

All articles written by Freydis

Herd Defense

24.10.04 Like all other animal species that socially congregate the vast majority of humans seek protection inside a group. Mixing into the herd usually enhances near-term individual safety. People don't have stripes like Zebras to confuse predators by obscuring individual targets and they don't have the speed and size advantages of small birds racing around in clusters; being at the top of the food chain alters the predator dynamic considerably. The herd that protects the human drone is one of common belief and orthodoxy. Adherence to the herd and its values is actually a rational approach for self-defense, to believe whatever it is that everyone else believes and to attack heterodoxy with an emotional outburst as if the belief being challenged was their very own person, their very own self being challenged. This is also why the herd defends current myths so vociferously, because they know that a challenge to their beliefs means danger for the group and their own safety. Even a small change could potentially be harmful for those unable to adapt or defend themselves using their own abilities, and thus it seems better to avoid all risks and just do what everyone else does: to support the local team, to wave the national flag and so on, even if it's in blatant contradiction to all objective reason or individual health.

By adopting group beliefs the members of the herd gain self-security, and they need it because they lack the intellectual faculties to defend themselves let alone to objectively and independently assess the nature of events on their own. This is why belief still exists even in the 21st century and why irrational responses to heterodoxy are actually rational, albeit flawed, approaches to self-preservation for members of the herd.

When beliefs are challenged they will change when a critical mass is reached but the time in between will likely be chaotic as the herd is forced to decide which side to shift towards.

When moral correctness becomes defined as obedience to the habit of social tradition then society is locked on a rail line to ruin because it has lost any ability to adapt to changing events and situations.

Knots & Threads

22.06.02 The search for and exploitation of universal consistency is an ancient one, regardless of whether it be real or imagined. Buddha found it in the universality of

human suffering; although totally relative no one would debate it's conceptual significance to humanity. Christianity uses the universality of the human soul, a fictional but popular thread to be sure. But the oldest and longest lasting "religion" of them all, the fertility 'cult' uses the undeniable universal element of birth. Conversely, yet another undeniable element of consistency is that of death which oddly enough seems to evoke more concern, fear and distress than birth, probably because it's unpredictable, something we can't control, and worse yet can't stop! There's a constant in life and the creation of more life. It is the tautology I've written of before that life is created to create more life and within that self-created reason is the ultimate purpose and the only purpose that can never be taken away.

This is not a new thing but indeed is, obviously, as old as life itself. It's interesting to note the timelessness and consistency of the fertility goddesses throughout human cultures and histories. These goddesses, and sometimes gods, have another interesting element in their amoral stance over humanity. This is because creating more life has no right or wrong associated with it, it 'just is'. These aren't the mystical figures that stand around and judge behavior, they just determine who or what grows and who or what dies, the typical capricious qualities of nature. The fertility deities remain to this day, albeit somewhat less literally within terms like 'mother Earth', and even has a revival of sorts in Earth worship and radical environmentalism.

Perhaps the most consistent thread is simply the nature of humans as creatures of both habit and imitation of what surrounds them.

A Collective Race To The Bottom

24.05.02 Government and other forces of social regulation have not just lost the battle they've lost the flippin' war. The most recent statistics in the UK show that illegal recreational drugs, such as LSD and Ecstasy, have plummeted in price with all evidence pointing to increased supply as the culprit. These drugs are about as affordable as alcohol and cigarettes both of which are subject to cyclical tax increases while the illegal party drugs are not. All this despite chronic government efforts to stem the tide, plus even more vociferous public outcry and the trite advertising campaigns against drug use.

As soon as the public picks up on the message that one drug is bad, another one comes along that's even more potent and they get hooked on it, and on the cycle continues. Legal penalties and restricting supply; neither effort works, it's all just chasing the wind because as long as the public wants a drug induced high they will find a way even if it means sniffing cheap solvents from the paint store. You can't make glue and every other potentially abused substance illegal and neither can government solve the drug problem through penalties.

