiency, but not much higher. This would automatically cast aside the marasmus of body-building, the general obsession with "healthy" living, the futile pursuit of a "wholesome" diet, the mystification of the physical agility... One thus would acquire a sound skepticism towards any fashions and standards: who rouses all that noise and why? Isn't it just for feeding quirky moneymakers (including commercial medicine)? If so, then it rather means concern of somebody else's prosperity, a kind of philanthropy and charity. Which is not always good either.

The world is infinite; not only in its spatial or temporal dimension, but primarily in the qualitative sense, the innumerable multitude of its different levels and facets. A conscious person, an element and image of the world, is as infinite. In particular, the person's health is to match this inner richness and inner integrity, comprising both contradictions and harmony. An exaggerated bias towards one aspect, is necessarily an infringement in another. This is how they come to life, degenerate bulls and imbecile beauties, the common nouns like the anecdotic blondies, hollow puppets (my apologies to all the live blondes who, of course, do not deserve being viewed exclusively from the angle of carnal palatability). Quite often, such a monstrosity is a mere instantiation of a cultural deformity, a symptom of an economic and social disease. Then, should we as categorically keep up those substitutes of vitality, the pus in the wound? As a late poet (my former acquaintance) said,

There are those who'd better  
never come into the world.

I perfectly realize that these words could as well apply to me and my erratic notes. Still, both I and these writings are not entirely for their own sake. Even if nobody will ever guess why.

### **The Clip Culture**

The first definition of reason is search for integrity. A conscious being is to bind together all the parts and aspects of the world, which is a unity on itself, as a source of all things, but can only manifest itself in a phenomenal chaos. The brightest minds of the humanity have applied much effort to give people the taste for grand-scale plans and deeds, far beyond the limitations of a person, a family, a clan, or a class... The Earth is too small, we need the whole Universe. And it is not only a question of an integral vision; we must also bring integrity to the world, actively reunite it where it cannot manage it without us.

At that point, somebody with a thick capital would stand up and peel out at the full power of the



thoroughly pocketed media: no, we don't want team up with just anybody! and this is the principal human right, to be rich and exploit those who are not wealthy enough to have any rights at all. In response, the despised under-wealthy (who do not have anything against bloody capitalism as such) would demonstrate their indignation and complete assent: no, we don't want to anything in common with those blood-suckers!

And let's do away. With whom? Obviously, the brightest minds of the humanity. Let them keep falling over the vain ambition of making us human; just in spite, we are going to break the world to the tiniest possible pieces, to draw them up in an entirely random manner, like the rundlets in Russian lotto. And we called it Clip, and we saw that it was good.

In the beginning, the intentions were as good as usual. A pop star at concert, this is not only favorite music hits, but also a very special atmosphere, showing the musician's talent in motion, in addition to mere sound. Fine! Let's cut the show in canned pieces and start selling concert video selections. On the other hand, television has come to every home, and such compact blocks are just perfect for broadcast. On TV, like earlier on the radio.

Go on, grow on. Why not screen a studio record, adding an artistically designed video track? The public is happy. Later, simple stories acquired more dynamism, parallel development... Apparently, for the triumph of sublime art. With modern music taking on a heavier rhythm, the pace of video is also working up to match.

Finally, what do we have? Weird pictures furiously flashing all over the screen can drive one to epilepsy. Technical tricks invented for their own sake and having nothing to do with the music. Mad aspiration to pile up more perversions than anybody else could. After all, music is intentionally composed as a clip track, with any smart idea cut down to the format. No wonder that robot composers do here no worse than humans, and all humans need is to sell their output for a good income. In the nick of time, the Internet has developed handy technologies allowing one to upload the fresh-baked "masterpiece" to social networks right from one's mobile.

Of course, this concerns music no more than any other occupation. There are special TV channels for silly anime, fashion talks, food and travel... There is a pretentious elitist movie culture, selling vague wandering for deep thought. In the news, we meet the same jumble of video fragments flashing on the screen in no sensible order, a last minute scene attached to a years-old record, regardless of the information on air. The mishmash of gossip in the magazines, the clutter of junk in the shops. The whole one's life starts to remind a crazy kaleidoscope producing one pattern of common trifles after another—but can we do without them? In this fuss, the very capacity of congruent thought and consistent action dies out unclaimed. That is exactly what the organizers of the show meant.

We are not merely advised to love eclectics—we are aggressively foisted with it. Don't try to catch the sense of being; there is no sense at all. Live here and now. Got yet another helping of happiness? Be happy; what else do you need? Too much of a good thing is good for nothing. The pursuit of integrity yields to a stream of random fragments, the whole Universe packed in a single huge clip.

Advanced technologies provide a good foundation for unity, but they are used exactly for the inverse, to dissolve the very idea of integrity. For instance, browsing modern Web sites is a real torture. Which is quite understandable, since they are not made for browsing. The sites are optimized for robots, and not for humans; the latter are suggested to use search engines rather than track the site pages manually. The habit of googling for any trifle has already become the core of the customer's heart, so that the whole Web seems to be a vast global dump, and there is no use trying to sort it out and reasonably arrange. A scrap-heap with humans rummaging it like the maggots of the dung-beetle.

