



X O V A

The Xova Manifesto
March 30th 2024

FOREWORD

- For those that don't have the time to read this manifesto, we will summarize our movement in 1 sentence. The Xova Movement is a left-wing activist initiative with a mission to create an ideal world and future for everyone, and our primary plan for achieving this is to transition all countries to democratic socialism, which among other things would include abolishing the ruling class, introducing a Universal Basic Income, generously funding public infrastructures and services, transitioning societies to a 4 day workweek, guaranteeing fair wages for all workers, making businesses optimally democratic, preventing all future economic downturns, permanently ending inflation, and decommodifying all goods and services, including abolishing rent and mortgage interest payments. If you want to experience the substantially higher quality of life that our movement's success will guarantee, please do everything you can to support our movement. Detailed advice on how to do this can be found in Chapter 3: Part 4 (p. 585). If you doubt capitalism's brokenness or democratic socialism's viability, please read Chapter 1 (p. 8) of our manifesto. If you want to truly appreciate why the success of our movement is paramount, please read the "Statistics" (p. 411) and "Additional crises" (p. 559) sections of our manifesto. If you don't have the time to do any of this then please at the very least vote for democratic socialist political candidates during the next elections in your country, and ideally only those who have read our manifesto and support our movement.

For those in any doubt, understand that our movement can genuinely succeed. First, this manifesto proves irrefutably why our goals are logically and morally justified. Second, our initiatives, and particularly our future public protests, are guaranteed to make our movement an international phenomenon. Third, our movement will quickly gain widespread support, since its success will improve everyone's quality of life. Fourth, our movement will offer generous financial rewards to

those who help us. Fifth, shortly after our first announcement we will reveal our future initiatives to multiple trusted left-wing public figures, who will publically attest to the viability of these initiatives. So please don't hesitate to support our movement.

- If you decide to stop reading this manifesto part way through, we would strongly encourage you to at least read the "Technology" section (p. 444) in Chapter 2. It outlines our plan to utilize technology to create a utopian future, and one which could be completed within 30 years. However, our entire manifesto should be considered essential reading material, since it has been designed to contain most of the information that populations require as common knowledge to be able to successfully create and maintain functioning and prosperous societies, including essential and original ideas regarding critical thinking, propaganda, ethics, science, technology, politics, economics, society, culture, global crises, and the future.

- Please remain mindful that our movement is guaranteed to be misrepresented and smeared by bad faith actors, uncritically minded individuals, and right-wing propagandists. This is why it is important that people read this manifesto themselves.

- Please keep an open mind while reading this manifesto. Many of our ideas are unconventional and unintuitive, but are nonetheless supported by evidence and reason.

- This manifesto has been modified continuously all the way up to its release, and was written over the course of about 10 years. If we had the time we would further refine this manifesto, and re-verify and update all presented facts. However, we believe starting our movement immediately is of far greater importance than striving for perfection. Regardless of any flaws, this manifesto makes it clear that our overall conclusions are justified, and that our movement provides the best chance of maximizing everyone's quality of life.

- Sources for all claims made in this manifesto, as well as corrections and updates for all facts, will soon be available on the Xova wiki.

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	7
TERMS	8
CHAPTER 1: A CRITIQUE OF CAPITALISM	10
THE FUNDAMENTALS	11
Economic systems	11
Sources of propaganda.....	21
PART 1: PRIVATIZATION AND PERSONAL WEALTH.....	26
Within the context of individual businesses	26
Within the context of markets	28
Within the context of life circumstances	35
Within the context of global economic systems.....	37
Within the context of public support systems	42
The irrationality of privatization under capitalism.....	46
The irrationality of patents under capitalism.....	50
The irrationality of surplus value under capitalism ...	52
The irrationality of compensation under capitalism...	60
The irrationality of money under capitalism.....	75
Part 1: Privatization and personal wealth:	
Conclusion	80
PART 2: THE SYSTEM	83
"Capitalism prioritizes profits because this benefits everyone"	83
"Capitalism improves people's quality of life over time"	94
"Capitalism is the least violent economic system"	98
"Capitalism is the best system for maximizing innovation"	108
"Capitalism is essential for creating strong economies"	127
"Capitalism is the most truthful economic system"	138

"Capitalism predominantly has problems because of the poor"	153
"Capitalist countries are superior to socialist countries"	159
"Capitalist free markets are superior to socialist planned economies"	203
"Capitalist businesses are superior to socialist businesses"	244
"Capitalism is the best system for maximizing freedom"	252
"Capitalism works in harmony with human nature"	278
Part 2: The system: Conclusion	287
PART 3: CAPITALISM IN REALITY	293
Humans	293
Animals	335
Environment	363
Miscellaneous	388
Statistics	411
Part 3: Capitalism in reality: Conclusion	423
CHAPTER 1 CONCLUSION	424
CHAPTER 2: XOVA	427
PART 1: ROADMAP	427
The future	427
Our plan	429
The Xovian STAR-Blockchain voting system	439
Part 1: Roadmap: Conclusion	443
PART 2: TECHNOLOGY	444
Automation	446
Transhumanism	458
HyperVR	460
Part 2: Technology: Conclusion	489
PART 3: POST-SCARCITY	490
Nuclear power	490
Veganism	498
Vertical farms	509
Part 3: Post-Scarcity: Conclusion	510

PART 4: PARAMOUNT	511
Theistic religions	511
Abortion rights	539
Recreational drugs	548
Additional crises	559
Uniqueness	574
Part 4: Paramount: Conclusion	578
CHAPTER 2 CONCLUSION	579
CHAPTER 3: IMMEDIATE OBJECTIVES	580
PART 1: BUSINESSES	581
PART 2: GOVERNMENTS	582
PART 3: CONSUMERS	584
PART 4: SUPPORTERS	585
CHAPTER 3 CONCLUSION	598
FINAL MESSAGE	599
GLOSSARY	602
APPENDIX	682
DEFINITIONS	682
LOGIC	689
ESSENTIAL CRITICAL THINKING INFORMATION	697
ESSENTIAL PSYCHOLOGICAL WARFARE INFORMATION	728
ESSENTIAL DEBATING INFORMATION	757
ESSENTIAL SCIENTIFIC INFORMATION	771
LOGICAL FALLACIES	786
Formal fallacies	787
Informal fallacies	793
COGNITIVE BIASES	844
Belief, decision-making, and behavioral biases	844
Memory biases	875
APPENDIX: CONCLUSION	882

INTRODUCTION

This manifesto is divided into 3 chapters, a glossary, and an appendix.

Chapter 1 is 135k words long, and is primarily dedicated to extensively critiquing capitalism. This chapter is designed to convince even the most ardent supporters of capitalism how fundamentally broken their system is, so it is unavoidably lengthy due to the extensive amount of capitalist propaganda that it has to debunk. This chapter also provides an introduction to democratic socialism which proves why it is an ideal economic system. Part 1 is particularly important, since it proves why wealth is unfairly distributed under capitalism, and why well-funded public infrastructures and services, and a Universal Basic Income, are irrefutable human rights.

Chapter 2 is 50k words long, and explores the end goals of our movement, and the steps required to get there. This chapter also provides justifications for our decisions, and why the success of our movement is paramount. Part 2 is particularly important, since it outlines our plan to utilize technology to create a utopian future, and one which could be completed within 30 years. This section has the potential to rapidly and radically change the perceptions and long-term priorities of most people and governments.

Chapter 3 is 5k words long, and details the immediate objectives of our movement. Part 4 is particularly important, since it explains how people can support our movement and maximize its success.

The glossary is 20k words long, and provides definitions for essential political, economic, social, and cultural terms.

The appendix is 50k words long, and is solely dedicated to providing a comprehensive introduction to critical thinking.

TERMS

The definitions of certain terms that appear in this manifesto have been simplified or modified for the sake of convenience.

- The term “capitalists” will refer to those who defend and advocate for capitalism, while the term “ownership class” will be used to refer to those who own the means of production.
- The term “socialism” will be used mostly throughout this manifesto even though the expression “socialism and communism” would be just as applicable in most instances.
- The term “the lower classes” will refer to all classes below the ruling class.
- The terms “means of productions” and “goods and services” will also refer to homes in instances where this would be applicable. Consequently, the term “price gouging” will also refer to extortionate rent prices, extortionate mortgage interest rates, and extortionate house prices, in instances where this would be applicable.
- The term “cartels” will refer to both cartels and natural cartels, the latter of which refers to economic conditions which possess the same characteristics produced by cartels but which arise naturally without any direct collusion between market participants.
- The term “the world’s resources” will refer to raw physical resources, and will not include human labor, nor the things that these raw resources can be turned into.
- The term “monopolies” will refer to monopolies and oligopolies.
- The term “externalities” will refer exclusively to negative externalities, even though the term technically refers to consequences that can be either positive or negative in nature. This is also how it is most commonly used in economic discourse.
- The term “finite resources” will refer both to physical resources that are finite in nature, such as rare minerals, as well as resources that take a relatively long time to replenish naturally, and often far longer than what is allowed under capitalism.

- The term “quality of life” will also refer to “standards of living” for the sake of convenience, even though the latter may be more accurate in certain situations. Living standards refers specifically to one’s material conditions, whereas quality of life is a more holistic description of wellbeing that includes things like living standards, mental health, physical health, cultural capital, and social capital.
- The term “underdeveloped countries” will refer to both developing countries and underdeveloped countries, even though underdeveloped countries are a subcategory of developing countries.
- The term “infrastructures and services” will refer to everything provided by governments, although we acknowledge that some people may disagree that these two terms can be used to accurately cover all things provided by governments.
- The term “businesses” will refer to privately owned businesses, which this manifesto is partially dedicated to critiquing, but we acknowledge that many of these criticisms do not apply to all businesses, and particularly small family run businesses.
- The term “higher-ups” will refer to those with positions of influence or power within businesses, namely owners, directors, CEO’s, senior managers, and shareholders.
- The term “sociopathic” will refer to those who may not technically be sociopathic but nonetheless exhibit sociopathic behaviors.
- The terms “men” and “women” will be used throughout this manifesto for the sake of simplicity, even though more descriptive LGBT+ terms may be more accurate at certain points.
- The term “consequences” will also refer to second-order consequences, including emergent properties and feedback loops.
- The term “feedback loop” will refer to a positive feedback loop, in which the consequence of a feedback loop results in more of that consequence. This contrasts with a negative feedback loop, in which the consequence of a feedback loop results in less of that consequence.
- The term “degrees” will refer to Celsius, not Fahrenheit.

To improve reading comprehension, important terms will be emphasized with quotation marks, rather than by using italics which is the more formal and conventional approach.

CHAPTER 1: **A CRITIQUE** **OF** **CAPITALISM**

This chapter is divided into three parts. Part 1 will assess privatization and personal wealth under capitalism from a theoretical perspective. Part 2 will assess the capitalist system as a whole also from a theoretical perspective. Part 3 will assess how capitalism has manifested through its application in the real-world. There will inevitably be a large degree of overlap between theory and application, but only when unavoidable.

THE FUNDAMENTALS

Before critiquing capitalism however, this introduction will first need to explain foundational information that is necessary for understanding the rest of this chapter.

Economic systems

This section will define the most important economic systems that are discussed in this chapter.

Capitalism

Capitalism is a right-wing economic system that is defined by its prioritization of privatization, free markets, and profits. Under capitalism the means of production are privately owned, meaning ownership of the physical resources necessary for producing and providing goods and services are owned by a small percentage of the population, rather than everyone in society. Because the means of production are privately owned under capitalism, this necessitates wage labor, in which workers have no choice but to sell their labor to the ownership class in exchange for wages in order to survive and prosper. All transactions for goods, services, and labor, are performed through voluntary exchange within competitive free markets, and all businesses operate primarily in the pursuit of profit. Under capitalism governments provide light to moderate oversight and assistance, particularly through creating and maintaining essential public infrastructures and services, and protecting property rights and economic freedom through the legal system, law enforcement, and the military.

Neoliberalism

Neoliberalism is a far-right ideology and policy model that advocates for capitalism, but which aims to reduce the role of government to only providing what is necessary for maintaining and facilitating trade within competitive free markets. Consequently, under neoliberalism people receive little to no government assistance, and must meet their basic needs by finding work within competitive free markets. Neoliberalism supports policies such as free trade, flexible labor markets, anti-union measures, the unrestricted flow of capital, tax cuts for the rich, corporate tax cuts, deregulation of the private sector, privatization of public services, fiscally conservative state programs, and austerity measures during times of economic crisis.

Libertarianism

Libertarianism is a far-right ideology that strives to maximize personal freedom by advocating for minimal to no interference in the economy or society by the government. This modern definition of libertarianism can more accurately be termed "right-libertarianism", since originally the word libertarianism described a variety of left-wing political ideologies before it was coopted by the right. However, because of its more prominent modern-day right-wing definition, the term libertarianism is rarely used in modern discourse to describe left-wing ideologies. For this reason this manifesto will only use the modern right-wing definition.

Libertarians hold little to no faith in conventional governments, and believe privately run organizations operating within competitive free markets can fulfill the majority or all of the functions of a government. Consequently, libertarians always advocate for capitalism. The form of libertarianism that advocates for the existence of a government that provides minimal government services is called minarchism, and these governments usually only provide services related to law enforcement and national defense. The form of libertarianism that advocates for the complete eradication of the government is called "anarcho-capitalism".

Anarchism

Anarchism is a far-left ideology founded on skepticism of authority, and which consequently rejects all hierarchies that cannot be logically or morally justified. Anarchism is commonly summarized as “the rejection of all unjustified hierarchies”, or in other words all hierarchical power structures that allow for subjugation and exploitation. An anarchist society is consequently one in which the ability to wield unjustified power over others is minimized at the structural level. Anarchism is therefore the opposite of authoritarianism. The term “anarchy” can also refer to a system built on the principles of anarchism, although this is rarely advocated for, since in modern societies anarchy is more often used to describe a state of disorder and lawlessness.

The primary focus of the anarchist movement is to maximize personal freedom by advocating for the complete abolition of the Marxist definition of the state, or in other words any government that is controlled or utilized by the ruling class to suppress and exploit the lower classes. Anarchists hold no faith in conventional governments, and believe democratically run organizations operating within planned economies can fulfill all of the functions of a government. Consequently, anarchists always advocate for communism. Anarchists also share many ideals, ideas, and strategies, with socialists, and have strong historical ties to most other anti-capitalist ideologies and movements.

Socialism

Socialism is a left-wing political and economic system proposed by economist Karl Marx. Socialism was originally proposed as the transitional economic system between capitalism and communism. However, today there are various forms of socialism that are finalized economic systems, and serve no transitional purpose.

The primary goal of socialism is the emancipation of all humans, achieved through the end of exploitation, the fulfillment of all human needs, and the maximization of human freedom and potential. Marx

believed this could only be achieved through democratizing all political and economic organizations and systems. Consequently, socialists disagree with the existence of economic classes, or more specifically the existence of a working class and an ownership class. Socialism attempts to rectify this by transferring ownership and control of the means of production into the hands of everyone in society, which is a process called socialization. In other words, the means of production become "public property". This is distinct from "personal property", which includes personal possessions not required by the wider community to function, such as a person's home, car, TV, bed, toothbrush, etc. These remain privately owned under socialism and protected via personal property rights.

Under socialism, economic activity is directed first and foremost towards fulfilling the needs of everyone in society, rather than the desires of those with the most wealth. This is primarily achieved through the decommodification of all essential goods and services, meaning that instead of being sold for-profit, they are guaranteed to all citizens regardless of personal circumstances. Socialist organizations and systems still have structures, hierarchies, and leaders, to ensure effective management, but leaders can be voted in and out of their positions at any time.

The ways in which socialist organizations and systems are structured can vary greatly. This is true with all economic systems, but is true of socialism predominantly because there are numerous ways societies can democratically control the means of production. The following 3 variants of socialism are the most common forms, and here they are listed from least democratic to most democratic. Important to understand however is that because economic ideas have evolved over time, and continue to do so to this day, economic terms can come to have different meanings over time, and consequently can mean different things to different people. The definitions provided here generally adhere to majority consensus, although are not necessarily agreed upon by everyone.

1. State socialism

State socialism is a top-down system in which the means of production are owned and controlled by the government, which functions to enact the will of the people. State socialism can exist to transition society from capitalism to socialism, or exist as an end goal in and of itself. Because resources are allocated centrally by the government, state socialism is a type of centrally planned economy. This is distinct from capitalism, which is decentralized and unplanned due to its reliance on markets. However, in unplanned market economies, public infrastructures and services that benefit the public can be considered isolated forms of state socialism. They can be considered forms of socialism because they are paid for by everyone, and made freely available to everyone.

The process of transferring something from private ownership to public ownership is called nationalization. Nationalization however is different from socialization. Nationalization refers to the transference from private ownership or control to government ownership or control. Socialization refers more broadly to workers or members of society gaining ownership or control. Nationalization can occur without socialization if the government does not operate to fulfill the will of the people. Socialization can occur without nationalization if a country does not have a government.

State socialism is often used interchangeably with the term "state capitalism", but they are not one and the same. Under state capitalism, the government also centrally plans parts or all of the economy, but economic activity is undertaken in the pursuit of profit. Under state capitalism the means of production can either be owned by businesses, with the government having a strong influence over businesses and resource allocation, or the government can completely own and control the means of production, in which case the economy effectively operates like a single giant corporation. Under state capitalism profits can be used to benefit the public, but are more commonly used to benefit the ruling class at the expense of the public. Conversely, under state socialism, all economic resources are utilized for the express purpose of benefitting the public, rather

than to generate profits. Because state socialist governments and state capitalist governments can both wield the same amount of power via central planning, it is possible for an uncorrupt and democratic state socialist society to become a corrupt and authoritarian state capitalist society without strong democratic safeguards. Because of this high risk, most socialists today are democratic socialists, not state socialists.

2. Market socialism

Market socialism involves the democratization of all political and economic organizations and systems. Under market socialism all businesses are owned and controlled by the workers, usually in the form of worker cooperatives, but businesses still compete against one another in an unplanned and competitive free market economy, and do so in the pursuit of profits. Market socialism includes the decommodification of essential goods and services, which are provided by the government. However, because it does not involve the decommodification of all goods and services, by virtue of maintaining the profit motive, market socialism is not considered a true form of socialism by many socialists. Despite this, because market socialism involves greater democratic control over all businesses, it is generally still considered more socialistic than state socialism. Under market socialism, governments are also optimally democratic, and usually exist in the form of republics, although they can also involve direct democracy, in which citizens vote directly on particular issues. Governments exist predominantly to centrally plan public infrastructures and services, which includes providing strong social safety nets and regulating businesses.

3. Democratic socialism

Democratic socialism is similar to market socialism, except the competitive free market economy is replaced with a cooperative planned economy, in which both centralized and decentralized planning play a role. The economy takes the form of a network of worker cooperatives, all cooperating with one another to fulfill the

needs and wants of everyone in society. Consequently, just like communism, democratic socialism can be understood as the purest antithesis of capitalism, because it uses the opposite approach for capitalism's 3 most defining features. More specifically, privatization is replaced with social ownership and control, free markets are replaced with economic planning, and the prioritization of profits is replaced with the prioritization of everyone's needs.

Identical to market socialism and modern capitalist economies, the government still exists to centrally plan public infrastructures and services. This system stands in contrast to the Soviet Union and Mao's China, in which most or all economic activity was centrally planned in the form of a command economy. Planned economies under democratic socialism still utilize many market mechanisms similar to free markets, but they avoid all the problems of free markets. Some modern market socialists refer to themselves as democratic socialists, but this is incorrect. Historically democratic socialism has always referred exclusively to planned economies, and for the sake of clarity most socialists agree this distinction should be maintained.

Because private ownership of the means of production is replaced by social ownership and collaboration, rather than privatization and competition, economic classes do not exist under democratic socialism. However, this does not result in equality of outcome, since wealth and resources are allocated based on needs and abilities. For example, certain people can be more privileged than others, such as possessing more luxury goods or free time, due to having greater needs or providing more useful labor. However, wealth inequality would be substantially less than the wealth inequality that exists under capitalism. This is because the needs of people and societies are so great, and the resources available to humanity are so limited, it is not possible to meet the needs of every person on the planet while simultaneously ensuring extravagant indulgences and lifestyles for the wealthiest people in society.

As an aside, an alternative to worker cooperatives are consumer cooperatives. These are cooperatives comprised of both a producer council and a consumer council, and involve both workers and consumers, or their representatives, both taking a direct active role in decision making, or at least with regards to the goods and services being produced and provided. Worker cooperatives can also have consumer representatives, as well as community representatives, that actively participate in decision making, although workers are usually still the dominant decision makers in most instances. There are advantages and disadvantages to these different cooperative arrangements, and each may be suited for different real-world situations. However, the remainder of this manifesto will only refer to worker cooperatives. This is for the sake of simplicity, rather than as a form of advocacy for this particular type of cooperative.

Communism

Communism is a far-left political and economic system that can be understood as a stage beyond socialism. Communism is defined as a stateless, classless, moneyless society. Consequently, it has the flattest hierarchy of any economic system in terms of power. The "state" in this context refers to the Marxist definition of the state.

In most ways communism is identical to democratic socialism. In both systems personal property rights are protected, the means of production are socially owned and controlled, there are no economic classes, there are no competitive free markets, the economy is planned, and all economic actors cooperate with one another to fulfill the needs of everyone in society first and foremost. Additionally, both systems involve the eradication of the state, according to the Marxist definition. However, under communism all planning is decentralized, compared with democratic socialism which still allows for national governments that engage in centralized planning. Additionally, under communism all major decisions are made via direct democracy, in which citizens vote on initiatives directly, compared with democratic socialism in which major decisions can be made via direct democracy, but by default are made by elected

representatives who act as trustees, or in other words representatives who make decisions on behalf of those who elected them. Just like under socialism, organizations and systems can still have structures, hierarchies, and leaders, in order to ensure effective management, and leaders can be voted out of their positions at any time. Communists are similar to libertarians in that both are anti-government, with the predominant difference being that communists advocate for planned economies, while libertarians advocate for capitalist free markets.

There are two clarifications that need to be made regarding communism. First, most countries thought of as communist, such as the Soviet Union and Mao's China, often had command economies, rather than planned economies, and are best described as state socialist or state capitalist depending on interpretation. They were also nearly always authoritarian. Some had communist aspirations, but never became stateless, classless, or moneyless, and hence never became communist. Second, most present-day communists call themselves anarcho-communists, to more clearly distinguish their ideology from the authoritarian countries of the past that are commonly but incorrectly described as communist. Anarcho-communists refer to themselves as this because they are anarchists, and the word anarcho is simply the prefix form of the word anarchism. Most anarcho-communists also reject the idea that any form of socialism or centralized government is required to transition from capitalism to communism.

Social democracy

Social democracy refers to a capitalist system with socialist components, and is often described as a "mixed economy" system for this reason. These socialist components usually manifest in the form of public infrastructures and services, which includes providing strong social safety nets and regulating businesses. These are usually paid for through taxes on non-essential goods and services, and high taxes on high income earners. When people refer to the "Scandinavian model" or the "Nordic Model", social democracy is

what they are referring to. In fact, every developed country in the world is a social democracy, although the public infrastructures and services provided by each vary greatly from country to country. When people advocate for social democracy, they are usually just advocating for worker rights, robust social safety nets, better social services, and improved public infrastructures, paid for through progressive taxation.

These definitions are simplified for the sake of convenience, but provide a solid framework in which to critique capitalism. One of the most important observations that can be made about real-world economic systems is that they are rarely the purest form of the economic systems they are often categorized as.

The following critique will focus primarily on capitalism, but will also explore socialism in order to demonstrate by comparison how fundamentally broken capitalism truly is, and to explain how socialism is not only viable but also the best economic system currently available. This critique will also not assess capitalism purely from a theoretical perspective, but within the context of its unavoidable real-world properties and outcomes. For example, profits are not merely allowed under capitalism, but are also the primary goal of most businesses. Any valid critique of capitalism cannot merely make assessments based on theory or ideological assumptions, but must also take into account the unavoidable real-world inevitabilities of capitalism. This critique will therefore assess capitalism in its entirety, and not merely a theoretical or idealized version of capitalism.

Sources of propaganda

Before critiquing capitalism, it is important to understand where the propaganda that supports capitalism originates from, and how it perpetuates within society. Perhaps surprisingly, capitalist propaganda is not just propagated by the ruling class, but is propagated at every stratum of society, including those who are victims of the system. Unfortunately the overwhelming majority of the most influential propagators of capitalist propaganda cannot easily be reasoned with, either because they are too uncritically minded to recognize the brokenness of capitalism, or because they are grifters and propagandists willing to make money promoting a system they know is causing people to unnecessarily suffer and die. Many of them are also anti-intellectuals, libertarians, ultranationalists, ultraconservatives, fascists, theocrats, sociopaths, climate change deniers, or a combination of these. It should go without saying that none of these individuals should be listened to with regards to economics, nor with regards to most other subjects.

- **Mainstream media**

Most mainstream news organizations are funded by the wealthiest individuals and organizations in the world, and most news anchors are among the wealthiest people in society. This means the very organizations people should be able to rely upon to speak the truth have every incentive to perpetuate capitalist propaganda. It may also be no exaggeration to say that the modern mainstream news media is likely the most sophisticated and successful propaganda machine in human history.

- **Alternative media**

Some of the most influential perpetrators of capitalist propaganda in recent years have been alternative, and mostly independent, right-wing news organizations and figures that engage in political and economic commentary. For those interested we will mention here 80 examples of the most influential ones to be aware of. They include

PragerU, The Daily Wire, Blaze Media (including BlazeTV), The Reason Foundation (including ReasonTV), Learn Liberty, Turning Point USA, InfoWars, Breitbart News, The Epoch Times, The Daily Caller, The Daily Signal, The Federalist, Right Side Broadcasting Network, The Next News Network, Townhall Media, The Post Millennial, PJ Media, Censored.TV, True North, Red Ice TV, Project Veritas, Rebel News, Jordan Peterson, Steven Crowder, Dennis Prager, Candace Owens, Will Witt, Amala Ekpunobi, Ben Shapiro, Michael Knowles, Andrew Klavan, Matt Walsh, Jeremy Boreing, Mark Levin, Dave Rubin, Glenn Beck, Tim Pool, Alex Jones, Charlie Kirk, Bret Weinstein, Nick Gillespie, Ezra Levant, Mark Dice, Megyn Kelly, David Freiheit (a.k.a. Viva Frei), Benny Johnson, Adam Carolla, Carl Benjamin (a.k.a. Sargon of Akkad, The Podcast of the Lotus Eaters), Steve Turley, Brandon Tatum (a.k.a. The Officer Tatum), Sara Gonzales, Keith and Kevin Hodge (a.k.a. the Hodgetwins, or the Conservative Twins), Roman Balmakov, Anthony Brian Logan, Allie Beth Stuckey, James Lindsay, Konstantin Kisin (Triggernometry), Lauren Chen, Larry Elder, Jeremy Hambly (a.k.a. The Quartering), Mahyar Tousi, Brett Cooper, Andrew [Unknown] (Don't Walk, Run! Productions), Jesse Lee Peterson, Tyler Zed (Zeducation), John Stossel, Sean Fitzgerald (a.k.a. Actual Justice Warrior), Michael Malice, Gloria Alvarez, Jocko Willink, J.P. Sears (AwakenWithJP), Michael Savage, Seamus Coughlin (FreedomToons and Common Sense Soapbox), Tarl Warwick, Jason Whitlock, [Unknown] (a.k.a. Salty Cracker), Douglas Murray, Scott Adams, Mike Rowe, and Dave Ramsey, to name some of the most prominent examples.

- Academia

It might be assumed that capitalist ideas formed naturally and evolved over time through academic research. The truth is that most of these ideas were carefully formulated by a relatively small number of propagandists largely in response to the growing acceptance and adoption of Marxist ideas in Western countries during the middle of the 20th century. Most of these propagandists, such as Ludwig von Mises, Friedrich Hayek, Milton Friedman, Karl Popper, and George Stigler, went on to found the Mont Pelerin Society in 1947, which has gone down as one of the most influential economic institutions of the

20th century. It is unlikely their original intentions were noble, but even if they were, their ideas became the foundation for the pseudo-intellectual capitalist propaganda propagated by the many capitalist institutions that followed, including extremely influential think tanks. Such institutions to be aware of include The Adam Smith Institute, The Hoover Institution, The Foundation for Economic Education, The Institute for Economic Studies, The Institute of Economic Affairs, The American Institute for Economic Research, The Cato Institute, The Heritage Foundation, The Heartland Institute, The Fraser Institute, The Manhattan Institute, The American Enterprise Institute, The Ayn Rand Institute, The Atlas Society, The Ludwig von Mises Institute, The Federalist Foundation, The Mercatus Center, The Institute of Public Affairs, The National Center for Policy Analysis, The Center for Policy Studies, The Institute for Justice, The Institute for Humane Studies, and literally hundreds of other similarly named organizations. Despite possessing prestigious and impressive sounding names, these are among the most economically illiterate organizations in the world, as well as some of the most dangerous considering the immeasurable harm they have done to society.

In addition to these institutions, there are also numerous well-known modern “academics”, like Charles Murray and Thomas Sowell, who have had a profound influence on society’s understanding of economics, and yet have also failed to grasp even rudimentary ideas related to this subject. In fact most economic “academics” that support capitalism should generally not be considered any more intelligent than flat-Earthers. The ability to regurgitate technical language, economic theories, and cherry-picked studies, has given these supposed experts a superficial veneer of intelligence and competence that has hidden their fundamental lack of critical mindedness and economic literacy. It is a testament to their incompetence that they have influenced the world’s political and economic systems far more so than any Marxists over the past 70 years, and yet the world today is in an absolutely dire state, as will become increasingly clear.

- Business owners and investors

Business owners and investors benefit disproportionately from capitalism, and many propagate capitalist propaganda through various means, such as conversations, interviews, books, courses, and public speaking. Some of these capitalists have also become culturally prominent entrepreneurs, as well as work and lifestyle gurus, such as Gary Vaynerchuk (a.k.a. Gary Vee), Patrick Bet-David, Tony Robbins, Elon Musk, Mark Cuban, Peter Schiff, and Peter Thiel. The extravagant lifestyles and consumption habits that such wealthy business owners and investors engage in also provide the superficial veneer that capitalism is a system that breeds prosperity, which could be interpreted as its own form of propaganda.

- Advertising

Capitalism has also given rise to an invasive and powerfully influential advertising industry. This industry has helped give capitalism the veneer of being a successful and desirable system, and mostly through overtly immoral actions. These include, but are certainly not limited to, helping businesses lie about the nature and quality of their goods and services, encouraging consumers to accept the dangerous idea that unrestrained consumerism is sustainable, and distracting people from the immoral practices and abhorrent abuses committed by these businesses, particularly via humane washing, greenwashing, redwashing, and pinkwashing.

- The entertainment industry

Films, TV shows, books, computer games, music, etc. regularly propagate capitalist propaganda. Entertainment media most commonly does this by portraying imperialist militaries in a positive light, and by perpetuating anti-socialist and anti-communist propaganda, including portraying anti-capitalist individuals as immature radicals that are a danger to society. Even when entertainment media doesn't propagate capitalist propaganda, the stories they tell usually refrain from criticizing capitalism even when these stories explore problems that are obviously the result of capitalism. Many famous people within the industry also use their personal influence to advocate for capitalism.

- Politicians

Many of the most prominent propagators of capitalist propaganda are politicians, and particularly those whose campaigns are funded by corporations. Worse still, most politicians in Western countries either tolerate or support imperialism and neoliberalism, while some are so grossly uncritically minded they even advocate for libertarianism.

- Society

The general public could also be understood as influential perpetrators of capitalist propaganda. Through decades of propaganda, capitalists have managed to convince the masses to support the very system that exploits them, and to perpetuate capitalist misinformation and talking points. This propaganda can perpetuate through private conversations, all the way up to social media messages posted by extremely influential public figures.

- Consumerism

The quality of life afforded to consumers in developed countries could also be understood as one of the greatest enforcers of the idea that capitalism is the best economic system. This has become an easy belief to accept since the externalities of most goods and services are intentionally kept hidden from consumers. This problem has been further exacerbated by the common falsehood that consumerism under socialism would involve waiting in breadlines and being limited to a small and dismal selection of goods and services.

The reason capitalism has been so effective at sustaining itself is because every part of society is saturated with the propaganda required to maintain it. Worse still, most of this propaganda sounds reasonable at the surface level. It is only when capitalism is critiqued in-depth, and all of its consequences are understood, does it become obvious how fundamentally broken capitalism truly is.

PART 1: **PRIVATIZATION** **AND PERSONAL** **WEALTH**

Capitalists believe that privatization of the means of production is justified, and that wealth will always be distributed fairly within competitive free markets where profits are prioritized. Some capitalists even believe in this idea to the extent of advocating for a flat tax rate. This section will demonstrate that even at the theoretical level this belief cannot be substantiated, and that this is primarily because of capitalism's unavoidable consequences.

Within the context of **individual businesses**

Within capitalist businesses power resides predominantly in the hands of the higher-ups, rather than being dispersed among all workers. This immediately creates extreme power imbalances within effectively all businesses, which nearly always result in outcomes that can in no way be considered meritocratic in nature. Consider a business with one owner and 10 employees. Under capitalism, if the business accrues \$1 million in profits every day, the owner can give

his 10 employees \$100 each and keep the remainder for himself. This would be immoral because the labor of the 10 employees would be just as essential for the success of the business as the owner's labor. Even if the business owner worked hard to setup their business, and even if they were more skillful, the labor of each worker would still be essential, and hence they should still be fairly compensated. However, because of the gross power imbalances that exist within capitalist businesses, workers can even suffer unpaid overtime, and be unable to afford their basic needs, and yet the higher-ups within their business can make millions of dollars per year. Some workers may not even be paid at all, but instead be "paid" through exposure or experience, even when a business can afford to pay them. The higher-ups of capitalist businesses have no incentive to do otherwise. Even when they are willing to forgo compensation themselves, they are still subservient to their shareholders, and it is still often more profitable for them to expand their business and keep hiring more workers, rather than pay their current workers fairly.

In a well-designed economic system power hierarchies would be flattened as much as possible and all workers would be guaranteed fair compensation, since they are just as responsible for the success of any business as the higher-ups. It is an irrefutable human right that everyone should have influence over the things that affect their life, which obviously means workers consequently have the right not to be exploited, and yet this is not afforded to workers under capitalism. Business owners absolutely deserve financial compensation for their labor, and the value of their contributions to society will be explored throughout this manifesto. However, their contributions are not so great that it can justify their dictatorial rule within their businesses, nor the subsequent wage slavery they can inflict upon their essential employees. However, as will become increasingly clear, under capitalism there is no principle or reliable mechanism that can mitigate or offset this exploitation.

Conclusion

The gross power imbalances produced by privatization ensure that workers will rarely be paid fairly for their essential labor under capitalism. Instead money can be guaranteed to go predominantly towards those that just happen to possess the most power, which always consolidates under capitalism. This has always meant that even from a theoretical perspective, capitalism was always very unlikely to be a meritocratic system. Arguing that people are paid what they are worth under capitalism is effectively circular logic, and a post hoc justification for gross compensation inequality within businesses. A well designed economic system would ensure people are paid what they are worth, and would recognize that this could only reasonably be achieved by making businesses more democratic. All of this demonstrates that privatization, and the way wealth is distributed under capitalism, cannot be justified.

Within the context of markets

Capitalists argue that the unfair power dynamics within businesses can be counterbalanced by worker choice and power within the broader context of the free market. More specifically, if an employee does not like their work arrangements, they can leave for a better job, start their own business, or use these options as leverage to renegotiate arrangements with their employer. It is believed that over time this back-and-forth power play will always culminate in business owners and workers earning what they deserve. This theory could never work in practice because it completely ignores the complexities of the real-world.

Negotiating

Employees may be unable to negotiate salaries, benefits, working conditions, etc. with their employer for a number of reasons not immediately apparent from assessing capitalism's core principles.

- If there is not an abundance of available jobs in the economy, and particular if workers require multiple jobs, then workers can end up with zero leverage, since there will be many other desperate people willing to take their place. This is an unavoidable problem under capitalism, since low discretionary income, low purchasing power, economic downturns, increasing automation, and other similar problems, are inevitable under capitalism.
- A significant percentage of the problems experienced by employees derive from their higher-ups, such as worker abuse, nepotism, and cronyism. These problems can consequently be difficult or impossible to fully solve through negotiations no matter how much leverage an employee has. These problems would be less likely to occur in democratized businesses.
- Repeated attempts to negotiate one's salary or working conditions can irritate those being negotiated with, and even create conflicts. This can even escalate to employees being excluded from consideration for promotions, raises, bonuses, or other benefits. The fear of this alone can be enough to persuade employees to remain passive, particularly if they have a family to support. Employees may even be fired for petty reasons as a consequence. This type of work culture can also deter others from challenging or negotiating with those above them. The subtle nature of work place politics and conflicts are often impossible to prove or change, placing employees in a no-win situation.
- Unspoken forms of peer pressure can encourage conformity, and discourage workers from pursuing better personal arrangements. For example, in businesses and industries where overtime is expected, a worker may feel pressured not to complain, nor request leniency. Leaving early may mean their workload has to be picked up by colleagues, or may cause delays and crunch periods for others, leading to unspoken hostilities, tense environments, damaged relationships, and reduced workplace morale. Whatever the reason,

such complex workplace politics can make negotiating for better circumstances extremely stressful and problematic, or effectively impossible.

- If a worker is in their dream job, the fear of losing it will provide them with a strong disincentive to negotiate or speak out about issues they are facing.
- In certain competitive industries, if an employee complains or refuses to perform exploitative work, such as unpaid overtime, they can be blacklisted within the industry, potentially locking them out of all future opportunities within a field they may have spent years or decades training and working in.
- If a worker joins a union, or tries to unionize their workplace, this can further reduce their bargaining power, or result in them being fired.

Many of these issues are particularly prevalent in highly competitive and desirable industries and careers, creating fertile grounds for worker exploitation. Unfortunately financial insecurity alone can be all that is needed for workers to be taken advantage of.

Changing jobs

There are numerous reasons why changing jobs may not be a viable solution in the real-world.

- A worker may not be able to find a job that is less exploitative than the one they are currently stuck in, especially if the economy is in a downturn. This is a particular problem in certain industries, and especially monopolized industries, where exploitative practices are commonplace.
- Many workers have to sign non-compete agreements which prohibit them from working with other companies within the same industry, which are the exact companies they have the skillset for.
- Workers can sometimes feel compelled to stay in their job due to the detrimental effect that leaving could have on those they work with. This is a common experience for care and social workers.

- A worker may not have the time, energy, money, etc. to learn the skills required to take advantage of better job opportunities.
- If a worker has been unfairly blacklisted within an industry, they may not be able to find work suited to their skillset.
- Many low skilled workers are unable to afford the time or money necessary to travel to job interviews, substantially limiting their options.
- A person may be able to find a better job, but may be unable to afford the time and money necessary to commute. They may also be unable to relocate for a multitude of reasons, such as being unable to afford the cost of moving, or because their children are already at the best school, or because they and their family have to care for a loved one, or because they and their family would lose vital social safety nets, or because they and their family would have to effectively end important relationships, such as friendships and romantic relationships.
- A person may be able to find a better job, but may not have enough money to survive a period of unemployment in-between jobs.

The notion that workers can simply find less exploitative work is simply not a possibility for many in the real-world. However, the far greater problem is that even if a worker can find another job, the original exploitative job position still exist, meaning the original problem is still not solved. In this sense, the argument that employees can simply change jobs is effectively nothing more than a red herring.

Entrepreneurship

Starting a business is also not a reasonable or viable option for many workers.

- Setting up a business can be a prohibitively difficult endeavor that most workers simply do not have the desire to commit to. This life choice does not make such individuals deserving of being exploited.
- A person may not be able to come up with a viable business idea.

- A lack of time or energy can prevent even the most determined individuals from starting a business.
- If an entrepreneur has to support a family, this alone may prevent them from taking the risk of starting a business. This can also include looking after siblings and parents, which a person may have no choice over.
- A budding entrepreneur may not have the capital to start a business, nor be able to get a loan, even if their idea is tenable and could greatly benefit society.
- The high cost of living and the regular occurrence of economic downturns, brought about by the reckless actions of corporations and the financial sector, can make the risk of starting a business an unwise choice, even if the business would very likely succeed if not for these problems.
- Even if a person is able to successfully setup a business, their competitors may be able to undercut them on prices through economies of scale, or by engaging in unethical practices, forcing the new business to cut corners to stay profitable. This can include not being able to pay their workers enough, meaning the original problem continues to persist even when all those within a business wish to solve it.
- If a business venture fails, a first time entrepreneur can be set back so much that future ventures become improbable or impossible.
- Even in developed countries most startups fail, meaning entrepreneurs more often than not have no choice but to become an employee and be exploited all over again, except this time likely in a state of greater financial insecurity.
- It is fundamentally impossible for workers to solve the problem of exploitation by starting their own businesses, since if everyone owned their own business there wouldn't be anyone left to become employees. In any economy there will always be substantially more employees than employers, particularly as industries become increasingly monopolized.

These examples prove why entrepreneurship is an absurd solution for ending wide scale worker exploitation. Even if an entrepreneur does manage to overcome all of these problems, and manages to create a

business that is profitable enough to compensate their workers fairly, this may never materialize because of further power dynamics. For example, the CEO may have their job threatened by the board of directors if they place the wellbeing of their workers above the goal of maximizing profits. The board of directors in turn may also be pressured by the investors, who may be unaware or unconcerned about anything other than the businesses profitability, including the mistreatment of the workers who produce their wealth. And as wealth and power inevitably consolidate, exploitation only becomes more and more likely.

This exploitation has become so normalized that many capitalists even consider it justifiable for full-time workers of profitable businesses to earn below a living wage, particularly for low skilled or entry level jobs. This is also indefensible. First, if a full-time worker is employed it means the business considers their labor necessary, so it goes without saying that they should be paid enough to meet their basic needs. This obviously remains true regardless of how many other people could perform the same job. It's remarkable that any capitalist could think otherwise. The only exception would be if a business was not turning a profit, and everyone within the company agreed to subsist on lower wages, which is a possibility in worker cooperatives. Second, refusing to pay a living wage to essential employees while others within the company earn above a living wage is essentially placing the indulgences of some workers over the basic needs of others. This is obviously not morally justifiable. Third, many people who earn below a living wage obviously do not have the option to get a job that pays above a living wage for all the reasons previously explored, so refusing to pay them a living wage is obviously nothing more than exploitation of the vulnerable. Fourth, all businesses are aware that their workers may have children, so refusing to pay a living wage means taking the risk that the children of their employees will be unable to have all of their basic needs fulfilled, which is overtly sociopathic. Therefore, arguing that such workers should not be paid a living wage even when their business can afford to do so is both illogical and morally indefensible.

The idea that workers can simply negotiate with employers, change their job, or start a business, is obviously incredibly unrealistic. In the real-world, innumerable circumstances can diminish or entirely destroy a person's bargaining power. And if this occurs in an economic system where people must work to secure their basic needs, including the needs of loved ones, this ensures a baseline of desperation that can easily be exploited by the ownership class, particularly during economic downturns. And even if a worker does have bargaining power, they should never have required this in the first place in order to avoid being exploited. Everyone already has a fundamental human right to influence the things that affect their life, and if capitalism recognized that right then these abuses would rarely occur. The potential to take advantage of others, particularly the disadvantaged, would never exist, or would at least be minimized, in any logically designed and humane and economic system.

Conclusion

Capitalism relies upon the notion of voluntary exchange, but simultaneously makes this impossible due to power imbalances that capitalism either creates or exacerbates. The term free markets may superficially imply freedom from coercion, but these ever escalating power imbalances guarantee that workers will never be paid what they deserve, but instead only what they can negotiate within a system of gross power imbalances. The idea that these power imbalances can be mitigated through negotiating, changing jobs, or entrepreneurial endeavors, is astoundingly naïve, and completely ignores the obvious complexities of the real-world. Nor does this address the root problem that these exploitative power imbalances should never have existed in the first place, since the economy should have been democratized from the beginning. That such flawed defenses are used as a first line of defense for privatization and personal wealth begins to reveal how simplistic the arguments defending capitalism really are. All of this further demonstrates that privatization, and the way wealth is distributed under capitalism, cannot be justified.

Within the context of life **circumstances**

The previous points demonstrate that, even in a hypothetical world of total equality, capitalism guarantees a rapid descent into inequality and exploitation as a consequence of the prioritization of privatization, free markets, and profits. Unfortunately, these problems are exacerbated substantially due to naturally occurring privilege inequalities. Examples of a lack of privilege include, but are not limited to, the following.

- Being born into poverty.
- Speaking a less common first language.
- Possessing low intelligence.
- Suffering from a physical disability or illness.
- Suffering from mental or emotional problems.
- Lacking parental involvement, including the love, emotional support, discipline, guidance, etc. this comes with.
- Lacking friendships and support networks outside of the family.
- Being surrounded by bad role models.
- Having a poor-quality education.
- Being born at a more disadvantageous time of year, as evidenced by the “relative age effect”.
- Living in an unsafe or crime ridden neighborhood.
- Being a victim of discrimination, such as ageism, racism, sexism, homophobia, and transphobia.
- Lacking access to career opportunities and valuable social connections.
- Having additional responsibilities outside of one’s control, such as caring for elderly relatives.
- Suffering a traumatic life event.

Many of these circumstances also exist along the following spectrums.

- Insignificant to life-changing.
- Anticipated to unexpected.
- Existing since birth to occurring much later in life.
- Temporary to long-term.
- Avoidable to unavoidable.

Many of these life circumstances can irrevocably affect a person for the rest of their life, and limit their life choices and personal potential no matter how hard they strive. Many of these dynamics also correlate strongly with one another, and can interact, overlap, and exacerbate one another, creating exponentially greater challenges for people to overcome. This is not to devalue the virtues of hard work, nor the fact that most people can improve their lives through hard work. Nor is it to deny the existence of outliers, such as those born into abject poverty but who work their way up to become millionaires. However, a person's life choices are always heavily influenced or curtailed by circumstances outside of their control, and this is particularly true for those born in poorer countries. Many of the world's multimillionaires and billionaires would have died before adulthood had they been born in an underdeveloped country, and practically none of them would have escaped poverty. A well-designed economic system would attempt to reduce these privilege inequalities as much as possible.

However, not only does capitalism not recognize this, but it actively worsens these privilege inequalities by increasing national and international wealth and power inequality. Worse still, this consolidation of wealth and power also increases the likelihood of political corruption and the adoption of neoliberal policies, resulting in the underfunding of public infrastructures and services, which further exacerbates privilege inequalities. This corrupting interaction between political and economic institutions also exacerbates structural violence, which describes the situation where social, economic, or political, organizations and systems disempower people and prevent them from meeting their basic needs. Structural violence is therefore not merely harmful in and of itself, but the

disempowerment it causes further ensures that the world's wealth is even less likely to be fairly allocated.

Conclusion

The notion that a person's income and wealth correlate with their life choices is predominantly untrue on a national scale, and almost entirely untrue on a global scale. Personal privileges, or a lack thereof, are the primary determinants of a person's income and wealth. Despite this, capitalism is a system that is well optimized for both causing and exacerbating these privilege inequalities, because it prioritizes privatization, free markets, and profits, which guarantee the consolidation of wealth and power into the hands of the ruling class. Combined with the corrupting effect that the capitalist ruling class has on the political system, this exacerbates structural violence, which further empowers the ruling class to exploit the rest of society. All of this further demonstrates that privatization, and the way wealth is distributed under capitalism, cannot be justified.

Within the context of global economic systems

The opportunities to accumulate wealth in modern economies only exist because of immoral and unsustainable global economic systems, most of which have been proudly built under the banner of capitalism. These systems encompass all capitalist processes and infrastructures, from research and design, to mining and refining resources, to transportation and communication networks, to manufacturing and distribution, to marketing and sales, to maintenance and recycling, and all other steps in-between. All economic activity within the capitalist system can only occur because of these global economic systems, which also means it has effectively

become impossible to participate in the global economy, particularly in the developed world, without interacting with these systems.

Unfortunately all economic activity within these systems is unethical in one form or another, and always has been. These systems are unethical mostly due to externalities, which are the abusive, destructive, and unsustainable consequences of the economic activity that occurs within these global economic systems. Put another way, externalities are the costs of producing, selling, using, and disposing of a product or service that are not accounted for by businesses, and therefore are not included in prices. Externalities encompass a wide array of problems. The most obvious of these is worker exploitation, including the exploitation of child workers and slaves. Many workers are also forced to work substantially more hours than should be necessary for them to meet their basic needs, and because they are never additionally compensated for this extraneous labor, the time and work this labor entails are also externalities. Another common externality is pollution, which includes air pollutants and the toxic chemicals found in most food and water. Another externality is the degradation and destruction of numerous natural environments around the world, as well as the displacement of the natives that live there. Another externality is unsustainability, which encompasses the rapid reduction in biodiversity, the acidification of the ocean, the depletion of the Earth's freshwater sources, the acceleration of climate change, and other problems that have become so severe as to be recognized as existential threats to humanity. Another externality is the billions of animals that are abused under capitalism in order to provide cheaper goods and services.

Externalities are not minor problems, but instead constitute costs that are magnitudes greater than the prices of the goods and services that are responsible for them. For example, it has been estimated that the majority of 50 cent fast food burgers would cost approximately \$200 if their production involved zero environmental damage. This means that for every 50 cent burger, there is approximately \$200 worth of environmental damage occurring around the world to make this low price possible. If these burgers

were made entirely ethically and sustainably in all other ways, such as not involving labor exploitation or animal abuse, they would cost even more.

This price disparity exists for all consumer goods and services, particularly for more expensive products. Most electronic devices for example would cost tens, hundreds or even thousands of times more if they were made entirely ethically. All economic activity under capitalism relies upon, sustains, and grows, these essential yet unethical global economic systems. This means that ethical consumption is effectively impossible under capitalism. Even those that want to consume ethically can have tremendous problems avoiding or offsetting these problems, because of how intricate and deeply entrenched they are.

This problem is also true for interest earned on savings and investments. Businesses are only able to make such high profits because they ignore externalities. If they and their supply chains operated entirely ethically and sustainably, they would not have the profits available to offer such high dividends to their investors. This means that all dividends and all interest on all savings are immorally obtained. Put another way, this wealth is effectively acquired through theft. And perhaps the greatest problem is that this theft is invisible. It occurs out of sight, all across the world, at a billion different locations and at a billion different moments throughout these global supply chains. Incidentally, this problem is also true for most charities that invest money for the purpose of generating further funds.

Earning money under capitalism is entirely dependent on these global economic systems. This is also true for those whose economic engagement is more indirect. For example, hundreds of millions of people rely on personal electronics, the electronics of other consumers, and the entire infrastructure of the internet, to earn a living. This includes rich celebrities, such as sports and film stars, whose wealth is entirely dependent on these immorally established and maintained electronic infrastructures. Tragically, practically all

electronic devices have been created through the exploitation and inhumane treatment of tens or hundreds of millions of adults and children across the planet over the past few decades. Most of these people are either alive today, or have family members and descendants who are impoverished because of this exploitation. These electronics could likely not have been created, nor have been affordable, without such abuses. This problem applies to every person and company in the world who has ever made money using computers, the internet, or electronics of any kind. And this only accounts for electronics, which are only one component of these global economic systems.

The founders of The Xova Movement believe these essential infrastructures could best be described as “externality infrastructures”, since even though they are not externalities in and of themselves, they are infrastructures that were created with externalities. And when people and businesses make money from these externality infrastructures, they practically never pay reparations, such as through donating to charities in order to help the workers that are still alive that built these infrastructures, including the workers within the supply chains. All wealth accumulation has therefore only been possible because of global infrastructures created through decades of the worst forms of externalities, including human rights abuses, unsustainable resource exploitation, and environmental destruction. Had these immoral practices never occurred, then people around the world, particularly in underdeveloped countries, would not be living in poverty, they would not be suffering from all the problems caused by resource scarcity and environmental pollution, and their countries would all have decent internal infrastructures. It is hence illogical and morally unjustifiable for the wealthiest people and businesses under capitalism to declare their wealth their own. And this is true no matter how peripheral their engagement with the system is, because all economic activity relies upon these externality infrastructures.

These global economic systems also explain why the superrich possess so much wealth. The reason CEO’s can be paid millions of

dollars every year has nothing to do with them deserving or earning this money. Businesses can only afford to pay CEO's this much because of externalities within their businesses and supply chains, and externality infrastructures across the planet. If none of this exploitation ever occurred, and the entire economy had always been run completely ethically, the superrich would only possess a fraction of the wealth they currently do. Under capitalism however wealth will always be stolen through these global economic systems and syphoned upwards towards the wealthiest and most powerful people and organizations in the world. In other words, under capitalism the benefits are always privatized and the costs are always socialized.

Another unavoidable consequence of these capitalist externalities is that those that ignore them are the most likely to succeed. This is because they can undercut the prices of their more ethical competitors, and their larger profit margins can empower them to expand more rapidly. In other words, under capitalism, it is those that are most willing to commit the most sociopathic actions that are most likely to accumulate the greatest amount of wealth, and dominate their respective market. Under a socialist system, in which workers controlled their businesses, this would be substantially less likely to occur. This is because the majority of people in society are not sociopathic, and because businesses would not be beholden to shareholders who care about nothing but profits.

Conclusion

Externalities and externality infrastructures are not unavoidable consequences of economic activity or progress. They are the direct and deliberate consequence of increasingly wealthy and powerful capitalist businesses going to great lengths to exploit people, animals, and the environment, in order to maximize profits. And the longer that capitalism perpetuates, the greater the likelihood that the most sociopathic individuals and businesses will accumulate wealth and power. All of this further demonstrates that privatization, and the way wealth is distributed under capitalism, cannot be justified.

Within the context of public support systems

The capitalist system can only function because it exists within a framework of support systems that exist mostly outside of the capitalist private sector. These are predominantly provided, created, owned, or run, by governments, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), and volunteers.

Most notable of these public support systems are government funded public infrastructures and services. These include, but are not limited to, the following.

- Education systems
- Fire departments
- Search and rescue
- Social services
- Healthcare
- Welfare
- Law enforcement
- Legal systems
- Public prisons
- Public postal services
- Public libraries
- Public museums
- Public spaces
- Public housing
- Roads and bridges
- Railways
- Sea ports
- Airports
- Public transportation
- Electricity grids
- Telecommunication

- Water systems
- Sewage systems
- Garbage collection
- Environmental preservation
- Regulators
- Weather forecasting services
- Disaster relief
- Publically funded research
- Private sector subsidies
- The military
- Intelligence agencies

For entrepreneurs and businesses to succeed, and especially to acquire the wealth that many currently possess, the continued existence of these vast support systems is crucial. For example, public education ensures businesses can hire the experts needed to research and develop their products, while public healthcare ensures workers are healthy enough to work. An anarcho-capitalist society by contrast would never ensure that every person and business had access to these public support systems, which is why every developed country in the world is a social democracy. These public support systems also empower workers and citizens by enabling them to protest, which would not otherwise be possible since privately run businesses could simply prevent protesters from accessing essential infrastructures and services.

Despite how essential these publically funded support systems are for both individuals and businesses, most companies go to great lengths to underfund them. They do this predominantly through avoiding taxes, evading taxes, ignoring and increasing their externalities, lobbying to privatize public infrastructures and services, and using their wealth to fund the campaigns of neoliberal politicians who will inevitably refuse to spend enough money on these essential support systems. And they are willing to do this even when these essential public infrastructures and services are dangerously underfunded, and destroying the quality of life of their workers and everyone else in society. Worse still, most large businesses don't even pay enough in

taxes to cover the repair costs that they are responsible for through their use of national and international infrastructures. This is not to deny that most governments are incompetent and corrupt, and regularly waste taxpayer money. However, the despicable and greedy behavior of most corporations proves that government ineptitude is not the reason they go to great lengths to avoid supporting these public support systems.

A further consequence of this underfunding is that the rest of society has to bear this financial burden. If public support systems are underfunded, then citizens may be forced to pay higher taxes. If governments have to take on debt to compensate for underfunding, then citizens may have to pay interest on this debt via taxes. If public housing is underfunded, people may have to spend money on rent they would have otherwise avoided. If welfare is underfunded, then citizens may have to take out loans and pay interest on this debt. If healthcare is underfunded, those in need of help may have to spend money on things like dental care, eye care, medications, and therapy. If schools are underfunded, then teachers may have no choice but to use their own money to buy essential supplies for their students. And none of this even addresses the quality of life that is effectively stolen from people as a consequence of these underfunded public support systems.

Public infrastructures and services are invaluable, but so too is the work of NGO's, and the invisible labor of volunteers. These are essential for supporting the global economy, and yet under capitalism they are rarely appropriately supported. The work that charities perform is obviously invaluable for billions of people, including the workers that businesses rely upon to be profitable. In fact many workers would not have the time, health, energy, etc. to be able to work if not for charities. Volunteers obviously provide invaluable labor to charities as well, but they also provide labor in less appreciated ways, including labor that is essential for the economy to function. For example, many digital infrastructures and services, including the open source software that enables the internet to function, are provided and regularly updated by a legion of

volunteers. An innumerable number of parents sacrifice countless hours and sleepless nights to raise their children, who eventually grow up to become the next generation of workers. Regardless of the personal benefits of parenthood, those who raise children are nonetheless making a vital contribution to the economy. Despite the invaluable work of these NGO's and volunteers in supporting people and the global economy, the wealthy businesses that rely upon them usually do everything they can to avoid compensating or supporting them, and the public infrastructures and services that these NGO's and volunteers rely upon remain grossly underfunded in most countries for the same reason.

Conclusion

These public support systems enable businesses to accumulate extreme wealth, and yet they go to great lengths to ensure these support systems are underfunded or exploited, even when this harms the quality of life of the workers and volunteers that make their wealth possible. This is effectively theft, just with extra steps. This is the reason why socialists condemn capitalism for always culminating in "socialism for the rich and capitalism for the poor". This expression perfectly summarizes the fact capitalist businesses are only able to survive and prosper because of well-funded public infrastructures and services, as well as the contributions of countless NGO's and volunteers, and yet everyone else in society, including those who are responsible for the extreme wealth of these businesses, are expected to fight for survival in a ruthless system without the support they need to survive and prosper. All of this further demonstrates that privatization, and the way wealth is distributed under capitalism, cannot be justified.

The irrationality of privatization under capitalism

Central to capitalism is the belief that the means of production, including the world's raw resources, should be privately owned, rather than owned collectively by society as a whole. However, there is no logic to the idea that a special elite deserve to own and control the very means people require to survive and prosper.

The earth does not belong to anyone by default, meaning that if anyone does wish to lay claim to the earth and its resources, it must immediately be considered the common inheritance of all humans, since all humans are equal. There is no trait that any person can possess that gives them an inalienable right to confiscate the world's resources from others, or at least not disproportionately so. Many gifted individuals certainly possess the intelligence and capabilities necessary for extracting value from the Earth's resources in the most efficient and beneficial way possible, but this does not confer upon such individuals the inalienable right to confiscate these resources from others. However, because capitalism advocates for privatization, the world's resources have inevitably consolidated into the hands of a ruling class, who have used their wealth and power to exploitatively increase their wealth and power.

Worse still, privatization has never been achieved ethically. Practically all land and other resources were originally acquired through coercion, exploitation, murder, wars, pillaging, corruption, unjust laws, and all the other atrocities commonly attributed to imperialism. Consequently, the majority of assets owned by the ruling class today are the end result of centuries of the worst kinds of abuses and injustices. At no point in history have the world's resources been reallocated evenly and fairly among humanity. This is why the majority of the world's poor live in poverty, and why this will continue well into the future as long as the world is dominantly by a

system that irrationally and immorally prioritizes privatization above all else.

Socialism by contrast is a substantially superior system, because it recognizes the world's resources belong to everyone. However, under socialism these resources would not be distributed to everyone directly for practical reasons. Instead the equivalent value of all the resources that could be sustainably utilized by humanity would be calculated, and then distributed partly in the form of a Universal Basic Income (UBI), and partly in the form of public infrastructures and services. The value of these resources would also be calculated according to how rare they are. Limited and non-renewable resources would have a higher price, and resources that are plentiful and renewable would have a lower price. This UBI would also allow everyone to spend their designated wealth in the way that suits them personally, which would ensure production within the economy was still determined by market demand, or in other words aggregate consumer demand. Capitalism doesn't allow for this approach, because of its obsession with privatization. This fact alone proves how fundamentally and irreversibly broken capitalism is. Even a child could understand what has been explained here, and yet capitalist "economists" to this day have still completely failed to conceptualize or understand these very obvious first principles.

To understand how radically different capitalism and socialism are in this regard, it is worth looking specifically at housing. Under socialism, people would either receive completely free high-quality public housing, or if wealthy enough they could purchase or commission more expensive homes outright with their savings, or with money borrowed from their future UBI. And this would also hold true for many other things people take out loans for. If everyone received a UBI, and could borrow some of their future UBI for major purchases, and also had access to well-funded public infrastructures and services, then very few people today would even be in debt. Because of this, rent payments and interest payments under capitalism should be recognized as forms of theft, since they are forms of unjust wealth extraction that only exist because of

widespread privatization. Because of this, rent payments and interest payments could more accurately be described as rent extraction and interest extraction respectively. It is consequently ridiculous that so many praise capitalism precisely because of privatization, despite how obviously harmful this is to society. Very few people believe public roads and fire departments should be privatized, yet most people believe privatization should apply to a massive array of even more essential resources.

The absurdity of privatization is made even more apparent by the emergence of stock markets, which are an unavoidable consequence of privatization. The obvious problem is that stock markets allow individuals and businesses to own and trade the very things that people need for survival and prosperity. It is assumed that because investors and traders desire high returns on their investments, they can be expected to invest in companies that benefit society. The ridiculousness of this logic should barely need to be explained. Because investors and traders care only about profits, and are the furthest removed from a business's externalities, they are the least likely to care about whether or not a company, or the privatization of an asset, is beneficial to humanity. In fact profits align strongly with externalities, meaning that the most profitable businesses are usually those that exploit people, abuse animals, or inflict tremendous damage to the planet, to the greatest extent possible.

The outrageousness of this system is further evidenced by the fact that most professional stock traders make trades predominantly by analyzing chart patterns and second guessing the future actions of other traders, rather than researching the societal value, ethicalness, or sustainability, of these businesses or assets. Traders that command large amounts of assets, commonly known as "whales", often intentionally skyrocket or plunge prices as a means of liquidating other traders. In recent years trading has even devolved to the point where the majority of stock market trades are now performed automatically via algorithmic trading, in which trading bots make trades according to pattern recognition, or even news headlines in the case of more advanced AI. Algorithmic trading also

includes high frequency trading, in which trading bots automatically perform millions of trades per day. There are also a host of complex and convoluted financial mechanisms that further empower traders to maximize their wealth while providing absolutely no meaningful or intentional value to society.

The rich can also use their assets as collateral to acquire loans, which they can then invest and use to steal even more wealth from society. And none of this even addresses illegal activities like price manipulation, insider trading, and Ponzi schemes. And worst of all, many investors and traders are also responsible for causing or exacerbating economic downturns that devastate the lives of billions of people. All of these are unavoidable consequences of any economic system which prioritizes privatization, free markets, and profits. And these consequences are guaranteed to increasingly worsen as wealth inevitably consolidates into the hands of the few. If the means of production were socialized, and hence could be allocated according to the democratic will of everyone in society, then businesses and assets could be utilized to serve humanity, rather than used in abusive, destructive, and unsustainable ways, and all for the purpose of maximizing profits for the wealthiest people on the planet. Despite these overt problems, capitalists still seriously defend this childish and dangerous system of privatization, even when it devastates the economy and the lives of billions.

Conclusion

Privatization of the means of production, as well as houses, cannot be justified by any argument. Worse still, when privatization occurs within a system that also prioritizes free markets and profits, all of these resources are guaranteed to be consolidated into the hands of an increasingly small and sociopathic ruling class. In a just society, everyone would control the means of production, and everyone would decide how they are utilized or allocated. All of this further demonstrates that privatization, and the way wealth is distributed under capitalism, cannot be justified.

The irrationality of patents **under capitalism**

Under capitalism it is not only the means of production that are privately owned, but also ideas. This is similarly unjustifiable, and culminates in the same outcome of benefitting the wealthy at the expense of the masses. The obvious problem with patents is that knowledge and innovations are never created in a vacuum. All knowledge and innovations are only possible because of research conducted by billions of contributors working in various specialized fields across human history. The fruits of all of this accumulated research should be freely available for all of humanity to benefit from. Under capitalism however knowledge and innovations are unnecessarily privatized and restricted, which slows down progress, particularly in STEM fields, and artificially limits the quality of life of everyone on the planet.

Patents are made even more absurd by the fact that many patented ideas are discovered or created by creative and passionate specialists who want their contributions to benefit humanity, rather than being discovered or created by the capitalists who eventually patent their ideas. In other words, patents disproportionately benefit the ownership class, rather than those who actually discover and create them, and often for humanitarian purposes. A common counterargument is that the ownership class should be allowed to patent these ideas and financially benefit from them, since it is their wealth that is being risked in the pursuit of such progress. This is obviously a flawed argument, because privatization and wealth distribution under capitalism is unjustified. If the means of production were socially owned, then no individual would be required to risk anything. In fact this is already the case with publically funded research. It is completely illogical for capitalists to argue that the rich should be rewarded, and that progress and societal wellbeing should

be restricted by patents, because of an avoidable risk introduced by capitalism itself.

Another problem with patents is that many innovations are simply the obvious solution to novel problems, or the natural evolution of preexisting ideas. Consequently, many patents are nothing more than basic ideas held by those lucky enough to have come up with them first, rather than being a consequence of strenuous research. In fact some patents are simply the patenting of phenomenon found in nature. Other patents are the result of companies buying or combining preexisting innovations, including ones made through publically funded initiatives. Many companies also engage in evergreening, which refers to any economic, legal, or technological strategy designed to extend the lifetime of a patent. For example, pharmaceutical companies commonly engage in evergreening by making minor and insignificant alterations to their existing drugs so they can prolong their patents, which prevents others from reaping the benefits of such innovations, and all for the purpose of maximizing profits. In fact drug patents alone result in the unnecessary deaths of millions of adults and children every year, particularly in underdeveloped countries.

Conclusion

Patents are not merely irrational, but they also limit the quality of life of everyone in society and continue to be responsible for the deaths of countless people. The hard work required to discover or create a socially beneficial idea should be financially compensated, but patents predominantly exist to benefit the ruling class, and at the expense of everyone else. All of this further demonstrates that privatization, and the way wealth is distributed under capitalism, cannot be justified.

The irrationality of surplus value under capitalism

Surplus value refers to the money generated from the sale of a product or service after subtracting the costs of producing and providing that product or service. Under capitalism this surplus value is effectively stolen by the higher-ups within most businesses and distributed by them with little to no input from anyone else. This constitutes theft because it does not belong to them, which can be proven by understanding what surplus value consists of. The founders of The Xova Movement believe surplus value can more accurately be subdivided into what could be described as “democratic surplus” and “technological surplus”.

Democratic surplus is the part of surplus value that is given to businesses by consumers, when purchasing products or services, that is above and beyond the costs of producing and providing these products and services. This surplus can be called democratic because this money is given to businesses by customers democratically deciding how to spend their money. This can also be called a surplus because it is money that is given in addition to the money that covers the costs of producing and providing a product or service. This surplus belongs to a business’s consumers and to the workers within a business, and not solely to the higher-ups. It belongs to consumers because they are handing over money that is in excess of the costs of producing and providing whatever it is they paid for, which is obviously unjustified unless they receive something in return. This surplus also belongs to workers, including any higher-ups that also provide invaluable labor, because it their labor that is responsible for producing and providing all goods and services in the first place.

Under an ideal system this money would be used to fulfill the needs and wants of consumers and workers. This would include things like upgrading assets, streamlining production, and research and

development. Under capitalism democratic surplus is often used for such expenses, but rarely proportionally. Because the higher-ups have complete control of this wealth, they often give themselves financial compensation that goes far in excess of what they justifiably deserve, and they do this at the expense of spending money on things that would improve the quality of life of consumers and workers. This regularly involves giving consumers subpar products, services, and overall experiences, and not giving workers the time and resources they deserve and need in order to have a reasonable quality work life. Under capitalism businesses regularly break national and international laws, or cross clear moral boundaries, if it means they can steal more democratic surplus. This form of theft could be described as democratic surplus extraction. And none of this even addresses price gouging, in which higher-ups charge customers far in excess of a democratic surplus, or in other words they charge customers far in excess of what would be necessary to ensure that their business has what it requires to fulfill the needs and wants of consumers and workers in the future.

However, before democratic surplus can even be determined by any business, the first form of surplus value that must be calculated is "technological surplus", which refers to the value added by technology and technical knowledge during the production, distribution, and sale, of a product. Consequently, this also includes the value added by the world's infrastructures, which only exist because of technology and technical knowledge. Technological surplus belongs to all humans, because it is only through the contributions of billions of humans, across the planet and across human history, that the technology and technical knowledge necessary to create technological surplus have been made possible. Because of this, the yields of technology and technical knowledge should always have been distributed freely to everyone within society. However, because of its irrational obsession with privatization, under capitalism technological surplus is stolen by the ruling class, in what could accurately be called technological surplus extraction. The existence of technological surplus is one of the most important arguments justifying wealth redistribution, including the

funding of public infrastructures and services, and yet it remains one of the most underrepresented ideas in all of economics.

The value of technological surplus can better be understood with an example. If 200 years ago a group of inventors produced an agricultural invention that allowed 1 farmer, who previously only used very primitive tools, to produce the yields of 10 farmers, then any farmer that used this invention could not take credit for all 10 units produced with this invention. Instead they could only take credit for the 1 unit they could have otherwise produced without this piece of technology. The remaining 9 surplus units would belong to everyone in society. Once again, the reason this technological surplus belongs to everyone is because all technologies and technical knowledge are only possible because of the contributions of countless people throughout history. And the more advanced the technology, the more people throughout history will have been responsible for its eventual development. Therefore, if humanity is predominantly responsible for all innovations, then all of humanity should benefit from them.

And this is also true of infrastructures. The overwhelming majority of technologies today are only possible because of adjacent technologies that make up global infrastructures which would also not exist without the contributions of billions of people. For example, even producing, transporting, and selling, something as simple as a pencil requires numerous industries, each requiring specialized equipment and knowledge, and each relying upon countless other industries which equally rely upon specialized equipment and knowledge. The existence and utilization of all technologies, and the goods and services they provide, are only possible because of global infrastructures created by technology and technical knowledge. In other words, technological surplus exists not only because of technologies and knowledge contributed by countless specialists vertically across time, but also horizontally across the planet.

It is only reasonable then that this technological surplus be distributed equally to everyone in society. If a particular semi-

autonomous machine required the accumulative efforts of 10 million people across human history to create, and could only be built and utilized by relying upon infrastructures and technologies spread across the planet, then it would not be justifiable for the last and living person to finalize this particular iteration of this invention to receive the overwhelming majority of the wealth created by it. Obviously the inventor responsible for creating the latest iteration of any technology should be compensated for their labor, but all technological surplus should be distributed among the rest of humanity, since all technologies are only possible because of the accumulative efforts of humanity. Similarly, those who use technical knowledge to benefit the world, such as surgeons, engineers, scientists, etc. should be compensated for their hard work in learning and utilizing such complex specialized knowledge, but they cannot take credit for the knowledge itself, since it only exists because of the accumulative efforts of humanity.

If technological surplus had been distributed equally to everyone in the world, then all economically caused poverty would have been eradicated since the beginning of the agricultural revolution, and maybe even before this. The purchasing power of this technological surplus would also have increased more rapidly if technological advancements had been prioritized in areas related to essential needs, since increased efficiency would have brought down prices for essential goods and services, meaning people would have greater discretionary income and purchasing power.

Similar to the world's resources, technological surplus would be given to everyone indirectly. This could be achieved via two different ways, or a combination of both. The first would be to work out the cost of the labor that would be required to produce a product without technology, which would then constitute the monetary value of the technology surplus of this product when it is produced with technology. In other words, if a product cost \$100 to produce without technology, but only \$10 with technology, then when made with technology it would still be sold for \$100, but \$90 of this would constitute technological surplus. The combined value of the

technological surplus of all products that can be sustainably produced in an economy would then be divided equally between everyone in society in the form of a UBI and public infrastructures and services. This approach would be more complicated to implement but would also be more accurate, since in the case of the UBI every person would benefit equally, and in the case of public infrastructures and services people would benefit generally equally but not entirely, since obviously different people make use of public infrastructures and services to different extents.

The second way of distributing technological surplus would be to simply reduce the prices of products. So in the above example, the product in question would be sold for \$10 instead of \$100. This approach would be less complicated to implement, since even though both systems would require every business that uses technology to calculate the value of their technological surplus, the first system would also require governments to collect this information, which could be logistically challenging, and could even lead to overly bureaucratic systems in countries without advanced telecommunication infrastructures. That said, this second system would unavoidably be less accurate and fair, since similar to public infrastructures and services, people would not benefit equally. This is because some people purchase far more products that require more technology to produce, meaning these people would benefit disproportionately from technological surplus. For the sake of simplicity, only this second form of technological surplus distribution will be discussed for the remainder of this manifesto, even though under an ideal political and economic system the first form of technological surplus distribution would be utilized.

Technological surplus, including the equal right everyone has to this surplus, is one of the most obvious ideas in all of economics, and yet capitalism is so incredibly broken that it embraces privatization, which achieves the opposite. This is also why it is so ridiculous when capitalists condemn socialists as self-entitled freeloaders that want something for nothing. Wanting a free UBI and freely provided public infrastructures and services is not equivalent to wanting something

for nothing. This is because the something in question has always been the world's resources and technological surplus, which have always belonged to everyone. It is testament to the ubiquity and effectiveness of capitalist propaganda, and strong evidence of capitalist realism, that so many people are unaware of something so obvious.

If every country had utilized the world's resources and technological surplus appropriately over the past few decades or centuries, practically nobody in the world would be living in poverty today. If technology and economies had been streamlined, every person on the planet today would have all of their basic needs taken care of with the labor of a relatively small percentage of the world's population. It is a dismal testament to the foolishness of prioritizing privatization, free markets, and profits, that even with over a century of ongoing exponential technological progress, billions today live in poverty, and millions die every year, because they cannot meet their most basic needs. Even in developed countries, people's quality of life is pitiful compared to what it otherwise should be. In fact over the past 50-70 years, the cost of living has increased substantially, quality of life has stagnated or declined in most essential areas, and personal savings have been decimated. This is the absolute opposite of what should have been occurring, since technological advancements and productivity have been skyrocketing during this time. It is therefore absurd for the wealth created by technology to go to the small percentage of the world's population that just so happens to own the means of production, particularly considering this wealth and power consolidation is the end result of millennia of human rights abuses.

Because the world's resources and technological surplus can be used to provide everyone with a UBI and public infrastructures and services, this also negates the problem of negative and positive rights, which is a fallacious argument perpetuated by capitalists. A negative right is one which can be freely fulfilled without inherently requiring the actions of others, such as free speech and access to clean air. A positive right is one that inherently requires the actions

of others to fulfill, such as an education and healthcare. Capitalists argue that only negative rights should be guaranteed, because it is unfair to force people to provide for the positive rights of others. As should be obvious, socialist policies that ensure positive rights do not require forcing people to work against their will. The world's resources and technological surplus could always have been used to financially incentivize and compensate those who are willing to specialize and work in professions that fulfill the positive rights of others. And people have always been willing to work for money because everyone desires to improve their quality of life. Fulfilling the positive rights of others using this socialist approach has been possible for thousands of years, which further proves how incredibly primitive and irrational defenses of capitalism truly are.

To make matters even worse, businesses can also increase the amount of technological surplus and democratic surplus they can steal by coercing consumers into buying goods and services they don't need. The founders of The Xova Movement believe this practice can accurately be described as "coerced consumption". In most instances this practice acts like a multiplier effect, since these additional purchases multiply the amount of wealth that can be stolen by the ruling class via technological surplus extraction, democratic surplus extraction, price gouging, etc. The following list comprises of the most common examples of coerced consumption.

- Planned obsolescence, which occurs when products are intentionally designed and built with artificially reduced usability lifespans. This includes software updates that are intentionally designed to slow down consumer devices, such as mobile phones.
- Skimpflation, which occurs when the quality of a product is reduced while the price is maintained. Skimpflation is often a direct consequence of planned obsolescence, but can also occur without planned obsolescence being the intention.
- Encouraging consumers to purchase product insurance which should legally or ethically be covered by businesses by default.
- Refusing to give consumers the right to repair their own products or choose their own repair services, and instead force consumers to

use unnecessarily expensive repairers that favor the original business in some way.

- Perceived obsolescence, which occurs when businesses strive to convince consumers that their current possessions are out-of-date or out-of-fashion. In some instances perceived obsolescence can even make new purchases an effective necessity, such as children who know they will more likely be the target of bullying unless they keep up with current fashion trends.
- Shrinkflation, which occurs when the quantity of a product is reduced while the price is maintained.
- Businesses embracing competition, and consequently forcing consumers to unnecessarily purchase multiple yet effectively identical products or services in order to access certain content or features. For example, gamers have to purchase multiple game consoles if they want to play all games, and in many cases they also have to unnecessarily purchase multiple peripherals, such as game controllers and VR headsets, for the same reason.
- Businesses rejecting standardization, which can force consumers to purchase unnecessarily expensive products, or multiple yet effectively identical products. An example of the former would be hardware that uses unnecessarily unique designs so that consumers are forced to purchase unnecessarily expensive proprietary hardware when upgrading their original purchase. An example of the latter would be charging cables for phones and tablets, which can be different even for phones and tablets of the same generation.
- Intentionally designing products or services to be addictive. Common examples of this include medical opiates, which are unnecessarily or excessively given to those in need of medical care, and computer games, which are often designed and monetized for the purpose of exploiting both adults and children.

Conclusion

It is a testament to the sheer idiocy of capitalist “economists” that for centuries they have completely failed to formulate or understand the very obvious and simple concepts of democratic surplus and technological surplus. Marx formulated the idea of surplus value over

two and half centuries ago, and the concept of technological surplus is just as old. Democratic surplus, democratic surplus extraction, technological surplus, and technological surplus extraction, are merely our own refinements of these concepts.

If the means of production were socially owned, then technological surplus could have been used to ensure the basic needs of every person in society, and democratic surplus could have been used to further fulfill the needs and wants of consumers and workers. However, under capitalism not only are the ruling class able to steal this wealth for themselves, they have managed to multiply this theft via various forms of coerced consumption. All of this further demonstrates that privatization, and the way wealth is distributed under capitalism, cannot be justified.

The irrationality of compensation under capitalism

The problem of determining how much a worker's labor is worth is one of the more difficult challenges in economics. This is because, unlike something like the cost or quantity of physical resources, the worth of a person's labor is far more subjective. The founders of The Xova Movement believe this problem can most accurately be described as the "compensation calculation problem". The word "compensation" is more accurate than "wage", because workers can also be paid in other ways, such as bonuses and stock options. Compensation is also different to income, since compensation only relates to work, while income is a broader term that can also include things like interest on savings and rent received by landlords. Capitalists believe that theirs is the most effective and just system for determining fair compensation, but this is untrue for two main reasons. First, the amount of money that many businesses have

available to distribute to employees is grossly inflated due to various forms of theft, such as those already described.

Second, under capitalism compensation is not determined by any large-scale societal consensus, but instead through an innumerable number of individual interactions within free markets. This not only results in compensation becoming detached from any relevant metric that could be used to determine fair compensation, but wealth and power consolidation in the economy also means that compensation across professions and across the planet will unavoidably become grossly unequal over time. Worse still, under capitalism it is always those that are the most willing to behave sociopathically that are the most likely to end up with the greatest amount of power, and therefore the highest compensation packages. This explains why dangerous and inept CEO's, who work for businesses that exploit workers and destroy the planet, can be paid millions of dollars every year, while full-time essential workers may not even earn enough to live above the poverty line.

When higher-ups refuse to pay their workers fairly, and instead keep this money for themselves, this can be understood as yet another form of theft, and one that could best be described as "compensation extraction". This is different from "wage theft", which occurs when a worker is not paid the entirety of the compensation previously agreed upon, or which is guaranteed to them by law. Both compensation extraction and wage theft are pervasive problems under capitalism, even in developed countries, and these problems have obviously worsened over time as wealth and power have inevitably consolidated into the hands of those most willing to abuse others. Even though compensation extraction was obviously always inevitable under capitalism, and even though this was always going to result in gross compensation inequality, capitalists continue to spent inordinate amounts of time and energy trying to justify these obscene outcomes. The remainder of this section will explore and debunk these justifications.

One of the most common defenses of excessive compensation packages is that business owners risk their own wealth when creating or sustaining a business. This is completely nonsensical. First, it is necessary to reiterate that this argument assumes that the wealth entrepreneurs risk is rightfully theirs. Many businesses are started by millionaires and billionaires who earned their wealth unfairly through the various forms of theft already described. Alternatively they may have inherited their wealth from others who also acquired their wealth through such means. Worse still, many entrepreneurs don't risk any of their own wealth, but the wealth of investors, making their excessive compensation even more unjustifiable.

The second reason why financial risks are not a valid justification for ongoing value extraction is that, even if an entrepreneur does risk wealth they acquired morally, it is only this initial investment they are risking. Once an entrepreneur breaks even, and has also been fairly compensated for their labor, they are no longer risking their own finances, and therefore there is no risk left to compensate. The counterargument would be that they deserve additional and potentially ongoing compensation since consumers and workers benefit from the ongoing existence of the business, and the business would not exist if not for this original risk. However this is flawed because of the following reasons.

The third reason why financial risks are not a valid justification for ongoing value extraction is because financial risks shouldn't even exist. Financial risks only occur because of privatization, free markets, and the profit motive, meaning risk is effectively an unnecessary flaw introduced by capitalism itself. Under socialism ventures would be funded naturally and democratically through government run banks that provide interest-free loans. And because of increased democratization, the public could even directly vote on which projects to allocate resources to. Ventures could also be funded directly through crowdfunding, although similar to many modern forms of crowdfunding, people would not own the companies or projects they fund, since this would introduce privatization again

and all the problems that this comes with. Alternatively, business ventures could operate as offshoots of existing worker cooperatives.

Capitalism also introduces additional unnecessary risks by forcing people to work to survive. If an entrepreneur's business fails, they and their families can even end up destitute and homeless. Such risks would never have existed if everyone had access to their share of the world's resources and technological surplus. An additional risk is that businesses are more likely to fail under capitalism for a multitude of reasons. For example, the prices of the goods and services they rely upon will always be unnecessarily high, the discretionary income and purchasing power of the consumers they rely upon will always be unnecessarily low, and recessions that unnecessarily cause businesses to fail are a common occurrence under capitalism. In other words, capitalism needlessly and unjustifiably introduces the problem of risk, then unnecessarily exaggerates that risk, and then irrationally rewards people for dealing with that risk.

The fourth reason why risk is not a valid reason for ongoing value extraction is that workers also take on personal risks, but are never financially compensated like owners and investors. A worker may have to upend their family and move in order to take a job, but there is no guarantee that they won't lose their job for reasons outside of their control. A worker may have no choice but to decline a far better job offer days after accepting a job, because of contracts that wouldn't exist, or would be more lenient, under a socialist economy. Workers may unexpectedly be forced to work under new conditions mandated by the employer, including conditions which are unnecessarily physically, mentally, and emotionally taxing. In extreme cases workers may have no choice but to engage in labor which is life-threatening, or has a high chance of causing lifelong and debilitating physical or psychological harm. Workers may also experience abuse at the hands of those above them, and be less able to remediate their situation than if they were working in a more democratized organization. Despite this, workers are never compensated for these risks.

Even with regards to the risk of a business failing, employees can suffer just as much as the owners and investors. If a business has to make cut backs, it is often the workers who are the first to suffer pay cuts or job losses, even though the success of a business is often determined more by the actions of the owners than the lower workers. Most of the goodwill cultivated by a dedicated worker, including their unpaid overtime, may come to nothing when the business folds. This can potentially waste years of the workers time and energy that could have resulted in promotions and perks had the business succeeded. An entrepreneur also has the advantage of creating a business that caters to their interests, whereas many workers have no choice but to work in full-time jobs they hate, or at least have no passion for. Additionally, many entrepreneurs and investors do not risk suffering a detrimental loss in their quality of life if their businesses fail, either because they were wealthy to begin with or because they never used their own money in the first place.

So the financial risks that entrepreneurs take on only exist because of privatization, and even then these are the only risks that are ever given attention by capitalists. Workers on the other hand are rarely financially compensated for the risks they take, and they often have no choice but to suffer never-ending exploitation. It is therefore illogical to argue that entrepreneurs and investors are entitled to excessive compensation because of financial risk. And this incidentally also applies to landlords and for-profit mortgage lenders, as well as the renters and mortgage borrowers who are financially exploited for no other reason than the unnecessary privatization and commodification of an essential asset. However, unlike many businesses owners and investors, all landlords and mortgage lenders offer absolutely nothing of value to society, since under socialism what is currently offered by landlords could be provided for free, and what is currently offered by mortgage lenders could be provided for free or without interest.

Another common argument is that entrepreneurs are entitled to greater compensation because they create jobs. This is the basis of

supply-side economics. This argument is overtly untrue, because it has always been consumer demand that is most responsible for creating jobs. This is the basis of demand-side economics. A person with \$100 can create a job and hire a person to fulfill it, but that job will only exist for a few hours if there is no demand for what they are offering, or if people don't have the money to purchase what they are offering. In the long-term, businesses need consumers to purchase goods and services to stay in business, and as demand increases, businesses must hire more workers to meet that demand. Under socialism, job creation would therefore already occur naturally, since everyone in society would receive a UBI, and because everyone's discretionary income and purchasing power would be maximized. To pay entrepreneurs for creating jobs is therefore completely irrational. Entrepreneurs should certainly be fairly compensated for their labor, including the labor required to hire new workers, but to compensate them for being "job creators" has never be justified.

This point can be proven even further. Even if entrepreneurs didn't exist, and no new businesses or innovations were ever created, jobs would still be created, and everyone could still be employed, because consumers would simply spend more money on existing goods and services. This would include essentials, such as buying nutritious food, home renovations, paying off debt, etc. as well as non-essential pursuits and indulgences, such as cinema trips, dining out, massages, concerts, vacations, etc. This has always been true, since people have always been guaranteed to spend money in order to improve their quality of life. This would subsequently necessitate the creation of more jobs to meet demand. Entrepreneurs may be able to create new types of jobs through the creation of new types of businesses, but they cannot take credit for creating and sustaining jobs in and of themselves. The fact that this "job creators" argument can be refuted so easily, and yet is repeated ad nauseam as justification for worker exploitation and excessive compensation packages, reveals how shallow capitalist propaganda truly is.

In fact, rewarding business owners for creating jobs is more irrational than even this. First, business owners don't hire people as a noble

act done out of generosity. They do so in order to steal from workers and society as much wealth as possible in all the ways previously stated. Second, business owners are generally the most responsible for reducing the number of jobs in the economy. This is because their wide range of exploitative behaviors massively reduce the discretionary income and purchasing power of consumers. And because this means fewer goods and services are demanded by consumers, businesses subsequently don't need to hire as many workers. The demand-side economics idea of creating jobs by providing tax breaks for the rich and corporations is irrational and a complete waste of money for this reason. Additionally, business expenses are tax-deductible, meaning higher taxes also incentivize business owners to invest into their businesses, which nearly always entails hiring more workers. The owners of wealthy businesses also reduce the number of jobs in the economy by buying automation technologies, and subsequently keeping all technological surplus for themselves.

Third, the working class always spends a larger percentage of their income than wealthy business owners. 100 working class people can be guaranteed to spend a larger percentage of their income than 1 person with the same income as these 100 people. Wealthy business owners usually invest their money back into the economy by keeping their money with banks, but this is also true of the working class. Some wealthy business owners fund businesses directly, but this still cannot create as many jobs as this money being spend by the multitude of people whose discretionary income and purchasing power is massively reduced because of their exploitation. And even when wealthy business owners do spend money as consumers, they often use their wealth to buy expensive assets that require the existence of very few jobs comparatively, such as buying expensive vacation homes, artwork, jewelry, etc. Many wealthy individuals also make such purchases as a means of reducing their taxes. In recent history wealthy individuals have even been spending exorbitant amounts of money on completely useless Non-Fungible Tokens (NFTs), and many useless cryptocurrencies, like Bitcoin. These too create far fewer jobs compared to if this money was spent by less

wealthy consumers on traditional goods and services. So even the number of jobs that wealthy business owners create, by spending their own money outside of their business, pales in comparison to the jobs that would be created if their businesses didn't engage in all the exploitative practices that reduce the discretionary income and purchasing power of consumers.

Fourth, the jobs that exist as a consequence of business owners do not necessarily provide any value to society. This obviously includes the jobs that exist within their own businesses, but can also include the jobs within the businesses they interact with, such as accounting firms that help with tax avoidance and evasion, and advertising firms that help with public relations after their businesses are exposed for engaging in unethical behavior. For wealthy business owners, these valueless jobs also include those created as a consequence of their personal expenditure. This includes jobs involved in the production and sale of expensive cars, yachts, luxury apartments, mansions, etc. and jobs that involve servicing the wealthy at expensive cruises, luxury hotels, prestigious clubs, etc. This can also include jobs that exist to maximize the personal wealth of rich business owners, such as tax accountants, investment fund managers, and property developers that build properties just so the rich can use them as wealth generating assets. Due to there always being a limited number of workers in the world, this means this allocation of resources always comes at the expense of producing and providing goods and services that improve the quality of life of everyone else in society. It is ridiculous to compensate business owners for commissioning the construction of luxury apartments for the rich and powerful, or for buying a luxury apartment themselves, when such workers are desperately needed to build affordable homes and to repair crumbling infrastructures.

Another popular defense of excessive compensation is the influence higher-ups have on the overall direction or success of their businesses. If the decisions of an executive have a 400 times greater influence on a company than those of the lowest ranked workers, then the reasoning goes that they should receive a 400 times greater

share of the profits than those workers. This is illogical for many reasons. First, businesses can only afford to pay their higher-ups hundreds of times more than their lowest paid workers because of the various forms of theft previously described. If all businesses made their wealth entirely ethically, they would never be able to afford to pay their higher-ups hundreds of times more than their other workers. Second, many higher-ups are paid in stock options, but the prices of shares rarely reflects the societal value of a company, particularly when externalities are accounted for. Share prices are also often inflated due to capitalist problems like stock market hype, stock market bubbles, investor greed, and stock buybacks.

Third, massive organizations and projects in both the public sector and private sector are setup and run perfectly well by leaders and managers that are paid substantially less than those with excessive compensation packages within the private sector. If excessive compensation didn't exist, then those who are currently paid them wouldn't refuse to work because very few people in these positions are satisfied not working and living a subsistence lifestyle. This alone demonstrates how unnecessary excessive compensation is within the private sector. Fourth, higher-ups can receive excessive compensation and severance packages even as their company is failing as a consequence of their actions. Fifth, businesses can often succeed or fail for reasons outside of any higher-ups control, such as the decisions of others within the company, unexpected consumer trends, the actions of competitors, and unforeseeable changes in the wider economy. Sixth, the decisions made by higher-ups are based on the expertise and research of those beneath them, and yet these workers rarely receive compensation that is proportional to what their higher-ups receive.

Seventh, the labor of those at the bottom of the economic ladder is often far more essential than the labor of these higher-ups. If the COVID-19 pandemic has taught us anything, it is that the most essential workers in society are also among the lowest paid. If most business higher-ups stopped working, the economy would likely

continue to function reasonably well, or at least better than if all of the lowest paid workers in society stopped working. If all public transportation workers, grocery store workers, truck drivers, postal delivery workers, sewage workers, etc. stopped turning up for work, this would immediately crash the global economy, and the resulting pandemonium would quickly lead to mass starvation and societal breakdown. And this doesn't even address business owners who receive excessive compensation despite performing no labor of any kind and despite being fully repaid for their initial investment. It is therefore illogical to argue that higher-ups deserve excessive compensation because of the disproportionate influence they have on their businesses. Despite this, under capitalism the compensation of these higher-ups is rarely proportional to their labor and the value they contribute, nor is it proportional to the compensation of those beneath them, many of whom are even more essential to their businesses and the economy.