So, what else goes with getting stoned and drunk? Sex of course! *The Guardian* ran a news article on French kids, who not unlike most other European kids, now get their sex education from violent, hard-core pornography on TV or rental movies. Just like the drugs it's a cheap, effective and easily accessible thrill. But kids are very impressionable and it doesn't take a doctoral degree in psychology to figure out this is bad news for everyone, especially if you're female. Not surprisingly sexual violence is rampant throughout urban France and seeping into the quieter suburbs as well. "Porn does not recognise that the other person might have a different urge to yours."

The common element in both is *male behavior*, who's doing the gang rapes? Who's buying, making, and doing most of the drugs? Young, bored and unfocused males are absolutely the worst enemy of peaceful, ordered and stable society. Conversely if you want to shake things up the target demographic is testosterone. Historically, the only reliable way to crack this conundrum has to been to implement young marriages (or bloody wars), but I digress.

But why is this? Basal human behavior enhanced by prurient media culture all within a society replete with human redundancy. By that I mean we have too many people, too few jobs and too much time. These people in sex and drug troubles aren't smart people nor are they naturally productive people without an authority force compelling them to otherwise. When given the choice to take up a constructive hobby or read a book they would rather smoke weed and watch porn flicks at 2 am. Furthermore, even fairly productive people that know better than to kill brain cells at parties when placed within a group that doesn't know any better, then everyone is reduced to the lowest level; this is simple group psychology.

You simply can't maintain a prosperous country when a major portion of the populace reaches this level of dysfunction. Problems create more problems, crime needs police, the homeless need housing, the drug addicted need treatment, the sex offenders need counseling, the felon needs a parole officer, etc. The conclusion is palpable. Amongst the interplay of competing forces, a society has never headed to nowhere so fast. We're more plagued by dissonant messages than any ever before creating a directionless, aimless, and unfocused mass of angst ridden egocentrics.

In the absence of external pressures and focused cultural guidance human behavior is reduced to its logical basal functions. And since most human endeavor is self-centered and ego-driven it should not be surprising at all that rape, drug abuse, petty crime, hedonism and similar 'anti-social' modes of thought predominate. Metaphysically speaking this is a reduction to solipsism, which is actually quite rational within the fractured context of an atomized and desensitized milieu, because the self is the only reference point left. But this isn't a hopeless tragedy, it's a brilliant opportunity because we all have a common reference point, the most crucial, constructive social element is staring back at us and waiting patiently, it's a

consensus!

But even though the tools and knowledge are better than ever, every single pre-existing institution tasked by law and tradition to solve our collective problems remains unable to do so. Representative democracy has been turned into a sham, too busy trying to stay elected to solve anything; it's all they can do just to put a bandage on a hemorrhaging wound. Isn't it laughable the sudden burst of enthusiasm by mainstream political left and right to address illegal immigration issues? Despite the consistent background noise emanating from much of the electorate, the politicians didn't give a damn until it became obvious that if they didn't do something they would get run out of office by the right wing "extremists"! In the meantime while the institutions of Church, media and industry fiddle, portions of western society are nearing the bottom, which necessitates starting anew from scratch anyway.

Unhealthy Competition

08.04.01 One of the unintended social consequences of technology is the epidemic of dangerous and 'stupid' behavior. This is largely the result of technology creating a sense of security combined with the lack of consequences for foolish actions. Think of medical science that can repair badly injured people through emergency room surgery and life-saving 'miracle' technology. People lose a fear of accidental death when they know they can just be fixed up with ease. Likewise with pain, the timeless contraindication for foolish behavior has unfortunately become dated. Painkillers and modern medical technology has significantly reduced the presence of pain in the lives of all but the most serious hospital patient. This trend is nothing to ignore nor is it something to praise just because the apparent benefits have been trumpeted minus the insidious effects. Furthermore the situation and the negative behavior stands to increase as people abuse what they see as a security net, a guarantee of protection and freedom from pain. As socio-biological equilibrium is dissolved, technology assumes the role of offender not defender.