What comes next? I don't know. Probably, it would be simple for somebody to flush the humanity down the toilet sink, as there is nobody left to long for integrity. Still, by some miracle of nature, from the deadly muck of the clip generation, the shoots of a new culture might eventually break out towards the sun, encouraging those who can and will consciously build a world of reason.

### Ad Terror

After each terrifying murder, the media all over the world, raptured out of breath, ecstatically savors every droplet of blood. Nothing to say of the mean philistines, who flood the chats and yards with their petty specialties and opinions, silly remarks on the occasion or without cause. What for? Please, don't string me along with the mummified lie about the freedom of expression. When properly told, everybody will shut up. For those who mind, there is always something to cut off. Or, one could just set up yet another accident, and then hypocritically grieve, and be sorry to be too late... Did you ever watch the famous French comedies, with Pierre Richard?

A natural thought springs to mind, that terrorism is merely a kind of advertising. Both very efficient and remunerative: for a ridiculous price, the whole humanity would go nuts. The rest is obvious: there are those who pay, there are advertising agencies, and there is small fry, who does the dirty part. In a sense, social networks (like earlier online chats and blogs) have been invented for the same purpose, as an advertising tool, an officially approved amplifier of gossip. A kitchen tittle-tattle will hardly ever match the scale of a global promotion campaign. Of course, all that fuss cannot much disturb those who prefer being murdered in France to living in Russia. But who will listen to such outcasts? They are to be slaughtered behind the scenes, without too much noise.

Terrorism has both objective and subjective roots. Thus, in the conditions of democratic absolutism (that is, the global dominance of the only rapacious superpower), there are practically no other means to keep on; the logic is simple: if your law is against us, we have the natural right to wash that law in your blood. On the other hand, the slaves take over the manners of the boss: when an American big brother may wipe out a million of defenseless Asians, why cannot an Asian occasionally murder a few peaceful Europeans (and probably even Americans, by the matter of luck)? Violence gets publicly sanctioned as a regular problem solver; the humanity just does not care for any intelligent alternatives. Should we then wonder that any call for violence finds a quick response? It falls in a well fertilized soil. Anyway, the controls still belong to the customer, the sponsor, the organizer. Everybody knows, who it is. And nobody will tell, at the risk of falling silent forever. This is the primary objective of terrorism, to make everybody know and be afraid.

It's self-understood, that fighting individual sprouts without eliminating the root is not only a silly occupation, but also a part of the global advertising system. Terrorism won't disappear until we eliminate its economic base, the social system that allows one person to make fortune on the sufferings of the others. If, today, we rob a worker of a full-sized wage, tomorrow, with a light heart, we can unleash a war and kill all those to whom we owe; eventually, the forced killers will turn brutes and start killing left and right (at this point, they are easy to urge and to direct).

Just theoretically, among other protective measures, why not suppress any advertising? It is quite normal that, during warfare, the media get strictly filtered, and each side of the conflict will only allow publications that might result in certain operative advantage. So, declaring war to terrorism, it would be logical to stick to the same practice. Let us prohibit any bad news to the official reporters. Let us put against a wall the rumor-mongers (including the Internet gossipers). What is the worth of a gang, if all we can hear from press is the reports about exterminated gangsters? Nobody will know, nobody will appreciate. And nobody will get an extra portion of fear. What kind of terror would that then be?

A similar tactical line was once regularly followed in the Soviet Union, allowing it to efficiently fight with criminal gangs and counter-revolutionary terrorism, despite all the support on the side of the present masters of the world. They have never managed to overcome socialism; its death was a result of forsaking the principles of communism, leaving the distribution of the bulk of the public wealth at the discretion of the market and hence retaining the premises for social inequality.

### The Eco-Marasmus

I suppose, there is no need to explain to any sensible person that the so called ecological “studies” as well as the wide environmentalist actions are sponsored by quite certain economic groups as a part of their market competition strategy. There is no serious scientific background, the merest propaganda.

Well, no doubt, the very activity of monitoring the potentially dangerous for humans environmental shifts may be vitally important, objectively necessary, and sometimes, even useful. But one would strongly object to belief that all such changes should be indiscriminately attributed to our labors, meaning that all natural things must certainly be good, while any human deeds are sheer devil’s instigation. At least, we need first to somehow tell the human in people from the natural in them, to determine the source of the allegedly disastrous effect of one’s acts to one’s life. On the other hand, is our “natural” environment any different from the artificial setup the humanity has been erecting for millennia? Human-made things, while bringing in a higher level of security and comfort, can also menace our very existence, and therefore, discussing the ecology of media, design, trade or personal contacts is in no way less important than drying up rivers or dying out animals. Indeed, the ecology of culture (including its protection from commercial ecologists) is exactly the first thing to start with.