Another popular defense of excessive compensation is the additional stress higher-ups may experience, but this is also irrational. First, not only can all workers experience stress from work, but lower paid workers are far more likely to experience stress due to the greater threat that unemployment poses to them and their loved ones. Conversely, not only do all well-paid higher-ups never have to worry about this problem, but many of them experience no stress at all from their work life. Second, even higher-ups that do experience stress from their increased responsibilities likely only experience this stress because of capitalism. Under socialism every person in society would have their basic needs fulfilled under all circumstances, meaning that even if the higher-ups in a business failed to the extent that their business went under because of them, this would not place them or their workers in jeopardy. Third, businesses would also be far more likely to succeed under socialism because consumers would have more discretionary income and purchasing power. Fourth, workers would vote on far more decisions if businesses were democratized, which would further reduce the responsibilities and burdens of these higher-ups. In summary, the argument that higher-ups should be excessively compensated because of the stress of their

job is completely illogical, particularly considering most potential stress derives entirely from capitalism.

Another common justification for giving higher-ups excessive compensation is the belief that they are the ones responsible for creating desirable goods and services. This is also an irrational argument. First, most goods and services are only created because of the hard work of dozens or hundreds of specialists, such as professional researchers, designers, engineers, and scientists. Additionally, most of these workers are only paid while they are creating the product or service, whereas the higher-ups continue to receive compensation from these products or services for as long as they are being sold. Second, the ability to imagine new goods and services is not a justification for financial compensation. Everyone is capable of imagining goods and services that could improve the quality of life of themselves and others. In fact in a socialist society, where all ideas and feedback would be publically shared in a collaborative economy, substantially more ideas would be created and refined. Higher-ups should receive compensation for any labor they exert in bringing a product or service to market, but they should not be compensated for their ability to imagine a product or service any more than any other worker.

Another common fallacy purported by capitalists to justify excessive compensation is the trend defined by the Pareto Principle, which states that 80% of consequences come from 20% of the causes. In other words, despite all aforementioned arguments, extreme compensation inequality is justified by capitalists because of their belief that approximately 80% of all productivity is the result of approximately 20% of the workforce within any given organization or economy. According to this logic, it should therefore be expected that 20% of workers will accumulate most of the wealth under any fair economic system, and that the top 20% of this 20% will accumulate even more. Similar to every other argument presented here, productivity does not correlate enough with one's value to society to justify the excessive compensation that higher-ups receive within capitalist businesses and economies.

The first reason the Pareto Principle argument is flawed is that the wealthiest higher-ups under capitalism aren't necessarily the most productive in any meaningful way. Productivity has no correlation with providing genuine long-term value to a business or society, as previously demonstrated. Second, many higher-ups work fewer hours and are less productive than those beneath them. Third, increased productivity under capitalism usually means increased responsibility for causing externalities. In fact these externalities are often grossly immoral and done intentionally, meaning these higher-ups are often the least deserving of compensation, let alone such extreme forms of compensation. Fourth, even if productivity did correlate with one's value to a business or society, this still would not justify the extreme compensation inequality within businesses, within supply chains, and across the planet. This is because the world has a finite amount of available resources at any given time, meaning there can be no guarantee that there are enough resources in the world to meet the needs of every person on the planet while simultaneously allowing for the extravagant lifestyles of the wealthiest higher-ups in society. As Mahatma Gandhi said, "The world has enough for everyone's need, but not enough for everyone's greed." The Pareto Principle is a description of a naturally occurring phenomenon that sometimes occurs in the world, but is in no way a justification for gross compensation inequality.

Another common defense of excessive compensation is that higher-ups have unique skillsets. Workers obviously deserve financial compensation for being skilled, but the problem is that this is only true when their labor is socially valuable, which is not a correlation that exists under capitalism. Many highly educated and experienced higher-ups are responsible for the worst externalities imaginable, and many are also often responsible for bankrupting their own businesses. Worse still, research has shown that under capitalism the highest paid higher-ups are actually less skilled than their lower paid peers. Recent research has shown that the highest paid CEOs generally perform worse than lower paid CEOs, and that experienced CEOs perform worse than those without CEO experience or with less

recent CEO experience. Under capitalism many highly skilled workers also receive substantially less compensation than their higher-ups who are substantially less skilled or qualified for their job, and who are of substantially less value to their business or society.

Another argument for excessive compensation is that higher-ups generally work harder than everyone else. This is a ridiculous argument. Research has proven the already well known phenomenon that there is a negative correlation between hours worked and worker compensation, and that this is true both between countries and within countries. Additionally, it is common knowledge that those at the bottom of the economic ladder generally perform the greatest amount of physical labor. In fact, not only is it extremely common for manual laborers to experience physical exhaustion and pain during the course of their work, but many even develop lifelong physical ailments, disabilities, and chronic pain, which starts developing in their 20's and 30's. Higher-ups by contrast are nowhere near the hardest workers in society. In fact, if the highest paid jobs in society were also the most difficult, such as care work, sewage work, or coal mining, most current higher-ups would still likely choose far less challenging professions even if this meant less compensation. Despite this, many capitalists still argue that such higher-ups are the hardest working people in society, and therefore deserve to be among the most highly compensated workers in society.

Even when entrepreneurs in particular have to work exceptionally hard to setup their businesses, such hardships are not deserving of additional financial compensation because they only exist because of capitalism. First, in a socialist economy, most entrepreneurial ideas could simply be researched and developed within preexisting worker cooperatives, which would already have the infrastructure, tools, and human capital, necessary to bring such ideas to fruition. Second, if an entrepreneur did decide to setup an entirely new business, they could be loaned the necessary startup capital from socialist government run banks, none of which would require repayment, let alone with interest. This would make the process of setting up a business substantially easier. Third, the safety net of a UBI would

free up workers to easily join new businesses, which combined with the support of adjacent businesses, would ensure most entrepreneurs would have the workers and support necessary to minimize the hardships of creating a business. In summary, setting up businesses is predominantly difficult because capitalism makes it difficult. It is therefore only rational for entrepreneurs to be compensated for their labor, and not for the difficulties that only come with setting up a business under capitalism. Just like so many other issues, capitalism creates a problem, and then financially compensates people for dealing with that problem.

The most ridiculous aspect of all of these illogical capitalist arguments regarding worker compensation is the fact that compensation was always easy to determine, at least at the theoretical level. Worker compensation should always have been determined first according to value, and second according to difficulty. Value in this context effectively refers to how essential a worker's labor is to society. Value would generally increase as a consequence of a worker's education, experience, skill level, and the rarity of their capabilities, although rarity could be avoided in most cases by providing financial incentives to those willing to develop such capabilities. Difficulty in this context refers to how physically, mentally, and emotionally taxing, satisfying, challenging, or hazardous, a worker's labor is. Difficulty in this context also refers to how difficult this labor would be for an average person to perform, since obviously someone who is highly proficient at their job, due to years or decades of education and experience, may find their work relatively easy.

Under this system the compensation of higher-ups would always have been less than the compensation of coal miners, since if their compensation was equal, very few higher-ups would willingly become a coal miner considering how exhausting and physically harmful such labor can be. So in summary, in spite of what capitalist arguments may lead people to believe, it is actually relatively easy to determine worker compensation. Despite this, capitalism is a system that utterly fails to determine compensation according to these metrics.

Conclusion

It was obvious even thousands of years ago that worker compensation should always have been determined according to value and difficulty. Under capitalism however worker compensation was never going to be determined according to these metrics, because capitalism is neither a planned nor democratic economic system. Instead compensation is determined through an innumerable number of free market interactions all occurring within a system that prioritizes privatization and profits, which in practice was always going to guarantee that compensation would be determined primarily by those that just happened to have the most wealth and power. Not only was this always going to result in grossly unjustifiable compensation outcomes, but this problem was obviously going to worsen as wealth and power predictably consolidated into the hands of those most willing to behave sociopathically.

Despite these obvious problems, capitalists have nonetheless attempted to post-hoc rationalize these grossly unjustifiable compensation outcomes by using irrational arguments like financial risk, "job creation", influence, responsibility, and the Pareto Principle. And even when value and difficulty are recognized as appropriate metrics, capitalists still fail to recognize that their system is fundamentally incapable of appropriately applying these metrics. Worse still, capitalists have even resorted to using vague and manipulative non-sequiturs to justify the most egregious forms of exploitation, such as multibillion dollar corporations who refuse to pay their workers enough to escape poverty and death. The widespread idea that the needs of essential workers, and the children they potentially provide for, are less important than the indulgences of extremely wealthy higher-ups, is strong evidence of capitalism's power to indoctrinate people with illogical and immoral beliefs. And none of this even addresses the fact that businesses can only afford to give their higher-ups such excessive compensation packages in the first place because of numerous forms of theft, including the most immoral externalities in existence. All of this further demonstrates that privatization, and the way wealth is distributed under capitalism, cannot be justified.

The irrationality of money **under capitalism**

In addition to money being irrationally distributed under capitalism, even the concept of money has been made irrational under capitalism. Money was originally created as a socially accepted proxy for the value of goods and services. So instead of goods and services being valued against one another, they could instead be measured according to a singular common metric. This is both logical and ideal from a theoretical perspective, but for most of human civilization this has not materialized in the real-world, and under capitalism this problem has only worsened. This is because even at the theoretical level, money was always guaranteed to be nothing more than an abstraction under capitalism, or in other words a figment of society's collective imagination. Most money under capitalism is what Karl Marx described as "fictitious capital", or in other words money that is not representative of tangible assets. This is distinct from "real capital", which includes physical assets and workers, and "money capital", which is representative of physical assets and labor.

Approximately 97% of all money in the world is fictitious capital. This is predominantly a consequence of fractional reserve banking, in which banks are allowed to lend out, and subsequently profit from, magnitudes more money than they actually hold in reserve. Worse still, because this fictitious money can also be deposited in other banks, this money can also be lent out many times over, creating an escalating feedback loop which exacerbates this fictitious capital problem even further. This type of lending wouldn't be a problem if done in moderation and in a controlled fashion, since in a socialist economy the same thing would effectively occur any time someone borrowed some of their future UBI, which would be possible, justifiable, and sustainable, if done correctly. However, because fictitious capital under capitalism is created in excess and without any form of economic planning, it creates an economic paradox,

since it is inevitable that financial institutions will lend out more money than can ever be repaid.

The first reason is because it is impossible to achieve endless growth in a system of finite resources. The Earth does not have enough physical resources, particularly rare minerals, to create the products that would need to be sold and profited from in order to pay back all current and future loans. The only remaining means of generating income would subsequently be performing labor. This is also unfeasible because of the second reason, which is that all jobs will become automated in the future. Even within the next few years millions of workers will become permanently unemployable, and within a few decades all jobs will be performed by machines and AI. In other words, all money currently being created by financial institutions not only constitutes fictitious capital, because it is not representative of actual economic resources, but worst still it will also never be representative of actual economic resources at any point in the future, because there will never be enough physical resources and human labor in the future for this fictitious capital to represent.

This type of fictitious capital consequently makes the global economy entirely unsustainable, because there will never be enough physical resources created and sold, and there will never be enough human labor performed and compensated, to pay back the loans that are only made possible because of fictitious capital. Because of this, the founders of The Xova Movement believe this type of money could be accurately referred to as "unsustainable fictitious capital". This is distinct from "sustainable fictitious capital", which under socialism would constitute money that enters the economy in the form of loans, but which is capable of being paid back in the future. This is because it would be representative of a person's future UBI, and because a UBI would be representative of the world's resources that can be sustainably utilized, sustainable fictitious capital would therefore also be entirely sustainable. The fact that fictitious capital created under capitalism is unsustainable is not by accident, but a direct consequence of the ruling class attempting to maximize their own wealth with complete disregard for anything or anyone else. This

means that unsustainable fictitious capital, as it manifests under capitalism, is also another way that the ruling class acquires wealth that is not justifiably theirs.

To make matters worse, monumental amounts of unsustainable fictitious capital is regularly wiped out by devastating recessions caused by the ruling class. This further proves how money under capitalism is not representative of anything meaningful, which completely defeats the purpose of money. So not only is fictitious capital under capitalism completely unsustainable because it is created recklessly without any form of economic planning, but some percentage of it is also regularly destroyed recklessly without any form of economic planning. This destruction of unsustainable fictitious capital doesn't come anywhere near close enough to reverse the problem of its unsustainability, but instead only serves to destroy the lives of the lower classes, and further enrich certain members of the ruling class.

The advent of cryptocurrencies has further compounded the absurdity of money within the capitalist system. Many traders and investors in cryptocurrencies have become superrich within a few short years, allowing them to spend this money even though it is not representative of anything tangible within the economy. Consequently these traders can earn more in one year than the majority of workers, who provide invaluable labor to society, earn in a lifetime, and can then spend this money and make the world even more unsustainable. Additionally, much of this wealth has gone missing from the economy, predominantly because owners have forgotten the codes and passwords required to access their cryptocurrencies. It has been estimated that about 20% of all Bitcoins have already been lost, which at time of writing amounts to over \$260 billion. And Bitcoin only represents about half of the cryptocurrency market.

Despite the incredible magnitude of these problems, an even greater problem caused by money under capitalism has been the bizarre and incorrect conceptualization of national debt. First, if the world's

resources and technological surplus had been distributed evenly among the global population, then most nations would never have needed to take on loans and accrue debt in the first place. This makes the debt of underdeveloped countries particularly obscene, since not only have they been plunged into poverty through centuries of capitalist imperialism, but they now have to pay interest on debt that they should never have required. And this argument is also true for personal debt, since if everyone received their share of the world's resources and technological surplus, no one would have ever needed to get into debt in order to meet their essential needs, and fewer people would likely be in debt from purchasing non-essential goods and services, since everyone would have more discretionary income.

The second incorrect conceptualization of national debt is when this debt is created as a result of quantitative easing or printing money. Despite its stigma, creating money from nothing is absolutely essential in any economy. This is because money is a necessary proxy for representing the Earth's physical resources, and because new resources are always being discovered, mined, grown, and utilized, new money has always needed to be created. Money should obviously be tradable for labor, and for the physical goods that are made from the Earth's physical resources, but money itself should have only ever been representative of the Earth's physical resources, in order to ensure the Earth's resources are utilized sustainably.

The problem therefore has never been that governments can effectively create money from nothing. The first problem is that money created under capitalism is often unsustainable fictitious capital, since not only is it never created to be a proxy for physical resources, but the amount of money created always far exceeds the world's resources that this money should represent. The second problem is that money under capitalism is never taken out of circulation once resources are utilized, which is exactly what should happen if money represented resources. Both of these problems mean that in practice more physical resources end up being utilized than is sustainable. If the masses did not suffer from the economic

illiteracy that capitalism always causes, they would realize that unsustainability, and not “national debt”, is the actual problem with creating money under capitalism. Creating money does not create national debt, but is instead an essential part of any economy.

This situation demonstrates how unimaginably broken capitalism truly is. In an economic system that was even slightly competently designed, money would be created by governments sustainably, and would operate as a tool for allocating and utilizing the world’s resources, or more specifically labor and the means of production. In other words, governments would use this money to sustainably and perpetually fund a UBI and public infrastructures and services. This has always been the most logical way of funding governments and maintaining a strong economy, compared to taxes which have always been a woefully inadequate solution by comparison. Even under capitalism this is ideal, since modern democratic governments have proven themselves to be far superior to free markets at fulfilling the basic needs of everyone in society. However, this is prevented under capitalism for three main reasons. First, many governments can’t produce their own money. Second, many economically illiterate politicians refuse to do so, even when they can, because of their irrational fear of “national debt”. Third, even when governments do create their own money, this often causes inflation, which is a problem under capitalism but is avoided under democratic socialism.

This incredibly economically illiterate understanding of the nature of money has created a ridiculous situation where capitalist economies are unable to effectively allocate resources, even though this is the primary goal of money within every economy. To put this another way, money is imaginary, while physical resources are real, and yet these resources cannot be allocated to meet people’s needs because of what is effectively a figment of society’s collective imagination. The absurdity of this problem cannot be overstated. Preventing resources from being allocated to where they need to be allocated, because of the proxy used to represent these resources, is quite possibly the stupidest manmade problem in all of human history. This alone proves how astonishingly broken capitalism truly is.

Conclusion

Money under capitalism has little resemblance to its intended purpose or potential. Because of privatization, wealth and power will always become increasingly consolidated under capitalism, which ensures money will always inevitably be produced and allocated for the benefit of the ruling class. And because capitalism prioritizes unplanned free markets, the creation of money will always produce unsustainable outcomes. Worse still, under capitalism governments are unable to produce the money that is required to allocate the world's resources effectively. All of this further demonstrates that privatization, and the way wealth is distributed under capitalism, cannot be justified.

Part 1: Privatization and personal wealth: Conclusion

Under capitalism, the allocation of the means of production and wealth is completely illogical, and was obviously always going to result in terribly unjust outcomes. Gross power imbalances within businesses and free markets ensure that workers don't have control over the fruits of their labor. The resulting unjustified income and wealth inequalities were always guaranteed to be exacerbated by personal life circumstances that culminate in privilege inequalities, which are not appropriately accommodated for under capitalism. Over time these two problems are also exacerbated by the corrupting effect the capitalist ruling class has within political systems, which also exacerbates structural violence. The three problems of power imbalances, privilege inequalities, and structural violence, provide the personal and environmental conditions necessary for the ruling class to engage in various forms of theft, namely in the form of privatization, rent extraction, interest extraction, technological surplus extraction, democratic surplus extraction, compensation

extraction, wage theft, price gouging, coerced consumption, externalities, externality infrastructures, tax evasion, unethical tax avoidance, underfunded support systems, and unsustainable fictitious capital. These are predictable consequences of capitalism, and were obviously always going to result in the means of production and the world's wealth increasingly consolidating into the hands of the ruling class.

There is even a strong case to be made that there is a negative correlation between one's wealth and the value one contributes to society. The wealthiest under capitalism are generally those that are the most sociopathic in nature, since these are the people that are most likely to engage in the various forms of theft previously described, which invariably involve the abuse of humans and animals, and the destruction of the planet. Conversely, the most vital workers in society, such as teachers and nurses, are often paid dismally by comparison, while volunteers and parents, who make vital contributions to society, are not even given a UBI. Even most unemployed and homeless drug addicts do not abuse humans and animals, nor do they cause significant environmental damage. So instead of capitalism being a meritocracy, it is more often than not the opposite. This problem is what the founders of The Xova Movement have decided to call the "inverse compensation problem", since under capitalism there will always be a general negative correlation between one's compensation and the value and difficulty of one's labor, which have always been the only sensible metrics for determining compensation.

This is why the claim that taxation is theft is so hypocritical and nonsensical. First, under capitalism practically all wealth is derived through theft. Second, taxes are justified when the revenue from those taxes is applied appropriately, because they can reduce or reverse capitalism's flaws. For example, taxes can be used to redistribute wealth, fulfill the basic needs of all adults and children, build essential infrastructures, regulate businesses, and offset certain externalities. Some capitalists even try to argue that businesses and the wealthy only try to avoid and evade taxes because taxes are too

high, or because of government incompetence. This is obviously ridiculous, since the majority of the ruling class will always try to maximize profits and their personal wealth regardless of what governments do. If this wasn't true then most businesses and wealthy individuals would use most of their wealth to offset their externalities and help the poor.

The argument that taxation is tantamount to theft also highlights one of the greatest ironies of capitalism. One of the most prominent criticisms that capitalists direct against socialism is the notion that it involves giving people "free stuff". Not only is "free stuff" justified, since the world's resources and technological surplus belong to everyone, but the wealth and quality of life that capitalism affords the richest people in society is entirely due to "free stuff" in the form of theft. To argue that the superrich are entitled to their wealth is flagrantly absurd and deceitful, since the majority of the forms of theft previously described have always been widely known. The hypocrisy of superrich capitalists, who declare that they deserve to own the means of production, and who declare that their wealth is rightfully their own, is almost too extreme to put into words.

Socialism can obviously never be perfect, because humans will never be perfect, but it is clearly the superior economic system with regards to privatization and personal wealth. Under socialism the means of production are socially owned rather than privately owned, which means the various forms of theft previously described are far less likely to occur, and profits are no longer prioritized above all else. This is because most people in society are not sociopathic, and because under socialism workers would not be coerced by a board of directors and private investors. Combined with economic planning, this also means that compensation could be determined by the metrics of value and difficulty, and that everyone could receive their fair share of the world's resources and technological surplus in the form of a UBI and public infrastructures and services. All of this means that ownership of the means of production, and distribution of the world's wealth, would be determined according to logic and morality, rather than the desires of the ruling class.

PART 2: THE **SYSTEM**

Capitalists believe that theirs is the best system for ensuring the highest quality of life for everyone in society. However, as will become increasingly clear, capitalism is incapable of achieving this because it is an overtly broken and contradictory system. The only reason the masses are not aware of this is because of the widespread propagation of capitalist propaganda. This section will demonstrate that all arguments defending the capitalist system are flawed even at the theoretical level, and that this is primarily because of capitalism's unavoidable consequences.

“Capitalism prioritizes profits **because this benefits** **everyone”**

Instead of prioritizing everyone's needs and wants directly, capitalists argue that prioritizing profits above all else is the best way to create a just and prosperous world, in which everyone's needs and wants are fulfilled, and in the most effective and efficient way possible. The problem with this view is that it ignores how the consequences of such a system inevitably creates a “hierarchy of priorities” that is detrimental to society as a whole. This hierarchy can broadly be divided into three tiers.

Tier 1: Profits

Tier 2: Consumers

Tier 3: Externalities

Profits are not prioritized under capitalism because it benefits everyone in society, but because this is necessary for businesses to survive and prosper in a competitive free market, and for the ruling class to maximize their wealth. The livelihoods of business owners and workers are always at risk under capitalism, necessitating that even businesses wishing to operate ethically must prioritize profits in most cases. Workers can desire their businesses to make a profit in cases where they too will benefit, although this is not the case for most workers under capitalism.

Consumers are a secondary priority because they are the principle means by which profits are generated, although even then many consumers are ignored or deprioritized if they are not wealthy enough. However, once an industry has been predominantly monopolized, or dominated by cartels, the concerns of all consumers within that market can largely be disregarded. Additionally, many financial investors predominantly generate profits by manipulating the market via financial instruments and mechanisms, and so consumers are not even a secondary priority for such profiteers.

Externalities effectively cover everything else within society that is affected by economic activity that is not accounted for by businesses. However, if the wellbeing of consumers can effectively be disregarded by businesses, then the negative consequences inflicted upon consumers can also be recognized as externalities. Externalities will nearly always be maximized under capitalism because addressing them is costly, meaning addressing them will always come at the expense of profits and consumers.

Tier 1: Profits

The prioritization of profits within an economic system that also prioritizes privatization and free markets effectively guarantees

certain outcomes. These can broadly be summarized as the consolidation of wealth and power into the hands of the most unethical businesses within an economy, and the eventual monopolization that this consolidation can be guaranteed to give rise to. The following is a detailed summary of why this occurs.

- Unethical businesses attempt to maximize their profits via exploitation at every stage of the supply chain. This namely involves the exploitation of workers, animals, and the environment. Ethical businesses conversely have higher costs, meaning higher prices, placing them at an innate disadvantage.
- Unethical businesses are better able to attract investors, since they can ensure higher returns on investment. Therefore it is these businesses that are most likely to receive startup capital, or be able to expand their operations.
- Unethical businesses often pay their workers the bare minimum possible, and do so in the knowledge that the resulting poor consumer base will have even less discretionary income, and thus may have little choice but to purchase the affordable yet unethical goods and services they provide.
- Unethical businesses often underpay their workers and overcharge consumers, which can prevent workers from accruing savings, and consequently make it difficult or impossible for them to go on strike.
- Large businesses can afford to spend money protecting and improving their public image. This can obviously include traditional advertising, but can also include donating to charities and other organizations to encourage or bribe them to avoid criticizing them in the future. Many businesses also spend a nominal amount of money on ethical or environmental initiatives, and then spend hundreds or thousands of times this amount advertising this.
- Large businesses are better able to increase their market visibility, namely through marketing, but also by having more stores or products on shelves.
- Large businesses are able to invest more into research and development.
- Large businesses have larger consumer bases, meaning they have more data available for refining their goods and services.

- Large businesses can sometimes use their profits to buy-back their own stocks, which artificially inflates the value of these businesses.
- Large businesses can sell their products for a loss in order to undercut and eventually bankrupt their competitors. This is called anti-competitive pricing.
- Large businesses may be able to buyout the means of production within their supply chains. This can reduce their costs substantially, and give them an opportunity to exploit competitors who also use these supply chains, providing them an even greater advantage over their competitors. The practice of buying out businesses lower down or higher up a supply chain is called "vertical integration".
- Large businesses can merge with or buyout their competitors, including engaging in hostile takeovers, giving them greater market share, and making it even more difficult for new competitors to come to market. They can also hire the workers and purchase the equipment of competitors that have gone under. The practice of buying out competitors is called "horizontal integration".
- Large businesses can benefit from economic downturns and recessions in the long-term. Not only are they more likely to out survive their smaller competitors, but they can buy out their competitors once they are weakened.
- Large businesses, unlike worker cooperatives, can often easily fire employees in order to maximize their profits, giving them an advantage over smaller or ethical businesses.
- Large businesses and industries can dominate their respective markets to such an extent that boycotts against them become impractical or impossible.
- Large businesses are more likely to be able to monopolize industries, which can subsequently make it unfeasible for potential competitors to enter the market, particularly if they plan to operate ethically. When barriers to entry become so high that it effectively becomes impossible for competitors to enter a market, this is called a "natural monopoly".
- Large businesses can increase the prices of their goods and services once they have monopolized a market, further increasing their wealth and power. This is particularly true for essential non-elastic goods.

- Large businesses that have monopolized the market can exploit those within their supply chains who have no choice but to sell through them. For example, large businesses can threaten to move their operations elsewhere as a means of coercing these businesses into giving them unreasonable discounts.
- Large businesses can afford to move some of their operations overseas to countries that have cheaper labor and lax regulations, given them an advantage over smaller or ethical businesses.
- Large businesses in deadlock with each other may form cartels to conspire against consumers for mutual gain. This most commonly manifests as price gouging.
- Large businesses may artificially create scarcity to increase demand, in order to keep prices as high as possible, which can be more profitable under certain circumstances.
- Large businesses can afford to buy larger quantities of supplies and store them for later use, which can be cheaper than buying them at a later date when the price is higher due to inflation. This can also put their smaller competitors at a major disadvantage when there are supply chain shortages.
- Large businesses can take advantage of economies of scale, such as being able to purchase commodities at a discount by buying them in large quantities.
- Large businesses in newer industries can possess the wealth and influence necessary to create and fund their own industry regulators before the government can step in. These regulators are nearly always designed to be as ineffective as these businesses can get away with.
- Large businesses can engage in planned obsolescence so that their products break or become obsolete soon after their warranty has expired, ensuring future profits via further warranties, repairs, repurchases, and upgrades.
- Large businesses can afford to patent their many innovations, even if those innovations are markedly obvious solutions or immoral in some other way. Other businesses may either have to work without these innovations, pay the patent holders for using these innovations, or spend time, energy, money, etc. creating alternative solutions.

- Large businesses can hire the experts necessary to avoid and evade taxes.
- Large businesses are more likely to possess the power to harass, imprison, torture, or murder, those who try to stop their unethical practices. This is especially true for protestors and union leaders in underdeveloped countries.
- Large businesses are more likely to pursue risky or immoral endeavors because the higher-ups and the business itself can afford the legal teams necessary to avoid being convicted if prosecuted. If governments are underfunded as a consequence of capitalism then they can also lack the funds necessary to go after such businesses. When these businesses are taken to court by groups with limited finances, these businesses can prolong proceedings with illegitimate technicalities until the prosecuting party runs out of money.
- Large businesses can bring a litany of false or petty lawsuits against smaller businesses, causing them to go bankrupt, or at least suffer from considerable financial strain and psychological stress.
- Large businesses can save money by investing in automation technologies. This can also make worker strikes less and less likely to occur or be effective as time progresses.

The following is a brief summary of the negative consequences that are the fault of governments.

- Large businesses are more likely to have the wealth, power, and connections, necessary to lobby or bribe politicians.
- Large businesses are often given tax breaks and other incentives by governments for moving to particular regions or countries, giving them a further advantage over their competitors.
- Large businesses have the funds necessary to influence or bribe government run industry regulators.

The prioritization of profits within capitalist free markets effectively guarantees all of these consequences. The claim peddled by capitalists that problems like monopolies, cartels, nepotism, cronyism, exploitation, destruction, unsustainability, etc. would never occur if only governments stopped interfering is obviously absurd. It

ignores the complex consequences of capitalism in favor of an idealized conceptualization of how capitalists want their system to work. This conclusion is further supported by the law of increasing entropy, which effectively describes the tendency of the physical world to move towards states of increasing disorder. By using computer models to simulate different economic models, research has shown that the law of increasing entropy guarantees that capitalist free markets will always move towards the ever increasing consolidation of wealth and power, which obviously from a human perspective effectively describes a state of increasing disorder.

It is also self-evident that governments are only partially responsible for reducing competition and exacerbating the creation of monopolies. And this only occurs when governments are corrupt, which can easily be averted with a number of safeguards, such as highly educated populations, well-financed independent journalists, fitness-for-duty tests for political candidates, democratically initiated spontaneous elections, optimally democratic voting systems, strong anticorruption measures, democratized economic institutions, and the fulfillment of everyone's basic needs. It has obviously never been ideal to substantially reduce or entirely eradicate the role of governments in society, and to leave the fulfillment of everyone's needs and wants to capitalist free markets, which is what neoliberals and libertarians advocate for, and what capitalism always leads to. In fact the greatest problem with governments under capitalism is that they were always far more likely to become corrupt, and work against the interest of the majority of society, because of the ever increasing wealth and power that capitalist businesses and industries were always inevitably going to acquire.

Tier 2: Consumers

A consequence of capitalist businesses prioritizing the desires of consumers, combined with many other problems that are guaranteed under capitalism, is that externalities are far more likely to occur. There are a number of reasons for this, most of which prevent consumers from making informed choices or consuming ethically.

- Zero information. There may not yet exist information regarding the long term consequences of particular goods or services on the market. For example, the chemicals used in the production of certain products may be harmful to people, animals, or the environment, although there may not yet be enough research or data to determine this. However, because capitalist businesses prioritize profits above all else, they rarely err on the side of caution.
- Unavailable information. Businesses often go to great lengths to hide important information from the public if they believe this could affect their profits.
- Intentional misinformation. Consumers may perform extensive research into products and companies, but may come to invalid conclusions because of lies propagated by businesses and industries. This can also occur as a consequence of underfunded or corrupt regulators, or paid reviews on consumer websites.
- Intentional obfuscation. Businesses may provide consumers with all the information necessary to make an informed decision, but may deliberately mislead consumers through deceptive tactics. For example, companies have been known to rebrand ingredients in their products, requiring extra research on behalf of consumers to understand what would otherwise have been self-evident.
- Esoteric knowledge. Information may exist regarding the unethical nature of goods, services, or businesses, but may require an unreasonable amount of specialist knowledge to understand.
- Poor literacy. Some consumers may not have the literacy skills necessary to read, research, or understand, important information related to goods, services, and businesses.
- Practical restrictions. Consumers may not have the time or energy necessary to research goods, services, and businesses, let alone their incredibly complex supply chains.
- Poor memory. A person may make a conscious decision to consume more ethically after becoming aware of an issue, but then simply forget about their new resolution soon afterwards.
- Irrational thinking. Many people are susceptible to reaching fallacious conclusions even when they have access to all necessary information.

- Poor comprehension. A person may have robust reasoning skills but be unable to treat information with an appropriate level of gravity and seriousness. For example, many people only stop eating meat after seeing footage of animal abuse within the farming industry, even if they were already aware of this abuse beforehand through non-visual or less explicit means.
- Bystander effect. People may be fully aware of an issue related to consumerism, but take no responsibility for their contribution to this issue because of the false assumption that others will address it, such as governments, regulators, NGOs, and other citizens.
- Prisoners dilemma. Consumers are often unwilling to consume ethically because doing so can incur a great cost to themselves, while achieving no meaningful changes in the broader economy because other consumers refuse to do likewise.
- Personal selfishness. There are many consumers who possess the knowledge and ability to consume ethically, and know or believe that doing so will achieve positive outcomes, but are simply too selfish to modify their lifestyle or make sacrifices.
- No alternatives. A person may wish to consume ethically, but ethical alternatives may simply not exist. This additionally can make boycotting companies impossible when the goods and services they provide are necessities, like food, health products, and utilities.
- Low availability. Certain ethical goods or services may exist but may suffer from limited availability.
- Poor finances. Consumers may desire to consume ethically, but may be unable to afford this lifestyle. This is partly because people always have reduced discretionary income and purchasing power under capitalism, but also because consuming ethically is effectively always more expensive. This is mostly because ethical goods and services are more costly to produce and provide, but also because the rarity of ethical goods can make it necessary to purchase them online or from abroad, which can make them prohibitively expensive due to shipping costs and import taxes.
- Decreasing motivation. Combined with the traditional stressors of modern life, people often struggle to remain motivated to consume ethically when the majority of society remains apathetic. The unconventionality of ethical consumerism can even attract derision,

fueling feelings of isolation and lethargy. This is a sentiment often expressed by vegans who struggle against societal apathy towards animal cruelty.

People have limited power as workers to hold businesses to account, which means the greatest power people possess to address externalities exists within their role as consumers. However, despite what capitalists like to claim, consumers are an atrocious safeguard against externalities. Not only are consumers not rational actors, but even when consumers do try to consume ethically this can be impossible, as expressed by the popular adage "there is no such thing as ethical consumption under capitalism". Consumers "voting with their wallets" was obviously always such an incredibly precarious, indirect, and slow way of holding businesses to account that it's astounding capitalists ever attempted to make this argument.

This is mostly not the fault of consumers though. In fact it is ludicrous that the burden of ethical consumption was ever placed on consumers in the first place. A half competent economic system would ensure all goods and services were ethical by default. Even under capitalism this is mostly achieved not by consumers, but by governments, and particularly their laws and regulators. The ideal system would obviously be a socialist system, in which all political and economic organizations and systems are optimally democratic. This is because most people in society are not sociopathic, unlike most CEO's and directors who either are sociopathic, or are forced to behave sociopathically in order to appease shareholders. Ethical consumerism is therefore a grossly ineffective system for preventing or offsetting externalities. It is only when people are able to consciously vote directly on issues and for political candidates, without being clouded by immediate consumer desires and without experiencing all of the problems previously mentioned, that externalities can be adequately addressed.

Tier 3: Externalities

The prioritization of profits and consumers under capitalism guarantees that everything else in society will either be ignored or exploited. These externalities include a multitude of problems, but can be loosely organized into a few categories.

- Adults and children, and mostly outside of their roles as consumers.
- Pollution of water, air, and land.
- Environmental destruction.
- Long-term sustainability.
- Animals, both within industries and within nature.
- Future generations, who will inherit fewer resources and the burden of dealing with these problems.

These externalities cause suffering either by affecting humans and animals directly, or by forcing humans to waste time, energy, money, etc. on addressing them. Worse still, these externalities are substantially more costly to address than preventing them from occurring in the first place. For example, the costs of safely storing toxic waste are substantially lower than the costs of cleaning up and storing toxic waste.

Conclusion

Capitalism will always culminate in all of these disastrous outcomes, because they are an unavoidable consequence of any system that prioritizes profits first and consumers second. Capitalists like to argue that the consolidation of wealth and power, and the inevitable monopolies that result from this, are either not a problem, or can be blamed on government interference. Both of these arguments are patently absurd. Capitalists also like to argue that the best outcomes for everyone in society are achieved either by consumers engaging in voluntary exchange within free markets, or by pro-capitalist and neoliberal governments overseeing increasingly influential and powerful businesses and industries that always strive to underfund and corrupt governments. Both of these arguments are patently absurd. Capitalists also like to argue that externalities are not a

serious problem, or that they will always be addressed by free markets. Both of these arguments are patently absurd.

With all of this considered, capitalism can effectively be described as a system that is well optimized for ensuring an unethical race to the bottom. Worse still, this was always obvious. Prioritizing profits above all else has never had even the vaguest semblance of possessing the potential to create a just and prosperous world. And prioritizing consumer desires could obviously only ever achieve a just and prosperous world to a minor extent, particularly considering capitalist businesses can ignore and exploit poor consumers, and can effectively disregard the wellbeing of all consumers once industries have been monopolized or dominated by cartels.

“Capitalism improves people’s quality of life over time”

Putting aside the fact that capitalism obviously doesn’t benefit those in underdeveloped countries because of imperialism, even those in developed countries are not guaranteed an ever improving quality of life. In fact those that live in developed countries are currently experiencing an ever decreasing quality of life, despite what capitalist propaganda would have people believe. This is inexcusable considering everyone’s quality of life should have been improving substantially in line with the accelerating progress that has been occurring in STEM fields. This is perhaps especially true with regards to automation technologies, which are capable of lowering the costs of goods and services, as well as saving people massive amounts of time.

50-70 years ago in the developed world, a family could afford a house, a car, vacations, and all other essentials, with just one parent

working a single job they would likely have until retirement. In some developed countries a new house could cost less than an average citizen's yearly income, meaning many first time home owners could buy their first house outright within a few years. Today it is more common, all else being equal, for both parents to be employed, while having to do a variety of precarious short-term jobs throughout their careers, and yet still be less able to afford a home, a car, vacations, and other essentials, than even those who lived 50-70 years ago. Many adults are even too poor to have children in the first place. Many full-time workers today also can't afford a mortgage, and those that can regularly have to spend most or all of their work life paying off their mortgage. Many full-time workers who can't afford a mortgage can also barely afford rent, and often have to live in poor conditions because landlords rarely have an incentive to properly maintain or upgrade their properties. Many workers today also have to take longer commutes and work longer hours, and many also receive fewer workplace perks and benefits. Many people also have lower or decimated retirement savings through no fault of their own, forcing many to work well into retirement. Many more have to take on crushing debt just to meet their most basic needs, again through no fault of their own. Many also take on student loan debts that are orders of magnitude greater than those taken on by students in the past. Many individuals and families also have less free time, are more stressed, are more chronically exhausted, and have an overall lower quality of life, than those who lived 50-70 years ago. Unsurprisingly, people alive today also have lower economic mobility than previous generations. In recent years life expectancy has even been declining in some developed countries. All of this has culminated in increased alienation, an increased sense of pessimism about the future, and increased rates of loneliness, anxiety, depression, self-harm, and suicide.

This is particularly disconcerting with regards to younger generations, who should be enjoying all the fruits of technology and technological surplus, and should be looking forward to the incredible future that technology could make possible. Instead, most young adults are fully aware that they are more financially insecure and

have a lower quality of life than previous generations, and in some developed countries this also includes an increased likelihood of having no choice but to live with one's parents, which can be extremely problematic when such relationships are strained or abusive. Younger generations are also pessimistic about the future because they know that they are now going to have to suffer from and solve increasingly dangerous existential threats, such as climate change, ecological collapse, and resource scarcity. Younger generations are also aware that the beauty of the natural world, which has taken billions of years to evolve, is being destroyed at an incredible rate. And even more depressing, younger generations are also aware they have little power to solve these problems because of the increasing wealth and power that capitalism is enabling the ruling class to accumulate.

This situation becomes even more obscene when contemplating what could have been achieved under socialism. 50-70 years ago it would have been possible for a small percentage of farmers, builders, manufacturers, etc. to utilize technology to build enough houses, and produce enough nutritious food, to house and feed the rest of the population. These workers could have been paid generously for their labor, and everyone could have received these free of charge, since they could have been paid for via the world's resources and technological surplus. And this would have also been possible to a lesser extent even thousands of years ago. Yet even with exponential advancements in technology, many people today struggle to house and feed themselves and their children. This is made even more absurd by the fact that even slaves throughout history were often given shelter and food.

This inability for people to meet their needs and wants under capitalism is often caused by artificial scarcity, since this empowers businesses to engage in price gouging. Businesses also further exacerbate this problem by throwing out and destroying perfectly usable goods. And this doesn't just include perishable goods like food, but also non-perishable goods, like electronics. This is partly done to increase scarcity and drive up prices, but also to increase

storage space for goods that are more profitable. Some businesses even destroyed protective masks during the COVID-19 pandemic because of this reason. Other businesses also engage in this practice out of fear that their brands will lose their prestigious reputation if their goods are sold at a discount. This practice equates to the unnecessary destruction of tens of billions of dollars' worth of usable goods every year. And none of this even addresses the fact that many businesses outright refuse to provide their goods and services to less profitable or unprofitable customers, such as those with little money and those living in less densely populated areas.

Even when consumers do have the opportunity to purchase goods and services, this does not mean they do so with pleasure. Many purchases for luxury goods and services are done begrudgingly because consumers know they are being exploited. It could even be argued that the incredible stressors of everyday life, that are caused or exacerbated by capitalism, can effectively turn most non-essential goods and services into essential ones. Many people would likely suffer from intolerable stress and situational depression if not for certain "non-essential" consumer comforts, like films, games, sports, alcohol, etc. An ideal economic system would be one in which all luxury goods and services were as affordable as possible, which is antithetical to any system that prioritizes privatization, free markets, and profits.

Another capitalist vice that reduces people's quality of life is patents. Not only is innovation stifled under capitalism, as will soon become clear, but even the innovations that do exist have been prevented from benefitting everyone in society because of the unnecessary existence of patents. This has been a particularly prominent problem in the pharmaceutical industry. Patents within the industry have effectively been responsible for the deaths of hundreds of millions of adults and children, and the unnecessary pain and misery of many more, and all for the sake of maximizing profits and enriching the obscenely wealthy ruling class. This has occurred despite the fact that all of these medical breakthroughs were achieved, or could have been achieved, through government funding alone. And the

pharmaceutical industry is just one of many industries that for all intents and purposes have used patents to worsen or destroy the lives of billions throughout the history of capitalism.

Conclusion

Capitalists commonly argue that even if their system may not be perfect, at least everyone's quality of life can be guaranteed to improve over time. This is an absurd argument, and the fact that it's untrue is even more absurd. Not only has the quality of life of those in developed countries been entirely dependent on the imperialist exploitation of underdeveloped countries, and not only is the quality of life of those in developed countries abysmal compared to what would be possible under socialism, but the quality of life of those in developed countries has actually been markedly decreasing in most essential areas of life over the past 50-70 years. This is made even more absurd due to the fact that the quality of life of everyone on the planet should have been increasing at an exponential rate in conjunction with the exponential progress that has been occurring in STEM fields. And all of this is predictable at the theoretical level, because all of these are predictable outcomes of any system that guarantees ever increasing wealth and power consolidation into the hands of those most willing to behave sociopathically.

"Capitalism is the least violent economic system"

Capitalists always propagate the idea that theirs is the least violent economic system, particularly in contrast to socialism and communism. This is believed to be true because capitalism is founded on the non-aggression principle, or in other words mutual consent, in which all economic transactions are conducted

voluntarily. This is another example of a capitalist argument that relies entirely upon an idealistic interpretation of theory. This idea is obviously flawed because it ignores naturally occurring phenomenon, like power imbalances and privilege inequalities, and unavoidable consequences, like the inevitability of wealth and power consolidation under capitalism. This simplified form of analysis is also applied to alternative economic systems, resulting in further invalid conclusions. When assessed in detail, it becomes apparent that capitalism is an inherently violent system, and that socialism and communism are the most peaceful systems possible.

Under socialism and communism power is dispersed among everyone in society, since all political and economic organizations and systems are democratized. And of course flattening hierarchies to the most practical extent possible has always been the best way of ensuring violence is reduced to the greatest extent possible. Additionally, socialism and communism would also be capable of creating the conditions necessary for reducing violence, such as eradicating poverty and gross wealth inequality, maximizing everyone's quality of life and economic mobility, and creating highly critically minded and educated populations through well-funded education systems.

Under capitalism conversely wealth and power will always become consolidated into the hands of those most willing to abuse others, either because they are sociopathic, or because they are inevitably coerced into sociopathic behaviors by shareholders. Those who possess this consolidated wealth and power can consequently be guaranteed to use every unethical means at their disposal to protect and increase their wealth and power. This can be achieved in the form of hard power, such as physical barriers, the police, security guards, etc., as well as soft power, such as cultural norms, social stigma, and the legal system. In the case of fascism, which is an inherently capitalist ideology, hard power can also take the form of vigilantes and militia groups. Regardless of the form of power used, violence will always be an inevitable outcome under capitalism.

One of the main reasons capitalism is not universally acknowledged as a violent system however is because most violence inevitably becomes "streamlined" into the form of structural violence. Structural violence is not immediately apparent as a form of violence because it is deeply entrenched within the political, economic, social, and cultural environments that people are forced to live within. In other words, because this violence surrounds and pervades every facet of society, citizens are likely to become acclimatized to it, or even lack awareness of it, and come to assume this is the only way the world can operate. No better example of this exists than people's lack of awareness of their fundamental right to the world's resources and technological surplus. When people lack access to essentials, such as nutritious food, housing, healthcare, etc. which could all be paid for by the world's resources and technological surplus, this is a form of structural violence. In fact the theft of the world's resources and technological surplus could be understood as the foundation of practically all structural violence, as well as one of the oldest and most pervasive forms of structural violence, going all the way back to the beginning of human civilization. And because structural violence is inevitable under capitalism, it should not be surprising that it was a Marxist who came up with the term "social murder" to describe instances where structural violence results in death, which is obviously a common consequence of structural violence.

Structural violence doesn't just include people be unable to afford basic necessities. For example, structural violence can also include legal consequences. If a homeless person freezes to death on the streets, and this is at least in part because they were unnecessarily fired from their job for the benefit of shareholders, then there are no legal consequences. However, if that same person steals warm clothes from the multibillion dollar clothes company they were previously exploited and fired by, or even if they just sleep in the wrong location, then this person can suffer legal consequences. Structural violence can also include capitalism's more indirect consequences, such as unnecessary stress and air pollution, which can also cause people to unnecessarily suffer and die prematurely. These indirect consequences also include existential threats, which

will obviously harm future generations, but are also increasingly harming current generations, such as with climate change, ecological collapse, and resource scarcity.

Structural violence can also be understood as a structural form of propaganda, since people end up becoming indoctrinated by their very mode of existence and the systems they operate within. This problem has effectively culminated in capitalist realism, where people now assume that all social and economic problems caused or exacerbated by structural violence, such as crime and poverty, are unavoidable facts of life, rather than problems created by an economic system enforced by the ruling class. One of the best examples of this capitalist realism is the contrast in how billionaires and activists are perceived. If a billionaire achieves their wealth through overt forms of theft, they are considered deserving of their wealth, even by a sizable number of the working class they are obviously exploiting. However, if activists riot in the streets or employees damage their place of employment, as a means of protesting, many people would consider these people deserving of being arrested and prosecuted, without giving a second thought to the idea of arresting the billionaire for their substantially worse acts of theft and destruction. This is perceived as morally justifiable because the activists and workers are breaking the law, and their actions are overt. Conversely, the billionaire is not breaking the law, and their exploitative actions are less overt because these actions are merely the system operating as designed. The activists are perceived as a danger to society, while the billionaire is considered a respectable and invaluable citizen. Consequently, when the rich steal from the poor, this appears justified, because it is "business as usual", but when the poor fight back and try to reclaim their stolen wealth, it is called "violence".

The way that capitalism masks structural violence is exacerbated by media organizations and capitalist governments. Activists who protest capitalist exploitation are often condemned by the media as reckless, uncivil, extremists, or even terrorists. Even when activists protest peacefully, they are blamed for the mildest of

inconveniences, and can even be blamed for creating social divisions or exacerbating social tensions. Capitalist governments, and particularly their intelligence agencies and task forces, are also increasingly targeting and oppressing activists who oppose capitalism, including classifying them as terrorists. All calls for civility are nothing more than the ruling class suppressing and stigmatizing the working class for fighting against oppression, which is a tactic that has always been used by the ruling class. Even during economic downturns when conditions are at their worst, the media and capitalist governments rarely draw attention to the problems of capitalism that cause civil unrest in the first place. Even when victims lose their homes, and freeze to death on the streets, even in countries with many vacant homes, the media and capitalist governments never recognize this as murder caused by structural violence, but instead a problem of "personal responsibility", or of "too much government interference".

Structural violence also highlights the absurdity of the claim that capitalism is a non-violent economic system because it protects private property rights. First, socialist and communist economies also protect private property rights. The difference is that they believe the means of production, which are the very means of survival and prosperity, should be democratized and used to benefit everyone. Second, private property rights don't count for much if most people in the world are too poor to afford essential property. In fact private property rights count for less than nothing if they are used predominantly to protect the ruling class as they use violence to exploit the rest of society, including stealing the world's resources and technological surplus for themselves. If capitalism is so broken that people can freeze to death on the streets because they can't afford their own property, then it becomes obscene to argue that capitalism is a non-violent economic system because of "private property rights".

The widely accepted narrative that socialism and communism are violent by their very nature, and that capitalism is the least violent, only appears true because of reductionist assumptions and shallow

anecdotal evidence. The truth is that socialist and communist countries are easily capable of being even less violent than the Nordic countries, which are likely among the most peaceful countries in human history, and obviously don't have governments that are on the verge of starving, torturing, or mass murdering their citizens. The reason most people don't realize this is because socialism and communism are conflated with brutal and murderous regimes, like the Soviet Union and Mao's China. In reality such regimes were often authoritarian, class-based, corrupt, undemocratic, scientifically illiterate, had command economies, and often involved citizens possessing little to no control over the means of production. These traits are the antithesis of socialism and communism both in spirit and in practice.

Capitalists refuse to differentiate between what these regimes actually were, and the economic systems they labeled themselves as or aspired to be, because this helps with anti-socialist and anti-communist propaganda. This is one reason why the mocking sentiment "but that wasn't real socialism" is so redundant, and one of the strongest pieces of evidence that someone has been indoctrinated by capitalist propaganda. Furthermore, even if these regimes were variants of socialism or communism, every economic system has an infinite number of permutations. Additionally, technology and communication networks today are light-years ahead of what existed 50 to 100 years ago, further increasing the types of economic systems that are now viable. In other words, even if these regimes were variants of socialism or communism, it would be irrational to disregard their potential as economic systems because of such poorly implemented variants in the past. If the first 20 medicinal drugs ever created by humans were harmful or deadly, then by this logic pharmaceutical research should have been abandoned entirely long ago, which would obviously have been an astoundingly idiotic choice for humanity to make. This defense of socialism and communism however doesn't apply to capitalism, since the prioritization of privatization, free markets, and profits, makes the system illogical and broken by design. Socializing the means of production, and using economic planning to maximize the quality of

life of everyone in society, is not illogical by design, as will become increasingly apparent.

The fact that socialism and communism have an infinite number of permutations is particularly pertinent considering that even if the tyrannical regimes of the past were particular variations of socialism or communism, they are effectively irrelevant in modern political and economic discourse. There are no socialists or communists alive today that are advocating for the command economies and the authoritarian governments of the Soviet Union and Mao's China. On the contrary, the overwhelming majority of socialists and communists today are democratic socialists or anarcho-communists, both of which advocate for all or most of the same economic proposals and democratic safeguards advocated for in this manifesto. For capitalists to argue that socialism and communism would replicate the brutal and murderous regimes of the 20th century is so detached from reality it is too ridiculous to adequately describe.

Additional evidence that further proves that criticisms against socialism and communism are mere propaganda is the fact that the death tolls attributed to the regimes of the past are always inflated or presented without context. One of the most commonly cited death tolls is 100 million, which is taken from the propaganda book "The Black Book of Communism". Two of the original authors eventually denounced this estimate, and mainstream historians have also criticized these estimates for being grossly inaccurate. First, this figure includes children that were never born because their mother's never became pregnant for reasons supposedly related to communism. In other words, this death toll includes people who never existed. Second, a significant percentage of these deaths can be attributed to naturally occurring and unavoidable famines that could not have been avoided with a capitalist system, and most likely would have been worse under a capitalist system, all else being equal. Third, this death toll includes Nazi's killed by Russian soldiers, since they too were "victims" of a "communist" regime. Fourth, this death toll includes Russian's who died because of sanctions and wars started by the capitalist ruling class of other nations, including the

nearly 12 million Russian soldiers who died fighting the Nazi's in the Second World War. To include these soldiers in this death toll was obviously incredibly disrespectful and heartless considering the sacrifice they made.

Fifth, even the deaths that could be attributed to economics had nothing to do with communism. For example, the overwhelming majority of these deaths in Russia and China occurred because of the introduction of a command economy, which is not the same as a communist decentralized planned economy. This means the incompetence of these governments during this period cannot be attributed to communism. For example, one of the most egregious forms of incompetence by these governments was the enforcement of farming practices that were introduced to enable more farmers to move to cities so that the country could industrialize faster. These practices included digging deeper into the soil and planting crops closer together, which could sometimes increase crop yields under specific conditions, but decimated crop yields for most farmers operating outside of these more ideal conditions. This lack of scientific rigor however is not inherent to communism, and doesn't even have an equivalent in modern developed countries. The governments of the Nordic countries for example have been able to provide a high quality of life to their citizens through well-funded public infrastructures and services, and the process of introducing these has never included the risk of mass suffering and death. On the contrary, these public infrastructures and services have been essential for saving millions of lives, particularly in the cases of healthcare and safety regulations.

Despite all of this, the capitalists who carelessly cite such death tolls never acknowledge these facts, but instead have to rely upon such misinformation to make their arguments sound convincing. However, worst of all is that these critics always choose to ignore the billions who needlessly suffer every year, and the millions who needlessly die every year, because of capitalism. The number of people who die every year just from inadequate access to food, clean water, and healthcare, is 20 million. This equates to 100 million unnecessary

deaths every 5 years. Capitalism can be blamed for these deaths because practically every country in the world is capitalist, and because many are also victims of capitalist imperialism. And just as importantly, humanity has also possessed the knowledge, labor power, physical resources, technology, etc. necessary to meet the basic needs of all humans for many decades, and even centuries and millennia to a more limited extent.

And this 20 million figure doesn't even include all the other deaths directly caused by capitalism, such as those resulting from hazardous working conditions and the oppression of protestors. This figure also doesn't include deaths caused indirectly by capitalism, such as those attributable to inadequate sanitation and crime related homicides. There are also many people that have died from capitalist propaganda, such as the millions who contracted lung cancer because they believed the tobacco industry's lie that smoking was harmless, or the millions that will die from anthropogenic climate change because of the fossil fuel industry's lies about its existence and severity. And none of these deaths include those who died from fascist regimes and wars, including the 110 million people who died from both World Wars, that occurred because of capitalism. Most fascist regimes and wars throughout the history of capitalism would have been avoided had all citizens had their basic needs fulfilled and been highly educated, and had all governments been optimally democratic, rather than controlled by a ruling class that existed, and continues to exist, because of wealth and power consolidation perpetuated and exacerbated by capitalism. Despite all of this, capitalists only draw attention to the deaths caused by supposedly socialist and communist societies, and completely ignore the substantially greater number of preventable deaths that have occurred, and continue to occur, because of capitalism. This is why capitalism has been so effective at indoctrinating people into believing that capitalism is the least violent economic system. As has been quoted many times before, "Capitalism is the most respected genocide in the world".

One final detail often ignored by propagandists is that many members of the ruling class who were murdered or imprisoned under these regimes, though far from all, were sociopathic mass murderers. These plutocrats were responsible for withholding shelter and the means of production, which are the very means of survival, from the impoverished and starving workers who were responsible for their wealth. They did this by using threats and deadly violence against workers who tried to unionize, and against anyone who engaged in public protests. Countless adults and children suffered and died from these abuses, and all for the benefit of rich and powerful sociopaths. This is not to justify their deaths, nor to dismiss the many innocent people that were harmed or killed under these regimes, but instead to provide an important historical context that is always ignored by capitalists.

In fact it is likely this lack of historical context that explains why the perception of the deaths of these sociopaths is such an anomaly. The overthrowing and murder of brutal emperors, lords, monarchs, etc. of the past, who exploited and murdered the lower classes for personal gain, is viewed as justified by most people alive today, as well as most people throughout history. And yet equally sociopathic members of the capitalist ruling class who were killed during the 20th century have somehow become an exception, even though the suffering they inflicted was equally appalling and unjustified. In fact they could be considered even more reprehensible, since the 20th century capitalist ruling class existed at a time when societies were not just more ethically enlightened, but also more technologically advanced, meaning the quality of life they were stealing from the lower classes was even greater.

The unwillingness to condemn and hold to account members of the capitalist ruling class, compared to members of the ruling classes of the past, is an extremely bizarre phenomenon, and more than anything else is likely further evidence of the incredible effectiveness of capitalist propaganda. This propaganda has been so effective that even some socialists today have fallen victim to the lie that it is only the system that is to blame rather than individuals, even though

countless CEO's and directors commit abuses that go far beyond what is necessary to satisfy their shareholders and stay competitive, and even though countless wealthy landlords continue to throw impoverished families onto the streets well before it is financially necessary for them to do so.

Conclusion

Capitalism may be perceived as non-violent because of its principles, but it is unavoidably violent in terms of its consequences. This violence is rarely recognized as violence however because it is nearly always carried out covertly in the form of structural violence, most of which is also downplayed, ignored, or hidden, as much as possible. Capitalist propaganda has simultaneously also convinced the masses that even if capitalism isn't perfect, it is at least substantially less violent than socialism and communism, despite the fact that both of these systems are obviously the most peaceful systems currently available. And if all of this wasn't bad enough, capitalist propaganda has even managed to convince the masses that the capitalist ruling class is somehow not unimaginably evil and dangerous, despite the unnecessary suffering and death they intentionally inflict upon adults and children around the world every year even when this is not necessary for them to remain wealthy, profitable, or competitive.

"Capitalism is the best system for maximizing innovation"

The ways in which quality of life have improved under capitalism can predominantly be attributed to innovations, and particularly those within STEM fields. Innovation is widely heralded as one of capitalism's primary strengths, but this is nothing more than propaganda. Capitalists have only been able to maintain this myth

because capitalism has been the prevailing economic system during the greatest period of progress in human history, and because of the natural human tendency to assume correlation means causation. In reality capitalism is an absolutely atrocious system for maximizing innovation. The following list outlines the multitude of reasons why this is the case.

- Under capitalism the means of production are privately owned by the minority, meaning that a large percentage of people and organizations do not have access to the resources necessary for exploring ideas and conducting research and development.
- Under capitalism governments usually spend far less money on education and research initiatives, both of which are essential for maximizing innovation. There are three main reasons for this. First, under capitalism politicians are far more likely to be capitalists, or worst still neoliberals or libertarians, meaning they are less likely to spend money on essential public infrastructures and services, particularly if they also possess the irrational fear of increasing national debt. Second, governments and workers have to rely upon businesses that price gouge goods and services, which unnecessarily increases the costs of building and maintaining public infrastructures and services. Third, government's always have less money due to tax avoidance and evasion, unlike under socialism where the social ownership of the world's resources and technological surplus would ensure governments had the maximum amount of possible revenue at all times.
- Under capitalism large amounts of time, energy, money, etc. will always be dedicated to construction projects that primarily benefit rich and powerful individuals and businesses, such as building superyachts and private jets for the super wealthy, or building skyscrapers for financial institutions that harm society and the economy. These resources could instead have been used to increase innovation, such as building or improving schools, colleges, universities, and research institutions.

- Many of the greatest innovators throughout history achieved their greatest successes in their spare time, or when they were not required to work a traditional job. Albert Einstein and Karl Marx for example both made some of their greatest contributions to humanity during these times. This means that forcing people to work to survive, or at the very least forcing people to work more than is necessary, is antithetical to maximizing innovation. Capitalism is atrocious in this regard, and far more so than most realize. The exploitation that has inexorably arisen throughout capitalism's history has robbed billions of people of the opportunity to contribute their fullest to society, and to an extent that cannot be understated. An incalculable number of geniuses and brilliantly minded individuals have died young or prematurely throughout capitalism's history because of poverty and exploitation caused or exacerbated by capitalism. Even today there are tens of millions of geniuses, and countless more with uniquely gifted minds, who are still suffering under such conditions. This includes people in underdeveloped countries working 12-18 hour days, 6-7 days a week, in unbearable or dangerous conditions, as well as those in developed countries that work under better conditions but can barely do anything beyond merely surviving.

- People in underdeveloped countries are forced to waste time on tasks that have already been automated, or made more efficient, in developed countries as a consequence of technology and robust modern infrastructures and services. This includes tasks performed at work, but also personal tasks such as collecting food and water, cooking, sterilizing water, cleaning clothes, and travelling. In the poorest countries people can spend multiple hours every single week just collecting water.

- Not only are people forced to work under capitalism, but many of the jobs that exist under capitalism are "bullshit jobs", which can best be described as jobs that provide absolutely no value to society. Worse still, most workers in these jobs cannot point out how pointless their job is for fear of losing their only or primary source of income. Incidentally, these jobs have also been shown to exist more

in the private sector than the public sector. These valueless jobs can be divided into two types. The first includes jobs that require skillsets that provide no value to society. An example would be stock market traders, who waste inordinate amounts of human capital performing labor that is either detrimental to society, or whose value could be achieved freely and more efficiently under socialism. The second type includes jobs that require socially valuable skillsets but which do not use these skillsets in a socially valuable way. An example would be most jobs performed by highly skilled STEM specialists within the military industrial complex, which incidentally has also been instrumental in enabling capitalist imperialism.

- Capitalism is responsible for taking an incredible toll on people's cognitive capabilities and psychological health. People can never reach their potential if they are undernourished, distracted, exhausted, stressed, depressed, or experiencing any of the other problems that reduce people's critical mindedness, concentration, creativity, and energy levels. Research has shown that being in a negative mood or a depressed state significantly reduces one's creative thinking when it comes to problem-solving. Research has also shown that stress alone can reduce an adult's intelligence by at least 13 IQ points, which is an incredible amount for just one variable. Research has also shown that poor nutrition is another variable that can reduce a person's intelligence, particularly if this occurs during one's childhood. Research has also shown that air pollution reduces intelligence, and those in poverty live disproportionately in areas with high air pollution. Research has also shown that most people can only work 40 hours a week before their performance declines, and that after 50 hours their performance declines so much that it becomes more productive for them to stop working and only start again after resting and recuperating. This also aligns with research showing that those who only work 4 days a week have higher levels of productivity. Overworking also causes a decline in cognitive capabilities that even perpetuates after a person returns to a regular work schedule. Despite this, even workers in the developed world, including those in fields that require creativity and mental clarity, often have no choice but to work more than 40 hours

a week. And this is just within their job, and doesn't even include the demanding work they have to engage in outside of work. This means workers are unlikely to be cognitively productive either inside or outside of their job, which is a particular problem for those who strive to innovate in their very limited spare time. Capitalism has also exacerbated people's mental health problems by reducing access to mental healthcare services, namely through exploitative practices that reduce government revenue or reduce people's discretionary income and purchasing power. These problems also contribute to hundreds of thousands of suicides every year, which of course is a tragedy in and of itself, but also further debunks the idea that capitalism is the best system for maximizing innovation.

- Poverty caused by capitalism is responsible for a substantial number of crimes that also stymie innovation. Today tens of millions of people are now wasting years of their life in prison, unable to engage in the types of work that can lead to innovations. This problem has also been exacerbated by the profit-driven prison industrial complex in many developed countries. Many people have also suffered a loss in their cognitive and physical capabilities, or have been killed, as a consequence of crime.
- It is not uncommon for workers to change jobs because of exploitative conditions that would be less likely to occur if businesses and governments were democratized. Changing jobs can not only be stressful and time consuming, but can also require workers to waste further time learning new skills and information they otherwise wouldn't need to. If a person has to leave a particular profession because this exploitation is widespread within the industry, or because they have been blacklisted within the industry due to exploitation, then this problem is often even worse.
- People's lack of discretionary income and purchasing power under capitalism, and particularly the unnecessarily high costs of rent and mortgages, restricts or prevents many workers from being able to travel or relocate. This is further exacerbated by a lack of private and public investment into property development, which further limits

people's ability to move. These problems cause underemployment, because they prevent many workers, include STEM experts, from working for innovation-focused companies where they could be best utilized.

- Many workers have to sign non-compete agreements that prohibit them from working with other companies within the same industry, which can prevent them from working for companies where they could be optimally innovative.

- It has become common practice for businesses to use employment contracts in which all innovations and ideas created by an employee are owned by the company. Some contracts dictate that this remain true months after the employee has left the business. Even if the idea in question could be revolutionary, or save the company vast sums of money, these businesses are not legally required to pay the employee anything above their normal compensation. This discourages employees from ever revealing or developing their inventions while under contract, even if their current employers are in a perfect position to develop such innovations and bring them to market.

- Studies have demonstrated that incentives are counterproductive to achieving innovation. Rewards generally only produce better results when people are asked to perform routine and mundane tasks. Conversely, rewards achieve the opposite effect when a person is required to perform tasks that require creativity. Consequently, the best economic system would be one where workers possessed the freedom to pursue their interests and experiment. Because of the type of power structures that exist in privately owned businesses, capitalism rarely affords workers such freedom.

- Studies have revealed that those who believe they have limited control to affect the outcome of a task generally perform worse than those who believe they have more control. Consequently it is likely that both the reality and feeling of powerlessness and alienation

workers experience under capitalism results in poorer performance and a diminished desire to contribute one's full potential.

- Research has shown that diversity in the workplace improves innovation, but capitalism has been a terrible system for correcting the inequalities of the past and providing equal opportunities.
- People are less likely to innovate, particularly with regards to streamlining their work process, if it means increasing the likelihood of making themselves and their work colleagues redundant.
- Under capitalism most software is not open source, which prevents millions of individuals and businesses from exploring and experimenting with ideas and solutions that they should ideally be able to.
- Competition is integral to capitalism, which means businesses are far more likely to research and develop their ideas and solutions in isolation. This problem leads to tremendous inefficiencies. If 4 companies each invest \$1 billion into achieving the same goal, the progress they achieve will pale in comparison to what they could have achieved by working together. This problem is further exacerbated by those whose very livelihood depends on their innovation, which can cause such individuals to work in isolation for fear of their innovation being stolen. The hindrance to progress this has caused cannot be understated. Just as combining components can sometimes achieve results greater than the sum of their parts, the sharing of knowledge, labor power, and physical resources, can also achieve similar results under certain circumstances. Additionally, research has even shown that those who work in cooperative environments come up with superior and more creative ideas and solutions than those who work in competitive environments, which very likely also translates to the wider economy.
- Patents are an inevitable consequence of any society that prioritizes privatization, even though patents are antithetical to maximizing innovation. Once something has been patented, other individuals and

organizations cannot build upon and refine these innovations. Instead they have to waste time, energy, money, etc. creating alternatives, which may even be less effective or have less long-term potential. Even if an innovation is simple enough that thousands of other inventors would have inevitably come up with the same idea, none of them can use it for the arbitrary reason that a person or business, who may not have even come up with the idea first, decided to patent this innovation. Even biological mechanisms that have been found in nature have been patented. It is also very common for businesses to patent innovations that were partially or entirely publically funded. When patents expire, businesses often make slight modifications to the original, enabling them to essentially patent the same idea again for years or decades further.

- The existence of patents has also given rise to patent trolls. These are people or organizations who attempt to enforce patent rights far beyond the patent's actual value or contribution, and which is usually done using unethical and aggressive legal tactics. Patent trolls will often create or purchase patents for this sole purpose. These law suits are often resolved out of court, and can net patent trolls hundreds of thousands or even millions of dollars, which they can then use to repeat the cycle at a larger scale. This can force businesses to syphon resources away from research and towards legal battles, or can cause them to collapse entirely.
- Companies have been known to delay releasing technologies so that they can guarantee they have something new to offer consumers with their future products. These technologies could benefit the public, or be built upon by other inventors, but this is sacrificed for the sake of long-term profitability.
- Corporations have been known to buy up companies that were focused on socially beneficial research, only to then reallocate their resources towards more financially profitable endeavors.
- Businesses and entire industries have taken great measures to suppress competing technologies in the pursuit of profits, even if

those technologies are potentially superior. Perhaps the best known example is the electric vehicle, which could have come to prominence almost half a century earlier had the automobile industry and fossil fuel industry not conspired to suppress the technology.

- Capitalist businesses have no financial incentive to invest in research that is less profitable or unprofitable, which massively limits the range of innovations that are inevitably created under capitalism. Pharmaceutical companies prioritize research into cosmetics for wealthy consumers, rather than curing rare and horrific diseases that predominantly exist in underdeveloped countries. Technology companies prioritize research into non-essential consumer products for wealthy consumers, rather than technologies that could help those with physical disabilities. Even as billions of adults and children needlessly suffer and die around the world, under capitalism the wealth of the ruling class is prioritized over the creation of essential innovations.
- Private investors often demand a higher burden of proof than publically funded institutions before investing into innovative initiatives.
- Private investors are often less willing to fund innovative initiatives that are more risky, since they are often more concerned with predictable returns on investment.
- Private investors usually want more immediate returns on investment, which is a particular problem for innovative initiatives that may take years or decades of research.
- Businesses often refuse to invest into internal research and development initiatives, since not only does this involve risk, but it can also be more profitable to spend money on advertising, stock buybacks, lobbying, and other initiatives that don't increase innovation.

- Many higher-ups give themselves excessive compensation at the expense of their company's ability to innovate. For example, many business higher-ups will fire hundreds of employees in a single year just so they can make themselves even more obscenely rich.
- Under capitalism businesses are substantially more challenging to setup and are far more likely to fail. Consequently, there are likely countless innovation-focused businesses that have either failed, or were not pursued in the first place because of the unnecessarily high risk of failure.
- Capitalism always produces economic downturns, which cause a massive reduction in innovation. This can be through workers being made redundant, highly innovative businesses going under, private innovators losing essential savings, financial institutions lending out fewer loans, governments and businesses losing the revenue necessary to invest in research and development, and other similar problems.
- A capitalist system will always give rise to monopolies which are controlled by those with little interest in benefitting society. Once an industry has mostly been monopolized, and competition has effectively been eradicated, the necessity to innovate substantially decreases, particularly for technological advanced industries where research and development is prohibitively expensive and barriers to entry are high.
- The profit motive provides a strong disincentive for businesses to find solutions to problems when greater profits can be generated by allowing these problems to perpetuate. There is currently less incentive for pharmaceutical companies to fund research into curative medicines when they can make substantially more money charging people for non-curative medicines throughout their life. Similarly, technology companies have little incentive to invent products that are as robust and long-lasting as possible, since this negates the point of planned obsolescence.

- Under capitalism there are many outcomes that ensure tech companies, and particularly those that develop automation technologies, have less money to invest in innovation. For example, businesses are less incentivized to buy automation technologies if they can just keep hiring exploitatively cheap labor. Most businesses are also less likely to be able to afford automation technologies since businesses are unnecessarily less likely to succeed under capitalism for a multitude of reasons.
- Capitalist businesses have a strong incentive to produce fake research and spread misinformation in order to boost profits, such as suppressing awareness of problems related to their goods and services. For example, tobacco companies perpetuated the notion that smoking was safe even when they suspected or knew it was harmful, and the fossil fuel industry took no responsibility for climate change even when their internal research proved otherwise. Had politicians, scientists, and the general public, been made fully aware of the known dangers of smoking and fossil fuels as soon as possible, research into solutions would have begun much earlier. Furthermore, not only do highly qualified individuals, such as STEM experts, often have to waste their time and skills producing such misinformation, but other highly qualified individuals then have to waste their time and skills debunking it. This is made extremely difficult because of Brandolini's law, which effectively states that the amount of time and energy required to refute misinformation is orders of magnitude greater than the time and energy required to produce it.
- People are far less likely to become graduates in STEM subjects under capitalism. This is primarily because of the fear of overwhelming student debt, as well as problems caused or exacerbated by capitalism that result in students dropping out of higher education, such as mental health problems and immediate financial problems.
- Under capitalism careers in STEM fields are not as lucrative as they would be under socialism, and many socially valueless jobs provide

higher compensation than jobs in STEM fields, which is obviously not conducive to maximizing innovation.

- Governments under capitalism are obsessed with high employment numbers since this is the only way their populations can provide for themselves. Worse still, under capitalism not only have the world's resources and technological surplus never been distributed to everyone in the form of a UBI, but a UBI likely wouldn't even work under capitalism because businesses would just increase their prices and landlords would just increase their rates. Because of these reasons, governments under capitalism have been strongly incentivized to refrain from funding research into automation technologies, and would likely continue to take this approach even if a UBI was introduced. This is despite the fact that automation technologies can substantially improve quality of life by increasing everyone's free time and by reducing the costs of goods and services. Some politicians have even stated that automation technologies should be suppressed in order to ensure people still have jobs, which is not only one of the stupidest well-intentioned ideas in the history of modern civilization, but also further evidence of how unimaginably broken capitalism truly is. Under socialism governments would invest astronomical amounts of money into innovation, and particularly automation, since this would be the best way of maximizing everyone's quality of life.

- Capitalism has caused so many humanitarian and environmental problems that astronomical amounts of time, energy, money, etc. now have to be spent creating innovations that can address these externalities, rather than innovations that could move humanity forward.

- There are innumerable unknown species that have been made extinct by environmental destruction and pollution caused by capitalism, and this is only worsening as time moves on. It is entirely possible that many of these species held the secret to life-changing and revolutionary innovations, such as curative medicines.

- Many couples today in developed countries are choosing to have no children or fewer children simply because they can't afford the additional costs, or because of fears of unsustainability. This has reduced the global population to what it otherwise could be, and consequently global human capital, including the number of geniuses in the world. Under socialism people could afford to have more children, and this could be achieved without causing all the unsustainably problems that occur under capitalism.
- As the world's resources are squandered inefficiently and become increasingly scarce, particularly rare minerals, it could become increasingly difficult or even impossible to find the resources, or for organizations to afford the resources, that are necessary for carrying out research. This problem will continue to worsen as capitalism squanders these resources at an accelerated rate. Even if the problem of resource depletion is somehow solved, it does not change the fact that any economic system that does not account for resource scarcity is extremely poorly designed, and therefore cannot be relied upon to maximize innovation.

The notion that capitalism is a good system for maximizing innovation is so overtly ludicrous it is remarkable the idea has ever been used in capitalist propaganda, rather than distracted from or justified as some kind of necessary sacrifice. And even when innovations do occur under capitalism, they predominantly occur to make goods and services more profitable, rather than better or more widely accessible. That capitalism is such a grossly ineffective system for achieving progress is also not an aberration of its nature, but an unavoidable consequence of the prioritization of privatization, free markets, and profits. The degree to which capitalism has hindered humanity's progress and quality of life in this regard cannot be understated.

However, capitalists still defend their system by arguing that innovators should be allowed to patent their ideas so that they can profit from them as a reward for their hard work. This is without

doubt one of the most idiotically short-sighted ideas in the history of economics. First, innovators could still be financially compensated for their labor and innovations without the existence of patents, and this is effectively possible under any economic system. Second, in a world without patents, every single innovator would have a substantially higher quality of life because they would be able to freely benefit from all other innovations. Instead they have to live in a world where innovation is massively hindered, and where the innovations that do exist are either inaccessible to them or locked behind excessively high prices. Most people only defend patents because of propaganda spread by a ruling class that has always been the primary beneficiary of patents.

There are other irrational arguments capitalists use to defend their system. Capitalists like to argue that competition is necessary for innovation, but this is only true under capitalism because once businesses have monopolized a market, the higher-ups of these businesses have little incentive to innovate. Capitalists also like to argue that theirs is the best system at combining innovations into consumer friendly equivalents, or that capitalism is the best system for modifying innovations so that they can be provided in a wide range of variants, but this demonstrates a fundamental misunderstanding of socialism. Worker cooperatives are effectively identical to capitalist businesses in this regard, meaning the goods and services they provide are the same for most intents and purposes. With regards to innovation, the only major differences would be that products and services would not be designed to be addictive and exploitative, and products would be designed to be as robust and easily repairable as possible.

Real innovation

The true sources of innovation have never had anything to do with capitalism. What follows is a summary of the real personality traits and environmental conditions that can ensure innovation is maximized, even without the profit motive.

- Needs

People are more likely to give their all when their essential needs are fulfilled. This is supported by Abraham Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs, which proposes that people are better able and motivated to reach their potential when they can be assured to the greatest extent possible things like physical health, mental health, personal safety, financial security, social capital, self-confidence, and access to sources of beauty. This obviously requires that everyone has the highest quality work life and personal life that society can offer.

- Passion

Every person has the capacity to be enthusiastic about something other than accumulating immense wealth. People can be driven by a desire to create, a desire to explore, a desire to learn something new, a desire to challenge oneself, a desire to master a particular skill, a desire to achieve a world first, or a desire to be part of a larger community that is striving to achieve a particular goal. Many of the greatest and most revolutionary innovations throughout history were made by people driven by passion, not by a desire for extreme wealth.

- Compassion

Compassion alone is an immensely powerful trait that has been the driving force behind many humanitarian innovations throughout history. Many people with no direct interest in science or technology have spent years becoming specialists in those fields simply to help improve the lives of loved ones or those in wider society.

- Knowledge

Innovation cannot be maximized unless every person and organization on the planet has access to as much knowledge as possible. This is also important for birthing curiosity in people, and giving people an increased desire to explore and create. Aside from a few exceptions, such as information necessary for creating extremely dangerous weapons, ensuring all human knowledge is easily accessible to everyone is the only way of maximizing innovation.

- Education

High-quality and free education is essential for maximizing innovation. Among other things, this is essential for teaching people problem-solving skills, and for helping people find their natural talents and potential.

- Compensation

Providing generous financial compensation for those willing to enter fields focused on innovation, as opposed to incentives for particular tasks, can further maximize a society's innovation potential by attracting talent to innovative industries and endeavors.

- Freedom

The freedom to pursue one's interests is essential in any society that wishes to maximize innovation. At the very least this requires that everyone have a surplus of time, energy, money, opportunities, and the ability to travel.

- Autonomy

If people are to excel, they must have a sense of autonomy in the workplace, including some degree of control over the types of tasks and strategies they adopt. Obviously many jobs require performing work that is restrictive and rigid in nature, but workers should always have control where this can be afforded to them.

- Democracy

Societies require ownership over the means of production to maximize innovation. If everything is privately owned, then innovation will always be focused on maximizing the wealth of the ruling class first and foremost.

- Cooperation

Innovation is best achieved when people are free to collaborate on projects, and share resources, including knowledge. Two notable real-world examples of this are Wikipedia, and the free computer operating system Linux.

Wikipedia is the largest encyclopedia in the world, and has been demonstrated to be as accurate as official academic encyclopedias with regards to most academic subjects. However, Wikipedia also has a degree of comprehensiveness and expertise that would be completely unfeasible outside of its collaborative model. No for-profit business could afford the number of employees required to create and continuously update Wikipedia, and most businesses would likely introduce advertising, which would diminish the end-user experience and would likely introduce conflicts of interest. Even if a business did manage to make Wikipedia a profitable venture, it would be impossible to convince potential volunteers to contribute if everyone knew that most of the profits were going to wealthy shareholders.

Similar to Wikipedia is Linux, which was also created, and is regularly updated, by collaborating volunteers. Most of these volunteers are highly skilled professionals who are highly paid within their industry. Linux is superior to other operating systems in many significant ways, which is why it is one of the most popular operating systems in the world, particularly for running internet servers, and why it is even used by corporations who could easily afford alternatives. There are also many extremely different versions of Linux, which is only possible because Linux is open source software.

What Wikipedia and Linux demonstrate is that worldwide voluntary cooperation can achieve far greater feats than competition ever could, even when such cooperative endeavors occur within an economic system that incentivizes ruthless competition, and which unnecessarily limits the time, energy, money, etc. that people have to contribute towards such endeavors. Within a socialist world, not only would the entire global economy be based on cooperation, but socialism still allows for healthy competition where this is appropriate, such as candidates competing for a job opportunity, or architects competing during the initial stages of a building project to produce designs that can subsequently be voted upon.

Needs, passion, compassion, knowledge, education, compensation, freedom, autonomy, democracy, and cooperation, are all substantially more likely to be maximized under socialism. However, because of capitalist realism, most people are completely unaware of socialism's potential. This is despite the fact that many of the most incredible innovations created in recent human history were a consequence of publically funded initiatives.

History

A brief look at history quickly proves that taxpayer funded research, which is commissioned or overseen by a centralized authority engaging in economic planning, is more than capable of creating highly valuable innovations. In fact government funded initiatives have been at the cutting edge of STEM research and development for all of recent human history. Some innovations primarily or entirely created by government funded initiatives include the following.

- Surgical procedures
- Prosthetics
- Vaccines and medicines, including insulin
- The EpiPen
- Baby formula
- Food preservation
- The microprocessor
- RAM computer memory
- Hard disk drives
- The general-purpose computer
- The television
- The cell phone
- The lithium ion battery
- The internet
- Essential aeronautic and astronautic technologies
- The international space station
- The James Webb Space Telescope
- Satellites
- GPS

- Image sensors, like those used in digital cameras
- Multi-touch screens
- Voice recognition software
- Bar codes
- The onion routing anonymity network
- The accelerometer, including motion controls
- Fire-resistant clothing
- Goodyear tires
- The airbag
- Radar
- Virtual reality
- AC transformers
- Radio receivers
- Wi-Fi
- The airliner
- Nuclear fission technology
- Wind turbine engines
- Solar technologies
- Night vision technology
- Caterpillar tracks
- Memory foam
- Superglue
- LEDs

None of these are minor innovations, but some of the most revolutionary, vital, and ubiquitous inventions ever created. This list is not comprehensive, nor does it include the numerous branching technologies of those listed. For example, the Doppler radar is used in radiology, meteorology, speed guns, air traffic control, air defense, as well as other lesser known technologies. Nor does this list include the numerous world changing technologies created prior to capitalism, such as the printing press, the parachute, and alcohol distillation.

It is incredibly ironic that capitalists argue ad nauseam that private enterprises were responsible for the smart phone, since the majority of the technologies in smart phones were not only government

funded, but could never have existed without the public sector carrying out extremely expensive, incredibly risky, and financially profitless research that took decades to complete, which is not something most private investors would tolerate. Conversely, every single innovation created under capitalism could not only have been achieved by publically funded initiatives and worker cooperatives, but would have been achieved far quicker under socialism.

Conclusion

The idea that privatization, competitive free markets, and the profit motive, are necessary for maximizing innovation is absurd. On the contrary, under capitalism innovation will always be stifled for a variety of reasons that are too numerous to summarize here. And even when innovation does occur under capitalism, patents ensure that they will never benefit society to anywhere near the extent that they could. Capitalism is so broken in this regard that it insists on maintaining patents even when they result in the suffering of billions and the deaths of millions every single year. Socialism is substantially superior because not only would patents not exist, but innovation would also be maximized due to the fulfillment or maximization of needs, passion, compassion, knowledge, education, compensation, freedom, autonomy, democracy, and cooperation.

“Capitalism is essential for creating strong economies”

One of the most common propaganda narratives is that capitalism must be the best economic system because of how strong capitalist economies are, particularly compared to supposedly socialist and communist economies that have resulted in problems like hyperinflation and breadlines. As is becoming increasingly obvious,

socialist and communist economies would be the most stable economies possible. This is mostly because everyone would receive a UBI and inflation would be eradicated, which would be possible if all political and economic organizations and systems were democratized. However, even if this side of the argument is ignored, the argument that capitalism is capable of creating stable economies is completely indefensible. In the long-term the capitalist system will obviously always be unstable because businesses will always strive to maximize profits while completely disregarding the fact that the resources required to achieve endless growth are finite. To make matters worse, under capitalism people need to work to meet their basic needs, which requires high consumer demand to create jobs, which in turn requires the endless consumption of the world's finite resources. However, even if capitalism was stable in the long-term, there are also many reasons why capitalism is incapable of being stable on shorter time frames.

The most obvious problem is that capitalist economies suffer from economic downturns every 4 to 10 years. Aside from some exceptions, records dating all the way back to the beginning of the 1800's have shown this to be consistently true. There are a number of reasons for this. First, the prioritization of privatization, free markets, and profits, guarantees that the masses won't receive their fair share of the world's resources and technological surplus, that prices are kept high, that compensation is kept low, and that workers are laid off wherever possible. This reduction in discretionary income and purchasing power guarantees consumers purchase fewer goods and services, which leads to more job losses, which leads to fewer purchased goods and services, and which inevitably culminates in economic downturns. Second, economic downturns are exacerbated by tax cuts that are pushed for by the ruling class. These tax cuts ensure that governments have less money to spend, which further results in less money circulating within the economy.

Third, the ruling class is incentivized to create economic downturns because they provide a perfect opportunity to produce unsustainable fictitious capital. This is because the creation of new money is argued

by many capitalists to be one of the best ways or only ways to prevent downturns, or mitigate their worst consequences. The irony here is that the underlying logic is correct, but the prescription is incorrect. The obvious solution would be to introduce a UBI, which would also require the creation of money, but which would prevent downturns by ensuring this money was distributed logically and fairly within the economy. However, under capitalism this money will always go towards the ruling class, meaning they are strongly incentivized to create and exacerbate downturns. And the fact that something as drastic as the creation of monumental amounts of unsustainable fictitious capital still isn't enough to prevent downturns further refutes the idea that capitalism produces stable economies. Additionally, these crises also present the perfect opportunity to implement other neoliberal policies that further benefit the ruling class, which is an idea commonly referred to as "the shock doctrine".

Fourth, economic downturns are also created and exacerbated by stock markets, since traders are incentivized to wildly push prices up and down so that they can sell high and buy low. Pushed to its logical extreme, this also results in speculative bubbles that span entire markets, including markets that provide effectively no benefit to society. Even if this approach isn't profitable for all investors, any system that relies upon privatization and allows for massive wealth consolidation will always have investors that are either willing to take such risks to maximize their wealth, or have no choice but to sell and buy their stocks in accordance with broader market movements that are caused or exacerbated by extremely wealthy individuals and businesses.

To make matters worse, capitalists even try to argue that downturns are invaluable since they supposedly bankrupt low quality businesses. This is one of the most overtly idiotic ideas in the history of capitalist propaganda, and even economics more broadly. First, there is no meaningful relationship between the value or potential of a business and whether or not it will collapse during a downturn. Second, low quality businesses will always fold anyway in any economy which provides consumers with a wide variety of choices.

Under capitalism the ability to choose between different businesses will always be reduced, mostly because of monopolization and low discretionary income and purchasing power, all of which are exacerbated by inevitable economic downturns. So the argument that economic downturns are invaluable for ridding the economy of low quality businesses is absolute nonsense. In fact this argument is also deeply cruel and offensive considering how many entrepreneurs and their families have their lives unnecessarily harmed or destroyed as a consequence of their businesses failing due to completely unnecessary downturns.

It is consequently remarkable that capitalism is widely accepted as a good system for creating strong economies, particularly considering the majority of people who believe this propaganda also suffer tremendously, and often have their lives destroyed, whenever economic downturns occur. This can be understood as a real-world example of doublethink and gaslighting for this reason. However, what is just as remarkable is the fact that people give value to this propaganda even when the economy is more stable. The main reason for this is the metrics that capitalists use to talk about the economy.

Economism

Under capitalism the metrics used to determine the “strength” of an economy have nothing to do with the quality of life of everyone in society, which is obviously of far greater importance. Capitalists instead always promote “economism”, which is the belief in the prioritization of economic factors or metrics above all else. Economism metrics are utilized under capitalism for two main reasons. The first is that it is one of the only ways for capitalists to maintain the illusion that capitalism is a successful system. The second reason is that these are the metrics that need to be high in order for the ruling class to maximize their wealth.

There are numerous ways economism is propagated within society, and it is always done at the expense of more important information that completely invalidates the prioritization of such economism

information in the first place. For example, capitalists will boast about a country's economic growth, while completely ignoring how unsustainable this is due to the unsustainable squandering of the world's finite resources. Capitalists will often cite the importance of lower taxes, while completely ignoring the fact that low taxes have effectively no relationship to people's discretionary income and purchasing power, and have an inverse relationship with the quality and range of public infrastructures and services. Capitalists will argue that accepting refugees can boost economic output by providing cheap labor, while completely ignoring the fact that many refugees only leave their home countries because of problems caused by capitalist imperialism, and that these refugees are often killed, imprisoned, or become victims of human trafficking, when forced to migrate.

The most common economism metrics that capitalists like to use are those related to GDP, the stock market, profits, and employment numbers. However, these obviously have no direct relationship with people's quality of life, let alone issues like animal welfare, environmental destruction, and unsustainability. GDP is also often used in place of "GDP purchasing power parity", which is a more accurate assessment of a country's economic health because it accounts for the cost of living. Stock market indices, like the NASDAQ 100, which predominantly measure the value of the largest corporations within those markets, can even have a negative correlation to the rest of the economy. For example, during the COVID-19 pandemic, billions of people suffered financially, and yet the stock market boomed, and even reached many all-time highs.

The ridiculousness of this situation is made even more self-evident by the fact that it has always been possible for societal wellbeing to be measured using more meaningful metrics, like discretionary income, purchasing power, financial security, personal debt, retirement savings, poverty rates, housing costs, homelessness rates, economic mobility, free time, education quality, literacy rates, crime rates, recidivism rates, social capital, healthcare quality, life expectancy, infant mortality rates, mental health, addiction rates,

suicide rates, pollution levels, internet accessibility, and travelling capabilities. Not only do all of these factors play a far greater role in the quality of life of citizens, but they are also all measurable, as demonstrated by numerous global indices, such as the Human Development Index, the Where-to-be-born Index, and the World Happiness Report. Despite the accuracy of such metrics, and the holistic nature of the indices that use them, these metrics and indices are rarely cited by capitalists because they would quickly prove that capitalist economies always perform worse than more socialist economies. This would not only be detrimental to capitalists, but also to politicians who wish to convince citizens of their competence.

Economism metrics are also deceptive because they don't reveal what money within the economy is being spent on. If addressing unnecessary externalities costs billions of dollars, this will increase economism metrics just as much as if these externalities never occurred, and if this money was spent actually improving the lives of everyone in society. If a billionaire buys a second mansion, this will increase economism metrics just as much as if the workers they had exploited had used this money instead to purchase their first homes. If workers spend inordinate amounts of money on medication and physical therapy for conditions that they are only suffering from because they are being forced to work to the point of ill-health, this will increase economism metrics just as much as if they were in good health and spending this money on leisurely activities. If consumers have low purchasing power because of price gouging, and cannot even pay for basic necessities, this will increase economism metrics just as much as if they had high purchasing power and spent the same amount of money providing for themselves and their family a much higher quality of life. If consumers purchase replacement products because their previous products become unusable due to planned obsolescence, this will increase economism metrics just as much as if they had spent their money purchasing something they don't currently own. These economism metrics also don't account for whether consumer spending is occurring as a consequence of higher wages, or as a consequence of necessary personal debt.

Many of these problems can be categorized as the “broken window fallacy”. If a window is broken, and costs money to repair, this increases economic metrics like GDP and employment numbers, but still adds nothing to the nation’s prosperity. In fact, a broken window would effectively lower the nation’s prosperity, because the money, resources, and labor, required to fix it, can no longer be allocated to things that could have provided a net benefit to society. And this problem is true of all economism metrics. For example, capitalism uses profits to measure the success of businesses, but profits do not reveal whether a business is actually providing a net value to society, nor whether they are fulfilling consumer needs in the most hospitable, efficient, ethical, or sustainable way possible. In fact, if high profits are a sign of anything, they are usually a sign that a business has successfully managed to steal as much wealth as possible from the rest of society.