Another example I can think of is sports wherein nearly everything today has been subsumed into this numerical, legalistic labyrinth where play and competition became irrelevant against winning and possessing the superior numbers. Ancient Greek runners competed not against the clock or pre-established scores but against *other runners*; it was not how fast one could run, a mile in 5:45, but rather a win against competitor A, B, and C. Ours is a deleterious trend: utilizing rank to magnify one and denigrate another, negative conflict versus positive game-competition.

It's not inherently wrong to categorize but it is wrong to elevate ranking to the point it inflates one and denigrates another. And really I think this problem is just carrying the typical viewpoint of a certain sex to an unhealthy extreme. Here's a hint it starts

with 'm' and ends with 'male'. Yes the quantifying male run amok. It's abusing numerical results to erroneously legitimize superiority, everything from my computer speed versus yours, my golf score, the price of my car, etc. It has reached the point of ranking everyone and everything so that one must always be better than the other who then is automatically considered to be of lower value! Reality is simply not that way, for everything has its purpose, improvements are always needed regardless of who it is, and yeah some need it more than others, but this negative competition and needless partisan and fratricidal divisiveness is just social poison.

A uniform is a prison for the mind of the individualist. Wearing a uniform is like being in prison and when one is forced to wear it, it is prison by whatever name it's called. A uniform is dehumanizing not magnifying unless you're trifling to begin with, and many are. A few truly wish to create their own niche and a define unique identity separate from the group. Most only seek assimilation to thereby gain the incessantly advertised values, powers and successes of the collective by proxy. They sacrifice separateness to secure success. Or try to anyway.

12.00 Impressions and image are so critical to the success of any public endeavor that, unfortunately, too often our culture takes it to the extreme and just dumps valid content in favor of the monophonic pop-image. Everything ends up being completely hollow and it's because people are attracted to the bright lights and loud noises, but once they arrive they find there's nothing there! The message turned out to be, there is no message.

Ever been to Las Vegas?

Baudrillard And The Destruction of Icons

01.11.00 Symbols formerly enacted to represent the most holy and powerful forces are now used to invoke the trite, common and the weak. So I think that it's likely due to the overflow of media images being funneled into everyone's mind (that's 'plugged in' anyway); symbols are being watered down so to speak; they lose their luster, their power to invoke reverence and obedience. People become jaded and inured thus losing their ability to cooperate within societies rigid rules.

But this is really just an uncomfortable inevitability that occurs for the right reason. Nihilism has validity because the symbols that represent our present Order are based on lies and destructive myths anyhow.

As long as humans have been sentient they've been making drawings and symbols,

just look at the oldest cave art (32-35,000 years ago in Ice Age Europe!) and you get the idea. Humanity doesn't lose its feeling, they just slowly realize that what they've been believing as fact for so long is really just myth. The need for icons and symbols is ingrained into the human psyche and will never be jaded out of existence since it's an integral, biological need. The population won't completely lose faith until they've discovered new and sufficiently popular symbols to replace the outdated ones. The only question that really matters is what new symbols will replace the old?

The Myth Drug

All things to nothingness descend,
Grow old and die and meet their end;
Man dies, iron rusts, wood goes decayed,
Tower fall, walls crumble, roses fade....
Nor long shall any name resound.
Beyond the grave, unless 't be found
In some clerk's book; it is the pen
Given immortality to men.

-'Master Wace' Norman chronicler

16.10.00 Factual truth is important but a mature realization recognizes that myth is probably more important to humans. Groups aren't swayed by analysis and reason but by myth, lies and emotional attachments, they see what they want to see. Hence famous historical figures true lives are eclipsed by the historical revisions, the collective myths and the legends that spring up in their wake. Napoleon, Cleopatra or Hitler for example, they all become things they never were and never intended to be when recorded in our collective history. We steal their names and reinvent their lives and machinations, repackaging them into a popular version based on outlandish exploits and fanciful deeds that didn't occur.