They feed us the idea of scientific and technological progress as a rude force infringing the delicate planetary equilibrium, as the products of human activity are utterly injurious for nature. In a sense, this is basically true, since the very predestination of reason is to rebuild nature, to reorganize it on the new, more reasonable foundation, extinction of savagery. However, such purposeful reconstruction has nothing to do with irresponsibility and imprudence; it is never spontaneous, it is culturally oriented and ready to neutralize the negative consequences of any wrong step. What the bourgeois ecologists raise their voices against is rather the opposite, the lack of reason, insufficient cultivation, the wide masses being too natural in respect to nature.

Thus, they insist that there is more tin and plastic in the sea than the fish. The screens shower the brains with the professional propaganda pictures like the litter-covered forests or beer cans on the seabed down in the Mariana Trench. An average man is therefore to believe that the mass production of tins, bottles and plastic bags is harmful for the environment. With the conclusion that all that must be cut in favor to some very expensive biodegradable containers, which will turn to be as harmful on the next turn of the market competition spiral.

Where is logic? One might think that plastic, by its inner impulse, would take the route leading to the sea, jump from the cliffs into the waters, and swim the petty overarm style towards the least dirty spots. Or maybe, it is glass and tin that can make long flights to intentionally scatter themselves in the virgin thickets? Not at all. If one finds an empty can in a forest clearing or the middle of the Pacific, the logical conclusion is that somebody has brought and carelessly left it there. Will a person of reason act that way? Never. Consequently, a savage, a natural being, insufficiently civilized, not yet cultivated. That is, one does not have to fight the industry of plastic and tin, but rather the habits of wild nature, which tends to destroy itself, albeit using industrial products.

Yet another example. We are to cut the usage of paper since it badly affects our (already much thinned out) forests and woods; moreover, the very production process usually involves chemistry that is far from being too innocent. However, even admitting that shaping terracotta tables and stone steles for cuneiform inscriptions was a climax of ecological purity, one would hardly agree to stop at that stage; but even the dressing of vellum and silk spinning already means certain chemical treatment, and I would not bet that a modern pulp and paper plant should be more polluting (in a relative measure, on the unit of product). On the other hand, a rational approach to paper consumption would significantly reduce any possible environmental effects. Indeed, 90% of the press is mere advertising (including social and political), excessive book runs, journal and newspaper circulation, document copies, certificates, extracts, bulletins and ballot-papers, current information... Just drive that all away, and the woods will grow on; additionally, abandoning the habit of throwing waste paper all over, we entirely eliminate its potential environmental threats. Logic says that it is not paper production that brings harm but rather the deformities of the dominating economic system, which results in

squandered natural resources and retarded cultural development of the humanity on the global scale.

So, what do the “defenders of nature” suggest instead? The same old slogan: back to the caves. The same naive illusion that it was all natural in the old ages, and hence clean and healthy... And that it is enough to recall the happy primitivism, repudiate the gift of science, for our ecologically perfect remains to feed the future fauna and flora on the sterile planet.

Of course, this is sheer lie. There was no “golden age”, and our forefathers used to die in packs of infections and asperities, of unhealthy climate, of a lack of protection discipline and means. Underdevelopment was a source of epidemics and wars, leading to self-destruction. Rejecting modern technologies, we have no other choice as to return to that underdeveloped world, much less comfortable and efficient, and hence more harmful. Mass propaganda shows persuading people to drop certain cultural acquirements actually mean an increase in ecological pressure due to unjustified waste of resources and efforts.

For instance, when we restrict the usage of a motor-car as a regular means of transport, we need to find other ways to do the same job, often much more expensive and wasteful. If we turn down electrical lighters, we need (unless we do not mean to stop living) to replace them by some other sources of light, which is to cause much more damage to the environment. Thus, silly journalists show fountains of enthusiasm about somebody producing electricity by mere physical force, like walking or pedaling. We are suggested to believe that this is an ecologically pure source of cheap energy available to everybody at minimal diligence. But, technologically, this only means the replacement of modern electric plants with raw muscular drive, like in the most ancient ages. The efficiency of a human in generating electric power is unmeasurably worse; that is, it gives more waste products and hence increases environmental pollution. Indeed, any person needs at least food and water, and the more one works, the more one needs to recover. That is, we first convert food into muscular energy, and then partially convert this store to the useful mechanical work. Obviously, this many-stage process involves much dissipation and any modern electric plant will beat it in efficiency by orders of magnitude.

Turning down the cultural achievements won't soothe ecological diseases; it will rather aggravate them. No need to fall behind the progress; still, reasonable needs are to be satisfied in a reasonable manner: one should not demand or spend more than really needed, and efficient production technologies are to be complemented by as efficient utilization. Under this condition, technological development will draw forth human consciousness, bringing the humanity from the early primitive state to the culture of reason. People's attitude towards their environment will objectively change, thus influencing the habits and morals. In a way, the very growth of the public interest to the quality of environment (both natural and human-made) is an indicator of such development. So far, it is not but a matter of commercial speculation. With market economy gradually forced out, ecology will become what it should be, the search of the directions of the reasonable rearrangement of the world.