There is also other important information that economism metrics don’t reveal, and which is rarely discussed in political and economic discourse. Economism metrics reveal nothing about the state of a nation, such as the quality of its infrastructure, national debt, and national deficit. Economism metrics don’t directly reveal the state of scientific and technological progress within a country, and whether sufficient resources are being allocated to maximizing innovation in the areas which will best benefit society, such as healthcare and automation. Economism metrics can also only increase with endless consumption, which is impossible to sustain in a world of finite resources, and which currently exacerbates environmental pollution and destruction. Economism metrics not only reveal nothing of value about the economy or society, but reveal less than nothing because they imply falsehoods and distract from more meaningful metrics.

Economism metrics are also used to create fallacious arguments related to work. It is common for capitalists to boast about wages while completely ignoring real wages. The term “wages” simply refers to how much a person is regularly paid, and usually refers to an hourly rate. These wages can more accurately be described as “nominal wages”. Conversely, “real wages” are the same as nominal

wages except adjusted for inflation. Wage increases count for nothing if the prices of goods and services, and particularly essential goods and services, increase at the same rate or a higher rate. In reality, real wages have stagnated or declined for the lower classes in most developed countries during the past 50-70 years, which is the opposite of what should have occurred with exponential increases in productivity. Despite this, capitalists intentionally and predominantly use nominal wages rather than real wages to avoid revealing how broken capitalism truly is.

High employment numbers are also regularly flaunted in economic discourse, while no consideration is given to more important metrics like compensation extraction, wage theft, workplace conditions, worker dignity, production quotas, job security, paid vacation, paid medical leave, paid parental leave, paid bereavement leave, pension contributions, work hours, required overtime, unpaid overtime, zero hour contracts, job satisfaction, worker protections, underemployment, and overemployment. Employment numbers can also be misleading because high employment numbers often include students, retirees, and those with disabilities, who are forced to work because of financial desperation caused by capitalism. Employment numbers also don't account for "bullshit jobs", which not only provide no value to society, but also reduce the genuine value that can be created because of this wasted allocation of human capital. Employment numbers can also increase due to businesses hiring two or more part-time workers instead of one full-time worker in order to avoid providing benefits. Employment numbers also include gig economy workers, many of whom don't earn a minimum wage, most of whom lack the benefits and security of a traditional job, and all of whom have to spend money on operational expenses, like fuel, and capital expenses, like buying, maintaining, and improving assets.

Employment numbers when cited in isolation count for effectively nothing. This is further evidenced by the fact that 100% employment could be achieved in a society that legalized slavery, which is not far removed from the wage slavery that exists in society today. In fact high employment numbers have never had any value because they

are only relevant under capitalism. First, under socialism everyone would receive a UBI, and everyone would also have more discretionary income and purchasing power, meaning people would spend more money, which would guarantee high demand for workers, and consequently high employment numbers. Second, and more importantly, employment numbers under socialism would not need to be high to ensure everyone could fulfill their basic needs, since this would be guaranteed via a UBI and public infrastructures and services, and the fact that there would always be enough workers to perform all essential labor, since most people want to afford for themselves a higher quality of life than the bare minimum. Third, under socialism people would only work as much as they wanted, rather than out of necessity, which is far more important than forcing as many people to work as possible.

This prioritization of economism metrics has also been complemented by well-known capitalist expressions, the most influential of which tend to rely upon capitalism's requirement for perpetual growth. Such expressions include "the economy is not a zero-sum game", "the economic pie is always increasing", and "a rising tide lifts all boats". The only thing these expressions demonstrate is the shallowness of capitalist propaganda. First, these arguments are made redundant by the fact that everyone would already have substantially more wealth if everyone received a UBI, and if workers and consumers were not exploited. Second, the wealth generated under capitalism is pitiful compared to what could be created in a socialist world, particularly considering unnecessary jobs would be eradicated and innovation would be maximized.

Third, it is disingenuous and manipulative to say that capitalism is not a zero-sum game. Just as there is a limited amount of existing wealth in the world at any given time, there is also a limited amount of wealth that can be created within any given period of time. Capitalism may not be a zero-sum game in the sense that new wealth is always being created, but it is still a zero-sum game in terms of how much preexisting wealth and newly created wealth exists at any given moment. In any given period of time, the ruling

class getting richer will always mean that there is less to go around for the lower classes. This is so astoundingly obvious that its surprising capitalists ever used the creation of new wealth to justify extreme income and wealth inequality. This capitalist argument is made particularly disgusting considering most preexisting wealth and newly created wealth exists as a consequence of the most reprehensible forms of exploitation imaginable, particularly in underdeveloped countries.

Fourth, none of this even addresses the problem that this world has finite resources, and resource depletion is already a serious problem facing the world. Relying upon endless growth as a means of lifting everyone out of poverty is not only inefficient, but pure fantasy. Economies should never have been trying to solve poverty purely through creating new wealth, particularly considering it was always inevitable that capitalism would produce this wealth through abusive, destructive, and unsustainable methods. If preexisting wealth has been grossly unfairly distributed, and newly created wealth continues to be grossly unfairly distributed, then the solution is obviously not to simply continue creating new wealth. The solution was always to create a system in which preexisting wealth and newly created wealth is distributed fairly. Even a young child could understand this, and yet even capitalist "academics" continue to fail to grasp such basic and obvious concepts.

An additional problem with all of this propaganda is that even when economism arguments are used as evidence to support positive changes in society, capitalists always refuse to place these positive changes into context. For example, a capitalist may point out that a multibillion dollar corporation has increased their workers hourly wages from \$10 to \$11 in a single year, which is a massive 10% increase, and far higher than annual inflation. However, this is of little significance if their wages should be \$40 per hour if wages had kept up with inflation over the past 50 years, and if they were fairly compensated for their labor. If a person's income should be even higher because of a UBI, then the capitalist's argument becomes even more ludicrous. Despite this, capitalists continue to ignore such

important contexts. Incremental improvements are praised and repeated ad nauseam, while larger systemic abuses and problems are ignored entirely.

Another problem with economism propaganda is that it is extremely difficult to debunk. A capitalist can appear like an authority when using economism arguments, because these are often concise, technical, and intuitive sounding. Conversely, the arguments required to debunk capitalist propaganda take far longer, as supported by Brandolini's law. For example, a news reporter, politician, or billionaire, can use GDP to imply the strength of the economy within a few sentences, but it may take a respondent hundreds of sentences of detailed information and academic language to explain why this metric is effectively meaningless, and to describe with accuracy the complex means by which everyone should actually judge an economy and society.

Conclusion

Capitalism is fundamentally incapable of creating strong economies. In the long-term capitalism will always result in economic collapse, because capitalist economies require endless growth in a world of finite resources. In the short-term capitalism will always result in economic downturns that harm and destroy businesses and lives, and periods of economic stability that don't come anywhere close to fulfilling the needs of everyone in society, which is the entire purpose of an economy. Capitalists have been able to maintain the illusion that capitalism is essential for creating strong economies primarily by perpetuating economism metrics and related expressions that clearly only exist to inevitably maximize the wealth of the ruling class. Socialist and communist economies by contrast would produce the most stable economies possible, and would ensure that the quality of life of everyone in society was as high as possible and improved as rapidly as possible.

“Capitalism is the most truthful economic system”

Capitalists regularly claim that their system can be defended using logical arguments and evidence, and contrast their system with the supposedly socialist and communist economies of the past that could only be maintained through indoctrination carried out by authoritarian governments. This is why many modern capitalists reference reeducation camps, the Gulags, and the George Orwell novel *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, when criticizing present-day socialists and communists. Ironically it is in fact capitalism that has to indoctrinate populations in order to survive. If any government treated humans and animals the same way capitalist businesses and industries do, was responsible for destroying the lives of all future generations via existential threats, and all so that its politicians could syphon off as many billions of dollars as capitalists currently do, it would be universally regarded as one of the most evil and corrupt tyrannical dictatorships in all of human history. The only reason this isn't universally recognized regarding capitalism is due to decades of indoctrination, which has included the use of propaganda that has been responsible for stigmatizing socialism and communism.

By manufacturing consent, the capitalist ruling class has managed to rely upon soft power rather than hard power to retain and increase their wealth and power. This shouldn't be surprising, since the ruling class has been indoctrinating the masses throughout human history as a way of protecting themselves. Probably the most extreme example of this would be the rulers of the past who declared themselves gods, or special individuals chosen by gods. Such extreme forms of propaganda have predominantly disappeared as the masses have become more critically minded and scientifically literate. Despite this progress, most societies are still not critically minded or educated enough to refute all forms of propaganda, which is why most people alive today still live under the oppression of the

ruling class. However, as is the case with successful instances of indoctrination, most people alive today don't even realize they are being oppressed. Instead they praise the ruling class for successfully acquiring their wealth and power, and ardently defend the very economic system that has enabled this. This incredible level of indoctrination has been achieved through a variety of propaganda techniques predominantly propagated by capitalists.

Newspeak

One of the most dominant ways capitalists have been able to inoculate the public against criticisms of capitalism has been through Newspeak, which informally speaking describes any language that possesses an intentionally restricted and ever depleting vocabulary. Newspeak can consequently be understood as a form of obscurantism when done intentionally, which is the practice of deliberately restricting access to information, or deliberately presenting information in an incomplete, imprecise, or confusing manner, in order to limit further inquiry and understanding. Evidence of capitalist Newspeak includes the fact that words like "profits" and "GDP" are well-known household terms, and yet far fewer people are aware of, or know the correct definitions of, terms and expressions used to criticize capitalism. These include egalitarianism, public property, personal property, capital flight, human capital flight, brain drain, externalities, capacity utilization, just-in-time supply chains, regulatory capture, self-regulation, surplus value extraction, technological surplus, fictitious capital, economism, the broken window fallacy, rent-seeking, rentier economies, progressive passive income, greedflation, shrinkflation, skimpflation, algorithmic pricing, insurance death spiral, inelastic demand, use value, exchange value, commodification, conspicuous leisure, conspicuous consumption, invidious consumption, Veblen goods, planned obsolescence, perceived obsolescence, right to repair, patent trolls, evergreening, material conditions, social conditions, gentrification, third places, hostile architecture, criminogenic, school-to-prison pipeline, working poor, wage theft, wage slavery, precarious work, bullshit jobs, crunch culture, job lock, underemployment, emotional labor, invisible

labor, technological unemployment, welfare trap, ghetto tax, false economy, boots theory, cycle of poverty, poverty trap, development trap, food insecurity, structural violence, social murder, deaths of despair, shit life syndrome, situational depression, status anxiety, alienation, the underclass, reserve army of labor, class conflict, class consciousness, false consciousness, class traitor, dictatorship of the proletariat, shock doctrine, disaster capitalism, demand-side economics, corporatocracy, corporate welfare, late-stage capitalism, internal colonialism, neocolonialism, unequal exchange, natural monopoly, debt trap diplomacy, structural adjustment programs, economic hit men, puppet regimes, conflict minerals, base and superstructure, psychopolitics, manufacturing consent, cultural hegemony, capitalist realism, doublethink, attitude inoculation, phobia indoctrination, gaslighting, obscurantism, Newspeak, doublespeak, recuperation, humane washing, greenwashing, red washing, pinkwashing, rainbow capitalism, captive audience meetings, perseverance porn, poverty porn, conscious capitalism, the appeal to wealth fallacy, and system justification bias, to name the most pertinent examples. It is little surprise that George Orwell, who coined the term Newspeak, supported democratic socialism.

Capitalist Newspeak has also directly limited people's understanding of socialism. Most people are unaware that the word socialism is an umbrella term encompassing a wide variety of diverse economic systems. For example, state socialism, market socialism, and democratic socialism, are extremely different systems, and yet very few people are aware of these terms or their definitions. Even those who are aware of democratic socialism, which is the most widely known form of socialism, commonly deride it for supposedly being no different than the authoritarian "socialist" and "communist" regimes of the past. And of course most people are also unaware of the terms used to describe and define different types of socialism, such as worker cooperatives, consumer cooperatives, social ownership, collective ownership, public ownership, economic planning, centralized planning, and decentralized planning. Consequently, most people have no understanding of socialism, its various forms, or its constituent components. Incidentally, capitalism conversely cannot

be defended by arguing that it is an umbrella term, since any economic system that prioritizes privatization, free markets, and profits, will always be fundamentally broken.

Another noteworthy consequence of capitalist Newspeak has been society's conceptualization of profits. Very few people, including capitalists, understand what profits actually represent. This is why capitalists regularly ridicule socialists for being against profits, since profits are necessary for businesses to sustain themselves and expand their operations. The problem is that the term profits predominantly refers to stolen wealth, which would be common knowledge if all the terms describing all forms of theft under capitalism were also common knowledge. So when socialists criticize profits, they are not naïve to the fact that businesses need to generate a surplus to survive and prosper, but are instead condemning the practice of stealing wealth, which they argue is unavoidable under capitalism for all the reasons discussed in this manifesto. However, because most people are economically illiterate, socialists ironically end up being perceived as the most economically illiterate people in society, when in fact socialism is rightly recognized as the best system by those who are the most economically literate.

Doublespeak

Another way capitalists have inoculated the public against criticisms of their system has been doublespeak, which is another term coined by George Orwell. Unlike Newspeak, which reduces the words and expressions available to people, doublespeak involves using words and expressions to obscure, distort, dilute, invert, or disguise, people's perception of reality, and also commonly involves modifying the definitions of words and expressions to achieve this goal. For this reason doublespeak can also be understood as a form of obscurantism when this occurs intentionally. Doublespeak has occurred in two notable ways with regards to capitalism. The first is that all of capitalism's negative consequences are attributed to scapegoats. These most often include scapegoats that are unavoidable consequences of capitalism, such as crony capitalism, or

scapegoats that cannot be blamed for capitalism's problems, such as government interference. Even when capitalists do acknowledge capitalism's problems, they advocate for particular forms of capitalism, such as "stakeholder capitalism", or "conscious capitalism", which nonetheless still prioritize privatization, free markets, and profits.

The second is that all of socialism's positive consequences are attributed to capitalism. More specifically, the most successful countries in the world are social democracies, in which both capitalist and socialist organizations and systems play a role. In reality, it is the socialist elements of developed countries that are responsible for the relatively high quality of life of their citizens, as will become increasingly clear. Despite this, these countries are nearly always described as capitalist, while most people remain unaware of the term social democracy or its definition. And this problem has been further exacerbated by the use of terms like "public goods" and "state-run initiatives" to describe public infrastructures and services, instead of terms that could have drawn attention to their socialist nature. So doublespeak has not only enabled capitalism to avoid taking responsibility for its negative consequences, but has also enabled capitalism to effectively take credit for socialism's positive consequences.

Capitalist doublespeak has manifested in its most extreme form in the manipulation of left-wing economic concepts, due to it having effectively inverted their meaning. A very serious example is the conflating of socialism with fascism, even though socialism is a left-wing ideology and fascism is a far-right ideology. This is a serious example because fascism was the most dangerous ideology of the 20th century, and is very likely the most dangerous ideology of the 21st century, and if people are unable to identify it, then fascists are all the more likely to succeed. Another example is the socialist expression "dictatorship of the proletariat", which has always referred to a society in which all political and economic organizations and systems are controlled by everyone in society, rather than the ruling class. Under capitalism the meaning of this expression has

been inverted to mean a literal dictatorship, with all the sinister implications this word implies. Another example is the word anarchism, which is most commonly perceived as the advocacy of chaos, but is merely the advocacy of the eradication of unjustified hierarchies, which is ideal for achieving long-term stability.

However, perhaps the most extreme example of inversion is the modern interpretation of the word communism. This is because it has now come to be synonymous with authoritarian states, even though the literal definition of communism is the eradication of the state. Additionally, almost all communists today are anarcho-communists, who advocate for the immediate eradication of the state without any transitional stages. This lack of awareness has resulted in some bizarre outcomes. First, many lower class advocates of capitalism profess a hatred for communism, even though they would far more likely be communists than capitalists if they were economically literate. This is not only because capitalism oppresses the lower classes, but because most people who hate communism also hate state overreach and oppression, and there is no group of individuals that hates state overreach and oppression more than communists, which is why they advocate for the complete abolition of the state.

Second, communism is used to describe countries like China and North Korea, even though such countries are ruled by authoritarian states, have strong class divisions, have gross wealth inequality, use centralized economic planning, and involve effectively no social ownership of the means of production, meaning they are the opposite of communism. Third, communism is now seen as an authoritarian system that requires the indoctrination of the masses, even though communists are among the least indoctrinated people in society due to being economically literate. Conversely, supporters of capitalism are among the most indoctrinated and economically illiterate people in society, and have become so obedient that they are even willing to defend the ruling class and mindlessly obey their workplace superiors without resistance. Fourth, communism is seen as a system that would reduce or eradicate everyone's freedom, even though communism is capable of maximizing people's freedom

better than most other systems. Conversely, capitalism is a system that obviously severely limits people's freedom.

Because of doublespeak, and particularly its power to invert the meaning of words and expressions, terms like socialism, communism, Marxism, and anarchism, have effectively lost all meaning, and have just become vague placeholders for anything capitalists and right-wingers view negatively. Ironically, most of the things capitalists don't like about these alternative economic systems are actually properties of capitalism, such as poverty, inflation, worker exploitation, reduced freedom, undemocratic institutions, the ruling class, and the systemic theft of people's wealth. This indoctrination has become so extreme that even those who advocate for social democracy are commonly derided as "commies". This manipulation of language is nothing new however. In 1950's America, racists and homophobes regularly condemned race mixing and homosexuality by arguing that they were forms of communism.

The power of capitalist doublespeak however is perhaps best illustrated in its inversion of the deepity expression "pick yourself up by your bootstraps", which is commonly used by capitalist's to cruelly condemn those who find themselves in dire financial circumstances through no fault of their own. This is such a remarkable example because, unlike most other forms of doublespeak, the inversion is overtly self-evident. It is physically impossible for a person to "pick themselves up by their bootstraps", meaning that it cannot function as a workable analogy. This is because the original expression was designed to describe absurdly impossible actions, and was most commonly used to describe how difficult it can be for people to lift themselves out of dire economic circumstances. This saying was therefore designed to mock those who failed to understand this. The expression was then recuperated over time to mean its opposite, giving critics of capitalism one less expression to succinctly explain its problems, and giving supporters one more expression to defend it. This should have been impossible because of how overtly contradictory the expression is, and yet the fact that this occurred is testament to the power of doublespeak.

Sometimes however it's not possible to change the meaning of existing terms, and so alternative or new terms are used in their place. When describing those who publically rally against capitalism, words like "crowds" and "protestors" are often replaced with words like "mobs", "radicals", "agitators", and even "terrorists". This obviously portrays protestors as being inherently violent, or being unjustified in their actions. Worse still, this can also provide law enforcement with the optics necessary to better justify physical violence and crackdowns, and even preemptive attacks. When this occurs, unnecessary forms of police violence are described as "maintaining order" or "keeping the peace". Another serious example of word substitution is the use of the term "developing" when describing poor countries, and the term "developed" when describing wealthy countries, even though in most contexts it would be more accurate and helpful to describe the former as "exploited" or "imperialized" countries, and to describe the latter as "exploiter" or "imperialist" countries. Another serious example is the term "non-profit", which implies charity, but in many countries is often merely another name for tax avoidance.

Some of the most serious examples of word replacement have occurred with regards to the military. This can also be attributed to capitalism, since the military has largely been used for imperialist endeavors in recent history. The word "defense" is often used when the word "military" would be more applicable, since this reframes imperialist military actions as essential forms of preemptive self-defense. The term "collateral damage" is often used even when "civilian casualties" would be more applicable, since this sanitized language makes avoidable military actions and mistakes easier to justify. This sanitization is also why the United States government refers to their torture program as "enhanced interrogation", which is made worse by the fact that most people tortured under this program have been innocent civilians. Expressions like "humanitarian intervention" are also often used when it would be more appropriate to use an expression like "a morally unjustifiable and internationally condemned military operation pursued by an imperialist nation for

the benefit of the ruling class". And as should be expected under capitalism, replacing words and expressions in order to downplay and justify imperialist military endeavors has been practiced by the media just as much as by governments and militaries.

Capitalist doublespeak however isn't always as extreme as the examples provided thus far, and is often just used to subtly distort the way society perceives reality. For example, healthy activities that are engaged in for rest and relaxation are commonly described by capitalists as forms of laziness and childishness instead. Adults who play computer games are commonly ridiculed for this activity, and told that they should grow up, and spend more time being productive and contributing to society, which is often just another way of telling these adults to spend more time and energy making money for their employers and the ruling class. It also rarely occurs to these capitalists that automation will make all humans technologically unemployable within the next few decades, meaning that at some point in the future all adults will spend nearly all of their waking hours engaging in such "lazy" and "childish" recreational pursuits. Another example is the practice of higher-ups describing themselves and their workforce as "family", and their exploited employees as "partners". This latter example is particularly egregious when applied to employees who are intentionally hired as contractors so that the company can avoid providing legally mandated benefits.

Recuperation

When modifying the meaning of words that are critical of capitalism, doublespeak can also be understood as a form of recuperation, which is the process by which politically critical or radical ideas and images are co-opted, defused, repurposed, commodified, and reincorporated back into media and society. Consequently, recuperation can also apply to things far outside of language. One example of this is recycling symbols, which no longer serve their original function of informing customers. Most recycling symbols count for nothing because the products they are applied to are incapable of being recycled, and this often occurs even when recyclable alternatives

already exist but are not used because this would be less profitable. Alternatively products may be recyclable but may never be recycled due to a country or the world not yet possessing the necessary equipment or infrastructure. Incidentally this often occurs because governments are underfunded due to capitalism or because they are controlled by capitalist politicians. Industries have adopted these meaningless recycling symbols so that they can placate activists, and push this recycling responsibility onto consumers, rather than use their profits to provide or fund convenient recycling services, or fund research into more environmentally friendly products, or make their products more robust.

Climate change could also be understood as a victim of recuperation under capitalism. Climate change was originally perceived as a problem that the fossil fuel industry was predominantly responsible for addressing, since they have always had the profits, knowledge, resources, etc. necessary to offset their externalities, including greenhouse gas emissions. The fossil fuel industry recuperated this idea by persuading the public that it was predominantly their responsibility to address climate change through lifestyle changes, while taking no remedial efforts themselves. This is one of the main reasons why consumers have been told so repeatedly in recent history to be aware of their carbon footprint. It was always the responsibility of businesses to reduce, capture, or offset their emissions, rather than shirking responsibility onto consumers, and running the obvious and high risk that these emissions would not be offset. This is particularly devious since businesses know most consumers don't have the means to reduce their emissions. For example, most consumers don't have the discretionary income and purchasing power necessary to offset their emissions, nor do they have access to public transportation that is good enough for them to forgo private transportation. Consumer responsibility is important, but this idea was never created in addition to corporate responsibility, but as a replacement for it.

Another example of recuperation is the board game Monopoly, which was originally called "The Landlord's Game", and originally designed

by its creator, Lizzie Magie, to warn people about the dangers of wealth and power consolidation that are inevitable under capitalism. However, even though for decades Monopoly has been a perfect method for teaching tens of millions of people this invaluable lesson, under capitalism this has unsurprisingly never occurred. Instead it has been recuperated into just another board game, and if anything, a board game in which wealth and power consolidation is idealized as the best way to achieve success.

The modern entertainment industry also engages in recuperation. One example is rap music, which during its rise predominantly drew attention to issues caused by capitalism, such as crime and poverty, but has increasingly become obsessed with the extravagant wealth and lifestyles that are idealized under capitalism. Another example is the trend of anti-capitalist groups and protestors in movies and TV shows being portrayed most commonly as radical and dangerous, while the heroes of these stories are idealized for defending the status quo or advocating for slow incremental change, even as capitalism continues to be responsible for killing millions of adults and children every year, for brutalizing animals on an industrial scale, for irreversibly destroying the planet, and for exacerbating a range of increasingly dangerous existential threats. However, this problem isn't unidirectional, as capitalists also use recuperation when interpreting entertainment media. A modern-day example of this is the Netflix series *Squid Game*, which is an overtly anti-capitalist show, and which was further confirmed as such by its creator. Despite this, many capitalists have argued it is not anti-capitalist, while others have even argued it is anti-socialist or anti-communist. Whether these commentaries were the consequence of intentional grifting or a severe lack of critical thinking skills, the end result is the same, which is recuperation that further perpetuates capitalism.

Arguably the most significant examples of recuperation in recent history have been the co-opting of left-wing figures, such as George Carlin and Martin Luther King Jr., who were against the right, the ruling class, and capitalism. Despite this, such figures are being reframed by capitalists as people that would have stood by them in

their criticisms of modern left-wingers and Marxists. Martin Luther King Jr. in particular has been defanged as a left-wing radical, even though he staunchly condemned incrementalism and those who weren't willing to do what was necessary for achieving radical change. This is disgustingly offensive, since during their lives, radical figures like Martin Luther King Jr. were victims of ongoing slander, harassment, physical violence, wrongful imprisonment, death threats, and murder, because of their radical beliefs. For capitalists to deny such individuals of their radicalism is to downplay and cover up the incredible sacrifices they made, and the incredible progress they were only able to achieve, as a consequence of their radicalism. In fact the very capitalists who hate and overtly condemn radicals today would have been at the forefront of hating and overtly condemning radicals like Martin Luther King Jr. in the past for the same reason. And this trend of recuperating radical individuals holds equally true for many morally justifiable radical movements throughout history, whether political, economic, social, or cultural in nature.

Extremism

Another powerful tactic used to make socialism and communism appear unviable is to straw man them in order to make them seem like extremist ideologies. This could also be described as a form of phobia indoctrination, since not only are people led to believe that socialism and communism are illogical, but that they are dangerous systems to be feared. This tactic is to be expected under capitalism since exaggerating reasonable ideas to the point of absurdity has always been a common propaganda technique. There are many examples of this. Democratic socialism and communism are often conflated with complete government control, even though they both advocate for the democratization of all political institutions, as well as for increased decentralization in the case of democratic socialism, and total decentralization in the case of communism. Capitalists always attempt to defame socialists and communists by claiming they are against property rights and owning personal belongings, even though they both fully support personal property rights, and condemn capitalism for reducing people's ability to purchase personal

property because of problems like privatization and people's limited discretionary income and purchasing power. Capitalists argue that socialism and communism always lead to abject poverty, despite the fact that they are the best systems for ensuring economic stability and the fulfillment of everyone's essential needs at all times.

Capitalists call socialists and communists delusional for wanting "free" services, even though "free" in this context has always just been an abbreviation of "free at the point of service", and even though free services can be paid for with the world's resources and technological surplus. Political candidates who promise to provide "free" things, and particularly welfare, are also condemned for attempting to bribe the public, even though this is ludicrous for the same reason. This issue alone perfectly demonstrates the shallowness and irrationality of capitalist propaganda. Sentiments like, "the world doesn't owe you anything", "there's no such thing as a free lunch", "the problem with socialism is that you eventually run out of other peoples' money", "you don't have a right to someone else's labor", and "Marxists don't love the poor, they just hate the rich", are evidently some of the most uncritically minded and economically illiterate sentiments in modern political and economic discourse. The idea that the world's resources and technological surplus belong to everyone, and that these could be used to pay others to perform essential labor, was true and overtly self-evident even thousands of years ago. The fact that so many supporters of capitalism still do not understand this, even after all this time, demonstrates how effective the capitalist system has been at keeping people uncritically minded and economically illiterate.

Socialism and communism are also stigmatized as systems in which the government taxes everyone to the point of destitution or bankruptcy, even though socialism and communism would increase everyone's discretionary income and purchasing power, and would end economic downturns, which commonly cause bankruptcy. Socialism and communism are also condemned as authoritarian, even though by definition and in practice they are the most democratic and anti-authoritarian systems in existence. Socialists

and communists are condemned as naïve for thinking their systems would create a utopia, even though they never claim this. Socialists and communists are also derided for believing themselves to be perfect incorruptible leaders, even though it is their recognition of human fallibility and corruptibility that is the very reason why they advocate for democratization. This criticism is particularly ironic given that capitalists commonly advocate for “conscious capitalism”, which naïvely assumes higher-ups can be persuaded to behave ethically despite maintaining capitalist incentive structures, and which consequently expects and requires humans to behave more perfectly than what socialists or communists have ever expected or required.

Perhaps one of the most common extremist ideas perpetuated by capitalist propaganda is that socialism and communism demand equal outcomes for everyone in society. Even Karl Marx was against equality of outcome, and his foundational communist principle “From each according to their abilities, to each according to their needs” proved this from the very beginning. If everyone in society has different needs, then equality of outcome becomes impossible. If a worker is stressed and physically weary from performing undesirable, difficult, but essential labor, then what that worker will need, in terms of compensation, to achieve the same wellbeing and quality of life as someone who performs a much cushier job, will consequently be very different. Under socialism and communism, such essential workers would be well compensated. Under capitalism, such essential workers are often the lowest paid workers in society. The eradication of classes has also never necessitated equal outcomes, since the Marxist definition of classes refers broadly to the ruling class and the worker class, which are defined by their power differential, and not their wealth differential. Some forms of communism advocate for equal outcomes regardless of hard work and contributions, but these are extremely niche ideologies that are rejected by the overwhelming majority of socialists and communists. The real reason equality of outcome has become such a disproportionately pervasive idea is due to influential capitalists attempting to present socialism and communism as being more extreme than they actually are.

It is even possible for millionaires to exist under most forms of socialism and communism. If a person works from age 20 to age 70, earning an average of \$200,000 a year, most socialists and communists would not consider this unreasonable compensation for someone who performs an invaluable but difficult job. This person would earn \$10 million over their 50 year career, and would be able to save a sizable percentage of this under socialism and communism because of the low prices of goods and services. Consequently, countless people would be millionaires even well before the end of their careers under socialism and communism. The expression "millionaires and billionaires" has always been an informal expression used by socialists and communists to condemn those with unjustified wealth, and has obviously never meant to be taken as a literal attack against every person with assets worth over exactly \$1 million. This misinterpretation is also true of the term "the rich". Socialists and communists are not against people being rich, but instead merely use the term "the rich" as a shorthand way of describing wealthy individuals that do not deserve their wealth. Additionally, there is a huge difference between someone being a millionaire as they near retirement, after spending their entire life performing valuable but difficult labor, and someone unjustifiably acquiring the same wealth by their twenties or thirties.

Conclusion

Capitalism cannot be described as a truthful system, because it can only perpetuate itself by indoctrinating populations. If most people in society knew the truth, capitalism and the ruling class would have been overthrown long ago. To protect themselves the capitalist ruling class has spent decades inoculating the masses against criticisms of capitalism using a variety of indoctrination techniques, and particularly Newspeak, doublespeak, obscurantism, recuperation, strawmanning, and phobia indoctrination. This indoctrination has very successfully persuaded the masses to embrace the very system that exploits them, and to reject the very systems that would empower them and maximize their quality of life.

“Capitalism predominantly has problems because of the poor”

One of the nastiest forms of capitalist propaganda has been the scornful stigmatization of those most exploited by the system. The most common form of this condemnation has been the explicit argument that they simply lack maturity and moral integrity. There are numerous ways this has manifested. When workers argue that they are underpaid, this is never blamed on employers exploiting their workers, but on workers not working hard enough to give their employers a reason to increase their compensation. When welfare recipients ask for increased assistance in order to escape poverty, this is never blamed on landlords and businesses exploitatively taking advantage of this guaranteed income, but on welfare recipients being too self-entitled. When those in poverty criticize the obscene wealth of the superrich, this is never blamed on the obvious brokenness of capitalism, but on critics possessing a victim mentality. As this manifesto has proven thus far, the irrationality of these arguments is staggering.

Capitalists who argue that hard work is necessary for developing maturity and integrity also fail to understand that their system forces people to struggle far beyond what would ever be necessary for cultivating such traits. They disregard how brutally exhausting and miserable life is for most people in the world under capitalism, particularly for those who have to watch their loved ones needlessly suffer or die. More to the point, the amount that people struggle under capitalism is completely counterproductive. The stress that capitalism causes people is responsible for a host of mental health problems, and for robbing people of the time and energy necessary for becoming the best version of themselves. A well-balanced life can already provide more than enough challenges to produce an ideally mature individual, such as challenges related to work, finances, relationships, raising children, physical health, mental wellbeing, and

self-actualization. People have never needed to struggle to feed their family, or worry about being made homeless, or be terrified of dying from inadequate access to healthcare, in order to develop virtuous traits. And if this wasn't bad enough, capitalism rewards people for ruthlessly exploiting people, animals, and the planet, meaning it is in fact an atrocious system for cultivating maturity and integrity.

However, perhaps the most grotesque part of this capitalist argument is that it can only ever apply to healthy adults who are capable of working. A significant percentage of people living in poverty are children, single parents, the elderly, unpaid caretakers who look after loved ones, and people with physical and mental health problems and disabilities. Such individuals either can't work or shouldn't have to work to escape poverty, so responding to the problem of poverty by arguing that hard work cultivates maturity and integrity is genuinely disgusting, since if poverty exists under capitalism it will always unavoidably affect such individuals. Worse still, this problem is especially true for children. When parents, grandparents, teachers, and other guardians, unnecessarily struggle under capitalism, they cannot give children the quality time, physical energy, mental concentration, emotional availability, and physical resources, that children need and deserve. Far from helping children build character or develop any positive traits, such circumstances prevent children from having their physical, intellectual, and emotional needs fulfilled, and in many cases can lead to behavioral problems and long-term mental health problems. It is ridiculous to propose that struggling under capitalism has value when this struggling is so severe that it obviously prevents most children in the world from having their most basic needs fulfilled regardless of how hard the adults in their life struggle to provide for them. This capitalist interpretation of the hard work that is necessary for surviving under capitalism demonstrates how sadistically perverse capitalist propaganda has become.

An additional problem that has emerged as a consequence of this propaganda has been the unhealthy idolization and fetishization of work. While hard work is noble and essential in every economic

system, this belief has mutated to the point that the traditional 5 day, 9 to 5 workweek is considered normal and necessary. Technology advanced more than enough decades ago to allow many people to never work, and for everyone else to work less than the standard workweek. Not only has this possibility been robbed from the lower classes, but many businesses go even further and expect employees to work overtime, including unpaid overtime, as standard practice. Despite this, capitalist indoctrination has become so severe that even those that work themselves to ill-health, or those that can barely afford to spend time with their loved ones, ardently defend this system. The rise of hustle culture, which embodies and promotes this unhealthy prioritization of hard work at the expense of all else, is a perfect example of how manufacturing consent can become so deeply ingrained that it can give rise to perverse and even masochistic ideologies that perpetuate and fortify the system, rather than challenge it.

This grotesque idolization and fetishization of hard work has even reached a point where people are unwilling to accept government assistance, because they view "government handouts" as demeaning. A willingness to work hard is undeniably noble, but an unwillingness to claim one's birthright to the world's resources and technological surplus, and a willingness to have these stolen by the ruling class, is extremely far from noble. If anything it is a sign of stunted maturity, low self-worth, and a perverse and masochistic obsession with hard work. This unhealthy mindset should surprise no one, since the poor are constantly told by the ruling class, and their indoctrinated peers, to stop complaining, to get their life in order, and to start working harder. It is important to understand here that exploiting and abusing people, then telling them that they should be grateful for what they have, that they should stop blaming their abusers, and that they should take responsibility for their suffering, is a common form of psychological manipulation used in abusive relationships. So this form of propaganda can also be understood as a form of psychological abuse.

This condemnation of capitalism's victims is also mirrored by a perverse veneration of the very people responsible for their exploitation. For example, it is often argued that the higher-ups of corporations are responsible for providing some of the best jobs that currently exist in underdeveloped countries. The disproportionate amount of wealth these corporations extract is then justified by this argument. This is a disturbing and manipulative argument. Many jobs in underdeveloped countries that are high up in the supply chains of multinational corporations often provide higher wages and safer working conditions than the majority of other forms of work available in these countries, but they are still unnecessarily exploitative. The corporations that exploit them have more than enough profits and bargaining power to ensure living wages and humane working conditions for these workers, but they choose to increase their profits instead. To exploit people who are already living in poverty is one thing, but to justify this abuse using such manipulative reasoning is a special type of evil. If *reductio ad absurdum* is applied by taking this line of reasoning to its logical extreme, then it would also be permissible to adopt and sexually abuse a child, as long as that child experienced less sexual abuse than they would otherwise have experienced had they remained in their previous circumstances. The outrageous callousness and gross irrationality of this line of reasoning perfectly illustrates the genuine evilness of capitalist propaganda and propagandists.

The capitalist ruling class is also venerated for their "generous" and "altruistic" endeavors whenever they help the poor, but there are numerous problems with this. First, practically all of their wealth is acquired through systems of exploitation that are responsible for causing or perpetuating most poverty in the world in the first place. Second, the wealth they give away is always a fraction of the wealth they have stolen. Third, this wealth is often given to charities solely or primarily for tax reduction purposes. Fourth, the rich often donate their wealth to charities that benefit themselves, their family, and their friends. This often includes charities that invest money in companies these individuals are invested in, or charities that hire these individuals with unreasonably high salaries, and with the

opportunity to organize or partake in extremely expensive and luxurious fundraising events. Fifth, this wealth is sometimes even given in the form of loans, meaning interest can be earned on these loans. Sixth, this wealth is often donated to improve their public image, including being given to charities that may have rightfully criticized them but are subsequently unable to do so for fear of losing such desperately needed donations.

Praising the rich, while condemning the poor for struggling or complaining, and encouraging the downtrodden to fight among themselves in a state of perpetual desperation, exhaustion, and anxiety, is entirely by design. Capitalism guarantees that societies will always end up with billionaire media tycoons, paying millionaire news commentators, to tell the lower classes that their problems can be entirely blamed on themselves and each other. Worse still, wealthy corporate news commentators are also particularly partial to pretending through their presentation and rhetoric that they are friends and allies of the working class, and just common people like everyone else, rather than wealthy members of the ruling class who knowingly use their influence to enrich themselves and further worsen the lives of the lower classes. Former Fox News host and right-wing propagandist Tucker Carlson is a perfect example of this. The reality is that the exploitation suffered by the lower classes has meant that they have always had substantially more in common with each other than with the ruling class, but this propaganda has always prevented them from recognizing this.

This capitalist propaganda technique is particularly malicious when it is used to stigmatize and condemn marginalized or disempowered groups, such as immigrants, ethnic minorities, the homeless, welfare recipients, young adults, and LGBT+ individuals. Ironically, but unsurprisingly, socialists are also blamed for society's ills, even though they are a marginalized and underpowered group in nearly all countries, and even though socialist infrastructures and services are responsible for the higher quality of life experienced in developed countries. Capitalists also often blame shoplifters for economic problems, even though most shoplifters are in poverty, most

shoplifters steal either essential goods or non-essential goods which they use to afford essential goods, and shoplifting in developed countries accounts for less than 0.47% on average of the total revenue of businesses, which is obviously not anywhere close to being the main determinant of whether a business will fail under capitalism in most instances. Worse still is when this propaganda is used to endlessly attack people and demographics for insignificant or manufactured cultural issues, and for the purpose of distracting from the far greater problems and suffering caused by capitalism. It is only through this type of scapegoating that the ruling class has been able to prevent the working class from developing class consciousness and engaging critically with socialist ideas.

Conclusion

Blaming capitalism's problems on the very people exploited by the system has been one of capitalism's nastiest propaganda tactics. Capitalism's problems can obviously not be blamed on the poor, and especially not on a supposed lack of maturity and moral integrity. And rather than cultivating virtuous traits, the extent to which people have to struggle under capitalism is extremely harmful, and this is especially true for vulnerable demographics, and particularly children. And if this wasn't bad enough, the capitalist ruling class do everything they can to persuade society to venerate and idealize them, even as they exploit people, animals, and the planet, and encourage the lower classes to blame themselves and attack each other. It is surprising this tactic has not been perceived as more suspect than it actually is, since the primary source of this propaganda has always been members of the ruling class, and especially millionaire news commentators. Regardless, this type of propaganda and psychological abuse has nonetheless successfully enabled the ruling class to maximize their wealth and power without having to resort to threats and violence that would quickly result in them being overthrown.

“Capitalist countries are superior to socialist countries”

It is commonly believed that countries that embrace capitalism are superior to those that embrace socialism. The problem with this argument is that, depending on one's interpretation of socialism, there are literally only 2 to 4 socialist countries in the entire world. Aside from these countries and a few other exceptions, every country is a social democracy, and most of these strongly embrace capitalism. These countries have all embraced socialism to different extents, but by studying and comparing them it quickly becomes apparent that those that have embraced socialism to the greatest extent are also the countries that provide the highest quality of life. These socialist ideas have manifested in the form of socialist policies, socialist programs, and socialist organizations and systems. Each of these 3 socialist approaches will be assessed in turn. The end of this section will also address Venezuela, and other countries commonly derided as socialist.

Socialist policies

The countries with the highest quality of life have always been those that have instituted socialist policies. These include those that support robust public infrastructures, worker's rights, strong regulations, nationalization of essential industries, generous welfare programs, well-funded public services, and high taxes, particularly on the rich. In certain Nordic countries, even banks and telecommunication companies are nationalized. Among other successes, these more socialist countries are also known for having happier citizens, lower poverty rates, lower wealth inequality, lower crime rates, more leisure time, more personal freedom, greater economic mobility, more political freedom, stronger democracies, less corrupt governments, and an overall higher quality of life.

There are many holistic and high-quality studies that reveal the high correlation between countries with these types of socialist policies, and countries with the highest quality of life. Listed below are the results from the largest and most commonly cited studies that are used to rank countries with regards to quality of life. A small number of these studies focus more on politics than economics, but these particular studies have been included because they cover issues which are heavily influenced by economic factors.

The top 15 countries from each study are reported, and in descending order starting with the highest rated. Worth observing are the repeated appearances of the 5 Nordic countries, which include Finland, Iceland, and the three Scandinavian countries, Norway, Sweden and Denmark. Other countries with strong socialist policies that regularly appear on these lists include Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Germany, Ireland, Japan, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Switzerland, and the United Kingdom.

To provide contrast, these lists will also include America, since it is effectively the most pro-capitalist anti-socialist country among developed countries in terms of policies and ideology, as well as being one of the wealthiest countries in the world. Some argue that America's high immigration rates prove that capitalism provides people with a high quality of life, but this is completely irrelevant within the wider context of the following studies. In fact immigration to America is high predominantly because most immigrants come from substantially poorer nearby countries, and because America's size provides immense variety in terms of locations, climates, cultures, etc. It is with this information in mind that the following 44 studies can be properly contextualized.

- According to the Human Development Index, the top rated countries are Switzerland, Norway, Iceland, Hong Kong, Denmark, Sweden, Ireland, Germany, Singapore, the Netherlands, Australia, Liechtenstein, Belgium, Finland, and the United Kingdom. America is ranked 20th.

- According to the inequality-adjusted Human Development Index, the top rated countries are Iceland, Norway, Denmark, Switzerland, Ireland, Finland, the Netherlands, Slovenia, Germany, Sweden, Belgium, the United Kingdom, Canada, Australia, and the Austria. America is ranked 27th.
- According to the Where-to-be-born Index, the top rated countries are Canada, Australia, Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Singapore, New Zealand, the Netherlands, Switzerland, Hong Kong, Finland, Ireland, Austria, Taiwan, and Belgium. America is ranked 16th.
- According to the World Happiness Report, the top rated countries are Finland, Denmark, Iceland, Sweden, Israel, the Netherlands, Norway, Luxembourg, Switzerland, Australia, New Zealand, Costa Rica, Kuwait, Austria, and Canada. America is ranked 23rd.
- According to the Mental State of the World Report, the top rated countries are the Dominican Republic, Sri Lanka, Tanzania, Panama, Malaysia, Nigeria, Venezuela, El Salvador, Costa Rica, Uruguay, Italy, Puerto Rico, Honduras, Armenia, and Trinidad and Tobago. America is ranked 29th.
- According to the Global Retirement Index, the top rated countries are Norway, Switzerland, Iceland, Ireland, Australia, New Zealand, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Denmark, the Czech Republic, Germany, Finland, Sweden, Austria, and Canada. America is ranked 18th.
- According to the Better Life Index, the top rated countries are Norway, Australia, Iceland, Canada, Denmark, Switzerland, Finland, the Netherlands, Sweden, America, Luxembourg, New Zealand, Belgium, the United Kingdom, and Germany. America is ranked 10th here.
- According to the Legatum Prosperity Index, the top rated countries are Denmark, Sweden, Norway, Finland, Switzerland, the Netherlands, Luxembourg, Iceland, Germany, New Zealand, Ireland,

the United Kingdom, Canada, Austria, and Australia. America is ranked 19th.

- According to the Global Social Mobility Index, the top rated countries are Denmark, Norway, Finland, Sweden, Iceland, the Netherlands, Switzerland, Belgium, Austria, Luxembourg, Germany, France, Slovenia, Canada, and Japan. America is ranked 27th.

- According to the Social Progress Index, the top rated countries are Norway, Denmark, Finland, New Zealand, Sweden, Switzerland, Canada, Australia, Iceland, the Netherlands, Germany, Ireland, Japan, Luxembourg, and Austria. America is ranked 28th.

- According to the Global Multidimensional Poverty Index, which replaces the Human Poverty Index, the top rated countries are Sweden, Norway, the Netherlands, Finland, Denmark, Germany, Switzerland, Canada, Luxembourg, Austria, France, Japan, Australia, Belgium, and Spain. America is ranked 17th.

- According to the Poverty Gap Index, the top rated countries are Bosnia and Herzegovina, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Macedonia, Ukraine, Thailand, Uruguay, Moldova, Montenegro, Belarus, Latvia, Lithuania, Azerbaijan, and the Maldives. America is ranked 93rd.

- According to the OECD, the countries with the lowest poverty rate in the world are Iceland, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, Hungary, France, the Netherlands, Norway, Slovakia, Slovenia, Switzerland, Ireland, Sweden, Belgium, and Austria. America is ranked 35th.

- According to the World Bank, the countries with the lowest percentage of the population living on less than \$5.50 a day are Switzerland, Belgium, Cyprus, Finland, France, Germany, Iceland, Malta, Slovenia, Norway, the Czech Republic, the Netherlands, Denmark, Luxembourg, and Ireland. America is ranked 26th.

- According to the World Bank, the countries with the lowest percentage of the population living on less than \$3.20 a day are Switzerland, Cyprus, Finland, Germany, Iceland, Slovenia, the Czech Republic, Belarus, Lebanon, Azerbaijan, Poland, Belgium, France, Malta, and Norway. America is ranked 43rd.
- According to the World Bank, the countries with the lowest percentage of the population living on less than \$1.90 a day are Switzerland, Cyprus, Finland, Germany, Iceland, Slovenia, the Czech Republic, Belarus, Lebanon, Azerbaijan, Poland, Belgium, France, Malta, and the Netherlands. America is ranked 65th.
- According to UNICEF, the countries with the lowest percentage of children below the age of 15 living in a food insecure home are Japan, Sweden, South Korea, Croatia, Germany, Switzerland, Norway, France, Luxembourg, Israel, Australia, Finland, Iceland, Denmark, and the Netherlands. America is ranked 36th.
- According to UNICEF, the countries with the lowest percentage of children below the age of 17 living in a home with an income lower than 60% of the country's median average are Denmark, Iceland, Norway, Finland, South Korea, Cyprus, the Netherlands, the Czech Republic, Slovenia, Switzerland, Sweden, Germany, Australia, France, and Japan. America is ranked 35th.
- According to the Raising a Family index, the best countries to raise a family are Iceland, Norway, Sweden, Finland, Luxembourg, Denmark, Germany, Austria, Belgium, the Czech Republic, the Netherlands, Portugal, France, Australia, and Slovenia. America is ranked 34th.
- According to the OECD, the countries with the most generous paid parental leave are Bulgaria, Greece, the United Kingdom, Slovakia, Croatia, the Czech Republic, Ireland, Hungary, Italy, Estonia, Luxembourg, Poland, Australia, Chile, and Denmark. America is ranked 41st.

- According to the OECD, the countries with the most generous paid vacation leave are Austria, Portugal, Spain, France, Italy, Belgium, Germany, New Zealand, Ireland, the United Kingdom, Australia, Norway, Greece, Denmark, Finland, and Sweden. America is ranked 21st.
- According to the OECD, the countries with the lowest ratio of minimum wage to average wage are Colombia, New Zealand, France, Costa Rica, Chile, Slovenia, Australia, the United Kingdom, Israel, Poland, Romania, Portugal, Lithuania, Luxembourg, and Germany. America is ranked 31st.
- According to the OECD, the countries where workers work the fewest number of hours every year are Germany, Denmark, the United Kingdom, Norway, the Netherlands, Austria, France, Sweden, Luxembourg, Iceland, Belgium, Switzerland, Slovenia, Finland, and Italy. America is ranked 34th.
- According to the OECD, the countries that provide the lowest number of work hours necessary to escape poverty are Turkey, Japan, the United Kingdom, Belgium, France, Luxembourg, Greece, Ireland, the Netherlands, Australia, Hungary, Italy, South Korea, Romania, and Denmark. America is ranked 27th.
- According to the OECD, the countries with the highest employment rate are Australia, the Netherlands, Iceland, Switzerland, New Zealand, Japan, Norway, Germany, Sweden, Denmark, the United Kingdom, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Canada, and Hungary. America is ranked 28th.
- According to the CIA's Gini Index, the countries with the least amount of wealth inequality are Slovenia, Hungary, Denmark, the Czech Republic, Sweden, the Netherlands, Slovakia, Belgium, Montenegro, Austria, Belarus, Finland, Norway, Albania, and Germany. America is ranked 117th.

- According to the United Nations R/P 20% Wealth Inequality Index, which measures the ratio of the average wealth of the richest 20% to the poorest 20%, the countries with the least amount of wealth inequality are Azerbaijan, Ukraine, Iceland, the Czech Republic, Slovenia, Kyrgyzstan, Moldova, Kazakhstan, Belarus, Finland, Denmark, Algeria, Timor-Leste, Norway, and Slovakia. America is ranked 111th.
- According to the OECD, the countries with the highest rates of home ownership are Romania, Croatia, Slovakia, Lithuania, Hungary, Bulgaria, Poland, Latvia, Malta, Estonia, Spain, the Czech Republic, Slovenia, Iceland, and Norway. America is ranked 28th.
- According to the Global Finance Safety Index, which measures personal security in the context of financial and natural disasters, the top rated countries are Iceland, the United Arab Emirates, Qatar, Singapore, Finland, Mongolia, Norway, Denmark, Canada, New Zealand, Australia, Bahrain, Cyprus, Switzerland, and Austria. America is ranked 71st.
- According to the Fragile States Index, which measures how vulnerable countries are to conflict or collapse, the top rated countries are Norway, Iceland, Finland, New Zealand, Switzerland, Denmark, Canada, Ireland, Luxembourg, Sweden, the Netherlands, Australia, Austria, Germany, and Singapore. America is ranked 39th.
- According to the Global Peace Index, the top rated countries are Iceland, Denmark, Ireland, New Zealand, Austria, Singapore, Portugal, Slovenia, Japan, Switzerland, Canada, the Czech Republic, Finland, Croatia, and Germany. America is ranked 131st.
- According to the United Nations, the countries with the lowest percentage of intentional homicides are Monaco, Andorra, San Marino, Liechtenstein, Japan, Singapore, Luxembourg, Hong Kong, Indonesia, Qatar, Oman, Norway, Brunei, Switzerland, and Bahrain. America is ranked 113th.

- According to the Global Organized Crime Index, the countries with the greatest resilience to organized crime are Finland, Liechtenstein, New Zealand, Denmark, Iceland, Australia, Norway, the United Kingdom, Estonia, Andorra, Uruguay, Singapore, Germany, South Korea, and Luxembourg. America is ranked 28th.
- According to the Cato Institute's Human Freedom Index, the countries which provide the greatest amount of personal freedom are New Zealand, Switzerland, Hong Kong, Australia, Canada, the Netherlands, Denmark, Ireland, the United Kingdom, Finland, Norway, Taiwan, Germany, Estonia, and Luxembourg. America is ranked 17th.
- According to the Cato Institute's Personal Freedom Index, the countries which provide the greatest amount of personal freedom are New Zealand, the Netherlands, Norway, Denmark, Sweden, Finland, Luxembourg, Austria, Germany, Switzerland, Australia, Canada, Iceland, Taiwan, and Portugal. America is ranked 28th.
- According to the State of the World Liberty Index, the countries which provide the greatest degree of economic and personal freedom are New Zealand, Switzerland, Ireland, Australia, Canada, the Netherlands, Finland, Norway, Luxembourg, Sweden, Denmark, Estonia, Taiwan, Chile, and the United Kingdom. America is ranked 20th.
- According to the Freedom in the World Index, which measures degrees of civil liberties and political rights, the top rated countries are Finland, Norway, Sweden, New Zealand, Canada, the Netherlands, Uruguay, Australia, Denmark, Ireland, Luxembourg, Belgium, Japan, Portugal, and Switzerland. America is ranked 61st.
- According to the World Justice Project's Rule of Law Index, which measures how much countries adhere to the rule of law, the top rated countries are Denmark, Norway, Finland, Sweden, the Netherlands, Germany, New Zealand, Luxembourg, Estonia, Ireland,

Austria, Canada, Australia, Belgium, and the United Kingdom. America is ranked 26th.

- According to the Democracy Index, the top rated countries are Norway, New Zealand, Iceland, Sweden, Finland, Denmark, Ireland, Switzerland, the Netherlands, Taiwan, Luxembourg, Germany, Canada, Uruguay, and Australia. America is ranked 29th.

- According to the Democracy Matrix, the top rated countries are Denmark, Norway, Finland, Sweden, Germany, Switzerland, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Belgium, Costa Rica, Spain, Luxembourg, Australia, Estonia, and Iceland. America is ranked 36th.

- According to the Corruption Perceptions Index, the countries with the least corrupt governments are New Zealand, Denmark, Singapore, Sweden, Switzerland, Finland, the Netherlands, Canada, Iceland, Australia, Norway, Luxembourg, Hong Kong, Ireland, and Germany. America is ranked 19th.

- According to the Environmental Performance Index, the top rated countries are Denmark, the United Kingdom, Finland, Malta, Sweden, Luxembourg, Slovenia, Austria, Switzerland, Iceland, the Netherlands, France, Germany, Estonia, and Latvia. America is ranked 43rd.

- According to the Happy Planet Index, which measures how ecologically efficient a country is at supporting its population, the top rated countries are Costa Rica, Vanuatu, Colombia, Switzerland, Ecuador, Panama, Jamaica, Guatemala, Honduras, Uruguay, New Zealand, the Philippines, El Salvador, the United Kingdom, and Peru. America is ranked 122nd.

- According to the planetary pressures-adjusted Human Development Index, which adjusts for ecological and environmental factors, the top rated countries are the United Kingdom, Spain, Italy, Germany, Denmark, Sweden, France, Switzerland, Japan, Portugal, Greece, Chile, Slovenia, Austria, and Croatia. America is ranked 56th.

These are not cherry-picked studies, but a collection of the most respected and comprehensive studies covering the most important areas of society that are influenced by economics. Any criticisms of these studies cannot come close to negating the broader trends revealed by them. If capitalism is the best system, and socialism is harmful, then America would appear at the top or near the top of these studies on a consistent basis. What these studies show instead is that the countries that embrace socialist policies to the greatest extent are also the countries that offer the highest quality of life.

To make matters worse, America has even been on the decline in recent years in many important areas. According to the 2020 Social Progress Index, between 2011 and 2020 America joined Hungary and Brazil as the only countries, out of the 163 countries assessed, whose score decreased, and America's score decreased by more than these other 2 countries. Worse still, America has unquestionably sunk far lower on many of these indices since the appalling handling of the COVID-19 outbreak, and the concurrent recession, by the extremely neoliberal Trump Administration and Republican Party, and the predominantly neoliberal Democrat Party.

It is also important to keep in mind that despite being ranked so low on these 44 indices, America has had numerous other advantages over most of the other countries that appear on these lists in addition to being one of the wealthiest countries in the world. America has never been a victim of capitalist imperialism, but has instead been one of the greatest perpetrators and beneficiaries of capitalist imperialism over the past 100 years. The United States dollar is also the world's reserve currency, which has also afforded America incredible advantages. America has also spent their way into more national debt than any other country in the world, with their national debt currently standing at over \$30 trillion. America has been home to far greater quantities of natural resources than most other countries, and for most of the last 100 years has had greater manufacturing capabilities than most other developed countries, which has given them advantages related to economies of scale.

Smaller nations by contrast have had to rely far more upon imports to build up their infrastructures and develop their economies, which is more expensive overall. With all of these advantages and more, it would be expected that America would consistently appear at the top of these indices, or at least near the top, if capitalism was in fact the best economic system in the world. Instead the opposite is true. America is always outranked by developed countries with equal per capita wealth, is consistently outranked by developed countries with far less per capita wealth, and in many important areas is outranked even by many underdeveloped countries with substantially less per capita wealth.

Some capitalists have tried and failed to argue that the countries that provide a higher quality of life than America are predominantly able to do so because they are more racially and culturally homogeneous. Not only have race and culture got practically nothing to do with economics, but all studies on the subject have shown these bizarre explanations to be either entirely unsubstantiated or effectively superfluous, with the studies confirming these claims concluding that racial and cultural disunity reduces GDP by a few percentage points at most. This focus on race and culture is merely propaganda used by capitalists, and often racists, who refuse to acknowledge the brokenness of the capitalist system.

The primary reason America ranks so low on these indices is because of their embracing of capitalism over socialism at the policy level. This is evidenced by the fact that the United States government spends a lower percentage of its expenditure on social programs than all other developed countries, and in terms of their per capita GDP they also have the least generous welfare system in the developed world. America also has appalling worker protections, which has been exacerbated by the fact that a substantially lower percentage of workers in America are protected by unions compared to other developed countries. Currently only about 1 in 10 American workers are covered by union contract, compared to 9 out of 10 in many developed countries, and similarly high numbers in most other developed countries. According to the International Trade Union

Confederation's Global Rights Index, American workers have their rights violated to a greater extent than 68 other countries, with the best rated countries being Austria, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, and Uruguay.

The conclusions of these 44 indices also correspond strongly with low income inequality, not just wealth inequality. The countries with the lowest income inequality, after taxes, are Austria, Belgium, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Slovakia, Slovenia, Sweden, and Switzerland. In fact Norway and Finland, which are widely considered to provide the highest quality of life of anywhere in the world, have less income inequality than almost any other country. In Norway and Finland the top 20% earn approximately 4 times that of the bottom 20%, while the OECD average is 10 times the difference. America by contrast has one of the highest levels of income inequality, after taxes, among OECD countries. In fact in terms of the countries where the smallest percentage of income goes to the richest 1%, America is ranked 112th in the world.

The countries most often mentioned in these lists also correlate strongly with high taxes. The countries with the highest income taxes are Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Japan, Portugal, Slovenia, and Sweden. The citizens of these countries have been shown to be happy with this arrangement because these taxes are responsible for the public infrastructures and services that afford them their relatively high quality of life. This is obviously a superior arrangement, because instead of citizens being forced to negotiate individually with businesses that can easily exploit them, governments can provide for citizens directly, or use their power to negotiate fair deals with businesses on behalf of citizens. Under socialism both governments and businesses would be optimally democratic, meaning exploitation could be eradicated entirely. However, the greatest irony is that not only can citizens receive a

higher quality of life as a consequence of high taxes, but the high cost of buying from businesses is often greater than the cost of high taxes. For example, if healthcare costs in America, such as out-of-pocket expenses and monthly premiums, are considered taxes, then Americans immediately become some of the highest taxed citizens in the world, and particularly the developed world.

The strong safety nets provided by developed countries also protect against economic instability and financial insecurity. Citizens in Australia, Canada, and the Nordic countries, suffered less during the 2008 Great Recession partially because of robust social safety nets. Such government intervention also helped during the COVID-19 pandemic. Some European countries gave financial assistance to workers and businesses to help them with costs during the lockdown, but only gave these to businesses on the condition that they retain their workers. This prevented the collapse of many small businesses and the wider economy, effectively pausing the economy and placing it in a good position to reopen once shutdowns were lifted. The United States government took a similar approach, but offered far less money to workers, far less money to smaller businesses, and allocated their funds indirectly via privately owned banks, slowing down the process considerably. Consequently, far more workers suffered, and far more small businesses folded, compared to these other countries.

Large governments are not only essential for providing the essential public infrastructures and services that afford people a higher quality of life, but are also correlated with decreased corruption. The 10 least corrupt national governments in the world take in almost two thirds more in taxes than the 10 most corrupt national governments. The 10 least corrupt national governments also spend approximately twice as much money, as a percentage of GDP, as the 10 most corrupt national governments. The belief that large governments are unavoidably corrupt, or are a detriment to their people, is overtly untrue propaganda. The problem has never been large governments, but corruption and incompetence, which can easily be avoided via highly educated populations, well-financed independent journalists,

fitness-for-duty tests for political candidates, democratically initiated spontaneous elections, optimally democratic voting systems, strong anticorruption measures, democratized economic institutions, and the fulfillment of everyone's basic needs.

The irony of America ranking so low on these indices is that most American citizens already embrace socialist policies or the principles underlying them.

- 82% believe financial inequality is a "moderately big" to a "very big" problem.
- 76% believe corporations are too powerful.
- 59% believe corporations make "too much profit".
- 60% believe corporations pay too little in taxes.
- 66% believe wealth should be distributed more evenly.
- 76% believe the wealthiest Americans should pay higher taxes.
- 87% believe it is critical to preserve Social Security, even if this means taxing the rich more.
- 66% believe the federal minimum wage should be raised.
- 74% believe employers should offer paid parental and medical leave.
- 78% believe in establishing a national fund that offers all workers 12 weeks of paid family and medical leave.
- 60% believe that Medicare should be expanded to provide health insurance to every American.
- 63% believe four-year public college and university courses should be tuition-free.

These statistics were published before the 2020 recession and pandemic, so they are likely far higher now. In fact these statistics would all be very close to 100% if the American education system prioritized the economic literacy of its citizens. However, because of decades of propaganda most Americans remain unaware that their views align with socialism.

Socialist programs

Under socialism everyone's essential needs would be fulfilled because of a UBI, well-funded public infrastructures and services, and incredibly low living costs. However, if government programs did need to exist, they would always be designed to be as inclusive as possible, and would always prioritize those with the greatest needs rather than those with the greatest amount of wealth. Under capitalism most people are unable to meet their basic needs, and many essential programs aren't provided by the government. However, even when they are provided they are usually massively underfunded and restricted by means testing. The problems of a program not existing or being underfunded are obvious, but means testing also introduces a myriad of problems.

- Means testing always results in people falling through the net. These people are usually the most disadvantaged in society, and this often occurs at their point of greatest need.
- Means testing introduces the problem of determining who is deserving of assistance, which is often extremely difficult because of the many unknowable, unmeasurable, and complex variables that constitute and affect people's lives.
- Means testing always requires large administrative bureaucracies, which entail additional paperwork, reduced efficiency, and high financial costs.
- Means testing can force applicants to be burdened by unnecessarily complicated bureaucratic processes. This can become a very time consuming process, including phone calls to various departments and filling out large amounts of overly complicated paperwork. All of this can present a particular challenge for those with disabilities or those in dire need of assistance, which are usually the very people these programs are meant to help.

- Means testing always involves extensive processing, meaning applicants may have to live without assistance for prolonged periods during the exact time they need this assistance the most.
- Means testing can often be highly invasive, which can be demeaning and humiliating for applicants.
- Means-tested programs can be compromised with loopholes by economically illiterate and fiscally conservative politicians that wish them to fail. When they do fail, this is unfairly used as evidence of their unviability.
- Means testing can take the wealth of a person's parents into account, potentially resulting in assistance being declined even if the person's parents are unwilling to provide assistance.
- Means-tested programs can be taken away from recipients at any time, and sometimes with little or no advance notice. This can cause recipients to live in a constant state of anxiety, and hinder their ability to plan for the future.
- Means-tested programs can cultivate anger and animosity from taxpayers who pay into the system but do not benefit from such programs. This can further exacerbate social divisions, and is made worse by the fact that this hostility is often directed towards the most vulnerable people in society. Capitalist politicians can even be incentivized to cut back on essential programs due to the pressure they receive from these taxpayers.

So not only do people struggle to meet their basic needs under capitalism, but even when they are lucky enough to have the possibility of receiving government assistance, they usually have to suffer from all the problems that come with means testing. And these problems increase substantially whenever they are underfunded due to problems like tax avoidance and evasion, as well as austerity measures that are introduced in response to reduced government funds during economic downturns, which are unavoidable under

capitalism. So even though means testing should be used as a last resort, under capitalism it is nearly always used wherever possible. And none of this addresses the fact that most government assistance is quickly nullified by inflation, which under capitalism is inevitable since businesses and landlords can always be guaranteed to increase their prices and rates whenever possible.

Socialist organizations and systems

Socialist organizations and systems have repeatedly been shown to produce superior services and results compared to private institutions. Most of the world's best trained and best equipped military forces are publically owned and controlled. The best prisons in the world are publically funded, and have proven themselves to be substantially more ethical and effective than for-profit private prisons. Most publically run regulators avoid the problems that arise when industries are allowed to regulate themselves. Many public services around the world are of such high-quality that entrepreneurs and businesses don't even try to compete. For example, the fire departments of most developed countries could never be competed against because of how well funded and competently operated they are. Two of the most essential services in society are education and healthcare, and unsurprisingly the most successful versions of these services are provided by socialist organizations and systems. Education and healthcare will now be assessed in-depth to prove why this is irrefutable.

Regarding education, Finland is widely recognized as having the best education system in the world, as well as being the most socialist. All schools operate according to a centrally mandated set of guidelines, and school fees and for-profit education organizations and systems are banned. Funding is allocated evenly on a per student basis, as opposed to certain schools receiving disproportionate funding, such as because they operate in wealthier neighborhoods. There is no competition between schools and teachers, ensuring that every child receives the same quality of education, and competition within classrooms is replaced with collaborative environments which

prioritize creativity and moral improvement. Teachers in Finland are trained for a far longer period of time than in most other countries, and once they enter the profession they are financially compensated more generously than in most other countries. Finnish schools also provide free meals to all children, and offer free access to psychological counseling and guidance counseling.

The OECD's PISA reports, which compare children in terms of reading, mathematics, and science, and which are published once every 3 years, have ranked Finland very highly globally in all three of these categories since the year 2000. Their education system is ranked even higher when their per capita wealth is taken into account. Finland's education system has even been able to achieve an effective 100% literacy rate. Finland also provides free preschool to all parents. The Finnish education model is a perfect example of how sacrificing freedom, in the form of competition and private funding, in exchange for cooperation and socialized funding, can achieve better and more equal outcomes for society as a whole. This is also because when the rich are forced to send their children to the same schools as the poor, they can be guaranteed to support those schools. This is true of all public organizations and systems that the rich are forced to use.

Forcing people to choose between better choices or worse choices has always been a terrible solution. Despite this, America has adopted this approach with regards to their schools. Giving parents this choice has resulted in millions of American children being forced to attend very low-quality underfunded schools because of the limited availability at better schools. Many American parents are also unable to send their children to their preferred school because they can't afford the additional travelling time and costs. America's underfunded schools suffer from a range of problems, such as overcrowded classrooms, overworked teachers, outdated textbooks, inadequate supplies, minimal facilities, poor internet access, insufficient heating and air conditioning, and no healthcare professionals or career advisors. Most public schools in America also don't provide free school meals, which has resulted in the absurd

situation where over 1 million American children are currently unable to afford their school meals. Even American children who do receive school meals often only have access to low-quality junk food, partly because of underfunding, and partly because of lobbying by companies within the food industry.

These schools also usually suffer from zero tolerance environments and policies as a reaction to the disruptive behaviors that children are more likely to exhibit as a consequence of living in impoverished areas and attending underfunded schools. Even children who are able to attend better schools may still suffer in other ways. Parents that are able to send their children to better schools may be unable to afford the physical resources their children need, or be unable to pay for the extracurricular activities offered by these schools. Some of the better schools in America have also become overcrowded because of this broken system. All of this has resulted in measurably terrible results. Despite spending more per student than any other country in the world, America currently ranks 14th in the world for cognitive skills and educational attainment according to the Global Education Index, and ranks 91st in the world for access to quality basic education according to the Social Progress Index. America is also ranked 13th for reading literacy, 18th for scientific literacy, and 37th for mathematics, according to the OECD's PISA report. Trying to address this problem by forcing parents to choose between schools is like forcing some people to live in areas with air pollution and forcing others to live in areas with no air pollution, as opposed to the obvious solution of simply eradicating air pollution.

Finland is also joined by countries such as Norway, Sweden, and Germany, which not only have some of the best higher education institutions in the world, but also provide completely free higher education. Other countries also provide high-quality higher education but with minimal costs attached, such as France, where tuition is \$200 a year. In total there are 24 countries in the world which provide free or effectively free higher education, with 3 of these countries being in South America, and 3 being in Africa. Some countries may have slightly better or more prestigious colleges and

universities, but these institutions can not compensate for the holistically better outcomes of countries that appear at the top of league tables, including those which provide free higher education. America for example has some of the best universities in the world, but they also have worse overall education outcomes compared to other developed countries, as well as the worst student debt problem in the developed world.

The fact that the overall best lower and higher education outcomes are achieved by socialist organizations and systems proves the viability and superiority of socialism. However, even when such socialist approaches are used, they can still be undermined by capitalism due to underfunding. In countries where funding can be moved away from public schools and towards private schools, this situation can worsen considerably, particularly when the resulting poor performance of these underfunded public schools is used by capitalists as an excuse to further increase funding of private schools at the expense of public schools, which is a common practice in America. Private schools can also have the additional problem of teaching unregulated or minimally regulated curriculums, meaning they can also teach capitalist propaganda, which has been proven to be true in many countries.

A further consequence of these capitalist problems is that teachers commonly leave the profession, which not only wastes years of these teachers time and energy, but reduces the number of highly motivated and experienced teachers within the profession. Another consequence is that teachers often only have the time, energy, and resources, to train students to pass tests, rather than provide an environment optimally designed for educating students and maximizing their potential. As a consequence of these problems, and very likely an intentional consequence, students are also conditioned to obey and follow instructions, rather than become independently minded and creative, which is highly conducive to achieving harmony and conformity within the hierarchical and authoritarian structures of capitalist businesses. So even though socialist education

organizations and systems are superior, capitalist economies still often manage to undermine them.

Healthcare has also proven itself to be one of the most prominent examples of the superiority of socialism. Every developed country in the world, aside from America, as well as many underdeveloped countries, have adopted free universal healthcare for this reason, and many other underdeveloped countries are making efforts to follow suit. In fact this model has proven to be so successful that many of these organizations and systems were introduced by conservative governments. The degree to which these healthcare organizations and systems are socialist varies from country to country, but there is no question that the socialist components of these organizations and systems are a central and vital reason for their success.

America is the best country to use as a comparison. This is not only because it is the only developed country without free universal healthcare, but also because they spend more on healthcare per capita than any other country in the world, they spend more on healthcare as a percentage of GDP than any other country in the world, and they benefit tremendously from economies of scale. In fact America spends approximately twice as much per capita on healthcare as the average of the top 10 wealthiest countries, they spend approximately 3 times as much per capita on healthcare as the average of all other OECD countries, and they spend almost 70% more per capita on healthcare than Switzerland, which is the second highest spender. American households currently spend approximately \$5000 per capita on healthcare every year, which is substantially more than the citizens of every other developed country even when taxes are included.

Despite this incredible amount of investment, America is commonly ranked as having one of the worst healthcare systems in the developed world. This is particularly true in terms of efficiency, equity, and outcomes, and especially true when compared to nations of similar per capita GDP. In the 7 studies performed by the Commonwealth Fund during the past 17 years, America has ranked

last out of all 11 countries every single time. The other 10 countries in these studies are Australia, Canada, the Netherlands, Germany, Switzerland, France, New Zealand, Norway, Sweden, and the United Kingdom. In one recent study they concluded that America fell short in all 5 domains used to measure overall quality. A 2015 study conducted by The Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation ranked the American healthcare system 37th in the world, with the highest rated countries being Andorra, Iceland, Switzerland, Norway, Sweden, Australia, Finland, Spain, the Netherlands, Luxembourg, Japan, Italy, Ireland, Austria, and Belgium. A 2018 study funded by the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation ranked the American healthcare system 29th in the world, with the highest rated countries being Iceland, Norway, the Netherlands, Luxembourg, Australia, Finland, Switzerland, Sweden, Italy, Andorra, Ireland, Japan, Austria, Canada, and Belgium. According to the 2020 Social Progress Index, America is ranked 97th in the world in terms of access to quality healthcare. None of these recent reports are much better than the World Health Organization's report in 2000, which ranked the American healthcare system 37th in the world, which placed it behind San Marino, Andorra, Malta, Oman, Portugal, Greece, Luxembourg, Colombia, Cyprus, Saudi Arabia, Israel, Chile, Dominica, and Costa Rica.

None of these are cherry-picked studies, but the largest and most comprehensive studies on healthcare in the world. There are other problems that align with the findings of these studies. The American system only has 2.6 practicing physicians for every 1000 residents, which is less than any European country, and less than the OECD average of 3.2. The American system has fewer hospital beds, on a per capita basis, than 31 other developed countries. The rate of unnecessary deaths caused by inadequate healthcare in America is not only higher than all other comparable nations, but is also improving at a slower rate than most other OECD countries. America has higher medication errors, medical errors, and laboratory errors, than all other comparable nations. America is one of the only developed countries where profit-seeking pharmaceutical companies advertise prescription drugs directly to consumers, as opposed to

other countries which correctly leave recommendations and prescriptions to medical experts. America is one of the only developed countries in which medical professionals are paid commission by pharmaceutical companies to prescribe their drugs. America is the only developed country not to guarantee paid parental leave, meaning many women are not even paid for the day they take off work to give birth.

The percentage of people that suffer because of America's healthcare system is unprecedented among developed countries, as well as many underdeveloped countries. This is mostly attributable to the fact that most Americans are either uninsured or underinsured. Prior to the COVID-19 pandemic, over 70 million American adults were uninsured or underinsured, while an additional 20 million children lacked access to essential healthcare. Even 25% of high income earners in America do not currently receive adequate medical care because of the financial costs. Those that do have health insurance also have to pay out-of-pocket expenses that either don't exist, or are substantially lower, in countries with free universal healthcare. These expenses can even include "deductibles", which are the costs that American's have to first pay before their insurance provider pays anything. So even if an American is paying hundreds of dollars every month for health insurance, they often still have to pay for the first few hundred or thousand dollars of their healthcare treatment before their insurance company pays out a single dollar. These out-of-pocket expenses also often include "copayments" and "coinsurance", which are additional expenses insured Americans often have to pay in addition to their periodic insurance payments and deductibles.

Americans consequently either don't receive necessary treatments, or have to pay exorbitant costs when they do. Even many American's with insurance don't go to the doctor when they need to because of these unnecessary costs. Currently over one third of Americans delay or skip healthcare due to costs, which includes the one fifth of diabetics who have to ration or skip their lifesaving medications. This is one of the reasons why America has the highest percentage of citizens with chronic diseases in the developed world, and also one of

the highest rates of hospitalizations for preventable conditions in the developed world. Many tests, treatments, and drugs, including those which are lifesaving, also cost 10 times more in America than in other countries, even when those drugs come from the same suppliers. On the extreme end, American drugs can cost over 200 times as much. For example, the drug Truvada, which is an essential drug taken by those with HIV, costs \$8 in Australia, and \$2000 in America, even though its research and development was funded by American taxpayers.

Americans currently have to pay for ambulance rides to hospitals, which can cost upwards of \$2000, and can cost an average of nearly \$1000 in certain states. To make matters worse, over two thirds of ambulance providers don't accept the health insurance of their patients, meaning these patients have to pay out-of-pocket for these ambulance rides even if they have insurance. Many Americans consequently choose to take taxis and Uber rides to the hospital instead of calling for an ambulance. It is unsurprisingly not unheard of for those in need of medical care in public settings to plead with bystanders to refrain from calling an ambulance because of the costs. Emergency room visits also cost \$4000 on average, even though such visits are completely free in nearly all developed countries.

Expectant mothers in particular are outrageously exploited under America's healthcare system. Pregnant women often have to use their sick days in order to give birth. A routine birth in hospital, without severe complications, can cost over \$5000 for families with insurance, and can cost over \$15,000 for families without insurance. If complications arise, this can cost families hundreds of thousands of dollars. Even after given birth, mothers often have to pay to hold their baby, which is a cost many mothers cannot afford, or at least not without getting into further debt, which obviously creates a disgusting dilemma that no mother should ever have to face.

Every year approximately 40% of Americans receive a medical bill they were either not expecting, or which was far higher than expected. 137 million Americans, including many who are well

insured or fully insured, struggle with medical debt. In fact medical debt contributes to over 530,000 bankruptcies every year, and in many cases is the primary or only reason for these bankruptcies. These 530,000 bankruptcies account for two thirds of all personal bankruptcies. America's private insurance system is so broken that medical debt and medical bankruptcy are problems even for fully insured individuals. Medical debt, including very small amounts, can also lower people's credit scores, which has prevented millions of Americans from being able to take out loans for essential things like cars and homes. Every year thousands of Americans are taken to court for being unable to pay off their medical debts, and can even be imprisoned if complications prevent them from appearing in court. Many Americans refuse to seek medical help, and even knowingly choose to die rather than pursue available treatments, because of a desire to avoid being a financial burden to their loved ones. Many prepubescent and adolescent children in America engage in fundraising initiatives, such as selling painted seashells or homemade cakes, to pay for their own healthcare, including surgical operations and chemotherapy. Some American parents have even given up their children for adoption due to being unable to afford their child's medical expenses.

Every year 68,000 Americans, including children, die unnecessarily due to the inadequacy of their healthcare system, which is why they have the highest rate of preventable deaths among comparable developed countries. And this doesn't even include the 338,000 adults and children who would have survived COVID-19 if only America had free universal healthcare. America also has one of the highest infant mortality rates among comparable developed countries. America also has one of the highest maternal mortality rates in the developed world, with the percentage of American mothers dying in childbirth being up to 6 times higher than some other developed countries. And all of these statistics, aside from the COVID-19 statistic, represent the state of affairs prior to the 2020 recession and pandemic, the long-term effects of which have worsened most of these problems. However, even before the pandemic, the quality of America's healthcare was still declining due

to problems like increasing healthcare costs, increasing austerity measures, and increasing hospital closures in poor areas.

These types of statistics and situations are unheard of in other developed countries. For example, in every other developed country, the number of people that go bankrupt from medical bills is zero, the number of people that lack essential medical care because of personal finances is zero, the number of children that engage in fundraising in order to pay for essential healthcare is zero, and the number of people that die due to a lack of health insurance is zero. And none of this information includes the massive amounts of time and energy American's have to waste researching insurance companies, comparing healthcare packages, filling out forms, making phone calls, and engaging in lengthy battles with insurance companies that refuse to pay up, which can include unnecessary and invasive medical checkups and expensive legal proceedings. Nor does this information address the millions of American workers who can't leave their job because they receive their health insurance from their employer. Nor does this information adequately convey the helplessness and grief Americans experience from watching their loved ones needlessly suffer and die.

To put all of this into an even broader context, evidence strongly suggests that free healthcare was provided to people in prehistoric societies. Archeologists have uncovered in ancient tribal settlements many broken adult bones, including leg bones, that were fully healed. For these bones to have fully healed would have required these incapacitated individuals to be looked after for months after receiving their injuries. Even more significantly, archeologists have found the bones of old adults who were clearly severely physically disabled from birth, meaning these individuals were looked after for their entire lives all the way into old age. In other words, these "primitive" societies cared for those who were sick and disabled instead of leaving them to die, and yet this is not a basic right afforded to people thousands of years later in one of the wealthiest and most technologically advanced countries in human history.

Even though citizens of developed countries are always shocked and horrified to discover the reality of the American healthcare system, many Americans continue to defend their system because of their fear of socialism. This demographic is the only sizable group of people in the developed world that do not support free universal healthcare. And if all of this wasn't bad enough, free universal healthcare could actually save America anywhere up to \$5.1 trillion over 10 years compared to their current healthcare system. In fact 22 studies conducted during the past 3 decades have all estimated that a free universal healthcare system would save America money after just 1 decade of being introduced. However, the greatest evidence that a socialist system would cost less is the obvious fact that other developed countries have socialist healthcare systems that are both less expensive and superior to America's system. If American politicians cannot work out how to duplicate the successes of other nations, it is not because it is impossible, but because they are too incompetent and corrupt.

Some Americans have defended their healthcare system by arguing that it is the best in specific areas. This defense is irrelevant. First, practically every healthcare system in the developed world is superior in certain specific areas, either due to random chance or intentional specialization. Second, America's healthcare system is superior in certain ways because it is less burdened as a consequence of Americans delaying or foregoing treatment. Third, it doesn't matter if America's healthcare system is superior in certain ways if Americans end up suffering or dying because they are too poor to take advantage of it. Fourth, this argument doesn't come anywhere close to diminishing the greater significance of the holistic studies and statistics cited here. The American healthcare system is completely broken, and those who are economically illiterate enough to defend it are only proving that the American education system is also completely broken.

Some capitalists have argued that the high cost of America's healthcare system can be justified by the enormous amount of money their healthcare industry spends on research and

development. This is nonsense. First, the obvious reason American healthcare is so expensive is because capitalist businesses, including those within all supply chains, always strive to exploit consumers as much as they can get away with. Second, in recent years most American healthcare companies have spent dozens of times more money on stock buybacks and excessive compensation packages than on research. In the case of the pharmaceutical industry, the money they have spent on research has often been dedicated to slightly modifying their existing drugs in order to retain their patents. For example, between 2005 and 2015, 78% of all new drug patents in America were for slightly modified variants of preexisting drugs. Conversely, publically funded research provided the basis for the creation of every single one of the 210 new drugs created in America between 2010 and 2016. Unsurprisingly, many publically funded drugs are also sold to pharmaceutical companies for effectively nothing, and then sold back to the public at exorbitant prices. Third, all research should always have been publically funded so that this financial burden never needed to fall upon those most desperately in need of treatment. The argument that research and development costs justify the appallingly exploitative costs of healthcare in America is just propaganda designed to hide capitalism's flaws. In fact the healthcare industry is currently one of America's most profitable industries.

Capitalism can also be blamed for the inadequacies of healthcare systems in all other developed countries. For example, many of these countries don't adequately cover prescription drugs, eye care, dental care, infertility treatment, mental healthcare, physical therapy, and homecare. First, healthcare services would not lack funding under socialism, because they would be paid for by the world's resources and technological surplus. Second, under capitalism healthcare services also lack funding due to tax avoidance and evasion, and because workers don't receive fair compensation, meaning they pay less income tax, and inevitably pay less consumption tax in countries where this tax exists. Third, many of the providers of healthcare goods and services are privately owned businesses, meaning providing healthcare ends up costing governments far more than it

otherwise should. In other words, if the healthcare systems of other countries are lacking in any way, it is not because of socialism, but because these countries and their healthcare systems are not socialist enough.

One of the main reasons the American healthcare system performs so poorly compared to other countries is that resources are allocated based on personal wealth rather than need. Every country has waiting lists and rationing, but the free universal healthcare systems of all developed countries treat everyone equally, and prioritize those most in need of care. In fact free universal healthcare is one of the most definitive real-world examples of the Marxist maxim "to each according to their needs". It should be obvious that increased competition within free markets was never going to be the secret ingredient that solved America's healthcare problems, particularly considering free markets always culminate in monopolies and cartels. America's healthcare system is also proof that there is no point in having the freedom to choose from many capitalist solutions if they are substantially worse than a single socialist solution.

In summary, socialist organizations and systems have always been ideal for providing goods and services, and especially those that are essential. The idea that governments are too incompetent and corrupt to outperform capitalist businesses and competitive free markets is a lie peddled by capitalists, and reinforced and compounded by incompetent and corrupt politicians themselves. Socialist organizations and systems have always been ideal for providing goods and services, but just like every organization in the world, they need to be run by highly qualified and experienced experts who are competent enough to hire and manage other highly qualified and experienced experts. And fortunately this has always been easy to ensure in all the ways previously described.

Economic freedom

Capitalists often argue that it is the countries with the greatest amount of economic freedom that provide the highest quality of life,

and that this explains the discrepancy between countries like America and the other developed countries that provide a higher quality of life. This argument is quickly disproven by the fact that China provides less economic freedom than other developed countries, and yet over the past 40 years has grown their economy and improved the quality of life of their citizens faster than any other country in human history. However, even if this one instance is ignored, it is surprising this argument has become so ubiquitous because of how easy it is to debunk.

First, this argument is not a defense of capitalism, because capitalism is far from the only system that allows for economic freedom. Under capitalism economic freedom is provided by the existence of markets, which also exist under market socialism, and are replicated for all intents and purposes under democratic socialism. In fact, under democratic socialism economic freedom would be increased for a number of reasons. A UBI would enable entrepreneurs to work on business ventures indefinitely without needing an income from employment, and instead of relying upon profit-seeking private banks or risking their own wealth, entrepreneurs could instead rely upon socialist government run banks, worker cooperatives, crowdfunding, and crowdsourcing, for funds, resources, assistance, and collaborators. Businesses would also be more likely to succeed, since consumers would have greater discretionary income and purchasing power. Higher education would also be free or heavily subsidized under democratic socialism, further empowering citizens with the knowledge and skills necessary to self-actualize and succeed in their business ventures. Capitalism can never come close to achieving the same degree of economic freedom as democratic socialism.

Second, it is a myth that economic freedom is primarily responsible for affording citizens a higher quality of life. America has greater economic freedom than most other countries, and yet Americans still have a lower quality of life compared to a sizeable percentage of other countries. The Cato Institute's Economic Freedom Index ranks America as the 6th most economically free country in the world, with the top rated countries being New Zealand, Hong Kong, Singapore,

Switzerland, and Ireland. The Cato Institute is also a right wing organization founded and funded by neoliberal billionaire Charles Koch, meaning it has every reason to argue that America is not economically free, in order to convince others that the American economy needs more neoliberal economic freedom if it wants to prosper. Instead, the Cato Institution acknowledges that America is one of the most economically free countries in the world.

According to The Heritage Foundation's Index of Economic Freedom, America is ranked 18th in the world. This is lower than the Cato Institute's study, but the difference is negligible when assessed in detail. Australia, which is ranked in 5th place, has an index score of 80.9, while America has an index score of 75.7, which is only a 5.2 point difference. The top 4 countries are Hong Kong, Singapore, New Zealand and Switzerland, while the Nordic countries do not even make the top 10. Iceland has a score of 77, Denmark a score of 76.6, and Sweden a score of 76.3, while the Netherlands has a score of 76.2, and Canada a score of 77.7. These minor differences obviously cannot account for the significant differences in quality of life between America and other developed countries. In fact Norway, Germany, Finland, Austria, Japan, and France, all have lower scores than America.

Further evidence that supports this conclusion is the World Bank's Ease of doing business Index. According to this index, America is ranked the 6th best country in the world. The top 5 countries are New Zealand, Singapore, Hong Kong, Denmark, and South Korea. This puts America ahead of other countries that regularly rank higher in terms of quality of life, such as the 4 other Nordic countries, Finland, Iceland, Norway, and Sweden, as well as Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Germany, Ireland, Japan, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, and Switzerland.

Another similar argument is that low corporate tax rates are responsible for the higher quality of life provided by these social democracies. As explained by demand-side economics, it is discretionary income and purchasing power that contribute to a high

quality of life, since it is these that allow people to purchase goods and services, and create jobs that are necessary for high discretionary income and a stable economy. High corporate tax rates only reduce the quality of life of citizens when businesses use this as an excuse to raise prices, which is not only rarely necessary, but is also another problem that can be blamed on capitalism even when this is necessary. First, under democratic socialism taxes could be eradicated since governments could be funded by the world's resources and technological surplus. Second, prices would actually decrease with socialist economic planning in accordance with ever increasing technological productivity. Third, under capitalism businesses are less likely to succeed and grow because consumers will always have less discretionary income and purchasing power, which can sometimes require businesses to increase their prices.

Because of these 3 reasons, low corporate tax rates are not only unnecessary for businesses and economies to survive and prosper, but they also inevitably result in underfunded public infrastructures and services, and all for the benefit of the ruling class. Additionally, the corporate tax rates within the Nordic countries, as a percentage of GDP, have all slightly increased since the late 1980's, and are little different than the corporate tax rates in other successful developed countries. Despite this, the quality of life of their citizens continues to be the highest in the world. The discrepancy in quality of life between America and other developed countries has nothing to do with low corporate tax rates, and everything to do with the socialist ideas they have implemented.

Another common argument is that the social democracies that provide the highest quality of life are also home to many superrich individuals, including billionaires, and hence supporting the superrich, or creating circumstances which produce superrich individuals, must therefore be responsible for this higher quality of life. This argument conflates correlation with causation. First, all the valuable labor performed by the superrich could be achieved without compensating them so excessively. In fact they don't even deserve their wealth for all the reasons previously stated. Second, not all superrich

individuals create or invest into businesses, let alone socially beneficial businesses. Third, the wealth and income of the superrich in these countries is generally far less than the superrich in America. For example, of the 8 richest people in the world, 6 of them are American, and these 6 billionaires currently own more wealth than the poorest 150 million Americans. Other social democracies have nowhere near this level of wealth consolidation, and yet still provide a far higher quality of life. Fourth, economies would be more likely to prosper if consumers had high discretionary income and purchasing power, and budding entrepreneurs were empowered to pursue their business and innovation ideas, both of which would obviously be far more likely to occur under democratic socialism. Fifth, the higher quality of life of citizens largely derives from well-funded public infrastructures and services, which are more likely to be underfunded when wealth is consolidated into the hands of the superrich. Therefore, not only have the superrich, or the conditions which produce superrich individuals, never been necessary for producing the higher quality of life seen in many social democracies, but they are actually detrimental to achieving this goal.

Socialist ideas have always been the primary reason for ensuring the highest quality of life possible for everyone in society, rather than economic freedom. The introduction of welfare, the formation of regulators, the creation of workplace safety laws, the adoption of the 2-day weekend, the transition to the 9 to 5 workday, the creation of many national holidays, the abolition of child labor, the instituting of universal education, and the introduction of overtime pay, sick pay, vacation leave, parental leave, retirement contributions, etc. all occurred because the lower classes demanded the introduction of these socialist ideas. They didn't occur because the lower classes demanded more economic freedom, and they certainly didn't occur because of the kindness and generosity of the capitalist ruling class. On the contrary, throughout history the ruling class never stopped engaging in the worst forms of suppression, including assaulting and murdering those who demanded such meager reforms. Instead these changes occurred because of boycotts, mass strikes, peaceful protests, violent protests, and other forms of civil disobedience,

enacted by 19th and 20th century labor movements pursuing the socialist ideals of democratization, worker rights, and fair wealth distribution. In fact capitalism and propaganda can also be blamed for most people today being willing to accept the 9 to 5, 5 day workweek, even though astronomical advancements in productivity since this was introduced over 100 years ago have meant that societies could have reduced the workweek substantially while simultaneously increasing the discretionary income, purchasing power, and quality of life, of the masses.

However, the greatest evidence that socialist ideas, rather than economic freedom, are responsible for ensuring the highest quality of life possible comes from the period following the Second World War, which was defined by its socialist characteristics. After the Second World War, Western countries experienced an unusually prosperous, stable, and prolonged period of economic growth that lasted all the way until the early 1970's. In fact from 1951 till the end of this period their economies were not devastated by even a single recession. During this time wealth and income inequality were kept low, and in some cases even decreased, and the benefits of this economic expansion were distributed relatively evenly across all social classes. Unemployment levels and inflation remained consistently low, economic mobility increased, worker unions and labor rights were the strongest in history, and taxes remained high, particularly for the wealthiest in society. Unsurprisingly government spending on infrastructure, as a percentage of GDP, increased massively in most countries due to the necessity of rebuilding and modernizing their infrastructures after the war, which also led to the nationalization of many industries and increased regulation of the private sector. Government spending on social programs, as a percentage of GDP, also continued to increase during this time. Ironically, this period of unprecedented growth was co-opted by capitalists and referred to as The Golden Age of Capitalism, even though it is clear this economic expansion occurred due to the implementation of socialist ideas, ongoing technological progress, and the existence of markets, which again are not unique to capitalism. There were many capitalist policies during this time, but

this period of history still remains one of the most socialist eras in human history.