It's interesting how famous people fade and discolor over time. Assuming pastel shades eventually they lose all original characteristics and become gods and demons. Hence the worship of ancestors, ancient men and women of exploit and valor change into symbols of the collective character. From Jesus to King David to Moses, only time gives them mystical meaning, their actions grow and evolve into mythical proportions. These important individuals make up history, and we see now that history is really all myth, at least in the collective mind. Or rather it is a duality, a binary history, one of fact through archeology historical studies and careful, painstaking research. The other is the one of movies and songs, of stories and fairy tales. One appeals to researchers and fact-seekers, the other to everyone else, the uneducated and the boorish. They need heroes and villains, knights and maidens, partly because they're incapable of serious critical analysis but equally because they need role models and icons to structure their chaotic lives.

From religion to fairy tales our heroes and villains come from a corrupted version of actual events. Truth becomes unimportant when reality is viewed through the lens of mythology. The myth-seeking masses will vehemently reject any scientific attempt to put their 'gods' into a humanist or rationalist perspective, for once turned into icons to turn them back into real men and women is blasphemous and culturally upsetting.

How to Usher in the New Year

06.12.99 Hey dudes and dudettes I'm sure you'll all soon be partying like it was 1999 seeing how it *is* 1999! Right on. We all know next year's the new millennium and probably the apocalypse so be sure to stock up on the hard-stuff for New Years.

But even the best plans can bomb, so what happens when your party goes sour and you end up in a dull social gathering? Not to worry compadre; when you *really* want to liven up the partay try this little trick – confidently proclaim: hey everybody the Holocaust didn't happen! I guarantee that will really get the gang charged up, especially the women!

Interestingly everyone seems to unequivocally know exactly which holocaust we speak of without any elaboration, this despite the numerous events throughout recent history which can be classified as a genocidal mass-murder. From Cambodia to Russia to Armenia to Iraq and Kosovo – (yes the media did for a while call it a holocaust); ethnically motivated mass-murder is nothing new, but the Jews hold the copyright to the only event that matters, apparently. Not only do people know exactly what you mean, but they instantly respond with a sharp tongue and offended spirit.

Why?

What is the need for the hostility and invective? If the whole story were a scientifically bulletproof concept then a rational respondent would merely laugh and change the subject just as if someone had stated 'the Earth is flat'. But they don't do they? Does this reaction sound like reasoned response or religious knee-jerk, dinner-bell reaction? I can think of no other issue that has the push button power that the Holocaust issue has.

To me it's a truly remarkable thing, a real taboo in a culture that prides itself on being jaded and impossible to shock! Which just goes to show that Joe and Jane-six-pac are hypocrites, they respond exactly as the ambient culture (mostly defined by TV) tells them to react. If gangbang is cool, fine, and if homophobia is wrong, ok too. And if they see a pile of emaciated bodies in front of a bulldozer and an ominous narration telling them they were Jews killed by Fascist monsters, well it must be true. People seem to believe that pictures can't lie because they're simplistically influenced by the shocking imagery they see and not with the motives

of the proponent, and even less with the actual context of the event.

Here's a simple example (by the way the photo's a personal fave):



Unarmed Timorese student cowers after being arrested by Australian invasion forces.



Radical Timorese terrorist subdued by Australian peacekeeper.

Now unless you were actually there you can't deny the legitimacy of either caption. So, just because we see lots of pictures of dead bodies doesn't tell us the whole story, why the people are dead, who they were or what they did or didn't do before they were dead; just like the Timorese guy with his hands behind his back. For all you or I know he could have just thrown a grenade into a schoolyard. The WWII Germans had a lot of different people in concentration camps, POW's, criminals, spies, terrorists, rapists - not just Jews. But isn't it interesting that we so rarely hear about the other ones in the cruel captivity of the German war machine? And isn't it convenient how Jewish interests have managed to milk the German treasury for billions, the Swiss banks, the Dutch, the Swedes and every west European nation for billions more in 'reparations' and 'stolen property'? Indeed the Holocaust continues to be a highly profitable enterprise for Israel and Jews everywhere. What kind of sickos would try so hard to make money exploiting such an astounding tragedy? Alas we aren't supposed to ask such questions, we're supposed to instantly respond with fear, hatred and revulsion at the mere thought of Holocaust denial.