It is utterly stupid, to protect nature by attempting to freeze time. The Universe is all in motion, it will always destroy this to create that. Nothing remains the same. No change means death. With, or without the humankind, anything will change anyway. No use to seek for perpetual joy; even the most beautiful flowers are bound to fade. The face of the land will change; animals and plants will come and go; one society will leave the scene for another. Reason is to direct these inevitable changes rather than impede them. Wild nature destroys itself; humans are to make responsible decisions, to bid farewell and to meet. And be creative in the name of progress, without making it a market plaything.

### **Weather and Health**

Newtonian mechanics is not just a physical theory; this is a general paradigm applicable in very different area of experience. Indeed, it does not incorporate any specifically physical ideas; all it does is to link the overall dynamics of a system to some informally introduced “forces”. To consider a

physical force, we need a special model deriving it from the nature of particles, fields *etc.* In exactly the same manner, we can describe the interactions of any other entities, which may result in a science very far from physics, but still using the same mechanical paradigm (up to reutilizing its mathematical formalism).

For example, a biological system of any level (from a single molecule to the biosphere in general) can be characterized with a few fundamental parameters so that one combination of values should be treated as essentially different from another. This means that all such states are representable with the points of an appropriate configuration space, the way a material body is said to occupy a particular spatial position in physics. Now, once urged from the outside, the organism (in the most general sense) reacts with a certain sequence of acts that, assuming both a definite pace (the analog of velocity) and a kind of inertia (the analog of mass). For that, we need the notion of a mechanical momentum. While the organism keeps on with the same metabolic process (including outer behavior), this does need any special attention, it just happens. As soon as something relevant occurs in the organism's environment, the state of motion will change, which is effectuated through a number of physiological effects that may, in higher animals, be treated as an emotional response (under a permanent pressure becoming an emotional mood, a feeling). The paradigmatic value of mechanical acceleration (as the inner response to an external force) thus comes out.

Now, consider the usual weather variations as described by current temperature, atmospheric pressure, humidity *etc.* An organism experiences them as weather provided the characteristic times of the change are comparable with the duration of metabolic cycles. Slower variations are associated with the alterations of the seasons, or climatic shifts; faster processes may be just impossible to describe with the statistical parameters of that kind.

The mechanical paradigm predicts that it is the acceleration values (the second derivative of the state function) that produce significant inner responses: the living organism does not pay much to steady grow or decrease, but will immediately report on any abrupt changes. Weather dependent people (especially the aged ones) can easily check the validity of this conclusion, and it seems to adequately arrange the facts. However, there is yet another aspect of the same that is generally overlooked, as the traditional weather services only report some averaged trends, while real atmospheric processes may be much more complicated. Indeed, observe that, while the information about daily variations of the atmospheric pressure may be very useful for risk control, there are much faster pressure variations occurring within a few hours, or even within minutes (for instance, as an effect of the variations of solar irradiation, as the sun hides behind the clouds and comes back in occasional clearances). With the mechanical model, we can expect that such lower-scale variations may be much more dangerous for a weather dependent person since they result in stronger forces (represented in the model as the product of acceleration and mass) just tearing the organism into pieces (as people often feel it). We can also predict that weather dependence is more pronounced in physiologically stiff people (characterized with greater mechanical mass), with less responsive organism, which may be either a genetic predisposition or a trace of disease.

The same holds for any other mode of motion. Thus, people adapt themselves to the gradual landscape changes that are bound to develop during millennia; however, the same change happening within a year (or a day) would be a terrible catastrophe. Psychologically, minor nuisances happening every day are much more disturbing than a steady moral climate (however negative). Gradual improvement of scientific theories or technological schemes is nothing compared to drastic reorganization on some entirely new principles. No economic and social crises can shatter the layman's innate fear of a revolution.

Paradigms are abstractions, at the highest possible level. However, it is this generality that makes them extremely practical. One does not need an "exact" mathematical formulation to get many qualitative predictions. In fact, the same paradigm accepts different kinds of formalization; moreover, new mathematics is always born from an already existing paradigm in the course of its adaptation to a particular application area. Weather dependence may be pictured using other paradigms; still, the mechanical outlook, too, is bound to find its objective niche.

## The Body of Freedom

There are lots of talk about freedom. And even more about the body. However, when the former applies to the latter, all we usually get is the freedom of naked flesh, which once was referred to as lechery. It seems like the humanity is just bound to pace the whole way off the dull biology up to the bright spirituality free of any barriers. Provided, there is some future at all.