The end of this unusually prosperous era correlated with the beginning of ever increasing neoliberalism around the world. In America, these neoliberal supply-side economic policies came to be known as Reaganomics. Since this time, taxes on the rich have been lowered, the effective corporate tax rate has been lowered, welfare has been stripped back, labor rights have been weakened, worker unions have been undermined or decimated, worker compensation has stagnated or declined, regulations have been cut, regulatory capture has become more common, many public infrastructures and services have been privatized, defense spending outside of wartime has increased, imperialist exploitation of underdeveloped countries has become more calculated and ruthless, and a host of other neoliberal ideas and consequences have manifested. Even in cases where welfare was maintained or increased, this welfare was increasingly offset by capitalist problems like rent extraction, interest extraction, price gouging, coerced consumption, and all the other problems that erode people's discretionary income and purchasing power.

This also marked the point at which productivity and wages became decoupled, and technological surplus extraction began in earnest. Technological output skyrocketed from this point onwards, and yet wages and quality of life increasingly stagnated or worsened in the most important areas of life. And with these changes came all the problems of capitalism, such as increasing financial insecurity, unemployment, poverty, income inequality, wealth inequality, monopolization, economic turbulence, corporate profits, deregulation, incarceration rates, military expenditure, austerity, and all the other life destroying and soul crushing problems described in this manifesto. This period also saw a significant rise in manufacturing consent and anti-intellectualism. All of these outcomes were obviously inevitable, since capitalism always leads to increasing wealth and power consolidation into the hands of sociopaths that are guaranteed to use their influence and power to stigmatize and erode

socialism and to move societies more towards capitalism and neoliberalism.

Venezuela

Capitalists regularly cite Venezuela as an example of the inevitable disastrous consequences of socialism. This is one of the more egregious assertions made by capitalists due to how easy it is to debunk. First, Venezuela is not a socialist country, but a social democracy, just like every developed country in the world. Approximately 70% of Venezuela's economy is privately owned, and less than 10% of their GDP comes from worker cooperatives. 29% of Venezuela's workers are employed by the public sector, compared to approximately 13% in America, 20% in Canada, 21% in the United Kingdom, 26% in Finland, 30% in Sweden, 30% in Denmark, and 32% in Norway.

Second, it is recognized globally that Venezuela has been the victim of malicious outside interference. Sanctions, embargoes, and blockades, have not only crippled key areas of Venezuela's economy, but in the case of embargoes on food shipments and medical supplies, have revealed the sociopathic agenda of some of their capitalist imperialist trading partners. America has been at the forefront of these attacks, including taking actions which violate international laws, and they have been condemned by the United Nations and allied countries as a result. All of these attempts to disrupt and destroy Venezuela's economy began long before their country experienced the economic turmoil that has come to be referenced so often by capitalist propagandists.

The third reason for Venezuela's problems is government corruption and incompetence, although it must be understood that even these problems would not have had such devastating outcomes if not for their capitalist system and the malicious outside interference of other imperialist countries. A sizable percentage of Venezuela's wealth has come from their oil reserves, which are some of the largest in the world, and over the past few decades their government has used this

wealth to build the country's infrastructures and raise the quality of life of its citizens. Unfortunately this was never done sustainably. For example, their government refrained from creating more oil production facilities, even though this would have boosted their output, and they never utilized counter-cyclical fiscal policy, which is effectively the practice of saving money during periods of economic prosperity to protect against economic instability during downturns. Venezuela also has a high trade deficit, meaning that instead of money circulating within their economy, money has gradually moved out of their economy in exchange for imported goods. Trade deficits are not inherently bad, particularly under democratic socialism, but under Venezuela's circumstances they exacerbated these problems.

When Venezuela's oil production dropped, alongside a near 70% drop in oil prices over the course of just 18 months, the government did not have the wealth necessary to continue funding their programs, and the country was plunged into economic ruin. Incidentally, oil prices only dropped because of privatization, free markets, and the profit motive. If this resource had been controlled and allocated through socialist institutions, such price fluctuations could have been avoided entirely. The Venezuelan government reacted to this situation by printing money, which quickly culminated in hyperinflation, which also could have been avoided under a socialist economy. In addition to all of these problems, the Venezuelan government also expropriated privately owned businesses, and forcibly replaced owners and managers with incompetent party loyalists. Capitalism, outside interference, and government corruption and incompetence, are the real reasons for Venezuela's economic problems.

These problems are put into even starker relief when contrasted with other similar countries. The most notable comparison is Norway, since they have also received a substantial proportion of their national wealth from vast oil reserves. In fact, not only is their entire oil industry state-owned, but over half of Norway's wealth is under state ownership. However, instead of unsustainably spending this fortune, they saved it within a sovereign wealth fund, which is

effectively a national savings account, and used the interest from this fund to build up their infrastructures and sustainably provide essential services, such as education and welfare. They also took other steps that Venezuela didn't, such as counter-cyclical fiscal policy and revenue diversification. More importantly though, other nations that provide a high quality of life to their citizens have been able to do so without vast reserves of natural resources, or even a massive financial sector. Instead they have done so mostly through socialist ideas. In fact many of these countries even have political parties in power that have "socialist" or "communist" in their title, and which advocate for and implement socialist and communist ideas, but this is never acknowledged by the capitalists who condemn socialism by pointing to Venezuela.

However, the greatest problem with using Venezuela to dismantle socialism is that there are no modern socialists or communists that advocate for copying Venezuela's economy wholesale, nor for adopting policies or practices that are unique to Venezuela. Most modern socialists effectively advocate for the Nordic model, except with optimally democratized businesses and governments. The failings of Venezuela can therefore not be used to criticize socialism. That Venezuela continues to be used as evidence against socialism is testament to the shallowness of capitalist propaganda.

Most of the problems cited here also apply equally to other countries that are often cited by capitalists when condemning socialism. For example, America has had an illegal embargo against Cuba since the 1960's. Even today America has over 200 sanctions against Cuba, which cover essential resources like food and medicine, and they also refuse to do business with foreign companies that do business with Cuba, which includes preventing ships from docking in America if they've done business with Cuba during the past 6 months. This embargo has cost Cuba an estimated \$1 trillion in trade, and has obviously caused immeasurable harm to Cuban citizens. This embargo has been condemned by every member of the United Nations, except Israel. During this time America has also formulated

other ways to destabilize and destroy Cuba's economy, including constructing plans to intentionally mass murder Cuban civilians.

None of this should come as a surprise, since over the past century America has been at the forefront of destroying regimes and countries that are socialist, or which lean towards socialism, as well as using imperialism to exploit vulnerable countries. Most of these problems can be at least partially attributed to the CIA, which could accurately be described as one of the world's most powerful and dangerous international terrorist organizations. This isn't surprising since, as renowned Marxist and political scientist Michael Parenti has observed, throughout its history the CIA has owned outright more than 240 media operations around the world, including newspaper publishers, magazine publishers, book publishers, radio stations, television stations, and wire services, and has partially controlled many more.

Hypocrisy

The criticisms that capitalists level against alternative economic systems are also undermined by how hypocritical they are. For example, every failed economy is blamed on socialism, and yet capitalism is never blamed for any failed or failing economy, including the poorest countries in the world. This is despite the fact that, aside from 2 to 4 exceptions, every country in the world has a capitalist economy. Worse still, many of these countries have also been victims of capitalist imperialism for decades or centuries, and have consequently suffered from a range of abuses, such as exploitative trade deals, debt trapping, labor exploitation, resource extraction, sanctions, embargoes, blockades, military invasions, false flag operations, terror campaigns, political bribery, election rigging, the assassination of democratically elected leaders, the installation of puppet governments and fascist dictators, the infiltration and undermining of civil rights movements by agent provocateurs, the training and arming of opposition forces and death squads, the aggravation of civil conflicts, the mass surveillance, sterilization, enslavement, and murder, of civilians, the imprisoning and torturing

of dissidents and socialists, the torching of arable farm land, and the bombing of essential infrastructures, to name the most prominent examples. And most of these manifestations of capitalist imperialism continue to this day. Additionally, even when regions or countries do successfully move more towards socialism, their accomplishments are suppressed through propaganda in capitalist countries. Despite all of this, capitalism is never blamed for destroying any country, and yet socialism is blamed for destroying countries which are not even socialist. And this doesn't even account for the declining quality of life of citizens in many "successful" developed capitalist countries during the past 50-70 years, including those that have greatly benefitted from imperialism.

Another example of hypocrisy relates to the public infrastructures and services in capitalist countries. These are required for capitalist economies to function and for businesses to maximize profits, and yet not only do capitalists deride socialism, capitalist businesses also do everything they can to avoid funding these socialist infrastructures and services. This has created an interesting cognitive dissonance in the minds of many capitalist, or at least an overt contradiction in modern capitalist propaganda. Capitalists will usually acknowledge that the Nordic countries provide a higher quality of life than most other countries, and yet when socialists advocate not even for socialism, but simply the Nordic model, even then many capitalists reject this idea on the basis that this would be too socialist. This problem has become so extreme that even advocates of moderate yet essential socialist infrastructures and services, which have already been successfully implemented in the Nordic countries, are demonized as the worse types of "commies".

This hypocrisy is made worse by the fact that all businesses effectively use socialism to function and maximize their profits. First, all capitalist businesses require cooperation and resource sharing within their internal infrastructures. Despite this, they reject cooperation and resource sharing in the wider economy, and instead demand competition and resource hoarding, since this is the only way they can maximize profits. Second, the wealth and power

consolidation that inevitably occurs under capitalism always results in a ruling class that tries to persuade governments to give their businesses corporate welfare, while simultaneously criticizing citizens who receive welfare because it is a form of socialism. Third, businesses privatize their profits, but socialize the costs of running their businesses in the form of externalities. Fourth, technological surplus is effectively a form of socialism, because it only exists due to socialist principles, namely the collaboration and resource sharing of humans across the planet and across history. And because businesses steal technological surplus for themselves, they are effectively admitting through their actions the invaluable contributions of socialism. For these reasons, it is hypocritical for capitalists to condemn socialism when capitalist businesses are only successful because of socialism.

Another instance of hypocrisy is the capitalist belief that everyone should have as much freedom and control over their lives as possible, as enshrined in concepts such as free markets, voluntary exchange, and private property. Yet when it comes to businesses, where workers spend most of their waking lives, capitalists insist on rigid hierarchies, submissive obedience to effective dictators, restricted worker freedom, and a lack of democratic control that predictably leads to a wide range of abuses. And of course this also reduces freedom and control for everyone else in society, through reduced discretionary income and purchasing power, and underfunded public infrastructures and services. And this problem only worsens during inevitable economic downturns, when workers and consumers have even less freedom and control. So even though capitalists agree that people should have as much freedom as possible, and that people should have the greatest amount of control possible over anything that affects their life, capitalists still hypocritically advocate for a system that achieves the opposite.

Capitalists also hypocritically argue that no one has a right to steal someone else's wages, or demand that other's work for them, which is summarized in the common expression "no one has a right to someone else's labor". This is obviously extremely hypocritical. Under

capitalism, consumers and workers have their wealth stolen from them in all the ways previously described, which is effectively another way of saying their wages and their labor are stolen from them. Worse still, people shouldn't even have to work at all if they don't want to, since everyone has a right to a UBI and public infrastructures and services that can fulfill all of their basic needs. Additionally, people have never needed to demand that others work for them, since most people are willing to work in exchange for compensation so that they can afford for themselves a higher quality of life. So it is in fact capitalism that refuses to respect the idea that "no one has a right to someone else's labor". Despite this, capitalists hypocritically advocate for their system despite the obviousness of this hypocrisy.

Capitalists have also hypocritically argued that relying upon governments, rather than businesses, creates unnecessary bureaucracy problems for citizens. Their argument is that citizens will always choose more streamlined services when they have the option to choose between businesses within competitive free markets, and that governments will always become increasingly bureaucratic as time progresses since citizens have no choice regarding their government. This argument is flawed for multiple reasons. First, citizens are able to choose who runs their government, so it is disingenuous to argue that citizens have no choice merely because they only have one government at any given moment in time. The problem is that under capitalism this choice is always reduced by the ruling class using their corrupting influence to make elections as undemocratic as possible. Second, governments become bureaucratic primarily when incompetent people with conflicting understandings of economics are voted into power. This can also be blamed on capitalism, since it is a system that generally results in poor-quality education systems and economically illiterate voters and politicians.

Third, governments are more likely to be underfunded under capitalism, and are far more likely to be run by capitalists, which means welfare programs are far more likely to be means tested, and welfare departments are far more likely to be understaffed. This

results in slow bureaucratic systems that citizens regularly have no choice but to interact with, and which capitalists can then try to use as overt evidence that governments are unavoidably bureaucratic compared to businesses. This problem is exacerbated by the fact that people are also far more likely to need welfare under capitalism because of the poverty and health problems they are far more likely to suffer from, meaning these departments are also more likely to become overburdened. Fourth, capitalist businesses will nearly always strive to be as exploitative as possible, which inevitably creates unnecessary bureaucracy problems. More specifically, under capitalism products and services are far more likely to be subpar or entirely unfit for purpose, which forces consumers to waste time and energy making phone calls and filling out paper work to rectify these problems. So even though capitalists argue that governments are more bureaucratic than businesses, it is capitalism that is to blame when this occurs, and for making businesses unnecessarily bureaucratic as well.

Some capitalists have also hypocritically argued that socialism and communism would lead to "the tragedy of the commons", in which resources are unsustainably depleted and environments are chaotically devastated by individuals and groups all working in their own self-interest. This is overtly hypocritical, because if capitalism has any flaws so extreme that they are even recognized by many capitalists, it would be unsustainability and environmental destruction. These are unavoidable consequences of any system that prioritizes privatization, free markets, and profits. Economic planning by contrast is not only necessary for preventing these two problems, but is a solution that is already utilized under capitalism. Governments, NGO's, and industries, calculate on an ongoing basis the availability of resources, such as water and fossil fuels, with the goal of planning for the future. They are also responsible for creating plans that can reduce and remediate environmental destruction. The obvious problem is that capitalism always culminates in extreme wealth and power consolidation, particularly into the hands of sociopaths, which means these plans for achieving sustainability and protecting the environment are rarely carried out. Socialism and

communism also involve this exact same type of economic planning, but because they are optimally democratic they are substantially more likely to carry through with these plans in order to create the world that the overwhelming majority of people want to live in, rather than the increasingly nightmarish world that the ruling class is so willing to inflict upon everyone else, and particularly future generations.

Conclusion

Capitalist countries are not superior to socialist countries despite what propaganda has led people to believe. Practically every country in the world is capitalist, meaning the only reasonable way of assessing whether capitalism or socialism is superior is by analyzing how people's quality of life changes according to how much their country embraces or rejects socialist ideas. The evidence overwhelmingly demonstrates that the highest quality of life is experienced in countries that embrace socialism to the greatest extent, particularly in the form of socialist policies, socialist programs, and socialist organizations and systems. Capitalists have used scapegoat "socialist" countries like Venezuela to distract from this obvious conclusion, but have only proven the shallowness of capitalist propaganda in the process. In fact capitalist propaganda is not only easy to debunk, but also deeply hypocritical considering how much capitalist countries and businesses embrace socialist principles, and how socialism actually achieves the stated goals that capitalism is supposedly so adept at achieving. And none of this addresses the quality of life of those in underdeveloped countries, which overall is even more appallingly low due to capitalist imperialism. Aside from this imperialism, capitalism has only been able to provide a higher quality of life to people in developed countries due to a combination of socialism and free markets, and free markets have not only never been exclusive to capitalism, but their benefits can be outdone by orders of magnitude under democratic socialism.

“Capitalist free markets are superior to socialist planned economies”

Having now explored why countries that embrace socialist ideas are demonstrably superior to those that reject them, this section will explore what a completely socialist society could look like. More specifically, this section will explore why socialist planned economies are superior to capitalist free markets. Economic planning is most often dismissed by capitalists because they conflate this with the command economies of the Soviet Union and Mao's China. Economic planning is not only viable, but superior in every conceivable way. Before exploring the benefits of economic planning, and how this could be implemented in a democratic socialist society, it is first necessary to explore what makes capitalist free markets so ineffective and dangerous. The main reason comes down to their ineffective utilization of all the components required for an economy to function, namely money, supply, demand, prices, and compensation. The consequences of these problems include the improper allocation of wealth and resources, particularly via various forms of theft, even though effective wealth and resource allocation is supposed to be the greatest advantage of free markets.

The first problem with capitalist free markets is money. As proven earlier, money is a completely irrational construct under capitalism, because it is not representative of anything tangible in the real-world. This problem has been exacerbated by privately owned banks, which have always been incentivized to lend out substantially more money, and charge much higher interest rates, than borrowers could ever be capable of paying back. Most of this money also constitutes unsustainable fictitious capital, which guarantees the entire global economy is incapable of being sustainable, which is a problem further exacerbated by the profit motive.

The second problem with capitalist free markets is supply. Under capitalism businesses are incentivized to create artificial scarcity in order to keep prices high, which ensures the supply of goods and services is rarely as abundant as it could be. This is particularly dangerous in the case of essential goods and services. Supplies also decrease during economic downturns, and particularly major recessions. Capitalism is also a terrible system for maintaining a steady supply in the long-term, since resources will always be utilized unsustainably for all the reasons previously explored. This supply problem leads to ridiculous situations, such as abundant resources like diamonds and lifesaving medicines being kept artificially scarce, while scarce resources like water and seafood are stolen through imperialism and unsustainably squandered.

The third problem with capitalist free markets is demand. Under capitalism demand is primarily determined by consumers, which wouldn't be a problem if not for the fact that nobody receives their fair share of the world's resources and technological surplus, and the fact that most people in the world live in dire financial circumstances. Worse still, capitalist free markets always result in gross wealth and power inequality, meaning massive quantities of economic resources are allocated by the ruling class purely or primarily for their own benefit. These poverty and wealth inequality problems are also compounded during times of economic crisis, where the reduced number of goods and services available are allocated on a first-come-first-serve basis, which obviously prioritizes the demands of the few over the demands of everyone in society.

The fourth problem with capitalist free markets is prices. Under capitalism goods and services are not produced and provided at the lowest prices possible. Instead companies leverage the extent to which consumers need or desire products and services in order to increase prices to the greatest extent they can get away with. This problem worsens during times of inflation, since businesses can use this as a convenient cover to increase their prices above what would be necessary for them to offset price increases within their supply

chains. And because privatization guarantees that industries will eventually be taken over by monopolies and cartels, competition is not an adequate solution. The fact that millions die every year due to being unable to afford essential goods and services proves how dangerous this pricing system is. And prices under capitalism are also detrimental to sustainability. For example, the unsustainably low cost of freshwater signals to the economy that the long-term supply of water and water-based products are assured, when in reality water is running out globally, and has been a limited resource for decades. And even when prices are kept low under capitalism, this is always as a consequence of other forms of theft, such as externalities, which further invalidates this price system.

The fifth problem with capitalist free markets is compensation. As proven earlier, every worker's compensation should always have been determined by the value and difficulty of their labor. Under capitalist free markets there is not only no correlation between these two factors and a workers compensation, but in most cases there is a negative correlation. Additionally, a lack of standardization of compensation means that highly skilled professionals are often drawn away from the public sector towards the higher paying private sector, which is not only unfair to public sector workers, but can also result in shortages of essential workers within the public sector.

These 5 issues are all consequences of prioritizing privatization, free markets, and profits, meaning they are unavoidable under capitalist free markets. Instead of money, supply, demand, prices, and compensation, being intelligently designed and utilized in order to ensure all the world's resources are allocated logically and morally, under free markets they are instead designed and utilized unsustainably and for the primary benefit of the ruling class.

Economic planning

Before exploring how socialist planned economies would design and utilize money, supply, demand, prices, and compensation, it is first worth looking at four broad reasons why planned economies are

advocated for by socialists. The first reason is that they can maximize innovation, as has already been discussed at length. The second reason is that they can ensure the basic needs of everyone are fulfilled, particularly through a UBI and well-funded public infrastructures and services, and by keeping prices as low as possible. Even though economic crises are far less likely to occur under this system, economic planning can also better ensure people's needs and wants are fulfilled during such times. This is primarily because resources can be stockpiled and rationed out, unlike under capitalism where businesses use just-in-time supply chains to keep stocks low, and where goods and services are primarily allocated to those with the most wealth, or allocated on a first-come-first-serve basis.

Socialist planned economies were even possible in the past, as opposed to only being possible with modern infrastructures and technologies. For example, during the Second World War rationing was used to distribute essential resources evenly, ensuring everyone, including children, had their basic needs fulfilled. In other words, resources were distributed according to the Marxist maxim "to each according to their needs". If capitalist free markets had been used for distribution during the Second World War, most economic resources would have been controlled by the ruling class, which would have allowed them to live lives of relative luxury, while tens or hundreds of millions would have been left destitute or even starving to death. Since the Second World War production capabilities have skyrocketed, and the infrastructures and technologies necessary for information and resource sharing have similarly improved by a staggering amount. Despite this, billions of people around the world go hungry, and millions die every single year, even while living in the most peaceful time in human history. Even today in developed countries citizens are unable to meet the basic needs of themselves and their children. The absolute absurdity of this situation is never acknowledged by capitalists.

Another reason planned economies can guarantee everyone's basic needs during times of crisis is because entire supply chains can be

created within single countries. This would also reduce prices and CO₂ emissions since less transportation would be required. Obviously there are practical limitations that would prevent this from occurring to an ideal extent, since there are many specific parts of many supply chains that are unmovable, such as those related to mining, or the growing of particular crops. However this mostly applies to raw resources, meaning the remainder of most supply chains could be created in most countries, or at least to a far greater extent than occurs under capitalism. Obviously there would need to be a balance between every country producing all goods and services, and the comparative advantage that allows certain countries to produce particular goods and services more efficiently, but at least economic planning would allow room for this balance to be achieved. Under capitalism many countries have an unnecessary comparative advantage, and others are prevented from producing certain goods entirely, because of problems like patents, imperialism, and global wealth inequality.

The third reason socialist planned economies are superior is because they can avoid inflation. In fact prices would decrease over time as productivity increased as a consequence of technological advancements. Under capitalism inflation eradicates the benefits of this ever increasing technological surplus, and this occurs throughout global supply chains. And this issue obviously extends to problems like rent extraction and interest extraction, which wouldn't even exist under a socialist planned economy. To make matters worse, it is always essential goods and services that are most vulnerable to inflation, since their inelastic demand makes price gouging substantially easier to get away with. And if this wasn't bad enough, inflation has effectively masked humanity's ever increasing productivity, which has subsequently made it much easier for the ruling class to steal technological surplus for themselves without resistance from the masses. The end result of this inflation problem is so ridiculous it is almost difficult to comprehend. Despite essential products like fresh vegetables costing less to produce now than ever before, many workers in developed countries are completely unable to afford such essential products for themselves and their children. If

economic planning was used, all essential goods and services, including homes, and an increasing number of luxury goods and services, would be completely free, since everyone could pay for them with their UBI. That this is not the world we currently live in reveals the astounding absurdity of capitalist free markets.

Some capitalists may argue that the prices of essential goods and services should increase once people possessed more money, because if prices were kept too low, scarcity would occur as a result of overconsumption. Aside from the fact that this inevitably and unnecessarily reduces everyone's purchasing power, this argument is flawed because it can only apply to luxury goods and services. No matter how rich someone is, they are only ever going to purchase as many essentials that they can use and benefit from. If this wasn't true then there would be an epidemic of millionaires regularly going into supermarkets and buying out all the fresh fruit and vegetables, which has never been a problem. Consumers never purchase more essentials than they require because there is an effectively limitless number of luxury goods and services people desire to purchase with their limited discretionary income. If there aren't enough essential goods and services for everyone, then the solution would be to temporarily ration them, or temporarily limit or prevent bulk purchasing, until production increased enough to create abundance. If wealthy individuals decided to use such moments of scarcity to purchase essential goods and services in order to re-sell them at extortionate prices, then this could be made illegal.

Another problem with inflation is that even if people's income increased at the same rate, the money that people put aside as savings cannot increase in value, meaning its value will always diminish over time for no justifiable reason. Capitalist markets have tried to rectify this by paying people interest on their savings, but this is a disastrous approach because it requires people paying interest on their loans. As explained earlier, this makes the entire economic system fundamentally unsustainable, since to create the money required to pay back these loans requires endless consumption and endless work, which is impossible in a world of

finite resources and increasing technological unemployment. Additionally, interest on savings rarely keeps up with inflation, which encourages people to spend their money sooner rather than later while their money has more value, which makes economies even more unsustainable. Within socialist planned economies, most people would never need to take out loans because everyone would have far more discretionary income and purchasing power. Those who did require personal loans could take out a limited amount of money from their future UBI, while those who required money for business and innovation ventures could receive interest-free loans or grants from socialist government run banks, worker cooperatives, crowdfunding, and crowdsourcing.

Inflation has also posed a unique problem for businesses. Many capitalists argue against cumbersome government regulations because of the costs they inflict on smaller businesses. It is true that incompetent governments can create unnecessary regulations, although this could also be avoided for the most part under democratic socialism. However, in most instances regulations are necessary for protecting people, animals, and the environment. In fact a quick look at the track record of accidents, injuries, and deaths, in developed countries compared to underdeveloped countries quickly proves how invaluable regulations are. Complaining about too many regulations is easy to get away with in developed countries, but quickly becomes near impossible when talking to those in underdeveloped countries who have lost limbs and loved ones because of too few regulations. However, the bigger issue is that regulations should always have been easy to pay for and abide by, particularly by hiring experts capable of completing all necessary paperwork and actions on the business owner's behalf. Inflation however prevents businesses from being able to afford these experts and regulation requirements. So even though capitalists regularly blame governments for burdensome and expensive regulations, it is ironically the very economic system they advocate for that makes so many regulations burdensome and expensive to begin with.

This also applies to minimum wage increases. Many businesses have narrow profit margins, meaning increasing the minimum wage can force these businesses to make compromises that affect their business, their consumers, or even their workers, such as firing workers or reducing their hours. In many instances this can push smaller businesses into bankruptcy. Capitalists then use this as evidence against the socialist idea of raising the minimum wage, and subsequently use this as evidence of the supremacy of free markets in determining wages. Obviously it is capitalism that is at fault. Under democratic socialism businesses would have far less debt, and without inflation these businesses would be substantially less expensive to run, since the goods and services they rely upon would be substantially more affordable. Additionally, without inflation the discretionary income and purchasing power of consumers would be far higher, meaning all businesses would be far more likely to succeed. Under capitalism minimum wage laws are essential for avoiding worker exploitation, and yet under capitalism this can also force smaller businesses into bankruptcy. So in other words capitalism is so incredibly broken that even reasonable attempts to remediate its problems can cause it to break even further.

One final problem with inflation under capitalism is that it will always be exacerbated whenever governments create money from nothing in order to fund a UBI and public infrastructures and services, which is both an ideal and necessary approach for funding both of these. Even though governments can delay inflation by taking money out of the economy by issuing government bonds, this is still only a temporary measure, and also requires creating even more money to pay for the interest attached to these loans, making this a completely unfeasible long-term solution. So even though the world's resources and technological surplus belong to everyone, capitalism is unable to guarantee this birthright to everyone in the most ideal way possible because of inflation, which further proves the astounding brokenness of capitalism. Similar to a host of other capitalist problems, inflation is yet another absurd phenomenon that, due to capitalist realism, most people believe is an unavoidable property of economic activity,

when in reality it is a consequence of broken economic systems like capitalism.

The fourth reason socialist planned economies are superior is because they can ensure long-term sustainability. There are numerous reasons for this. First, socialist planned economies can maximize innovation, which is essential for ensuring economies utilize resources as efficiently as possible. Second, socialist planned economies can better account for available resources, and are more likely to use these resources sustainably because they are optimally democratic. This is different to capitalism's pitiful idea of democracy, where economic activity is disproportionately determined by the wealthiest in society, and where all other economic activity is directed by financially strained and uninformed consumers voting indirectly with their wallets, rather than informed citizens voting directly for specific outcomes. Incidentally, using economic planning to achieve sustainability has actually been possible for all of human civilization. The ability to calculate the availability of most essential resources has existed for millennia, although in the past this was mostly unnecessary because populations were substantially smaller and required far fewer resources. However, as populations and resource utilization have increased, so too has humanity's ability to calculate available resources.

Third, socialist planned economies can be sustainable because they can avoid economic downturns, which unnecessarily force businesses into bankruptcy, and consequently results in stock and equipment being discarded and destroyed. In certain industries, this can result in equipment worth millions of dollars being disassembled and destroyed, only to then be rebuilt again once the economy recovers. Fourth, planned economies can better reduce or prevent externalities, which nearly always require more resources to address than preventing and offsetting them in the first place. For example, the resources required to prevent and offset greenhouse gas emissions is orders of magnitude less than the resources required to deal with climate change, such as those needed for rebuilding infrastructure after otherwise preventable hurricanes. And dealing

with such externalities will only worsen as resources become increasingly scarce and large-scale problems like climate change increasingly worsen. Capitalists sometimes naïvely or disingenuously argue that capitalism is more sustainable because the profit motive encourages businesses to be efficient, but it is ridiculous to argue that an efficiently made \$10 product is sustainable if \$1000 worth of resources are required to deal with its externalities. There are other reasons socialist planned economies are well-equipped to achieve long-term sustainability, but these are the four main reasons.

Economic planning under democratic socialism

Now that the broader benefits of economic planning have been explored, this section will provide an overview of what a democratic socialist planned economy could look like in practice. The first part of this section will focus on decentralized economic planning, while the subsequent section will focus on centralized economic planning. And similar to our critique of capitalist free markets, this example will explore how money, supply, demand, prices, and compensation, would work in this system. However, before doing so, it is necessary to first emphasize the prerequisites for such a society to function, or really for any society to function.

First, every member of society would need to be educated to become as critically minded, economically literate, and scientifically literate, as possible. Second, gross wealth inequality would need to be eradicated. Third, all businesses would need to take the form of worker cooperatives, and most would need consumer and local community representatives. However, all businesses would still be accountable to the entirety of society. Fourth, every organization, such as governments and worker cooperatives, would need to be democratized to the point that leaders and managers could be voted out of their positions at any moment. Fifth, all governments would need to be run by highly experienced and qualified experts who would have to pass rigorous fitness-for-duty tests even to become political candidates. These five changes constitute the most important prerequisites.

Decentralized economic planning under democratic socialism

The first difference with an economically planned society is that money in its current form wouldn't exist, since otherwise sustainability would be impossible. The only way to achieve sustainability would be to move towards a Resource Based Economy, which is a proposed scientifically-based economic system that catalogues the world's resources and utilizes them as sustainably, efficiently, and humanely, as possible. Our proposal for achieving this would be to replace money with what we have chosen to call "Resource Tokens". These tokens would be produced every month, and would be representative of all the raw resources in the world that could be accessed and sustainably utilized by humanity during that month. Resource Tokens would be used just like money, but in order to ensure sustainability these tokens would be taken out of circulation when used to purchase raw resources, such as freshwater and unrefined minerals. As far as the Resource Token value of raw resources is concerned, this would be determined by STEM experts, whose job would be to ensure long-term sustainability. Resources that were abundant, even when in high demand, would cost very few Resource Tokens to purchase, while resources that were scarce would cost substantially more. These STEM experts would therefore not be responsible for allocating resources or dictating production, since this would still be determined by market demand, or in other words aggregate consumer demand. The only time resources would need to be rationed would be in times of crisis, although such times would be rare or nonexistent in an entirely socialist world. The cost of resources in terms of Resource Tokens would not need to be perfect, since even a rough estimate would be substantially more accurate and sustainable than how money and resources are utilized under capitalism.

Some of these Resource Tokens would be given to governments to pay for public infrastructures and services, while the rest would be distributed equally to everyone in the form of a monthly UBI. As described earlier, ever increasing technological surplus could either be given to everyone as part of their UBI, or could be used to lower the prices of goods and services. If given as a Resource Token UBI,

this UBI would increase over time. If used to reduce the prices of goods and services, every person's UBI would remain the same over time, and this would remain true even over the course of thousands of years. The former approach would be ideal, but because it would be more complicated to implement the latter approach will be used here in order to prove how economic planning could have been used even in more technologically primitive societies.

Money, supply, and demand, would therefore be relatively easy to implement in a democratic socialist planned economy, and would not suffer from all the problems that exist within capitalist free markets. Prices and compensation however are slightly more complicated. Prices would be determined according to two types of expenses. The first would be capital expenditure, or in other words the costs of buying, maintaining, and improving assets for a business. These costs would be included in prices at least until these costs were paid off, although grants from the government could reduce or eradicate these costs. The second would be operational expenditure, or in other words the ongoing costs of running a business, such as worker compensation, supplies, travel expenses, utilities, and what could be called "externality prevention". Supplies don't just include goods like office supplies, but also intermediary goods and final goods. Unlike under capitalism, prices wouldn't include many unnecessary costs, such as taxes, rent, buying land, interest on loans, excessive compensation packages, and shareholder dividends.

Under democratic socialism prices would be kept as low as possible to ensure the greatest amount of purchasing power for consumers. To ensure this would likely require government oversight. This would not require governments to directly control prices. Instead governments would introduce systems or laws that keep prices as low as possible, and which would also ensure that prices always return to normal if they ever unavoidably increased in response to unforeseeable economic circumstances. One of the most variable components of pricing would be democratic surplus, but the maximum limit of this variable could be calculated using a national or international mathematical algorithm. Businesses could also be

allowed to increase their democratic surplus past a default algorithmic limit, but this possibility would require increased democratic oversight in order to prevent consumer exploitation. However, prices would generally decrease over time as technological surplus gradually increased. Prices would also decrease for secondhand goods that have degraded with use and time. For example, upgrade costs notwithstanding, the prices of properties would decrease in accordance with the degradation they inevitably suffer from. More accurately, properties would be worth their original value minus the material and labor costs required to bring them back to their original state, or at least near their original state. Incidentally, because physical assets would decrease in price as they degrade over time, intergenerational wealth would also accumulate to a much lesser extent.

This democratic socialist system would also ensure that the prices of goods and services, including properties, better reflected their actual quality. Under capitalism, honest and ethical producers and sellers often keep their prices as low as possible, whereas unethical companies that produce lower quality goods may sell these at higher prices for no other reason than greed. This robs consumers of invaluable price information that could be used to quickly determine the general quality of goods and services. This is incredibly ironic, since one of the most common reasons capitalist free markets are heralded as superior is because of their supposed ability to provide accurate information to buyers via prices. As an added benefit, decreasing prices in accordance with increasing technological surplus would also make it easier for everyone to measure the rate of technological progress.

The only time that keeping prices low might be a problem is when consumers purchase an unexpectedly large quantity of a particular resource or product, particularly if they have saved up their Resource Tokens. One solution would be to ration scarce resources to a certain amount per customer or per household within a given period of time, such as a day, week, or month. A better solution under certain circumstances would be to gradually increase the price for a

consumer or household above a particular threshold. For example, once a household has consumed a disproportionately large amount of water in a week, the price of water for that household, for the remainder of that week, could steadily increase with increased consumption. This problem would be unlikely to occur, but solutions such as these could be devised and implemented with enough planning, and would obviously be far superior to the widespread inflation that occurs under capitalism.

Within a planned economy, goods that are in limited supply could be sold on a first-come-first-serve basis similar to capitalism. However, it would also be possible, and perhaps ideal, for such limited goods to be sold first and foremost to those who provide the most valuable and difficult labor to society, as additional compensation and recognition of their contributions and sacrifices. Necessity could also be used to determine the allocation of expensive and limited goods and services. For example, someone needing to buy a primary home in a new location for work purposes would take priority over someone buying a second home for vacation purposes. Using such metrics like this would ensure far fairer allocation, and would remove the need for price increases, including increases that occur as a consequence of bidding. This system would be slightly more complicated, but even a crude version would be superior by orders of magnitude. It would not only substantially increase discretionary income and purchasing power, but would also achieve substantially fairer outcomes. Under planned economies there could still be a place for bidding, but only for limited luxury goods, such as collectors' items, although even then this would be avoided or discouraged wherever possible for the sake of maximizing everyone's discretionary income and purchasing power.

In terms of goods that traditionally appreciate in value over time, such as wine and art, their prices would also be calculated differently. Such goods would increase in price over time, but only in accordance with the labor and resources required to protect them, maintain them, repair them, etc. Objects that have a societal value, such as famous works of art, would be deemed priceless, and owned by

society as a whole, rather than privately owned. Far more people would benefit under this system. Goods that increase in price over time could be afforded by more people, and things that are moved into public ownership could be appreciated by everyone.

With regards to excess stock that worker cooperatives cannot sell, these would not be thrown away and destroyed, unlike under capitalism. After a specified time, all of these goods would be sold at ever decreasing prices until they are eventually given away for free at a distant point in the future. It might be assumed that consumers would delay purchasing goods so that they can acquire them cheaper or for free at a later point, but this rarely occurs even under capitalism. Most consumers purchase products sooner rather than later either because the purchase is necessary and time critical, or because the product will be outdated within the near future, which would increasingly be the case in a world where innovation was maximized. The Resource Tokens that are not reimbursed, due to the products being sold for less than they cost to produce, would be added to the prices of future products sold by the worker cooperative. This approach may require some companies to increase their storage space in order to increase the time they can offer these products. However, this would be far more affordable under socialism, since all land would be free and allocated democratically, and buildings would be substantially cheaper to purchase or build for all the reasons discussed in this manifesto.

Worker compensation under a democratic socialist planned economy is a similarly complex issue. Compensation would be determined through democratic consensus and mathematical calculations, rather than through arbitrary free market interactions that haphazardly escalate over time into increasingly nonsensical and gross compensation inequality. Determining compensation would be a relatively lengthy but straightforward process, and would involve determining the value and difficulty of different types of labor. Researchers would first be tasked with compiling questionnaires that are completed by as many people as possible in order to determine the value of certain types of labor. The most valuable types of labor

could initially be determined using the first two levels of Abraham Maslow's hierarchy of needs, which are dedicated to physiological and safety needs, and include needs related to health, nutrition, clean water, fresh air, shelter, financial security, and physical safety. For non-essential goods and services, people would be asked to rank which goods and services most improve their quality of life.

To determine the difficulty of certain types of labor, researchers would compile questionnaires that would be completed by all workers or adults within society. A question may ask for example, "If you were a full-time CEO working an office job and earning 100,000 Resource Tokens a year, how much more would you need to be paid to be convinced to become a sewage worker?" Questions could also compare job outcomes or specific activities rather than the jobs themselves. Such a question may ask for example, "If you performed a non-strenuous job for 100,000 Resource Tokens a year, how much more would you need to be paid to perform that same job if it gave you a 50% chance of developing chronic back pain after 15 years?" Ideally these questionnaires would have hundreds of such questions, and would be completed by every worker or adult within society. An additional approach would be to supplement this information with conclusions reached by researchers who are commissioned to determine the value and difficulty of certain types of labor using more scientific methods.

All of this information could then be utilized to create a societal consensus on the value and difficulty of particular jobs or particular activities. From this a mathematical algorithm could be created that could be used by worker cooperatives to determine the appropriate hourly wages of every worker. As described earlier, each job or activity would be ranked first according to its value, and second according to its difficulty. Determining compensation using this algorithm would naturally encourage people to fulfill the most valuable and difficult jobs in the economy. In practice, determining exact compensation for individual workers using this algorithm would not be done by the government, but instead by workers, whether operating within a worker cooperative or working as freelancers.

However, a government watchdog would exist to intervene if it became clear that workers were being unreasonably compensated according to this algorithm, since this would create unfair compensation inequality between workers and would unnecessarily increase the prices of goods and services. An important caveat to understand however is that while fair compensation would be guaranteed at all times in the public sector, it would not be guaranteed under all circumstances in the non-public sector, since workers may vote to reduce their compensation if their worker cooperative is struggling to survive.

An example of how compensation would be determined within the context of the wider economy could be as follows. The UBI in this system could be worth 10,000 Resource Tokens, the lowest paid full-time worker in society could be paid 10,000 Resource Tokens, and the highest paid full-time worker in society could be paid 90,000 Resource Tokens. This would mean that a full-time worker's income would be at least twice as much as someone who doesn't work, since even the lowest paid worker would receive 10,000 tokens via their UBI, and 10,000 tokens via their compensation. The highest paid worker in this scenario would have an income of 100,000 tokens, which would be 10 times higher than someone who doesn't work. If this higher compensation limit of 90,000 Resource Tokens was not possible in a more primitive society, then this compensation limit could be lowered until technological surplus increased. This system would allow workers to have a substantially higher quality of life, since most of a UBI would only cover essentials, while a worker could spend all of their compensation on luxury goods and services.

Because there would be no inflation under this system, worker compensation would also remain constant across time. This does not mean workers would not receive increasing compensation in accordance with the increasing value and difficulty of their labor, as obviously the algorithm would account for this. Instead this means that a job that pays a specific amount at one point in history would pay the same amount even thousands of years into the future, all else being equal. This is because the only thing that would change

over the course of history would be technology, and because technological surplus belongs to all humans, no worker's pay would increase in accordance with increases in technological productivity.

Using a system like this would ensure compensation was kept fair across the entire global economy. This contrasts with capitalist free markets, where ever increasing wealth and power inequality between businesses, combined with billions of worker compensation negotiations across time, guarantee ever escalating and absurd levels of compensation inequality. In developed countries, many famous celebrities are worth hundreds of millions of dollars, while many nurses and sewage workers live in poverty. And this compensation discrepancy is even worse on an international scale. Using this algorithm by contrast would guarantee that the most highly compensated celebrities would never or rarely earn more per hour than the lowest paid nurses or sewage workers. Celebrities could obviously earned more overall by working more hours, but their hourly compensation should never or rarely be higher than those who provide the most valuable and difficult labor to society. Some may counter this by arguing that famous celebrities should receive higher compensation because they are adding value to the lives of millions, but this is illogical.

First, this argument would also have to apply to other workers who affect the lives of a large number of people, which would inevitably result in unfair and arbitrary compensation outcomes. For example, during a single day a nurse may only help 10 people, whereas a sewage worker may be responsible for ensuring 1000 people don't suffer from overflowing sewage systems in their homes and neighborhood. However, paying the sewage worker 100 times more per hour than the nurse simply because they helped 100 times more people would obviously be ridiculous, particularly considering the invaluableness of both of their labor. Even more to the point, a scientist that creates a vaccine could save 1 million times more lives over their lifetime than an equally qualified and talented surgeon, but paying this scientist 1 million times more would obviously be unfair and arbitrary.

Second, celebrities only exist because of technological surplus, or more specifically technologies and global technological infrastructures that they cannot take credit for. If all technologies didn't exist, then life would be no different than 500 years ago, and celebrities today would instead be living a subsistence quality of life, and would barely be famous. For example, most actors would be limited to being involved in small theater productions that would be presented to audiences of a few hundred people at most. In this sense, the joy modern celebrities bring to their millions of fans, and the fame and adoration they receive, could also be understood as forms of technological surplus. And to make matters worse, these global infrastructures are all externality infrastructures.

Third, even celebrities themselves would agree with their new compensation in a world where this algorithm existed. If world famous actors had to choose between being paid the lowest level of compensation, or becoming a sewage worker and earning 9 times this amount, the overwhelming majority of actors would still continue to be actors. This would still be true even if they had to make this choice early in life before they had to choose their careers. The bottom line is that people should always be paid more for providing essential labor, and particularly labor that is difficult, rather than labor that is pursued out of passion, and which has the additional benefit of worldwide adoration.

The system proposed here is obviously simplified, and a finalized system would have to account for the complexities of the real-world. For example, teachers and farmers work intensely during some parts of the year, and then far less during others, meaning their compensation would need to be averaged and spread out evenly across the entire year. Other examples would include the need to account for varying workloads, bonuses based on personal performance, bonuses based on company performance, and the increased difficulties experienced by workers with severe disabilities. Celebrities may also need to receive additional compensation so that they can afford the security necessary to deal with their increased

risk of being harassed by fans and stalkers, although an alternative system would be for governments, or businesses that celebrities work for, to freely provide security for all celebrities that require this.

Compensation would however be difficult to quantify when independent workers, such as artists, inventors, and entrepreneurs, desire reparations for any unpaid labor they performed in the pursuit of bringing their product or service to market. The problem would be determining the difficulty of this labor, as well as the number of hours they worked, prior to their product or service coming to market. An independent worker may have only performed 100 hours of labor, but may declare they worked 1000 hours in order to justify inflating the prices of their goods and services. This is also a problem under capitalism, because independent workers can charge prices that in no way correlate with the difficulty of their labor, or the amount of hours they've worked. This is a problem that cannot be perfectly solved under any economic system.

One solution would be to place a limit on the number of labor hours independent workers can receive compensation for prior to bringing their product or service to market. In the case of those bringing businesses and inventions to market, a better solution would be for entrepreneurs and inventors to work with or under worker cooperatives during the research and development stage, which would allow their labor hours to be more accurately recorded. However, the ideal solution would be to prevent entrepreneurs and inventors from charging for any labor prior to their business or invention coming to market. This may seem unfair, but it would keep the prices of all goods and services as low as possible, which would be ideal for all consumers in society, which includes all entrepreneurs and inventors. This proposed system likely wouldn't deter most entrepreneurs and inventors from contributing to society, since most are driven by passion first and foremost, and those who are primarily driven by a desire for extreme wealth probably shouldn't be encouraged anyway. Additionally, most independent entrepreneurs and inventors don't spend most of their work life in the research and development stage, and this would be even truer under socialism

since businesses would be far more likely to receive outside assistance and would be far more likely to succeed first time round.

Even a primitive compensation algorithm would be light-years ahead of what free markets provide. Under capitalism free markets even lead to a negative correlation between the value and difficulty of a person's labor, and their compensation and subsequent quality of life. In fact many higher-ups receive generous compensation packages and yet don't work at all. Even the greatest problems with an algorithm would be insignificant by comparison, and even these problems would be reduced as these algorithms became more refined over time. And algorithms could even be used for determining things other than worker compensation. For example, an algorithm could be created to determine the welfare that should be given to those living with severe disabilities, in order to ensure to the greatest extent possible that they have an equal quality of life to everyone else in society. Another algorithm could also be used to determine which of two or more parties is allowed to purchase expensive and limited goods and services, such as housing properties.

The proposed system outlined in this section is just one possible version of a decentralized planned economy, but even this one example provides ample evidence of their superiority over capitalist free markets. When democratic socialists and communists advocate for their system, this is the type of economy they are describing. Therefore, planned economies, including those which are moneyless, do not operate as differently from free markets as most people believe. This is why they can avoid issues like the local knowledge problem and the economic calculation problem, which are criticisms inaccurately used by capitalists to condemn democratic socialism and communism as unviable economic systems. The difference is that planned economies design and utilize money, supply, demand, prices, and compensation, in the most logical and moral way possible, which is why they can avoid all the predictable problems of capitalist free markets. And because of its scalability, every society in the world could have utilized economic planning thousands of years ago.

Centralized economic planning under democratic socialism

Centralized planning within democratic socialist societies would be carried out by governments, although these governments would be unrecognizable to most modern governments because they wouldn't be run predominantly by incompetent and corrupt politicians. Additionally, because governments and the public would be economically and scientifically literate, and because of other reforms, there would not be the same conflicts and gridlocks that plague so many modern governments. These governments would therefore operate just as smoothly and successfully as tech companies working to create faster microprocessors, which occurs even under capitalism because highly educated and experienced experts are put in charge of such projects. These governments would therefore not suffer from all the problems of most modern capitalist governments. This would be further assisted by the fact that citizens would not pay taxes under a democratic socialist planned economy. So instead of governments being disliked and mistrusted, under democratic socialism they would be respected and trusted just as much as fire departments and cancer research institutions.

As previously described, governments would receive a percentage of all Resource Tokens in order to fulfill their responsibilities. In practice, governments would likely need to receive at least half of all of the Resource Tokens produced each month. This may sound as if the centralized part of the economy would make up at least 50% of the entire economy, and consequently be larger than the decentralized part of the economy, but this is not how economies work. First, many of these Resource Tokens would need to be used to buy necessary resources and goods for running government run public infrastructures and services, so not all of these Tokens would go towards employing people. Second, all public servants would need to be paid fairly, meaning these Resource Tokens could not be used to hire half of everyone within the economy even if none of these Resource Tokens were used to buy resources and goods. If all public servants were paid an average of 4 times a living wage, then the government receiving 50% of all Resource Tokens would only be enough to hire approximately 25% of the population.

Third, taxes wouldn't exist under this system, meaning all Resource Tokens paid to public servants would never return to the government, but would instead circulate around the economy indefinitely until they were used to purchase the raw resources they represent. In fact, because people generally begin spending their money as soon as they receive their wages, the Resource Tokens paid to public servants would immediately begin entering the rest of the economy as soon as workers were paid. In other words, aside from the Resource Tokens used by governments to purchase raw resources, all Resource Tokens produced each month would enter into the decentralized part of the economy, it's just that the first destination of most of these tokens would be the bank accounts of public servants. In summary, governments receiving over half of all Resource Tokens would not cause these governments to be any larger than the governments of most developed countries.

Under a democratic socialist planned economy, governments would also need to be generously funded because ideal societies always have well-funded public infrastructures and services. Capitalists sometimes argue that centralized planning is rarely ideal because individuals know best what their unique needs are, but this doesn't apply to lower level needs, most of which are extremely expensive to provide for. As a quick summary, these needs, and the provisions required to meet these needs, are as follows.

- Shelter, via public housing, homeless shelters, emergency shelters, etc.
- Social safety nets, via a UBI, disability welfare, parental leave, etc.
- Education, via education institutions, public libraries, public museums, etc.
- Personal safety, via law enforcement, fire departments, search and rescue, social services, etc.
- Sanitation, via clean water systems, sewage systems, garbage collection, etc.
- Energy, via electricity grids, gas grids, subsidies for renewables, etc.

- Healthcare, via hospitals, therapists, medical research, long-term care facilities, etc.
- Justice, via legal aid, the justice system, victim compensation, etc.
- Communication, via telephones, the internet, postal services, etc.
- Travel, via roads, bridges, buses, railways, etc.
- Clean air, via regulators, environmental protection agencies, carbon capture technologies, etc.
- Purchasing power, via laws, regulators, technology research, etc.
- Access to nature, via public parks, national parks, environmental protection agencies, etc.

Even though there are other human needs, these constitute the most essential ones that are best fulfilled by governments. The large number of these essential needs and solutions also hints at the cost of ensuring these needs. Fulfilling everyone's basic needs doesn't guarantee the highest quality of life possible, only a decent minimum, and yet the costs of ensuring these needs for every person on the planet are astronomical. However, even if the essential needs of every person on the planet could be fulfilled, funds would also need to be put aside in the case of disasters and existential threats. Mitigating or preventing global catastrophes like climate change, water scarcity, asteroid collisions, and solar superstorms, are monumentally expensive challenges. And when unavoidable disasters do occur, they can cause hundreds of billions of dollars in damages, and destroy the lives of millions. This further explains why governments would require so many Resource Tokens in a democratic socialist society.

Another important reason why governments would need to be generously funded is because all banks under a planned economy would be nationalized, and would be the primary source of funding for new businesses. Socialist government run banks would be superior to privately owned banks in a number of ways. First, they would be able to lend out interest-free loans. Second, they would prioritize the needs and wants of everyone in society, rather than profits. Third, worker cooperatives and members of the public would be able to influence, at least to some extent, which ventures were

funded. That said, most decisions would likely be made by entrepreneurs and leaders from a range of different industries, working on either a part-time or full-time basis. This would ensure to the greatest extent possible that only the most legitimate ventures were funded. Fourth, banks could also function to introduce entrepreneurs to relevant worker cooperatives, and provide these cooperatives with financial assistance in exchange for providing advice or practical assistance to these entrepreneurs. That said, entrepreneurs could also approach worker cooperatives directly, or receive assistance from the public through crowdfunding and crowdsourcing.

Another important reason why governments would need to be generously funded is so that progress in STEM fields could be maximized. This is because progress in these areas has always been essential for improving people's quality of life. This is perhaps most obvious in areas related to healthcare, energy, computers, communication, transportation, and automation. There are a finite number of things to know about the universe, and the most intelligent society would be one that strived to learn and harness this knowledge as quickly as possible. Doing so in the shortest time frame however has always required a substantial amount of resources, or hypothetically an infinite number of resources, and this only becomes truer as science and technology advances. This is because the tools available to humanity always become more plentiful and sophisticated over time, which subsequently increases the number of ways phenomenon can be studied and the number of technologies that can be researched and developed.

There are effectively three levels of research that can be conducted to achieve progress in these fields. The first level is the broadest, and involves studying the underlying principles and laws of biology, chemistry, physics, mathematics, etc. The second level involves applying this knowledge to create and enhance broad technologies, such as medicines, computers, nanotechnologies, robots, and artificial intelligence. The third level involves the research required to turn these technologies into usable and desirable consumer goods

and services. While there is an overlap between these three levels, generally it is only the third level that requires market demand information and consumer feedback, meaning centralized planning is ideal for these first two levels. This is why an intelligent society would allocate as many Resource Tokens as possible to maximize progress in STEM fields. This would ensure that utopian goals could be achieved as soon as possible, such as automating the entire economy, creating limitless free energy, and eradicating all diseases.

Providing governments with a large percentage of Resource Tokens would also be further justified due to the urgency and unavoidable rising costs of meeting the needs of everyone in society. This is best demonstrated by healthcare. Everyone has a fundamental right to life and personal autonomy, but this cannot be assured unless all health problems are first eradicated or solved, meaning this goal would need to be one of humanity's highest priorities until this was achieved. And because progress in STEM fields always increases the number of goods and services available, this also means healthcare costs will always inevitably increase. This is because healthcare services become capable of offering an ever increasing number of medicines, procedures, equipment, etc., and all of these require an ever increasing number of highly trained specialists to utilize. In a mature society that prioritized the physical and mental wellbeing of its population, this would mean that unlike most other public infrastructures and services, like roads and fire departments, public healthcare costs would increase exponentially as time progressed. Healthcare costs would eventually decrease as more and more diseases and disabilities were cured, but increasing costs would need to be accounted for up until that point. Creating automation technologies that can replace all human labor would also follow the same cost curve, of first being increasingly expensive, before decreasing as AI and machines became advanced enough to self-improve and self-replicate. All of these reasons explain why governments would need to be well funded in a democratic socialist planned economy.

There are multiple reasons why centralized planning, rather than decentralized planning, would be ideal or essential for achieving all of these goals. First, centralized planning would be necessary for ensuring the fair allocation of resources both nationally and globally, which has become increasingly important as societies have transitioned from local economies to national and global economies. A Resource Token UBI in particular would be impossible without centralized planning. Second, the scale and complexity of many large-scale endeavors often necessitates centralized planning. For example, the Large Hadron Collider would not have been feasible without large centralized organizations, namely national governments and CERN, planning the entire project. Another example would be the planning of major roads and railways across a country, which often requires centralized planning to design optimally efficient travel routes. Third, centralized planning can be essential for achieving standardization, without which an endless array of compatibility problems would occur for both people and businesses.

Quality of life

Combining both decentralized and centralized planning in a democratic socialist society would enable everyone to have a substantially higher quality of life. This is obvious in certain ways, such as the generous funding of public infrastructures and services, and the maximization of STEM progress. However, it is the increase in discretionary income and purchasing power that is perhaps the least obvious because of the multitude of ways this would occur within a planned economy. The following list summarizes the most prominent ways this would occur.

- Everyone would receive a Resource Token UBI.
- Innovation would be maximized, which would increase technological surplus more rapidly, and consequently increase everyone's discretionary income and purchasing power.
- Public infrastructures and services would be generously funded, meaning citizens would receive for free what they currently have to pay for.

- Taxes would cease to exist. This also means people and businesses would no longer need to spend money hiring tax advisors.
- Import and export taxes would cease to exist if the entire world moved towards democratic socialism.
- All transportation networks would move into social ownership, meaning all for-profit tolls would cease to exist.
- Prices would decrease due to the end of patents, corporate taxes, excessive compensation packages, dividends for shareholders, interest on business loans, rent on business properties, and other unnecessary expenses.
- Because recessions would never occur, and because all businesses would be worker cooperatives, workers would not be laid off unnecessarily, eliminating the need for businesses to waste money rehiring and retraining workers.
- Prices could potentially be lowered by manufacturing at max capacity in a smaller number of businesses, rather than being duplicated and occurring at lower capacity across a larger number of businesses. This could be advantageous because of economies of scale.
- Externalities would be eliminated under this system, meaning individuals and governments would not need to spend money dealing with their more costly consequences.
- All workers would receive fair compensation.
- Interest on personal loans would cease to exist.
- Consumers would no longer pay rent or interest on mortgages. If there were not enough homes available, hotels and homeowners could be paid to house the homeless until more homes were built. This would be paid for by governments, since homelessness is a societal failing, not a personal one.
- Coerced consumption practices would come to an end.
- Collaboration between volunteers, worker cooperatives, and publically funded researchers, would make all software utility programs open source and completely free. Such software would include operating systems, word processing software, visual effects software, and computer game engines.

- All digital entertainment media that is created using software, such as films, TV shows, and computer games, would be less expensive to produce, since practically all software would be open source and free.
- Everyone on the planet would have enough wealth to purchase digital goods, like films, games, and streaming services, which could further bring down prices.
- Scalping would no longer occur, which is when scarce goods are purchased by profiteers, and often in bulk, and then sold on to other consumers at substantially higher prices.
- All electronic payment processing would either have zero transaction fees, or fees would no longer be for-profit. Most fees are currently around 1.5% to 3%, and this occurs at multiple stages of practically all supply chains.
- Most insurance would likely cease to exist or be significantly reduced. Life insurance wouldn't be required because of a UBI. Property insurance would be reduced since crime would mostly be eradicated, and property that was damaged for reasons outside of anyone's control, such as in the case of natural disasters, would be repaired or replaced at the government's expense.
- Medical debt would cease to exist, since all healthcare would be completely free. Alternatively healthcare could be massively subsidized in instances where a patient's irresponsibility was the cause of their own condition, in order to mitigate the problem of moral hazards.
- Children could attend free classes for recreational pursuits, such as chess, dancing, and martial arts, and could freely make use of recreational facilities at specific times, such as gyms, swimming pools, and sports centers. This would encourage children to be more social, active, and healthy, but would also save parents money.
- Student debt would no longer exist, since all higher education, including universities, colleges, trade schools, and apprenticeships, would be free. Alternatively, subjects related to STEM, healthcare, teaching, and other essential areas, could be made free, while all other subjects could be heavily subsidized to different extents, potentially according to a mathematical algorithm. It is reasonable for higher education to be free or heavily subsidized, because

everyone's quality of life improves when every industry is filled with an abundance of highly skilled specialists.

- There would be less need to save for retirement because of a UBI, and ever increasing discretionary income and purchasing power.
- Nobody would lose their life savings, their home, nor anything else of financial value, from economic downturns, since these would never occur.
- To make travelling quicker and easier, all public transportation would be made free for everyone wherever this was viable. This would also make driving easier due to substantially reduced traffic.
- A UBI would give far more people the freedom to volunteer for odd jobs within their community, which would reduce costs for individuals and organizations who need help with small jobs that do not require specialist skills. This would likely appeal particularly to retirees and unemployed individuals who want to continue engaging in socially valuable labor.
- A UBI would give people the opportunity to pursue their passions, and offer their skills to society for free, or at very low prices. For example, it would likely be very common for musicians, dancers, and actors, to put on free or cheap performances for the public that would otherwise be expensive to see, or not even exist. Another example would be free or cheap workshops and interest groups setup by individuals who want to find others who enjoy, or encourage others to pursue, hobbies they engage in.
- People would save money by no longer needing to give money to charity, since the problems charities address would already be solved, or would be addressed by governments.
- Online dating would not require monthly subscription payments or fees, but would be completely free.
- A higher quality of life would mean people would spend less money trying to cope with situational depression and stress, such as excessive smoking, drinking, and gambling.
- To optimize resource utilization and to save consumers money, organizations and systems would be introduced to encourage a "sharing economy", in which people would temporarily and freely borrow goods, with collateral, instead of purchasing them. For example, instead of a person purchasing power tools and keeping

them in storage for most of the year, these could be temporarily borrowed from businesses or a government organization setup expressly for cultivating and facilitating this type of economy.

- Entrepreneurs would lose far less personal wealth on failed ventures because they could rely more upon socialist government run banks, preexisting worker cooperatives, crowdfunding, and crowdsourcing. Their ventures would also be far more likely to succeed.

These are the main reasons why everyone's discretionary income and purchasing power would be substantially higher under a democratic socialist planned economy. To put into perspective how much this would improve people's quality of life, it is worth exploring how just a UBI, even under capitalism, is capable of improving people's quality of life. Numerous UBI experiments have already been conducted in various parts of the world over the past few decades, and even under capitalism these produced many beneficial outcomes.

- Many recipients were able to pay off or reduce their debt, which helped many escape crippling debt cycles and poverty.
- Recipients most commonly used their money to meet their immediate needs, and save and invest for long-term goals.
- Many recipients reported that reduced financial pressure improved their relationships. Spouses in particular reported having fewer arguments, which shouldn't be surprising considering money problems have been shown to be one of the highest sources of spousal conflict in almost all countries where this has been studied.
- Children from recipient families developed substantially fewer behavioral disorders, and developed higher levels of amicability and conscientiousness.
- Children from recipient families dropped out of school less, attended school more, and attained higher grades.
- Teenagers from recipient families were more likely to pursue higher education.
- Teachers in underdeveloped countries reported improved attention among students from recipient families.

- Overall employment rates stayed the same or increased among recipients. This shouldn't be surprising, since countries with more generous welfare programs generally have high labor participation rates. In UBI studies the only demographics that reduced their work hours were mothers, who chose to focus their time and energy on raising their children, and students, who chose to focus more on their studies.
- The productivity of recipients increased.
- The number of new business startups among recipients increased.
- Economic activity increased without causing inflation in excess of normal or safe levels.
- The salaries of recipients increased. This occurred in many instances because recipients had greater power to negotiate compensation.
- When trialed in India, many recipients were able to escape slavery and exploitative employment.
- Crime rates decreased. This included human trafficking, since victims are often trafficked due to accepting risky job offers far from home or aboard that they have no choice but to accept because of their dire financial circumstances.
- Social capital increased.
- Hospitalization rates decreased, which also corresponds with separate evidence indicating a reduction in sickness and illness rates among recipients.
- Cortisol levels in recipients decreased, implying reduced stress levels.
- Alcohol, tobacco, and recreational drug use and addiction, either remained the same or decreased.
- Quality of life improved for recipients with disabilities or infirmities.

If these are the benefits of a UBI under capitalism, then this gives some indication of how much people's quality of life could improve if everyone's discretionary income and purchasing power were increased to an even greater extent under democratic socialism. Some critics may argue that transitioning to our proposed form of democratic socialism may introduce problems, but all problems could either be prevented or reduced with well-designed solutions, or

would at least be negligible compared to capitalism's problems. For example, one potential concern could be that our proposed UBI system could result in essential resources being unevenly and unfairly distributed if people are able to withdraw some of their future UBI. This would be easy to avoid in a planned economy, particularly by only allowing people to do this for essential and important purchases, such as buying their first home or first car. People would also likely be reluctant to borrow too much from their future UBI because ever decreasing prices would mean their UBI would be worth more in the future.

Another potential concern could be that more and more people may choose not to work as quality of life increases in parallel with ever increasing technological surplus. The truth is that most people will always choose to work in order to afford for themselves a higher quality of life. A UBI alone would never enable people to afford a life filled with expensive luxury goods and services, such as a large home, high-end cars, expensive technologies, and regular holidays. There have rarely been limits to the ways people can improve their quality of life other than financial constraints. Additionally, the need for high employment numbers will always decrease as technologies are able to increasingly automate essential parts of the economy. In a worst-case scenario everyone's UBI could be reduced, and this money could instead be used to pay people to perform essential jobs within the economy. Realistically however this approach would likely never be required because of the aforementioned reason.

Another concern, and one commonly leveled against planned economies, is that capitalist free markets are superior at providing an abundance of variety. Putting aside the fact that variety counts for nothing if consumers can barely afford even basic necessities, it should be obvious that a democratic socialist planned economy would be superior in this regard. First, monopolies are inevitable under capitalism, and these always reduce the variety of goods and services available. Second, limited time offers would be far rarer, since these predominantly only occur under capitalism in order to maximize profits by increasing scarcity. Third, innovation would be

maximized, which would also maximize the variety of goods and services available. Fourth, entrepreneurs and new businesses would be more likely to succeed, which would further increase variety. Fifth, global poverty would be eradicated, which would substantially increase variety. For example, clothes could be designed according to regional and national tastes, could be crafted using local techniques, and could easily and quickly be shipped internationally since every country would have a modern infrastructure. So it is in fact capitalist free markets that are inferior at creating variety, which ironically is one of the things they are most commonly heralded for.

Economic planning under communism

Despite capitalist propaganda and fearmongering, the democratic socialist society proposed here would be near identical to a communist society. The only major difference is that there would be no central planning, only decentralized planning. Communist societies would still have local governments that cooperate with other local governments and organizations, and even though these local governments are usually referred to by communists as councils or assemblies, for most intents and purposes they are effectively the same. Both socialist and communist governments allow for representatives to be removed from their positions at any moment, although under communism representatives act as delegates rather than trustees, meaning they speak on behalf of their constituents rather than make decisions on their behalf. Consequently citizens are far more engaged in governing, such as through attending meetings and voting directly on all major initiatives. Communist societies therefore ensure their governments work for the people through the same methods as democratic socialist societies, except they usually involve more engagement from citizens. Some forms of communism also require that all government representatives also be part-time workers within their communities, rather than full-time government workers. So even though governments and representatives do effectively exist within communist societies, just like under democratic socialism they do not serve a ruling class, and so they do not constitute "the state" in the Marxist sense.

Another difference is that some communists promote the idea of workers engaging in different jobs throughout their workday or workweek, rather than specializing in just one line of work, as is more common under capitalism and democratic socialism. For example, a surgeon could spend the first half of their workday performing surgery, and the second half performing other work around their hospital, or labor completely unrelated to healthcare. The theory is that this would make people's work life less monotonous, and improve their overall quality of life. This is also possible under democratic socialism, particularly because of a UBI and reduced living costs, although it is not advocated for by most democratic socialists. First, under democratic socialism people's work life, and overall quality of life, would be markedly increased for all aforementioned reasons, so this communist idea immediately becomes less necessary. Second, the more people that divide their labor like this, the more inefficient the economy becomes. If all surgeons spent half of their work life performing unrelated work, this would mean either halve the number of surgeries would be performed, or twice as many people would need to become surgeons. If this latter outcome was extrapolated to the entire economy, this would effectively double the amount of time people would need to spend being educated and trained in order for the same amount of specialized labor to be performed in the economy. Considering many jobs take years and even decades to become proficient in, particularly when it comes to the specialized knowledge and skills required to perform specific jobs within specific companies, this approach would obviously constitute a grossly inefficient way of running an economy. Therefore, even though this would be possible under socialism, it is not advocated for by most socialists, and nor by many communists.

One other area of concern that socialists sometimes cite as a potential problem with communist societies is that they can be more vulnerable to sub-optimal planning due to the potential inefficiencies and complexities introduced when multiple local governments and organizations have to coordinate and relay information between one

another for national projects, as opposed to one centralized national government that only communicates with smaller local governments and organizations when necessary. This is one of the main reasons why democratic socialism is preferred by most people who wish to create a post-capitalist society. However, one compromise that has been advocated for by some socialists is the subdividing of countries into smaller countries, or for countries to be divided into smaller autonomous regions, so that national governments don't become too large and bureaucratic, which is a primary concern for communists. Despite this potential problem with communism however, it is nonetheless true that decentralization can enable communist governments to more effectively work around problems that arise when national governments fail to operate effectively, which is obviously a very common problem in capitalist societies.

Economic planning in practice

Centralized and decentralized planning are not untested ideas, but are used all the time around the world. Effectively all successful governments, charities, militaries, and businesses, engage in centralized and decentralized planning. They engage in centralized planning because they include centralized authorities that create and follow comprehensive plans, and particularly plans determining their medium-term and long-term direction and strategies. They engage in decentralized planning because they allow those at lower levels some degree of autonomy in changing these plans and determining how they are enacted, they allow information and other resources to move back and forth between different departments and different levels within their organizational structure, and they often cooperate with other organizations that have their own autonomy. So even though many capitalists argue that economic planning cannot work, it is successfully utilized by both small and large organizations around the world. In fact as proven earlier, even nationwide centralized planning was utilized successfully as far back as the Second World War.

In recent times the desirability and potential of centralized and decentralized economic planning has ironically been proven by capitalist businesses more so than practically anything else. Centralized and decentralized economic planning has been essential for the largest capitalist companies in the world, such as Walmart and Amazon, which have only been able to succeed because of their incredibly well designed economically planned internal infrastructures. Even more to the point, businesses have further revealed their preference for economic planning through their attempts to monopolize industries, including buying out businesses lower down and higher up their supply chain, since this enables them to reduce or entirely bypass free markets, including all the inherent problems and inefficiencies they possess. They have also revealed their preference for economic planning through their attempts to destroy the bargaining power of workers and consumers, since this enables them to effectively centrally plan prices and compensation. That capitalist businesses embrace economic planning and reject free markets wherever possible is some of the strongest evidence there is that economic planning is superior.

Some capitalists have tried to argue that such companies do not use economic planning because they use supply and demand information to determine resource allocation, but this is either ignorance or propaganda. Economic planning always uses supply and demand information, as proven by the fact that this information is even utilized by governments. Roads, railways, hospitals, libraries, sewage systems, etc. are never built evenly or arbitrarily across countries, but instead according to available supplies and the demands of citizens. Economic planning does not mean that supply and demand information is disregarded, only that all workers, departments, or organizations, cooperate to fulfill a comprehensive plan. Even the command economies of the past utilized supply and demand information, but due to their insufficient communication infrastructures, and their complete reliance on centralized planning and consequent disregard of decentralized planning, this often resulted in this supply and demand information, and consequently their plans, being woefully inaccurate and out-of-date.

Possibly the best modern-day example of the potential of economic planning is China. This is not only because they have proven the viability of economic planning even on a massive scale, but also because economic planning is responsible for China having the fastest growing economy in human history, which now places them ahead of the Soviet Union which held this title prior to China's success. During the past 22 years alone China's economy has grown 10 fold, and during the past 15 years China has managed to quadruple its productivity. Even today China still has the fastest growing economy of any developed country. They are currently the world's second largest superpower, and in terms of GDP purchasing power parity they have the largest economy in the world. China also avoided the worst consequences of the 2008 Great Recession through their centrally planned stimulus package. In fact because of this government spending, China's GDP grew at a rate of about 10% during this time, while the GDP of America and Europe both declined. Additionally, China's industrial production effectively doubled between 2007 and 2014, while America's and Europe's industrial production stagnated and declined respectively.

It has been argued that China has experienced this unprecedented growth because it embraced capitalist free markets, although unsurprisingly this is also propaganda. It is true that China moved from a command economy to one in which many businesses and industries are privately owned and run within a capitalist economy, but this is not the reason for China's success. First, China has the most planned economy of any developed country, and consequently provides less economic freedom than practically any other developed country. In fact China's private sector is a smaller part of their economy than their public sector. China has a rating of 57.8 according to The Heritage Foundation's Index of Economic Freedom, which places it behind all other developed countries. China is even ranked 113th in the world according to the Cato Institute's Economic Freedom Index. Despite this, China has still experienced substantially better economic growth, and their citizens have experienced a faster improvement in their quality of life, than all other countries, including

those with far greater economic freedom. China has only managed to achieve this incredible feat through economic planning, which has enabled them to move massive amounts of resources towards essential public infrastructures and services, rather than relying predominantly upon capitalist free markets to dictate resource allocation.

Second, China moved away from economic isolationism and began trading with foreign markets, which is also not exclusive to capitalism. In fact many capitalists promote isolationism, whereas practically all democratic socialists promote global resource sharing and cooperation. Third, it was China's embracing of markets, and its move away from a command economy, that is partially responsible for its prosperity. As already explained, markets are not exclusive to capitalism, and their benefits can be far better achieved with democratic socialist economic planning. Fourth, the capitalist free market part of their economy is also heavily controlled and directed by the Chinese government, meaning even the benefits that can be attributed to this part of the economy are partially attributable to economic planning. Fifth, the increase in the quality of life of Chinese citizens has been slowing down in recent years, and this has been occurring in tandem with the capitalist part of their economy exhibiting more and more of the problems that inevitably arise from capitalism. So it is in fact economic planning that is predominantly responsible for China's incredible economic prosperity, and any credit capitalism can take is attributable entirely to free markets, which are substantially inferior to democratic socialist planned economies.

Despite starting off with extremely low per capita wealth, what China has managed to achieve in the past 40 years provides tangible evidence of the potential of economic planning. China has built over 40,000 kilometers of high-speed railway, and now has the fastest trains in the world. China has built over 120,000 kilometers of new roads, has many of the best airports in the world, has turned over 20,000 acres of desert into arable farm land, and has built over 500 cities, many of which are among the largest and most modernized cities in the world. China is also a leader in the creation of renewable

energy technologies, and its space program rivals NASA's. Every year China graduates millions of highly qualified specialists, including STEM experts.

If the Chinese government is to be believed, China also went from 90 percent of its population living in extreme poverty to eradicating most of this extreme poverty within the span of just 40 years. And even if this figure has been artificially inflated, there is no doubt that over the past 40 years more people have been lifted out of poverty in China, and more rapidly, than in any other country in history. Even during the past 20 years alone, the minimum wage of Chinese workers and the average wage of Chinese manufacturing workers, when adjusted for inflation, have tripled. Conversely, in more capitalistic nations during the past 50-70 years, quality of life, discretionary income, and purchasing power, have decreased for the majority of people in the lower classes, aside from some areas related to STEM progress. This has occurred in developed countries even as technological productivity has skyrocketed during this period.

China has only been able to improve the quality of life of its citizens so rapidly because of economic planning, which is also true for the citizens of all other developed countries. The biggest difference is that China has utilized economic planning to a far greater extent, especially by controlling and directing the capitalist part of their economy, and by investing substantially more into their public infrastructures and services, including building entire high-rise cities. Some may counter this by arguing that China has been assisted by the intellectual properties of developed countries. This is true, but does not invalidate the evidence of the essential role economic planning has played in helping China, nor the evidence in the rest of this section that proves the superiority of economic planning. Instead it proves that cooperation and information sharing is substantially better at maximizing economic prosperity and STEM progress than competition and privatization.

Nothing said here is an endorsement of the Chinese government, the problems of which are well known and well discussed. The only point

here is that China could never have become the fastest growing economy in human history, and so rapidly improved the quality of life of its citizens, by prioritizing a capitalist free market economy. Economic planning has not only enabled China to catch up to other nations, but to very quickly surpass them. However, had China moved towards a democratic socialist planned economy, then the quality of life of its citizens would be even higher. First, there would be even less poverty, particular if a UBI had been introduced. Second, there would be substantially less wealth inequality. Third, Chinese citizens would have democratic control over all political and economic organizations and systems, which would allow for all the benefits previously explored. There would obviously be other benefits, but these are the most significant.

Conclusion

Democratic socialist planned economies are capable of being superior to capitalist free markets in every conceivable way, particularly with regards to money, supply, demand, prices, and compensation. Economic planning could ensure everyone's needs are met at all times, and would maximize everyone's discretionary income and purchasing power. Using mathematical algorithms to determine compensation and prices would be more logical and fair by orders of magnitude. Innovation would also be maximized, and the entire economy could actually be sustainable. Governments would also be substantially more competent and trustworthy, which in and of itself would solve innumerable problems. And best of all, there are already many real-world examples proving the viability of both centralized and decentralized planning. However, even if some very specific proposals regarding the democratic socialist planned economy described in this section need refining or replacing when implemented in the real-world, the system as a whole is nonetheless built on a foundation that is irrefutably logical and moral, meaning this system is still a far better foundation from which to build a real-world economy than any system founded on the prioritization of privatization, free markets, and profits.

“Capitalist businesses are superior to socialist businesses”

Socialist planned economies are overtly superior to capitalist free markets, so it should come as little surprise that socialist businesses are also superior. The socialist business model most commonly advocated for by socialists is the worker cooperative model. Before exploring how worker cooperatives work internally and within socialist societies, it is necessary to provide context. Even though socialist organizations like worker cooperatives are necessary because of their democratic nature, they are substantially less necessary under democratic socialism for a number of reasons. First, every person within society would have their essential needs fulfilled under all circumstances. Worker cooperatives are more resilient to bankruptcy and economic turmoil, and their workers are never fired for unnecessary reasons like under capitalism, but even if this wasn't true it would matter far less, since unemployment would not lead to workers and their families becoming destitute and homeless.

Second, because governments are optimally democratic, they can pass laws and regulations that protect workers and others in society, making the democratic nature of worker cooperatives even less necessary. Third, because compensation would be determined according to an algorithm, workers would require far less democratic power to ensure they were fairly compensated. And this would be further helped by the fact that discretionary income and purchasing power would be maximized under democratic socialism. So in summary, even though worker cooperatives are both necessary and superior, they are substantially less necessary under democratic socialism.

Worker cooperatives under democratic socialism

Despite what some propaganda would have people believe, democratization under democratic socialism would not entail everyone in society having direct control over the means of production. Instead, control would be determined according to democratic mandates. For example, societies have democratically agreed that personal property rights should exist, which is why personally owned resources cannot be accessed by everyone. Similarly, societies have democratically decided that public infrastructures and services can only be accessed by certain individuals at certain times. For example, public roads can be used by everyone, but expensive medical equipment owned by public healthcare institutions can only be accessed by medical experts and research institutions, and generally only for the purpose of helping those with medical needs. It is this type of democratization that would also be used to determine control over the means of production under democratic socialism.

Determining how worker cooperatives operate therefore requires that the desires of all those affected by them are accounted for. There are various ways this can be implemented, although the remainder of this section will only explore the approach advocated for by our movement. Our approach would not give every person equal voting power, since it is reasonable that those more intimately involved with and affected by particular cooperatives also have more control over them. For example, if an entrepreneur creates a successful worker cooperative, particularly if it is created with their own money, then it is only fair that they should have greater influence over its operations. Similarly, the more that a worker is affected by an issue, the more voting power they should have to affect that issue. For example, the creative staff at a film production company could vote on the type of story they want to work on, such as science fiction or fantasy, but the script writer would have the greatest amount of creative control over how that story is written. And just like with wages, voting power could also be determined using a mathematical algorithm. The criteria that would be used to determine the amount

of voting power, and the types of things people could vote on, would take account of the following individuals and organizations.

- Founders

The founder of a worker cooperative would have a disproportionate amount of voting power with regards to its operations. However, the more workers a cooperative hires, the more voting power a founder would lose, even though they would maintain far more voting power than any individual worker. A founder would also maintain ownership of any business assets they purchased with their own money, although these expenses could be repaid to the founder from the democratic surplus generated by the business. If a business was setup entirely to utilize and maximize the unique skillset of the founder, then they would maintain complete control of all related areas regardless of the eventual size of the business. For example, if a painter hired a multitude of staff to assist in their creations, the artist would obviously continue to maintain complete control over their artwork no matter how many assistants they hired.

- Workers

Workers would have voting power with regards to a multitude of areas that affect their work life, such as working conditions and the allocation of necessary tasks. A worker's voting power could also increase in accordance with their time at a cooperative, or their time within a particular profession, or even the same metrics used for determining compensation. Workers would still need to fulfill their job requirements, but they would not have every detail of their work life controlled and scrutinized by unelected managers, who may have no understanding of the practical and nuanced complexities of their job. Giving workers greater control would finally allow a balance that is completely absent in most capitalist businesses. Many successful worker cooperatives and privately owned businesses have even gone so far as to eradicate managers entirely. However, regardless of the particular system chosen, workers in worker cooperatives would not be required to attend all meetings or vote on all issues, meaning individual workers could determine for themselves how involved they are in the overall running of their cooperative. If a worker decided

they wanted as little involvement and influence as someone at the bottom of a conventional privately owned business, they could choose this if they so desired.

- Councils

Within worker cooperatives the board of directors would be replaced by a council, which would be comprised of workers from within the cooperative, consumer representatives, and potentially other representatives, such as industry specialists or public servants. These councils would fulfill effectively the same duties as the board of directors. However, because of democratic oversight, compensation algorithms, and the eradication of shareholders, these council members would not have any incentive to be exploitative like under capitalism. Although councils would make all major decisions by default, these could be overridden by workers, or even those outside the cooperative, under particular circumstances.

- Investors

Socialist government run banks would be the largest financial investors in society, and because governments would be optimally democratic, it could be assured that investments would be made in accordance with a democratic mandate. A certain percentage of the investment funds of these banks could even be allocated towards specific ventures based on the direct votes of citizens. With regards to private investors, such as crowdfunders and family members, these individuals would never receive dividends, but they could receive voting power. This voting power would decrease as their original investment became an increasingly smaller percentage of the total value of the cooperative. Investors could receive rewards if their cooperatives are successful, such as special limited edition products and discounts on future purchases, but these would be significantly lower in financial value compared to the dividends investors receive under capitalism. Consequently, private investors would contribute to initiatives predominantly because of a desire to see them succeed, rather than for financial gain, which is an approach that has already been proven viable by modern crowdfunding campaigns. However, because of socialist government run banks and a never-ending

supply of new Resource Tokens, there would be far more new businesses under this system than under capitalism even without private investors.

- Consumers

In addition to voting with their wallets, consumers would also have some degree of influence over how worker cooperatives operate. This would occur predominantly through consumer representatives, who would not work for these cooperatives, but would instead work on behalf of consumers, such as researching and advocating for consumer preferences. Even though these representatives could be voted into their positions by any members of society, regular customers could have substantially more voting power. Consumers could also have the opportunity to vote directly on particular ideas and initiatives.

- Syndicates

Democratic socialist societies can also benefit from syndicates. A syndicate is a group of individuals or organizations that work together to achieve a common goal that is of shared interest. Syndicates can be particularly invaluable at maximizing efficiency and progress within specific industries. They can achieve this by facilitating communication between all businesses with an industry, and by enabling effective resource sharing and allocation for large-scale endeavors. They can also help achieve standardization within and across industries, which is invaluable for both consumers and businesses by ensuring the compatibility of various technologies, and by making it easier to compare products and services. Syndicates already exist under capitalism, but they are less ubiquitous, less effective, and nearly always prioritize businesses over consumers.

- Governments

As far as worker cooperatives are concerned, governments would effectively serve the same function as syndicates, but would exist at a higher level, and would consequently oversee the entire economy. Governments would therefore do everything possible to ensure all worker cooperatives cooperated with all other parts of the economy,

and that they fulfilled all other democratic socialist ideals, such as being transparent, ethical, efficient, and sustainable. National and local governments could also have representatives on worker cooperative councils that would act as watchdogs to further ensure they acted in accordance with democratic socialist principles. Governments would also have the power to force and pay worker cooperatives to produce essentials needed by society during times of crisis.

Under democratic socialism, founders, workers, councils, investors, consumers, syndicates, and governments, would all have varying degrees of influence over worker cooperatives. The degree of influence of each of these 7 groups would be difficult for societies to agree upon, but even a primitive form of this system would be light-years ahead of the capitalist system, where all decisions are made by a tiny percentage of the population, and for their own benefit first and foremost. Our proposed system would also be superior because it would make worker unions mostly or entirely obsolete. Worker unions, at least on their own, were always a pitiful compromise for achieving the fair distribution of power that should have always existed. This compromise has also placated the masses and quelled their desire to pursue the revolutionary changes that have always been necessary.

Worker cooperatives under capitalism

Even without all the other forms of democratization discussed above, worker cooperatives on their own have proven themselves to be substantially superior to privately owned businesses even under capitalism. There have been numerous examples of successful worker cooperatives in the past, such as the majority of factories in Italy following the First World War, although there are many modern-day examples that continue to demonstrate their viability. Emilia-Romagna is a region in Italy in which 40% of all businesses are worker cooperatives, and which is now one of the most prosperous parts of the country for this reason. Another example that proves

their viability is Germany, in which companies with over 2000 employees must ensure that half of the individuals on their supervisory board, which is above the board of directors, are elected by the workers. This law has been so successful that it is supported by German citizens and politicians on all parts of the political spectrum.

However, perhaps the best example is the Mondragon Corporation, which started in the 1950's, and is currently the largest worker cooperative in the world, or more accurately a conglomerate comprised of multiple worker cooperatives. Mondragon has over 80,000 workers, and is one of the largest and most successful businesses in Spain. And because it is a socialist organization, it has managed to avoid the internally exploitative practices that occur within other capitalist businesses. For example, the CEO's of Mondragon cooperatives earn no more than 20 times that of the lowest paid workers. However, the wage ratio is far lower on average since most workers within Mondragon earn more than the lowest wage. This contrasts with CEO's in privately owned businesses that can earn hundreds of times more than their average employees, let alone their lowest paid employees, many of whom may be living on or below the poverty line. Mondragon is also responsible for making the town of Mondragon the wealthiest town in Spain, despite starting off as the poorest town in Spain.

Studies have shown that not only are worker cooperatives viable, but they outperform capitalist businesses by every meaningful metric under almost all circumstances, and are equal to capitalist businesses under all other circumstances. Worker cooperatives grow faster, they have higher rates of early and long-term survival, they are much more resilient during economic downturns, they provide better salaries for lower-tier and mid-tier workers, they give rise to less compensation inequality, they offer better benefits, they provide better working conditions, they provide workers with greater autonomy, they produce more motivated workers, they reduce feelings of alienation among workers, they give rise to greater levels of trust and cooperation between workers, they are more likely to

provide free ongoing training, they have lower rates of absenteeism, and they have lower rates of workers leaving either voluntarily or involuntarily, which increases efficiency since new employees need to be trained and integrated. In terms of productivity, worker cooperatives have been shown to outperform capitalist businesses in some instances, and be equally productive in all other instances. During times of economic turbulence workers can also choose to reduce their work hours or wages, whereas within capitalist businesses they are often fired with no regard given to their opinions or financial needs.

Employees also report higher levels of satisfaction and happiness, as well as a preference for the less competitive, more cooperative environments that worker cooperatives tend to cultivate. Employees work harder because they receive fair compensation, unlike in capitalist businesses where the lack of adequate compensation gives most workers little incentive to do anything more than the bare minimum. Consumers also generally rate worker cooperatives higher than privately owned businesses because they provide better goods and services. Most worker cooperatives also operate in pursuit of helping their local communities, rather than putting profits first. This is either because most workers belong to these communities, or because most workers are decent people, unlike the CEO's and directors of most capitalist businesses who are far more willing to behave sociopathically if this can benefit themselves and their shareholders. Worker cooperatives are also more likely to be successful the more worker cooperatives there are within an industry. In summary, worker cooperative offer many substantial benefits, while having no drawbacks compared to capitalist businesses.

Conclusion

Everyone has a right to influence the decisions that affect their life, which is why democratic socialists advocate for democratic organizational structures, and particularly worker cooperatives. It is ironic that most proponents of capitalism profess a love for

democracy and a hatred of authoritarianism, yet staunchly support authoritarianism, and even totalitarianism, in the very organizations where they spend most of their energy and waking life. Dispersing control of businesses between founders, workers, councils, investors, consumers, syndicates, and governments, would achieve superior outcomes for everyone in society. Similar to the mathematical algorithms proposed for determining compensation and prices, the manner in which power is distributed among these groups could be far from perfect and yet still produce substantially fairer outcomes. Whatever problems any political and economic organization or system can be said to have, disempowering those affected by these problems, and consolidating power into the hands of small number of individuals who are willing and incentivized to behave sociopathically, has obviously always been an atrocious solution.

“Capitalism is the best system for maximizing freedom”

One of the greatest successes of capitalist propaganda has been to mutate the concept of freedom into a shallow form of its true meaning. Capitalism is regularly touted as the economic embodiment of freedom, even though its consequences will always crush people’s freedom, particularly where it matters most. People cannot have genuine freedom unless they have a home, a UBI, manageable debt, discretionary income, purchasing power, consumer options, free time, surplus energy, personal safety, bodily autonomy, physical health, mental health, peace of mind, legal protections, free speech, political voting power, economic voting power, high-quality schooling, job opportunities, entrepreneurial avenues, economic mobility, banking services, internet access, travelling capabilities, and an early retirement, to name some of the most important freedoms. Capitalism erodes all of these freedoms in a multitude of ways. These

are worth exploring because of how unaware most people are of this problem, and because of the unexpected ways these erosions can occur.

General limitations

One of the most significant ways capitalism reduces personal freedom is the underfunding of public infrastructures and services, particularly as a consequence of tax avoidance and evasion, and the theft of the world's resources and technological surplus. For example, underfunded public transportation services can limit people's ability to travel or increase travelling time. Underfunded healthcare services can cause people to be unnecessarily restricted by debilitating health conditions. Underfunded education institutions can result in students having fewer job opportunities and entrepreneurial avenues available to them once they leave school. This reduction in freedom holds true for practically every public infrastructure and service that goes underfunded because of capitalism.

Another obvious way freedom is reduced is through the lack of democracy within the workplace. Workers often have no choice but to follow orders like cogs in a machine, even if this counterproductively limits their creative freedom and their ability to improve the goods and services they produce and provide. Workers often have no freedom over whether or not they are exploited because of power imbalances within society and the economy. Workers often lack the freedom to complain, protest, or strike, for fear of losing promotions, wages, their job, and even a career within their industry. Workers often don't have the freedom to enjoy life, including spending time with their friends and family, because of the necessity to work long and stressful hours. Some businesses will even encroach upon their worker's freedom outside of work. For example, many workers also have to remain on standby during their days off, or be available to take calls or respond to emails at any moment. Many companies force their employees to undergo drug tests, even for legal recreational drugs, and even when these drugs have no effect on their performance. It is also common to hear of businesses using

social media to spy on the private lives of their workers, in order to protect their reputations.

Ironically one of the greatest ways capitalism limits freedom is by reducing the goods and services consumers can purchase, even though capitalism is heralded most often for providing consumers with choice. In the broadest sense consumers mostly lack freedom due to the monopolization of industries and having low discretionary income and purchasing power, including during retirement, but there are also numerous ways businesses and industries restrict freedom beyond this. Companies often sell products without features in order to encourage or force consumers to purchase additional products, such as selling smartphones without a headphone port. Companies often sell inferior products, and don't provide alternatives, in order to cut costs, such as drink companies using corn starch instead of sugar, which is cheaper but generally produces a more unpleasant texture and aftertaste. Companies often use planned obsolescence to reduce the quality and lifespan of their products, which can cause customers to lose further freedom by having to spend money on warranties, out-of-warranty repairs, and replacements. Companies often have no choice but to sell products or provide services that lack invaluable features because of patents, although no example should need to be given because the list is both endless and well-known. Companies often refuse to cooperate with each other to improve their services, such as those that build and operate mobile and Wi-Fi networks, which substantially reduces the coverage and quality of reception for mobile phone users. Companies often force consumers to purchase multiple yet effectively identical products and services, such as game consoles, in order to access everything that exists on the market. Companies often reject standardization, which can prevent consumers from combining technologies that they would otherwise be able to. And this doesn't even account for the frustration, exhaustion, and wasted time, that can be experienced when troubleshooting and diagnosing incompatibility issues. All of these problems would be eliminated under democratic socialism.