Keep it up and be sure to open your wallet wide when the next 80 year old Jewess comes to town to tell of her tortures and miraculous escape from the blood-stained German fiends.

Collective Crimes

01.11.99 Cops become black and white thinkers in a world of good versus evil. By the logic in this world the cops are good because they beat-up the bad guys. But criminals (like most people) become what society expects them to become, in this case evil. In fact society needs criminals just like Christianity needs the Devil and if all the crooks were eliminated, somehow, soon the definition of bad would trickle upwards into new sectors of society; criminality changes to fit the new society like a melting iceberg calving apart. Witch trials anyone?

The Salem witch trials are a good example of this phenomenon. Puritanical society had a nearly non-existent crime rate (certainly by modern standards) but they led difficult, subsistence lives in a very strict and conformist culture. Creating criminals allowed the stresses of life to be vented in a specific, 'appropriate' outlet. I don't think the witch trials were a conspiracy, just an inevitable psychological reaction.

Much of popular thought on crime is complete myth and it seems surprising that common belief centers so prominently on the myth that police somehow prevent criminal acts. While it may be true that crimes are less likely to be perpetrated *right in front of a cop*; police do not stop crime, and in fact they legally can't presume guilt where none is shown to exist! They can only react to a crime and attempt to capture

and send to trial the guilty party. Even if you know someone is going to commit a crime and you tell the authorities, the police cannot arrest until the person actually does it, leading to the classic criminal conundrum.

Crime doesn't really disappear it just moves, which is why it wouldn't change the overall crime rate even if it was possible to put a cop on every corner. Most crimes are committed in poor sections of the city and against young males, but the areas that get the most security patrolling, like the retirement fortresses, are the least likely to be involved in crime. Retirees have little reason to steal, kill or commit other crimes, but those in the destitute neighborhoods have plenty of reasons to do such thing: food, clothing, drugs, unemployment, social status, and so on. Thus, logically the poor neighborhoods should have all the police protection and not the rich parts. This just demonstrates that police serve as an insurance policy for plutocrats and aristocrats.

Police uphold laws designed to protect property, possessions and wealth and if you're a person who has none of those things, the police are probably not going to do you much good. And in fact a cop would probably view such a person as a potential criminal because you immediately have motive for theft of property. So *maybe one definition of a criminal is any poor and destitute individual*. That certainly defines most of the people in your county jail.

Since no matter how utopian the motives of any society may be poor people will always be around, it's logical then that criminals will always be around too. Crime is one of those social problems that is at best minimized and never eliminated. So, if crime can't be eliminated it must at least be mitigated; but how to do that? Society has ways and most involve simply stealing the life-time of the guilty. And in fairness many, if not most career criminals, are not capable of being rehabilitated or turned into productive members of society. This all leads back to the problem of assuming individuals can be something other than what they are. Indeed the information-age society really has no place for these people anyway, crime is often the only option these people have. Fundamentally, punishment boils down to either living with crime or completely removing such elements from society.

But criminology rarely reaches that sober point in analysis anymore. Locking 'em up is a temporary solution if it can be defined as a solution at all; corporate interests certainly love the profitable prison and security business. The most troublesome problems arise from the fact that this reasoning has been applied to civilizations throughout mythological and moral history. What happens when everyone is a criminal? What happens when evil is institutionalized? Or what happens when no one is a criminal, when nothing is illegal? Is that possible? I tend to think not, because human psychology favors a hierarchy, 'I'm better than you are', and this translates into groups of 'I have' and 'I don't have', the good and bad. But for the moment, imagining a place where such a concept existed may bring us closer to some real answers.

The Biblical parallel would be Sodom with its inhabitants of sodomists, and the neighboring city of Gomorrah. Their evil brought God's wrath upon them, burning both towns to the ground along with the amoral citizenry. **"Then the Lord rained down burning sulfur on Sodom and Gomorrah - from the Lord out of the heavens."** Genesis 19:24 NIV* God sought good people residing in the twin cities and a reason to spare them, but none was found, except for Lot and his family.