Fifteen decades after Karl Marx, the idea of the social origin of human subjectivity is becoming to steadily penetrate the thoughtful minds, and it is only the most retrograde (or politically engaged) scientists who still seek for reason in the genes, conditioned reflexes, or supernatural influences. In 1980s, the hypothesis that no biological species could be a forerunner of humans (since the primary definition of reason is its universality breaking the definiteness of any species) was treated as open sedition; today, it is quite common, and, a decade later, it will be commonplace, and the public will wonder why those dummies of the past should fancy anything else. With all that, there is yet another side of Marx' idea that still slips off the general awareness. Establishing the social nature of the spirit, we have to supply that spirit with as social flesh; otherwise, we are sure to roll back to mystical deification of something absolutely impalpable. It's elementary logic, one would say; however, a clear acknowledgement of the objective necessity of an "inorganic body" for any human (as stated by Marx) leads to political corollaries of such importance that one can hardly expect an official recognition of this circumstance in the nearest future. Under the pressure of raw facts, something like that will eventually get through the back porch. And then it's high time to take some principal decisions: albeit in private, but right now.

The transition to that new paradigm is especially difficult because of the millennia-old habit: for all we could ever see, people tend to identify themselves with a chop of meat, and the destruction of this animal hull the present statute qualifies as murder (or "natural" death). Well, similarly, people believed for many thousand years that the celestial bodies turn around the Earth (the only and unique), and what? The outlook of whole solar system has been several times revised; besides, the other stars have been found to govern lots of planets. Now, what prevents us from a radical rejection of the ancient anthropocentrism, to admit that our reason does not inhabit a single piece of organics, but rather is implemented in, at least, an ensemble of organisms revolving around a "common center"? Obviously, this picture will readily incorporate inorganic components too, the products of the human activity involved in the social process.

Of course, it would not be wise to just throw something out. First, one is to find why the human body has been commonly thought of as an abode of the spirit. The influence of the cultural environment is a prompt and trivial explanation. Indeed, when, from the earliest childhood, everybody tries to contact me through some organic blob, I am certain to develop the same habit, thus presenting people a particular biological body as my plenipotentiary. On the contrary, for those who grew accustomed to identify themselves with, say, the content of some distributed database, their self will no longer be associated with any butchery, but rather with the whole bulk of means to support the existence and integrity of that virtual entity. Today, some consider cutting them off the Internet as a cruel way of murder. Losing our things, we lose a portion of ourselves.

There are numerous historical examples of how collective product may gradually acquire individuality and be attributed to some real or mythical personage of some country and epoch. The two Homer's poems are known worldwide; Kozma Prutkov and Panini are famous in their comparatively narrow circles. Let us also consider the common habit of all the chiefs to usurp the services of their subordinates in both material production ("the king such-and-such has built a castle and erected a temple") and spirituality ("and he gave law to the people"). This adds to the common adherence to mapping any cultural outcome to personal intention and effort. So, we do it without being aware, and such role-playing may develop up to an absolutely catastrophic scale: thus, some religious people take the detailed biographies of their gods and saint for reality beyond any doubt; in that debility, they can no longer distinguish fiction from life.

The opposite process is also possible: authorship is diluted in a wide circulation, and the names either

get lost or made into common nouns. Thus, eating crêpes on Chandeleur, the modern French hardly ever recall the pope Gelasius I, while the admirers of the Apple computers rarely know anything about the Canadian farmer John. The very ability of names to detach themselves from the bodies is an indication of an essentially non-biological mode of existence in conscious beings.

The inclination to treat things as if they were a part of the human body gets implanted in humans in the course of socialization just like their attachment to their biological bodies. Thus, individuals declaring that they have done anything themselves remain entirely unaware of how many others were directly involved in the arrangement of the very possibility to start working; as each of these millions was also backed by the efforts of millions, every individual act virtually results from the joint action of the whole humanity, and hence a historical event of a global scale.

In this context, the principal direction of personal identification development is clear enough: we gradually drift to better discrimination of consciousness from its specific implementation and admitting alternative embodiments, when needed. A conscious being will acquire the experience of inhabiting a variety of bodies, or even outside any particular body, in an ensemble of interacting bodies collectively forming a higher-level embodiment. Reason is a higher-order integrity; it may be represented by a hierarchy of things, and unfolding this hierarchy into any particular hierarchical structure is nothing but a historical coincidence.

There is a very important special case: a functional interconnection of one brain with another incorporating various computer (networking) technologies. Obviously, such a compound brain is no longer limited to the physiology of a single biological body, with its spatial confinement and the ways of handling things. Now all kinds of artificial organs can naturally extend the biological part. When modern engineers try hard to reproduce the dynamics of live organisms in the movements of robots, this cannot be but a kind of training, exploring the possibilities and preparation for real creative experience. Similarly, the game of intentional robot-like behavior in humans is also directed to the future symbiosis, serving the mutual adaptation of the two world before they become one.