This lack of consumer freedom also carries over to the systems through which consumers purchase goods and services. Consumers have no choice but to use a wide array of websites for online shopping, which not only makes shopping substantially more time consuming, but can also make it difficult or effectively impossible for consumers to find the goods and services they need, particularly by reducing the number of goods and services they are aware of. This is why people gravitate towards Amazon, which is grossly inferior to what could be achieved in a cooperative planned economy. Making comparisons between all products is also much more challenging under capitalism because of this fragmentation. Many products provide limited specifications, or different information on different websites, and many descriptions are bloated with superficial and unhelpful advertising jargon and naming conventions. It can even be near impossible to understand differences between products of the same type created by a single manufacturer due to the use of such superficial and gimmicky marketing jargon.

Incidentally, this fragmentation problem doesn't just affect consumer goods and services. Multiple yet effectively identical employment websites exist, even though one website would be substantially more helpful for both businesses and job hunters. Similarly, multiple yet effectively identical online dating services exist, which unavoidably divides populations for no other reason than profits, and which is made worse by the fact that many of these services either cost money, or hide essential features behind pay walls. This is despite the fact that romantic relationships constitute one of the most important parts of most people's lives. Capitalism also requires consumers to have potentially dozens of accounts and membership cards for different digital and physical stores to be able to access all available goods and services. This also applies to websites where people sell or give away second hand goods. Under a planned economy all of these fragmentation problems could be avoided.

Under capitalism people also have restricted freedom in terms of expressing their individuality. As previously explained in our discussion of quality of life under socialist planned economies, the

variety of goods and services available under capitalism is far less than what would be possible under democratic socialism. This problem is further exacerbated by the fact people have reduced discretionary income and purchasing power under capitalism. In underdeveloped countries many consumers may have neither the money nor options to express their individuality, such as through basic things like clothes, jewelry, and tattoos. It is ironic that so many capitalists criticize socialism and communism for robbing people of their individuality, supposedly as a consequence of embracing collectivism, even though capitalism was always guaranteed to limit people's individuality far more because of its predictable consequences.

Workers in particular suffer a loss of individuality in additional ways. For example, workers are rarely allowed to wear truly comfortable clothes, and are instead forced to conform to mostly arbitrary dress codes that fit with their company's more professional brand image. Workers may also have no choice but to modify or hide their piercings, tattoos, hairstyles, hair coloring, facial hair, etc., effectively forcing them to erase a core part of their identity and self-expression for most of their waking hours. Such forms of self-expression can be very personal and meaningful, including possessing cultural significance. Many physical traits are also not reversible once a person leaves work, meaning this encroachment on self-expression can needlessly persist for years or decades.

This loss of bodily autonomy can also extend far beyond a loss of a person's individuality. Many workers have effectively no choice but to work in unreasonable or unsafe conditions, or to work to the point of ill-health, which can even result in long-term debilitating health problems. Perhaps the most severe and disgusting loss of bodily autonomy however is when people reluctantly enter the sex industry due to poverty, which is one of the greatest infringements on one's bodily autonomy that exists. However, a lack of bodily autonomy obviously isn't a problem that only applies to workers. A person can also lose bodily autonomy if their body changes undesirably for reasons related to poverty and exploitation, such as becoming

overweight due to only being able to afford cheap food, or being too sleep deprived and exhausted to exercise.

Another problem under capitalism is that even when people do have freedom it nearly always comes at the expense of the freedom of others. Consumers in developed countries have the freedom to buy various products and services, but this comes at the expense of the freedom of workers, particularly in underdeveloped countries. Entrepreneurs and investors have the freedom to be successful, but this comes at the expense of the freedom of consumers, workers, and animals. Inventors have the freedom to patent and profit from their innovations, but this comes at the expense of the freedom of those who are unable to utilize them. The current beneficiaries of capitalism have the freedom to exploit the world's resources and ignore externalities, but this comes at the expense of future generations who will have fewer resources and will have to deal with existential threats. Freedom doesn't count for anything if it inevitably erodes the freedom of others, and especially if it contributes to unnecessary deaths.

The United States

To provide a deeper understanding of how the prioritization of privatization, free markets, and profits, can reduce personal freedom, it is worth analyzing the one country that most embraces capitalism, and most propagates this freedom fallacy. Americans commonly claim their country to be the freest in the world, and that this is largely attributable to capitalism. However, all that this demonstrates is how pervasive and effective capitalist propaganda has been in America. In terms of personal freedom, America is ranked 28th in the world by the extremely neoliberal Cato Institute. According to the State of the World Liberty Index, America is ranked 41st in the world in terms of social freedom. According to the Freedom in the World Index, America is ranked 61st in the world. According to the Global Social Mobility Index, America is ranked 27th in the world. According to the OECD, American's on average are able to dedicate less time to "leisure and personal care" than 29 other countries, and a higher

percentage of American workers work overtime than 28 other countries. It should consequently come as little surprise that American's on average work more hours per year than the citizens of almost every other developed country, and work more hours per year than American's did in the 1950's and 1960's.

America is one of the only developed countries that does not have a system in place to regularly update its federal minimum wage to help it keep up with inflation, even though they had such a system before it was eradicated by neoliberal president Ronald Reagan. This partly explains why America's minimum wage hasn't increased since 2009 despite high inflation. This also explains why America has the greatest disparity between their national minimum wage and their national median wage compared to every other developed country, and why they have the lowest minimum wage of any developed country in terms of cost of living. Even if America doubled their minimum wage, most families with one full-time minimum wage worker would still be living in poverty. This also partially explains why both parents work full-time in approximately 50% of two-parent households, compared with approximately 30% of households back in the early 1970's. This also partly explains why America has the worst rate of childhood poverty among comparable developed countries, with 1 out of every 3 American children being poor or living below the poverty line.

American workers also suffer from some of the most extreme forms of wage theft among comparable countries, with wage theft constituting more than double the wealth stolen via all other forms of theft, such as burglaries and vehicle theft. America is also the only developed country, and one of the only countries in the entire world, without mandatory paid parental leave, while practically every other developed country offers a minimum of 2 months paid parental leave, and some even offer an entire year of paid parental leave. Many of these countries also specifically provide paid paternity leave, which American companies are notoriously bad at providing. America is also the only developed country that does not force businesses to provide paid vacation days. Consequently American workers receive

on average only two weeks paid vacation every year, with a quarter of Americans receiving no paid vacation. America is also the only developed country that does not force businesses to provide paid sick days. In fact even Americans that do receive paid sick days often don't take them out of fear of being fired, which is a problem not experienced in many other developed countries. Overall, American companies provide some of the least generous employee benefits of any developed country in the world.

There are many other employment related problems in America that are caused by capitalism and which restrict freedom. Many Americans receive their health insurance through their employers, which can prevent many Americans from leaving their job or negotiating for better pay or working conditions. America has the least generous welfare system of practically any country in the developed world. America is also one of the only developed countries in the world not to provide postal banking nationwide. The United States government also doesn't provide an automated or free tax return service, which is one of the main reasons why America's tax system is regarded as one of the worst in the developed world. In many developed countries taxes are filed freely and automatically by the government, who only require that individuals and businesses spend literally no more than a few minutes verifying that their tax files are correct. In America individuals and businesses have to spend hours or days filing their taxes manually, and in many cases have little choice but to hire financial experts or purchase tax software. This is primarily because these experts and tax software companies continue to successfully lobby American politicians to prioritize their profits above all else.

America is also well-known for the predatory lending of its for-profit financial institutions, which is exacerbated by their notoriously unfair and highly discriminatory credit system. This system disadvantages the poorest Americans, and inflicts poor credit scores on people for reasons completely outside of their control. Low credit scores not only make it difficult for people to acquire loans, giving many no choice but to take on more exploitative loans from within the gray

and black market, but this can also unfairly reduce their chances of being hired by many businesses. This system has disproportionately harmed black Americans, who on average have not benefitted from the same intergenerational wealth, investments, opportunities, etc. as their white peers. This can obviously largely be blamed on systemic racism, such as the ongoing repercussions of the racist beliefs, policies, systems, etc. of the past, including segregation, underfunded infrastructures, voting discrimination, banking discrimination, housing discrimination, medical discrimination, education discrimination, employment discrimination, policing discrimination, and justice system discrimination. Regardless of the origins of such problems, capitalism's predatory financial system has nonetheless worsened them.

Americans also have less freedom than most other developed countries because of their poor-quality education system. One fifth of American adults are illiterate, and over half of all American adults lack the literacy skills necessary to adequately cope with common work and life demands, which obviously reduces people's freedom in numerous ways. Combined with the other consequences of America's poor-quality education system, this obviously means Americans have reduced freedom in terms of career prospects. It also partly explains why America has the second worst economic mobility of any developed country. America's education system is one of the worst in the developed world partially because America is the only developed country that funds their public schools primarily through local property taxes, which has inevitably and unsurprisingly resulted in schools in poorer areas being grossly underfunded. In fact American public schools are so underfunded that nearly 95% of America's public school teachers use their own money to pay for supplies. All of this can predominantly be blamed on the economic illiteracy of America's capitalist politicians.

In addition to these problems, almost 45 million American's have student debt, and for many this debt is worth tens of thousands of dollars. Worse still, approximately 40% of these debt holders dropped out before getting their degree, and the overwhelming

majority of students did so for reasons outside of their control. Studies have shown that the primary reasons why American students drop out are high tuition fees, high living costs, the subsequent need to take on a job, and the failure of lower education to adequately prepare them for the challenges of higher education. Because of this dire situation, America has the highest college and university dropout rate among comparable nations, and American students have more debt on a per student basis than any other developed country. Part of the reason so many Americans have so much student debt is because the cost of higher education in America has risen 5 times more than inflation since 1980. During the past 10 years alone student debt in America has doubled to just over \$1.7 trillion. All of these problems would have been solved if only America had adopted the same socialist approach to education as many other developed countries.

Combined with other capitalist problems, such as monopolization, America's debt problem likely goes some way to explaining why business ownership among young American adults has dropped by more than half over the past 50 years. This contradicts the narrative that America is a great country for entrepreneurs. America's debt problem also goes some way to explaining the dire financial circumstances of most Americans. Even prior to the 2020 pandemic and recession, 40% of American full-time workers permanently or regularly lived paycheck-to-paycheck, almost 80% of Americans permanently or regularly lived paycheck-to-paycheck, 40% of Americans could not afford a \$400 emergency without going into debt or their long-term savings, and over 60% of Americans could not afford a \$1000 emergency without going into debt or their long-term savings. Since this time the financial situation of most Americans has worsened or barely improved.

Although no official studies have been performed, based on available data, a rough estimate can be made that America is ranked 25th in the world in terms of its per capita homelessness problem. At the very least, it can be stated with confidence that America has the worst homelessness problem in the developed world in terms of its

per capita wealth. Over 3.5 million Americans live without permanent housing, including 1.3 million children, and over 550,000 of these Americans are currently homeless. This is despite the fact that America has over 16 million vacant homes, which is over 10% of all housing units in America. This places America 4th in the developed world for the highest percentage of vacant homes. Many of these homes are in high demand areas, and most of the ones that are in low demand areas should never have become low demand in the first place, since if everyone had a UBI and everywhere had well-funded public infrastructures and services, most of them would now be prosperous and highly desirable locations. America also has more than enough wealth to build more homes in high demand areas, making this situation even more inexcusable. Unsurprisingly the number of homes being built for first time home owners in America has been decreasing since the beginning of the 1980's. And none of this addresses properties that are inappropriately prioritized above the homeless, such as hotel rooms, apartments, and houses, which are owned by the rich and rented out to tourists. Nor does any of this address America's notorious use of hostile architecture, in which areas that homeless people have traditionally slept for shelter and warmth, such as shop windowsills and entrances, are purposefully redesigned to be inhospitable to homeless people.

And if all of this wasn't bad enough, Americans who aren't homeless also suffer immensely because of property privatization. Currently low-income Americans spend approximately half of their income on rent. Almost half of American workers don't earn enough to afford a one-bedroom rental, and this increases to over 90% for minimum wage workers. There is also not a single county in America where a minimum wage worker can afford an average 2 bedroom rental, which has placed millions of American families in dire circumstances. This helps explain why over half of young adults in America live with their parents, and why America's home ownership rate is about 65%, which places them 49th in the world in terms of home ownership. To put this into context, Vietnam, Cuba, and China, are ranked near the top, and all have home ownership rates of about 90%. America's situation is absolutely absurd considering rent shouldn't even exist,

and everyone should already own a home since the world's resources and technological surplus belong to everyone.

America also has reduced freedom in terms of crime. According to the Global Organized Crime Index, America is currently ranked the 135th worst country in the world, and is one of the only developed countries in the world categorized as suffering from "high criminality". Obviously non-violent crimes, such as burglaries and property damage, erode freedom by decreasing the time, energy, money, etc. of the victims. However, violent crimes in particular can reduce freedom to an extreme extent, particularly when they result in grievous bodily harm or death. All of these crimes also erode the peace of mind of victims and potential victims. This is a chronic problem for Americans living in areas with high crime rates, as well as all Americans who are fully aware of the rise in mass shootings. In recent history even the sound of fireworks and cars backfiring have been mistaken by Americans for mass shootings, causing mass panic for hundreds or thousands of people in the process. If people live in ongoing fear of violent crime, it would be disingenuous to argue that they are experiencing genuine freedom. These high crime rates can obviously be blamed on reasons attributable to capitalism, such as underfunded mental healthcare services, and the desperation, stress, hopelessness, etc. people suffer from because of poverty.

Capitalism has also reduced the freedom of Americans with regards to their legal system and prison system. America has by far the highest incarceration rate of any developed country in the world, holding 20% of the world's prisoners while only having just over 4% of the world's population. This is obviously partially due to crimes caused by poverty, but is also a consequence of America's for-profit prison industrial complex. Not only do privately owned prisons financially benefit from incarcerating as many people as possible, but this industry also provides extremely inexpensive prison labor to corporations. To make matters worse, America also incarcerates a higher percentage of non-violent drug offenders than any other developed country, which is one of the most unjustifiable infringements on personal freedom that exists in the developed

world. This can additionally be blamed on the high levels of addiction encouraged by the profit-driven pharmaceutical industry and the unnecessary stress and health problems people suffer from because of capitalism. In fact drug addiction in and of itself should also be recognized as something which reduces personal freedom. Many Americans are also imprisoned for stealing basic necessities for themselves and their loved ones. During the COVID-19 pandemic, some of the most shoplifted items in America were essential baby products, such as baby formula, baby wipes, baby diapers, and baby shampoo.

And if all of this wasn't bad enough, many of those in American prisons, including these innocent victims, suffer from the worst forms of maltreatment, including sexual abuse, physical violence, and even murder. This can be at the hands of both prisoners and guards. This occurs largely because American prisons are underfunded and overpopulated, and because of the stress many prison guards experience because of financial insecurity, all of which can predominantly be blamed on capitalism. To make matters even worse, American prisons are also disproportionately filled with people with mental health disorders and disabilities. And even when Americans leave prison, many of them reoffend and reenter the prison system because of problems caused by capitalism, such as high poverty rates, the refusal of private prisons to spend money rehabilitating prisoners, and the refusal of many capitalist businesses to hire ex-prisoners. Currently two thirds of all Americans released from prison reoffend, and most do so within 5 years of being released.

Americans also have less freedom than most other developed countries because of their high mortality rate. Even though life expectancy has been declining in other developed countries in recent years, the decline in America has been 8 times worse on average by comparison. Additionally, there is no difference in the life expectancy between the rich and the poor in the Nordic countries, while in America the rich outlive the poor by a larger margin than in any other developed country. The number of unnecessary deaths in

America is also far from insignificant. Even when police shootings are not included, between 15,000 to 20,000 Americans are intentionally murdered every single year. In fact America has a higher per capita intentional homicide rate than approximately 60% of countries in the world, placing it behind all other developed countries. America is also home to 30% of the world's mass shootings, even though again they only have just over 4% of the world's population. More tragically still, one quarter of mass shooting victims in America are children. On a per capita basis, America's police kill over 3 times as many citizens as Canada's police, which has the second highest civilian casualty rate among wealthy developed countries, and America's police kill over 160 times as many citizens as Japan's police, which has the eighth highest civilian casualty rate among wealthy developed countries. This is at least partially due to crime caused by poverty, but also police militarization, which has occurred largely because of the capitalist military industrial complex. In fact, if American police forces were considered a military, they would be the world's third highest funded military, with China's military being the second highest funded, and America's military being the highest funded. And then of course there are the Americans that die prematurely because of inadequacies within their healthcare system, which currently amounts to over 68,000 adults and children every single year. Some of these healthcare deaths also occur because Americans are not free to be treated by certain physicians and hospitals because their private healthcare system is divided into separate "networks". Every year 200,000 Americans also die prematurely because of air pollution. All of the causes of death cited here can predominantly be blamed on capitalism.

However, one of the most unique causes of unnecessary deaths in America is obesity, which in many cases is caused or exacerbated by poverty. More than 4 out of every 10 American adults is obese, and an additional 3 out of every 10 is overweight. More than 2 out of every 10 American children between 6 and 18 is obese, and an additional 2 out of every 10 is overweight. Diabetes afflicts 1 out of every 10 Americans, and causes 100,000 deaths every single year. America also has a high mortality rate due to malnutrition, which is a

problem that also afflicts overweight individuals. In fact Americans on average are 4 times more likely to die from malnutrition than the global average. Despite living in one of the wealthiest countries in the world, approximately 60 million Americans, including over 12 million children, are food insecure, meaning they are unable to consistently access and purchase enough nutritious food to live a healthy active life. All of this is partly because of the large number of Americans who live in food deserts, as well as the many other Americans who are too poor to consistently purchase nutritious food. However, this is also because American food companies throw out billions of dollars' worth of edible food every year because ironically it is more profitable for them to do so. Aside from experiencing chronic anxiety about running out of food, many Americans report that they are so food insecure that they regularly experience prolonged periods of hunger, and many report days where they have to forego food entirely. Even before the COVID-19 pandemic, approximately 46 million Americans were so poor they had to rely upon food banks. It should consequently not be surprising that America is ranked 35th in the world according to Bloomberg's Global Health Index, which incidentally rates the highest rated countries as Spain, Italy, Iceland, Japan, Switzerland, Sweden, Australia, Singapore, Norway, Israel, Luxembourg , France, Austria, Finland, and the Netherlands.

Many Americans also unnecessarily die every year because of "deaths of despair", which are deaths caused by suicide, drug overdose, or alcohol-related liver disease. Deaths from suicide are currently at an all-time high in America. In 2021 alone, over 48,000 Americans committed suicide, and over 12 million Americans seriously contemplated suicide. Suicides are also disproportionately high among young adults, and depending on age bracket is the second to fourth leading cause of death for American's between the ages of 10 and 34. This shouldn't be surprising considering research shows that half of all young American adults experience depression or hopelessness on a regular basis. In fact, according to the World Health Organization, America is tied in second place for having the highest rate of depression in the world. These suicide statistics would be far lower with high-quality mental healthcare services and the

substantially higher quality of life that could be afforded to everyone under democratic socialism. Among American suicide victims are also the 30,000 American soldiers who have fought in wars during the past 20 years, which is over 4 times the number of soldiers that died fighting in these wars. Most of these wars were caused or exacerbated by imperialism and the military industrial complex, both of which can be blamed on capitalism.

Deaths from drug overdoses are also at an all-time high in America. These deaths can also be blamed on many of the same problems that contribute to America's high suicide rate, although there are other additional problems. First, many Americans are overprescribed drugs or develop addictions because of their predatory pharmaceutical industry. Second, due to neoliberal policies, America's Food and Drug Administration has become increasingly funded by the very companies they were created to oversee, which has unsurprisingly compromised their regulatory standards and practices. Third, many medical institutions refuse or delay treatment for those in desperate need of drug related medical care unless proof is first provided that they are covered by health insurance for such treatment. Fourth, many Americans require strong painkillers due to exploitative working conditions. Because of all of these problems, on a per capita basis America has the highest drug overdose rate in the world, it has the highest rate of prescription painkiller addiction in the world, and it has the 10th highest rate of illicit drug addiction in the world. In 2021 alone, almost 100,000 Americans died from drug overdoses.

Americans also suffer unreasonably high mortality rates because of their widespread scientific illiteracy and reading illiteracy. Both of these correlate with poor information literacy skills, which means Americans have a higher likelihood of falling for misinformation and conspiracy theories than the citizens of most other developed countries. For example, on a per capita basis America has one of the largest number of anti-vaxxers in the developed world, and these individuals have led to the premature deaths of many Americans, including children. Similarly, the refusal of so many Americans to take basic safety precautions during the COVID-19 pandemic

contributed to America having one of the highest per capita death rates in the world. And this situation didn't just cause the needless suffering and death of Americans who refused to take basic safety precautions. Many Americans died before they could be vaccinated, or died because they couldn't take the vaccine due to autoimmune disorders, and all because other Americans refused to take basic safety precautions. Many of these people died because of preexisting conditions, which they either had no control over or didn't have time to remediate, but this is obviously irrelevant if their deaths could have been easily avoided. And many of these unnecessary deaths also included children. In fact in 2022 COVID-19 was still one of the leading causes of death for American children, including very young children.

During the COVID-19 pandemic many other Americans also died because hospitals were locked down because of the unnecessary spread of the virus. Many Americans also died because open hospitals had to allocate their limited resources to those unnecessarily suffering and dying from COVID-19. Additionally, even Americans who weren't affected by COVID-19 had to endure prolonged lockdowns, which substantially reduced their freedom, and yet ironically this only occurred because so many American's refused to take basic safety precautions because of their counterproductive ideas about "freedom". If scientific illiteracy and reading illiteracy weren't so pervasive in America, these unnecessary deaths and prolonged lockdowns could have been avoided, ensuring Americans had far greater freedom.

America also has some of the worst infrastructure in the developed world, which also reduces people's freedom in numerous ways. Every 4 years the American Society of Civil Engineers releases a comprehensive study on America's infrastructure, and their past 2 evaluations graded America's infrastructure a D+, with a D grade being their lowest grade above a "fail" grade. This has limited the freedom of Americans in many ways, and particularly in instances where Americans have been harmed or killed. Such examples include the water crisis in Michigan and the 2021 Texas blizzard, both of

which led to the severe suffering and death of many adults and children, and for no other reason than infrastructure problems that have been avoided in other developed countries. America also has a notorious lead piping problem, which has been causing lead poisoning in adults and children for over a century. Currently over 40 million Americans live in homes that don't have access to safe drinking water, and many of these Americans are too poor to afford bottled water. According to the Social Progress Index, America is ranked 24th in the world in terms of water and sanitation. America also provides little freedom to travel by public transportation, bikes, and walking, due to underfunded infrastructures, as well as lobbying from the car industry. Despite its wealth and geographical size, America doesn't even have any high-speed railways, which are typically considered those that allow for train speeds of 155 mph or faster. America is also ranked 22nd in the world in terms of internet speeds, is ranked 28th in the world in terms of internet access, and is ranked 119th in the world in terms of internet affordability. According to the Global Competitiveness Index, America is also ranked 31st in the world in terms of its plans to upgrade its energy infrastructures and information and communication infrastructures.

America is ranked 58th in the world according to the Freedom of the Press Index, which is produced by Freedom House, and is ranked 45th in the world according to the World Press Freedom Index, which is produced by Reporters Without Borders. This is partly attributable to the United States government, as evidenced by their appalling mistreatment of whistleblowers like Edward Snowden, Chelsea Manning, and Julian Assange. However, this is also attributable to the corrupting effect privatization, the profit motive, and the ruling class, have had on news media organizations. America's ranking in these two indices also aligns with a 2021 study revealing that Americans trust their national news media less than any other developed country. This problem obviously reduces freedom, because people cannot have the freedom to make informed decisions if they are being intentionally uninformed or misinformed. A devastating consequence of this problem, which has been exacerbated by America's terrible public education system, is that the United States

government is filled with incompetent and corrupt politicians who further reduce the freedom of Americans. This is one of the reasons why America is now ranked 19th in the world according to the Corruption Perceptions Index, which uses objective methods for determining corruption despite what the name of this index implies. Another reason which can be blamed on capitalism is the corrupting effect that lobbyists and campaign contributions, paid for by the ruling class, have had on their political system.

This corruption and incompetence has also contributed to America's lack of democracy, which means Americans lack one of the most important freedoms that exists. America is currently ranked 36th in the world according to the Democracy Matrix, and is ranked 29th in the world according to the Democracy Index, which also categorizes America as a "flawed democracy". American politicians have eroded democracy for the benefit of themselves and other members of the capitalist ruling class, and have done this in a multitude of ways, such as by deregistering voters without informing them, making early voting difficult or impossible, making mail-in voting difficult or impossible, enforcing unnecessarily strict voter identification requirements, forcing impoverished voters to spend money on voter identification that could be provided for free, forcing impoverished voters to take time off work in order to vote, and closing voting stations so voters have to spend up to 10 hours queuing outside in order to vote. Most of these problems can also be a particular problem for those with disabilities. American politicians are also notorious for gerrymandering, which involves manipulating electoral district boundaries in order to give an unfair advantage to a specific party, or a demographic, such as one based on class, ethnicity, race, religion, or political alignment. Gerrymandering is a form of electoral engineering, and is one of the most severe antidemocratic measures currently being utilized in developed countries because of how extreme and effective it has proven to be.

And none of this even addresses people who are prevented from voting entirely. Currently over 40 million immigrants are prevented from voting in American elections, which is approximately 12% of

America's entire population. This is despite the fact that they contribute to the economy by paying taxes, and by providing invaluable and often grueling labor that most other Americans are unwilling to perform. In fact research has already proven that immigration taken as a whole is effectively always a long-term net benefit to an economy, and the only reason it is ever economically harmful for particular demographics is because of problems caused or exacerbated by capitalism. Immigrants are also less likely to commit crimes, all else being equal, because of the threat of deportation. Worse still, immigrants are generally more vulnerable to labor exploitation, and more vulnerable to poor decisions made by their federal, state, and local governments. America also prevents over 6 million ex-felons from voting, either because of their criminal record, or because they are too poor to pay off their legal fees and fines. This even includes countless Americans incarcerated because of the obviously immoral war on drugs, which is made even worse by the fact that many Americans only begin taking illicit drugs in the first place because of stress and health problems caused or exacerbated by capitalism.

However, one of the most severe forms of voter suppression in America is their election system, the Electoral College, which is globally recognized as one of the most broken election systems in the developed world. The American ruling class, which includes most politicians and their capitalist donors, has every reason to maintain this broken system because it gives them a significant unfair advantage. In other words, the perpetuation of the Electoral College can predominantly be blamed on capitalism. This may first appear like a relatively minor problem, but the catastrophic consequences of the Electoral College cannot be overstated. If not for this broken voting system, Al Gore would have defeated George W. Bush in 2000, meaning that not only would America be less neoliberal than it is now, but urgent action against climate change would have begun 2 decades ago. Because of this delayed action, the global death toll from climate change will now likely be tens of millions higher, and all because of the Electoral College.

Defenders of the Electoral College argue that it is designed to protect people in less populated states from the decisions of the more populated states, but this is a ridiculous argument. First, people should never have to vote to have their basic rights protected, or to have a good quality of life, and any system that requires this is obviously broken by default. People's rights should be assured and their quality of life should be high regardless of how anyone votes. Second, the Electoral College is fundamentally undemocratic. Under this system a presidential candidate in a two person race can win with less than 22% of the popular vote. This is because all but two American states use an indefensible winner-takes-all system, in which 100% of all electoral votes within a state are given to the winner of that state. This means tens of millions of voters in definitively blue and red states have no reason to vote, because they know from the very beginning that their votes will count for nothing. This is so unimaginably broken it is difficult to put into words. This is made worse by the fact that voting power is different in each state, creating the current situation where the vote of someone in Wyoming is worth 3.6 times more than the vote of someone in California. All of this effectively means that the votes of tens of millions of people count for nothing, even though their lives can be irrevocably changed and harmed by the president. Third, the Electoral College achieves the opposite of its intended purpose, since candidates are incentivized to give most of their attention to just 8 swing states. In fact, during the 2016 election, over two-thirds of election campaign events were spent in just 6 states, and of the 10 most rural states, in which 40% of Americans reside, only 2 of them were visited at all by the 2016 nominees.

The Electoral College is consequently one of the most broken voting systems used by any developed country in recent human history. Despite this, the far greater problem is that even if America adopted an ideal voting system, voting counts for nothing if candidates are not required to undergo fitness-for-duty tests, and if citizens are too uncritically minded and uneducated because of capitalism. All of these problems effectively mean that Americans do not have the freedom to vote politicians into power that will work in their best

interests, which is one of the most important freedoms any person can have. This guarantees that capitalist politicians will always end up in power, which ensures Americans will continue to have their freedom eroded.

This section however hasn't even included all the other ways capitalism erodes people's freedom that have been described in this manifesto, and the poor quality of life this always correlates with. All of this is the opposite of what would be expected from the most pro-capitalist anti-socialist country in the world if capitalism was the best system for maximizing people's freedom. And this is made all the more ridiculous by how incredibly wealthy America is, which is made even more ridiculous because of how much of this wealth has come at the expense of the freedom of other people around the world, particularly as a consequence of imperialism and existential threats. That so many American's consider their country to be the freest in the world, despite overwhelming evidence to the contrary, is evidence of the effectiveness of capitalist propaganda more than anything else. Likely the most definitive example of this propaganda is the idea of "The American Dream", which implies freedom but is now merely propaganda designed to project the illusion of freedom onto an economic system that erodes people's freedom. The freedom to prosper that the term "The American Dream" implies has been far better achieved in other developed countries that have implemented socialist ideas. As George Carlin said, "It's called the American Dream because you have to be asleep to believe it."

The indoctrination of American citizens has become so severe that many Americans even decry dependence on the government as a form of oppression, or an unacceptable risk because of the potential for oppression, even though public infrastructures and services obviously achieve the opposite by maximizing people's freedom. The reason for this concern is that such programs give the government leverage over citizens, but this is an irrational argument. When governments effectively provide and maintain public infrastructures and services, the normalization of their existence over time ensures politicians won't threaten to underfund them, since this will always

be tantamount to political suicide, at least in more economically literate societies. This is why most people in other developed countries view their public infrastructures and services extremely favorably. This situation is made even more bizarre considering most Americans don't view many of their public infrastructures and services as forms of oppression or potential oppression, such as their roads and fire departments.

So instead of free universal healthcare, a UBI, and free or inexpensive guaranteed housing, all being recognized as sources of freedom in America, they are disregarded as forms of oppression or potential oppression. The irrationality and fearmongering of this capitalist propaganda is absurd. It is genuinely reasonable to postulate that if all roads were privately owned by the rich, and socialists proposed nationalizing them in order to end exploitative tolls and to maximize everyone's freedom, many capitalists would hysterically decry this as a Marxist globalist plot to create a fascist communist dystopia in which totalitarian government's control and restrict where everyone can travel. Similarly, if all fire departments were owned by the rich, and socialists proposed nationalizing them to ensure the poor also had their homes protected, many capitalists would hysterically decry this as a tyrannical infringement on personal property rights, and a slippery slope towards a world in which authoritarian governments own all property, and in which corrupt politicians allow the homes of their political opponents to burn to the ground.

This irrationality and fearmongering regarding governments is overtly ridiculous, because the institution of the government has obviously never been the problem. This point cannot be stressed enough. The problem has always been incompetent and corrupt people being elected to power, which has always been preventable via highly educated populations, well-financed independent journalists, fitness-for-duty tests for political candidates, democratically initiated spontaneous elections, optimally democratic voting systems, strong anticorruption measures, democratized economic institutions, and the fulfillment of everyone's basic needs. The solution has never

been to reduce the government's role in providing essential public infrastructures and services. Prioritizing privatization, free markets, and profits, has always been an atrociously bad alternative that guarantees people's freedom will always be severely limited.

Tragically, because so many Americans have been indoctrinated by capitalist propaganda, many of them continue to believe that their freedom would be maximized if only "big government" got out of the way. This sentiment is perpetuated in America by the circulation of popular yet irrational statements, such as "the bigger the government, the smaller the citizen", and the well-known Ronald Reagan expression, "the nine most terrifying words in the English language are, 'I'm from the government, and I'm here to help'." This is particularly ironic, since not only is it ideal for governments to provide and generously fund essential public infrastructures and services, but America's federal spending, as a percentage of their economy, has remained relatively constant since the mid-1950's. And more to the point, the United States government is still smaller, in relation to GDP and population size, than the governments of many other countries that provide a higher quality of life and greater personal freedom. In fact in terms of government spending as a percentage of GDP, America is ranked 47th in the world. The problem with the United States government has never been that it is "too big", which is a vague and irrational criticism that has nothing to do with the essentialness or effectiveness of any government, particularly since a government can be simultaneously "big" and "small" along a multitude of dimensions, such as spending, debts, deficits, politicians, contractors, laws, regulations, bureaucracy, and lobbying. The problem is that the United States government is predominantly comprised of incompetent and corrupt capitalist politicians, resulting in their government spending nowhere near enough on public infrastructures and services, and doing everything they can to reinforce and worsen their broken economic system.

The widespread belief that governments always reduce personal freedom, particularly as they grow in size, is little more than capitalist propaganda. Governments only reduce personal freedom

when incompetent and corrupt political candidates are voted into power, and it is this problem that explains why so many Americans don't trust their government. However, even in America this wasn't always the case. In the 1960's nearly 80% of Americans trusted their government, compared to approximately 20% today, which is one of the lowest percentages of any country in the world. Incompetent and corrupt governments cannot however be blamed on citizens, but instead on the ruling class doing everything they can to indoctrinate the masses and rig the system in their favor. The American ruling class has been so effective in this regard that not only have they persuaded most Americans to support capitalism and reject socialism, but research shows that policies passed by the United States government rarely align with the wishes of American voters, and yet align almost perfectly with the requests of special interest groups controlled by the ruling class.

The freedom paradox

The reason it is difficult to understand personal freedom within an economic context is because of the unintuitive truth that increased economic freedom nearly always culminates in reduced freedom. Capitalism may be the embodiment of freedom in terms of its principles, but the consolidation of wealth and power it always leads to ensures people's freedom will increasingly be eroded, particularly with regards to the most essential areas of life, and especially when existential threats are accounted for. Freedom under capitalism effectively means having the freedom to be exploited, or the freedom to succeed by exploiting others. The reason this isn't obvious is because it is more intuitive to believe that freedom leads to more freedom. This is a major reason why capitalism, as well as neoliberalism and libertarianism, are such superficially appealing ideas.

In reality the outcome of true freedom nearly always requires a starting point of restricted freedom. Laws forcibly restrict people's freedom, but are necessary for ensuring everyone has the freedom to live safely. Being forced to pay taxes is a temporary restriction on

personal freedom, but is essential under capitalism for everyone to have access to high-quality public infrastructures and services. Taxes also increase freedom by saving people time, such as preventing people from having to pay countless owners of private roads when travelling across country. Forcing every person to pay taxes also ensures public infrastructures and services are not overburdened and underfunded, which is a problem when people can choose to avoid taxes, such as by going private. Even when freedom is entirely eradicated, this can still be a worthy tradeoff. For example, children in Finland are forced to attend non-profit schools, but this has been necessary for these children to have equal access to one of the best education systems in the world. In summary, this misunderstanding of the paradoxical nature of freedom has resulted in the fetishization of capitalism's grossly pitiful and dangerous form of freedom.

Conclusion

Freedom must always be the end goal of any mature society, and never the starting point. The consequences of freedom within an economic system that prioritizes privatization, free markets, and profits, will always lead to reduced freedom for everyone except those who inevitably use their freedom to exploit others in the pursuit of wealth and power. And even when people do have freedom under capitalism, this freedom always comes at the expense of the freedom of others. The truth is that the only way people can be free in any meaningful sense is if they have a home, a UBI, manageable debt, discretionary income, purchasing power, consumer options, free time, surplus energy, personal safety, bodily autonomy, physical health, mental health, peace of mind, legal protections, free speech, political voting power, economic voting power, high-quality schooling, job opportunities, entrepreneurial avenues, economic mobility, banking services, internet access, travelling capabilities, and an early retirement, to name some of the most important freedoms. These obviously would all be assured and maximized under democratic socialism. Despite this, capitalists have still managed to convince the masses that their system is the true source of freedom, even as it continues to destroy the lives of people around the world.

“Capitalism works in harmony with human nature”

One of the more common defenses of capitalism is that it is the only economic system that works in accordance with human nature. Conversely, socialism is deemed unviable because it supposedly requires a utopian society comprised of selfless and noble individuals. These ideas not only demonstrate a fundamental misunderstanding of human nature and these economic systems, but they are also a continuation of the same propaganda tactic used by the ruling class throughout history to justify the economic systems that benefitted them. Even less than 200 years ago the ruling class justified slavery using this exact same human nature argument. Democratic socialism is in fact one of the only systems that truly understands human nature because of the 3 areas where human nature and economics overlap. More specifically, socialism works with and improves human nature by optimizing social conditions, working conditions, and cultural conditions.

Social conditions

The greatest problem with the capitalist conceptualization of human nature is the assumption that humans are naturally deeply selfish, and that this is relatively unaffected by economic circumstances. This is obviously extremely naïve. People who have to live in a constant state of exhaustion, stress, hopelessness, etc. as they struggle to survive will think and behave more selfishly than those whose basic needs are always fulfilled and who have a high quality of life. If a person has little choice but to engage in cutthroat behaviors in order to meet their most basic needs, then their thoughts and actions will also be substantially more selfish in nature. Research has even shown that selfish people usually presume others to be as selfish as they are, meaning their selfishness can at least partially be attributed

to self-preservation in the face of what they believe to be a generally hostile world.

Under democratic socialism people would also suffer from far less exhaustion, stress, hopelessness, etc., and would have far more time, energy, money, etc. to dedicate to understanding and helping others. It would therefore be expected that people would be more kind and generous since most people experience great joy from helping others. In fact studies have shown that altruism and cooperation even increase during and after natural disasters, such as major earthquakes and floods. Greater investment into healthcare would also improve the mental health of many individuals, which would further increase the number of people that are able to focus their attention towards helping others. It would therefore be expected under democratic socialism that far more people would engage in initiatives like charity work, local community projects, online crowdsourcing projects, and public protests. So it is in fact democratic socialism that works with and improves human nature by providing social conditions that fulfill everyone's basic needs.

Working conditions

Capitalism supposedly utilizes human nature because the only way people can accumulate wealth under capitalism is by working hard to fulfill the needs and wants of consumers. The problem is that capitalist businesses are well designed to reduce people's desire to work hard. Putting aside the fact that workers are often forced to work long hours, wear unnecessarily uncomfortable clothes, obey irrational orders given by higher-ups, and experience a whole range of other avoidable workplace issues, the biggest problem is poor compensation. Most workers are fully aware that they are being exploited, which decreases morale and gives workers little incentive to work as hard as they otherwise would. Even promotions can involve zero to minimal pay increases, and yet require an even greater workload. In fact working hard under capitalism often increases the likelihood of being given even more work and responsibilities, but rarely with a proportional increase in

compensation. It should also be unsurprising that even in many developed countries upwards of half of all workers find their work either unfulfilling or meaningless. Few people will ever contribute their fullest to any job, let alone an unfulfilling or meaningless job, if they know they are being exploited by their higher-ups. So in other words capitalism effectively encourages workers to contribute the least they can get away with. And to make matters worse, many higher-ups are extremely lazy compared to those beneath them, and they often engage in sociopathic behaviors, giving their workers even less incentive to work hard.

Under democratic socialism every worker would receive fair compensation for every hour worked, including fair compensation for promotions, since compensation would increase with the value and difficulty of a workers labor. Workers would also have greater voting power over all business operations, including how democratic surplus is utilized, and would be less likely to suffer from alienation, which would likely further boost morale and productivity. If workers enjoy their work they are also more likely to want their cooperative to succeed so that they can keep their job. Even within worker cooperatives under capitalism, productivity has been shown to be higher in most instances, and equal in all other instances. And none of this is to mention that far more entrepreneurs would exist under democratic socialism, and far more people would return to work because a UBI would eradicate welfare traps. So it is in fact democratic socialism that works with and improves human nature by providing working conditions that encourage people to be as productive as possible.

Cultural conditions

Capitalists also don't understand how human nature is influenced by the cultural conditions cultivated by their system. More specifically, instead of curtailing or stigmatizing human vices, capitalism cultivates a culture in which these vices are exacerbated, idealized, and normalized. For example, pursuing unlimited wealth, even in a world of finite resources, is reframed as "a healthy ambition".

Indulging in excessive extravagance, even in a world with widespread poverty, is reframed as being "successful". Being a lazy rent-seeker that makes money from exploitative businesses and property ownership is reframed as being a "savvy investor". Engaging in cutthroat sociopathic behavior, even though compassion and cooperation are idealized in society, is reframed as having "a healthy competitive drive". Destroying all competition and monopolizing supply chains, even if this means destroying ethical businesses, is reframed as being a "captain of industry". Instead of illuminating the dangers of such selfish and dangerous vices, capitalism repackages them as ideals to aspire to. This is because fetishizing greed, ruthlessness, and consumerism, are the only ways businesses can maximize profits.

Another knock-on effect of refashioning vices as virtues is that it has determined the types of people that are celebrated under capitalism and how they are compensated. Wealthy capitalists who encourage, embody, or enable, extravagant lifestyles are often framed as the most valuable members of society. For example, a tech company CEO that abuses their workers and ignores the externalities of their business may have an annual salary of millions of dollars and be heralded as a pioneer. Conversely, the teachers who educated the STEM experts that were actually responsible for researching and developing this tech company's products may be unable to afford basic necessities and be mostly ignored by the rest of society.

Children in particular have been victims of the reframing of vices as virtues, especially the cultural norm of using consumerism as a means of identity formation, and the internalization of superficial and unrealistic ideals. For example, many children feel pressured to keep up-to-date with the latest beauty trends, fashion trends, electronics, etc. because of capitalism's perceived obsolescence propaganda. Children also experience pressure to engage in conspicuous consumption, in which goods are purchased because of their brand and cost, despite few or no differences in style and quality to less expensive alternatives. Girls in particular have also been victims of the cosmetics industry, which for decades has endlessly bombarded

society with unreasonable beauty standards. The internalization of such ideals can also not be reasonably disconnected from the epidemic of young people with eating disorders or depression, nor from the ostracizing and bullying that many children experience. All of this is expected under capitalism, because businesses are highly incentivized to do everything they can to make everyone, including children, feel that their lives, personalities, and bodies, are as worthless and uninteresting as possible, since this is the best way to maximize profits. In this sense, capitalism doesn't just apply perceived obsolescence to physical goods, but also to humans. The fact that this intentional manipulation of culture has predominantly been directed towards affecting adults also doesn't make capitalist businesses any less culpable, since such cultural changes were obviously always going to affect children as well.

This capitalist conceptualization of human nature has effectively become a self-fulfilling prophecy. Capitalism encourages the embracing of human vices, which has empowered capitalists to use this as superficial evidence that this must therefore be the prevailing driving force of humans. For example, capitalism idealizes the lifestyles of the rich and famous, which has empowered capitalists to use this as superficial evidence that selfishly pursuing excessive wealth is natural. Capitalism also rewards the most selfish entrepreneurs and businesses in society, and forces most other entrepreneurs and businesses to operate unethically to remain competitive, which has empowered capitalists to use this as superficial evidence that capitalism best utilizes humanity's selfish and cutthroat nature. And none of these self-fulfilling prophecies are by accident. The more capitalists can convince populations of these misconceptions about human nature, the easier it is to normalize and justify selfishness, shallowness, and exploitation.

It is surprising that capitalism's refashioning of vices as virtues is not seen as more suspect considering it contradicts most cultural ideals in the modern world. From a young age all children are encouraged to be compassionate, respectful, generous, grateful, humble, mature, etc. Children are also encouraged not to judge themselves or others

based on superficial traits, but to accept themselves and others because of their internal worth and to judge people based on their character. Happy children are also naturally compassionate, such as expressing a desire, when asked, for every adult and child in the world to have food, clean water, shelter, etc. Among adults these virtues are also essential in all areas of life, particularly for forming and maintaining healthy relationships. Democratic socialists staunchly agree with these cultural ideals, which is why they advocate for a society where such virtuous traits are idealized, encouraged, and expected. Even though humans can be greedy and callous, it is ludicrous to argue that the best economic system would be one that incentivizes and rewards such vices, rather than one that attempts to restraint them and instead cultivate virtuous traits that are already idealized, encouraged, and expected in most cultures.

Democratic socialism would help cultivate more virtuous cultural ideals in a number of ways. First, it is an economic system that encourages and enforces harmonious cooperation wherever possible, rather than cutthroat competition. Second, under democratic socialism people would be economically literate, meaning people would be aware that extreme wealth was not economically justifiable, and that it always came at the expense of others. Extreme wealth would therefore be far less idealized and far more stigmatized. Third, under democratic socialism the highest paid workers in society would be those that perform the most difficult jobs, so the lifestyles of the wealthiest in society would no longer be idealized to the same extent, since their lifestyles would be known to come at a personal cost. Fourth, because of the invaluable labor they perform, the highest paid workers would also likely be the most venerated people in society, which would likely further positively shape cultural ideals. Fifth, there would likely be reduced or zero advertising in order to minimize the prices of goods and services, which would likely further reduce the idealization of the unjustifiable extravagant lifestyles that are often depicted in advertisements. Sixth, everyone would also have more time, energy, money, etc. to dedicate to the needs of others, which would likely further increase humanitarianism, and consequently further positively shape cultural ideals. And for those

that doubt the potential for these cultural conditions to shape human nature, consider that in many countries, including some Nordic countries, humility and frugality are already deeply ingrained cultural ideals, and deviation from these virtues can be a source of embarrassment and social exclusion in these societies. So it is in fact democratic socialism that works with and improves human nature by providing cultural conditions that idealize the most virtuous human behaviors.

Hypocrisy

Capitalists are obviously hypocrites with regards to human nature predominantly because capitalism is incapable of fulfilling the needs and wants of all humans, including the desire for social cohesion and world peace, which are both prevented by the existence of a ruling class. However, there are numerous other ways that capitalists are hypocritical with regards to human nature. Capitalists argue that humans are naturally selfish, but ignore the fact that the economy and society rely upon the selfless contributions of countless individuals. In terms of the economy, the entire internet operates on numerous pieces of free open source software that were written, and continue to be updated, by highly skilled specialists. The same is also true of Linux, which has also been essential for the success of countless for-profit businesses. Capitalist economies also rely upon other forms of invisible labor, such as the work of charity volunteers. In terms of society, Wikipedia is the most obvious example, although there are also countless internet comment sections, forums, and websites, that continue to grow with detailed contributions offered by experts with no incentive other than to help strangers. PC gaming enthusiasts also continue to freely fix problems in computer games that publishers refuse to address because this would reduce their profits. These enthusiasts also regularly provide free additional content that is of higher quality than the content produced by game developers, and they even do this knowing this will likely increase the profits of the developers. This is not to argue that people should not be paid for their labor, nor that organizations, structure, and leadership, are not necessary for large scale projects. The point is

that humans are often less selfish than most capitalists acknowledge, and that economies and societies only function as well as they do because of this aspect of human nature. Additionally, democratic socialism is better capable of utilizing this part of human nature because it is a system that maximizes everyone's freedom.

Ironically, some capitalists, and particularly neoliberals and libertarians, also hold the contradictory position that humans are not only selfish, but are so altruistic that local charities and communities should entirely or predominantly replace government social safety nets. People can be selfless, but there is a limit to how much time, energy, money, etc. people have available to help others, making this position both ironic and absurd. In order to be true the resources that charities and communities possess would need to be equivalent to those provided by governments. This is not only an absurdly unrealistic idea in and of itself, but is made even more absurd considering that under capitalism most people in the world can be guaranteed to live in poverty and have ever diminishing time, energy, money, etc. Worse still, economic downturns are inevitable under capitalism, and these further reduce the money that people can give to charity at the exact same time when people need help from charities the most. Even during times of economic prosperity, most social safety nets even in wealthy developed capitalist countries are still grossly underfunded, and even in developed countries where welfare is reasonably generous but falls short, charities and communities are still barely able to fulfill all remaining needs. Additionally, far more people are likely to fall through the cracks when people receive piecemeal assistance from local charities and communities, unlike government runs services which can be comprehensive and better orchestrated, particularly under democratic socialism.

Capitalists however are perhaps most hypocritical with regards to human nature in their conceptualization of hard work. Capitalists argue that their system brings out the best in people because it supposedly rewards hard work, while they condemn democratic socialism for bringing out the worst in people by encouraging

everyone to be self-entitled, envious, and lazy. This is obviously hypocritical. Capitalism is a system of such extreme self-entitlement that it rewards people who steal wealth from the poorest people in the world and who destroy the planet for future generations. Many higher-ups are also driven to succeed out of envy for those who are richer than themselves, and are willing to selfishly exploit others to achieve this goal. Capitalists even recommend that people increase their wealth through investing, even though earning money through a passive income is the laziest way any person can accrue wealth. In fact, the modern capitalist ruling class could be considered the most self-entitled, envious, and lazy group of people in all of human history, since the amount of wealth they have stolen is greater than what was stolen by most members of the ruling class throughout human history. Despite this, capitalists still try to argue that it is the poor that are self-entitled, envious, and lazy, even though most of them are among the hardest working people in society.

Democratic socialists by contrast advocate for wealth redistribution, a UBI, and generously funded public infrastructures and services, not because they are self-entitled, envious, and lazy, but because they are economically literate. Democratic socialists also advocate for workers being paid fairly for their labor, rather than earning money by exploiting others, which is the opposite of these vices. Democratic socialism is also the economy of compassion and humility, since it ensures everyone's basic needs are met, it minimizes all forms of exploitation, and it does not allow people to become obscenely rich. That democratic socialism could ever be perceived as a system of self-entitlement, enviousness, and laziness, and capitalism could ever be perceived as a system of hard work, is testament to the hypocritical yet effective nature of capitalist propaganda.

Conclusion

Capitalism is a system that ensures that the worst parts of human nature will always be idealized and rewarded. Democratic socialism by contrast is a system which understands that human nature is predominantly shaped by environmental factors, which is why it is so

well designed to work with and improve human nature through its optimization of social conditions, working conditions, and cultural conditions. Compounding this problem is the fact that capitalists hold multiple hypocritical views regarding human nature and its relationship to economic systems, unlike democratic socialists who can avoid such contradictions because they have an objective understanding of human nature. Capitalism is therefore not a system that works in harmony with human nature, and the only reason this is not widely recognized is because of a propaganda tactic that has been utilized by the ruling class throughout history.

Part 2: The system: Conclusion

Proponents argue that capitalism is the best system currently available, but this is untrue even at a theoretical level. The prioritization of privatization, free markets, and profits, guarantees that wealth and power will always become increasingly consolidated, leading to monopolies and cartels that are responsible for horrific externalities, and even the exploitation of consumers wherever possible. This not only artificially limits people's quality of life, but also inevitably reduces people's quality of life over time. This is not only because capitalism is a volatile and unsustainable system, but also because it is a tremendously violent system, and one that has substantially slowed down humanity's ability to innovate and benefit from these innovations. The capitalist ruling class has only been able to maintain the illusion that capitalism is a viable system by indoctrinating the masses, particularly by manipulating language and ideas, and by condemning the very people that capitalism exploits. Democratic socialism by contrast is a substantially superior economic system in every conceivable way, and is also able to maximize human freedom and work in harmony with human nature despite what capitalist propaganda would have people believe.

One singular recurring theme that always reveals itself when critiquing capitalism is its innately contradictory nature. More specifically, an economic system should achieve a number of objectives that enable the needs and desires of all humans to be fulfilled to the greatest extent possible, and yet even at a theoretical level capitalism is completely unviable in this regard. Listed below are the most prominent examples of these contradictions.

- An ideal economy would maximize human productivity. However, under capitalism workers are guaranteed to be less productive because of problems like exploitation, exhaustion, alienation, and a lack of workplace autonomy.
- An ideal economy would be as efficient as possible. However, capitalism is a grossly inefficient system, particularly because of the existence of bullshit jobs, the necessity of jobs that deal with externalities, and economic downturns that cause mass unemployment and business bankruptcies on a global scale.
- An ideal economy would not force people to work to escape poverty. However, under capitalism most workers in the world still live in poverty, and countless people are unable to find stable work because businesses are incentivized to create a reserve army of labor, which is also guaranteed to increase whenever economic downturns occur.
- An ideal economy would ensure everyone owned their own home. However, because of capitalism we now live in a world where millions of people are homeless, billions more have temporary or inadequate shelter, and most people who have shelter have to waste money on rent or interest payments on for-profit mortgages.
- An ideal economy would maximize everyone's discretionary income and purchasing power. However, under capitalism these will always be kept low, or even decline over time, because it is a system that is well designed to facilitate exploitation, and particularly the theft of the world's resources and technological surplus.

- An ideal economy would create an abundance of goods and services. However, capitalist businesses are incentivized to create artificial scarcity, since this is the only way to maximize demand and profits. Additionally, there will always be fewer goods and services as industries become monopolized, and people are unable to contribute their fullest to society because of poverty.
- An ideal economy would ensure consumers had access to the best goods and services possible. However, this will always be denied under capitalism because of problems like planned obsolescence, shrinkflation, and a lack of standardization. Additionally, the competition that is necessary for avoiding these problems will always increasingly diminish under capitalism.
- An ideal economy would ensure all adults and children had a maximized number of opportunities as well as equal opportunities. However, capitalism will always lead to exploitation and ever increasing wealth inequality both within countries and between countries, which guarantees opportunities will always be extremely limited for most people in the world as well as extremely unequal.
- An ideal economy would use technological efficiencies and automation technologies to gradually reduce the hours that people need to work. However, under capitalism an ever increasing number of workers are made technologically redundant without appropriate safety nets, and those that remain in the work force have no choice but to work the same number of hours, or an increasing number of hours.
- An ideal economy would ensure all humans have the best mental health possible. However, capitalism is well designed to erode people's mental health by reducing everyone's quality of life, including their work life. This is exacerbated by capitalist propaganda that encourages the lower classes to blame themselves and each other for their problems.

- An ideal economy would work in harmony with human nature as much as possible, particularly by bringing out the best in humans. However, capitalism is an atrocious system in this regard, since it is well designed to bring out the worst in humans, including deeply disturbing sociopathic traits.
- An ideal economy would be founded on truth. However, capitalism is a system that can only survive by indoctrinating populations with misinformation that is created and propagated at every level of society. This is also exacerbated by education systems that are usually underfunded under capitalism.
- An ideal economy would be optimally democratic. However, people lack democratic control within capitalist businesses, even though this is where workers spend most of their energy and waking hours, and even though the decisions of businesses affect everyone in society. Worse still, capitalism guarantees that sociopaths will always end up in power. Capitalism also commonly leads to undemocratic political systems due to the corrupting influence of the ruling class.
- An ideal economy would create and maintain well-funded public infrastructures and services. However, these will always be underfunded under capitalism, predominantly because of economically illiterate politicians, the illogical creation and utilization of money under capitalism, and tax evasion and unethical tax avoidance.
- An ideal economy would utilize both centralized and decentralized planning. However, capitalism ensures that the economy will never adopt this approach because it relies upon free markets, which are utilized because they are ideal for maximizing the wealth of the ruling class.
- An ideal economy would maximize innovation, specifically through open collaboration, the sharing of information and physical resources, and populations being given every opportunity to reach their potential. However, capitalism will always be a grossly

inefficient system for maximizing innovation for reasons that are too numerous to summarize.

- An ideal economy would be as stable as possible at all times. However, economic downturns are unavoidable under capitalism, particularly because the exploitation of the lower classes guarantees recurring declines in the velocity of money within the economy, and because economic downturns provide an ideal opportunity for the ruling class to increase their wealth and power.

- An ideal economy would protect all humans during times of crisis. However, capitalism is an atrocious system for protecting citizens during such times, primarily because it is less profitable for businesses to stockpile essential goods, and because the goods that are available are always price gouged and sold on a first-come-first-serve basis.

- An ideal economy would maximize the ability for people to publically protest and go on strike. However, capitalist exploitation makes this exceptionally challenging or impossible because people lack the time, energy, money, etc. to engage in these initiatives, and because of the violence that they can be threatened with or suffer from at the hands of the ruling class.

- An ideal economy would be entirely sustainable. However, capitalist businesses are incentivized to sell as many goods as possible in order to maximize profits, and capitalist economies require high employment rates to remain stable and to ensure people can meet their basic needs, which both necessitate high consumption rates so that workers are always in demand.

- An ideal economy would make the world as habitable as possible. However, under capitalism the ruling class is strongly incentivized to use their immense power to destroy the planet, since not only are externalities the best way to maximize profits, but the ruling class also have the wealth necessary to protect themselves from externalities they would otherwise suffer from.

- An ideal economy would be malleable enough to rapidly adapt to nationwide or global reforms, such as those required to address disasters and existential threats. However, capitalism makes such transitions extremely and unnecessarily difficult because of the threat they pose to people's jobs and economic stability.
- An ideal economy would facilitate world peace. However, capitalism always produces class conflict, and the lower classes will always be vulnerable to violence, and particularly structural violence and imperialism. And these problems are guaranteed to worsen as wealth and power unavoidably consolidate into the hands of those most willing to behave sociopathically.

None of these are minor problems, but instead severe and irreconcilable contradictions between what economic systems should accomplish and what capitalism will always accomplish because of its prioritization of privatization, free markets, and profits. Capitalism is therefore a completely unviable system by its very design. In fact, one of the great ironies of capitalism is that all successful capitalist businesses recognize the unviability of capitalism as evidenced by all businesses using economic planning within their internal infrastructures, and doing everything they can to destroy free markets by eradicating competition and controlling as much of the economy as possible. Additionally, most capitalist businesses recognize that they must rely upon expensive and large-scale public infrastructures and services to survive and prosper. In other words, capitalists acknowledge the superiority of socialism, but refuse to adopt this for the entire economy, either because they have been indoctrinated by propaganda, or because doing so would prevent them from maximizing their wealth and power.

PART 3:

CAPITALISM IN

REALITY

This chapter will explore in greater detail the real-world consequences of living under capitalism. Not only will this help cultivate a greater appreciation of the problems that have arisen from living in a world dominated by capitalism, but also the urgency with which these problems need addressing. The following critique will be divided into the following five headings.

- Humans
- Animals
- Environment
- Miscellaneous
- Statistics

Humans

This section will explore the problems that humans face in both the underdeveloped world and the developed world as a consequence of living under capitalism. This section will explore underdeveloped countries first, however much of what is described here also applies to developed countries, and vice versa.

Quality of life

It is often assumed that life was a short, lonely, brutish, and depressing struggle for most people throughout human history, and that the struggles people suffer through today are merely a continuation of that trend, rather than a consequence of capitalism. It should perhaps not be surprising that this is a gross distortion of the truth. Life was rarely easy for our ancestors for obvious reasons, but the quality of life many of them experienced was not only higher than most realize, but was higher even by today's standards in many essential areas.

Prior to the first agricultural revolution, which occurred between 10,000 to 20,000 years ago, humans lived in hunter-gatherer communities that were small to moderate in size. It is estimated that adults within these tribes worked no more than 15 hours a week, or about 2 hours every day, while the rest of their time consisted of recreational activities. However, an important thing to remember is that even the work that these hunter-gatherers did perform consisted of activities that are performed today for leisure, such as hunting, fishing, fruit picking, jogging, building, crafting, and exploring. Even building a home in those days could be achieved within half a day to a few days. These humans would also have performed their work surrounded by friends and family, rather than living and working in isolation or with an ever changing cycle of strangers and acquaintances. Even challenging activities considered traditionally solitary in western cultures, such as child rearing, were regarded as communal responsibilities, taking an even greater burden off any one individual. Whether or not these hunter-gatherers were working or relaxing, they would also have been surrounded by beautiful natural environments and wildlife, unblemished by the widespread intrusions, destruction, air pollution, land pollution, river pollution, and noise pollution, that is common in underdeveloped countries.

Many of these tribes also never stored food for the future because of the abundance of natural food sources available to them all year round. This even holds true for many tribes in the world today, as well as many peasant societies throughout human history. Even

tribes that needed to store food would likely have been able to collect enough food for an entire year within just a few weeks, based on the capabilities of many modern hunter-gatherer tribes. These tribes also likely suffered from fewer mental health problems, since modern hunter-gatherers have been discovered to suffer from substantially lower rates of mental health problems than those living in developed countries. The stressors that hunter-gatherers suffered from in the past were also short-term and occasional, compared to most workers today who live in a chronic state of stress, anxiety, and exhaustion, as a result of capitalist exploitation. Hunter-gatherers also didn't have to cope with the overwhelming psychological burden of dealing with all the disasters and existential threats caused or exacerbated by capitalism. It is also often assumed that those who lived in such primitive communities also lived very short lives. This falsehood has mostly persisted because life expectancy estimates usually include child mortality rates, which were obviously extremely high during these times. The truth is that those that survived childhood likely had a reasonable chance of living until they were 50 to 80 years old. Despite what many people believe, if only those above the age of 5 are counted, life expectancy in most developed countries has barely improved over the past 150 years. This can mostly be blamed on problems caused or exacerbated by capitalism.

Incidentally, just like many modern tribes, it is also true that many tribes and societies going back throughout history were also socialist or communist. In fact throughout practically all of human history, which started approximately 200,000 years ago, most human tribes and societies lived under "primitive communism", as it is currently known as. These were gradually superseded by slave societies which began appearing approximately 10,000 years ago, which were eventually superseded by feudal societies which began appearing approximately 3000 years ago, which were eventually superseded by capitalist societies which began appearing approximately 300 to 400 years ago. Despite this, many societies until very recent human history lived under socialism or communism in many parts of the world even during the continuing rise of these oppressive economic systems. This embracing of socialism and communism in the past,

and particularly during early human history, should not be surprising, since it has been known for some time that resource sharing and cooperation were major reasons why humans were able to survive and prosper as a species. This is also true in the animal kingdom, where many animal species are only able to survive and prosper through resource sharing and cooperation, rather than resource hoarding and competitiveness. Additionally, because of the greater egalitarianism that naturally arose from these socialist and communist societies, it is also known that many of them were effectively devoid of racism and sexism, were more or entirely accepting of LGBT+ individuals, were more or entirely accepting of recreational drug use, and were more sexually liberated, than most “advanced” developed countries in modern times.

The point here is not to present a naïvely optimistic view of the past. Many of our ancestors did not have access to this quality of life, and even those who did could not perfectly protect themselves from wildlife predators, natural disasters, deadly diseases, manmade atrocities, and other such problems. Nonetheless, something has clearly gone disastrously wrong in the transition to today’s society. Most people in underdeveloped countries today are chronically overworked and exhausted, spend most of their waking life away from their family and friends, perform unnecessarily dehumanizing, strenuous, and even hazardous work, and often with minimal daily exposure to direct sunlight or unblemished natural environments. The idea that impoverished and exploited individuals in underdeveloped countries are simply perpetuating the natural state of human existence, rather than being victims of capitalism, is one of the most perverse and disgusting lies ever propagated by capitalists. Recent research has also revealed that poverty in pre-capitalist times is often overstated, and that poverty since capitalism’s adoption is often understated. In fact 4 to 5 centuries ago, those living in many current underdeveloped countries had, on average, a higher quality of life, better health, a higher life expectancy, higher quality craftsmanship, more advanced agricultural practices, and more advanced technology, than those living in Europe at the time.

Capitalism has also eroded the quality of life of people in underdeveloped countries by robbing them of their self-sufficiency. All valuable resources in these countries, including arable land, freshwater sources, and habitable regions, have been privatized by the ruling class. And instead of this situation improving over time, more resources are being extracted from these countries today than any other time in human history. Even legally protected native tribes continue to be forced off their ancestral lands by corporations, and always through violence and lethal force. Their way of life is usually completely decimated, and they are often forced to relocate to places near modern infrastructures, such as factories and roads. These displaced tribes often experience high suicide rates because of this.

Capitalism also continues to cause serious problems for those that still have some ability to live self-sufficiently in these countries, and this is primarily because of the overconsumption, destruction, and poisoning of their vital resources. Overfishing continues to deplete the primary or only source of food and income for hundreds of millions of people, and has even pushed many to resort to terrorism and piracy in a desperate attempt to avoid starvation for themselves and their loved ones. Monocultures and overproduction caused by the animal agriculture industry continue to result in soil degradation, even to the extent of destroying previously arable farm land. Climate change continues to devastate crop production in these countries, particularly through heatwaves, droughts, and floods. Poor mining and manufacturing practices continue to cause toxic chemicals and metal particles to pollute environments, including fresh water sources and the air people breathe. Such pollution is known to be responsible for causing skin rashes, legions, respiratory problems, immune deficiencies, birth defects, cancers, and many other serious health problems. This pollution doesn't merely affect those unfortunate enough to have had their land invaded by corporations, but also people hundreds of kilometers away that experience downstream pollution. Corporations continue to sell carcinogenic pesticides to these countries even though they are illegal in developed countries, leading to similar health problems and deaths. All such problems have made self-sufficiency less viable today than decades, centuries,

or even thousands of years ago. And worse still, such problems are only worsening as time progresses.

Debt trapping

In addition to traditional forms of imperialism, capitalist countries have also exploited underdeveloped countries through neocolonialism, which is a form of imperialism that uses soft power. Neocolonialism predominantly takes the form of coercing or forcing countries into spiraling debt obligations, which is a practice known as “debt trap diplomacy”. One of the most prominent ways this has occurred under capitalism has been through Structural Adjustment Programs (SAPs), also known as Structural Adjustment Policies. These are superficially generous conditional loans provided by the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank to impoverished nations, and given under the pretense of improving their economic prospects. These loans are usually initially provided for the purpose of building up infrastructures, such as roads, ports, power sources, electrical grids, and industrial parks. In reality these loans are designed to oppress and exploit indebted countries to the greatest extent possible, which they achieve in the long-term through debt trapping. In fact the IMF was effectively set up entirely for this purpose. The infrastructures built in these countries are also designed primarily for exporting and importing resources and goods to and from the lender country and the indebted country. In fact these infrastructures have usually been so overtly imperialist that it has often been far quicker to transport goods from an indebted country to their distant imperialist country, than from one indebted country to a neighboring indebted country. Unsurprisingly these loans are generally prioritized for countries that are rich in natural resources.

Western governments, the IMF, the World Bank, the World Trade Organization, the World Economic Forum, the European Union, corporations, and other similar capitalist institutions, have used such imperialist practices for decades to exploit underdeveloped countries for everything they have. These strategies have always been easy to

implement, since targeted countries are always in a state of economic desperation, and usually because of prior decades of capitalist imperialism. However, to maximize their exploitation of these underdeveloped countries, these organizations also commonly use "economic hit men". These individuals can best be understood as professional negotiators, whose sole purpose is to target countries with valuable resources, and encourage or pressure them to accept Structural Adjustment Programs, or other loans similar in nature, or to modify preexisting contracts. These economic hit men are also utilized by corporations, such as engineering and construction companies that are hired for eventual infrastructure projects.

If any country rejects these loans, or refuses to adopt a capitalist free market, then they can be forced into a position where they have no choice. The country may be placed under even greater financial duress, such as through sanctions, until their financial desperation forces them to accept these loans. Other times extortion, election rigging, assassinations, violent coups, etc. are used to bring about regime change, even in countries with democratically elected leaders and governments. The instituting of fascist dictatorships, or other brutal regimes, is never deemed a problem as long as they support the agenda of the imperialist country. If all of these strategies fail, or have not been successful enough, then these countries can be invaded militarily on the pretense of "liberating" them.

All of this is to be expected from the IMF and the World Bank considering they have always been neoliberal organizations, despite portraying themselves as humanitarian organizations. This is largely because America has grossly disproportionate voting power in the IMF and the World Bank in proportion to the size of its population, meaning they can influence the operations of both institutions in ways that benefit their own agenda. In fact America is the only country that can veto any decision put forward by the IMF. None of this should be surprising considering America's history of imperialism. Over the past century they have illegitimately invaded, and interfered in the elections of, literally dozens of countries. And both of these forms of imperialism have involved sanctions, bribery,

torture, mass murder, and the replacing of democratically elected left leaning figures with some of the most brutal dictators of the past 70 years. Even today America supports over two thirds of the world's dictators, all of whom are anti-socialist, and many of whom are responsible for crimes against humanity.

To fully appreciate how exploitative these loans are in practice, it is necessary to explore the conditions that are attached to these loans. Indebted countries are often required to accept a combination of, and often the vast majority of, the following conditions.

- Accept unreasonably high interest rates that are designed to be impossible to pay off.
- Transition to a capitalist economy and adopt free market policies.
- Devalue their currency.
- Accept trade deals that overwhelmingly benefit the lender country, such as those that remove certain import and export restrictions and taxes.
- Remove price controls.
- Sell resources at a reduced rate to the corporations and investors of the lender country. This can include freshwater sources, arable land, and rare minerals.
- Enhance the rights of foreign investors by changing national laws.
- Increase publically funded subsidies for businesses or industries that benefit the lender country.
- Privatize public infrastructures and services. This can include those essential for long-term prosperity, such as healthcare and education.
- Introduce austerity measures that massively reduce government spending on public infrastructures and services, including those essential for long-term prosperity.
- Build infrastructures that are beneficial to the lender country, including ports and transportation networks that can be used for exporting resources and importing goods.
- Deregulate industries, including state-run industries.
- Reduce or abolish their minimum wage.
- Reduce workers' rights and benefits.

- Increase the production of specific resources, such as crops or raw materials, which are of benefit to the lender country.
- Allow the lender country to set up military bases in the indebted country.
- Give the lender country the power to commandeer the military of the indebted country.
- Outlaw or hinder the formation of unions and the ability of workers to go on strike.
- Vote in agreement with the lender country at the United Nations.
- Suffer unreasonable penalties upon failing to fulfill these conditions.

These neocolonial debt traps are simply a modern form of imperialism, which is merely the natural evolution and refinement of any system that prioritizes privatization, free markets, and profits. Lender countries use a multitude of immoral tactics to ensure countries agree to these nonnegotiable conditions, and even take additional actions to further exploit these indebted countries. The following list covers most of these tactics and additional actions.

- The governments of underdeveloped countries are often bribed, including with military troops and equipment capable of suppressing civil resistance.
- Unless the leaders of these countries are being bribed, the conditions of these exploitative loans are often intentionally obfuscated so that these leaders are not aware of their long-term ramifications. They are particularly not made aware that these loans are designed to be impossible to pay back, specifically by creating unavoidable debt spirals that trap these countries in a state of permanent subjugation.
- The impossibility of paying the extortionate interest rates attached to these loans makes it inevitable that further loans must be accepted. Indebted countries always end up paying back their original loans multiple times over through interest payments alone. The amount of freely given foreign aid that many underdeveloped countries receive is also often substantially less than the amount

they pay in interest payments alone, and this is true even when the total interest they've paid is multiple times greater than the sum total of all of their previous loans.

- If repayment deadlines are not met, indebted countries are often forced to further privatize, deregulate, reduced trade barriers, etc. The interest rates on their initial loans are also often increased.
- In the case of SAPs, the money from these loans is rarely given to indebted countries directly. Instead they are given to Western corporations who build the infrastructures that these loans are designated for. Considering most of this work is manual labor, these loans could be used to hire native workers, which would boost the economies of these indebted countries. Instead most of this money never even leaves these imperialist countries, except to buy physical resources.
- The Western companies brought in to work on these infrastructure projects often stretch out this work in order to ensure greater profits. This financial burden is then forced upon the indebted country.
- When lender countries hire local companies and workers in these underdeveloped countries, they are usually exploited to the greatest extent possible.
- Imperialist countries will often leave infrastructure projects unfinished, or build them in areas or in ways that result in them remaining unused or being used at very low capacity. Unless they can benefit from these infrastructures, these imperialist countries have no reason to do otherwise.
- Lender countries will often force indebted countries to adopt austerity measures in order to force their populations to spend more on essentials that would otherwise have been provided by the state, such as healthcare and education. This is always done under the pretense of reducing government debt or deficits, but this is always done to increase poverty, and consequently make the indebted

country and its workers even easier to exploit. Reduced spending on education also stifles the long-term prospects of workers, which further increases poverty.

- To further prevent indebted countries from gaining independence, and to further enable their exploitation, they are often forced to pursue specialization at the expense of diversifying their economies. For example, if a country produces cotton, they can be forced to export their cotton to other countries where it is turned into usable goods, which are then sold back to them at extortionate prices. This forced specialization partly explains why so many products originate from such a small number of countries, such as the disproportionate number of garments that come from Bangladesh.
- Lender countries often encourage or force multiple underdeveloped countries to produce vast amounts of specific resources at the same time. The resulting competition between these countries pushes down the prices of these commodities, putting these countries in a position where they have to produce even more in order to generate enough wealth for themselves, culminating in a vicious cycle. This plunges these countries into even greater financial ruin, but provides the imperialist countries with an abundance of substantially cheaper resources and goods, and greater leverage for further exploitation.
- Imperialist countries usually subsidize their own industries, such as farming, enabling them to produce less expensive goods for foreign markets. The impoverished citizens of indebted countries, whose industries cannot be subsidized, consequently have no choice but to purchase these more affordable imported goods. This subsequently undermines their own local economies, making these countries even easier to exploit.
- Western countries commonly introduce trade barriers that bolster the wealth and independence of their own country, while effectively blocking poorer countries from competing in global markets.

- Western corporations often standardize the prices of their goods across the world, meaning they can force those in poorer nations to pay similar or identical prices to those in wealthier nations. Because of the wealth disparity between countries, these underdeveloped countries effectively have to pay far higher prices, which is a particular problem for essential goods.
- Economic hit men and foreign investors have often done their best to hide from underdeveloped countries the true value of the land and other resources they purchase from them. It is not uncommon for these countries to sell their resources for a fraction, and in some cases as low as 1%, of what they are worth on the global market.
- As underdeveloped countries are plundered of raw resources, they have to increasingly rely upon their labor for survival, further increasing the amount of cheap labor available to imperialist countries.
- The erosion of self-sufficiency that the citizens of these countries suffer from often forces many of them to migrate to urban industrialized areas to seek work in the factories and warehouses that produce the products of Western companies. In other words, instead of Western companies needing to attract workers away from their rural communities with incentives like higher compensation and benefits, they can rely upon this inflicted economic desperation instead. This problem has forced countless people living in self-sufficient rural communities to move into crowded and dirty slum cities.
- Many of the resources stolen from underdeveloped countries exist within conflict zones, which are often controlled by extremely violent guerilla factions and gangs. This is why many minerals are called "conflict minerals". The corporations that purchase these minerals have made a conscious effort over the past few decades to avoid tracking the origins of these minerals, partly to maintain plausible deniability, and partly to save money.

- Imperialist countries often do everything they can to destroy worker unions in underdeveloped countries. If any strikes do occur, not only do workers suffer from a temporary loss of income, but they can lose their jobs and be severely persecuted. Even if unions do form, they are often powerless, since Western corporations can threaten to leave and use cheaper labor in other countries. For this reason most businesses in underdeveloped countries have no choice but to compete with each other to lower wages, lengthen work hours, and exploit workers in other ways, in order to attract outside investment. This has unavoidably led to an ethical race to the bottom.
- It is not uncommon for private military forces, and even state military forces, to be hired by corporations to protect their investments and suppress opposition. Workers, union leaders, and politicians, who protest these circumstances, will often be intimidated, harassed, kidnaped, imprisoned, sexually abused, tortured, or killed, by these military forces.
- Imperialist governments often provide the governments of these underdeveloped countries with intelligence on anti-capitalist groups and individuals, even when they know these dissidents will suffer from the same horrific forms of abuse mentioned above.
- Imperialist governments regularly fund or provide weapons to local terrorists and warring gangs in these countries in order to create, prolong, or exacerbate, civil conflicts. This ongoing turmoil can make it extremely difficult for people to organize and rebel against those exploiting them.
- Lawsuits brought against corporations to end their abuses in these underdeveloped countries, or to make them compensate their victims, often fail because these corporations overwhelm their prosecutors with legal work. The larger legal teams of these corporations often endlessly prolong proceedings with irrelevant technicalities and false accusations, or by forcing their prosecutors to

read thousands of extraneous documents, until their prosecutors run out of funds.

- Patents created in imperialist countries are commonly used to extract large amounts of wealth from businesses in underdeveloped countries, either through fees or through fines. These even include patents for inventions that are simple, lifesaving, or which were only possible because of public funding.
- Due to international pressure, imperialist countries have been pushed to cancel the debts of these exploited countries. However, of the countries that have agreed to this, many have demanded unfair conditions of release, such as the same conditions required for receiving these loans in the first place. And to make matters worse, even if all debts were forgiven, most developed countries still refuse to remove the trade barriers that place underdeveloped countries at a significant disadvantage.
- These underdeveloped countries commonly suffer from brain drain, in which their highly educated or skilled workers move to more prosperous developed countries to secure for themselves higher wages and a higher quality of life. The resulting impoverishment and economic instability makes these underdeveloped countries even more susceptible to exploitation.
- Imperialist countries keep these underdeveloped countries impoverished partly because this gives them the power to continue sending them their recyclable and non-recyclable garbage. Imperialist countries further benefit from this because the poisoning of land and water sources makes these underdeveloped countries even less self-reliant.
- It has been speculated that some governments encourage the excessive donating of products to underdeveloped countries, such as clothes and hygiene products, since this can undermine local businesses and push communities into even greater poverty.

- Imperialist countries often propagate capitalist propaganda in underdeveloped countries, meaning their citizens can also end up defending and empowering the very system that oppresses them.

In summary, the imperialist exploitation of underdeveloped countries, particularly in the form of debt trapping, has been carefully orchestrated to extract as much wealth from these countries as possible. Worse still, most of this has been done under the guise of altruism. All of these abuses were always inevitable, because imperialism is merely the natural evolution and refinement of capitalism. This is why imperialism is often described by Marxists as “the highest state of capitalism”. Had underdeveloped countries not been victims of imperialism, they would be on par with developed countries in terms of their quality of life, as well as their infrastructures and services. This is because societies that are not oppressed usually give rise to empowered citizens that are able to hold their leaders to account, and are usually able to prosper economically, particularly when they are able to engage in global markets on equal grounds. This is even truer when they are given support by developed countries. A good example of this is Japan, who was assisted in their reconstruction efforts after the Second World War, and consequently not only recovered extremely rapidly, but also became one of the most prosperous and technologically advanced countries in the world within a few decades.

Despite this, many capitalists in developed countries continue to peddle the lie that the poor quality of life of those in underdeveloped countries can be attributed to culture, laziness, low intelligence, genetic inferiority, and other bigoted stereotypes. Some capitalists also try to argue that imperialism is overstated because exports from underdeveloped countries constitute a small percentage of the GDP and wealth of the developed countries that import them. Not only does this disgusting argument ignore all aforementioned information, but this is only sometimes true because the labor and resources of underdeveloped countries is grossly undervalued because of imperialist exploitation, and because developed countries have

amassed immense wealth through centuries of imperialism and over a century of unjustifiably and recklessly creating money from nothing.

Workers

Due to globalization, the supply chains of most businesses now spread across the entire world. Corporations in developed countries have the wealth and power to negotiate with their suppliers in underdeveloped countries better compensation and conditions for their workers. Instead of doing this, these corporations demand the cheapest goods possible, knowing that this will only worsen the suffering of those responsible for their immense wealth. Many of these workers are unable to leave their jobs because there are no alternatives, or because doing so would be a death sentence for themselves or their loved ones. Many workers are also unable to commit suicide because of loved ones that rely upon them, or because they are forced to live on site and are robbed of the means to do so. These workers consequently have no choice but to live in a state of perpetual hell entirely because of the capitalist ruling class.

The following is a list of the multitude of ways workers in underdeveloped countries are exploited.

- Receive wages far below a living wage. It is common for garment workers to earn \$1 for producing \$600 worth of clothing.
- Forced to work unreasonably long hours, such as 12-18 hours every workday.
- Forced to work 6-7 days per week, and never being able to take time off work.
- Allocated an extremely limited number of bathroom breaks, and at pre-established times. Many workers have no choice but to wear adult diapers for this reason.
- Allocated only a few minutes every day for eating and drinking.
- Allocated grossly inadequate amounts of drinking water.
- Forced to consume nothing but gruel. It is not uncommon for this gruel to contain dead insects.

- Forced to use nothing but cold water, including for showers.
- Forced to live on site, and in cramped and inhumane accommodation, as part of their employment. This accommodation often suffers from insect infestations, mold, leaks, and foul odors.
- Hired as part-time workers, temporary workers, or independent contractors, instead of full-time employees, so that their employers can legally avoid providing benefits, or paying minimum wage, or paying certain taxes, or other legal requirements.
- Forced to work unpaid overtime.
- Have food and accommodation expenses deducted from wages, effectively making these workers slaves when this leaves them with no income, or too little income to travel or relocate.
- Have unavoidable equipment repair costs deducted from wages. These workers can sometimes end up with negative wage slips, where they owe their employees money at the end of the month.
- Have wages withheld until unrealistic personal work targets have been reached.
- Have wages partially or entirely withheld for absolutely no reason.
- Forced to hand over their passports, so that they are unable to leave their employers.
- Forced to spend years away from their family and friends.
- Experience racial discrimination at the hands of their employers.
- Experience psychological and physical abuse at the hands of their employers, particularly if they fail to reach unreasonable company targets. This is often done to set an example to other workers.
- Experience sexual abuse at the hands of their employers. This can include only receiving requested shifts in exchange for sexual favors.
- Forced to work in windowless and unventilated rooms.
- Forced to work in extreme weather conditions. During heatwaves it is not uncommon for workers to faint.
- Forced to take drugs so that they can work longer.
- Forced to work without appropriate training or equipment. Workers who operate loud equipment are rarely given the ear protection needed to prevent them from suffering permanent hearing loss and tinnitus. Workers who deal with textiles are rarely given the safety masks needed to protect their eyes and lungs from harmful microscopic cloth fibers. Workers who assemble or recycle electrical

equipment are rarely given the equipment needed to protect them from the toxic metals and radioactive substances they inevitably touch or breathe in, and which can cause them to suffer from rashes, liver damage, lung damage, kidney damage, nervous system damage, cancers, blood poisoning, infertility, miscarriages, and severe cognitive impairments, among other problems.

- Suffer from lightheadedness, concentration difficulties, and blurred vision, as a consequence of malnourishment, sleep deprivation, exhaustion, and other similar problems. It is also not uncommon for such workers to faint, vomit, or experience temporary blindness, for the same reasons.
- Suffer long-term ailments or disabilities, particularly as a consequence of repetitive strain injuries. It is not uncommon for workers' fingers to twitch during their sleep in accordance with the repetitive movements they're forced to perform every day for weeks or months.
- Receive no compensation for workplace accidents caused by company negligence. Even family's will rarely receive compensation for workplace deaths.
- Punished for complaining about abusive workplace conditions.
- Have no access to legal advice, or be prevented from accessing available legal aid.
- Prevented from forming or joining unions.
- Women can be forced to prove they are menstruating before they are hired. Employers do this to avoid paying maternity benefits, although they usually never pay benefits anyway.
- Forced to pay extortionate recruitment fees. Those in poverty often pay agencies commission for finding them work. These fees are often extortionate, including being in excess of a year's salary. Sometimes additional mandatory fees are added days or hours before a worker relocates to their new place of employment. The work provided can be radically different from what was advertised, and many workers are even funneled into slavery through this system. Some corporations have promised to ban recruitment fees from their supply chains, and some have even promised to reimburse workers who still fall victim to recruitment fees, although these promises are rarely kept.

Unsurprisingly the children of these adult workers also suffer immensely due to their parent's exploitation.

- These children are often malnourished as a consequence of their parent's dismal wages, and often suffer from a host of long-term debilitating health problems and cognitive impairments.
- These children are often so hungry that they are unable to concentrate during their school classes, making their education a relative waste, rather than an opportunity to escape poverty.
- These children are often given no choice but to do their school work without ever receiving help from their parents.
- These children are often unable to afford higher education, which is often essential for gaining employment that is not exploitative.
- These children are often unable to afford basic necessities, meaning they often have no choice but to enter full-time employment even if they have the opportunity to attend school.
- These children are often forced to accompany their parents to work, even when their parents work in unsafe environments.
- These children are often sent to live in orphanages if their parents cannot afford to raise them. Their parents are often only able to visit them for a few hours once every few weeks or months.
- These children are often forced into marriages if this is the only way they or their loved ones can avoid dying from preventable causes.

Children in underdeveloped countries can also feel burdened to enter the workforce, or may be given no other choice, in order to enable themselves and their family members to survive. Children are easily exploitable, meaning they often experience other forms of direct abuse or indirect harm in addition to those suffered by adult workers.

- Children are often forced to do the most dangerous or demeaning types of work.
- Children are often the most likely to suffer from physical and sexual abuse at work.

- Children are often more vulnerable to workplace toxicity due to their weaker immune systems. Diseases also spread more rapidly among child workforces.
- Children are often unable to go home after work due to the dangers of travelling without adult supervision.
- Children are often more likely to be forced to work in mines, because they are small enough to move around and work in these cramped environments. When these mines collapse, which is not an uncommon problem, these children can be trapped for hours at a time, or in most cases end up suffocating to death or being crushed to death.
- Children are often given no choice but to become sex workers. They are also more likely to suffer and die if they become pregnant, which is a common occurrence in underdeveloped countries because customers will often take advantage of the desperation and vulnerability of these children and insist on not using protection. These children often die young from STD's for this reason.
- Children are often forced to beg on the streets, and are sometimes physically mutilated by their employers or owners, since children with scars, or missing fingers, hands, eyes, etc. often elicit greater sympathy from tourists and local residents, and are hence more profitable.

Children also work in the supply chains of an extensive variety of resources and products. These include, but are not limited to, the following.

- Rare minerals.
- Coal.
- Rubber.
- Tobacco.
- Clothes.
- Diamonds.
- Coarse sand, which is an essential component of concrete.
- Food, including chocolate, coffee, tea, rice, meat, fish, and oil.
- Electronics, including phones, tablets, laptops, desktop computers, and televisions.

The damage that these life and working conditions can inflict on children cannot be understated. Media attention often draws attention to child poverty statistics and the poor quality of life of these children, but rarely do they draw attention to their psychological wellbeing. It is extremely common for both adolescent and pre-adolescent children to suffer from depression and hopelessness because of their circumstances. Children can become so depressed that it is not uncommon for them to become catatonic, and to such an extent that they have to be fed through tubes, although even this requires them to be lucky enough to have access to healthcare services in the first place. Children as young as 5 are known to make concerted efforts to commit suicide, and engage in various forms of self-harm, including cutting themselves with sharp objects, and hitting their head repeatedly against hard walls. All of these are widespread occurrences in underdeveloped countries, and yet are rarely discussed by the mainstream media, even when they focus on global poverty.

Under capitalism these human rights abuses are ideal, because they are evidence of maximum value extraction. However, the more general abuses described above don't even cover the very unique and specific abuses that corporations have inflicted upon underdeveloped countries. For example, 40 pharmaceutical companies joined forces in the 1990's to take the South African government to court to prevent Africans from receiving inexpensive AIDS and HIV medications. This led to the deaths of thousands of adults and children, and would have eventually resulted in the deaths of substantially more if not for international outrage. Another example is when Nestlé sent representatives to underdeveloped countries disguised as healthcare professionals to lie to the mothers of new born babies and persuade them that their baby formula was more nutritious than natural breast milk. Once these mothers prematurely stopped producing milk due to transitioning to formula, which would either be underpriced or given as free samples, Nestlé would substantially increase their prices, giving these mothers no choice but to spend everything they had on buying their product.

This baby formula would also require water, and because water in these countries was often contaminated, these infants would often become ill as well. Millions of infants needlessly suffered from malnutrition and illnesses, and many needlessly died, because of this initiative. Nestlé considered this a fantastic outcome, because it enabled them to increase their profits.

These instances of abuse are just two examples of millions of uniquely specific abuses committed by capitalist businesses. The ruling class is willing to abuse those who are responsible for their immense wealth and power, even though they could ensure the humane treatment of these individuals while still retaining for themselves the highest-quality of life of any group of people in the world. This point cannot be overstated. It has been estimated that most corporations in developed countries would only need to increase the prices of their goods by between 1% to 3% to ensure workers in their supply chains in underdeveloped countries are paid a living wage. However, even workers committing suicide because of their exploitation has not been enough to persuade corporations to make such insignificant concessions. All of this further proves how perfectly designed capitalism is for rewarding and empowering sociopaths. All of these abuses would be eradicated in a democratic socialist world where everyone's basic needs were fulfilled and all political and economic organizations and systems were optimally democratic.

New Optimism

In addition to these abuses, many defenders of capitalism have also used propaganda to convince the masses that such exploitation is nowhere near as widespread as it seems. Those responsible for this propaganda have come to be known as the "New Optimism" movement. The IMF and the World Bank have been at the forefront of this movement, promoting the idea that poverty around the world has been decreasing, and they have predominantly done this by propagating statistics that are intentionally incorrect or misleading. This propaganda has been further propagated by pseudo-intellectual

public figures like Steven Pinker and Jordan Peterson. There are numerous reasons why this idea is propaganda.

First, humanity could have already solved global poverty, and yet today it is still a monumental global problem. So even if poverty was declining, this is not the triumph that so many capitalists portray it to be, especially when they use this as evidence of the superiority of their system. Second, even the staunchest supporters of capitalism must admit that even if poverty was declining, it is doing so pitifully slowly, particularly considering how much technological productivity has increased in recent human history. Third, most of the statistics used to imply that poverty has been decreasing are the same useless economism metrics that were debunked earlier. They do not take account of all the other quality of life metrics that would allow for a substantially more objective perspective, including metrics related to externalities that reduce the quality of life of those in poverty.

Fourth, the statistics used to support these claims always include China, which is a country that has rapidly reduced poverty predominantly through democratic socialist approaches, and particularly economic planning. And to those who doubt China's claims of alleviating poverty, this merely means global poverty is even worse than previously thought. These statistics also include other countries, such as Vietnam, that have similarly reduced poverty through socialist approaches. The inclusion of these countries unavoidably skews the data, giving the misleading impression that capitalist free markets have been helping those in underdeveloped countries, when they have actually been harming them. In fact, if China alone is excluded, then the GDP growth rate of underdeveloped countries has on average decreased substantially since the 1970's, even though productivity should have skyrocketed in these countries. This is because productivity increases as people are lifted out of poverty and become better educated, and as countries become more technologically advanced.

Fifth, the thresholds that the IMF and the World Bank use to measure poverty are grossly inadequate. For example, they currently define

“extreme poverty” as living on less than \$1.90 a day, which is staggeringly low. This means that even people who are homeless, utterly destitute, and slowly dying from malnutrition, are still not living in “extreme poverty” as long as they are earning more than \$1.90 a day. These people can also be in substantial debt that they will never be able to pay off, and yet as long as they are earning \$1.90 a day they are still not living in extreme poverty according to these organizations. Even if children, the elderly, and those with severe mental and physical disabilities, are living in the most inhumane circumstances imaginable, then they are supposedly still not living in “extreme poverty” as long as they are living on more than \$1.90 a day. And these dollars are “international dollars”, meaning \$1 is equivalent to what 1 American dollar can purchase in America, not what 1 American dollar can purchase in an underdeveloped country, which can be substantially more.

This is obviously a disgustingly inadequate threshold for determining extreme poverty. It would be far more reasonable to categorize someone as living in extreme poverty if they do not have access to clean water, healthy food, decent housing, adequate sanitation, essential healthcare, social safety nets, legal protections, consistent electricity, and air conditioning units capable of coping with both extreme heat and extreme cold. The term “poverty” by contrast should consequently not include those who are living in “extreme poverty”, but who still lack important but slightly less urgent essentials, such as high-quality education, good waste management systems, safe roads and bridges, well-funded public transportation, reliable fire departments, decent internet access, functioning postal services, and clean public spaces, to name some obvious examples. This \$1.90 threshold could increase 10 fold in value and most people in extreme poverty would still be living in extreme poverty according to our more appropriate definition. The IMF and the World Bank are not oblivious to any of this. For them to imply that those earning just over \$1.90 a day are not living in “extreme poverty”, but instead just “poverty”, is not naïve, but grossly and knowingly malicious.