Likewise Nineveh was a similar case although not with the same dramatic ending. Nineveh was a city of sin (not unlike Las Vegas) that Jonah was tasked with saving by none other than God himself. Jonah hated the town and all its rotten inhabitants so he figured, why waste my breath on them? They deserve God's destruction. Nonetheless, Jonah was eventually convinced by certain heavenly powers to save the town.

The ancient Greeks believed in hubris, that humanities self-confidence and arrogance would bring about their self-destruction, usually due to godly retribution or their own foolishness. When the humans got out of line the gods felt compelled to intervene and shoot some plague or a little bit of natural disaster in the direction of Greece.

Both examples demonstrate a fundamental human idea, that morality is something that's not relativistic but tangible, absolute and quantitative. Since morality is definable then good and evil exist and punishment is inevitable for wrongdoing. This same thinking is what compels human authorities to punish their own wrong doers. It's out of inbred fear that if evil is not stopped it will destroy us all! If crime is not punished it will cause our entire civilization to become corrupt and send divine retribution our way, wiping us all out both good and evil with fire and brimstone. *That bum on the street corner is the beginning of the end for our way of life if he isn't locked up.*

This reasoning seems ludicrous to a modern rationalist but it's what makes our civilization tick, just like every other superstitious one before it. Indeed most people realize this and it has turned the criminal justice system into a hollow, hypocritical institution. We punish but we don't know why, but we know it doesn't do any good, but we keep on doing it because it must be better than doing nothing.

Has any proof ever been verified that prison is a crime deterrent? Or is it that it just gives incentive for criminals to avoid getting caught? I would posit that prisons are an anti-deterrent. Anyone who spends any time in a state prison comes out more hardened and less able to function and survive in traditional society. *It's total hypocrisy; the punishment only makes crime and criminals worse.*

It's not founded on rational thought but on a superstitious sense of divine authority and a subconscious link between forces we cannot control, such as death, weather and disease and godly retributions. Not surprisingly, Christians and other religious

people are some of the most ardent supporters for stiffer penalties and stronger police authority.

*Yes *Lord* is stated twice in one sentence just as I printed it, which amply demonstrates the difficulty with reading the Bible and a criticism I rarely hear but is nonetheless quite evident, that being that grammar in the Bible is atrocious to the point where one is reading nothing but strings of syntax errors. How many translators and this is the best that has been produced? Come on, and the King James Version is even worse.

Many for the One

19.09.99 Why does our society expend the resources to rescue a single individual caught in a disaster or an accident? Just think about the cost associated with the massive system we maintain that serves no other purpose than to save people from their own stupidity and incompetence in many cases. A local fool tries to drive his car through a flash flooded arroyo and gets stuck, uh oh, better call in the National Guard and every paramedic unit from here to god knows where, his life is in danger! Another fool has gotten lost in the national forest and didn't bring any food, water, compass or cold weather clothing and now the sun is going down and they can't be found! Call out the rescue team, the helicopters and every cop for three counties over. They must be saved at all costs to the taxpayer!

From any economic perspective this entire system is totally ludicrous and unnecessary. Not only is it the cost associated with maintaining fire, paramedics units, rescue personnel, but they must be trained, and equipped as well. Oh but that's such a 'heartless' viewpoint, but guess who foots the bill for a rescue operation: Joe-6-pak the taxpayer that's who, yeah I'm talking about *YOU* pal. And besides that having a system of instantaneous rescues only promotes poor planning and stupid behavior, after all why bother to be careful if the hordes of police and paramedics will always be right there to help you for free?

The entire moral concept is flawed because except in very rare cases no single life is worth the expenditure of time effort and money put into a rescue operation. It used to, be back say 100 years ago, if you did something dangerously foolish, like get lost in a desert or get stuck climbing a mountain without any prior experience, then you would, gasp - DIE. No mountain rescue teams with dogs and aircraft searches, no paramedics to resuscitate you or med-flight you to the nearest intensive care unit; a person either knew how to survive in the natural world or they didn't venture out there at all without a competent guide and proper supplies. This is just common sense but evidently common sense is just not needed anymore.