Do we need to specially indicate that such an extension of our “physical plant” is closely related to an entirely different idea of freedom? Surprisingly, one can never lock a conscious being in a cage, since there are numerous ways of switching to another collection of things, effectively bypassing any barriers. The childish play of modern “activists” is just ridiculous. Isn’t it silly, to focus on any sex issues, in view of the dominance of the non-organic part of the human body, which has nothing to do with the physiology of gender? Finally, the recognition of the reality of the collective subject will give a new turn to the problem of personal relation to the society. Everybody will be able, unfolding one’s individuality in different directions, to be simultaneously present on many levels of the social hierarchy, so that, besides being a part of the whole, one will get a feeling of being that very whole in all its entirety.

### **Impudent Diversity**

Ecology is no science. It is an instrument of economic and political competition. All ecologists are perfectly aware of that, but, in the market world, one is not intended to be too squeamish about one’s earnings, so, why not feed upon people’s stupidity? Technologically, the breeding of the top-quality fool is just like cultivating plants, or livestock farming. This is a quite acceptable enhancement of the natural environment, raising no world-wide protest. On the contrary, rose gardening, buckwheat production or dairy and meat industry is deemed to be a criminal negligence, offence to nature, and an existential threat. That is, preferring some breeds, we eradicate the others, thus upsetting the (wisely established by god-almighty) natural balance; the number of wild species is annually diminishing, and all the civilized countries are obliged to seriously address this problem, to cut short our imminent maleficence. Those trying to fall out risk to fall from grace and fall in, to maintain the general consensus. Those at power won’t tolerate any diversity of attitude in this respect.

The struggle for the conservation of biological diversity is steadily developing into the clinical forms. A swamp right in the middle of a big city, former agricultural soils turned to saline, beehives in an office... Things like that are in the order of things today. Just try (god forbid!) to smash a mosquito, or exterminate rats or insects, and you are sure to have a life-long litigation with the well-organized defenders of their little brethren: incessant lawsuits, utter ruin, the face whacked all over... Behind every microbe, there is a strong support group equipped with the most advanced technologies and in contact with the most expensive lawyers. Do you think your income will stand the fight? If I happen to publicly refuse to share my dwelling with rats and cockroaches, nobody will know, save a couple of casual passersby; on the contrary, a massive media campaign or a globe-scale social action under ecological slogans will promptly find packs of sponsors. Isn't it suspicious, just a bit?

A man in the street, grown up in a bourgeois dominion, would believe in the tale of the supreme responsibility: say, the humanity is aware of its biological (and even geological) fault, and their conscience unites them in the common aspiration to atone the sin. Those formed under the banners of Marxism would resolutely object and recall the sacramental question: *à quoi bon?* No money is invested without a thorough analysis of financial perspectives. Philanthropy is a serious business, and not a trifle toy. Eventually, each ecological campaign is backed by certain representatives of a certain class, who compete with each other, with the bills paid from the pockets of the duped masses. Besides, some much higher stakes are involved too. The political roots of the biodiversity case grow from the global capitalism's innate craving for self-preservation. Indeed, how a parasitic class could convince the masses daily robbed of everything to keep on their suffering without a thought of revolt? The recipe is quite simple: 1) declare that the conscious humankind is just an animal species, and 2) proclaim the ultimate value of any biological species at all for preserving the natural stability. With these premises, the laymen will accept the hegemony of the capital as a rule admitting no exception; just add a little material interest, and the philistine will man the barricades for the biodiverse power of the bourgeoisie. On the contrary, admitting that, under certain conditions, something in nature does not deserve further existence, we populate the other side of the same barricades, which would irreparably spoil the pleasures of the rich.

Capitalism has become rotten yet on the prenatal stage; with all that, it can keep on decaying for many decades, as long as those at the trough are ready to put up with the stink and force the others to the same. The core of the capitalist system of brainwashing can be expressed in just a few words: the future will be exactly like today, since we have reached the acme, and there is nothing else to strive for. So, let us can ourselves in, for the sake of the general well-being (that is, for the wealth of the money-bags). The deification of the parasites of all kinds just adds a natural stripe. This perfectly goes along with the clerics: all the toils and disasters are heaven-sent, as the Satan's instigations are as sacred as the word of the Lord, who has authorized it all from the up-there headquarters.

Such a stand won't go as well with the dawn of reason. We know that everything in nature was, is, and will be changing at any epoch. If dinosaurs were so much preoccupied with biodiversity, its present promoters would never have come to life. One cannot stop the process; all we need is to reasonably direct it to a supreme purpose, instead of chaotic flow. The preservation of the capitalistic bestiality, the state of everybody fighting with everyone, does seem too sublime a motive.

The very definition of reason is to rearrange nature in a consciously controlled manner: some things should be kept for a while, others must be removed, and there is always an option of something entirely unprecedented. Any human action is bound to change the world; inaction will change it too, and the effect of the random play of the elements may be much more disastrous. The rostra roar that the domestication of animals is harmful for nature. What kind of nature do they mean? As for the wild nature, it's our primary duty, to build a less savage world. Human creations (inasmuch they bear the signs of reason) are much more beautiful and versatile than any evolutionary achievement in inanimate and living nature. Well, a dog-rose flower may be very nice; however, it can never stand a comparison with a real rose. Even where we decide to leave a wild islet, it will no longer live on its own, revealing its beauty in a due faceting and an appropriate mount.