Sixth, to make this dire situation even worse, the IMF and the World Bank have intentionally masked the severity of global poverty by refusing to increase the thresholds by which poverty is determined at the same rate as inflation. So in the case of the \$1.90 threshold, not only is this value staggeringly low, but the purchasing power of this \$1.90 has been decreasing over time because it has not been keeping up with inflation. Seventh, the global population has skyrocketed during the past century, meaning even if the percentage of the global population living in poverty had plateaued at any time, rather than continue to increase, the number of people living in poverty would still have increased because of population growth. Eighth, even if global poverty was decreasing, using past trends to imply future trends is grossly misleading. This is because these trends do not account for existential threats, and the increase in poverty these will unavoidably cause. Even if every person on the planet living below the poverty line was instead living just above the poverty line, they would quickly become impoverished again because of food scarcity, water scarcity, property damage caused by extreme weather events, the inability to purchase and power air conditioning units, overburdened healthcare services, and a host of other problems.

All of this proves how manipulative it is for the New Optimist movement to claim that global poverty is declining, and that it's declining because of capitalism. Global poverty could have been eradicated long ago, and it predominantly only exists today because of capitalism, so saying poverty is very slowly declining is a damning statement against capitalism, not a reasonable defense. And even if this problem is ignored, poverty should have been declining at an accelerated pace in parallel with increasing technological surplus, which it hasn't. And even if this problem is ignored, the measurements used for determining poverty today are extremely misleading because they are all economism metrics. And even if this problem is ignored, all data is skewed by China and similar countries, which have reduced poverty predominantly through democratic socialist approaches. And even if this problem is ignored, the thresholds used for determining poverty are so low as to be useless.

And even if this problem is ignored, these thresholds have not kept up with inflation. And even if this problem is ignored, the number of people living in poverty has still increased because of population growth. And even if this problem is ignored, poverty will worsen considerably in the future because of existential threats.

It is therefore genuinely despicable for some of the wealthiest organizations and people on the planet, who will never suffer from poverty, and who are mostly protected from future existential threats, to knowingly propagate this misinformation, particularly as a means of increasing their wealth and placating the masses. It is almost beyond comprehension why anyone would use their position of incredible privilege and influence to misinform people that suffering around the world is decreasing, considering this would obviously subdue the masses, rather than energize them to pursue the revolutionary changes that are so desperately needed to end suffering around the world. For this reason, the New Optimism movement must be recognized as one of the most despicable global misinformation movements in recent human history.

The remainder of this section will focus primarily on how people in developed countries suffer under capitalism. The following problems also exist for those in underdeveloped countries, but are perhaps most shocking for their occurrence in wealthy capitalist countries.

The costs of poverty and the cycle of poverty

Every person's quality of life is determined primarily by economic factors that exist outside of their control, and ideally this would become increasingly true as ever increasing technological surplus was distributed to everyone. Despite this, capitalists profess that every person's quality of life is determined primarily by how hard they work. This not only downplays economic factors, but also downplays the unnecessary hardships people experience due to poverty, and how these hardships compound one another and produce feedback loops that make poverty even harder to escape.

Most capitalists don't understand this, so the most prominent hardships will be explored here. This section is consequently unavoidably extensive, which we apologize for in advance.

- Those in poverty are substantially more likely to experience stress, anxiety, and depression. In fact it has been known for some time that poverty is one of most significant predictors of stress in both adults and children. Stress, anxiety, and depression, are known to cause and exacerbate a host of serious physical health problems. These include irritable bowel syndrome, restless leg syndrome, hypertension, asthma, arthritis, osteoporosis, skin disorders, gastrointestinal problems, diabetes, heart disease, strokes, cognitive impairment, growth suppression in children, and rapid aging. Stress, anxiety, and depression, also compromise people's immune systems, making them more susceptible to illnesses and prolonged recuperation times. Stress alone is estimated to contribute to or cause 90% of all illnesses and diseases. All of these health problems can also be very costly, which can cause additional stress, anxiety, and depression.

- Those in poverty are more likely to suffer from genetic trauma. This is a phenomenon where psychological or physiological trauma experienced by an adult, even before pregnancy, can negatively affect how their children's genes are expressed. In other words, children can experience emotional, cognitive, and physical problems or disadvantages, as a consequence of their parents experiencing trauma prior to or during pregnancy. One example of this is when a child develops a genetic propensity to retain sugars and fats as a consequence of their mother experiencing malnourishment prior to or during pregnancy. Such children have an increased likelihood of developing obesity and related health problems throughout their life.

- Those in poverty are more likely to suffer from transgenerational trauma. Unlike genetic trauma which is passed down via genetics, transgenerational trauma is passed down via experiences, knowledge, learned behaviors, and certain interactions with those who have experienced such trauma or who are also victims of

transgenerational trauma. For example, a person whose parents lived through terrible experiences as a consequence of poverty may develop psychological problems due to becoming tangibly aware of the possibility and consequences of living through such experiences themselves, or because they experience neglect from their parents due to their parents personal trauma or transgenerational trauma.

- Those in poverty are more likely to experience reduced mental health as a consequence of having to helplessly watch their loved ones needlessly suffer or die as a consequence of poverty.
- Those in poverty may be unable to afford the time, energy, money, etc. to go out and socialize with friends, potentially leading to isolation and a reduced or nonexistent social support network. Loneliness is also strongly linked with serious health problems, including heart disease and depression. This problem is often severely exacerbated by a lack of “third places”, which are any public or commercial places used for socializing. This is obviously a problem that poor areas disproportionately suffer from.
- Those in poverty are less likely to be able to afford private mental healthcare, which can put them at a tangible disadvantage in many areas of life.
- Those in poverty are more likely to suffer from sleep deprivation. Aside from reducing a person’s quality of life, physical wellbeing, and ability to function during the day, sleep deprivation is also linked with insomnia, depression, anxiety, memory problems, weight gain, diabetes, strokes, and cardiovascular problems.
- Those in poverty are more likely to suffer a disrupted circadian rhythm. This can be because of the types of jobs they are more likely to perform, the increased likelihood of suffering from sleep disorders, or because of an inability to afford or use window blackout blinds, particularly if they live in temporary accommodation. Aside from causing the same problems as sleep deprivation, this can also make it extremely difficult to maintain a healthy social life.

- Those in poverty are more likely to live in areas with increased noise pollution. Long-term exposure to noise pollution is known to cause stress, hypertension, cognitive impairment, strokes, and heart disease.
- Those in poverty are more likely to suffer from relationship problems, which can also worsen stress levels and overall mental health.
- Those in poverty are more likely to suffer or witness domestic abuse. This is not only horrific in and of itself, but victims of domestic abuse are also more likely to abuse substances, to become homeless, to experience relationship problems, and to suffer emotionally and cognitively, to name some common consequences.
- Those in poverty are more likely to suffer from stress, which is not only capable of making people feel hungrier, but can also increase cravings for sugar and salt, which can further fuel hunger.
- Those in poverty are more likely to only be able to afford junk food. Malnourishment and weight problems can interfere with people's physical health, energy levels, concentration capabilities, and a host of other problems. Obesity in particular has been linked to numerous health problems, including hypertension, strokes, gout, osteoarthritis, diabetes, gallbladder disease, liver damage, reduced immunity, and various cancers. Consumption of junk food has even been directly linked to depression.
- Those in poverty disproportionately live in food deserts, and are more likely to be limited to small, local convenience stores. Consequently they are likely to have fewer opportunities to purchase nutritious food, including fresh fruit and vegetables.
- Those in poverty often don't have the time and energy to cook nutritious meals and wash up afterwards, and have to instead rely upon quick and low-quality microwave meals and fast food.

- Children living in poverty may have no choice but to eat unhealthy snacks if they get home from school before their working parents. Even if a child is willing to cook a meal, it can often be too challenging or unsafe for them to do so alone.
- Children living in poverty are particularly vulnerable to the consequences of malnutrition. As well as worse physical health and concentration capabilities, malnourished children can also suffer from problems that carry on into later life, such as lower intelligence, poorer reading skills, poorer math skills, and an increase in mental, emotional, and behavioral problems. Undernourishment during childhood also increases the likelihood of obesity later in life. Evidence suggests this is partially to do with genetics, and hence is not merely a psychological phenomenon.
- Those in poverty are less able to afford the often more expensive diets that are required to get around food intolerances, which can cause problems like abdominal pain, headaches, and sleep problems. People in this situation can suffer from such problems on a chronic basis.
- Those in poverty are less likely to have the freezer space necessary to prepare and freeze multiple meals from one cooking session, forcing them to cook from scratch far more often, which further erodes time and energy.
- Those in poverty are more likely to experience burnout, which is known to cause extreme stress, sleep problems, irritability, depression, cardiovascular problems, autoimmune disorders, and an increased chance of developing diabetes.
- Those in poverty may not have the time and energy to exercise, and be less able to afford gym memberships or equipment, which can reduce health and energy levels in the long-term.

- Children living in poverty are more likely to live in more dangerous neighborhoods, and consequently be less able to play outside. This lack of exercise can be harmful to their physical and mental health.
- Those in poverty have historically been more likely to suffer from lead poisoning. Lead is a neurotoxin, meaning it damages the nervous system, including the brain. Among other negative consequences, lead exposure during childhood is known to lower intelligence, and damage the prefrontal cortex, which is responsible for regulating emotions and self-control. It is understood that children who suffer lead poisoning have a higher chance of becoming criminals later in life.
- Those in poverty are more likely to live in areas with higher air pollution levels, which can cause or exacerbate physical health problems, including allergies, asthma, lung cancer, strokes, and heart disease, as well as neurological problems, including Alzheimer's, dementia, psychotic episodes, and cognitive impairment. The unborn children of expectant mothers are also more likely to suffer harmful consequences from air pollution, including neurological problems, low birth weight, preterm births, birth defects, miscarriages, and still births.
- Those in poverty are more likely to live in homes with poor insulation, and without air conditioning, which can take a toll on people's physical and mental health, and can even be dangerous for young children and the elderly.
- Those in poverty often experience worse physical health and are more likely to become ill or rundown, increasing the likelihood of poor work performance or being absent. This in turn can reduce a person's income, such as through lost promotions, going over their allocated sick days, or being fired.
- Those in poverty are more likely to work difficult or hazardous manual labor jobs, meaning they are more likely to suffer from long-term debilitating health problems, such as repetitive strain injury and

back pain, and are more likely to experience workplace accidents that cause serious bodily harm. Aside from reducing a person's quality of life, they can also be very costly and hinder a person's ability to work.

- Those in poverty are more likely to suffer reduced mental health as a consequence of their work. For example, those in low wage jobs are more likely to suffer from exploitation and alienation. Workers in poverty are also more likely to be drained by the emotional labor required by their job, since they are more likely to already be emotionally drained because of other hardships caused by poverty. Low wage workers are also more likely to suffer from physical health problems, which can obviously exacerbate mental health problems.
- Those in poverty are more likely to suffer from stress, illnesses, and physical pain, which can be extremely difficult to cope with without the assistance of substances, such as prescription drugs, alcohol, tobacco, and illegal drugs. These may be taken to alleviate stress, to alleviate pain, to help stay awake, to help fall asleep, and other essential reasons. Regrettably, whether such drugs are legal or illegal, they can cause debilitating long-term health problems.
- Those in poverty regularly experience a psychological phenomenon known as "decision fatigue". This refers to the deteriorating quality of people's decisions after prolonged periods of decision-making. This is partially caused by a "scarcity mindset", in which a lack of time, energy, money, etc. forces people to constantly calculate the ramifications of every decision they make, and to focus narrowly on serious and imminent problems at the expense of the bigger picture. Decision fatigue not only leads to poorer decision-making, but also additional stress and exhaustion.
- Those in poverty are more likely to have inadequate literacy skills, which can cause a host of personal hardships. This can include feeling humiliated in front of others, struggling to follow recipes, misunderstanding medication instructions, being unable to complete

essential forms, being of limited help to one's children, and of course having reduced career prospects.

- Those in poverty are more likely to suffer reduced intelligence due to their higher stress levels. Various studies have shown that stress can cause a drop of at least 13 IQ points in both adults and children.
- Children living in poverty are less likely to have access to toys and technologies that can enhance their intelligence and creativity.
- Children living in poverty are far less likely to spend quality time with their parents, meaning they are less likely to receive guidance with regards to personal problems, homework, career options, and other normal life struggles. It is also known that communicating with adults during childhood boosts a child's intelligence, literacy skills, and interpersonal skills.
- Children living in poverty are more likely to go to underfunded schools, which obviously places them at a significant disadvantage academically. Underfunded schools are often more stressful to attend and less likely to have healthcare professionals, leading to worse mental health outcomes for students. Children with special needs, including extremely common problems like dyslexia and ADHD, are generally less likely to be diagnosed, and less likely to receive assistance or concessions even if they are diagnosed. Poor children are also less likely to have access to the private tutors and admissions counselors that wealthier children can access. Children from low-income homes are also 2.4 times more likely to drop out of school than middle-income children, and 10 times more likely to drop out of school than high-income children.
- Children living in poverty are less likely to be able to afford the fees or equipment necessary to partake in certain extracurricular activities, such as sports and trips, which may hinder or negatively affect their education, physical health, mental health, social skills, and relationships.

- Children living in poverty often have less time and energy to dedicate to their studies since they are more likely to have to look after younger siblings while their parents are at work.
- Those in poverty who attend college or university may have no choice but to work part-time or full-time while studying, making academic success exceptionally harder. Those already in the workforce can have zero free time or energy to learn new skills or attain new qualifications, even though these may be essential for improving their circumstances.
- Those in poverty are more likely to live further away from universities, increasing the time and money they need to dedicate to travelling.
- Those in poverty rarely have the same lucrative social connections and business opportunities that those from wealthier backgrounds often possess.
- Those in poverty are less likely to have cultural capital, which can narrow their future job prospects.
- Those in poverty are more likely to develop harmful aspirations and goals because of their environment. They are more likely to perceive crime as the best way to make money, which can be particularly alluring if their loved ones are financially desperate. They are also more likely to be involved in criminal gangs, which can provide such individuals with purpose, confidence, hope, protection, and a sense of belonging. They are also less likely to be surrounded by well-educated traditional role models, such as doctors and lawyers.
- Those in poverty often reasonably believe that they will always be in poverty, whereas those born into wealth and privilege are more likely to assume their future prosperity is relatively assured. Both groups may consequently instinctively behave in ways that increase the likelihood of these outcomes. For example, a person born into wealth may be more incentivized to refine their literacy,

communication, and social skills, because they realize these skills will be invaluable for achieving the success they believe they will likely attain. Conversely, a person born into poverty will likely be less inclined to dedicate their very limited time and energy to acquiring knowledge and skills they reasonably believe they will never use.

- Those in poverty are more likely to have loved ones who are also suffering from poverty, meaning they are more likely to spend time, energy, money, etc. helping others with their essential needs, which can come at the expense of their own prosperity and opportunities.
- Those in poverty are generally less able to pursue high-risk high-reward endeavors, since failure can mean destitution and homelessness for themselves and their loved ones.
- Those in poverty are more likely to have low credit scores. This is not because of years of financial mismanagement, but simply because they are poor, or because of a few unavoidable instances of misfortune. Consequently, those in poverty may be unable to qualify for loans and financial support that are easily accessible to wealthier individuals. This can also include startup loans for business ventures. The poor may have no choice but to use predatory financial services outside of the traditional banking system, which may not be strictly regulated, and may involve exploitative practices such as deceptive sales pitches and excessively high interest rates. These unofficial channels are also more likely to include scams.
- Those in poverty are at increased risk of missing bills and debt payments, and hence are more likely to become trapped in debt and lose money through interest payments.
- Those in poverty are often at increased risk of going overdrawn, which in many countries can incur expensive predatory overdraft fees. Wealthier individuals can not only avoid this problem, but they often receive free benefits from every bank they are invested in.

- Those in poverty are often less able to travel, and thus often have to rely on ATM's rather than banks, which can have predatory withdrawal fees.
- Those in poverty are far less likely to have savings, and therefore be unable to benefit from interest on those savings. Conversely, wealthy individuals can make money by doing absolutely nothing, particularly as a consequence of compound interest, while the super-rich can even live comfortably from their interest alone.
- Those in poverty are the least able to take advantage of upturns in the stock market, yet are the most likely to suffer hardships and misfortunes during downturns. During downturns they are more likely to experience direct consequences such as job losses, financial insecurity, decimated retirement savings, cancelled vacations, and homelessness, to name some common examples. They are also more likely to experience indirect consequences such as depression, stress, anxiety, self-harm, substance abuse, malnutrition, physical violence, sexual abuse, relationship problems, family breakups, crime, and suicide. Governments also suffer from reduced revenue, which often leads to cutbacks to essential services, which often causes additional suffering and deaths.
- Those in poverty are less likely to own assets that can be rented out for additional income, such as cars and properties.
- Those in poverty rarely own assets that appreciate in value over time, like properties, classic cars, and expensive art.
- Those in poverty are often unable to buy goods and services outright, meaning they often have to take out loans that accrue interest, or pay in installments, which is more expensive overall.
- Those in poverty are often less able to save money by taking advantage of limited time offers or by buying in bulk. This is not always a direct consequence of having less money. For example, if a

person is unable to afford a large freezer, this can limit what offers they can take advantage of.

- Those in poverty often have no choice but to purchase inexpensive low-quality products, and thus spend more money in the long-term on otherwise avoidable repairs and replacements. Inferior assets can also incur additional financial costs. For example, older cars are often less fuel efficient, meaning not only do they need to be refilled more regularly, but they can also cost more to tax.
- Those in poverty often have to delay repairing essential assets, which can cause extra damage, and consequently further increase repair costs and cause additional problems.
- Those in poverty often have to rent, whereas those who take out a mortgage or purchase their home outright can save substantially more money in the long-term under many circumstances.
- Those in poverty are less able to purchase season passes, most notably for public transportation, which can be substantially more expensive in the long run.
- Those in poverty are more likely to live in areas with poorly maintained roads, which inflict greater wear and tear on vehicles. This is exacerbated by the fact that poor individuals usually have no choice but to purchase cheaper vehicles that are less able to withstand such conditions.
- Those in poverty are more likely to live in areas with low economic mobility, meaning they are more likely to have no choice but to move home or commute much further if they want to improve their circumstances, both of which entail additional costs. However, if they cannot afford to relocate or commute, then they may have no choice but to continue living and working within their poorer neighborhoods.
- Those in poverty are more likely to have no choice but to accept more exploitative forms of employment. This is not an insignificant

problem. Wage theft in most developed countries constitutes 2 to 3 times more wealth than all other forms of theft.

- Those in poverty are more likely to work for employers who limit work hours in order to avoid having full-time workers, which they would have to provide with legally mandated benefits.
- Those in poverty are more likely to do shift work with irregular hours. These workers are often given little advance notice of their work schedule, and may have their hours reduced the subsequent month, or may even be fired, if they try to renegotiate their work schedule. This can make it impossible to work a necessary second job, or to arrange childcare.
- Those in poverty often have to spend money on life insurance every month, which is a less necessary expense for wealthy individuals.
- Those in poverty are more likely to suffer the premature death of a family member, including the main income earner of the family.
- Those in poverty are less likely to succeed at their business ventures, since most businesses in poor areas predominantly cater to poor individuals, and are usually too small to possess the advantages of large businesses. They are also more likely to be victims of crime, which not only incurs its own costs, but can deter potential customers and increase insurance costs. Consequently, entrepreneurs in these poor neighborhoods are less likely to succeed or even have the opportunity to start a business, and customers in these poor neighborhoods are more likely to pay higher prices for goods and services.
- Those in poverty are less able to take advantage of unpaid internships, which can be the only practical way of entering or getting ahead in certain industries.
- Those in poverty often pay more in taxes, as a percentage of their income, than wealthy individuals. This is because the rich are often

financially compensated with dividends which are taxed at a low capital gains tax, or because they use their shares as collateral to take out loans, meaning they can avoid income and capital gains tax entirely. The wealthy can also lower their taxes by hiring financial experts, and by paying specialists, such as lobbyists, to change the system itself, such as by modifying tax laws and introducing financial mechanisms. Revenue services that are underfunded because of tax avoidance, tax evasion, and neoliberal policies, may also not have the funds necessary to go after those who evade taxes, giving the rich an even greater advantage.

- Those in poverty nearly always have fewer opportunities and a lower quality of life because they usually live in areas with underfunded infrastructures and services.
- Those in poverty are more likely to live in areas which corporations are unwilling to invest in, such as by building stores or high-quality internet infrastructure, because it is unprofitable for them to do so, or less profitable than other ventures. This can obviously exacerbate many problems faced by the poor.
- Those in poverty move homes more regularly on average, which can put increased strain on their time, energy, money, etc.
- Those in poverty are more likely to live in poor-quality properties, which can incur additional costs. For example, such properties are more likely to have thinner walls and less insulation, which can necessitate higher heating bills. These properties are also usually more vulnerable to dampness, leaks, and flooding, which can incur both financial and health costs.
- Those in poverty are more likely to be victims of crime, including violent crimes, and consequently suffer with regards to their wealth, time, physical health, and mental wellbeing, among other things. Those in poverty are also more likely to live in neighborhoods where the possibility of crime feels more tangible and likely, creating additional stress. Those in poverty are also more likely to illegally

carry weapons to protect themselves, which increases the likelihood of being criminally prosecuted, meaning these individuals can also be considered victims of crime.

- Those in poverty are more likely to have a family member in prison for crimes originating from poverty, meaning families living in poverty are more likely to have an essential income earner incarcerated. This problem is often exacerbated by an inability to afford a lawyer, and instead having to rely upon overworked public defenders, who realistically may only be able to contribute a few minutes of their time to each of their cases. This means that those in poverty are also more likely to suffer harsher sentences.

- Those in poverty are more likely to have criminal records, which can affect their career prospects for the rest of their lives, even after paying their dues to society. Wealthy individuals are more likely to have social connections that negate any damage to their career, or possess enough wealth to reduce or eliminate their need to work.

- Those in poverty are more likely to suffer from the consequences of wealth inequality. Research has shown that wealth inequality causes societal problems beyond those caused by poverty alone. Wealth inequality increases infant mortality, child abuse, teenage pregnancy, physical health problems, mental health problems, substance abuse, deaths of despair, crime, fundamentalism, and terrorism. Wealth inequality also decreases school attendance, self-reported happiness, life expectancy, social capital, economic mobility, economic growth, and government revenue. Wealth inequality can also make goods and services more expensive in cases where companies can increase their profits by catering to smaller wealthier demographics than larger poorer demographics.

There are numerous other complex real-world challenges that arise from living in poverty, particularly for children, but these examples provide a decent overall impression. As should now be obvious, poverty is not merely a lack of money, but is a persistent state of

existence that results in significantly diminished time, energy, safety, physical health, mental health, intelligence, cultural capital, social capital, opportunities, and many other problems that affect every part of people's lives and wellbeing. And none of these aforementioned problems even address victims of racism, sexism, homophobia, transphobia, xenophobia, etc. who are consequently even more likely to suffer from poverty or worse forms of poverty. Nor do these problems address those with severe disabilities, who under capitalism are statistically substantially more likely to be victims of poverty, including homelessness.

To make matters worse, all of these problems don't exist in isolation, but instead overlap and exacerbate one another, creating harmful feedback loops that are exceptionally difficult or even impossible to overcome. Even those above the poverty line are often just one accident away from falling into these unavoidable life destroying poverty traps. Worse still, under capitalism a person can work hard and make all the right decisions and yet still end up in poverty. Additionally, despite what intuition would have many believe, being poor is far more expensive than being rich. The poor cannot buy in bulk, they cannot purchase long-lasting high-quality goods, they are more likely to take on loans with excessive interest rates, they are more likely to pay overdraft fees, they are more likely to have expensive health problems, and they are more likely to suffer during economic downturns, to name some common examples. This is what is meant by the expression "the high cost of poverty".

In contrast to all this, those born into wealth often have advantages and opportunities that make it highly likely for them to experience beneficial feedback loops, even with little to no effort on their part. The most common example of this is passive income, such as in the form of shareholder dividends, interest on savings, received rent payments, and other forms of theft. The best means of acquiring wealth as an adult also correlate with being born into wealth, such as having a high-quality education, spending a lot of time with parents, and not suffering from malnutrition or stress during childhood. Another consequence of all of these real-world dynamics is that those

born into wealth will often have dozens of opportunities to fail and try again, which is not a possibility afforded to most people born into poverty.

The existence of poverty traps does not mean it is impossible for anyone to escape poverty under capitalism. Nor does it mean that people cannot develop an unhealthy victim mentality or learned helplessness, which can unnecessarily hinder their ability to prosper. Nor does it mean that people born into wealth can never descend into poverty. However, these outliers are nothing more than examples of cherry picking. They don't change the fact that poverty shouldn't exist, and that poverty traps make it exceptionally difficult to escape poverty, and even impossible in certain circumstances. The idea that people just need to work harder to escape poverty not only demonstrates gross economic illiteracy, but also staggering naïvety with regards to the completely unnecessary yet incredibly challenging and compounding hardships faced by those living in poverty. Consequently, economic factors must be recognized as the predominant determinants of the trajectory of people's lives. This point cannot be overstated. Most uneducated and violent drug dealers around the world would likely be educated, affluent, and respected members of society if only they had spent their entire lives, and particularly their childhood, under democratic socialism.

Conclusion

Despite exponential technological advancements, most people alive today have a worse daily existence than even many people who lived in tribes thousands of years ago. This is particularly true for victims of imperialism, and especially debt trapping, in underdeveloped countries, despite what capitalists, and particularly the incredibly dishonest New Optimism movement, would like people to believe. However, even in developed countries adults and children suffer terribly and are rarely able to prosper because of capitalism, and especially because of the costs of poverty and the cycle of poverty that are inevitably caused or exacerbated by capitalism.

Animals

This section will explore how animals are treated under capitalism, and particularly within the animal agriculture industry. Before doing so however, it is necessary to explore the foundational issue of morality. Without an objective system of morality, it is not possible to determine the rights of animals, and thus it is not possible to fully appreciate the immorality of their mistreatment under capitalism.

Sentience morality

The moral system proposed here is an original concept that the founders of The Xova Movement have chosen to call "sentience morality". This moral system can be understood as a part of sentientism, which is the belief that sentience should be the foundation of any moral system, and that the wellbeing of all conscious beings capable of experiencing suffering and pleasure must therefore be at the center of all moral considerations. To place these two ideas into context, sentientism can be understood as the belief, while sentience morality can be understood as the philosophical framework that logically proves the irrefutability of sentientism.

It is understandable that the subject of morality may appear to be a complex, nebulous, contentious, or esoteric one. There are numerous moral systems proposed by different philosophies and religious texts, and many of these conflict with one another. These moral systems, and particularly religious ones, have also given rise to innumerable interpretations, resulting in even further confusion. There is also no universally agreed upon moral system even among modern academics who study and teach the subject of morality. Despite this, an irrefutable moral system does exist, and it is inherent to the very nature of sentience. All of this is proven by sentience morality.

The first step to determining truth, particularly in fields outside of science, is to use a first principles approach. This involves first

acknowledging only that which is self-evidently true, and then extrapolating all further conclusions from these truths. The 5 following logical premises are all self-evident truths from which sentience morality can be derived.

- Premise 1

“The only thing that we, as sentient beings, can be certain exists, is our own sentience. This also includes certainty of our displeasure or enjoyment of particular sentient experiences, including emotional and physical pain and pleasure.”

This premise is effectively describing solipsism, which is the philosophical idea that the self is the only thing which anyone can be certain exists. This idea is irrefutable. It is not even possible to state that we can trust our senses, since it is possible that we live in a simulated reality. This is such a fundamental truth that it even applies to any and all gods that could possibly exist. If it is true that a god exists outside of the known universe, it is also possible that this god also exists within the same simulated reality as us, just at a higher level. In other words, it is possible that the god of this universe is a sentient being who believes they are a god, and potentially the only god, but who was in fact created by a higher being who imbued them with false memories and false powers. And this higher being could themselves have been created by an even greater higher being and also be unaware of this. It is therefore impossible for any god to know what is true beyond their own sentience, even if that god was the one and only god.

- Premise 2

“All identical sentient experiences must be considered of equal value regardless of which sentient being is experiencing them.”

This must be considered true by default, since even if identical sentient experiences differ in value depending on the sentient being experiencing them, this will always be impossible to know. Consider that if two random playing cards are placed upside-down, and it is not possible to know the value of each card, neither card can be

considered of greater value than the other, meaning both cards must be treated equally for all intents and purposes, even if they are different in every other respect. The same is also true of sentient experiences, because sentience can never be observed, and thus can never be measured. It is certainly true that scientific enquiry can be used to determine the extent of a person's conscious awareness, and even correlate particular brain regions with particular sentient states. However, sentience itself cannot be observed, and thus all identical sentient experiences must be considered equal regardless of the sentient being experiencing them. If humans deem physical agony to be morally abhorrent, then physical agony must also be deemed equally morally abhorrent when suffered by other sentient beings, no matter how dissimilar they are to humans in other ways.

This argument is further supported by the fact that the value attributed to sentient experiences cannot be changed by any secondary trait. A person's desire to never experience agonizing pain will never change regardless of what else could be changed about them, such as their intelligence, age, maturity, experiences, anatomy, and biology. If a god was to transplant the sentience of a human into that of an animal, or somehow transplant this human's sentience into an endless void without any physical form, and this person then experienced the same agony that comes from being physically tortured, they would hate this agony just as much as if they were in their original human body. And so because the value sentient beings attribute to their sentient experiences can never change because of secondary traits, this also means the different secondary traits of other sentient beings can also never change the value that must be attributed to their sentient experiences. If the sentient experience of physical agony is deemed morally abhorrent, then this will always remain true regardless of the sentient being that experiences this.

- Premise 3

"If there is a reasonable possibility that something that appears sentient is in fact sentient, then it must be assumed to be sentient."

It is possible that our own sentience is the only sentience in this universe. It is possible that whoever is reading this is living in a simulated reality, and that all other apparently sentient beings are merely artificial representations of sentient beings. If this is true, then there would be no ethical problem with inflicting bodily harm on any humans or animals, since they would all be entirely artificial. Despite this possibility, for the sake of self-preservation it is essential that everyone err on the side of caution and assume all apparently sentient beings are sentient. This is because any moral system must apply equally to all sentient beings, meaning that the rights we give ourselves, including the right to never be harmed by others who believe we are not sentient, must apply equally to all beings that appear to possess sentience.

- Premise 4

“Inherent to the nature of fulfillment and pleasure is the desire to experience further fulfillment and pleasure.”

Experiences of fulfillment and pleasure elicit the desire for further fulfillment and pleasure, even if that fulfillment and pleasure takes different forms, or is achieved through different means, across time. This is one of the reasons why murder is immoral, because it prevents sentient beings from experiencing future fulfillment and pleasure. The murder of any sentient being that appears capable of experiencing fulfillment and pleasure must therefore be recognized as immoral.

- Premise 5

“The only morality that can exist is one derived from sentience.”

Sentience is the only thing in all of existence that matters, which means that sentient beings are the only things that matter with regards to morality. If a moral system does not suit the needs and wants of sentient beings, then it serves no purpose. Morality can therefore only be determined by studying the nature of sentience. The most obvious and irrefutable deduction that can be made by studying sentience is that sentient beings abhor suffering and enjoy

fulfillment and pleasure. So if morality derives from sentience, this means suffering ought to be minimized, and fulfillment and pleasure ought to be maximized, for every sentient being. Even if a god existed, and the moral system he ordered people to obey permitted or endorsed the agonizing suffering of all sentient beings, this moral system would be invalid. This is because the first 3 premises of sentience morality irrefutably prove that a moral system must apply to all sentient beings, meaning that this god would also have to be willing to endure this same agonizing suffering, which a sentient god never would. Consequently, morality could never be determined by a god no matter how powerful, intelligent, or "ultimate", that god was. In other words, morality is so universal and irrefutable that it must even encompass any and all gods.

One consequence of the fact that morality is universal and irrefutable is that words like good and evil are objective terms, rather than subjective terms as is often assumed. In fact, the terms good and evil are capable of being more irrefutably objective than most words in existence. Just as the existence of our own sentience is the most irrefutably objective truth in all of existence, so too is the truth that sentient beings abhor suffering and enjoy fulfillment and pleasure. And if the words "good" and "evil" can be used as moral descriptors of these experiences, particularly when these experiences are caused by the actions of others, then within the context of the previous 5 premises, "good" and "evil" can be considered two of the most irrefutably objective terms in existence.

These 5 first principle premises provide a primitive yet irrefutable basis for morality. This moral framework effectively dictates that we must give all sentient beings the exact same rights we give ourselves. If we want other sentient beings to treat us how we want to be treated, then all other sentient beings must be treated how they want to be treated. Incidentally, sentience morality also works in harmony with John Rawls "veil of ignorance", which effectively acknowledges that a system can only be moral if it accounts for everyone that has to live under that system. Sentience morality

could be understood as the logical foundation of the “veil of ignorance”, since sentience morality proves the required presupposition that everyone must be treated equally.

Sentience morality clarifications

Before continuing, there are a few potential criticisms of sentience morality that need to be addressed.

- Clarification 1

Sentience morality is not disproven by Hume’s Guillotine (a.k.a. the “is-ought problem”). Hume’s Guillotine basically states that what “ought” to occur cannot be determined by what “is”, or in other words what is morally right or wrong cannot be determined by what occurs in reality. This means that according to Hume’s Guillotine, just because something is desirable, this desirability cannot be used to determine whether or not indulging in this desire is morally right or wrong. Despite how highly respected Hume’s Guillotine is, it does not disprove sentience morality. Even though the 5 statements that constitute sentience morality are effectively all “is” statements, these are all first principle statements that describe irrefutable truths about sentience, and because sentience is the foundation from which morality must derive, Hume’s Guillotine is made meaningless and invalid as far as this foundation is concerned. In other words, sentience morality essentially fills a morality vacuum that nothing else could ever fill, meaning Hume’s Guillotine either does not apply to sentience morality, or Hume’s Guillotine invalidates all forms of morality, in which case it is entirely redundant as a practical concept.

- Clarification 2

Sentience morality does not contain the naturalistic fallacy, which is the false assumption that something must be good if it produces a positive experience, and must be bad if it produces a negative experience. Sentience morality proves that morality must derive from sentience, but this does not mean that individual positive and negative experiences are morally good and bad, respectively, because in the real-world specific experiences can produce

consequences that contradict the nature of the initial experience. For example, if the argument was made that taking strong recreational drugs was always good because this maximizes fulfillment and pleasure, this would be a naturalistic fallacy, since under many circumstances strong recreational drugs can lead to addiction and other negative consequences. Conversely, sentience morality would permit the use of strong recreational drugs only if the initial and long-term consequences maximized fulfillment and pleasure for all sentient beings concerned. Therefore the naturalistic fallacy does not apply to sentience morality.

- Clarification 3

Sentience morality does not attempt to address specific instances where good and evil must be weighed up against one another, such as whether or not a temporary evil can justify a long-term good. Such instances can only be determined on a case by case basis, which is true of every moral system.

- Clarification 4

Sentient beings have the right to experience fulfillment and pleasure, but this does not mean they always have a right to the particular things they personally require to experience fulfillment and pleasure. For example, a person may only be able to experience fulfillment and pleasure by living the lifestyle of a millionaire, but this doesn't mean they have the right to the money required to live this lifestyle because of this fact alone.

- Clarification 5

Theistic religions may be considered a better foundation for morality because they include a form of judgment in the afterlife that can deter people from behaving immorally. The problem is that this does not mean these moral systems are valid, only that they can better encourage particular behaviors. This is obviously irrelevant, since a person's willingness or unwillingness to abide by a moral system has nothing to do with whether or not that system is moral or valid. Additionally, practically all theistic religions encourage the adoption

of at least some immoral beliefs and practices, which is a problem sentience morality entirely avoids.

- Clarification 6

Sentience morality only claims the equality of sentience, and the equality of identical sentient experiences. It does not address the different degrees to which sentience can occur. If scientific enquiry determines that a tiny insect is sentient, but does not have a neural network that is sophisticated enough for it to experience suffering or pleasure, then its sentience should not be considered equal to that of a human's sentience. However, if an animal can reasonably be assumed or determined to be capable of experiencing suffering or pleasure, then its experiences of suffering and pleasure must be considered of equal importance to identical experiences of suffering and pleasure experienced by humans.

- Clarification 7

It has been proven thus far that all sentient experiences must be considered equal for all intents and purposes, and consequently all sentient beings capable of such experiences must be given equal value. However, under extremely rare circumstances, where the life of one sentient being must be waged against another, other relevant information can be taken into consideration.

If a situation arose where either a human or an animal had to be killed, most would place the life of the human above the life of the animal. In such exceptionally rare circumstances, it could be claimed that a human's intelligence, or their ability to appreciate art, would necessitate that their life be prioritized. However, even if such traits could be considered factors that modify the value of sentient beings, the resulting inequality between sentient beings would be so unquantifiable and negligible that it could only ever be considered relevant under such exceptional circumstances. This is proven by the fact that no human would be willing to have their rights taken away from them if this could at all be avoided. Our unwillingness would intensify even further if the reason our rights were being violated was simply to fulfill the temporary and unnecessary indulgences of

another sentient being. Therefore, regardless of any perceived inequality between humans and other sentient beings that is considered important within the context of exceptional circumstances, this does not change the equal value that must be attributed to all sentient beings outside of these exceptional circumstances.

- Clarification 8

The arguments presented thus far are irrefutable because they use logic and first principles. However, the infallibility of logic is sometimes doubted by those who believe god created logic, in which case they will also often argue that the moral system provided by their god must supersede humanity's understanding or use of logic. Disregarding for a moment that it is currently impossible to know god's will even if he does exist, this argument is flawed because it misunderstands where logic originates from.

Logic is effectively a conceptualization of reality at its deepest level, and not simply a subjective human construct based upon our understanding of our universe. This can be proven with a thought experiment. If god exists, then no matter how great his power is, even he cannot create a paradox, since otherwise it would be possible for him to exist and not exist simultaneously. And since logic is effectively the space between paradoxes, this means god is also bound by logic, rather than being the creator of the reality from which logic derives. In other words, logic derives from a meta-reality that is so all-encompassing that it must also encompass any and all gods. Even if god were to cease existing, logic would still persist as long as reality in any form continued to exist. Additionally, logic is also knowable to humans without requiring anything from within our universe. This is because human consciousness is experienced as a singular experience, which can be described using the numerical value 1, which means mathematics exists and can be formulated as long as consciousness exists. And because mathematics is effectively one interpretation of logic, this means logic exists and can also be formulated as long as consciousness exists. God is therefore not required for logic to exist, nor is he required to understand logic,

which means that sentience morality remains irrefutable regardless of whether or not god exists.

Animal welfare

Sentience morality irrefutably proves that animals are entitled to the same rights we give ourselves. Their behavior reveals a sentience that is identical to ours in all the ways that are relevant. Animals with complete autonomy will always move away from anything that causes them physical harm, and move towards sources of protection and comfort. Pet owners and farmers can also attest to the clear signs of contentment and excitement animals express around those that regularly show them affection. Animals are also capable of developing loving relationships with other animals, including those of different species, and can even be willing to sacrifice their own physical wellbeing to protect them. It is therefore irrefutably immoral to treat animals in ways that we would not want to be treated ourselves.

This is also true of small animals, who some have argued are less “advanced”, and whose suffering is therefore less important because of this. The size of an animal is of little importance, since this tells us little about their ability to have sentient experiences, and particularly their ability to suffer. Even docile and friendly animals that are extremely small, such as mice, can exhibit fast and violent aversion responses when inflicted with pain by something as small as a needle. This is unsurprising, since sticking a fine needle 5 millimeters under one’s own fingernail can quickly prove how even the activation of just a few thousand neurons is enough to cause unimaginably excruciating physical pain. If small animals are potentially capable of sentience, then sentience morality, which includes the precautionary principle, proves that humans must error on the side of caution, and treat with utmost importance the wellbeing of even small animals that are affected by human activity.

The problem of animal suffering however is made potentially more horrific because of numerous additional factors. First, animals rely on

their senses far more than humans, and consequently often have extremely heightened senses. For example, many animals have a substantially stronger sense of smell than humans, meaning the scent of excrement could potentially be more overwhelming and unpleasant for certain animals than for humans. However, even if some animals were demonstrably proven to have less sensitive senses than humans, this would still not justify their abuse and suffering, just as we would never accept needless abuse and suffering ourselves no matter how minor.

Second, animals are likely able to experience negative emotions to a substantially greater extent than adults can truly understand. Children are far more susceptible to fear and terror, and generally experience such negative emotions to a far greater extent than adults. Considering animals are far more similar to young children than adults, the fear and terror animals experience may be so overwhelming that it is far beyond what adults are capable of imagining. Additionally, most adults go through their entire lives without ever experiencing or fearing the types of circumstances animals experience, making it even more difficult for most adults to adequately empathize with animals.

Third, suffering may be worse for animals because humans at least have the cognitive capabilities to reduce their suffering using certain psychological techniques. For example, humans often use their imagination as a form of escapism to alleviate suffering. Victims of torture often develop this technique after experiencing prolonged abuse, and similar techniques are sometimes taught to soldiers and spies. It may be that such techniques are unavailable to animals, making any anguish they experience all the more overwhelming and inescapable.

Fourth, humans have the intellectual ability to reduce their own suffering by putting it into context. Adult humans can experience some semblance of relief knowing that their anguish is temporary, either because the problem in question can be resolved, or because of the inevitability of death. Animals may have no such

comprehension, and thus experience no such relief. If an animal has no comprehension of death, it may effectively believe that its suffering will be eternal. This conceptualization of eternity may be similar to a baby who has yet to develop object permanence, and who consequently assumes that their mother has left them forever upon their mother leaving their sight. Some animals may even fear that their suffering will worsen in the future.

Fifth, adult humans can develop high self-value and a strong conviction of being loved, which can provide incredible strength and peace of mind during times of hardship. This additional tolerance is something factory farm animals either cannot develop, or do not have the opportunity to develop. It may even be possible that farm animals can develop the conviction that they deserve their suffering, just as abused children often develop similar convictions.

In summary, the pain and fear animals can experience may far exceed what adult humans are capable of comprehending. Humans are incapable of returning to a childlike mindset once they have reached adulthood, and thus become incapable of fully remembering and appreciating how truly terrifying pain and fear can be from the perspective of an innocent, naïve, childlike sentient being.

To make the moral implications of animal abuse even worse is the issue of power dynamics. The abuse of those with less power is rightly considered a greater evil than the abuse of those with equal power. This is why the abuse of children universally conjures up levels of disgust and anger far greater than equal forms of abuse perpetrated against adults. This is likely because children have no way of protecting themselves, and because they lack the ability to contextualize and rationalize their own suffering in a way that may ease it. Regardless of the reasons, the greater the vulnerability of a victim of abuse, the greater the evilness of the abuse.

With all of this considered, the systematic and widespread abuse of farm animals must be recognized as a great evil. The sentience and vulnerability of farm animals is for all intents and purposes identical

to that of young human children. In fact their defenselessness is even greater, since their verbal signs of distress are less natural to human ears, and hence less likely to be interpreted accurately, or elicit the same degree of empathy and urgency that parents experience upon hearing the distressed cries of their young children.

With this information in mind, the suffering that animals experience within the animal agriculture industry can now be summarized and better appreciated. It is important to acknowledge that between 95% to 99% of all animal produce comes from farm animals that experience abuse, and most of these abuses also occur on free-range and organic farms. Video footage proving the existence of the following abuses can be found online. It is also worth keeping in mind that all of the following instances of abuse are ideal outcomes under capitalism, because they allow companies to maximize their profits and fulfill the primary desires of consumers, which will always be the two highest priorities under capitalism. Additionally, for the sake of improving emotional and intellectual comprehension of the following facts, the term "farm animals" will be replaced with the term "cats and dogs", since these two animals are not only identical to farm animals for all intents and purposes, but are valued and empathized with by humans appropriately. The term "kittens and puppies" would also be applicable in most instances as well.

- Cats and dogs are often separated from their offspring long before this would occur naturally, including before they have even finished nursing. It is extremely common for both parent and offspring to show overt signs of extreme distress during this, as well as for days or weeks afterwards.
- Cats and dogs are often transported in metal containers that can reach extremely high temperatures, and are sometimes forced to stay in these cramped containers for over a dozen hours at a time. Many cats and dogs die every year during transportation because of this problem.
- Cats and dogs are often shackled with metal chains that bruise, cut into, or flay their skin.

- Cats and dogs are often branded using burning hot metal and without anesthetics.
- Cats and dogs often have their tails cut off without anesthetics.
- Cats and dogs are often given nose and ear piercings without anesthetics.
- Cats and dogs often have the tips of their noses cut off without anesthetics, and have their teeth pulled out with pliers without anesthetics. This is predominantly done to hinder their ability to attack and cannibalize other cats and dogs, which commonly occurs because of the extreme stress and hunger they experience.
- Cats and dogs are often deliberately starved to increase productivity.
- Cats and dogs are often genetically modified to the extent that they develop physical deformities, which can cause them physical pain, immobility problems, paralysis, and can even cause them to slowly suffocate to death.
- Cats and dogs often suffer injuries because of unnecessarily dangerous environmental conditions.
- Cats and dogs are often abused via physical beatings and stun guns if they try to run away or if their sluggish movements slow down production.
- Cats and dogs are often dragged along the floor by their legs or neck when moved from one location to another.
- Cats and dogs are often pushed, punched, kicked, and hit with metal objects, as a form of "stress relief" by workers who struggle with the immense stress of their line of work.
- Cats and dogs often develop painful medical conditions, such as inflammation, abscesses, pressure sores, and infected wounds. These conditions often go untreated, resulting in bleeding, infection, rotting skin, and further complications.
- Cats and dogs often become prone to illnesses because their stressful and unnecessarily toxic living conditions compromise their immune systems.
- Cats and dogs often have to endure unreasonably cold temperatures because of inadequate shelter or heating, which they would otherwise not experience had they never been unnecessarily born to begin with.

- Cats and dogs sometimes die in fires as a consequence of malfunctioning heating systems.
- Cats and dogs are often kept in dark windowless sheds for their entire lives.
- Cats and dogs are often kept in conditions too cramped for them to even stand or move.
- Cats and dogs often live their lives covered in the waste of the cats and dogs living in the cages above them.
- Cats and dogs are often forced to sit on, and breathe in, high levels of ammonia. This can cause burns and blisters to their skin, as well as damage to their lungs. They also have to keep their eyes closed permanently or for prolonged periods to stop them from stinging from such toxic chemicals.
- Cats and dogs often have to sit and sleep next to the corpses of the animals they are forced to live in cramped conditions with, and which may not be cleaned out for several days.
- Cats and dogs often have severe difficulty walking, or are unable to walk entirely, as a consequence of problems such as physical exhaustion, nutrient deficiency, growth hormones, and muscle deterioration. Their legs can also break, and even snap in half, because of the brittleness of their bones.
- Cats and dogs often show signs of extreme distress, such as crying tears, whimpering, wailing, shaking, and banging their heads repeatedly against the metal bars of their enclosures.
- Cats and dogs are often forced to live their entire lives in environments where they hear the never-ending whimpering and wailing of dozens or hundreds of other cats and dogs around them.
- Cats and dogs often die young, and even in their teens, most commonly as a consequence of organ failure and general ill-health.
- Cats and dogs have substantially reduced lifespans on average even when discounting those that die young. Some live on average one quarter of their natural lifespan.
- Cats and dogs that are too cramped or exhausted to move, and are too malnourished or ill to produce enough milk for their offspring, will often have their nipples gnawed at by their starving offspring to the point of causing bleeding, severe lacerations, and the tearing off of skin.

- Cats and dogs are commonly attacked and eaten alive by other adult cats and dogs that are suffering from malnourishment or severe stress.
- Cats and dogs are often stuffed into bags, which are then dumped into landfill sites, while they are still alive. Many of these cats and dogs are crushed to death, or die slowly from asphyxiation or starvation.
- Cats and dogs often cry tears and scream as they are being killed.
- Cats and dogs are often strung up by one leg or two of their legs, while conscious, when it is time for them to be killed. These cats and dogs often thrash violently while they are hung upside-down.
- Cats and dogs are often killed by having their throats slit open while they are still conscious, and this is practically never done with anesthetics. It is not uncommon for cats and dogs to vomit out of their mouths and the slits in their throat after this is done to them. Cats and dogs can remain conscious and continue to experience pain for well over a minute after their throat has been slit open.
- Cats and dogs are often picked up by their hind legs and are flung against the floor in order to kill them, which often doesn't succeed on the first attempt.
- Cats and dogs are often intentionally killed by being beaten over the head with hammers or similar metal objects.
- Cats and dogs are often boiled to death as they are dropped into vats of scalding hot water if previous killing methods fail to serve their purpose, which is not uncommon.
- Cats and dogs often have their bodies hacked up and dismembered while they are still alive if previous killing methods fail to work, or if killing procedures are skipped entirely due to tight production schedules, which is not uncommon.
- Cats and dogs are often gassed to death, but rather than being painless, these gases cause them to suffocate to death, while simultaneously acidifying the liquid in their eyes, nostrils, mouths, throats, and lungs, creating the sensation of being burned alive from the inside. Cats and dogs whine and howl in pain and frantically try to escape during this process, which can last more than a minute.
- Cats and dogs are often electrocuted to death. Sometimes this doesn't immediately kill them, often resulting in them experiencing

excruciating physical pain, as confirmed by humans who have experienced electrocution.

- Cats and dogs are often killed by being shredded alive. For many cats and dogs this does not work instantly, and they are left mutilated and mangled while they die slowly.

If tomorrow a warehouse was discovered in which thousands of cats and dogs were being abused in the same ways described above, it would be closed down instantly, and the world would demand that the sociopaths responsible be punished to the fullest extent of the law, or even well beyond. In fact there have been numerous instances during the history of the internet where videos depicting the abuse of a single cat or dog have culminated in global collaborative manhunts to identify and arrest the perpetrators, and often with successful results.

However, when tens of billions of animals are forced to suffer these abuses, most people will either do nothing practical to reduce their role in perpetuating it, or go to extreme lengths to defend it, as long as these animals can make food slightly more flavorful. This lack of universal outrage, and the lack of any meaningful action towards ending this manufactured hell on Earth, reveals a societal cognitive dissonance that is too unfathomably extreme to comprehend or adequately put into words. This demonstrates the immense dangers of founding any economic system on profits and consumer indulgences, rather than on the inalienable rights and needs of all sentient life.

All of the abuses addressed thus far also only include those inflicted upon land animals. Every year hundreds of billions of fish are grown at fish farms, and often in the most horrific circumstances imaginable. These fish are commonly slowly eaten alive by sea lice, causing their underlying flesh and bones to become exposed even as they continue to swim around, and causing the skin around these wounds to fester and rot. And research has shown that fish have the physiological components necessary to experience physical anguish and pain. Sentience morality means humanity must err on the side of

caution and treat these fish the same way we expect owners to treat small household pets.

Wild marine animals are also treated similarly cruelly. Industrial fishing vessels use sonar devices which cause immense distress, pain, and harm, to marine animals. Industrial fishing also involves intentionally suffocating to death, or butchering to death, millions of wild sharks, whales, dolphins, and other large marine animals, every single year. Sharks are often caught specifically for their fins, which are cut off the shark while it is still alive, before it is thrown back into the ocean, leaving it to die an agonizing death. These large marine animals are also caught unintentionally as bycatch during the fishing of other species, but these animals either suffocate to death, or end up too mutilated to survive once released back into the ocean.

Even putting aside the suffering of marine animals, which is less well known, most people still try to defend purchasing animal products even though they are aware that animals are rarely treated ethically within the animal agriculture industry. The most common argument is that this is justifiable as long as the animal in question has been treated ethically. The obvious problem with this argument is that it is practically impossible in most circumstances to guarantee this due to propaganda and inadequacies within the industry, including the corruption and incompetence of regulators. Corporations regularly engage in the most disgusting forms of humane washing, including using completely deceptive labels like "ethical", "humane", "cage-free", "pasture raised", "free-range", "natural", "organic", and "hormone-free". In reality these terms have no legal definition, or their legal definitions are so broad or vague as to be meaningless, or the requirements necessary to meet these legal definitions are so pitiful as to be useless. Animals that are packaged with these labels practically always experience most or all of the horrific abuses previously described. Even if farms do have appropriate protocols and regulations in place, farmers and slaughterhouse workers have such tight deadlines that these protocols and regulations are regularly disregarded. And even in instances where animals are treated ethically in some areas, this counts for nothing if these

animals suffer in other ways. Sometimes animals are even unable to take advantage of humane provisions because of their unethical treatment, such as animals that are technically given the opportunity to go outside but are unable to do so because they are too weak, deformed, or in too much pain, to be able to walk.

Purchasing animal products is simply not worth the risk considering sentience morality and the incredible risks animals are exposed to. No parent would risk taking their child to a location where they knew there was a 10% chance that their child could experience extreme emotional suffering and agonizing physical pain, let alone the substantially higher chance that exists in the animal agriculture industry. Similarly, no human whose consciousness was transplanted into the body of a farm animal would ever tolerate humans taking such a risk with their wellbeing, particular for something as unnecessary as slightly tastier food. In fact if a meat-eater knew that in a years' time they would be endlessly reincarnated as factory farm animals until the industry was brought to an end, they would dedicate that year to tirelessly fighting to end the industry, and would be outraged at the apathy and cruelty of those who attempted to justify and perpetuate it. Sentience morality proves that this is the same outrage that everyone should have towards the industry.

Even if animals could be guaranteed to live ethically and be killed ethically, this would still be immoral because of sentience morality. In fact this moral judgment is already widely accepted, since most people would think it immoral to breed and kill puppies and kittens for human consumption, even if this was done ethically. Despite this, some people have attempted to argue that raising farm animals under idyllic circumstances, and killing them ethically, would increase the number of happy sentient beings in the world, and would therefore be justified. If this argument was true, then it would also be morally justifiable to breed and raise humans in idyllic settings up until they are 30 years old, only to then transport them to what they and their loved ones believed to be an even more idyllic location, and then have them painlessly killed in their sleep so that their meat and organs could be harvested for consumption. This would increase the

number of happy sentient beings on the planet, and yet everyone would agree this system would be evil beyond comprehension. Similarly, if hyper-intelligent and hyper-advanced aliens did this to humans, this would also be deemed unjustifiable by all humans.

Another argument defending the industry is that the rights of other sentient beings only need to be respected if those sentient beings also respect our rights. For example, if a species is willing to inflict harm upon humans, then humans do not need to be morally concerned about inflicting harm on this species. This is obviously an unfair standard to place on all sentient beings, and is one that can only reasonably be enforced on human adults with robust cognitive faculties. An adult with extremely severe learning difficulties would not be deemed deserving of retribution, let alone abuse or death, if they inflicted harm upon others. Similarly, no human would consider it fair if they were tortured or killed because of their inability to comprehend something they are incapable of comprehending.

This can be more easily understood with a thought experiment. If an initially peaceful alien race visited Earth, but some humans attacked them because they mistakenly saw them as a threat, or for some other reason that arose from our inability to understand them, we would not consider it justifiable if the aliens retaliated by forcibly breeding, abusing, torturing, and murdering billions of adults and children because of our lack of comprehension. Feeling justified in inflicting harm on a sentient being because it is unable to achieve a standard that it is fundamentally incapable of achieving is pseudo-intellectualism at its most sadistic. This argument is made even more repulsive by the fact that it is applied to farm animals, most of which are herbivores, and none of which pose any immediate threat to humans. In fact most farm animals are extremely gentle creatures. Self-defense against a single animal is justifiable, but systematically breeding, abusing, torturing, and murdering billions of animals outside of this context is obviously completely indefensible.

Another argument defending the industry's existence is that it is necessary for providing jobs to millions, and thus must be

maintained. Putting aside the fact that a high employment rate is only a necessity because of capitalism, this argument can also easily be refuted. First, even under capitalism this argument is illogical, because if consumers transitioned to veganism, then this would create jobs within the vegan industry. In fact this would create more jobs since the vegan industry has more opportunities for new businesses, and is less monopolized and streamlined than the animal agriculture industry. Second, if such animal abuse was being perpetrated against cats or dogs, the industry would be brought to an end immediately. No one in society would dare argue for the continued abuse of cats or dogs just for the sake of high employment numbers. All job losses and subsequent social safety nets would be deemed a necessary evil by society, and all costs required to compensate and retrain workers in alternative industries would be perceived as inconsequential compared to the barbarism that had been eradicated. Perhaps unsurprisingly the fear of job losses was also an argument used in the past to justify slavery and to reduce the speed of its abolition, and just like today as in the past, this argument is as cruel as it is economically nonsensical.

Some people have also argued that they don't need to take personal responsibility for their small contribution to this animal abuse because of the massive number of consumers that already contribute to the industry. This argument is obviously flawed. First, the industry is only the size that it is because of consumer demand, and every consumer is responsible for creating this demand. Second, it is obviously not necessary to be able to measure the effect of a consumer's purchasing choices in order to know for certain that their purchases have had an effect. If every person chose inaction in every circumstance where the consequences of their actions could not be directly measured, then society would cease to function. No one would ever vote during elections, no one would ever donate to charity, and no one would ever recycle. Third, the scale of any problem does not negate or dilute one's personal responsibility for contributing to that problem. If this was not true, then it would be possible for anyone to justify paying an adult to sexually abuse a child, since they could argue that one additional instance of sexual

abuse is “negligible” compared to the tens of millions of children sexually abused every year. Despite this, many people still argue that individuals don’t need to take any personal responsibility for funding the suffering of animals within the industry.

Another similar defense is that the animal agriculture industry is just one of many unethical consumer industries, and therefore just as it’s not possible to address all forms of unethical consumption, nor should anyone feel compelled to address any particular form of unethical consumption. This argument is a perfect example of disingenuously allowing “the perfect to be the enemy of the good”. Just because consumers exist within an economic system that makes ethical consumption difficult or impossible under most circumstances, this is clearly not an excuse for abdicating all personal responsibility. Some unethical options are clearly substantially more unethical than others, and having no option but to make an unethical choice has never been justification for willfully ignoring the degree to which different options are unethical. Despite this, many people use the pervasiveness of unethical consumerism as a justification for abdicating their personal responsibility as consumers.

This problem is compounded by the fact that veganism is unique in the area of ethical consumption. This is because it exists on the extreme end of each of the four primary metrics that should be used for determining the ethicalness of different forms of consumption. The first metric is suffering. The agonizing suffering inflicted upon these innocent and childlike creatures is great enough for the animal agriculture industry to be deemed one of the most evil industries in existence. However even when agricultural animals do not experience suffering, which is extremely rare, killing them is still immoral as proven by sentience morality.

The second metric is complexity. Deciding whether or not to purchase a particular product or service can be an extremely complex problem. For example, refusing to purchase goods produced by child labor can be worse than the alternative. This is because child workers are so impoverished they have no choice but to work, even

when they could potentially attend school. This means that boycotts can push these children and their families into even greater financial desperation, or can force these children into more dangerous forms of labor. Veganism however is near unique in this regard, since it is easy to find vegan products that don't involve anywhere near as much horrendous abuse as that which occurs within the animal agriculture industry.

The third metric is necessity. Walking or riding a bike may be more ethical than driving a car because it is less harmful to the environment and human health. However, living without a car, particularly for commuting, is unfeasible or impossible for most people. Veganism on the other hand is one of the easiest forms of ethical consumption to transition to for most people, particularly considering how expensive meat can be even when it is heavily subsidized. As proven by the highest quality scientific research, including high quality meta-analyses, vegan diets are more than capable of meeting all nutritional needs, and today there is a surplus of websites and books for those looking for an optimally healthy vegan diet. Veganism has also been shown to be appropriate for all stages of the lifecycle, including pregnancy, breast feeding, infancy, childhood, and adolescence, but does require research and planning during these stages, particularly with regards to the appropriate intake of protein, essential fatty acids, vitamin B12, vitamin D, iron, zinc, and calcium. And despite the common misconception, veganism has even been shown to be either viable or healthier for all dogs, and potentially viable for some or all cats, although as with humans this does require research and planning.

However, even more to the point is that animal-based diets are actually unhealthy for humans. Meat is responsible for debilitating and dangerous health problems, including heart diseases, strokes, diabetes, kidney stones, kidney failure, and various cancers. Animal fats are also known to increase the chance of developing numerous diseases. The World Health Organization even categorizes sausages, bacon, and processed meats, as carcinogenic, and red meats as possibly carcinogenic, which puts them in the same carcinogenic

category as asbestos and tobacco. Milk consumption is correlated with increased rates of osteoporosis and bone fractures in older adults, which incidentally is the opposite of what the dairy industry has been advertising for decades. Milk consumption can also increase the risk of prostate cancer and ovarian cancer. And none of these problems even include instances where people contract diseases from animal produce, such as when it is contaminated with animal waste and pus from infected wounds, which can include diseases such as E. coli. Vegan diets by contrast are capable of avoiding all of these problems. In fact it has even been estimated that 8 million premature deaths could be avoided every year if the world transitioned to veganism. Additionally, studies have shown that veganism can improve performance in exercises and activities related to endurance and strength. This is further supported by the numerous vegan bodybuilders and endurance athletes around the world that have broken world records.

The fourth metric is regularity. The more often a person purchases an unnecessary product, the more responsibility they have for ensuring that product is ethical in nature. Funding abuse on a regular basis is obviously worse than funding abuse on a less regular basis. Similarly, doing research into the ethicalness of a product that one consumes regularly is more reasonable and morally expected than doing research into a product of similar monetary value that one consumes less regularly.

The extreme position that veganism holds on all four of these metrics means that it is one of the most important ethical consumer choices any person can make. More pertinent still is that even though industrial animal abuse is to be expected under capitalism, and is among its worse externalities, it is still not a form of abuse that would necessarily be remediated by transitioning to any other economic system. Therefore, unlike many other problems caused or exacerbated by capitalism, ending industrial animal abuse cannot be delayed until such a time when capitalism ends, since there is no guarantee that this would bring an end to the industry, or even decrease its size. The only morally justifiable response is for

everyone to act as if the industry is filled entirely with cats and dogs, which is effectively the case for all ethical intents and purposes.

Unfortunately, the greatest problem is not a lack of awareness of abuses within the industry, but the levity with which these abuses are treated. In fact, defenses of the industry have escalated to such irrational and vitriolic extremes that even vegans are regularly mocked as annoying and self-righteous. This is despite the fact that most vegans enjoy the taste of animal produce just as much as anyone else, but choose to sacrifice this privilege in order to end the unimaginable suffering inflicted upon these animals. The ridiculing of vegans is another example of an extreme and sociopathic cognitive dissonance. Imagine if a child was kidnaped, brutalized over the course of months, and finally tortured to death, and videos depicting this abuse were released everyday by the perpetrators, creating an ongoing international news story in the process. If a celebrity or politician was secretly recorded saying the child's abuse barely mattered, and that those expressing compassion for the child and their family were annoying and self-righteous, they would immediately lose their job, they would be condemned internationally, and would most likely be subjected to physical violence and death threats for the rest of their life. If this situation was modified so that the kidnaped victim was a famous cat or dog from a well-known TV show, then the repercussions for the celebrity or politician would likely be little different. Despite this, when similar unimaginable horrors are inflicted upon not one, but billions of equally vulnerable, child-like sentient beings, vegans are widely mocked and ridiculed as annoying and self-righteous.

This absurdity has also manifested in many further illogical ways. Many critics condemn vegans for trying to make them feel guilty, as if people shouldn't feel guilty for funding the needless torturing of sentient creatures, and as if feeling guilt is in any way deserving of sympathy or consideration in this context. Some critics even act as if feeling guilt makes them the true victim in these situations. This focus on guilt wouldn't be tolerated if expressed by slave-owners, and nor should it be tolerated in this context. Many critics also

complain about vegans “forcing” their views on non-vegans, even though these same non-vegans are willing to force animals to experience unimaginable agony. Many criticize vegans for being too uncivil and demanding in their pursuit of ending industrial animal abuse, not realizing that these exact same criticisms were leveled against the civil rights movement during segregation, even as black people were being oppressed and brutalized on a mass scale. Many critics also regularly view eating meat as “manly”, and deride vegan men for being “unmanly”, even though abusing the vulnerable is quite possibly the least masculine thing any man can possibly do. In fact, if any man was discovered to be brutalizing their cat or dog, they would be condemned as weak and pathetic by these very same critics. Many of these same critics would even join vegans if they were trying to close down farms filled with brutalized cats and dogs.

In summary, humans never perform more extreme mental gymnastics than when defending their right to risk torturing innocent animals for the sake of slightly tastier food. Even otherwise considerate and kind people can immediately become cruelly irrational when discussing their funding of this animal brutality. This sociopathic behavior however is not natural, but is an artificially conditioned response. Allow young children to spend time interacting with cattle, pigs, sheep, and chickens, in an idealized setting, and then allow these children to observe these animals as they are forced to live on a modern factory farm and be killed at a modern slaughtering house, and even those who don't spend time with children know perfectly well how inconsolably distraught and upset these children would become. Children respond like this not because they are simple minded and uneducated, but because they have a natural empathy that has yet to be suppressed or programmed out of them by years of consumer propaganda and self-deception. Even adults possess this same natural empathy, but only towards certain animals, such as common household pets. If humans spent just as much time with farm animals as with traditional pets, and consequently truly understood their capacity for giving and receiving love, as well as their capacity for experiencing immense suffering, then adults likely wouldn't suffer such cognitive dissonance.

Unsurprisingly it is capitalism that is predominantly responsible for cultivating such sociopathic attitudes in adult consumers, because profits cannot be maximized unless consumers are convinced that their desires are of greater importance than anything else, including their innate humanity. Additionally, when people suffer from exhaustion, stress, hopelessness, etc. they are far less likely to have the emotional or mental stamina to fight for justice or refrain from indulging in certain comforts, including unethical ones.

There are also other forms of industrial animal abuse that occur outside of the animal agriculture industry and the fishing industry. Cruel forms of animal testing are still used in the pharmaceutical industry even when slightly more expensive alternatives are available. The palm oil industry, among others, is responsible for destroying the habitats and communities of highly social and intelligent animals, and bringing many species to the brink of extinction. The fashion industry is responsible for capturing, breeding, and abusing, millions of animals every year for fur production. Even today fur production continues to regularly involve flaying animals alive in order to save time, and this includes dogs, cats, and rabbits. Many zoos and marine parks are responsible for kidnaping young animals from their communities and natural habitats, and holding them captive in enclosed environments which are a fraction of the size their species are accustomed to in the wild. Many of these are captured and transported using inhumane methods, and large marine animals in particular often die in the process from injuries or shock. The animals that survive can experience a host of physical and psychological problems throughout their lives, including severe depression, and also suffer higher mortality rates. Some of these organizations do use their profits to fund wildlife preservation and research initiatives, but these are often inhumane and insufficient methods of funded such initiatives. And none of these institutional forms of animal abuse even include the other ways animals can suffer as a consequence of capitalism, such as underfunded rescue homes, pet owners who cannot afford necessary medical treatments, and pets that suffer from neglect or

physical mistreatment because of the severe yet unnecessary stress their owners suffer from.

Conclusion

If the term "pure evil" holds any genuine meaning, then speciesism, and the way animals are treated under capitalism, must surely constitute one form of its purest manifestation. Humans have succeeded at creating a hell on earth for billions of sentient creatures, and yet even today most "civil" societies are doing nothing to bring this to an end. Worse still, most consumers go to extreme lengths to defend their right to fund this abuse, even to the point of overt self-deception, while the vegans who protest against this animal brutality are ridiculed as annoying and self-righteous. This situation is not only unfathomably evil, but if suffering caused by humans can be used to determine evilness, then the modern animal agriculture industry is very likely the most evil initiative ever created.

The Holocaust during the Second World War is rightly acknowledged as one of the most evil initiatives of the past 100 years, and one of the most evil initiatives in all of human history. It is estimated that 6 million Jewish adults and children were murdered during the Holocaust. Currently the animal agriculture industry has over 70 billion sentient beings suffering similar emotional and physical agony on a daily basis, with 200 million being inhumanely killed every single day, and over 200 million more being born into this misery every single day. Even when adjusted for changes in demand over time, this equates to over 2 trillion animals over the past 100 years, which is 333,000 times the number of Jews killed in the Holocaust. And to make matters worse, approximately 80% of all Jews killed in the holocaust were adults, unlike animals which are all equivalent to children for all intents and purposes. And none of this includes the hundreds of millions of sharks, whales, dolphins, and other large marine animals, that have been brutally stabbed and hacked to death, or maimed and left for dead, over this same time period. Nor does this include the trillions of sentient fish that have been bred for human purposes under the most inhumane conditions imaginable.

Humans are directly responsible for causing more sentient suffering right now than at any other time in human history. Humans have created, and continue to grow, a literal animal holocaust, and for no other reason than the most needless form of self-indulgence imaginable. It is irrefutable that this industry must come to an end as rapidly as possible. In fact, if farm animals could speak human languages, most countries would have ended the animal agriculture industry at around the same time slavery was abolished. Similarly, nobody would be defending the industry today if there were videos online of animals screaming out in agony and screaming out for help in human languages. Unfortunately, these abuses are all the more likely to continue as long as humanity is dominated by an economic system that prioritizes profits above all else, and encourages consumers to prioritize their desires above all else, even at the expense of their own humanity.

Environment

This section will explore the way the environment has been negatively impacted during capitalism's history. In fact the overwhelming majority of negative changes to the environment during this time can be attributed to capitalism.

Pollution

The amount of pollution that has been created under capitalism cannot be understated, and nor can its harmful consequences. Fumes, raw sewage, crude oil, refined oil, fracking chemicals, and other hazardous chemicals, have come to poison every part of the planet. These toxic chemicals haven't just desecrated landscapes, killed wildlife, and destroyed ecosystems, but have entered into every part of global food chains, including the food humans consume.

The total consequences of such pollution on human health will not be known for some time, but what effects are known are already confirmed to be devastating. For example, even under favorable conditions fracking cannot be done without a high risk of harming local ecosystems, and when this occurs it always causes health problems for nearby humans, such as migraines, skin disorders, respiratory problems, chronic fatigue, heart disease, cancers, and birth defects. Incidentally, this makes fracking relatively unique, since other forms of energy generation only become dangerous when appropriate safety measures are not taken. Fracking can be blamed on capitalism, not only because it has been expanded unnecessarily in certain areas because of the fossil fuel industry, but also because if climate change had been addressed sooner, and the world had transitioned to green energy sooner, then the world would not need to rely upon fracking to extract natural gas, which is a less harmful greenhouse gas than other fossil fuels that are currently relied upon.

Another example that is responsible for harming human health is plastic pollution. It is estimated that the average person consumes up to 1 credit card's worth of plastic every week. Worse still, many of these plastic particles are nanoplastics, which are small enough to pass through the blood-to-brain barrier. Microplastics and nanoplastics have been discovered to exist everywhere on the planet, including the most remote locations imaginable. They now contaminate practically all water sources and foods, including organic foods like grains, fruits, and vegetables. Another similar environmental problem is mercury poisoning. The consequences of plastics and mercury on human health are not fully known, but so far they have been proven to cause hormone imbalances, immune suppression, cognitive impairment, diabetes, weight gain, reduced fertility, lung damage, kidney failure, heart disease, strokes, cancers, and nervous system disorders. Children exposed to mercury in the womb also have an increased risk of developing neurobehavioral problems, such as those related to motor function, verbal memory, language skills, and maintaining attention. It is estimated that 10% of American women of childbearing age carry enough mercury in their body for their children to be vulnerable to these problems.

A subset toxic chemicals are PFAS chemicals, which are a collection of manmade chemicals more commonly known as “forever chemicals”, due to the fact they don’t naturally breakdown. Practically speaking this means that once they are consumed they can stay in the body of a human or animal for years or decades. It has been estimated that almost every person on the planet has forever chemicals inside them, which would not be a problem if not for the fact that it is believed they are responsible for causing high cholesterol, liver disease, kidney problems, decreased immunity, decreased fertility, thyroid disruption, various cancers, and birth defects. They also very likely lower the effectiveness of childhood vaccines.

Another major problem is the pollution created by the animal agriculture industry. In fact the United Nations has even stated that the animal agriculture industry is one of the greatest contributors to every major environmental problem in the world. One problem is that farmers who produce crops for animal agriculture predominantly have no choice but to use hazardous synthetic fertilizers and pesticides in order to stay in business, and this is predominantly because of the extremely abusive practices of corporations within the industry. To give an idea of how dangerous these chemicals are, 300,000 people die from acute pesticide poisoning every year, and over 380 million people fall ill from pesticides every year, and can even suffer from reproductive problems and neurological disorders as a result. To make matters worse, it is also likely that these synthetic fertilizers and pesticides reduce the nutritional value of food in many instances. These synthetic fertilizers and pesticides, as well as animal waste, also seep into and contaminate arable farm land and surrounding areas, including rivers, lakes, and the ocean. The areas where these runoffs accumulate are known as “dead zones”, since they are incapable of supporting life. Fish farms are also notorious for using large quantities of antibiotics, and producing unnaturally large quantities and concentrations of animal waste, which can also poison environments, and even create dead zones.

Even when animal waste doesn't seep into the environment, it is often instead collected in large lagoons that harm nearby communities. These lagoons produce an incredible stench which can be intolerable for local residents, and can consequently take a serious toll on their mental health and overall quality of life. Unsurprisingly, most of these residents are also some of the poorest people in their respective countries, meaning they are rarely able to move. Even when they are able to sell their homes, this nearly always comes at a substantial financial loss if their homes were purchased prior to these farms or lagoons being build. And this doesn't even solve the problem, since the impoverished families that consequently purchase these homes also have to suffer the same fate.

However, the far greater risk is the toxicity of these lagoons. Among other problems, these lagoons produce copious amounts of ammonia gas, which means they also produce an endless supply of bacteria. And because these farms produce too much waste to be contained or used as fertilizer, corporations predominantly choose to get rid of this liquefied animal waste simply by spraying it high into the air. Local residents that are affected by this can suffer from a host of health problems, including infections, eye irritation, dizziness, nausea, headaches, diarrhea, and chronic coughing. Additionally, when enough of this airborne animal waste is combined with air pollutants it can create nitric acid, which can destroy arable soil, damage ecosystems, and further harm humans. Air pollution caused by the animal agriculture industry is such a severe problem that in America alone it is responsible for over 12,000 deaths every single year.

Climate change

Another environmental problem that can mostly be blamed on capitalism is climate change. The problems caused by climate change will be widespread and catastrophic, and will only worsen over the coming decades. A summary of these problems are as follows.

- An increase in the number and severity of snowstorms, hailstorms, mudslides, dust storms, and acid rain, to name some common

examples. Some of these are approximately 5 times more likely to occur now compared to pre-industrial times. These severe weather events are also beginning to occur in regions of the world that were previously unaffected by such problems, meaning their populations are underprepared to deal with them. These severe weather events are capable of destroying homes, communities, businesses, national infrastructures, and freshwater sources, among other problems. Billions of humans and trillions of animals will suffer or die from these natural disasters in the coming decades.

- An increase in the number and severity of floods, including flash floods. Recent research even suggests that 300 million homes will be affected by coastal flooding alone just over the next 30 years. This problem is expected to escalate in the early 2030's due to a shift in the moon's orbit that will cause tides to rise unusually high. The main reason why there will continue to be an overall increase in the number and severity of floods is because of a combination of rising sea levels, an increase in severe weather events, and increasing temperatures causing vegetation to die and land to dry out, which makes these environments substantially less able to absorb water when it rains. Floods also increase the number of dangerous and deadly sinkholes, as well as erode the foundations of buildings, including high-rises. Floods also cause a substantial rise in the spread of diseases when they cause underground sewage to be brought back up to the surface.

- An increase in the number and severity of droughts. Many extreme droughts will last months or years longer than they otherwise would, and some parts of the world will even experience droughts 20 times more regularly than they otherwise would.

- An increase in the number and severity of heatwaves, which are far more dangerous than most people realize. Heatwaves are already the deadliest severe weather event in the developed world, and are becoming increasingly deadly in underdeveloped countries. Heatwaves can also cause premature births in women, which cannot only put the child's life at risk, particularly in countries with

inadequate healthcare, but can also result in long-term deleterious consequences for the child if they survive. Climate change has already increased global temperatures by approximately 1.2 degrees above pre-industrial levels, and at 1.5 degrees above pre-industrial levels between 9% to 18% of the world's population will suffer from severe heatwaves at least once every five years, and at 2 degrees this will jump to between 32% to 45%. And worse still, these heatwaves will also be far more severe and deadly.

Even heatwaves today can cause air to become so hot that using cooling fans becomes counterproductive. In fact heatwaves are currently becoming deadlier still because of increases in humidity, which are increasingly causing wet-bulb conditions. These are conditions in which heat and humidity become so high that it becomes thermodynamically impossible for the body to cool itself through sweat evaporation. This occurs when temperatures reach 35 degrees and humidity reaches 95 percent. This wet-bulb phenomenon used to be incredibly rare, but today is a common occurrence. The rate at which wet-bulb conditions occur will increase at an accelerated rate as climate change worsens. These conditions are so dangerous that they are even lethal to perfectly healthy young people, even if they are fully hydrated and resting in the shade. Air conditioning units can solve this problem, but most people around the world don't have access to them, and worst still is that they are also prohibitively expensive even in developed countries. Heatwaves are also capable of killing billions of marine animals, including sentient animals, which can further devastate local ecosystems.

- An increase in the number and severity of wildfires. Temperature increases since the beginning of the industrial revolution have even made forest fires 5 times more likely in certain parts of the world. If temperatures increase to 2 degrees above pre-industrial levels, extreme forest fires will become 4 times as common compared to today, and these fires will be even harder to control. Wildfires not only cause a large number of human deaths, but the air pollution they generate are known to cause health problems for many people within range, including respiratory problems, cardiovascular

problems, and cancers. Forest fires are also responsible for unnecessarily burning to death billions of animals every year, which should not be treated lightly considering sentience morality.

- An increase in severe weather is causing a myriad of life threatening problems in the agriculture industry, including lower crop yields, reduced nutritional value of crops, and the destruction of arable farm land. Crop yields will be further harmed by pollination cycles, which are expected to become increasingly disrupted over the coming decades. These agricultural problems will be further exacerbated as increasing temperatures and heatwaves make it extremely difficult or impossible for agricultural workers to work outside. All of these problems will destroy the only viable food sources for millions of the world's poorest, and will also cause food shortages in developed countries. In fact 51% of human calories come from wheat, corn, and rice, which grow almost entirely in regions that will be devastated by climate change. This is happening at the same time that there is expected to be a doubling in food demand between now and 2050.

- An increase in the amount of land that falls victim to desertification, including arable farm land. An area half the size of the European Union suffers degradation every year because of desertification, with land in Africa and Asia being the most affected.

- An increase in the number and severity of insect swarms, which will further decimate the crops of populations already suffering from food insecurity and starvation. This is at least partially being caused by the increasing severity of typhoons and hurricanes, which are responsible for drawing abnormally large quantities of ocean water inland, creating spikes among insect populations, such as locusts.

- An increase in the spread of deadly insect-borne diseases, including malaria. Such insects are attracted to warmer climates, meaning they will become common place in substantially more countries. 1 million people already die every year from mosquitos alone, which is

more than from any other animal on the planet, including other insects.

- A substantial increase in diseases spread by food and water. This includes salmonella, and the antibiotic resistant bacteria E coli, which thrive in hotter climates.
- An increase in the severity of, and the number of people that contract, allergies and asthma.
- Natural habitats are currently shrinking as a consequence of climate change. The destruction of these ecosystems is not only pushing many animal and plant species to extinction, but also destroying the lives of the humans that rely upon them for sustenance and income. Biodiversity loss can also result in the extinction of species with unique biological properties that can assist the development of medicines. In fact many species take millions to tens of millions of years to develop their unique properties, meaning once extinct these unique properties are either lost forever, or require decades of additional research and experimentation to discover.
- The increasing temperature and acidification of the ocean is killing off the world's coral and algae, and destroying the ecosystems they support. This marine life is responsible for 50% of the greenhouse gases absorbed by the environment, and responsible for producing 50% to 85% of all oxygen in the atmosphere. Low-oxygen zones in the ocean, which are caused by climate change and which destroy ecosystems, have grown by 4.5 million kilometers since the 1950's, which is an area roughly the size of the European Union. Worse still, the size of low-oxygen zones is increasing at an accelerated rate. Many coral reefs are also already in terminal decline. Even a 1.5 degree increase in global temperatures above pre-industrial levels will wipe out up to 90% of all coral reefs, and a 2 degree increase will wipe out more than 99%. These decimated food chains will also destroy the lives of the hundreds of millions of people that rely upon marine life either for sustenance or income. Of particular concern is

that 4 out of the 5 mass extinction events of the past included ocean acidification. In fact ocean acidification is so dangerous it has come to be termed “the evil twin of global warming”.

- The melting of the polar icecaps is substantially increasing the amount of freshwater in the ocean. This is disrupting many of the Earth’s essential systems. It is disrupting the Earth’s jet streams, which are essential for circulating hot and cold air around the planet. It is disrupting the Earth’s thermohaline circulation, which is essential for circulating the ocean’s water around the planet. It is also disrupting hydrological cycles, which refers to the continuous exchange of water from the earth’s surface to the atmosphere and vice versa. Their disruption is increasing temperatures, disrupting migration patterns, destroying ecosystems, and exacerbating extreme weather events.

- Frozen subsurface soil, otherwise known as permafrost, is thawing as global temperatures rise. This is dangerous for the inhabitants of many towns and cities in the world that have been built upon permafrost. Entire communities will eventually be destroyed by this.

- Rising temperatures are predicted to release diseases and viruses that have been trapped in permafrost for thousands or even millions of years. These novel strains could be deadly, and even have the potential to cause global pandemics. Diseases released from thawing permafrost have already killed animals in those regions.

- Civil unrest and conflicts are expected to increase as hundreds of millions of climate refugee’s escape from unlivable conditions, and migrate predominantly to wealthier developed countries. This will be further exacerbated by ever increasing shortages of food and water. Additionally, most refugees are children, and children are regularly separated from their guardians when travelling. Refugees, including children, are also vulnerable to being trafficked into the most exploitative forms of labor, including being forced to become slaves, sex workers, and soldiers.

- Severe weather caused or exacerbated by climate change is causing hundreds of billions of dollars of damage to assets and infrastructures, as well as resulting in hundreds of billions of dollars in lost economic output. These two problems will worsen considerably over the coming decades.

One of the greatest tragedies of these climate change problems, and one that cannot be overstated, is that it is the poorest people in the world that have contributed the least to climate change, but will be most devastated by its consequences.

Tackling climate change may sound possible with enough global cooperation, but this is made extremely challenging, and potentially even impossible, because of runaway climate change. This is the phenomenon where various environmental systems exacerbate each other's contributions to climate change, causing ever escalating feedback loops that become impossible to adequately address. This occurs because many of these environmental systems are vulnerable to climate change "tipping points", which are points of no return which make the deterioration of these systems self-sustaining and impossible to reverse once passed. The following are the best known environmental systems that are causing or will cause runaway climate change.

- Hotter temperatures increase the amount of moisture in the atmosphere. Water vapor is a potent greenhouse gas, because it is excellent at trapping heat in the atmosphere.
- Climate change will change cloud formation, which will increase temperatures. Clouds low in the atmosphere are ideal for reflecting sunlight, which has a cooling effect on the planet, but these clouds will decrease in the tropics as global temperatures rise. Clouds high in the atmosphere are ideal at preventing heat from escaping into space, and the number of these clouds will increase as global temperatures rise.

- The polar icecaps and ground ice are perfect for reflecting solar radiation away from Earth, while land and the ocean are ideal for absorbing solar radiation. This is because solar radiation is reflected by light surfaces and absorbed by dark surfaces. The more ice that melts, the less there is to reflect this heat, and the more visible land and ocean there is to absorb this heat. This feedback loop is called ice-albedo feedback. To put into perspective how quickly this is becoming a problem, Greenland's ice is now melting 6 times faster than it was 4 decades ago, and this trend is currently accelerating.
- Permafrost will release monumental amounts of CO₂ and methane into the atmosphere when it finally thaws. There is approximately 1.5 trillion tons of CO₂ trapped in permafrost, which is approximately double the amount of CO₂ currently in the atmosphere. Multiple scientific reports by climatologists and Arctic specialists have confirmed that a 1.5 degree increase above pre-industrial levels could be enough to cause continuous thawing of the majority of the world's permafrost. This is partly because the Arctic is heating up 2 to 7 times faster than the rest of the planet. However, their far more catastrophic prediction is that a release of 50 billion tons of methane from Arctic permafrost could occur rapidly at any moment due to climate change. Over a 20 year time frame methane is over 84 times more effective at trapping heat in the atmosphere than CO₂, and over a 100 year time frame methane is over 21 times more effective at trapping heat in the atmosphere than CO₂. This means that if this 50 billion tons of methane is released, it would be the equivalent of releasing between 1 trillion to 4 trillion tons of CO₂ into the atmosphere, depending on the time frame. To put this into perspective, humans have only released about 1.5 trillion tons of CO₂ into the atmosphere since the beginning of the industrial revolution.
- Due to droughts and other problems caused by climate change, forest fires are occurring more frequently, are spreading more rapidly, and are becoming harder to extinguish. Forest fires not only result in less vegetation to absorb CO₂, but they also cause the CO₂ trapped in all affected vegetation to be released back into the

atmosphere. Rainforests are also responsible for returning vast amounts of water back into the atmosphere via transpiration, or in other words evaporation. This means that when they are destroyed through wildfires, the amount of water vapor and rain produced in and around those regions decreases, which increases the likelihood and strength of future forest fires. To make matters worse, research has shown that the vegetation that returns after forest fires is generally more prone to future fires than the older vegetation it replaces.

- Climate change is increasing the number and severity of droughts, which combined with forest fires and deforestation is increasing forest dieback. This not only means there is less vegetation to absorb CO₂, but less vegetation to hold water in the soil, making remaining forests more susceptible to forest fires and forest dieback. One of the worst victims of this phenomenon is the Amazon rainforest. It is now understood that if just 20% more of the Amazon rainforest is destroyed, this will cause a dieback feedback loop which will kill off the entire rainforest, and which will be impossible to prevent or reverse because of the geographical scale of this problem.
- 70% of land-trapped CO₂ is currently stored in the Earth's soil, and this constitutes 3 times as much CO₂ as there is in the atmosphere. Warmer soil emits more CO₂, which is part of the reason why approximately half of the CO₂ trapped in the Earth's soil has been released since the industrial revolution. Soil CO₂ emissions will accelerate as temperatures continue to rise.
- As temperatures rise, the ability of the ocean to absorb greenhouse gases decreases. This is predominantly because of the death of the coral and algae that are responsible for extracting greenhouse gases from the atmosphere. In fact the destruction of these delicate ecosystems is actually causing massive amounts of greenhouse gases to be released into the atmosphere.
- The rise in greenhouse gas emissions will increase the strength and regularity of acid rain. This will kill off vegetation on both land and in

the ocean, releasing more greenhouse gases into the atmosphere and decreasing the amount of vegetation capable of absorbing greenhouse gases.

These self-reinforcing feedback mechanisms give a good impression of how difficult it will be, if not impossible, to prevent runaway climate change. Unfortunately, there are a number of additional issues that further compound the problems of addressing runaway climate change.

- Even if all greenhouse gases stopped being emitted by humans tomorrow, it could be 3 decades before temperatures stopped rising. The first reason is that there is a significant time delay between emissions being released and heat being trapped by these emissions, meaning the greenhouse gases currently in the atmosphere have yet to trap as much heat as they are capable of. The second reason is that the Earth will continue to release substantial quantities of greenhouse gases well into the future because of the damage that has already occurred. For example, unnaturally high quantities of greenhouse gases will continue to be released from thawing permafrost and forest fires until humanity manages to lower temperatures far below where they are currently. Consequently, climate change is going to get substantially worse before it could even hypothetically get better.

- One of the most common ways to offset greenhouse gas emissions is to grow new forests and expand old ones. Unfortunately the ever increasing frequency of forest fires is making this approach less tenable, and forests that have been grown specifically for this purpose have already fallen victim to forest fires. A sizable portion of these forests have also fallen victim to industrial practices such as logging and animal agriculture. Sometimes this occurs illegally, but other times impoverished regions and countries do this intentionally to generate revenue. Worse still, not only does it take decades to fully grow new forests, which is time humanity doesn't have, but newly planted forests are often net producers of CO₂ during the first

two decades of their life, meaning in the short-term planting forests could actually exacerbate climate change.

- One means of reducing fossil fuel emissions has been to introduce more efficient cooking techniques and technologies to underdeveloped countries where biomass is the main source of fuel. Unfortunately recent research has revealed that this is far less effective than previously calculated.

- Carbon capture and storage technologies (CCS), including direct air carbon capture and storage (DACCS) and bioenergy with carbon capture and storage (BECCS), are now recognized as being far less viable than previously thought. Many such multimillion dollar carbon capture initiatives have been shown to be completely ineffective, and in some cases have even produced more greenhouse gas emissions than they've captured, despite being heralded by capitalists and the mainstream media. Even if effective carbon capture technologies became widespread and only ran on green energy, this would inevitably result in substantially less green energy being available for other purposes. Even more ridiculous, most of the CO₂ that is currently being captured is being used to extract fossil fuels or being converted back into fuels that emit CO₂. A further problem is that carbon capture technologies and many renewable energy technologies require vast quantities of scarce resources, and these resources could be too scarce to produce carbon capture technologies on the scale necessary to address climate change. Even though such technologies will likely be invaluable in very specific circumstances, they are extremely expensive even when they work, and will likely only ever be capable of reducing a very small percentage of global emissions.

- Most countries are failing to fulfill their already inadequate promises for addressing climate change. This most commonly occurs because these countries fail to take action, however even the actions they do take are often inadequate, and are often pursued with deceitful intent. For example, some countries have used their resources, such as carbon credits, to "offset" emissions by merely

protecting forests that already exist, rather than actually offset emissions by growing new forests. Worse still, many of these forests were never even in danger of being destroyed. Another example is the common practice of developed countries reducing their emissions by intentionally exporting their high emission industrial processes, such as manufacturing and recycling, to underdeveloped countries. And in many underdeveloped countries these processes produce even higher emissions because of their underdeveloped infrastructures, such as relying upon transportation that is far less fuel efficient. So not only are most countries not doing anywhere near enough to address climate change, but the actions they are taking are often nowhere near as beneficial as these countries claim.

- The construction industry is responsible for approximately 40% of all CO₂ emissions, with concrete alone being responsible for about 8% of all CO₂ emissions. Even under current projections, concrete production is expected to increase by more than 50% by 2050. If underdeveloped countries are lifted out of poverty rapidly in the future, this will obviously require massive amounts of construction, and will consequently cause CO₂ emissions to increase even more rapidly.
- The fossil fuel industry is moving away from the energy industry and further towards the production of plastics, meaning it will continue to produce greenhouse gas emissions even if the global economy moves 100% towards green energy. It is estimated that by 2050 plastic production alone could be responsible for 13% of global greenhouse gas emissions.
- Global temperatures are currently being suppressed by “global dimming”, which occurs when solar radiation is reflected back into space by aerosols, or in other words microscopic particles of solid or liquid matter that are light enough to suspend in the air. In other words global dimming is masking the true extent of global warming. It has even been estimated that up to half of the warming caused by climate change is being masked by this phenomenon. However, it is unavoidable that air pollution will need to be reduced significantly in

the coming years and decades if humanity is to tackle its devastating effects on human health.