Going back even farther, from a historical perspective, it actually *was* worth the effort to try and rescue people in danger. When every man woman and child in the clan was needed for survival it was a different story. But that simply isn't the case at all in our modern, overcrowded and overprotected society. It seems like our culture is operating on the old rule book but the game has changed radically.

Maybe it's time we upgraded the user's manual.

Stimulus - Response

31.10.98 Generally I spend far too much time trying to figure out the irrationalities of human nature but in my defense its hard to ignore something so pervasive and simultaneously offensive. Still it really isn't that complicated; it all distills down to two rules:

1. 'Don't make waves'
2. 'Follow the Leader'

Why do they do such stupid things, fads and pop conduct? Well it's because somebody more important did it before them and they don't want to draw unnecessary attention to themselves by *not* doing it, and at the same time they want to follow the leader.

This leads me into a related interest - religion. Our society has a very narrow definition of religion, limiting it to the boundaries of an official organization. However the word 'superstition' doesn't have the restrictions of 'religion' but it covers the same meaning. So I guess I should refer to religion as superstition but I digress.

One of the most popular contemporary religions is Political Correctness. This belief-set may seem especially ludicrous given the level of empirical knowledge our society now possesses but its intent is certainly no less pernicious than Christianity's. A debate is brewing over PC and its aversion to open dialogue and criticism. It seems that PC just isn't very survivable outside a University campus, and this leads to a very important point: *criticism* is the arch-nemesis of all religion. In defense against criticism, religion (in other words organized superstition) seeks to control a system in totality; it wants not just the church but the legal system, the government and the leadership too. So just like during the dark ages in Europe when they put swarms of bees and dogs on trial, PC is doing the same thing, first by totally dominating the faculty and students on campus and eventually reaching out into larger portions of society. But how does it spread when it's so ridiculous? Just reference back to the two rules of human nature! Most people avoid standing out by following the leader.

The immunity to criticism is so critical to religion that this structure called the church was developed in lieu of that total control of society that religion needs to fully function. The church is an island of refuge for the adherents to hide from the dangers of criticism and truthful allegations. Sometimes this church becomes so isolated that the adherents never even leave. This is one way of achieving that total control I described earlier. Usually when this occurs we refer to it as a 'cult', and send in the government to burn down their housing compounds.

Digital insignificance

Worldwide structural homogeneity is a modern reality not unexpected, just improperly predicted. Common economy has, and *is*, driving individual political systems into greater global cohesion, and inevitability a true structure of confederation. The revolution isn't top to bottom authoritarian dictatorship rather it's an aggregation from bottom up. We see that gradually the barriers to commonality, such as cultural and nationalistic mores, become subjugated to pop-culture and rapid, mass-communications. The group interest is no longer localized, it's globalized! Now we have the same political, economic, and cultural template for everyone - just change the details to suit your neighborhood, a global direct marketing program! For instance, language is no longer a serious barrier since mass-communications are generally symbolic anyhow and also English is nearly universal thanks to Pax Britannica uber alles .

Even thought patterns adjust to suit the new system: act and forget, live in the now, symbolic reasoning through phantasmagoric imagery and sounds - reduction to impulse and emotion, life like a movie. The distilled substance left is a true herd-group as democratic as they're controlled. Problems simply become to daunting and remote to deal with (it's never a *local* problem so why care?) so we simply hand them off to our "leaders" who put on a performance and hope everything works out in the end.

New sociological realms will be a fundamental component of the 21st century. How will group-think function on a global scale? Who runs the group: the leader-actors or the masses? It could be a chaotic feedback mechanism. Insignificance reaches new heights in our new world of digital purpose, the volume of inertia simply becomes unstoppable and unmanageable, and what then? 25.06.97

As this writer has observed before, any individual who has, from whatever causes, begun to adopt a detached, skeptical and critical attitude towards an ailing 20th century world and its dubious values has, in fact, set his feet on the path towards personal regeneration and that of the community to which he belongs. - Ivor Benson