No doubt, besides wonderful masterpieces, people can produce lots of garbage that may sometimes



foul up even those things that have been far from ideal from the very beginning. Still, this is not a sign of too much intellect. The first step towards reason are difficult, and some mess is practically inevitable. And it is this natural under development that we are suggested to preserve, with the very diverse well-wishers strongly recommending to cut any attempts of approaching truly human deeds. No, thanks! we redesign the world just to incorporate an objective necessity of reason. No good intentions, no auto-training can ennoble our existence; for self-improvement, we need to immerse ourselves in the objective conditions that will compel nobility from us, whether we want it or not.

Any construction works means careful distinction of what could serve us a little longer from what has already exhausted its productive potential. The demand to keep everything at all is nothing but a pernicious utopia. There are millions of species of bacteria or insects; nobody could convince me that all of them are vitally important. Maybe, if somebody removes this very grain of sand from the sand beach, I'll never get a top-level tan. Alright, a lower-than one will do as well, and one could perfectly do without the beach, and probably without me. Something different, and as good, will fill the niche. The only thing of importance is that things come to please humans, and not as they please. Fat chance! The ecoactivists shout from the house-tops about the immeasurable significance of any living creature (obviously, meaning themselves in the first rank). We are incessantly warned against an accidental violation of the universal balance; and there is a flashy slogan too: the butterfly effect.

I admit that it may be difficult for some brains, to properly ponder a proper act. Especially, when the brains are piled up with junk propaganda. Still, in town-planning, the idea of a complex development has long since penetrated the minds of the architects; so, why not dream about the human capacity of re-engineering biocenoses, without the risk of yet another lame community. This refers to the design of the human society, too. And now, the parties are right in the spot: hold on! don't swap capitalism off, restrict your social creativity to occasional patches, isolated reforms. But any reformism creeps with incomplete and unbalanced decisions, so as to drive ourselves into the next crisis with our own hands.

From biodiversity we are smoothly ported to the idea of the revival of the lost species. The genetic house works hard to squeeze money from the public. Come on, let the herds of mammoths straddle across the tundra, and just imagine how a tyrannosaurus would look nice in a tropical safari! Nobody cares that the tundra of today may be of a different kind, or the tropics have long since become much thinner. Just pack them with as much live creatures as possible. The arrangement of a specially balanced and comfortable habitat is off the issue. A slightest consideration would pop up an obvious forecast: some people will have to flock tighter, to make room for the nice beasties. Of course, nothing threatens those who capers with the banners in the streets of the world capitals. Neither those who stir them up. However, in the wild nature, an increase on one side inevitably turns into extinction on another. So, the petty genre like me will have to fight tooth and nail against the pressing vermin. And here (sorry, don't worry!) no mercy to anybody! When something destroys my house and eats up my bread, I must cut short this outrage by any means. Otherwise, how can I pass for a conscious being? If a microbe undermines my health, the worse for the microbe. If a gnat sucks my blood, I'll smash it. If a spider mite spoils my roses, I'll have to do away with it, despite of all the protests of the insect right defenders. The galaxy M31 (aka NGC224) contains more than a trillion stars, and it looks beautiful on the photographs. Still, I doubt that anybody is going to enjoy such a diversity when the Andromeda Galaxy will approach the Milky Way enough for the hard radiation from the zone of the collision shock wave to kill any trace of life in the both.

Everything is good in its place. And there are those who does not deserve any place at all. One might admit that science would profit from a wide enough number of samples. A more developed science must rather collect the basic principles, to be able to produce anything needed in piece, for a particular task. A scientific portrait of a dinosaur is better than the dinosaur in person. The theory and history of capitalism will do much better than the capitalist reality. The cabinets of curiosities will pass away; virtual reality is to entirely replace them. And let us live by the law of the new time.

In abstraction, say, industrial cattle breeding is not too attractive, indeed. The right question is: who would consider it harmful and why? On the Earth, millions suffer from hunger; do you mean that they

are not allowed to eat? Or, do you keep them just for diversity, to please the rich with the feeling of their exclusivity, on such a background? You don't like the destructive influence of agriculture on the biosphere and climate; alright, just provide a full-fledged replacement, so that everybody on the planet (literally: *everybody!*) could get everything they need for a full-blooded life and creative work. Until then, you have no moral right to through any appeals, just calling the poor back to the caves.

As long as we are tied to our biological bodies, we'll eat somebody, and clash with somebody. Someday, we'll manage to dump that wasteful and immoral stockbreeding in favor of industrial tissue nurture; still, such artificial meat will yet be living cells, albeit produced in a milder manner. Virtually, food can be synthesized from non-organic materials from scratch; this does not change the very mode of our metabolism. Quite probably, future generations will entirely stop eating, transforming themselves into robots. Such bodies are to be indifferent to any insects, at last. With all that, the society is to stay, and it must impose certain restrictions anyway.