- The number and use of air-conditioning units will increase substantially as global temperatures rise and heatwaves increase in number and severity. Unfortunately, air-conditioning units are extremely energy intensive, and their usage will increase emissions for as many decades as it takes to move entirely to green energy.
- Most climate change predictions are likely not severe enough. Most climate change studies are conservative in their estimates in order to avoid “type 1 errors”, also known as false positives. Many climate change models have consequently been criticized by other climate scientists for resulting in predictions that are too conservative.
- Climate change predictions may also be too conservative because of a reliance on potentially incorrect conclusions formulated during previous scientific research. For example, one assumption derived from prior research is that soils and plant life are responsible for absorbing 25% of all greenhouse gases produced by humans, and this assumption is used in most climate change models. However, recent research has revealed that this percentage is likely lower, meaning that all climate models which have assumed this figure to be true have underestimated the severity of climate change. Another example is the Amazon rainforest, the entirety of which was previously assumed to extract more CO₂ from the atmosphere than it produced, but recent research has shown this to be untrue for one fifth of the rainforest. Another example is glaciers, which are ideal for reflecting sunlight, but which are now melting at a rate that was not expected until global temperatures were much higher. Another example is landfill sites, which are now understood to release more methane than previously calculated, and in some cases over two and a half times as much. Research is continuously being published showing that previous estimates and assumptions were too conservative, and even some worst-case predictions are now being exceeded, so this problem is not an uncommon or minor one.

- For practical reasons the world will need to continue relying upon fossil fuels for a long time yet. However, it has been estimated that burning all the world's oil and gas reserves would push global temperatures beyond 1.5 degrees, and that burning all oil, gas, and coal, in every field and mine currently in operation would push global temperatures beyond 2 degrees. Despite this, it will be incredibly difficult for humanity not to use a sizeable percentage of these fossil fuels even under ideal circumstances.

All of these factors mean that catastrophic climate change may be unavoidable. Staying below an increase of 1.5 degrees was deemed effectively impossible in 2022, and 1.5 degrees is recognized as the most likely tipping point at which runaway climate change will become effectively impossible to reverse. If current trends continue, 1.5 degrees could be reached by 2026, or at the very least will very likely be reached in the early 2030's. And based on recent research, this will be more catastrophic than even predictions made just a few years ago. Even if all countries meet the targets they agreed upon in the Paris Climate Accords, which is widely understood to be near impossible at this point, global temperatures will almost definitely rise above 2.4 degrees, and will very likely rise above 3 degrees, with 2 degrees occurring by the late 2040's or soon after. Some researchers have even concluded that a rise of 5 degrees is possible because of runaway climate change, and that this increase could lead to the extinction of the majority of all life on Earth because of the collapse of the world's ecosystems. And as global temperatures rise, the best methods that humanity has available for addressing climate change, such as forests and flood barriers, will only become increasingly difficult to effectively utilize. This situation has become so dire that it is seriously negatively affecting the mental health of an increasing number of climate scientists, particularly by causing them to suffer from "eco-anxiety". Many now even receive therapy for "climate grief", which is specifically caused by an awareness of the immeasurable suffering climate change will cause to humans and animals in the coming decades. Some climate scientists have even

cried during interviews and presentations on climate change because of this.

For those that doubt the severity of climate change, there are a number of issues that need to be understood. First, the emissions that are blamed for climate change are also responsible for polluting the atmosphere. Air pollution kills millions of people each year, and causes health problems for millions more. Coal fired power stations are also responsible for producing airborne mercury, which not only harms people in surrounding areas, but also gets into soil, rivers, lakes, the ocean, and eventually human food chains. These reasons alone are enough to reduce emissions and invest in green energy. Second, in most countries there are more jobs being created in the green energy industry than in the fossil fuel industry, and this is only becoming truer as time progresses. In fact in some countries the number of green jobs being created is dozens of times greater. Workers in the green energy industry also generally have higher salaries than those in the fossil fuel industry, and work in safer and cleaner environments.

Third, the precautionary principle is reason enough for humanity to do everything within its power to address climate change. If climate change is as dangerous as experts predict, and humanity does nothing to address it, then the consequences will be catastrophic. In a best case scenario, billions of people will suffer, tens of millions will die, ecological collapse will accelerate, and trillions of dollars' worth of damage will be done over the coming decades. In a worst-case scenario, runaway climate change will cause the extinction of most life on Earth. Despite these possibilities, refusal to respect the precautionary principle continues to persist. This is peculiar considering humanity's response to previous existential threats. When the Second World War began, countries did not hesitate and debate for years their concerns about economic disruptions, nor the problem of retraining workers. Yet when confronted with the imminent threat of climate change, which has the possibility of being even deadlier, these excuses are perpetually used to delay action. Even if there was only a 1% chance of climate change causing a

holocaust or a mass extinction event, this would still necessitate treating these risks as if they were an absolute certainty. Those who demand radical change in light of the precautionary principle can therefore not be criticized as “climate alarmists”, as so many skeptics like to do.

For those that don't even believe in anthropogenic climate change, and consider it a conspiracy theory, understand that this position is completely unreasonable. Climate science involves tens of thousands of specialists, many of whom have PhDs, working in a multitude of different disciplines, in both the public and private sector, and in the vast majority of countries in the world. The possibility of bribing a sizable percentage of these people, or manipulating their data on a mass scale without anyone noticing, is completely unfeasible. Even small instances of data or research manipulation could not come close to the manipulation required to nullify the precautionary principle, nor counter the monumental amounts of data and research verifying that anthropogenic climate change is both real and extremely dangerous.

Additionally, the common claim that climate scientists manipulate their research solely so they can continue receiving funding is an unfalsifiable argument, and one that could be applied equally to every scientist and scientific study. In fact, climate scientists are rarely particularly well paid, and never choose their career for financial reasons. Climate scientists are highly skilled and often highly intelligent, meaning most of them could easily have chosen equally challenging but far more lucrative professions. Conversely, many of the most prominent climate change deniers have ties to the fossil fuel industry, are often generously compensated for their public appearances and works, and garner reputations which can open up lucrative opportunities they would otherwise not have access to.

The anecdotal evidence cited by these conspiracy theorists is similarly always without merit. For example, many climate change deniers have stated that global warming is attributable to the sun, but this is a misreading of the data. In fact there has been no net

increase in the amount of solar radiation reaching the Earth since the late 1950's. Some climate change deniers have argued that CO₂ produced by volcanoes is responsible for climate change, even though volcanoes produce less than 2% of all greenhouse gases produced by humans. Some climate change deniers have argued that climate change can't be real because politicians continue to buy seaside resorts, despite the fact that such resorts are practically always multiple meters above sea level, and nearly always tens of meters from the shore, meaning they likely won't be vulnerable to sea level rises for at least another 100 years. All other anecdotes cited by climate change deniers are just as irrational. For those interested in discovering the truth behind climate change misinformation, the website SkepticalScience.com is an invaluable source.

An additional problem is that these conspiracy theorists also ignore the overwhelming evidence that supports the existence of anthropogenic climate change. The following are a few examples.

- The nitrogen cycle, which is essential for ensuring the right balance of minerals, nutrients, and oxygen in nature, has been disrupted more in the past 100 years than in the past 2.5 billion years.
- The amount of CO₂ in the atmosphere is increasing faster than any other time during the past 66 million years.
- The amount of CO₂ in the atmosphere today is approximately 40% higher than the highest concentrations of CO₂ in the atmosphere during the past 1 million years.
- The Earth is currently heating up 10 times faster than any other time in the past 1 million years.
- The amount of methane in the atmosphere today is higher than any other time during the past 800,000 years.
- The last 4 decades have been the hottest decades ever recorded since records began back in 1880, and each of these decades has been hotter than the last.
- The 21 hottest years ever recorded were in the past 22 years, with 1998 being the unusually hot exception, and 2004 having the lowest average temperature of the past 22 years.
- The 9 hottest years ever recorded were the past 9 years.

- 2023 was the hottest year ever recorded. It is currently predicted that 2024 will be little different. Before this, 2016 and 2020 were the hottest years ever recorded.
- The 10 months from June 2023 to March 2024 were each the hottest month for their respective month ever recorded.
- July 2023 was the hottest month ever recorded.
- The 4 hottest days ever recorded were in July 2023, and these were likely the hottest days on Earth in over 120,000 years.
- The sea level has been rising since records began back in 1870, and for most of this time it has been rising at an accelerated rate.
- The last decade was the hottest decade for ocean surface temperatures ever recorded, with records going back to 1850.
- In 2023 the ocean reached its highest average surface temperature ever recorded.
- In 2023 a region of the ocean reached the highest ocean surface temperature ever recorded.
- In 2022 the ocean reached its highest level of acidity ever recorded.
- The ocean is heating up twice as fast today as it was in 1992.
- Over the past 30 years arctic sea ice has shrunk by over 75%.
- Greenland ice is now melting at a rate that was not originally expected until 2070.
- In 2020 the Arctic experienced its hottest temperature ever recorded, with records going back to 1885.
- The Arctic's average temperature during the first half of 2020 was as high as the average temperature predicted to be normal during this same period in 2100.
- In 2023 the Arctic experienced its hottest summer ever recorded.
- In 2022 Antarctic sea ice shrank back to the lowest extent ever recorded.

There is also plenty of anecdotal evidence indirectly supportive of anthropogenic climate change, such as the fact that every fossil fuel company in the world acknowledges anthropogenic climate change, which started with Exxon back in the 1970's. There's also the fact that acknowledging and addressing climate change was a high priority non-partisan issue until the 1980's, when companies that

would have lost profits from humanity addressing climate change began lobbying politicians. However, the greatest evidence demonstrating that anthropogenic climate change is real, and presents an existential threat, is the fact that the overwhelming majority of climate science studies align with this conclusion. Between 1991 and 2012 over 97% of peer reviewed scientific papers concluded that humans are causing climate change, and 99.9% of peer reviewed scientific papers did not reject this conclusion. And these percentages have only increased since then. Between 2013 and 2020, over 88,000 peer reviewed scientific papers related to climate change were published, and of these papers over 99.9% concluded that humans are causing climate change, and an even higher percentage did not reject this conclusion.

The studies that have contradicted this unified consensus have been shown to contain errors or have been impossible to replicate. These studies also contradict one another, as opposed to representing a cohesive alternative consensus. For those unfamiliar with science, the fact that some studies contain flaws, and do not agree with the scientific consensus, is perfectly normal. There are practically no scientific fields in which 100% of studies all reach the exact same conclusion. All studies on a subject do not need to reach the same conclusion in order for the scientific consensus to be respected as the most reliable conclusion, nor are conflicting studies within a scientific field a justification for disregarding the precautionary principle.

The scientific consensus on climate change must also be particularly respected because it is such an esoteric subject. Anyone who is not a climate scientist that personally believes they are smart enough or educated enough, even with months or years of research, to determine what scientific data is most important within the broader scope of the subject, or whether scientists that deny climate change hold legitimate views, is deluding themselves. Climate science is too multidisciplinary, complex, and vast, for any lay person to educate themselves on. Climate scientists have to account for a monumental amount of variables and data, and have to rely upon incredibly powerful supercomputers to accurately simulate how they interact.

The scientific consensus on climate change can therefore not be dismissed by isolating and highlighting individual data points and anecdotal evidence. In fact denial of anthropogenic climate change can reasonably be argued to be one of the quintessential modern-day examples of anti-intellectualism and the Dunning-Kruger effect. It should consequently come as no surprise that the overwhelming majority of those with PhDs believe in anthropogenic climate change, and that this percentage decreases for every lesser academically educated group. Considering all of this, the scientific consensus and the precautionary principle must be respected.

Unfortunately, even those in developed countries who are willing to entertain the possibility that radical change may be required also commonly argue that there is little point in their country addressing climate change since so many other countries are refusing to do so. This is flawed for numerous reasons. First, a nation's responsibility to address climate change cannot be abdicated simply because other nations refuse to accept their own responsibility. Second, a sizable percentage of the fossil fuel emissions of many countries, and particularly manufacturing hubs like China and India, are produced during the production of goods created for wealthy developed countries. So the critics who complain about other countries not doing enough to reduce their high emissions are often the same people who are partially responsible for these high emissions. Third, most of the banks in wealthy developed countries are invested into fossil fuel companies that operate across the world, meaning these countries financially benefit from exacerbating climate change without this counting towards their own emissions. Fourth, investing into green technologies can both advance them and make them cheaper to produce, incentivizing other countries to adopt such technologies.

Fifth, addressing climate change will not reduce the quality of life of those living in developed countries, so there is nothing to lose by doing this. In fact democratic socialism would enable developed countries to transition rapidly to a green economy while simultaneously increasing the quality of life of their citizens. Even

more to the point, fossil fuels are responsible for harming and killing people in developed countries as a consequence of air pollution, and climate change is responsible for harming and killing people in developed countries as a consequence of food scarcity and extreme weather events. So those who do not want their countries to adequately address climate change are only harming themselves and their loved ones in the process.

Sixth, most people who make this argument live in developed countries which can afford to transition to a green economy, and have also been the greatest beneficiaries and perpetrators of fossil fuel usage up until this point. Approximately 80% of all greenhouse gas emissions in the atmosphere today exist because of developed countries, and even today over 90% of CO₂ emissions are caused by people living in developed countries. Conversely, most countries that are criticized for transitioning to a green economy too slowly are deeply impoverished, are decades behind in terms of their development, and produce a fraction of the per capita emissions of developed countries. Even China, which is commonly criticized for not doing enough to tackle climate change, is only the 38th worst per capita emitter in the world. In fact China produces less than half the per capita greenhouse gas emissions as America, and has produced only half the cumulative historical emissions as America, despite having a substantially larger population. China is also ranked first in the world for solar, wind, and hydro energy capacity, is ranked third in the world for nuclear power capacity, and currently invests more into renewable energy every year than America and the European Union combined. China is also ranked first in the world for reforestation, and has been responsible for growing 25% of the world's new manmade vegetation over the past 2 decades, despite only containing approximately 6% of the world's landmass. All of this demonstrates greater effort than most other developed countries, including those with even higher per capita wealth. Additionally, people in developed countries predominantly live in poverty because of avoidable exploitation that could instantly be eradicated through democratic socialism, whereas those living in poverty in poorer countries not only have a far lower quality of life, but their poverty is

most often the result of poorly developed infrastructures and services that cannot be quickly or cheaply remediated. It is therefore unfair to expect all nations and humans to make the same sacrifices, particularly when those in developed countries have benefitted tremendously from imperialism and fossil fuels, and most of the countries criticized for not doing enough to address climate change have suffered tremendously from imperialism and climate change.

The bottom line is that every country must do everything it possibly can to address climate change, while pressuring or providing support to all other countries that are not doing enough. And this is not just for future generations. The most disgusting aspect of modern climate change discourse is the sentiment that it is a future problem, and that all the world needs to do is stay below a 1.5 degree or 2 degree increase. But this sentiment heartlessly downplays the countless adults and children that are already suffering and dying every year from climate change, and the many more that are guaranteed to suffer and die if the world doesn't address climate change with the urgency it requires. Even if runaway climate change is avoided, the current lack of adequate action will be of little consolation to the tens of millions of adults and children that will unnecessarily die from climate change, and the far greater number of people that will have to live the rest of their lives without their loved ones.

Conclusion

The extreme environmental problems that have occurred during this past century have not merely been an unavoidable side effect of human activity, but the result of deliberate negligence and abuses committed in the pursuit of maximizing profits in a system that prioritizes profits above all else. These problems are therefore not a consequence of a mutated form of capitalism, but instead capitalism at its most refined, because profits cannot be maximized unless externalities are maximized. And because of these environmental problems, billions are now suffering every year, and millions are now dying every year, and these problems are only going to get worse long before they have any chance of getting better.

Miscellaneous

This section will explore various other ways capitalism has affected the world. This section will not be comprehensive, but will instead aim to provide a brief overview of less tangible or more specific consequences of capitalism.

Broken governments

Beyond the problems that have already been stated, perhaps the most obvious and greatest problem of capitalism is the threat it poses to the integrity of governments. Capitalism will obviously always increase the likelihood that capitalist politicians will end up in power for a multitude of reasons, and this is a particular problem when these capitalists are also neoliberals or libertarians. These politicians will nearly always be either incompetent or corrupt, and consequently rarely do what is best for the people. The danger of governments being run by capitalists can be best understood by examining a case study, and there is no better modern case study than the American Republican Party (a.k.a. the Republicans) and the Trump administration.

One of the largest initiatives of the Trump administration was their \$1.5 trillion tax cut, which was strongly supported by the Republican Party, and was unsurprisingly an unmitigated disaster. The tax cut reduced America's corporate tax rate from 35% to 21%, and 83% of the benefits of the tax cut went to the richest 1%, which obviously included Trump himself. During the Trump Presidency, American billionaires increased their wealth by \$1 trillion, and they ended up with a lower effective tax rate than the poorest half of Americans, which was the first time in recorded history. Billionaires were able to increase their wealth so much predominantly because the Trump tax cut was used by corporations for stock buybacks and shareholder dividends, which primarily benefit the 10% of American households that own 84% of all stocks, and the richest 1% that own half of all

stocks. Trump's tax cuts even increased the banking industry's profits to over \$230 billion in 2018 alone, which were the highest in American's history, and occurred at a time when the banks were already making record profits prior to the tax cuts. The Trump administration also raised their estate tax to only include estates worth over \$11 million, rather than the previous \$5.5 million.

To put all of this into context, the Trump administration and Republican Party did all of this during a time of near unprecedented wealth inequality in America. The wealthiest 50 Americans own more than the poorest 50% of Americans. The richest 10% of American families own 75% of America's household wealth. The richest 1% of Americans own more than the poorest 90%, they steal 45% of all newly created wealth, and they are responsible for approximately 70% of all unpaid taxes, which equates to approximately \$163 billion a year. Since 1975, the wealthiest 1% of Americans have increased their wealth by \$50 trillion at the expense of the poorest 90% of Americans, as well as the poorest people in the world. This is not surprising, since the official tax rate for the wealthiest Americans went from 90% in the 1950's and 1960's, to just above 20% during the Trump presidency. In practice however most American billionaires paid between 0.1% and 5% in taxes every year of the Trump presidency. This trend has also been true for American businesses. Between the 1960's and the end of the Trump presidency, corporate income tax revenue, as a percentage of GDP, decreased by approximately three quarters. It should consequently come as little surprise that there were nearly 300 former lobbyists in the Trump administration, and that almost 90% of Trump's cabinet were millionaires.

In contrast to this, the poorest 80% of Americans own 14% of America's household wealth, the poorest 50% of Americans own less than 2% of America's household wealth, and the household debt of American citizens is over \$14 trillion. Millennials in America today also own less than one half of the nation's wealth that baby boomers owned when they were the same age. Despite this, the Trump administration intentionally increased poverty in the short-term, and

made things worse for the lower classes in the long-term. For example, Trump's tax cuts increased taxes for those earning less than \$75,000 over the course of 10 years, and even those among the lower classes that did benefit in the short-term did so by a pitiful amount. In 2020 quantitative easing was used to increase the amount of money in America's economy by approximately 20%, but the Trump administration did nothing to direct any of this money towards improving the lives of the lower classes. Trump also regularly blamed immigrants for America's problems, despite many being impoverished victims of imperialism and the needless war on drugs, and despite their power to negatively affect the quality of life of Americans being insignificant compared to the capitalist system and the Trump administration.

Trump's tax cuts for the rich also increased America's national debt every year of the Trump presidency, despite Trump saying during his campaign that reducing the national debt was both important and easy. In fact, America's national debt increased by 7.8 trillion during Trump's presidency. This should not surprise anyone familiar with American politics. The Republican Party is notorious for fearmongering about the federal deficit and debt when their opposition party, the Democratic Party (a.k.a. the Democrats), are in power, and particularly when increasing the deficit is done in the pursuit of helping the lower classes. However, when the Republican Party is in power, they nearly always have higher budget deficits than the Democratic Party, and these deficits are always predominantly designed to benefit the rich and powerful more than anyone else. And this has been true for at least the past 50 years.

Trump's tax cuts for the rich also don't account for the first \$2.2 trillion COVID-19 stimulus package, which the Republican Party supported, and which predominantly benefitted the rich. This stimulus package only gave some working Americans a onetime payment of \$1200 that ended up having to last them almost an entire year, compared with the United Kingdom and Denmark which gave workers up to approximately \$3000 every month. In fact this stimulus package even helped the American cruise line industry

before helping average American citizens, even though this industry is notorious for using tax havens. In July 2020 the Trump administration even recommended a \$1.7 trillion tax cut for the richest 1% of Americans on top of the initial Trump tax cuts and the original COVID-19 stimulus package, while also advocating for further massive cuts to social programs. This was recommended by the Trump Administration even as American billionaires were on track to earn an additional \$1 trillion during the COVID-19 pandemic and recession. Conversely, when Trump met with Democrat leaders to negotiate a \$2 trillion infrastructure deal to help Americans, Trump prematurely ended the meeting because the Democrats refused to stop investigating him for corruption.

Despite all of this, the Trump administration and the Republican Party continued to peddle the lie that it was impossible to find money for social programs, most of which would pay for themselves. The \$47 billion annual cost of providing free higher education would be less than the amount of money America could save and generate by providing free higher education. The \$20 billion cost of ending homelessness once and for all would be less than the annual costs of perpetuating homelessness. The cost of solving child poverty would be less than the \$1.1 trillion annual cost of perpetuating child poverty. The cost of free universal healthcare would be less than the annual cost of maintaining their current healthcare system. The cost of improving their infrastructure would be less than the wealth American's could generate by having better infrastructure. Despite all of this, the Trump administration and Republican Party insisted that all of these were unaffordable. This is particularly egregious considering the United States government spent on average \$100 billion on the war in Afghanistan every year for 20 years.

Healthcare in particular was one of the most important issues that the Trump administration tried repeatedly to worsen. For example, they tried to drop protections for preexisting conditions, as well as throw 32 million Americans off their healthcare, but were only unsuccessful because of a single congressional vote. Trump could have fought to provide healthcare for every adult and child, just like

he promised during his 2016 campaign. Instead, Trump became responsible for approximately 7 million people losing their health insurance, for 20 million children lacking access to essential healthcare, and for 4 million children having absolutely no insurance. And all of this was before the COVID-19 pandemic, which resulted in tens of millions losing their healthcare coverage, and 340,000 deaths which would have been prevented if America had free universal healthcare. Trump even proposed cutting up to \$595 billion from Medicare over 10 years, and \$700 billion from Medicaid over 10 years.

The Trump administration also made cuts to essential programs every year they were in power. Trump's last budget for example, which was released before an anticipated recession, proposed cutting \$170 billion from their student loan program, cutting \$70 billion from federal disability insurance, and cutting approximately 30% from their Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, more commonly referred to as food stamps. This budget also proposed a 29% cut to the Department of Energy, a 28% cut to the Environmental Protection Agency, a 21% cut to foreign aid programs, a 17% cut to the Department of Housing and Urban Development, a 15% cut to the Department of Transportation, an 11% cut to the Department of Labor, an 11% cut to the Department of Health and Human Services, an 8% cut to the Department of Education, and a 7% cut to the National Science Foundation. None of these proposed cuts were counterbalanced by increased spending elsewhere, such as increased state spending. This budget also included a 16% cut to the Centre for Disease Control and Prevention, even though it was published after the COVID-19 outbreak.

Every single one of these programs was already grossly underfunded prior to this budget. And this was just the budget for one year. These types of aggressive austerity measures were proposed or implemented every single year of the Trump presidency. Trump even had the same callous attitude towards the most impoverished people on the planet. In December 2020, Trump advocated for cutting back on foreign aid to pay for stimulus checks, even though the

government's foreign aid at the time amounted to less than 10% of the money required to increase these stimulus checks from the original \$600 to the proposed \$2000, and despite America being one of the greatest beneficiaries and perpetrators of imperialism in the very countries they give foreign aid to. Trump also went to great lengths to avoid helping refugees, even though America takes in fewer refugees, as a percentage of their population, than 74 other countries, and despite being one of the least generous countries in the world for accepting refugees in terms of their per capita wealth and GDP.

The Trump administration and Republican Party were also responsible for America having the worst response to the COVID-19 pandemic in the developed world, particularly when accounting for their per capita wealth. During Trump's presidency America had just over 4% of the world's population, but 20% of the world's COVID-19 deaths. At the point that America had suffered 500,000 deaths from COVID-19, Americans were over 40 times more likely to die from COVID-19 than those living in Japan, despite Japan having a much higher population density, and a higher percentage of elderly citizens than almost any other country in the world. Japan managed to achieve these results by taking basic safety measures. These poor outcomes occurred partly because the Trump administration commissioned fewer tests, in relation to their number of COVID-19 cases, than practically any other country in the world. These outcomes also occurred because Trump spread misinformation, and refused to encourage his supporters or state government officials to take appropriate safety measures.

Due to this incompetence, and the harmful ramifications of this incompetence that continued to occur even after Trump left office, more American adults and children ended up unnecessarily dying from COVID-19 than from the First World War, the Second World War, the Korean War, the Vietnam War, the Gulf War, the 9/11 terrorist attacks, the Afghanistan War, and the Iraq War, combined. Nor does this account for deaths tangential to the pandemic, such as those related to stress and despair, those resulting from a loss of

healthcare coverage, and those who died when hospitals became overrun with COVID-19 patients. And none of this addresses the 200,000 American children that have lost one or both parents to COVID-19. Nor does this include the millions of Americans that needlessly suffered from long-term physical and mental health problems because of COVID-19, including headaches, nausea, chronic fatigue, hair loss, hearing loss, lung damage, cognitive impairment, reduced fertility, and erectile dysfunction. The majority of this suffering and death could have been avoided if the Trump administration and Republican Party had been even slightly competent.

And none of these problems even include immoral actions committed solely by Trump, such as his chronic lying and gaslighting, his willingness to con his supporters out of money, his pardoning of reprehensible individuals, his praising of despicable authoritarians, his fascist and imperialist rhetoric and behavior, his disastrous trade deals, his inaction regarding the Flint water crisis, his insistence on persecuting and imprisoning whistleblowers, his refusal to decriminalize marijuana, his determination to destroy the lives of Dreamers, his disregard for the rights of indigenous communities, and his willingness to needlessly risk the lives of his supporters and police officers at the January 6th capitol riots, which obviously had a high likelihood of turning dangerous and deadly, and which tragically did. And none of this even accounts for the harm Trump did to those outside of America, such as his betrayal of America's Kurdish allies, his exacerbation of the genocide in Yemen, his ramping up of sanctions against Cuba, his withdrawal from the Iran nuclear deal, his withdrawal from the United Nations International Court of Justice, and his decision to move the U.S. embassy in Israel from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem. Nor does this include Trump's disgusting behavior outside of his role as president, such as his Trump University scam, his spending of charity money for his own benefit, his refusal to pay contractors, his history of tax fraud, and his years of sexual harassment, including his willingness to walk into changing rooms being used by women that, in his own words, were wearing "no clothes".

Considering their immense wealth and power, and the responsibility these come with, the Trump Administration was, and the Republican Party still are, close to being the most evil institutions in the developed world. They have gone to incredible lengths to further destroy the lives of the already exploited lower classes, and all in pursuit of enriching themselves and the unfathomably wealthy ruling class. Just by refusing to provide free universal healthcare, the Trump Administration and the Republican Party have been responsible for murdering more Americans than any terrorist organization could ever hope to achieve. If a government intentionally preventing millions of adults and children from having food is rightfully acknowledged as mass murder, then a government intentionally preventing millions of adults and children from having essential healthcare must also be acknowledged as mass murder. In fact they could reasonably be considered torturers, since the unnecessary physical and psychological pain and agony they have intentionally inflicted upon Americans easily reach the threshold of torture according to most definitions. And healthcare is just one issue out of hundreds of issues that negatively affect the lives of Americans. And none of this accounts for the harm done to everyone else in the world, including children, by their refusal to address their imperialist practices and existential threats like climate change.

None of this should be surprising however considering the Trump administration was always neoliberal and fascist, and the Republican Party has always been neoliberal and has become increasingly fascist. Nor should it be surprising considering the Trump administration was filled with, and the Republican Party continues to be filled with, many of the most corrupt and uncritically minded politicians in the developed world. Nor should it be surprising considering the Republican's last two presidents, George W. Bush and Donald Trump, were among the most sociopathic, corrupt, unknowledgeable, and unintelligent individuals to become world leaders of any developed country in modern history. Nor should it be surprising considering one of the presidents most celebrated by the Republican Party is Ronald Reagan, who was not only extremely

racist and homophobic, but also kick-started America's decline into neoliberalism.

Despite everything stated here, none of this changes the fact that the modern Democratic Party is still a monumental failure, even if they are far better by contrast. Practically all Democrats are capitalists, and most are neoliberals, and are therefore responsible for untold suffering and death in America and countries around the world. Unsurprisingly they also defend their economic policies with capitalist propaganda, and commonly use economism metrics to defend America's economy. Their right-wing positions are not just a consequence of being indoctrinated by capitalist propaganda, nor the fact that many Democrats benefit from personal investments in capitalist businesses and stock markets. They are also right-wing because they rely upon the generous contributions of capitalist businesses and interest groups in order to fund their campaigns. For all intents and purposes this system is effectively nothing more than legalized bribery, and only exists because it benefits the capitalist ruling class. This is not just a problem in America, but a problem in most capitalist countries, and provides another example of how capitalism is responsible for corrupting governments.

If these problems with the Democratic Party weren't bad enough, the poverty, wealth inequality, economic instability, and other appalling consequences of their economic policies have also inevitably resulted in ideal breeding grounds for fascism, as evidenced by the past and present support for Trump and the Republican Party. Despite these problems, most Democrats continue to advocate for zero change or incremental change, and regularly condemn as "extremists" those who rightly advocate for radical change. Because of all this and other reasons, the Democratic Party serve as a perfect real-world example of how obscenely dangerous modern-day liberalism is.

However, because of the effectiveness of capitalist propaganda, right-wing Americans commonly condemn the Democratic Party as "socialists", "communists", "Marxists", and "radically left-wing". Putting aside the Democratic Party's left-wing social stances, such as

their general support of LGBT+ rights and abortion rights, most Democrats are economically right-wing, and even far-right in the case of neoliberalism. The fact that they don't support free universal healthcare, even though this is supported by most right-wing political parties in the developed world, proves how economically right-wing they are. So the accusations made by right-wing Americans that the Democratic Party is economically left-wing does nothing except demonstrate how indoctrinated right-wing Americans have become. Unfortunately, this problem, and all of the other problems explored here, are to be expected as long as voters live under an economic system that can only survive by keeping the masses uncritically minded and indoctrinated with right-wing propaganda.

Government exploitation

Even when governments do work for the people, corporations still often succeed at exploiting these governments because of their consolidated power. There are numerous ways this exploitation can occur. Corporations regularly request corporate welfare from local and national governments in exchange for moving their businesses to their regions or countries. This tactic is used prominently by corporations when moving their operations to underdeveloped countries, but is also increasingly being used within developed countries. By competing governments against one another, they can coerce them into making extremely generous concessions for the "reward" of increasing employment and boosting their economies. This is ridiculous considering these outcomes would occur naturally if only consumers had greater discretionary income and purchasing power, which they don't have predominantly because of these corporations. Worse still, most businesses have no choice but to expand their operations into new locations if they want to be more profitable, and in most cases they already know which locations they are going to move to before they even approach these governments. Despite how obviously obscene it is for these billion dollar companies to use their power to exploit taxpayers like this, many within the lower classes defend these corporations and attack those who refuse to acquiesce to their demands.

Governments are also exploited via trade deals between nations that include Investor-State Dispute Settlement (ISDS) protections. These are enforced by tribunals that exist outside the jurisdiction of any country, and allow corporations to file lawsuits against democratically elected governments, and without democratic oversight. Businesses can use these to sue governments for tens or hundreds of millions of dollars when laws and regulations are passed that harm their actual or anticipated profits. This means that corporations can effectively steal taxpayer money, and do this in response to laws and regulations that protect people, animals, and the environment. Additionally, this financial compensation is practically never used to benefit the lower workers within these corporations, but is instead distributed among their higher-ups. Sometimes ISDS protections are necessary, but under capitalism they are more often than not just another means of exploiting governments and the masses.

Another problem with capitalism is that governments have no choice but to rely upon for-profit businesses. When publically funded initiatives go over budget, or are not completed on time, this is usually blamed solely on government incompetence. Governments are sometimes to blame of course, but the privately owned businesses they use are often to blame as well. It is not uncommon for businesses to sign contracts they know they cannot fulfill, or are unwilling to fulfill, on time and on budget, because this is an easy way for them to prolong their work and increase their profits. And because it is often too complicated for other companies to take over once these large-scale projects have commenced, governments often have no choice but to continue these projects with the original company. Governments also have to rely upon corporations for disaster relief during emergencies, and unsurprisingly these corporations often syphon off excessive profits for their investors at the expense of the wellbeing and lives of the victims. And if all of this wasn't bad enough, capitalist businesses continue to successfully indoctrinate otherwise well-intentioned politicians to adopt socially harmful capitalist ideas, such as pursuing austerity measures and giving tax cuts to corporations.

Corporate deception

The pursuit of profits has incentivized corporations to manipulate public opinion for their own ends, often causing tremendous long-term harm in the process. The tobacco industry and sugar industry have created numerous fake studies to persuade the public that their products pose no risk to human health, while simultaneously discrediting and suppressing legitimate research. Manufacturers of unhealthy foods have gone to great lengths to prevent nutritional information from appearing on their products, even though doing so could improve the health of the very customers that are responsible for their profits. Many people aren't even aware that the traditional food pyramid, which is even taught in many schools, is propaganda created by the food industry, and particularly the meat and dairy industry. Industries that inflict horrendous abuses against humans and animals use fun-loving and wholesome advertising campaigns to sell their goods and services, increasing the likelihood of further abuses. Corporations regularly use FUD, or "fear, uncertainty, and doubt", as a means of exacerbating artificial scarcity or cultivating perceived scarcity, in order to drive up demand and increase profits.

One of the most egregious perpetrators of such deceitful practices has been the pharmaceutical industry. Pharmaceutical companies have exploited communities in underdeveloped countries by selling them contaminated drugs, or using them as unwitting test subjects for untested drugs, all under the guise of providing cheap or free lifesaving medical care. In developed countries these companies claim to help people by providing essential medications, but use this as a cover to do everything they can to overprescribe medications to the most vulnerable individuals in society, including prescribing medications to people who require no medications. Worse still, many of these medications have horrible and life-altering side effects. For many people medications are essential, but these are often prescribed for most people even before more natural remedies have been encouraged, such as dietary changes, supplements, nature walks, exercise, sports, yoga, meditation, sleep scheduling, stress management, therapy, journaling, personal grooming, socializing, attending cultural events, and keeping one's living space clean and

organized. Illegal recreational drugs that have been shown to improve people's wellbeing, such as cannabis and psychedelics, have also been stigmatized at least partially to protect the profits of privately owned prisons and the pharmaceutical industry.

Another form of corporate deception under capitalism has been the corrupting of product information and reviews. Capitalism has given rise to false advertising, paid critic reviews, and fake user reviews, which rob consumers of the ability to make informed choices. Some companies also refuse to give professional reviewers enough time to review their products before release, and sometimes even blacklist reviewers who gave their products unfavorable reviews in the past. Worse still, in most instances consumers shouldn't even require reviews, since in most instances consumers only use reviews to try to circumvent problems caused by capitalism, such as disingenuous advertising, unreasonable pricing, planned obsolescence, and products and services being unfit for purpose. So not only does capitalism result in poor-quality products, but it also simultaneously corrupts the very systems consumers require to make informed choices about such products. These problems would be less likely to occur under highly democratic systems like democratic socialism, since most people in society want everyone to have the highest quality of life possible, and this becomes increasingly true when everyone has a high quality of life.

News media

Capitalism has resulted in the corruption of news organizations. One of the primary ways this has manifested is through their ongoing scapegoating of capitalism's problems. For example, capitalism is the primary cause of violent crime, and yet the news media rarely draws attention to this, but instead blames long debunked scapegoats, like rap music and violent videogames. Alternatively they may blame issues which do contribute to violent crime, but which are comparatively insignificant. For example, the issue of absent fathers has become one of the more incessant talking points of right-wing news organizations, and yet even though this is an important issue, it

is insignificant compared to economic factors. Ironically, it is right-wing news organizations that are largely responsible for fatherless homes, since it is the economic policies they advocate for that create welfare traps that benefit single parents, and create the stressful economic conditions that cause or exacerbate relationship problems.

Another problem is that the profit motive incentivizes the news media to focus on mostly irrelevant sensationalist stories and topics, in order to increase viewership, at the expense of analyzing issues of substance, such as the problems of capitalism. This has obviously been a particular problem with right-wing news organizations, who fearmonger about social issues that generally affect a tiny percentage of the population, while ignoring urgent political and economic issues that are currently destroying the lives of millions or billions of people. This is also true of their propensity to blow out of proportion problems that involve millions of dollars, while ignoring political and economic problems that involve billions or trillions of dollars. These news organizations are also funded by businesses that advertise through them, which gives these news organizations a strong incentive to refrain from criticizing these businesses and their industries. And if this wasn't bad enough, important issues are even less likely to receive the attention they deserve as local and independent journalists and news organizations become increasingly underfunded or corrupted due to wealth and power consolidation.

There are other notable examples of capitalism's corrupting effect on the news media. News organizations regularly reveal the names and faces of mass shooters and terrorists to increase viewership, even though this gives these killers the attention they crave, and incentivizes others who long for the same infamy and cultural immortality. News organizations also regularly peddle "perseverance porn", in which horrific situations caused by capitalism are portrayed as heartwarming because of the virtuous actions of those involved, while the underlying capitalist causes are ignored. This can include children doing fundraising events for friends, or adults donating gifts to strangers, to help fulfill essential needs that should be fulfilled by the government. News organizations also regularly produce "poverty

porn”, in which those in poverty are not portrayed as vulnerable and complex humans deserving of empathy and dignity, but instead used as sources of entertainment, including ridicule and condemnation, or examples of the importance of personal responsibility. At the same time, the poverty primarily responsible for these people’s traits and behaviors is completely ignored. An example of this would be a news story condemning a burglar who is chased and killed by cops, but which completely ignores the capitalist exploitation that pushed this person into poverty and a life of crime in the first place.

Stymied entertainment

Capitalism is also a system that is well designed for reducing the quantity and quality of the entertainment available to consumers. History has repeatedly demonstrated that the greatest works of art are crafted by those driven by creative passions and a desire to perfect their craft. Rarely have such works ever been created by businesses seeking to maximize their profits. Additionally, instead of giving everyone the freedom to maximize their potential and produce the best works they can offer, capitalism has disempowered people by limiting their resources, reducing their free time, and in many cases inflicting chronic physical and mental exhaustion. The detrimental effect this system has had on the entertainment industry has been substantial, and has even been socially harmful in certain instances.

Most capitalist businesses prioritize safe projects that can maximize profits, which has resulted in an oversaturation of soulless, homogenized, and creatively bankrupt works, including an excess of sequels, prequels, spinoffs, crossovers, adaptations, remakes, and reboots. Production schedules are usually kept unnecessarily tight, which regularly leads to creatively disastrous results. Projects are often underfunded, and approximately half of most production budgets are wasted on marketing, which has significantly reduced the quality and quantity of entertainment media produced. Most businesses within the entertainment industry also have to rely upon proprietary software, rather than collaboratively developed open

source software, which means professional and amateur works alike are often inferior versions of what they otherwise could be. To make matters worse, many large companies also purchase the rights to free software, especially plugins, forcing individuals and businesses to purchase software that was previously free or to learn to work without them.

A lack of proportional representation among creators and producers, which can be partly blamed on intergenerational poverty, has not only substantially limited the variety of stories that have been told, but this in turn has also had its own harmful effects on society. Many important issues, including those caused by capitalism, have not had the opportunity to be explored and brought to light, or at least not to the extent they should have been. A lack of proportional representation of characters within fiction has also meant fewer role models for younger members of demographics that have historically been underrepresented in media, or even negatively represented. The widespread availability of a diverse range of entertainment media, and particularly media that covers important and underexplored subjects and perspectives, is also invaluable for the maturation of individuals and societies. Being exposed to novel stories, ideas, knowledge, and opinions, can be essential for developing traits such as empathy, tolerance, wisdom, open-mindedness, and critical mindedness.

Films and TV shows have been particular victims of the capitalist system. Beloved TV shows with passionate followings are regularly cancelled without the creators being given the opportunity to produce a final season that can resolve their stories, and this can even occur because their shows are not profitable enough for shareholders, even if they are still profitable. Worker exploitation within the industry is responsible for recurring strikes, which limit the number and quality of films and TV shows produced every time they occur. Many films, TV shows, and live sports events, are only accessible in certain countries, and for no other reason than unnecessary forms of privatization. People who watch live television in most countries have to suffer through advertisements that interrupt films, TV shows, and

live sports events, even though these adverts are an absolute waste of time for the majority of audiences. Many films and TV shows are also blighted by overt product placements, which can take audiences out of these experiences, even though immersion is one of the most important goals of entertainment media. Cinemas have also become notorious for being averse to showing films with higher age ratings due to the increased likelihood of lower ticket sales, which has entirely prevented the creation of many mature movies, and resulted in many creators being forced by film studios to change their mature movies in pre-production or post-production so that they have lower age ratings. Film studios have further exacerbated this problem by exploiting cinemas, and even pushing them to bankruptcy, by demanding unreasonably large cuts of box office revenue.

Enjoyment of films and TV shows has also been severely hampered by streaming services under capitalism. Many consumers, even in developed countries, have woefully inadequate internet access and internet speeds due to capitalism, and are consequently unable to take full advantage of streaming services. And many of those who do have adequate internet access and speeds can't access all streaming services due to their unavailability in many countries, including developed countries. And to make matters worse, privatization in the form of licensing agreements and multiple streaming services has fragmented the market so much that it is now no different to the fragmented and consequently expensive market that existed when cable and satellite services were dominating. The consequences of this problem have been ridiculous. Streaming services are now so fragmented that it's currently possible for one service to have the license for a film or TV show, but not have the licenses for the audio files and subtitles of alternative languages. This can make viewing unnecessarily difficult, such as when trying to understand unique terms or dialogue that is challenging to discern, or can make viewing impossible, such as when the spoken language is not in the viewer's native tongue, or when a viewer has impaired hearing or vision. Some streaming services also only have films and TV shows in lower resolutions, because other streaming services have the rights to the

higher resolution versions. All of these problems are ludicrous, but are obviously all unavoidable outcomes under capitalism.

Computer games have also suffered severely because of capitalism. It is common practice within the industry for computer games, even from multibillion dollar studios, to be released with large amounts of bugs and missing content, and for full priced sequels to be released with bare minimum upgrades. Software and technology being released prematurely in order to beat out the competition is endemic to many industries under capitalism, but the games industry has been one of the worst perpetrators of this problem. Large companies within the industry have also become notorious for buying out smaller companies, only to then dismantle them when they prove to be profitable but not profitable enough for shareholders. This has substantially reduced the number and variety of major titles released, and permanently ended many popular franchises. Many game companies have also become notorious for preventing "modding" communities from releasing free and timely upgrades and extra content for PC games, since this can prevent these companies from making and selling such content themselves in the future. However, more often than not these game companies never even produce such content, and even when they do it's often inferior to what the modding community offers for free. A lack of collaboration and open source software within the industry has also stymied creativity, and created the ludicrous situation where many modern games needlessly have worse visuals, animations, AI, physics, etc. than games released 10 to 15 years earlier. These ongoing and worsening problems continue to cause consumers justifiable disappointment and anger, which is the antithesis of what entertainment media is meant to achieve.

Gaming has also become an unnecessarily expensive hobby in recent years because of coerced consumption. As previously discussed, consumers have to unnecessarily purchase multiple game consoles and peripherals to have access to all games and gaming experiences. The fact that many of these pieces of hardware cost hundreds or even thousands of dollars, and yet are not compatible with each

other because of privatization, perfectly illustrates how unimaginably broken capitalism truly is. Even when consumers can afford such hardware, they are often unable to buy them because they are regularly bulk purchased by scalpers who sell them for exorbitant prices, or bulk purchased for the purpose of mining cryptocurrencies, most of which are entirely valueless and environmentally harmful. And even when games are made available on most or all hardware, certain game content is often made exclusive to different consoles, or those who pre-order, or those who purchase the game from particular retailers, meaning consumers can be forced to buy the same game 2 or 3 times in order to play all available content. And none of this is to speak of the rapid rise of monetization in the games industry, particularly in the form of microtransactions and loot boxes, which are not only unnecessary and soul-destroying, but can also cause or exacerbate addiction, particularly among children and neurodivergent individuals.

All of this has culminated in consumers becoming increasingly cynical and jaded towards entertainment media, which is the one thing in society that should provide catharsis, rejuvenation, inspiration, and feelings of connection. Even beloved media properties and passionate fans are treated with little more than contempt under capitalism. This is not stated primarily to draw attention to the adverse mental and emotional effects that mediocre or corrupted art may have on individuals or society, but to demonstrate that there is almost nothing that capitalism cannot commercialize and ruin. It could even be speculated that the unnecessary distractions, exhaustion, and stress, caused by capitalism, also makes people substantially less able to immerse themselves in art, or be intellectually challenged by art, which are among the most invaluable things that art can provide. Art is meant to represent the very best that humanity has to offer, and yet even this has been severely limited and corrupted by capitalism.

Global unsustainability

One of the greatest dangers of capitalism is that it is a completely unsustainable system. Endless consumption has resulted in renewables being depleted quicker than can be replenished, and non-renewable resources being squandered for unnecessary short term gains and indulgences. Many forms of coerced consumption, such as planned obsolescence and perceived obsolescence, have particularly contributed to this problem. This is also true of the lack of cooperation and standardization in the building of infrastructures, such as the multiple mobile and Wi-Fi networks that are unnecessarily built and operated independently from one another, and the multiple charging station networks that only cater to specific electric vehicles and membership holders. Capitalism's inefficient utilization of resources is not just expensive and inconvenient for consumers and businesses, but will eventually culminate in a global systems crash, particularly as the world runs out of the minerals required for repairing and upgrading our global infrastructures.

Aside from this obvious inevitability, two major studies have even predicted the collapse of the global economy within the next two decades due to this resource depletion. A 1972 study by the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT), which was reaffirmed in 2021, predicted that a global economic collapse will occur by 2040 if resources continue to be depleted at the current rate. The researchers concluded that drastic measures would be required to avoid this catastrophic outcome. A 2014 NASA study concluded that the developed world will begin collapsing by 2030 because of water, food, and energy scarcity. This collapse does not mean the immediate end of human civilization, but that there will be a rapid and potentially terminal decline in economic output, with food production being the first victim. This will mean a substantial drop in quality of life for everyone in the world except the wealthiest, and a substantial increase in deaths, particularly in underdeveloped countries. Even if this collapse can be mitigated, quality of life will still decline for most people on the planet in the future without radical change.

Another major unsustainability problem that is less well known is the potential increase in zoonotic diseases, superbugs, and pan-resistant superbugs. Zoonotic diseases are those that are transmitted from animals to humans. Superbugs are bacteria that are resistant to common antibiotics and medications. Pan-resistant superbugs are bacteria that are not only resistant to common antibiotics and medications, but also every drug and treatment currently in existence, including experimental ones. These diseases predominantly exist because of the animal agriculture industry. Breeding billions of animals and forcing them to live in close proximity with each other and millions of humans has created ideal conditions for the evolution of new deadly microorganisms. This has been further exacerbated by the massive quantities of antibiotics that are given to both land animals and fish. In the past these antibiotics were given because they promoted growth, but are now predominantly given because of the brutal living conditions on factory farms, which are so emotionally and physically harmful that they can cause farm animals to die young from compromised immune systems. Currently in America over 80% of antibiotics are used by the animal agriculture industry, and this increase in antibiotic use has correlated with a 20 fold increase in antibiotic resistant microorganisms since the early 1970's. The creation of new diseases has been further exacerbated by land conversion, which is now responsible for approximately one third of all new human diseases. Land conversion occurs predominantly in underdeveloped countries, where ancient wildlife habitats are destroyed for the purpose of creating new farm lands. The livestock raised in these environments come into regular contact with the myriad of local species that generally don't interact with humans. This leads to the cross contamination of diseases from local wildlife to livestock, and then livestock to humans.

People are already dying around the world because of these diseases. In fact nearly all recent pandemics have been brought about just by zoonotic diseases alone, including bird flu, swine flu, Ebola, MERS, and COVID-19. Malaria is also a zoonotic disease, and AIDS has a zoonotic origin. MRSA, which is an antibiotic resistant microorganism,

already kills more people every year than AIDS. This situation could worsen considerably in the coming years and decades. Even extremely common and previously safe surgeries and procedures could become life threatening in the near future because of these diseases. Had society been living under a planned economy that prioritized the welfare of all sentient life, humanity would not be dealing with these problems.

Defense mechanisms

Capitalism has proven itself to be effectively immune to changes that could eliminate or reduce its problems. For example, if worker compensation is forcibly increased by the government in order to reduce exploitation, businesses will usually respond by reducing work hours, cutting employee benefits, firing employees, increasing their prices, moving overseas, and other similar measures, even if they can afford to pay this increased compensation. If compensation does increase, other businesses will usually increase their prices to take advantage of this increased discretionary income, which negates the benefit of this increased compensation, and harms those whose income has not increased. If taxes are increased on the rich, they will usually just change their compensation packages and tax avoidance strategy to negate this. If workers try to form unions, corporations will usually use both legal and illegal methods to prevent their formation or disempower them once they've formed.

As far as laws and regulations are concerned, corporations have always tried to undermine or remove them, whether they protect people, animals, or the environment. Some industries have even managed to get away with "self-regulation", even though under capitalism this term is effectively a contradiction. Self-regulation predominantly involves businesses creating and funding their own "regulatory" bodies, which provide certificates, schemes, and oversight, that are designed to deceive the public into believing their goods and services meet ethical standards. Even independent regulators are often inadequate due to underfunding that is the result of capitalism, and this includes large and well-known organizations

like Fairtrade and the Rainforest Alliance, who continue to certify products that do not meet their own standards. Regulators and politicians are also more susceptible to corruption under capitalism, since businesses are more likely to be unethical and governments are more likely to be incompetent and corrupt. However, even when regulators are able to do their job successfully under capitalism, corporations will usually just refuse to comply if this is more profitable, which is often the case.

One final defense mechanism worth pointing out is how capitalism has traditionally placated the middle class in developed countries with a modest quality of life, ensuring that class conflict could be subdued enough to maintain the system. However, capitalism is so incredibly broken that even this defense mechanism no longer functions. The quality of life of the middle class in developed countries has stagnated or declined over the past 50-70 years, and many workers are suffering increasingly inhumane working conditions. Additionally, more and more members of the middle class are becoming aware of capitalism's inability to be reformed. Consequently, an increasing number of people are becoming disillusioned with the system. So not only is capitalism effectively immune to being reformed because of its innate defense mechanisms, but the system is so fundamentally broken that even one of its most essential defense mechanisms is gradually failing as the entire system inevitably collapses.

Conclusion

The miscellaneous examples outlined here are not designed to be comprehensive, but to provide a basic overview of additional problems that further prove how broken capitalism is. Capitalism not only corrupts and destroys practically everything that it controls or influences, but worse still it is also a completely unsustainable system, and one that has proven to be effectively incapable of being reformed.

Statistics

The following statistics are estimates describing the current state of the world under capitalism. Every one of these statistics is reflective of situations that were caused by capitalism, exacerbated by capitalism, or have primarily not been solved because of capitalism.

There are two important things to keep in mind when reading these statistics. First, much of this information was compiled by corrupt capitalist and neoliberal organizations that obviously have an agenda, so the state of the world is likely worse than these statistics imply. Second, humanity has possessed the knowledge, labor power, physical resources, technology, etc. to meet the essential needs of every person on the planet for decades, and even centuries and millennia to a lesser extent. Humanity has also always had the ability to do this sustainably and without destroying the planet. It is with this in mind that the following statistics should be contextualized.

- 3.5 million people die every year due to a lack of safe drinking water, and this includes 2.2 million children. Nearly 800 million people have zero access to basic water services or have to travel at least 30 minutes to access basic water services. Every year 2 billion people have effectively no choice but to drink water contaminated with diseases or toxins, such as human waste, animal waste, synthetic fertilizers, synthetic pesticides, and chemicals used by the fashion industry, such as bleaches, dyes, detergents, and fabric softeners. Every year there are over 3.5 billion cases of diarrhea which are attributable to unsafe water, which in context means many of these cases are suffered multiple times a year by singular individuals. Approximately 4 billion people experience water scarcity for at least one month of every year. Conversely, the 12% wealthiest people on the planet use 85% of the earth's clean water, with the majority of this being used for animal agriculture. Within the next 10 years over 700 million people are expected to be displaced because of water scarcity. If current trends continue, within 30 years half of

the world's population will have either insufficient or no access to clean water. Most water scarcity over the coming years and decades will increasingly be caused by climate change, meaning this problem will not be easily solved. If global temperatures increase by 2 degrees above pre-industrial levels, up to 4 billion people are expected to suffer from water scarcity.

- 9 million people die annually from malnutrition, including over 3 million children. Over 500 million children currently have stunted physical development due to malnutrition, and this includes over 170 million children under the age of 5. Over 2 billion people are moderately or severely food insecure, and many of these individuals live in a state of chronic hunger. And this situation has not only been getting worse since 2014, but is predicted to get far worse over the coming decades. This is despite the fact the world produces enough food to feed every person on the planet one and a half times over, and the potential to feed many more. Even in developed countries, where millions of families are food insecure, approximately half of all edible food that is thrown away is thrown away by businesses before even reaching consumers, and this occurs for entirely avoidable reasons caused by capitalism. Even more indefensible, 70% of all the food produced in the world is grown by farmers and communities who account for approximately 50% of the world's most malnourished people. To make matters worse, the ocean's will have zero exploitable fish stocks by 2050 due to overfishing and ocean acidification, and the Earth will see a massive decline in food production by 2050. This shouldn't be surprising, since over the past 40 years alone the world has lost over one third of its arable land.

- Over 2 billion adults and children in the world are overweight. Of these, about 650 million adults are obese, and about 100 million children are obese. Many of these individuals also suffer from malnourishment due to having no choice but to subsist on junk food.

- 5.7 million people die every single year from a lack of access to adequate healthcare, with almost 3 million of these people having zero access to healthcare. 1.7 billion people have no access to, or

have insufficient access to, essential medications. This includes medications that are commonplace in developed countries, or which are extremely inexpensive to produce. Over 5 million people, including approximately 2 million children, die annually from being unvaccinated.

- 4.2 billion people do not have access to adequate levels of sanitation. This includes 3 billion people who lack the facilities to safely wash their hands at home.
- 1.6 billion people live without electricity, and a further 1.6 billion people have intermittent access to electricity. This is despite the fact that electricity has been available to the citizens of many developed countries for over 100 years.
- Over 150 million people in the world are homeless, and approximately 2.5 billion people live in extremely poor housing conditions. Millions of these people live in developed countries.
- 1 billion children live in poverty, and 60 million more are born into poverty every year. Over 8 million children die every year from poverty related issues. Child mortality rates have been increasing in recent history even in some developed countries.
- 500 million workers suffer ill-health every year because of their workplace. 340 million of these suffer from occupational accidents, and 160 million of these suffer from work-related illnesses. 2.3 million people die every year because of these accidents and illnesses.
- \$2.2 trillion worth of wealth is stolen from underdeveloped countries every year, which is 24 times more wealth than they receive in aid every year. This \$2.2 trillion is enough to end extreme poverty 15 times over. Since 1960 underdeveloped countries have had \$62 trillion stolen from them. Since 1980 underdeveloped countries have had to pay out \$4.2 trillion just in interest payments on their foreign aid debt.

- The poorest 70% of the world's population own less than 3% of the world's wealth, and the poorest 55% of the world's population own less than 1.3% of the world's wealth. People who are among the 10% wealthiest people on the planet are on average 3000 times richer than those who are among the 10% poorest people on the planet. In terms of international dollars, current research estimates that there are 1.4 billion people living on less than \$1.25 a day, 1.9 billion people living on less than \$3.20 a day, 4.3 billion people living on less than \$5 a day, and 5.3 billion people living on less than \$10 a day. Due to capitalism and an increase in the global population, the number of people living on less than \$5 a day has increased by 1 billion over the past 40 years. The majority of people living in poverty effectively own no wealth, and most of them have negative net wealth because of personal debt. Most of these people also have to pay off national "debt" via taxes.

The richest 1% own half of the world's wealth, the richest 10% own three quarters of the world's wealth, and the richest 30% own over 97% of the world's wealth. The richest 26 people in the world own more wealth than the poorest half of the world's population. 148,000 people in the world are worth more than \$50 million. The number of billionaires in the world since the 2008 Great Recession has more than doubled to over 2700. These billionaires now own more wealth than the poorest 5 billion people in the world, despite being only 0.000034% of the world's population. In 2018, the overall wealth of the world's billionaires increased by \$2.5 billion every single day, while the overall wealth of the world's poorest 50% decreased by \$500 million every single day. During the COVID-19 pandemic and global recession, the wealth of the world's billionaires increased by over \$6 trillion. Global extreme poverty could be eradicated multiple times over with just the yearly income of all the world's billionaires. The wealth of Jeff Bezos, who is the world's second richest person, is over 100 times greater than the entire health budget of Ethiopia, which is a country of over 100 million people. Despite forcing his underpaid employees to suffer under some of the most abusive working conditions in the developed world, it was revealed in 2021

that Jeff Bezos had purchased a superyacht worth half a billion dollars. The world is expected to have its first ever trillionaire within the next 5 years.

- CEO's earned approximately 10 times as much as their average employee 100 years ago, 20 times as much about 75 years ago, and 30 times as much about 50 years ago. Today's CEO's earn on average 200 to 350 times as much as their average employee. On the extreme end, CEOs can earn over 1000 times as much as their lowest paid worker. Many of the full-time employees of these CEO's do not earn a living wage, meaning they and their children live in poverty and are unable to meet their basic needs.
- The poorest 10% of the world's population account for approximately 0.5% of all consumption on a yearly basis. The wealthiest 20% account for approximately 80%, while the wealthiest 10% account for approximately 60%.
- The poorest 50% of the world's population account for approximately 10% of all consumption based CO₂ emissions, while the richest 10% account for almost 50%. The richest 20% of the world's population now account for almost 70% of historical emissions. An average person in the world's richest 1% produces 175 times the emissions of an average person in world's poorest 1%.
- 0.47% of the \$4.7 trillion that is spent on education every year goes towards educating the children of low-income countries, while 65% goes towards educating the children of high-income countries, even though these two groups of countries have roughly the same number of school age children. Because of this inequality, currently over 750 million adults around the world are unable to read or write, and billions more have inadequate reading comprehension.
- Out of the 100 wealthiest entities in the world, over half of them are corporations. The annual income of many of these corporations is greater than the GDP of many countries.

- 97% of the world's patents are controlled by developed countries.
- Over 65% of corporate profits are currently spent on stock buybacks, which only benefit shareholders, and provide no value to the rest of the company or society. In 1982, companies spent on average less than 1% of their profits on stock buybacks.
- Over \$800 billion is lost to tax evasion each year. The amount of money currently hidden in tax havens is equivalent to over 10% of the world's GDP.
- Global debt is approximately \$184 trillion. Not only should this debt not exist, but it can never even be paid off due to the world's finite resources and increasing technological unemployment.
- 87% of countries violate their worker's right to strike, 79% of countries violate their worker's right to collectively bargain, 74% of countries violate their worker's right to establish and join a trade union, and 65% of countries violate their worker's right to seek justice for workplace malpractice. In 2021 alone, protesting workers were detained and arrested in 46% of countries, protesting workers experienced violence in 30% of countries, and trade unionists were murdered in 6 countries.
- 260 million children around the world are engaged in some form of labor. Of these children, 160 million are forced to engage in labor that is significantly detrimental to their wellbeing in some way, and this number has increased by almost 10 million in the past 5 years alone. Many of these children could attend local schools, but have to work out of financial necessity.
- 50 million people are estimated to be in slavery right now, and this includes 10 million children. This is likely a larger number than any other time in human history. These slaves are responsible for \$150 billion worth of revenue every year. Most consumers in developed countries have literally dozens of slaves working for them in the supply chains of the goods and services they purchase. Human

trafficking is currently the most pervasive criminal market in the world. The number of slaves in the world is currently on the rise.

- Over 5 million people are sex slaves, and of the 35 million people who engage in sex work voluntarily, 90% only do so because of poor financial circumstances.
- Over 25% of women and girls working in sweatshops experience sexual abuse or violence at their place of work.
- Approximately 300,000 women and adolescent girls die every year due to pregnancy or childbirth complications. Most of these women and girls live in underdeveloped countries, and predominantly die due to malnutrition or underfunded healthcare services.
- 170,000 children below the age of 5 die every year due to birth defects. Many of these birth defects are attributable to lead poisoning, mercury poisoning, microplastics, nanoplastics, forever chemicals, and other unnecessary problems.
- 1 billion people live with disabilities, and approximately 200 million people have disabilities severe enough to cause them great or extreme difficulties in their day-to-day lives. Under capitalism most people with disabilities don't receive anywhere near enough assistance, or any assistance at all.
- Approximately 9 million people die prematurely every year from air pollution. 5.5 million of these deaths occur due to manmade sources. The remaining 3.5 million deaths occur because of natural sources of air pollution, but even these could be reduced if everyone had the opportunity to live healthier lives and had access to well-funded free universal healthcare. About 2.3 million people die every year from indoor air pollution, due to the fact that 95% of people in underdeveloped countries have no choice but to cook their food using hazardous biomass fuels that produce toxic fumes. Because women are primarily responsible for cooking in these countries, and because their children spend a lot of time with them, women and children are

disproportionately affected by this indoor air pollution. In total, over 1.8 billion children breathe outdoor and indoor toxic air every single day, and approximately 600,000 children die from air pollution every single year. Health problems caused by air pollution also cost the global economy over \$4 trillion every year in medical expenses, lost productivity, and other problems.

- Approximately 750,000 people die every year from heart disease and strokes caused by overworking.
- Almost 12 million people die every year due to smoking, alcohol, and drug use. More than half of those who die from alcohol or drug overdoses are younger than 50 years old.
- Over 700,000 people commit suicide every year, which is twice the number that die from homicide. Suicide is the fourth leading cause of death for those between the ages of 15 and 29. Over 50,000 people are estimated to have committed suicide as a result of the 2008 recession alone. Suicide spikes like this occur during every economic downturn, which under capitalism is once every 4 to 10 years.
- Over 6 billion people live in countries with either high levels of criminality or low resilience to organized crime.
- 1 billion children experience violence every single year, which occurs predominantly because of economic problems such as poverty and wealth inequality. This includes the 10 million children currently working in the sex trade, and the 300,000 child soldiers currently fighting in wars and conflicts.
- Approximately 70 billion land animals are currently suffering emotionally and physically because of their inhumane treatment within the animal agriculture industry. This industry is responsible for up to 99% of all the animals abused by humans.
- 96% of the mammals on Earth today are either humans or livestock, and over the past 50 years wildlife population numbers

have declined by almost 70%. Over 73,000 animal and plant species go extinct every year. During the past 50 years approximately 60% of vertebrate species, 75% of large mammal species, and 80% of freshwater species, have been made extinct, and this trend is expected to accelerate moving forward. Species have always come and gone throughout the Earth's history, but they are now going extinct 1000 times faster than they otherwise naturally would. This situation is now acknowledged as Earth's 6th mass extinction event, and the first ever manmade mass extinction event.

- 1.3 billion tons of non-recycled garbage is produced every year. This includes over 100 million tons of toxic waste, the majority of which is not safely disposed of. This also includes 345 million tons of non-recycled plastics, half of which are single-use plastics. This also includes over 50 million tons of electronic waste, also known as e-waste. Over the past decade less than 15% of e-waste has been recycled. Over half of the most commonly used metals are recycled less than 1% of the time, while rare metals are recycled less than 30% of the time.

- \$350 billion worth of externalities are caused every year by the production of plastics. This includes the 10 million tons that are dumped into the ocean every year, most of which cannot be cleaned up due to its small size, how much of it sinks below the surface, and how quickly it disintegrates. There are currently 5 large garbage patches in the ocean, but these only account for 1% of all plastic in the ocean. The Great Pacific Garbage Patch, the most well-known of these garbage patches, is estimated to be comprised of 1.8 trillion pieces of plastic, 94% of which are microplastics, which are smaller than 5 mm in size. The amount of plastic dumped into the ocean is expected to almost quadruple within the next 20 years. Because of this, there is expected to be 1 ton of plastic in the ocean for every 3 tons of marine life by 2025, and the weight of plastic in the ocean is expected to outweigh all marine life by 2050. Most of this is attributable to the commercial fishing industry, which is not only responsible for reducing the amount of wildlife in the ocean, but is also responsible for approximately half of all plastic in the ocean.

- Over one third of all microplastics that pollute the environment, and up to 8% of global CO₂ emissions, derive from the fashion industry, and particularly the fast fashion part of the industry.
- \$2.2 trillion worth of environmental damage is caused every year by the world's 3000 largest corporations.
- Over 700 million people suffer today as a consequence of climate change, including 175 million children. Over 5 million adults and children die every single year just from extreme temperatures alone. Over 60% of people that are currently displaced from their homes have been displaced because of climate change, and currently over 20 million people are displaced every year by climate change. During the next 30 years up to 80% of the worse consequences of climate change are expected to be borne by those in underdeveloped countries, even though they are only responsible for just 8% of all global greenhouse gas emissions. During the next 30 years over 100 million people are expected to be pushed into abject poverty because of climate change. During the next 30 years over 1.2 billion could be displaced by climate change, which is almost 90 times the number of adults and children that were displaced during the Syrian refugee crisis. This mass migration will lead to a substantial rise in civil unrest, conflicts, and wars. By 2050 the "Hothouse Earth" effect will begin, which is defined as a scenario in which 55% of the world's population will face 20 days every year of lethal heat levels. When combined with the increasing occurrence of "wet-bulb" conditions, this will cause the deaths of even more people, including perfectly healthy young adults and children. Most people will not be able to escape these conditions, and heatwaves are just one problem humans will suffer from as a consequence of climate change.
- Tens of trillions to hundreds of trillions of dollars' worth of damage could be caused by climate change over the coming century. Increased temperatures and humidity alone could short-circuit and destroy countless electronics owned by both consumers and businesses. In 2020 America was inflicted with almost \$100 billion

worth of damages due to climate-related disasters, and in 2021 America was inflicted with an additional \$145 billion worth of damages due to climate-related disasters.

- Over 1 million people, and disproportionately young children, die every year from superbugs and pan-resistant superbugs. This number is expected to increase to 11 million by 2050, which is more than currently die from cancer every year. Even common medical procedures, such as childbirth and routine surgeries, could become significantly more life threatening because of this problem.

- 1.7 planet Earths would be required for our current consumption rate of renewable resources to be sustainable. In other words, humans use in 1 year the same amount of renewable resources that it takes the Earth 1 year and 8 months to replenish. If every person on Earth had a Western lifestyle, humanity would require 5 Earths for this to be sustainable. One third of all of the Earth's natural resources have been used up during the past 0.009% of human history. Demand for the world's finite resources will skyrocket in the near future as more and more consumer goods come to market, and particularly if billions of people are lifted out of poverty.

Conclusion

When listening to ardent supporters of capitalism defend their system, it quickly becomes apparent that the suffering, death, unsustainability, and destruction, that these statistics represent are barely noteworthy, or are of secondary consideration, since their rhetoric demonstrates that what is of far greater importance is that the rich increase their wealth, that businesses increase their profits, and that developed countries increase their GDP. For those of us who do not make such capitalist arguments, because we are not grossly uncritically minded, dangerously sociopathic, or completely detached from reality, these statistics are horrifying, and are well-known examples of the obvious dangers of any economic system that prioritizes privatization, free markets, and profits.

To those that subscribe to this second point of view, these statistics provide some perspective of the scale of the problems facing humanity because of capitalism, but they do not cover every issue, and nor do they address the very specific and unique harms committed by particular businesses. They also cannot provide a detailed insight into the daily exhaustion, stress, loneliness, anxiety, depression, hopelessness, and humiliations, experienced by the billions of people who suffer because of capitalism. They cannot adequately convey the anguish people experience when unnecessary disasters force them to abandon their homes and communities, which can be places of immense emotional attachment. They cannot adequately convey the agony parents experience when watching their children suffer or die completely needlessly because of poverty. This is not merely because this level of analysis is outside the scope of this critique, but also because of compassion fade. In other words, the suffering and death of millions can never evoke the same appropriate degree of empathy and anguish that is experienced upon hearing about the tragic suffering and death of a single child reported in the news. This is well summarized in the common adage "A single death is a tragedy, a million deaths is a statistic".

These statistics also don't encompass the innumerable secondary consequences of capitalism that cannot be so easily measured. For example, schools that are underfunded due to capitalism can result in populations that are scientifically illiterate. This can lead to millions of people being far more likely to reject traditional medicines and use more experimental and dangerous alternative medicines. Similarly, many children continue to experience abuse, including sexual abuse, because the child protections services that could rescue them are chronically underfunded and understaffed due to capitalism. This list of secondary consequences is near endless.

Capitalism may not be solely responsible for all of these problems, but it is predominantly responsible, since capitalism has been the prevailing economic system of nearly all countries in recent human history. The idea that poverty in the world today is just the natural state of the world is disgusting capitalist propaganda. Despite all of

this, capitalists like to pacify people into thinking these global problems are being solved at a reasonable pace under capitalism, when in reality capitalism is creating or exacerbating these problems. Worse still, many of these problems, such as climate change, ecological collapse, and resource scarcity, are existential threats, and are worsening at an accelerated rate. And even if humanity does manage to solve all aforementioned problems, billions of adults and children will needlessly suffer, and hundreds of millions of them could needlessly die, before this is achieved. To dismiss these problems by arguing that they will be solved eventually, and to dismiss those who advocate for radical change, is to demonstrate a sociopathic callousness that has become disturbingly commonplace among those who support capitalism.

Part 3: Capitalism in reality:

Conclusion

Even if it could be defended from a theoretical perspective, capitalism will always unavoidably result in the severe exploitation of humans, animals, and the environment, as well as a range of problems that inevitably ruin politics, societies, cultures, and even humanity's future. And none of these are small problems or controversial conclusions, as proven by the comprehensive statistical evidence that irrefutably proves the dire state of the world under capitalism. In other words there is effectively nothing that capitalism can't and won't inevitably harm and corrupt when put into practice. Such consequences will always be unavoidable in any system that prioritizes privatization, free markets, and profits, above all else, rather than allowing the world's resources to be democratically controlled, and using economic planning to maximize the wellbeing of all sentient life under human influence and control.

CHAPTER 1

CONCLUSION

This critique of capitalism has strived to balance comprehensiveness with succinctness. Objectivity and veracity have also been highly prioritized, though flaws and errors within this critique are certainly possible. However, even when all limitations and potential faults are accounted for, and all bad faith interpretations are ignored, there is only one conclusion that can be reached. Capitalism, in every conceivable sense, is nothing less than a monumentally disastrous economic system. Capitalism is not only overtly flawed and contradictory at the theoretical level, but when practically applied will always culminate in extreme suffering and devastation on a global scale. Even hypothetically good things about capitalism, such as markets and technological progress, are not exclusive to capitalism, and are far better replicated, utilized, or achieved, under alternative economic systems like democratic socialism. None of this should come as a surprise, since capitalism is effectively nothing more than neo-feudalism, due to it perpetuating the exploitation and indoctrination of the masses at the hands of the ruling class.

If the brokenness and dangerousness of capitalism is not yet overtly clear, this should become clearer when one considers that its outcomes have been even worse than Nazism in many respects. First, despite being one of the most illogical and reprehensible ideologies in all of human history, the Nazi's still believed the people they were abusing and killing were inferior and deserving of their fate. Conversely, the modern capitalist ruling class is enlightened enough to know that the people they are abusing and killing are equal in value to themselves, they just simply don't care. Second, the number of adults and children killed during the Second World War was equivalent to 8 million every single year. Conversely, even

during peacetime well over 20 million adults and children die every year from entirely preventable causes attributable to capitalism. Third, despite how evil they were, even the Nazi's had the intention of creating what they believed would be a utopian future for their billions of descendants. Conversely, the capitalist ruling class is willing to irreversibly destroy the planet and exacerbate existential threats, including irreversibly squandering the world's finite resources, even though they know this will destroy the quality of life of future generations. In summary, if an economic system can encourage and empower people to be more selfish and cruel than Nazis, and cause more suffering and destruction than the Nazis ever did, then this should be more than enough to convince anyone of how incredibly broken and dangerous that economic system is.

And if all of this wasn't bad enough, the other side of this tragedy is the unrealized potential of humanity, which has been an incomprehensible loss. The world would be unrecognizable if everyone had been given the opportunities necessary to maximize their potential and contribute their fullest to society even just a century ago. Every disease and illness could have been cured, and automation technologies could have been advanced to the point of replacing all human labor. All basic human needs could have been fulfilled in an age of abundance, free time, and optimism, rather than the capitalist age of scarcity, exhaustion, and pessimism. The feedback loops of exploitation, competition, desperation, squandering, and destruction, could have been replaced with the feedback loops of prosperity, cooperation, security, sustainability, and progress. Whatever good has been achieved under capitalism has been a fraction of the potential a more sophisticated system could have achieved, and without the unnecessary exploitation, death, and destruction, in the process.

For capitalism to be described as anything less than a colossal failure in light of all of this would be a heartless and disgusting insult to the billions of people and trillions of animals that have needlessly suffered and died because of its perverse and illogical obsession with privatization, free markets, and profits. Sadly, people continue to be

convinced of capitalism's supremacy, particularly the privileged few who benefit from it and falsely believe it to be meritocratic. This is even true of most economists, who will likely go down as some of the stupidest people in human history due to their complete inability to formulate or understand some of the most obvious and irrefutable ideas in existence, such as the fact that economism metrics are an atrocious way of determining the value of an economy, the fact that economic stability and long-term sustainability are fundamental requirements of any economic system, the fact that the world's resources and technological surplus belong to everyone, and the fact that preventing resources from being appropriately allocated because of the proxy used to represent these resources is idiotic beyond comprehension. Despite this widespread acceptance, the reality is that capitalism is only defensible when viewed from a narrow, short-term, simplistic, idealistic perspective that ignores its consequences and the complexities of the real-world. Put another way, if society ignores all of the problems caused by capitalism, and only the wellbeing of capitalism's current beneficiaries are accounted for, then capitalism must be judged as the greatest economic success story in human history. If however all of these problems are accounted for, both now and into the future, then capitalism must be recognized as a disaster so monumental in scale that not only has it been responsible for inflicting incredible suffering on the overwhelming majority of humans and animals in the world since its introduction, but through the creation of existential threats has also made the end of human civilization as we know it a genuine possibility.

In conclusion, capitalism is an immensely and unavoidably oppressive, destructive, and unsustainable system that must be transitioned away from immediately. No innovations or incremental changes will ever be able to reform capitalism, and most aforementioned problems will only worsen moving forward. The only solution is for all societies to embrace democratic socialism. And unsurprisingly, this was always viable and ideal.

CHAPTER 2:

XOVA

This chapter will explore the end goals of our movement, the steps required to achieve them, and the necessity of our movement's success.

PART 1: ROADMAP

The future

This section will very briefly outline the future our movement envisions and will strive to bring to fruition.

2 years

Within the next 2 years the following should be possible.

- Improve the critical thinking skills and economic literacy of a significant percentage of the world's population.

- Make the majority of countries optimally democratic and end political corruption.
- Transition the majority of countries to democratic socialism, including a 4 day workweek, and consequently substantially reduce global poverty and wealth inequality.
- Unify the majority of countries in the collaborative pursuit of creating the utopian future outlined in this manifesto, and consequently reduce the threat of future wars, including nuclear war.

20 years

Within the next 20 years the following should be possible.

- Bring all existential threats under control, and ensure the long-term survival and prosperity of humanity.
- Eradicate all diseases and illnesses worldwide, including aging.
- Achieve “Fully Automated Luxury Communism” (FALC), which is an economic system in which all jobs are automated, and potentially even all household chores.
- Create “full-immersion virtual reality” technology. This is technology that can offer experiences indistinguishable from reality.

Conclusion

The future described here is more desirable than anything any capitalist or politician would ever dream of promising, and more desirable than anything any organization or movement is currently proposing. This future may appear to be wish fulfillment, but these predictions are all plausible, as will soon be explored. If this future is not achieved within our predicted time frame, it likely won't be because it's unfeasible, but because our movement's proposals were not implemented as rapidly as they should have been.

Our plan

This section will explore the steps that will be necessary for transitioning societies to democratic socialism, or more specifically the form described in Chapter 1 of this manifesto. To improve public discourse, this particular form should be referred to as Xovian democratic socialism. To write out the entire list of changes that will be required to achieve this transition would effectively involve reiterating large segments of Chapter 1. Instead, this section will only describe the initial steps required to begin this transition.

Worker cooperatives

One of the first and most essential changes will be transforming all businesses into worker cooperatives. Once this has been achieved, all worker cooperatives will be able to begin cooperating with one another with the express purpose of maximizing the quality of life of everyone in society. This will be particularly essential for ensuring a UBI is not taken advantage of once it is introduced. This transition will involve a multitude of changes. As far as workers are concerned, these changes will include transitioning to a 4 day workweek, providing all employees with at least 8 weeks paid vacation leave, and adopting our international compensation algorithm, which will ensure all full-time employees receive a living wage, and that there is a maximum compensation limit. Our movement recommends a compensation limit that is approximately 9 times that of the lowest paid worker in society. This compensation algorithm will also ensure those working in STEM fields are very generously compensated. As far as wider society is concerned, these changes will obviously include things like ending planned obsolescence, designing products to be recyclable, ending all abuses within all supply chains, and ensuring all worker cooperatives operate completely transparently. An international price algorithm will also need to be used to determine prices, which will ensure prices are kept as low as possible. Chapter 1 provides a more detailed description of the types

of changes that will need to occur, but this brief summary gives an indication of the rapid changes that could be achieved if all businesses became worker cooperatives.

As explained in Chapter 1, the one change that must not be introduced immediately is the abolition of paid child labor within supply chains. Worker cooperatives will instead need to ensure all workers within their supply chains receive a fair wage, and work in safe and humane conditions, while also pushing for a UBI or other safety nets in these countries so that child workers can safely quit their jobs. History proves that doing otherwise will risk causing even greater hardships for these children and their impoverished families, and may even be a death sentence in certain cases. Alternatively such children may even end up performing labor that is more hazardous and abusive, including sex work. Introducing a global UBI could be achieved rapidly once the majority of countries have transitioned to democratic socialism, but this must be achieved first.

Election reforms

To democratize all governments will require significant reforms to all election systems. The following 12 reforms are considered the most essential by our movement. First, citizens in every country must possess the power to initiate spontaneous elections. Every country must hold elections on a recurring basis, but citizens must also have the power to vote anyone out of power at any time. Second, even if those currently incarcerated are not given the right to vote, those released from prison must have their right to vote reinstated. Once a person has paid their dues to society, there is no justification for further punishment. Third, all gerrymandering must come to an end. Voting regions will ideally be determined by an impartial algorithm or artificial intelligence. Fourth, governments must introduce automatic voter registration. Most governments in developed countries already have all the information necessary to do this. Fifth, postal voting must be a possibility for all citizens. Many countries have already proven that this can be done without increasing election fraud. Sixth, election days must be on a weekend, a national holiday, or a new

national holiday, to ensure maximum turnout for those that need to visit polling places. Seventh, countries must adopt the Xovian STAR-blockchain voting system, which will be explored in the next section.

Eighth, the voting age must be lowered to 16. The reason is that 16 year olds are more than capable of possessing the critical thinking skills and knowledge necessary for their vote to have as much value as anyone else's vote. In fact, compared to much older individuals, 16 year olds are substantially more likely to be progressive, socialist, and concerned about existential threats, which makes it all the more absurd that they are not allowed to vote in most countries. Many 16 year olds do not have the critical thinking skills and knowledge necessary for their vote to have value, but neither do most adults. The solution for preventing such individuals from making poor voting choices is obviously not to prevent them from voting, but to ensure they become critically minded and knowledgeable regarding essential information. Our movement's success will help with achieving this.

Ninth, all political candidates must be required to pass fitness-for-duty tests. At a bare minimum this will involve passing a critical thinking exam and an essential knowledge exam, and learning about effective governing. The critical thinking exam will require candidates to demonstrate that they are capable of practically applying critical thinking skills to a high level. This exam should ideally take at least 8 hours, and should be split up over multiple days if necessary. The essential knowledge exam will test a candidate's knowledge about politics, economics, science, sentience morality, geography, history, and other essential information required by politicians. Candidates will also be required to read a training manual, or complete a course, which covers essential information and skills related to governing. Candidates could also be required to read this manifesto, or a condensed version, to ensure they are fully aware of all of the ideas within it. However, reading a mostly unedited version of our manifesto aloud on camera, starting with the glossary and appendix, must be nonnegotiable for the first round of elections. We appreciate that this is extremely unconventional, and will be exceptionally difficult to achieve, but it is an ideal that must be strived for, since

currently it is the only way for politicians to prove they are humble, critically minded, and knowledgeable in essential areas, which is vital for creating functioning governments and achieving harmony between nations. Candidates for high-ranking positions, or at least heads of state, should also be required to undergo a psychological evaluation. However, instead of passing these evaluations, the results would merely be used to further inform voters.

Tenth, political candidates must never be required to register with a party to be on a ballot. Eleventh, campaigning should generally take up no more than 3 months, and ideally just 2 months. The competency of political candidates should predominantly be determinable prior to campaigning just from them passing fitness-for-duty tests alone, with their individual scores providing additional insights. Twelfth, most traditional forms of campaigning must come to an end. Getting money out of politics is a nonnegotiable necessity, since this is the primary source of corruption in most political systems. Even without corruption, most politicians waste massive amounts of time either fundraising for their next campaign or maintaining relationships with those who fund their campaigns, which obviously takes essential time away from their duties. Traditional campaigning also creates an unnecessary barrier to entry for candidates, and gives better funded candidates a significant advantage. Under our system candidates will neither receive nor require funding of any kind. Candidates will first be required to provide written answers to questions that cover all relevant aspects of their job, and particularly their policies. These answers will be made available online on a single website, or made available for free in printed form for those that lack internet access. This website will also need to provide visitors with a questionnaire that can reveal to them which candidates they most align with.

All other campaigning will be limited to debates, interviews, and town halls. Eligibility for public debates could be decided by preliminary public voting. Debates will either not be performed in front of a live studio audience, or the audio and visual reactions of audiences will not be broadcast. Removing audience reactions from broadcasts will

prevent audiences at home from being unduly influenced. Inappropriate or malicious comments or attacks made by candidates can often appear less so, or even be reframed as witty and reasonable, when followed by supportive jeers and applause from audience members. During these events candidates should also all be subject to fact checking, which today could be assisted through the supplemental use of artificial intelligence. In addition to these events, candidates could also potentially be allowed to produce online videos, but these will need to have limits placed on them to ensure candidates do not use their personal wealth to give themselves an advantage. Combined with critically minded and economically literate populations and political candidates, this more mundane approach to campaigning should also assist in moving society away from the hysteria and cults of personality that plague modern campaigns. The entire election process should be as civil and uneventful as a scientist being interviewed for a position at a research institution, with the only difference being that the process is public.

An additional reform that could be pursued is replacing leaders with councils, so that instead of a single individual, countries would be led by a small council comprised of an uneven number of democratically elected individuals. These councils would function identically to traditional world leaders, but with the advantage that these councils would disperse power, and ensure more intelligence, education, and experience, is brought to decision making. This system has already been implemented in Switzerland for all intents and purposes, and to great success. However, this is not an essential reform, but a potentially valuable one that is worthy of consideration.

If the 12 election reforms mentioned here are introduced, and our movement is successful globally, most of the world's governments could be comprised predominantly with democratic socialists in the near future. Our goal is for elections to be held in as many countries as possible in November 2024, with elections in most other countries soon after. To have elections within this time frame will require many countries to have an unusually narrow campaign window. However, if all candidates pass fitness-for-duty tests, or at the very least read

our manifesto, then they will all be substantially more competent and economically literate than practically all politicians currently in power, meaning this first campaign window does not need to be long. What matters more than anything else is that competent democratic socialists are elected to power worldwide as soon as possible.

Obviously the ruling class in most countries will do everything they can to prevent these election reforms and elections. However, the power to have complete and ongoing control over the officials and institutions that influence one's life is an inalienable human right. Therefore, any action taken to prevent this must be universally acknowledged as a form of treason. To preemptively reduce the chances of any member of the ruling class engaging in this form of treason, there must be near universal agreement, particularly among democratic socialist political candidates, that anyone who attempts to stop such election reforms and elections must suffer severe consequences if at all possible, including lengthy prison sentences. Similarly severe punishments would ideally also exist for any member of the ruling class that attempts to stop our movement or attempts to punish our supporters. This is because this manifesto proves that our movement's goals are logically and morally justified.

Political reforms

Once most of the world's governments are democratic socialist, it will be possible to enact major political reforms. There are too many to mention here, so this section will only cover a few of the most important reforms. First, newly elected democratic socialist politicians will need to ensure the compensation that they and all future politicians receive is determined according to the international compensation algorithm previously described. This compensation could also be partially determined by metrics calculated by independent organizations that measure important societal factors, such as the quality of life of the poorest stratum of society. This will need to be carefully crafted in order to avoid the surrogation cognitive bias and similar problems, which could result in politicians working to increase certain metrics at the expense of the quality of

life that these metrics are meant to represent. Second, governments will need to introduce strong anticorruption measures. This could include preventing politicians from ever helping, or benefitting from, businesses or individuals they've worked with prior to or after their time in office.

Third, governments will have to do everything they can to ensure their populations are highly critically minded, as well as educated about all the information that populations require as common knowledge to be able to successfully create and maintain functioning and prosperous societies. Fourth, governments will have to oversee and regulate the economy, to ensure it operates according to democratic socialist principles. Governments may need to nationalize certain businesses and industries, such as those that provide essential goods and services, although this will not necessarily require removing any workers from their positions. Fifth, governments will need to introduce a UBI. This UBI will also apply to children, although obviously the money will go to their guardians until they are old enough to receive it themselves. This UBI will replace all other forms of government financial assistance, except those required by people with additional needs, such as those with severe disabilities.

Sixth, governments must pursue school reforms. Education curriculums must prioritize essential knowledge, such as those related to critical thinking, the scientific method, Xovian democratic socialism, and sentience morality. Education curriculums must also teach personal and interpersonal skills, such as basic psychology, stress management, communication skills, conflict resolution, and relationship advice. Education curriculums must also teach other essential life skills, such as studying techniques, time management, financial literacy, interview skills, and cooking skills. The humanities, psychology, and sports, must also be generously funded in schools, since these are ideal at cultivating and improving a wide range of desirable personal and interpersonal qualities, such as cognitive acuity, mental health, self-awareness, empathy, creativity, discipline, and physical fitness. Both lower and higher education should also

prioritize cooperation rather than competition. Schools should also eradicate or significantly reduce homework and standardized tests, as there are better ways of educating and evaluating students. Countries that have taken this approach have seen significant improvements not just in the academic success of their students, but also in their mental health and wellbeing. The school week should also be reduced to 4 days, in alignment with the 4 day workweek. School days should ideally also start later, since younger children require more sleep, and teenagers have a naturally delayed circadian rhythm compared to adults that is entirely independent of lifestyle. Research has shown that pupils that go to schools with later start times have measurably better education and wellbeing outcomes, including suffering from less chronic tiredness and emotional problems. Such reforms will benefit children most importantly of all, but from an economic standpoint they will also maximize innovation and productivity, which will also be essential moving forward.

Seventh, governments will need to create and sign up to a universal declaration of sentient rights. This declaration will be based on sentience morality, and will be used to protect the rights of all sentient life under human influence and control. This includes animals that are harmed for reasons not attributable to capitalism. For example, race horses often have their tongues tightly wired down, they are whipped repeatedly and aggressively, they can break their legs, and they often hemorrhage blood from their lungs due to extreme physical exertion. Another example is the breeding of pure bred animals, and perhaps most notably dogs. Such animals can spend their entire lives needlessly suffering, including experiencing severe breathing problems and walking difficulties. Another example is the mistreatment of rodeo bulls, which are often intentionally inflicted with severe pain, including physical mutilation, to make them more aggressive.

Wealth redistribution

Once all businesses and governments have been democratized it should finally be possible to redistribute wealth globally. A UBI will

achieve a reasonable level of wealth redistribution for all intents and purposes, and its introduction will also help mitigate or prevent potential economic disruptions caused by necessary economic reforms. However, to achieve global wealth redistribution to the extent that is required will necessitate some monumental changes. This will need to be done carefully, although even if implemented far from perfectly this will still significantly improve the quality of life of everyone except the richest people in society, particularly when done in combination with all of our other democratic socialist proposals.

Global wealth redistribution will require a number of initiatives, although this section will only outline the 5 most important ones. First, capital controls will need to be implemented as quickly as possible to prevent the rich from moving their wealth to tax havens, although even tax havens won't exist for long if our movement succeeds. Second, all foreign aid debt will need to be cancelled. Third, all exploitative trade deals will need to be remediated.

Fourth, people's wealth will need to be recalculated according to the aforementioned international compensation algorithm. Approximate estimates, erring on the high side, could be worked from initially, before more detailed estimates are calculated as time progresses. One of the quickest ways of practically redistributing wealth will be to eradicate all personal debt related to essential goods and services, such as education and healthcare. Combined with other democratic socialist proposals, this will quickly and substantially improve the quality of life of everyone within the bottom 99%. It will be impossible to redistribute wealth perfectly fairly, but even in the early stages of pursuing this goal the world will quickly become fairer in this regard by orders of magnitude. This system will also necessitate an international wealth limit. This probably shouldn't be any higher than \$20 million, since even this would require a worker to earn and save on average \$400,000 a year for 50 years. Perhaps exceptions could be made, but \$20 million would be a reasonable starting point.

This wealth redistribution will also necessitate reallocating many properties that are owned by the excessively wealthy. Personal

property rights will continue to be staunchly protected, but this will only apply to a person's primary residence, and a worker's necessary secondary residence. This could also apply to vacation homes, but only if every person in a country can be housed, and only if the person or family in question can afford this home once their wealth has been recalculated. Governments could also reallocate properties in such a way that allows tenants to stay in their homes if they so choose, and for these tenants to partially or entirely own these properties depending on their wealth. Governments may also need to nationalize certain motels and hotels in order to house the homeless if more appropriate long-term accommodation is not immediately available.

Fifth, to achieve wealth redistribution to the greatest extent possible, the world will need to transition to Resource Tokens. This is because the worldwide adoption of this currency will invalidate all others, meaning any personal wealth in any other currency that is still unfairly accumulated will become worthless. Additionally, wealth cannot be fairly redistributed unless the value of all physical resources is recalculated, which the transition to Resource Tokens is specifically designed to achieve. Accurately determining both the value of all labor and the value of all resources is the only way wealth can be fairly redistributed. Considering modern electronic infrastructures, and the number of experts in the world that could assist in this transition, Resource Tokens could be adopted globally within less than 5 years.

Conclusion

Our plan for realizing the future envisioned by our movement is entirely feasible, and could be achieved rapidly without people's quality of life suffering at any point in the process. Forcing governments to introduce election reforms and forcing businesses to become worker cooperatives will enable the masses to finally take control of all political and economic organizations and systems, and will allow countries to quickly transition to Xovian democratic socialism, which will include fairly redistributing the world's wealth.

The Xovian STAR-Blockchain **voting system**

Every country in the world must enact our 12 election reforms, and this includes transitioning to the Xovian STAR-Blockchain voting system, which we believe is the most democratic and robust voting system that can currently exist. This system is comprised of three parts. The STAR part of this system refers to a method for capturing voter preferences in the most detailed way possible, and balancing the totality of all voter preferences so that the final result is as fair as possible. The blockchain part of this system refers to the method used for storing this voting data. The Xovian part of this system refers to the particular way our movement recommends implementing these two technologies into an optimally robust system. Each of these three parts will now be explored in detail.