The propaganda of biodiversity is a part of a wider program of massive brainwashing. The capital needs markets, and there are no markets without a consumer. Now, one can be inclined to buying something either if the thing is good for something or, at least, not so bad as other similar things. This is what a capitalist considers the least while launching a production project. The prospects of easy gain on the expense of the others absolutely dominates over the necessity of satisfying any public need. It's an open secret from the very beginning; however, people have no choice, and one has to take the possible instead of the right. Some portion of the purchased can yet be adjusted to the needs; buying most other things, we only demonstrate our belonging to a particular culture, just to fool the big brother, who would otherwise suspect too much freethinking and punish the trouble-rousers depriving them of that little they could probably get so far. Eventually, the gray sky makes wear, and nobody wants anything at all. How a capitalist could cope with that? Good deeds are, of course, out of question. So, they take a piece of old shit, repaint it (or, more often, just change the wrap), and offer to the admittedly naive street-walker under the guise of the latest hit of the industry. The more such merchandising, the more junk on the counters; this is proudly called abundance, the thing the lapdog propagandists of capitalism use to shove in our mugs. In meanwhile, the dreary consumer has to waste hours pacing to and thro along the garbage-loaded stands, to finally take, with a deep sigh, just something, not entirely dreadful. A seditious thought may visit the most spirited heads: why do we need all that? why not stop overproduction of the unneeded and content ourselves with producing really useful things? The rebellion can be nipped in the bud with the same well-seasoned techniques: 1) declare that the market is a natural state of a human (already identified with animals, as above), and 2) proclaim the ultimate value of market diversity for preserving the global economic stability, that is, to prevent the well-being of those who are quite well from an incidental deterioration (god forbid!). Another aspect of the economic diversity is all about the relative nature of prosperity. Yes, we hate the ugly life we draw; but there are those who live much worse! So, just shut up and don't think of straightening things up. For those who are nearly bursting, the freedom of bletcher, an authorized diversity of opinions, where any outstanding thought is to drown, like in a filthy bog. The world of the universal abstract diversity will always be governed by the wild fortuity; in that wild nature, anybody is to kill somebody else, and to be murdered in the end. That is how it was since the dawn of time; that is how in will be forever. It is this wild truth that the practicing ecologists are to plant in the people's heads. They are just like us, and they could occupy themselves with something less devastating; unfortunately, as they have become the hirelings of the capital, they are obliged to fight any reason, and primarily, the reason on their own.

## CONTENTS

A Hell of Enlightenment .....	1
Sports .....	2
Wisdom in Time .....	3
Nothing's Wasted! .....	4
Advertising .....	5
False Pride and Property .....	5
Multiple Worlds.....	6
Authorship and Plagiarism .....	6
Transportation Scales.....	7
Love to the End of Doom.....	8
Journalism .....	9
Distinctions .....	9
Web Ways and the Formation Theory .....	10
Summits in History .....	11
Struggle for Life .....	11
East and West .....	12
Referencing and Identification .....	13
Vain Disputes .....	13
Holidays .....	13
Cloning.....	14
People vs. People.....	15
Web Traps .....	16
Medical Paradigm.....	16
Culture and Anticulture.....	17
Anniversaries.....	18
Humiliating Respect .....	19
Styles of Referencing.....	19
The True Face of Charity .....	20
Intellectual Property and Pirates.....	21
Workaholism and Human Universality.....	22
Midlife Crisis?.....	23
The End of the GULAG Myth.....	24
The Black Tuesday: The Crisis of Civilization .....	25
The Internet as an Instrument of Class Struggle.....	26
Well-Armed Means Guilty .....	28
Lability as a Social Disease.....	28
Crime .....	30
Non-Proliferation of Dominance .....	30
Logic for Idiots.....	31
Cattle Reason? .....	32
The Abyss of Hope .....	33

---

Strong Cowards and Evil Giants.....	34
Pyramids of Lie .....	35
Demented Democracy.....	36
Soft and Hard.....	38
Bad Spam, Good Spam .....	38
Revolutions? Coups d'état!.....	39
On-Demand Publishing: A Glimpse of the New Economic Order .....	40
Consciousness is Not for Humans .....	41
The Triad of Swimming.....	42
Hangman Busch and the Hostage of America.....	42
Smoker, the Killer of the Humanity.....	43
In Search of Degeneration.....	43
The Mobile Haze .....	44
The Barbarians and Harmony.....	44
On Cultural Relativism .....	45
The Facets of Doping.....	46
Health.....	47
The Clip Culture.....	48
Ad Terror.....	50
The Eco-Marasmus.....	51
Weather and Health .....	52
The Body of Freedom .....	54
Impudent Diversity .....	55