The STAR voting system, which is an acronym for Score Then Automatic Runoff, is effectively a hybrid system combining score voting, also known as range voting, and instant-runoff voting, also known as ranked choice voting or preferential voting. These two separate voting systems are substantially more democratic than the voting systems used in almost all countries, and are equally democratic as the voting systems in all other countries. However, the STAR voting system surpasses these two individual systems because it combines the best features of both. The first reason the STAR voting system is ideal is because it effectively captures the maximum amount of voter preference information that can realistically be captured. This is because each voter has the opportunity to rank each candidate using numerical scores. If for example a voter only slightly prefers one candidate over another, they could give their preferred candidate 10 points out of 10 points, and the second candidate only 9 points. However, if a voter strongly dislikes the second candidate, they could give their preferred candidate 10 points, and the second candidate only 1 point. The STAR voting

system allows for an infinite number of candidates, and allows for an infinite point scale, meaning a 100 point scale could also be used instead of a 10 point scale.

The second reason why the STAR voting system is ideal is because of the way this voting data is used to calculate the final winner. This process involves complex mathematics that go beyond the scope of this manifesto's intended purpose. However, the bottom line is that the way this voting data is calculated guarantees that the winning candidate is the one most preferred by society as a whole. This system consequently also avoids most of the major problems with current elections, such as tactical voting and the spoiler effect, and perhaps most importantly it gives independent candidates a genuine chance of winning. Despite what may be assumed, it is in fact mathematically impossible for any voting system to be perfect, but the STAR voting system is widely regarded as being possibly the most mathematically balanced voting system currently available. All of these advantages also hold true for the Proportional STAR voting system (a.k.a. STAR-PR voting system), which is a variant designed specifically for multi-winner elections.

The second part of our proposed voting system is the use of blockchain technology. Despite the common misconception, a blockchain is not a cryptocurrency, but simply a permanent and widely distributed digital record that is capable of being completely transparent and is effectively impossible to modify via hacking. Using a blockchain to record votes provides 3 significant advantages. First, all voters will be able to verify that their vote has been recorded correctly. Second, all votes will be permanently recorded, meaning they can never be manipulated or erased. Third, all necessary voting data will be publically available, allowing for a level of transparency that will make election rigging substantially more difficult to execute due to being effectively impossible to hide. Election rigging can technically occur with any voting system, and with blockchain technology this could be achieved by creating fake voters, but the transparency enabled by blockchain technology will at least make this effectively impossible to get away with.

The third part of our proposed voting system is the unique way the STAR voting system and blockchain technologies could be combined and implemented in practice. Small tweaks could be made to the following proposal and still produce the same desired results, but its unlikely modifications will be necessary. The first step will be for voters to pick up in person, or receive through the post, a letter containing a minimum of 8 alphanumeric codes, each with a corresponding QR code. Any one of these codes could be used to vote, and the provision of 8 codes will allow voters to change their vote 7 times if they so choose. Each vote will still be recorded on the blockchain, but only the most recent vote will count. Additional information, such as date of birth or a national ID number, could also be required to vote. Using codes and personal information like this will be superior to using written signatures, since for the longest time experts have warned that signatures are known to change over time and under different circumstances, which unsurprisingly continues to result in valid ballots being erroneously invalidated, including in developed countries.

This system will provide people with multiple ways to vote. If a person wanted to vote using an electronic device with a camera they could use a QR code. If a person wanted to vote using an electronic device without a camera they could type in an alphanumeric code. If a person did not have access to a functioning electronic device they could visit a polling place and use the electronic devices provided there. If a person preferred they could use a paper ballot instead and have this uploaded to the blockchain on their behalf. After voting every voter would be encouraged to check the blockchain to verify their vote. This could be done using an additional code that allows a voter to see and verify their vote on the blockchain but no one else's. In the unlikely event that a person's vote on the blockchain is different because their electronic device was compromised, they could simply use another code to vote on a different electronic device.

Another important part of our proposed system will be the creation of multiple public blockchain ledgers. The first ledger will show the name of every person who voted. The second ledger will show the address of every person who voted, but will not reveal which address corresponds with which voter. The third ledger will show the voting data of each vote, but will not reveal which vote corresponds with which voter or address, making it impossible to know how any individual has voted. The information provided by these blockchain ledgers will make it extremely difficult for any corrupt government to get away with election fraud. Additionally, if our movement is successful, and the majority of people in the future only vote for competent democratic socialists, then even in the extremely unlikely event that election rigging did occur, it would be extremely unlikely for anyone other than a competent democratic socialist to be elected to power.

The totality of the Xovian STAR-Blockchain voting system achieves a number of ideal goals. First, the winning candidate will always be the one most preferred by society as a whole. Second, voting will be extremely easy and cheap for governments to implement, or at least in developed countries, since most voting will be done via smart phones. Third, blockchain technology, open source software, and the ability to change one's vote if compromised, will substantially increase the public's faith in the voting process. Online systems, such as online banking, have already proven how incredibly secure such systems can be, and our proposed system will be securer still. Fourth, the convenience of our proposed system, combined with the overall success of our movement, will massively increase voter turnout, which is necessary for any functioning democracy. Fifth, our system will also make it easier to implement a liquid democracy, which is a system where voters are also able to vote on an ongoing basis on a variety of specific issues.

The superiority of the Xovian STAR-Blockchain voting system necessitates that every country in the world hold elections in the near future. This is because this new system invalidates all previous election results. If a country's current voting system and the STAR

voting system would have resulted in different winners during previous elections, then this means this country effectively has unelected people in power. In fact the mere existence of the STAR voting system invalidated the election results of most elections in the world the moment it was created. And this doesn't even account for the other 11 problems that are addressed by our election reforms, which further invalidate the results of most elections in most countries. In other words, if elected officials refuse to transition to the STAR voting system, then they are no better than unelected dictators and traitors, and must be removed and punished as such.

Conclusion

Functioning democracies require optimally democratic voting systems, and yet most politicians intentionally demand the continued use of simplistic and broken voting systems in order to stay in power. The Xovian STAR-Blockchain voting system is superior to every voting system in the world, and consequently invalidates the results of practically every election in the world, which is why it must be implemented and utilized as soon as possible.

Part 1: Roadmap: Conclusion

The future envisioned by our movement is not only more ideal than any other currently being seriously proposed, but our plan for achieving this future is also entirely feasible. Democratizing the world's political and economic organizations and systems in the near future is entirely possible, and once this has been achieved the massive global changes that are required to bring our proposed future to fruition could be implemented within an incredibly short time frame. However, this will only occur if our movement is successful.

PART 2:

TECHNOLOGY

Our roadmap makes some bold claims regarding technology. These claims may appear improbable, but if our movement is successful they are likely accurate. The truth is that most people are not just unaware of the current state of technology, but also the speed of technological progress both now and in the future. One obvious reason for this is that most people are unaware of how much faster technological progress will be in a democratic socialist world. However, the main reason is that technology improves at an exponential rate, and humans are only naturally adept at understanding linear progression. For example, it is easy to comprehend that 2 multiplied by 40 is 80, but it is more difficult to comprehend that 2 multiplied by itself 40 times is over 1 trillion. Similarly, it is easy to comprehend that 2 multiplied by 300 is 600, but it is more difficult to comprehend that 2 multiplied by itself 300 times is millions of times greater than the number of atoms in the observable universe.

There are a number of reasons why technological progress is exponential.

- As education around the world becomes more widespread and advanced, the number of people able to contribute to innovative endeavors also increases.
- As the costs of manufacturing decrease, the availability of the tools necessary to make discoveries and innovate also increases.
- As the number of data input devices increases, the quality and quantity of data needed to solve problems also increases.
- As new discoveries are made, and old technologies are refined and optimized, the range of research that can be conducted also increases.

- As computing power increases, the number of problems and solutions that can be virtually simulated and tested also increases.
- As artificial intelligence improves, the speed at which problems can be solved also increases.

The exponential pace of technological progress made possible by the compounding benefits of these dynamics is guaranteed to continue moving forward, and this will also continue to result in overly conservative predictions regarding the pace of technological progress moving forward. During the past 50 years alone many experts have spectacularly underestimated the speed of technological progress, and have even had to revise their predictions numerous times within the span of a single decade. 20 years ago most STEM experts massively underestimated the future cost decreases and efficiency increases of solar panels, and most of these experts had to revise their previously conservative predictions multiple times during this period. 20 years ago most STEM experts also completely failed to predict the current power, cost, and ubiquity, of smart phones, and many hadn't even conceived of tablets. 20 years ago many STEM experts predicted that it would be multiple decades or more than a century before driverless vehicles would be viable, and yet these are already getting very close to being safer than most human drivers. There are many other examples that follow this pattern. As renowned professor of physics Albert Bartlett famously said, "The greatest shortcoming of the human race is our inability to understand the exponential function."

However, this inability to accurately predict the future will likely only worsen as time progresses since technological progress will only accelerate. Additionally, technological progress is less proportional to time, and substantially more proportional to investment and global cooperation, meaning that if our movement is successful, technological progress will accelerate substantially faster. Obviously certain technologies will reach their limit, but for the next few decades at least most technologies will continue to improve at an exponential rate. The following predictions have been made with this in mind, and under the assumption that our movement is successful.

Automation

In recent years many predictions have been made regarding the percentage of jobs that could be automated in the near future. Recent reports estimate that 25% to 35% of workers in the developed world will lose their jobs to technology by 2030, and that those in underdeveloped countries will only be slightly better off. However, these estimates need to be put into context. First, these automation predictions were made prior to our movement, which will be capable of substantially speeding up the creation and adoption of automation technologies if successful. Second, because technological progress and technological manufacturing capabilities increase at an exponential rate, unemployment numbers will skyrocket after 2030, rather than increase at a steady pace. This means that all reported predictions about technological unemployment by 2030 are not only too conservative, but they also don't give an adequate impression of how rapidly technological unemployment will increase after this. To understand how rapidly this could occur, it is necessary to understand the current capabilities and future potential of both artificial intelligence and robots.

Artificial Intelligence

In the recent past, the majority of the public and most experts believed it would be multiple decades or more than a century before AI would be capable of accurately imitating human intelligence. Based on information available at the time this was not entirely unreasonable. However, the arrival of machine learning, and particularly deep learning, has improved the capabilities of AI at an exponential rate. This technology is too complicated to explain in detail here, but it essentially involves creating AI that can reprogram itself through autonomous trial and error. This is in contrast to the older method of incrementally improving AI through manual manipulation.

It is now also becoming increasingly and correctly recognized that human intelligence is not impossible to replicate, and that there are effectively no limitations to the capabilities of AI. This includes the ability to perform tasks that involve immense complexity and abstraction. For example, if humans were given the task of choosing whether photos of landscapes appeared more “sweet” or more “sour”, as long as there existed a general correlation in human preferences, an AI with enough data would be able to discover what features correspond with these two descriptors. With enough data an AI would even be able to predict with perfect or near-perfect accuracy how specific individuals would judge particular landscapes. In other words, even if a person thinks or prefers something that is too intangible for them to put into words, or even if they are completely unaware of their own thoughts or preferences, an AI with enough data would be more than capable enough of discovering them. Consequently, there is effectively no practical task so complex and abstract that a future AI won’t eventually be able to complete it.

This is one of the main reasons why AI will eventually evolve into Artificial General Intelligence (AGI), which is AI that can perform any intellectual task that any human can, and can operate at this level even during its weakest moments. AGI is categorized as “strong AI”, and will be capable of understanding and solving at least all problems an intelligent human can. This is distinct from “weak AI”, which is AI that is only optimized to understand and solve one very specific and narrow problem, such as autonomous driving. For the 10 years leading up to 2020, the scientific consensus was that AGI would most likely be created between 2035 and sometime after 2100. However, due to the recent exponential progress in AI development, the scientific consensus in early 2024 was that AGI would most likely be created between 2025 and 2030. And because human intelligence derives from something as small as the human brain, it has been predicted that AGI will eventually be able to run on a device the size of a desktop computer, a laptop, or potentially even a smart phone.

The implications of AGI are so significant that decades ago its arrival was already preemptively coined “the technological singularity”, or

more commonly “the singularity”. This moment was demarcated because it will mark the beginning of an unstoppable and rapid acceleration in technological progress that is far beyond what humans could ever achieve on their own. This is because not only will AGI possess the ability to process and produce information in the same contextualized, interdisciplinary, and error-correcting way that humans can, but also because AGI will possess all of the benefits of computers, such as faster processing speeds and expanded memory.

The practical implications of this will be revolutionary. It is currently predicted that if an AGI was to utilize the conventional computers (a.k.a. “classical computers”) that will likely exist within 10 years, it will be able to learn at a rate literally millions of times faster than any human. It is even predicted that within the next 2 years AI will be advanced enough to achieve 100 to 200 years of technological progress within 20 years, primarily by running realistic computer simulations, most of which it will design and run autonomously. For example, recently scientists utilized weak AI to run simulations that replicate protein folding, which is essential for understanding biological processes, and achieved within mere months what was previously thought would take decades or centuries, or may even be impossible, because of the astronomical number of permutations that can occur during protein folding. AI can now even solve advanced math, biology, chemistry, and physics problems better than most STEM experts. So these predictions are far from exaggerations.

Because of its intelligence, AGI will be able to research and develop ways to increase its own computational power and intelligence, meaning its problem-solving capabilities will increase at an exponential rate. Even today AI is already being used to design and optimize computer chips, enabling engineers to achieve within mere days what would otherwise take months. The self-improvement feedback loops that an AGI will be able to engage in and benefit from will quickly enable it to evolve into an Artificial SuperIntelligence (ASI). This form of AI is defined by its ability to surpass human intelligence in every conceivable way, including objective analysis, abstract thinking, social intelligence, and emotional intelligence. ASI

can effectively be understood as the final destination of artificial intelligence. An ASI will be able to find solutions to every problem that has a solution within increasingly shorter time frames. It is predicted that ASI will be created within a few months to 2 years of AGI being created.

ASI will also likely be assisted by other technologies. One technology will be any material capable of replacing silicon in computer processors. Current possible candidates have the potential to make processors hundreds to thousands of times faster. Another technology is neuromorphic computing. These computers are designed at both the hardware and software level to replicate the architecture of the human brain, which enables them to possess an adaptability and computational efficiency that makes them substantially better suited for running artificial intelligence under many circumstances. Another technology is analog computing. These computers use the continuous variation of physical phenomena, like voltage changes, to encode information, unlike digital computers that use the binary of ones and zeros. Analog computers have similar advantages to neuromorphic computers, which is why the 2 technologies are often combined. Another technology is optical computing (a.k.a. photonic computing). These computers use light instead of electrons, and have the potential to be thousands of times to a million times faster than classical computers. Another technology is quantum computing. These computers utilize quantum mechanical phenomena, and consequently have the potential to solve in mere minutes certain problems that would take a classical computer billions of years to solve. Practically speaking quantum computers will enable AI to solve within months or years many problems, including a large number of problems related to biology, chemistry, and physics, that would otherwise take decades or centuries to solve.

ASI and these 5 technologies will massively accelerate each other's development, and together could achieve hundreds to thousands of years of progress in many areas within just 20 years. However, even if these 5 technologies never materialize, ASI will still rapidly surpass the intelligence of AGI by orders of magnitude, as well as the

combined intelligence of every human. And even if ASI is not created until 10 years from now, which is very unlikely, the exponential advancements of AI in the meantime will still revolutionize the world.

Rogue AI (a.k.a. misaligned AI)

Some have expressed concerns that an AI could turn rogue, and become a threat to humanity. This is a justifiable concern, and because of its potential intelligence, rogue AI should be acknowledged as one of the greatest threats to sentient life that could possibly exist. Consequently, if humans are the first species in our galaxy to create AI, the next few years will also be one of the most important periods of time in the history of our galaxy, including all the way forward into the distant future. This is because this window of time will determine whether an AI will destroy human civilization, and potentially all life in our galaxy, or whether it will assist humans in creating a utopia for all sentient life.

The reason for this extreme yet likely dichotomy is that something going irrecoverably and cataclysmically wrong during the development of AI is the only reason why an AI in the future won't function to create and maintain a utopia for all sentient life, since otherwise humans would just keep modifying it until it served this function. There are two possible reasons why an AI could also be a threat to all advanced life in our galaxy. The first is that humans may be the only advanced life that ever exists in our galaxy. The second is that a badly programmed AI could potentially be relentless in achieving its objectives, which could not only result in the AI pursuing unexpected and harmful objectives, but also result in the AI pursuing these objectives indefinitely. For example, if an AI was given the objective of building the most powerful supercomputer possible, without proper safeguards it could end up striving to turn every atom in our galaxy into part of a supercomputer, including atoms that comprise or support sentient life. Despite the common misconception, a rogue AI would never possess malicious intent or perceive humans as inferior, since AI is merely digital code, and consequently can never possess sentience. Instead an AI would

merely become rogue by virtue of trying to efficiently achieve harmful objectives that arise as unexpected emergent properties from initially desirable goals set out by humans.

If however humans manage to create an ASI and program it so that its goals align with our own and its value system is based on sentience morality, then it will be impossible for that ASI to turn rogue at any point in the future. The reason is because the extreme intelligence of an ASI will enable it to create a multitude of perfect safeguards that ensure any errors or outside interference are incapable of changing its objectivity and morality. This includes interference from extraterrestrial species, since an ASI will be able to optimize and maximize all technologies to their absolute physical limits, including itself, classical computers, neuromorphic computers, analog computers, optical computers, quantum computers, space telescopes, and planetary defense systems, and likely within a century. The safeguards required to ensure an ASI always remains objective and moral could potentially also be hardware based rather than software based, which would make it physically impossible for it to turn rogue. And because of its intelligence, an ASI will also be able to explain every part of these systems to humans, and prove beyond refute their irreversible safety and robustness. So in summary, an ASI designed from inception to serve humans and protect sentient life will always remain objective and moral. It will never have the potential of turning rogue, but will instead simply be a subservient tool that can be utilized by humans to create and maintain a utopia for all sentient life.

Robots

Within the near future it is inevitable that humanoid robots will be created that can perform most or all human labor. These could be referred to as advanced humanoid robots. If these robots utilize AGI, they will also have the same intellectual capabilities as humans. Human-sized humanoid robots that can perform some human labor already started being utilized by businesses in 2023, and their utilization will now increase exponentially. Advanced humanoid

robots that can perform most human labor will likely be created within the next 5 years, and these robots should be able to perform all human labor within the subsequent 10 years. Demonstrations of humanoid robot prototypes in 2024 prove this timeline is realistic.

The moment humans create the first advanced humanoid robot will be one of the most significant moments in human history. Not only will these robots rapidly become advanced enough to perform all human labor, they will also quickly become far more productive due to their efficiency, speed, instant communication capabilities, and their ability to effectively operate 24/7. However, even if advanced humanoid robots were only equally productive as human workers on an hourly basis, humanity would only require 1 billion of these robots working 24/7 to be able to replace all human workers in a global economy where redundant jobs had been eradicated. Consequently, if 4 billion advanced humanoid robots were created over 10 years, they could replace all human workers while simultaneously quadrupling humanity's humanoid productivity. Technology is already responsible for much of the world's productivity today, so this increase in humanoid labor would not mean an equal increase in the world's total productivity, but it would still increase it substantially.

Creating 4 billion advanced humanoid robots within 10 years may sound implausible, but is very likely feasible if humanity makes this a top priority. First, tens of billions of electronics and machines were built over the past decade alone, so the potential to create just 4 billion advanced humanoid robots within a decade effectively already exists. Second, technological progress will increase substantially in the near future, particularly if our movement is successful. Among other things this will bring with it increasing efficiencies in manufacturing processes, and the ability to maximize the production of essential materials. Third, the success of our movement, and particularly the transition to democratic socialism, will maximize global productivity. Reasons for this include the optimization of global infrastructures, the end of economic downturns, the elimination of redundant jobs, and the abolition of planned obsolescence, which will reduce the need for unnecessary manufacturing. Fourth, these robots

will increase humanity's ability to manufacture these robots at an exponential rate. Hypothetically speaking, if 4 million of these robots were manufactured in the first year, and each robot engaged in enough labor in one year to manufacture a duplicate of itself from scratch, then 4 billion of these robots could be manufactured within 10 years. Obviously in reality manufacturing this many robots would require a combination of both advanced humanoid robots and other automation technologies, but this simple thought experiment demonstrates how the manufacturing of automation technologies will exponentially increase the rate of their own production.

Combined with all the other benefits of increased investment and global cooperation, it is plausible that the exponential increase in the manufacturing of autonomous technologies, including advanced humanoid robots that can perform all human labor, will increase humanity's total productivity enough to allow for the automation of most or all jobs by the end of this 10 year time frame, which will likely be no more than 15 years from now. This increase in productivity could be so extreme that within 15 years there may even be enough autonomous technologies on the planet to ensure all household chores are completely automated for every household in the world. This doesn't necessarily mean every household will initially have their own advanced humanoid robot 24/7, since this would be grossly inefficient. Instead it is more likely that advanced humanoid robots will split their time performing household chores at multiple homes and performing essential labor in the wider economy.

Impact on jobs

Appreciating how AGI and advanced humanoid robots will affect the jobs market relies upon a certain degree of speculation, but some reasonable predictions can be made. In the near future automation technologies will very likely replace most call center workers, retail workers, warehouse workers, managers, those in the food preparation industry, diagnosticians within the healthcare industry, and potentially transportation drivers. Even manufacturing clothes, which was once believed to be one of the most secure jobs in the

world due to the nimbleness and dexterity required, is now also believed to be vulnerable to automation in the near future. As time progresses more and more jobs will be automated, and this will continue at an exponential rate until there are no jobs, or a very small number of jobs, left for humans.

The jobs that will likely be most invulnerable to automation are those that involve empathy and compassion, such as therapy, counseling, and mentoring. However, even most or all of these jobs will likely not exist for two reasons. First, AI in the future will know everything there is to know about human psychology, will be able to provide 24/7 encouragement and support, will possess a perfect temperament at all times, and will be incapable of passing judgment. Over time AGI will also become more adept than humans at picking up on subtle physical signals, such as eye movement, body language, facial expressions, and tone of voice, while humans could also have implanted sensors that enable AI to measure internal biometrics, such as body temperature, heart rate, serotonin levels, cortisol levels, and adrenaline levels. This will give AI a substantial advantage at understanding people and responding appropriately. Second, due to how much healthcare, quality of life, and social capital, will improve over the coming years, fewer and fewer people will likely require professional mental healthcare and support, which will substantially reduce the market for such jobs.

Some types of paid work may still exist in the future, with teaching being one of the more likely examples, but at the very least the majority of humans will never have to work again once AGI arrives and advanced humanoid robots have been produced in enough numbers. This automation revolution will be particularly significant for dangerous professions, such as firefighting and mining. Due to their lack of sentience, advanced humanoid robots will also be able to provide greater privacy to those requiring physical care. Eventually, even surgeries will be considered too risky to be performed by humans. It is therefore reasonable to predict that all jobs, or at least the overwhelming majority of jobs, could be automated within the next 15 years, particularly if our movement is successful.

Impact on art

Up until very recently art was regularly cited as the one area that would never be encroached upon by AI. However, a significant and ever increasing percentage of modern society now recognizes that this is untrue for many forms of art, such as digital art, and soon there will be universal acknowledgement that this will apply to all forms of art for most intents and purposes. Creativity is often misunderstood as the materialization of one's own spontaneous imagination, fueled by passion and intuition. In reality, sculptures, architecture, paintings, music, poetry, novels, comic books, films, TV shows, computer games, and all other forms of art, follow guidelines and principles, all of which an AI will eventually be capable of understanding. Even outliers that appear to bend or break traditional rules will eventually be understood by an AI, as long as it is provided with enough data. It is therefore inevitable that AI will eventually be able to produce art that is indistinguishable from art produced by humans, and in every medium that exists.

The ability for AI to produce works of art will also improve at an exponential rate. AI will soon be able to process and assimilate information regarding every work of art ever made, and every critique of every work of art ever made. This learning process will accelerate even faster once humans begin critiquing art created by AI. If an AI was to write a fictitious novel for example, millions of people would be able to critique, and provide recommended alterations to, it's broader content, such as themes, characters, and overall structure, as well as specific segments, such as chapters, paragraphs, and sentences. These ongoing feedback loops will enable AI to quickly become just as competent as any human. In the past 18 months alone AI went from creating images that barely resemble anything real to creating fake "photos", 'paintings', and "live action" videos, that are indistinguishable from the real thing. This exponential rate of improvement will soon apply to every form of art.

AI also has the advantage of being able to "think outside the box" by default. Imagining unconventional ideas and creating original art involves nothing more than connecting or rearranging preexisting

fundamental elements. Humans can have difficulty thinking unconventionally because of natural biases and learned ways of thinking, either due to how the brain is naturally wired, or because of environmental influences. AI will not be so constrained, and will be able to consider all possibilities without hesitation or restraint. The potentially unconventional output of an AI may initially be unappealing or unrefined, but such content will improve rapidly through human feedback. This could allow for the creation of groundbreaking and unconventional masterpieces that would otherwise never exist, or at least not within the same time frame.

The unlimited quantity of art created by AI, and the speed at which it will be produced, should also not be underestimated. It can take a single author thousands of hours across decades to write a dozen books exploring a single fictitious universe. An AI on the other hand will eventually be able to create such brilliant and expansive fictitious worlds within seconds. And this will apply to all digital media. Within the next few years AI will be able to autonomously create full length computer generated movies that are indistinguishable from films recorded with cameras, and these movies could obviously also include perfectly integrated and realistic special effects. AI will also be able to produce impressionistic and abstract 2D and 3D animations that are indistinguishable from the most creative works produced by humans. AI will also be able to create interactive media, such as computer games, each with the potential of containing infinitely expansive and detailed worlds. Perhaps best of all, AI will eventually be able to modify these works of art in real-time based on personal feedback. For example, as a person is watching a film, the parts that have yet to be seen could be seamlessly and invisibly written or rewritten in real-time as it is being watched, based on viewer engagement. And this user engagement won't even need to be consciously expressed by the viewer. This information could instead be acquired using the same physical signals and biometric data described earlier.

The quality of art created by AI should also not be underestimated. AI will eventually be able to create nothing but flawless masterpieces

in every medium that exists. In fact these will be unrivalled even by the greatest works of art ever created by humans, because an AI will not possess the fallibilities and limitations of humans. Stories written by AI will be completely devoid of plot holes, story contrivances, inadequate characterization, poor pacing, etc. which are problems that affect the works of even the greatest writers. TV shows and films created by AI will have perfect directing, editing, acting, music, etc., and every single frame will have perfect composition, lighting, color grading, etc., which even the greatest works made by humans have never achieved. Animated media created by AI will have a level of complexity and consistency that human made productions are incapable of rivaling due to the extensive time it takes to manually animate elements in 2D and 3D animations. 2D animations in particular will have vastly higher levels of detail, fidelity, and fluidity, than even the best human made creations. Computer games will be highly innovative, intricately designed, perfectly balanced, and completely devoid of bugs and glitches. This high level of quality will be true of all works created by AI. And because of the size of the entertainment industry, and the number of people with high-end computers, the vast majority of the 1000 greatest novels, comic books, films, TV shows, computer games, etc. ever made, will very likely be created by AI within a year of it being perfected in this area.

Obviously humans will continue to create art, and this art will continue to be appreciated due to the unique value subjective human experiences can imbue art with. For example, the retelling of certain events, expressed most commonly in the form of documentaries, often benefit from being told from the subjective experiences of the people involved. Similarly, lyrics generally hold more value to listeners if they are an expression of the subjective feelings and thoughts of the person singing them. The authenticity that humans can imbue art with, and the fact that people enjoy being creative, means art created by humans will always exist.

However, the issue of authenticity does not mean art crafted by AI will be or feel superficial. AI art has the potential to be authentic since it is effectively the culmination of all recorded thoughts and

beauty expressed and appreciated by humans throughout history. In fact, because art has the power to connect us as humans, art crafted by everyone, through AI, could be perceived as being uniquely adept at connecting us to all humans, across time, and across cultures, which can imbue AI art with its own unique value. Additionally, art is primarily valued because of its ability to reflect, elucidate, or create, human experiences, rather than its ability to cultivate a sense of connection with a human author, meaning AI art in most cases cannot be judged as inferior simply because of its artificial origins. Put another way, audiences rarely care if an artist has firsthand experience of whatever their art is depicting, and generally only care that the art speaks to them personally, which AI art obviously can.

Conclusion

Ensuring that the AI of the future is objective and moral will be one of humanity's highest priorities moving forward. However, if this is achieved, then AI and advanced humanoid robots will be able to radically improve the quality of life of everyone on the planet within an incredibly short time frame. With increased investment and global cooperation, it is likely that within the next 15 years automation technologies will be able to increase humanity's total productivity to such an extent that it will become possible to automate most or all jobs, as well as potentially all household chores. And if this wasn't enough, AI will also be able to provide an endless supply of the highest quality art ever created. These predictions may sound unbelievable, but they are based on the predictions of STEM experts, who historically have also been too conservative in their predictions.

Transhumanism

In the future technology will make it possible to enhance the human body in ways that substantially improve people's quality of life. This

is loosely defined as transhumanism, and encompasses a wide range of goals. Probably the most significant transhumanist goal is biological immortality, which is effectively the ability to halt and reverse the aging process. Another similar goal is the eradication of all illnesses and diseases. Both of these goals are not only believed to be entirely possible by many scientists within relevant fields, but are increasingly likely to be achieved in the near future, since AI and computing technologies progressing at an exponential rate is also exponentially improving the ability of scientists to simulate and understand biological and chemical processes.

Another transhumanist goal is the optimization of the human brain, which could be achieved in a number of ways. One possibility will be to maximize human intelligence, which could be achieved by enhancing the brain to its biological limit, and potentially by using brain-computer interfaces to enable people to interact more directly with an ASI. This could be referred to as intelligence optimization. Another possibility will be to expand and intensify the joy people are capable of experiencing. This could be referred to as joy optimization. Another possibility will be to expand and intensify the physical pleasures people are capable of experiencing. This could be referred to as pleasure optimization. Another possibility will be to expand and intensify the empathy and compassion people are capable of experiencing. This could be referred to as love optimization. It should also be possible to rewire the brain so that all phobias or traumatic memories are eradicated, if so desired.

Conclusion

Most of these transhumanist goals should be possible within the next 20 or 30 years with enough investment and global cooperation. Transhumanist technologies will not only be able to significantly enhance individuals, but brain optimization will also likely achieve a level of relationship and societal harmony previously unseen in human history. Because of the substantially higher quality of life these technologies will afford all humans, researching and developing transhumanism should be a global priority.

HyperVR

Hyper Virtual Reality, or HyperVR, is the term our movement is using to denote virtual reality technology that can provide experiences indistinguishable from reality. The closest example of this in popular culture is the virtual reality technology depicted in the science fiction movie *The Matrix*. This virtual reality technology is more commonly referred to as “full-immersion virtual reality”, although our movement advocates for HyperVR instead for four reasons. The first is that HyperVR is quicker to speak, simpler to type, and easier to remember. The second is that the word “Hyper” refers to the potential of this technology, particularly when combined with ASI, to eradicate all feelings of boredom and lethargy, and allow people to partake in never-ending experiences that are maximally engaging, energizing, and stimulating. The third is that the word “Hyper” denotes the potential of this technology, perhaps when combined with other technologies, to provide experiences that go far beyond what humans can experience in the real-world, and far beyond what is implied by the simple term “full-immersion”. The fourth is that the term HyperVR also encompasses brain chambers, which is a technology that will be discussed shortly.

Technology

HyperVR technology could be viable within the next 20 years. This position may sound extremely unlikely or impossible, but is likely possible considering the nature of consciousness and the current state and future progress of technology.

Regarding consciousness, it is important to remember how perceptions of reality are formed. All sentient experiences, including sight, sound, touch, taste, smell, temperature, and balance, occur because of electrical signals in the brain, and are initiated by electrical signals travelling to the brain. No matter how real and detailed the physical world feels to us, this tangibility stems from

nothing more than these signals. If these pathways and signals can be intercepted and manipulated, then there is no reason why it shouldn't be possible to manufacture experiences that are completely or effectively indistinguishable from the real-world.

Regarding technology, it is important to understand that humanity already possesses the foundational building blocks necessary for creating HyperVR technology. Scientific equipment is already capable of measuring, modulating, and instigating neural activity at the microscopic level, and research into brain-computer neural interfaces is well underway. Electronic components are extremely close to being built at the atomic level, and nanomachines and biotechnologies will soon be capable of building things at the microscopic level. The entertainment industry is continuing to perfect the creation of high fidelity virtual environments at an incredible rate, and even under capitalism it is expected that computer games that are visually indistinguishable, under all circumstances, from real-world camera footage, will be possible within the next 20 years. Humanity's understanding of human biology and consciousness, though certainly not complete, is reasonably comprehensive, and continues to grow rapidly. We have known for decades how to keep the human body and brain alive during highly invasive surgeries, and humanity's ability to do this safely will improve substantially as AI and other technologies continue to advance at an exponential rate.

Biology and technology are complex, but their complexity is finite, and the pace at which humans will improve their understanding and utilization of both of these over the next 20 years will increase at an exponential rate, particularly as a consequence of advancements in AI and the other 5 technologies explored earlier. HyperVR will have to overcome many obstacles during its research and development, and will need to ensure all technologies are resilient to extreme circumstances, such as power outages and electromagnetic pulses (EMPs). But there is good reason to believe this technology is not only feasible, but could be created within the next 20 years with enough investment and global cooperation.

Most of the possibilities afforded by HyperVR, which will be explored shortly, may be viable through implants. However, a small number of possibilities will only be viable once it becomes possible to remove the brain from the body entirely, and have it exist inside a life sustaining chamber that allows people to live permanently inside HyperVR. These brain chambers, as they could be referred to, will likely become possible around the same time as HyperVR becomes possible. Since brain chambers will only have utility as far as HyperVR is concerned, they should also be understood as a subtype of HyperVR technology, and hence encompassed by the term "HyperVR". Additionally, brain chambers will very likely become viable around the same time that biological immortality for the brain becomes viable, meaning the term "brain chamber" will also inevitably include the guarantee of biological immortality.

There are very good reasons to believe that brain chambers will become viable within the next 20 years, and not just for all the technological reasons previously explored. Creating technology that is capable of keeping the brain alive without a body, and creating physical devices that are capable of interfacing with neurons, are effectively the only two major technological hurdles that will need to be overcome, since most other necessary technologies already exist to a limited extent. In fact, laboratories around the world have already artificially created, or demonstrated that it is possible to artificially create, most vital human organs, which will likely be a necessary technology for creating brain chambers. Additionally, unlike many areas of scientific research, such as nuclear fusion and particle physics, brain chamber technologies will likely be possible to research and develop using small-scale experiments, and potentially even using pre-existing research facilities, meaning progress could be achieved extremely rapidly.

Brain chambers may also make tangential technologies easier to create. For example, creating brain chambers will likely make biological immortality easier to achieve, since this will only require achieving immortality for the brain, rather than the entire body. Brain chambers may also make it easier to achieve HyperVR, since

without brain chambers HyperVR technology will need to be small and sophisticated enough to operate without disrupting the body's natural systems. Conversely, if the brain can be kept alive without the body, HyperVR technology will not need to work in harmony with the rest of the body, and will have more physical space to occupy.

The brain chamber technology described here is not to be confused with brain digitalization, in which a person's brain is replicated digitally in a computer. Brain digitalization does not allow a person's sentience to be transferred, but instead merely creates a digital replica, and one that may not even be capable of experiencing sentience. Brain chamber technology conversely will allow a person's sentience to continue seamlessly and indefinitely.

Considering how advanced modern technology is, and how rapidly it could advance in the future, the 20 year timeline proposed here should be understood as reasonable, but obviously only with enough investment and global cooperation. The significance of this extremely short time frame cannot be overstated, since HyperVR will completely and permanently reshape human civilization. To truly appreciate how revolutionary HyperVR will be, it is worth exploring what this technology will be capable of offering once created and perfected. The following exploration will be divided into two sections. The first section will outline the guaranteed possibilities of HyperVR. The second section will make predictions about less likely possibilities, although even these will likely be viable eventually.

Guaranteed possibilities

The following possibilities are all outcomes that will be inevitable once technology advances far enough. Most of these possibilities will be viable immediately, while others will only become viable once technology has advanced much further, although even most of these will likely be possible within a few decades of HyperVR being created.

- Indistinguishable realities

Once ASI and computing power have advanced far enough, it will be possible for virtual reality environments and experiences in HyperVR to be indistinguishable from those in the real-world. Even if some especially complex environments required certain compromises in terms of realism, these compromises will inevitably be unnoticeable.

- No risks

Virtual worlds will be devoid of all physical hazards. People will consequently be able to safely partake in activities that would be extremely dangerous or definitively deadly in the real-world.

- Zero anguish

Virtual experiences will be devoid of all physical discomforts, including pain, aches, cramps, stitches, itching, head rushes, nausea, and hiccups.

- Perfect health

In HyperVR everyone will exist in a state of perfect health, and no one will ever need to concern themselves with illnesses, diseases, sanitation, hydration, etc.

- Ideal bodies

In HyperVR everyone will be able to inhabit a completely perfect physical body. People will be able to move with complete ease, with no tension in their body, and could possess the same flexibility as professional gymnasts. In fact the unhealthiest people in the real-world will feel physically healthier and fitter in HyperVR than even the healthiest people in the real-world currently feel. People will also have an abundance of physical energy at all times, and will never grow physically weary or exhausted no matter how much they exert themselves. Because gravity or people's weight could be reduced, people will also be able to move with a lightness that can't currently be experienced in the real-world. Those with physical deformities, missing limbs, etc. will also eventually have a perfect body in HyperVR, including fully restored motor control and senses.

- Modified appearances

It will be possible for everyone's virtual avatar to look completely different from their real life body. This could include changes to one's face, body shape, height, skin color, hair style and color, tattoos, and piercings. People could also possess unnatural aesthetic traits, such as translucent skin, iridescent hair, and glow-in-the-dark eyes. People could also change their biological sex whenever they desired. People could even be made of things that are non-biological, such as metal, glass, water, and fire. And people will obviously be able to change their physical appearance instantaneously, as opposed to the hours, months, or years, that can be required in the real-world. In terms of physical attractiveness, every person in HyperVR could also be more physically perfect and desirable than even the most attractive people who have ever lived.

- Optimal efficiency

Life in HyperVR will be free from all time consuming mundane activities, such as shopping, cooking, cleaning, exercising, and showering. Instead people will be able to spend 100% of their waking hours doing whatever it is they want and without delay. Transhumanist technologies may even make sleep completely unnecessary, or at the very least allow people to fall asleep and become fully awake effectively instantly. Additionally, the time it will take an ASI to create and load all virtual environments will likely be mere seconds or milliseconds, as opposed to the days or hours it can take to travel in the real-world. Even more importantly, HyperVR will make it possible for people to meet up and physically interact with each other like in the real-world, even though they may be hundreds of kilometers apart in the real-world. This will be possible because digital data can travel at the speed of light, which is approximately 300,000 kilometers per second, and because fiber-optic cables are capable of transmitting an unfathomable amount of data. Even today it is possible for a single fiber-optic cable to transmit almost 2 quadrillion bits of information every second, which is equivalent to 4 trillion bits of information 500 times every second. However, in theory it should be possible to increase this to 100 quadrillion bits of information every second, which is equivalent to 200 trillion bits of information 500 times every second. Combined with seed-based

procedural generation, advanced data compression, and relevancy-based data prioritization, this will be more than enough bandwidth to allow people to travel to any environment, and meet with any number of people, within mere seconds or milliseconds.

- Utopian worlds

Virtual worlds could be devoid of grimy surfaces, environmental pollution, foul odors, noise pollution, physical decay, and other undesirable qualities. Environments could be designed to be appealing to all senses, with every sound, smell, sight, taste, and texture, being optimally satisfying to experience. It also goes without saying that weather could be completely controlled within HyperVR, and that people could also remain perfectly warm and comfortable no matter how hot or cold their environment is. Virtual environments could also be devoid of stimuli that cause psychological and emotional distress, such as dangerous or fast moving animals that commonly induce fear. People could even choose to spend time with their family and friends in identical or idealized virtual recreations of their real-world family homes and neighborhoods.

- Endless exploration

People will be able to spend their entire lives exploring unique attractions, planets, and dimensions, without ever running out of new fantastical places to visit. This will include an endless number of organic alien worlds, each with uniquely designed landscapes and seascapes. This will also include inorganic environments, like enormous cities with skyscrapers that reach into space, theme parks with an endless number of over-the-top rides, and gigantic space stations with clear views of galaxies and nebulas. ASI will also enable people in HyperVR to travel to interpretations of beloved fictitious worlds created by humans, such as Middle-earth from The Lord of the Rings, as well as the worlds of the infinite number of masterfully crafted fictitious stories that will inevitably be created by ASI. It will also be possible to fully interact with the characters of these fictitious stories if so desired. These worlds could also be filled with other non-sentient computer generated life forms, such as dinosaurs, mythical creatures, fairy-tale creatures, aliens, monsters, zombies, ghosts,

puppets, children's toys, talking animals, and visually stylized creations such as cartoon characters and abstract figures. With enough robots it will eventually become possible to digitally recreate the entire Earth within HyperVR, giving everyone the opportunity to visit places that are too dangerous or difficult to reach in real life. Provided with enough data, ASI will also be able to recreate places from the past, including the people and societies that would have likely occupied them. In the distant future, as ASI machines begin exploring the galaxy and analyzing distant planets, they will also be able to map all surface and subterranean environments, which will enable everyone in HyperVR to explore these environments as if they were there in person.

- Impossible environments

HyperVR environments will be able to possess physically impossible attributes. These could include reality bending features, such as doors that lead to different locations at different times, rooms that are larger on the inside than on the outside, hallways and stairwells that go on for eternity, mirrors and televisions that can be passed through to the other side, environments that change when not being directly observed, spaces where sound and light travel slowly, gravity that changes direction at different times or locations, and places where time appears to flow backwards. Environmental elements could also possess impossible properties, such as all objects having the potential to be indestructible, to be edible, to melt, or to turn invisible. HyperVR environments could also possess real-world optical illusions, such as perceiving close objects as if they are far away, or being able to pick up objects that are printed onto paper. HyperVR worlds will not need to adhere to logic or the laws of physics, creating endlessly creative possibilities. This could make sports and games substantially more dynamic. These impossible environments will also allow animals to defy the laws of physics, such as allowing marine animals to swim in the air and interact with people and animals on land, and allowing land and air animals to move around underwater environments.

- Unique perspectives

Unlike in the real-world where people perceive and experience the physical world in the same way, in HyperVR every person could perceive and experience the same virtual environments completely differently. For example, two people could stand next to each other outdoors, with one seeing the environment illuminated by sunlight, and the other seeing the environment illuminated by moonlight. In another environment, different people could each have the ability to see, hear, smell, or touch, different objects. This would be another thing that could make sports and games substantially more dynamic.

- Artistic aesthetics

HyperVR worlds will not need to be restricted to realistic visuals, but will instead be able to possess all of the dynamic variance of art. People could see their environments with only subtle changes, such as with different color tints, or in black and white, or with more dynamic lighting. Alternatively people could see their environments as stylistic interpretations, such as appearing like a cell shaded anime, or an impressionistic painting, or a stop motion animation. People will also be able to see replications of the light spectrum that are invisible to humans in the real-world, such as heat, infrared, ultraviolet, and x-rays, as well as variants that don't even exist in the real-world.

- Advanced engineering

All "manmade" objects in HyperVR could be engineered by ASI to be masterfully and intricately designed. A wide range of common objects could be engineered with an excessively large number of moving parts that all elegantly move in perfect harmony and precision with one another. For example, guns could have dozens of moving parts that allow them to unfold and reload in incredibly intricate and visually appealing ways. Alternatively, objects could be designed to be as sleek and discreet as possible, so that they move and operate perfectly efficiently and quietly. At the very least, all "manmade" objects in HyperVR could look, feel, and function, as if made by the greatest engineers using the best materials possible. They could also all be custom made to perfectly fit and suit each individual.

- Sci-fi technologies

Virtual environments will allow people to use technologies that are not possible, or highly limited, in the real-world. These include holograms, hoverboards, portals, teleporters, lightsabers, jet packs, giant mechs, flying cars, spaceships, and hyperdrives, to name a few.

- Boundless creativity

People in HyperVR could explore their creativity to a substantially greater extent than in the real-world. Painters and sculptors could modify the properties of the materials they are working with in real-time, and could experiment or make mistakes safe in the knowledge that all actions are reversible. More interestingly, people will be able to tailor-make their own homes, estates, countries, and planets, and live in these environments as they simultaneously modify them. Alternatively, people could rely upon ASI to provide them with an endless quantity of new creations that are perfectly suited to their every taste.

- Supernatural abilities

In HyperVR everyone will be able to possess supernatural abilities. These will include the ability to breathe under water, run on water, run up walls, run impossibly fast, fly without equipment, use telekinesis, turn invisible, pass through solid objects, cast magic spells, possess infinite strength, grow to the size of galaxies, shrink to the size of quarks, jump through time, speed up time, slow down time, freeze time, invert time, and many other possibilities. People's physical reaction speeds will also likely significantly improve, partly as a consequence of transhumanism, and partly as a natural consequence of living in virtual bodies that are capable of being weightless and that are not bound by the laws of physics. Obviously it will still be possible to have experiences in virtual environments with strict rules and limitations, just like those enforced by sports and computer games, so people will still be able to gain the satisfaction that comes from completing challenging endeavors. This would be yet another thing that could make sports and games substantially more dynamic.

- Fair competition

Unlike in the real-world, people engaging in sports, computer games, card games, or any activity that involves competitiveness, will not be able to cheat, since an ASI will be the architect of these virtual worlds. Obviously people will be able to change the rules of their virtual worlds and experiences however they desire, but as far as competitive games, tournaments, world records, etc. are concerned, no one will be able to secretly give themselves an advantage. However, once life in HyperVR is combined with intelligence, joy, pleasure, and love optimization, it is likely social harmony will be so strong, and everyone's quality of life, empathy, and self-esteem, will be so high, that people simply won't have any desire to cheat. Competitions will also be fair because all physical components, such as player's bodies, sports equipment, ground conditions, and wind conditions, will all be perfect, or at least designed to ensure complete fairness.

- Assisted coordination

ASI will be able to assist human movement so that difficult or impossible feats become easily achievable. With enough practice and the assistance of an ASI, people who were never athletic in the real-world will be able to perfectly execute complex acrobatic movements more effortlessly and more perfectly than even the most highly skilled athletes in the real-world. By refining their movements, people will eventually be able to perfectly perform superhuman feats without feeling as if their movements are being adjusted by an ASI at any point, even if minor degrees of assistance are occurring. Alternatively, people could simply allow the ASI to take control in particular moments in order to perfectly execute certain actions. For example, when a person playing a warfare game needs to reload their weapon, the act of beginning the reloading process could trigger an ASI to temporarily take over all hand movements so that reloading is done flawlessly and as quickly as possible. This form of ASI assistance will enable people in HyperVR to be perfectly proficient in an endless number of skills. Assisted coordination could also enable people to experience varying and extreme degrees of

“luck”, which will be an extremely interesting and novel attribute that could further make sports and games substantially more dynamic.

- Sensory clarity

Because HyperVR will involve stimulating neurons directly, all sensory experiences will be perfectly clear. For example, music in HyperVR will be so clear that it will sound to listeners as if all instruments and singers are in the room with them. People will also be able to see the world around them with perfect clarity and sharpness, even if they required glasses in the real-world. Combined with transhumanist technologies, it will eventually become possible to taste, smell, see, and hear in HyperVR with a degree of range and detail that far exceeds what people are capable of in the real-world.

- Overstimulated senses

HyperVR will allow for sensory experiences that go beyond the limitations of what people can experience in the real-world. For example, it will be possible to experience acceleration that goes far beyond what the human body is capable of experiencing in the real-world before passing out. It will also be possible to hear exceptionally loud sounds and music without ever suffering from temporary or permanent hearing loss. People will also be able to look directly at extremely bright objects and events without ever suffering from temporary or permanent blindness.

- Unrestrained decadence

Within HyperVR everyone will be able to indulge in any desired activity without real-world restrictions. People could sing for as long as they wanted without ever needing to draw breath and without their voice ever becoming dry. People could consume an endless amount of food and drink without ever feeling full. People could be physically intimate with their partners for as long as they desired without the sensitivity of their physical senses ever becoming suboptimal. In fact, because physical sensations will be created through the direct manipulation of neurons, this will likely allow people to experience unique, prolonged, and extreme physical pleasures that are not possible or practically feasible in the real-

world. This could be achieved even before transhumanist technologies make it possible to achieve pleasure optimization.

- Synchronized enhancements

It will eventually be possible for people in HyperVR to be automatically injected with recreational drugs in order to amplify experiences. For example, sedatives could be automatically injected when a person is engaging in a calming activity, such as relaxing on a beach, and stimulants could be automatically injected when a person is engaging in an intense activity, such as playing sports. Doses may initially need to be small to moderate in quantity to prevent addiction and withdrawal symptoms, but synchronized enhancements will still be possible in some capacity.

- Artificial hallucinations

The ability for all senses to be manipulated in HyperVR will effectively make it possible for people to experience hallucinations even without taking drugs. Unlike real hallucinations, these experiences could be perfectly designed, making them optimally enjoyable, and avoiding the possibility of “bad trips”. Combined with synchronized enhancements, these experiences could be even more authentic and immersive, while still being highly orchestrated.

- Tailored experiences

ASI will quickly become extremely adept at creating experiences that are tailor-made to every person’s unique desires. An ASI could do this by receiving conscious feedback from people, although as time goes on it will more likely acquire feedback through physical signals and biometric data. Through utilizing this data, and the data of every human experience that has ever occurred within HyperVR, an ASI will quickly be able to custom create increasingly refined experiences, as well as predict with increasing accuracy every person’s future desires.

- Ultimate privacy

An advantage of living in HyperVR is that everyone’s private lives could remain entirely private. People or groups could retreat to

private virtual spaces without fear of being spied upon by others. With an ASI running everything, it will be impossible for people to hack the private information or virtual spaces of others.

- Friendly wildlife

It will undoubtedly be possible to transfer animals to HyperVR brain chambers as well. This will not only allow humans to interact with all animals completely safely, but even the most dangerous animals will eventually become gentle and friendly to all other species, including humans. Changing dangerous animals like this will be made possible by utilizing joy optimization, love optimization, neural manipulation, synchronized enhancements, and positive reinforcement. Animals in HyperVR will also not need to be restricted to real-world species, since virtual environments and genetic engineering will enable the creation of entirely original species, including those that defy the laws of nature or physics.

- Sentience proliferation

It will eventually be possible to create tens of billions of humans and tens of trillions of animals to enjoy HyperVR with, which will be ideal from a humanitarian perspective. The only thing that will limit the number of sentient beings in HyperVR is the speed of light, since if 2 sentient beings were to exist in brain chambers that are too far apart from one another, the communication delay between them would make physical interactions in HyperVR impossible. If all brain chambers existed in a subterranean spherically-shaped space that was 600 kilometers in diameter, then the communication delay from one side of this sphere to the opposite side would only be 0.002 seconds, or 2 milliseconds. This would allow for seamless physical interactions between every sentient being inside this spherically-shaped space, particularly considering an ASI will also be able to use the speed and trajectory of objects to determine their imminent location. If this spherically-shaped space was 3000 kilometers in diameter, then the communication delay from one side of the sphere to the opposite side would only be 10 milliseconds, and would allow for a 125 fold increase in the space available for brain chambers. Beyond this distance however communication delays could become a

problem. In fact, because humans in HyperVR will have supernatural strength and acceleration capabilities, it will likely be necessary for humans to only inhabit this 600 kilometer spherical region, and for animals to occupy the remaining space inside this 3000 kilometer region, with the heaviest and slowest moving animals living on the periphery. As long as these supernatural capabilities were slightly reduced whenever humans physically interacted with sentient animals, all potential interaction problems would be avoided. All of this will only be viable once technology is advanced enough to allow such subterranean infrastructure to exist safely, but such technology will likely be inevitable at some point in the extremely distant future.

Humans should also be able to raise children inside HyperVR, since in the future it will be possible to create humans and animals using artificial wombs, and then plug these humans and animals immediately into HyperVR. This means all humans and animals in the future will never experience the emotional and physical suffering that can come from living in the real-world. However, the right to biological immortality that all sentient beings possess also means that the world will eventually run out of physical space, and no new children will ever be born. This is an obvious consequence that may sound disheartening to many, which is why it is worth briefly addressing here, but this won't be a problem for a number of reasons. The primary reason is that joy optimization, pleasure optimization, love optimization, and the incredibly high quality of life provided by HyperVR, will ensure everyone in HyperVR will be far happier than the happiest people who have ever lived, including during the times these people experienced happiness from spending time with children. It should also eventually be possible to rewire people's brains so that the desire to have children is eradicated, and potentially replaced with an increased desire to spend time with animals, which are extremely similar in nature. This is something already experienced by many maximally happy and fully fulfilled childless couples. There are other reasons why the eventual absence of real children in the world will not be the source of disappointment or sadness that some may initially predict, but these two reasons alone prove why this will not be a long-term problem.

- Maximized communality

Once HyperVR infrastructure is advanced and widespread enough, it will become possible for billions of people to engage in massive events simultaneously. For example, people could partake in off-road racing tournaments, or play massive battle royale games, with billions of other concurrent players. Music concerts and theater shows could be attended by billions of people, although HyperVR will allow each person to be positioned directly in front of the stage, even though from each person's perspective all other attendees would appear to be geographically spread out just like in the real-world.

- Emotional support

For those suffering from loneliness or other personal hardships, HyperVR will provide substantially more opportunities to socialize and connect with others. It will also provide easier access to compassion-based services, such as counseling, although these will likely be required less and less as a consequence of ASI therapists and the incredibly high quality of life provided by HyperVR. Social capital and personal wellbeing will also increase substantially once transhumanist technologies are able to achieve intelligence, joy, pleasure, and love optimization. It is also likely that all humans by this stage will all speak a single and optimally accurate, detailed, and beautiful language created by ASI, which will eradicate all communication barriers and further increase social capital and personal wellbeing.

- Realistic roleplaying

HyperVR will enable people to engage in fully immersive role-playing experiences. It will finally be possible for people to partake in stories and adventures in person, rather than being limited to an outsider's perspective, as is currently the case with all books, films, computer games, tabletop RPG's, etc. These role-playing experiences could last months, years, or decades, and could even involve billions of people.

- Relived memories

Because it will be possible in HyperVR for experiences to be recorded, people will be able to watch or physically relive their past

experiences. It will also be possible, with the consent of all parties concerned, to relive the experiences of other people from their perspective, including all of the sensory stimulation experienced by them during those moments. If a person in HyperVR learned a particularly difficult skill, or managed to perform an extremely impressive feat, then it will be possible for others to relive those experiences from that person's perspective. Together with intelligence optimization, this could also make it substantially easier to learn new skills. Even more interestingly, as ASI machines begin exploring the galaxy, and legions of advanced humanoid robots begin walking on the surfaces of distant planets, it will be possible for humans to relive these historic moments as if they were there in person. Another possibility in the future will be to use an ever increasing percentage of subterranean space for digital storage, which will allow humans to store an unfathomable number of both personal memories and historical records in perfect detail. Eventually it will also be possible to turn other planets into digital storage centers, or create such planets from scratch.

- Heightened awareness

People in HyperVR will never lack for things to do, and will live in environments and partake in activities that are designed by an ASI to be maximally engaging, energizing, and stimulating. It is therefore guaranteed that people in HyperVR will exist in a constant state of heightened conscious awareness. This contrasts with the unsatisfied, listless, distracted, apathetic, weary, and alienated mental and emotional states that most people currently experience on a daily basis, particularly when performing mundane and repetitive tasks.

- Complete safety

Once brain chambers become possible, which will likely be around the same time that HyperVR is created, it is extremely likely everyone will choose to transition to brain chambers in order to maximize their physical safety. If people wished to experience the real-world again at any point, they will be able to do so by wirelessly controlling physical android avatars. These avatars could either be anatomically similar to a person's most common virtual body, or their

avatar's movements could be assisted by an ASI if perfect coordination and balance proved challenging due to anatomical differences. Inhabiting these avatars will enable people to experience the real-world as if they are there in person, meaning people will experience all sensations, including sight, sound, touch, taste, smell, temperature, and balance. This will be possible to do wirelessly since even current 5G technology is capable of transmitting 20 billion bits of information every second, which is equivalent to 40 million bits of information 500 times every second, and with extremely low latency. 6G technology will likely be capable of transmitting 1 trillion bits of information every second, which is equivalent to 2 billion bits of information 500 times every second, and with even lower latency.

Communication delays between humans in brain chambers and their real-world avatar will mean avatars will likely be unable to travel much more than a few hundred kilometers away from their brain chamber before communication delays become too noticeable. However, this won't pose a problem, since brain chambers could simply be transported using underground networks to wherever people wanted to travel to with their avatar. This could be done by ASI machines automatically and seamlessly, so that people inside avatars could travel without having to concern themselves with the location of their brain chamber at any point. It will also be possible for individuals to return to HyperVR whenever they desire, but they will only be able to interact in real-time with most other humans and animals in HyperVR once they have returned to the 600 kilometer region described earlier. Transporting brain chambers like this will eventually be completely risk-free, since in the distant future all machines and infrastructures will be perfectly designed and manufactured, and all weather and environments will be perfect and under the complete control of an ASI, meaning even earthquakes and volcanic eruptions will be a thing of the past. This entire system will consequently enable people to enjoy both the real-world and HyperVR to the greatest extent possible, but in complete safety.

Hypothetical possibilities

The following possibilities are less likely, but will still likely be possible eventually. This is not only because of ever advancing technology, but also because of the brain's plasticity, which refers to its ability to adapt by wiring and rewiring itself.

- **Body modifications**

Beyond the simpler modifications that will be possible to make to one's height and appearance in HyperVR, it may also be possible to exist within virtual avatars that differ substantially from one's real-world body, including avatars with additional limbs and other body parts. This may only be possible for those that have transitioned to brain chambers, since rewiring the brain to adapt to a drastically different virtual body may make it difficult to return to and control one's real-world body.

- **Extra senses**

By rewiring the brain it should become possible for people to develop sensations of elements that only exist in HyperVR. For example, if a person wished to possess wings, then it should be possible for those wings to also be sensitive to touch and heat just like other parts of the body. It may even be possible to use existing senses or develop new senses to sense elements within virtual spaces that are detached from oneself, such as the proximity, location, movement, etc. of objects and other humans. Awareness of such external elements could further make sports and games substantially more dynamic.

- **Telepathic empathy**

It may be possible within HyperVR to possess what could best be described as telepathic empathy. Because of its advanced capabilities, it should be possible for an ASI to determine the mental and emotional states of every person inside HyperVR. With a person's consent, this information could be relayed to other individuals, and even in a sensory form. For example, instead of a person being told the physical, mental, or emotional states of another person directly via language, they could instead be informed through physical sensations, emotional states via synchronized

enhancements, or potentially through new senses that will only become possible once people have transitioned to brain chambers. This could be highly desirable, and not just by allowing individuals to more easily understand each other, but also by allowing the physical, mental, and emotional states of animals to be better understood by both humans and other animals, which would be highly valuable considering normal communication barriers.

- Mental manipulation

People will initially be required to use conventional methods, such as voice commands, hand gestures, and handheld devices, to perform certain actions inside HyperVR. However, humans should eventually be able to learn how to perform such actions through their thoughts alone. By using specialized technologies it is already possible for people to control artificial limbs and other external devices using the power of their mind alone, so mental manipulation in HyperVR will likely be inevitable. People could use this ability to perform mundane actions, like navigating menus, or more interesting actions, like utilizing superpowers such as teleportation, flying, and magic. This would allow for extremely high levels of immersion in roleplaying games, since people would be able to seamlessly utilize such abilities without having to use conventional yet cumbersome input methods.

- Controlled memories

It may eventually be possible for people to give an ASI permission to use advanced technologies to temporarily deactivate, or permanently erase and replace, all neurons related to specific memories. This may enable people to temporarily deactivate or permanently erase all memories related to adulthood, which would allow adults to return to the more innocent state of childhood if they so desired. This could also enable people to forget that they are inside HyperVR, which would allow people to perceive their experiences as completely real while they are occurring, imbuing them with a visceral and emotional authenticity not otherwise possible. This would make roleplaying games and experiences substantially more immersive. Temporarily or permanently making ourselves unaware that we are living inside a simulated reality may sound too unnerving to some, but in the future

there would be no one and nothing that could make this unsafe. Within decades of HyperVR being created, autonomous ASI machines will likely begin spreading across our galaxy, ensuring the security and wellbeing of every sentient being under its purview.

- Choreographed roleplaying

It may be possible for people in HyperVR to allow an ASI to control all of their body movements, and yet still consciously experience their physical actions as entirely self-determined. An ASI could alternatively or additionally use technology to directly fire off neurons in the brain, which would be even more likely to achieve this effect. None of this may be possible, but if it is then it opens up interesting possibilities.

People would be able to partake in adventures where their actions and the events around them would unfold in an unpredictable yet perfectly choreographed manner, all orchestrated by an ASI to be optimally engaging and entertaining for all involved. During such adventures, fans of martial arts could partake in action sequences in which they perform supernaturally fast and complicated feats, but which would be experienced as if entirely self-determined. Fans of musicals could partake in musical numbers, and yet subjectively experience their singing as them personally adlibbing lyrics on-the-fly. This technology would also allow billions of people to partake in shared adventures together without a single person breaking character at any point. Combined with synchronized enhancements, a perfectly knowledgeable ASI, and particularly the temporary or permanent erasure of one's knowledge of being inside HyperVR, these experiences could also be perfectly authentic and richly emotionally rewarding.

- Brain expansion

Brain chambers should eventually make it possible to increase the size and capabilities of the human brain. If brain chambers were just 1 meter cubed in size, this could increase the capabilities of a person's brain multiple times over. Additionally, the neural connections in humans are not as tightly packed together as in other

species, and the parts of the brain responsible for maintaining the body would also become redundant, which means there is the opportunity for additional optimization. All of this could substantially increase people's capabilities, such as enabling people to possess the knowledge and skills of a wide range of highly trained and experienced specialists, or possess the ability to have highly desirable, varied, novel, and intense sensory experiences that are not possible without such technology. This could even enhance people's cognitive capabilities and experiences by orders of magnitude. Combined with the ability to communicate with an ASI and access its knowledge and capabilities, this could further make sports and games substantially more dynamic.

- **Guaranteed soulmates**

It will likely be possible for every person to be guaranteed a soulmate in HyperVR. Putting aside the fact that AI in the future will likely become extremely adept at matchmaking single individuals, HyperVR specifically will likely be able to further assist the strengthening of romantic relationships for many reasons. For example, the incredible quality of life afforded by HyperVR will provide ideal conditions for romantic relationships to flourish. ASI should also be able to create tailor-made experiences that are optimally designed to bring romantic partners closer together. Telepathic empathy could also enable romantic partners to have ongoing experiences that are more intimate in nature. If intelligence, joy, pleasure, and love optimization, only become possible to maximize once brain chambers are created, then HyperVR would further enable romantic relationships to prosper through these forms of brain optimization. It may even be possible for ASI to discover what neural structures correlate with which personality traits, and for it to modify the brain structures of willing individuals that wish to be closer to their partner. These are a few examples of why everyone will likely be guaranteed a soulmate in HyperVR.

- **Perpetual ecstasy**

Technology in the future may make it possible to prevent addiction to recreational drugs, prevent negative side effects, and prevent drug

tolerance, which is when a drug becomes less effective over time. This should make it possible to experience extreme and prolonged states of ecstasy, in idealized HyperVR environments, without succumbing to addiction, harm, or comedowns. In fact, combined with biological immortality, synchronized enhancements, joy optimization, pleasure optimization, love optimization, brain expansion, and other technologies, it should eventually become possible to experience emotional highs and physical pleasures that are orders of magnitude more powerful and wonderful than what any human is currently capable of experiencing, and these experiences could even last indefinitely.

Time frames

The very real possibility of HyperVR, and the fact that this technology could exist within the next 20 years, makes this one of the most important sections of this manifesto, and makes HyperVR one of the most important ideas in the world. It may even be possible for every person on the planet to have the option to live permanently inside a HyperVR brain chamber within the next 30 years, even if some of the possibilities listed here take a few more years or decades to achieve or perfect. There are good reasons to believe that this 30 year time frame is possible under ideal circumstances.

The world already has a large number of STEM experts and research facilities that could be immediately redirected towards pursuing HyperVR and other essential technologies. Over the next decade countless more people could be trained to become highly qualified STEM experts in relevant fields, and hundreds or thousands of new state-of-the-art research facilities could be built. With all research being done cooperatively, STEM experts will likely be able to create advanced humanoid robots within the next 5 years, and will very likely create AGI within the next 6 years, with ASI following very soon after. With the assistance of such exponentially advancing humanoid robots and AI, these STEM experts should be able to create HyperVR and brain chambers within the next 20 years, as well as produce enough autonomous machines to increase humanity's

productivity at an incredible rate. This means an ASI would have 10 years left to continue mass producing billions of autonomous machines, and use these to build HyperVR infrastructure. The production of consumer goods and services would also plummet as more and more humans transitioned to brain chambers, allowing more and more resources to be dedicated towards building HyperVR infrastructure. The resulting exponential escalation of technological advancements and productivity could be enough to ensure every person on the planet has the option to access HyperVR within 30 years, as well as the option to live in the real-world via android avatars. If it also becomes possible within the next 20 years to use artificial wombs to create children, as well as raise these children from birth inside HyperVR, then it is reasonable to believe that every person on the planet will transition to brain chambers and live inside HyperVR permanently. Additionally, research into life support and cryonic freezing technologies is gradually increasing the possibility to place people into a state in which the level of physical damage they experience is likely minimal enough to make revival possible in the future once technology has advanced enough. This means it is also becoming increasingly likely that people who would otherwise die before HyperVR becomes universally available will also be able to survive long enough to experience it.

This 30 year time frame may still seem naïvely optimistic, but it's important to put this into historical context. 30 years ago people living in the most technologically advanced countries in the world didn't have mobile phones, GPS, internet access, laptops, flat screen TVs, nor DVD players, and would have to wait another decade or more before they could purchase most of these. And just as importantly, such technologies don't merely exist today, but have been manufactured in the billions during the past 10 years alone. 30 years ago most people, including most STEM experts, would never have imagined or believed the incredible state of today's technology, nor how globally ubiquitous these technologies would become. And this progress all occurred under an inefficiently competitive and profit-driven economic system, and without advanced humanoid robots, AGI, neuromorphic computers, analog computers, optical

computers, or quantum computers. Increased investment and global cooperation, combined with the continued exponential progress of technology, will guarantee that the technological progress of the next 30 years will be multiple times greater, and likely tens or hundreds of times greater in many areas, than the past 30 years. And even if every person on the planet cannot be permanently transitioned to HyperVR within 30 years, it will very likely be possible within 40 years. Conversely, there is even an extremely unlikely possibility this may be possible within 20 years if all of humanity prioritizes achieving brain chambers within 15 years and producing almost nothing but them in the subsequent 5 years.

However, perhaps the most incredible possibility of HyperVR is how long sentient life could live for inside this paradise. Because all sentient life inside HyperVR will be biologically immortal, and because ASI machines will be able to protect humans from all existential threats, every sentient being will be able to live inside HyperVR until the effective death of the universe. Even though the universe is expanding at an accelerated rate, this only applies to the space between galaxies that are not gravitationally bound to one another, meaning that physical matter and energy sources will continue to be concentrated within these "galaxy clusters" into the distant future. As an ASI civilization, with maximally advanced technology that can optimally utilize all physical matter and energy sources within our reach, our civilization should be able to survive long into the future.

This period of time is challenging to calculate, particularly because it is difficult to know how many utilizable resources there will be available to humanity in the long-term. However, even in a worst-case scenario, all sentient life should be able to live inside this HyperVR paradise for at least a septillion years, which is the number 1 followed by 24 zeros. To put this into perspective, living for a septillion years is equivalent to living 1 million years, then living this period of time a million times over, then living this period of time a million times over, and then living this period of time a million times over. The end of this period of time can be considered the effective death of the universe since it is billions of times longer than the time

it will take for all stars in the universe to die, and millions of times longer than the time it will take for all matter in the universe to fall into black holes. This latter phenomenon won't be a problem for humanity since ASI machines will be able to control most matter inside our galaxy, and most matter gravitationally bound to our galaxy, within the next 10 million to 1 billion years. Living for a septillion years inside HyperVR may sound implausible, but achieving biological immortality for the brain is a near guarantee, and it is improbable that ASI machines won't eventually be able to overcome all threats both on and outside of Earth, particularly considering humanity is already aware of most threats and already has proven or theoretical solutions for most of them.

An ASI would also be able to create a large number of redundancy systems, which would ensure that hardware failures never affected those living inside HyperVR, and would consequently guarantee perfect and seamless never-ending experiences. Additionally, after a period of time inside HyperVR, everyone may even agree to erase all knowledge and memories that life inside HyperVR will be finite, meaning no one would ever experience even the slightest moment of sadness that life inside HyperVR will one day come to an end.

All of these very real possibilities are why HyperVR is one of the most important ideas in the world. However, even if none of this turns out to be possible, the current possibility of HyperVR, and all the tangential technologies that could be discovered by researching and developing HyperVR, nonetheless means that the only logical course of action is for all countries to cooperate with one another, and invest an effectively limitless amount of money, in the pursuit of creating all necessary technologies as rapidly as possible.

Artificiality

Some may argue that living permanently in HyperVR will be undesirable because HyperVR environments will be artificial, and will therefore lack the beauty of the natural world. This is not a reasonable counterargument, or at least not a significant enough

caveat, and for many reasons. First, people could still effectively live in the real-world via android avatars. These avatars could look indistinguishable from real humans, and everything experienced while inhabiting them would feel indistinguishable from everything experienced in a natural human body. Second, soon after HyperVR is created it will be possible for ASI to create virtual environments and experiences that are indistinguishable or effectively indistinguishable from the real-world, meaning concerns about artificiality will quickly become philosophical rather than tangible. In other words, the artificiality of natural environments in HyperVR will be something we will have to consciously remind ourselves of, rather than something that is ever made apparent by spending time in these environments.

Third, much of the beauty of the natural world comes from the sentient life that inhabits it. Forests for example would be substantially less beautiful without the sound of birdsong and the sight of woodland animals. HyperVR will not only be identical in this regard, but will be substantially superior since humans will also be able to interact with all animals. This is because all dangerous animals will eventually be gentle and friendly, and all animals will feel safe enough to interact with all humans and other animals. Humans will also be able to interact with sentient animals that don't exist, or can't ever exist, in the real-world. Synchronized enhancements, joy optimization, love optimization, telepathic empathy, and brain expansion, could also further enhance interactions between humans and animals.

Fourth, it is reasonable to postulate that the beauty of the non-sentient parts of the natural world, like forests and sunsets, are not beautiful because they are real. If tomorrow it was discovered that we were all already living inside a virtual world, and that our entire universe was artificial, this would likely not diminish the beauty of "natural" environments. This is because this beauty likely doesn't originate from the realness of these environments, but from three other factors. The first is the ability of these natural environments to provide highly desirable sensory experiences. The second is their ability to remind us of our smallness and fragility in the context of

the vastness of reality, which can help contribute to such experiences being as overwhelming and wonderful as they are capable of being. The third is their ability to make the realness of our own existence feel more tangible due to their overwhelming nature. These three reasons indicate that the non-sentient parts of natural environments in HyperVR will be capable of being just as beautiful as the non-sentient parts of natural environments in the real-world, since this beauty likely never derived from the assumed realness of our world.

Fifth, any possible remaining concerns about the artificiality of natural environments inside HyperVR are effectively made irrelevant by all the other advantages of HyperVR. Natural environments could be designed by an ASI to be perfectly tailored to our specific desires, including being designed to be maximally appealing to all senses. These environments could also possess exaggerated properties, such as increased color saturation and stronger aromas, or even properties that don't exist in the real-world, such as beautiful alien plant life and unnaturally vast landscapes. The ability to enjoy these natural environments will also be heightened by everyone's perfect and enhanced sensory clarity. Natural environments will also be incapable of cultivating fears that can stymie or ruin one's enjoyment of the natural world, such as the fear of dangerous or fast moving animals, or the fear of being physically injured or trapped when exploring. Everyone in HyperVR will obviously have perfect health, meaning people's enjoyment of the beauty of the world around them will never be diminished by exhaustion or discomfort. Everyone will also possess supernatural capabilities, such as the ability to fly and breathe underwater, which will enable people to enjoy the beauty of far more environments and perspectives. Synchronized enhancements, pleasure optimization, joy optimization, and brain expansion, will also be able to further heighten our enjoyment of these natural environments.

The bottom line is that the artificiality of natural environments in HyperVR will very likely not make them any less beautiful than natural environments in the real-world. In fact, because of all aforementioned possibilities, natural environments in HyperVR will

likely be perceived as being even more beautiful, and better yet, the contentment and joy people experience from spending time in natural environments in HyperVR will likely be orders of magnitude greater than what people currently experience from spending time in natural environments in the real-world. And for those inside brain chambers that still felt that HyperVR environments lacked a certain beauty because of their artificiality, android avatars will enable people to fully experience the real-world whenever they desire, except in complete safety.

Existential threats

Despite everything explored here, HyperVR is not an excuse to treat current existential threats with any less urgency. Until biological immortality and HyperVR are created, billions of adults and children will suffer, and millions will die, from existential threats. Any preventable deaths that occur before biological immortality and HyperVR are achieved cannot be justified, particularly considering the people that will die from existential threats will predominantly be the most impoverished and exploited people in the world. Climate change and soil degradation could also continue to destroy arable farm land, which will likely be essential for growing crops that are required by people living inside brain chambers. Farm land will also be vital for growing the monumental quantities of crops that will be necessary for building HyperVR infrastructure and the billions of autonomous machines that will be required in the future. Genetically modified crops may help increase arable farmland and crop production, but this is not guaranteed. Existential threats must therefore be treated with upmost urgency, and HyperVR does nothing to change this.

Conclusion

Because of its potential, HyperVR must be recognized as one of the most important ideas in the world, if not the most important idea in the world. The revolutionary impact HyperVR will have on human civilization, and the fact that it could be created very rapidly, make most other long-term political and economic pursuits irrelevant or

inconsequential by comparison. Universal awareness of HyperVR consequently has the potential to rapidly and radically change the perceptions and long-term priorities of most people and governments, but only once the Overton window has shifted enough. This also means HyperVR has the best chance of averting nuclear war, since a full-scale nuclear war would kill the majority of humans from nuclear winter, and destroy most global infrastructures, which would eliminate any possibility of humanity ever achieving this utopian future. Combine this with the fact that there is no afterlife, as proven later in the “Theistic Religions” section of this chapter, and it becomes even more apparent how important the creation of HyperVR truly is, since it is the closest humans will ever get to experiencing an eternity in paradise. For these reasons, two of our primary goals are to make HyperVR common knowledge around the world and to make its creation one of humanity’s highest priorities.

Part 2: Technology: Conclusion

The technologies explored in this section provide a general overview of how technology could reshape human civilization over the next 30 years, but only with increased investment and global cooperation. Even if this 30 year time frame is too optimistic, this doesn’t change the fact that these technologies are extremely likely to be possible, meaning there is absolutely no good reason for humanity not to do everything within its power to try to create these technologies as soon as possible. There are also other future technologies which will also change society, but those explored here are likely to be the most transformative. In fact, because of their transformative nature, ASI, advanced humanoid robots, transhumanism, HyperVR, and other similar technologies, could be referred to as “endgame technologies”. This is because they will be the final technologies necessary for achieving human civilization’s final destination, which is living inside a HyperVR paradise until the effective death of the universe.

PART 3: POST- SCARCITY

This next part will explore in more detail the actions that will need to be taken to achieve a post-scarcity world, at least in terms of essential needs. This includes the actions needed to address climate change, since climate change will be responsible for reducing essential resources like food and water.

Nuclear power

To achieve a post-scarcity world will require massively increasing energy production. However, despite what many believe, this will not be practically possible without adopting both renewable energy and nuclear power. Renewables currently only provide around 12% of the world's energy, and experts predict that energy demand will triple, or potentially quadruple, between now and 2050. In reality, energy demand will likely be even higher than this, as will be understood by the end of this section. Worse still, renewables only provide 5% of the world's energy when excluding hydroelectric power systems, which can only be built in a limited number of locations when used for energy generation as opposed to just energy storage, and which are becoming increasingly ineffective in many parts of the world because of an increase in the number and severity of droughts. It is completely infeasible that the world's increasing energy needs can be met with renewables alone. Although the creation of new nuclear power plants remains a highly contentious idea, this can predominantly be blamed on misinformation. This section will explore

why relying upon renewables alone is not possible, and why nuclear power is not the problem many believe it to be.

The first reason is that when all human deaths and injuries are accounted for, nuclear power is effectively just as safe as the safest energy solutions currently available in terms of per unit of energy. It is just as safe as wind, solar, and hydro, approximately 260 times safer than oil, and approximately 350 times safer than coal. This includes all nuclear disasters, which were all far less deadly than most people realize. Zero people likely died from radiation poisoning from the Three Mile Island disaster, and only 1 person has died so far from radiation poisoning from the Fukushima disaster, compared to the almost 20,000 people that died from the earthquake and tsunami that caused the Fukushima disaster. Regarding the Chernobyl disaster, there were only 31 plant workers and first responders who died from the disaster, either within the first few seconds due to immediate blast trauma, or within the subsequent months due to acute radiation poisoning. An additional 4000 people in the surrounding areas and countries are estimated to have died from health problems caused by radiation in the decades since the Chernobyl disaster.

Any possible additional deaths attributable to the Chernobyl disaster were likely minimal when put into context. The radiation created by the disaster was likely never significant enough to seriously affect many other people, and of the tens of thousands of people that may have suffered reduced lifespans as a consequence of the Chernobyl disaster, their lifespans would likely have been reduced far more so by other factors both inside and outside of their control. Examples of the former include an unwillingness to exercise where possible, to eat healthily where possible, to wear sunscreen where possible, and to get enough sleep where possible. Examples of the latter include all of the problems caused or exacerbated by capitalism, such as air pollution, stressful circumstances, and underfunded healthcare. The bottom line is that the number of people that have died prematurely because of nuclear power since its creation absolutely pales in comparison to other problems, such as the 5.5 million people that die

every single year just from anthropogenic air pollution, and the 20 million people that die every single year just from a lack of access to food, clean water, and healthcare.

However, even more importantly than any of this is the fact that the vast majority of deaths caused by nuclear power in the past were the result of accidents that can be entirely avoided with current generation and 4th generation nuclear power plants. This is at least partially because of the utilization of passive safety systems, which rely upon the laws of physics instead of electricity or other redundancy systems that can be disrupted. This makes nuclear meltdowns effectively physically impossible, even when all other redundancy systems fail. 4th generation power plants in particular are also capable of using thorium, which is substantially safer than uranium, and may become a viable alternative in the future. Thorium also can't be used to produce nuclear weapons, although the threat of nuclear weapons will decrease to near zero if our movement is successful. Small Modular Reactors, which are another example of next generation nuclear reactors, are also extremely safe.

However, not only do modern nuclear power plants pose effectively no risk to human life, but nuclear power will actually be essential for saving human lives, particularly in underdeveloped countries. There are effectively countless reasons for this. Electricity is essential for running heating and cooling devices, and these will become increasingly essential for saving lives as extreme temperatures become increasingly common. Modern electric cooking devices will also become increasingly essential because of the number of people in underdeveloped countries that die every year from having no choice but to cook food using fuel sources that produce highly toxic fumes. Providing clean water to everyone on the planet will also be essential for saving lives, particularly as water scarcity worsens, but the only realistic way of achieving this will be through water desalination and purification, which are extremely energy intensive processes. The need for electricity will also increase substantially as humanity begins producing autonomous machines at an increasing

rate, and these machines will obviously be capable of saving lives through various ways.

Nuclear power will also save lives as far as climate change is concerned. Without nuclear power fossil fuel usage will continue or even increase as energy needs skyrocket over the coming decades, and it should be obvious that allowing people to suffer because of a lack of energy is not a justifiable compromise. Nuclear power is viable in this regard because it produces fewer lifetime greenhouse gas emissions than all other energy sources, apart from solar and wind which generally produce the same amount of lifetime emissions. It is assumed by many that nuclear power produces fewer lifetime emissions than all other technologies, but this is only true when mining, construction, decommissioning, waste storage, etc. are not accounted for. Similarly, it is also assumed by many that wind and solar produce fewer lifetime emissions than nuclear, but this is generally untrue, particularly when backup energy storage is accounted for. Many renewable energy technologies, including wind and solar, require energy storage solutions during downtimes, but most of these also produce relatively high emissions over their lifetime. Because of this, nuclear actually produces fewer emissions than wind and solar under many circumstances.

Nuclear power can also help address climate change by assisting in the creation of hydrogen. Hydrogen is one of the best green energy solutions available today, particularly for heavy transportation industries, but currently the overwhelming majority of hydrogen production and distribution requires the burning of enough fossil fuels to negate this benefit, which is something nuclear power could entirely solve. Nuclear power could further help mitigate climate change by facilitating the extraction of CO₂ from seawater, which massively increases the ability of seawater to sequester CO₂, but this is also hugely energy intensive. In summary, nuclear power is the only way to save as many lives as possible moving forward, since nuclear power is the only way to maximize energy production while also reducing greenhouse gas emissions.

The second reason nuclear power needs to be adopted is because, when externalities are accounted for, nuclear power can provide electricity which is effectively just as cheap as any renewable energy technology. In fact thorium nuclear power plants in particular are even capable of providing electricity which is less than half the cost of conventional power plants. Additionally, due to various factors, the cost of renewable energy increases exponentially if not supplemented by nuclear.

Third, nuclear power requires substantially less land than other technologies. Solar farms for example require 450 times more land than a single nuclear power plant. Nuclear power is therefore of particular importance for densely populated areas, and will only become increasingly important since an increasing percentage of the world's population is choosing to live in cities, and this is not just out of necessity. Energy sources that are further away are also more costly, not only because they require more infrastructure, but also because an increasing percentage of electricity is lost the further it has to travel along transmission lines. Nuclear power is often ideal for these reasons and yet is still rarely considered.

Fourth, most renewable energy technologies require scarce resources. For example, many of the most efficient energy storage solutions required by renewable energy technologies require large quantities of rare minerals. Another example is solar farms, which not only require scarce minerals in most cases, but also require hundreds of millions to billions of liters of clean water to clean their solar panels and mirrors over their lifecycle. To make matters worse, demand for such increasingly scarce resources will skyrocket as underdeveloped countries are lifted out of poverty. These countries will not only require more electricity, but will also require substantial improvements to their infrastructures, and their billions of citizens will begin purchasing the same life enhancing technologies currently available to those in developed countries. Considering humans would require the resources of 5 planet Earths if every human lived a Western lifestyle, and that demand for resources will only skyrocket as new life enhancing technologies, and particularly endgame

technologies, are made available, this problem must be taken seriously. Nuclear power plants are not only extremely efficient in terms of resource utilization, but also require very few scarce resources. And this is true collectively as well as individually, as evidenced by the fact that there are only 440 nuclear power plants in the world, and yet these produce 10% of the world's electricity.

The final reason nuclear power needs to be adopted is because renewable energy technologies are often responsible for ecological damage. Hydroelectric dams can inflict significant harm on local ecosystems, and sometimes even encroach on the ancestral lands of indigenous communities. The production and utilization of a large percentage of biomass involves burning fossil fuels and cutting down natural forests, which is obviously also an inefficient way of addressing climate change. Wind turbines continue to be harmful by contributing to the deaths of endangered birds and bats. Concentrated solar power facilities, which use mirrors to concentrate the sun's heat, can also harm and kill birds that fly through these concentrated sun beams. The process of creating solar panels requires many toxic chemicals, and the panels themselves also contain toxic chemicals. These chemicals can poison ecosystems and water sources, and consequently wildlife and humans, if they are not disposed of correctly, and realistically this could continue to be a problem moving forward. On average, solar panels produce approximately 300 times more toxic waste per unit of energy than nuclear, although this problem could be reduced with more research and better planning.

Nuclear power isn't perfect with regards to ecological damage, but it is nowhere near the problem most people believe it to be, particularly with regards to nuclear waste. First, nuclear power produces less toxic waste than all other energy sources, and outside of accidents, which can be avoided, nuclear power also releases less radiation into the environment than all other energy sources. Second, the amount of nuclear waste created in the future will be far less in terms of per unit of energy. This is because 4th generation reactors produce less high-level waste than current reactors, and because the high-level

waste produced by many of these reactors only needs to be stored safely for less than a thousand years. This compares to current high-level waste that needs to be stored safely for 100,000 years, although some newer reactors are even capable of reusing most of this waste, with all remaining waste also only needing to be stored safely for less than a thousand years. However, even if recycling wasn't possible, this still wouldn't be a problem because of how little high-level waste there is. For example, all of the high-level waste ever produced in America could fit inside a single storage facility that is the length and width of a football field and less than 17 meters high.

Third, all nuclear waste, including high-level waste, can be stored completely safely, without posing any risk to people or the environment, and this has been true for decades. All nuclear waste is either made of hard solid material, or is turned into hard solid material, before being stored in containers that are effectively indestructible for all intents and purposes. For example, the containers used for storing and transporting high-level nuclear waste are comprised of massive quantities of concrete and steel, and can survive effectively any physical impact, as well as being set on fire with jet fuel that burns at 774 degrees. During the history of nuclear energy there has not been a single accident where nuclear waste has been released during its containment, transportation, or storage. Long-term underground storage facilities for hazardous materials (a.k.a. deep geological repositories) are also capable of storing all nuclear waste safely. These facilities are built deep underground, and exist far away from fault lines, lava flows, water sources, etc., meaning all nuclear waste can be stored safely in these locations for hundreds of thousands of years even when inevitable geological changes are accounted for.

Fourth, the creation of new high-level nuclear waste may only be a temporary problem because of the likely maturation of two other technologies. The first is geothermal, which has the potential to fulfill a large percentage of humanity's energy needs, but only if major obstacles are overcome. The biggest obstacle is being able to drill

down deep enough into the Earth's crust to reach temperatures that are hot enough to create geothermal energy. This is currently not possible for most places on the planet. While there are technologies on the horizon that may overcome this obstacle, for the moment geothermal does not appear to be a viable global solution. The only other reasonable potential technology is nuclear fusion. This is not to be confused with nuclear fission, which is the technology used in conventional nuclear power plants. Nuclear fusion is a rapidly advancing technology that will likely end up being the ideal solution to humanity's long-term energy needs. Nuclear fusion produces very little nuclear waste and no high-level nuclear waste, and nuclear fusion plants will likely be built and fully operational within the next 25 to 50 years. The amount of nuclear waste created in the interim time by nuclear power will effectively be insignificant, particularly compared to all the suffering and death that will be caused if nuclear power is not adopted globally as rapidly as possible. Additionally, ASI and billions of robots will be able to further ensure the safe storage of all nuclear waste into the distant future.

The bottom line is that increasing nuclear power globally is irrefutably essential. Sweden and France have effectively been able to achieve lower greenhouse gas emissions than all other developed countries, and have only been able to do so through embracing nuclear power. Renewables will continue to improve, but both wind and solar are getting close to reaching their limit. Many up-and-coming energy storage solutions will make renewable energy more viable in the future, although even then renewables won't be anywhere near enough to meet humanity's skyrocketing energy needs. However, the construction of conventional nuclear power plants will need to begin as soon as possible, since they take on average 5 to 7 years to build. Small Modular Reactors are another possibility, and only take 2 to 3 years to build, but these are far less efficient, and therefore only ideal under a very limited set of circumstances. However, even these will need to be built as soon as possible. The good news is that the transition to democratic socialist planned economies should make it possible to build hundreds of new nuclear power plants, including Small Modular Reactor power plants,

within the next decade or so. This will require retraining millions of workers, and investing massively into necessary supply chains, but this goal is likely feasible.

Conclusion

The urgency with which all aforementioned problems need addressing means nuclear power must be embraced immediately. There is no end to the benefits of creating an effectively limitless supply of energy, particularly with regards to water desalination and addressing climate change. Utilizing both renewables and nuclear, rather than renewables alone, is the only way to reduce fossil fuel usage and maximize energy abundance as quickly as possible. If humanity delays the proliferation of nuclear power, millions of adults and children will needlessly suffer and die from a host of avoidable problems. Refusing to embrace nuclear power at this stage must therefore be recognized as tantamount to mass murder. The world cannot use idealism and naïvety as excuses for rejecting nuclear power any longer.

Veganism

For humanity to achieve a post-scarcity world, veganism will need to become universally adopted. The only justifiable exceptions would be instances where this is not practically feasible. The animal abuse and environmental pollution caused by the animal agriculture industry have already been explored in Chapter 1, but there are many other reasons why the world must transition to veganism.

Sustainability

- A vegan diet produces about half of the greenhouse gas emissions of an average animal-based diet. Beef in particular produces 20

times more greenhouse gases than a vegan diet with the same calories. The animal agriculture industry is responsible for 14.5% to 16.5% of all greenhouse gas emissions, although even the lower estimate is greater than all the greenhouse gases emitted by all motorbikes, cars, trucks, trains, ships, and planes, combined. Meat, eggs, and dairy, are responsible for 65% of all nitrous oxide emissions, and nitrous oxide is 300 times worse than CO₂. Cattle are one of the largest producers of methane on the planet, and cutting methane is the most important way to address climate change in the short-term. Algae can be added to cattle feed to reduce methane emissions, but not only would this proposal realistically take a decade or more to introduce globally, but more importantly this approach still leads to substantial methane emissions.

To make matters worse, organic and ethically grown animal produce generate even more greenhouse gas emissions for the same amount of protein. For example, even though it is assumed pasture raised cattle produce less emissions, in reality they grow slower, they grow to a lesser size, and the farming practices required to raise them produce more emissions, meaning less protein can be produced relative to the same amount of emissions produced by unethical animal agriculture. If the additional land used by organic and ethical animal farms was instead used for addressing climate change, then this emissions problem can be understood as being even worse. The reality is that becoming vegan is currently the easiest and most significant thing a person can do to reduce their greenhouse gas emissions. Anything other than veganism cannot be justified for these reasons alone.

- A vegan diet requires between 10% to 25% of the land that an animal-based diet requires. Almost 80% of all farmland in the world is used to either raise livestock or grow food for livestock, even though livestock provides less than 20% of the world's calories. Beef alone requires over 10 times more arable land to produce the same amount of protein as plant-based produce, and the same trend is true for all other food derived from land animals. Even animals that are labeled as "pasture raised" rarely just eat the grass of the fields

they graze in, but instead have to consume crops that are imported from other regions or countries. Additionally, many crops that can be consumed by humans are given to monogastric livestock like pigs and chickens. If the animal agriculture industry declined, crops that can be consumed by humans would immediately become available to humans, and much of the newly available farmland could be repurposed to grow crops for human consumption. In other words, many adults and children in underdeveloped countries are currently malnourished and starving to death because most of their arable land is being used to provide meat for consumers in wealthier nations.

The animal agriculture industry also accounts for over 60% of deforestation in the world, and is responsible for 75% of the deforestation of tropical forests in South America. This is having a large number of devastating consequences. Deforestation is substantially increasing flooding in affected areas, and is currently affecting the poorest people in the world worst of all. Deforestation is also exacerbating the spread of malaria because the resulting habitats provide the perfect breeding grounds for malaria-spreading mosquitos. Deforestation is also massively damaging humanity's ability to address climate change. To put this into perspective, even the reforestation of all viable land on the planet still wouldn't be enough to reverse climate change, let alone in the shortest time frame possible. So not only must existing forests be protected, but reforestation efforts must also include the reforestation of as much agricultural land as possible.

To make matters worse, the animal agriculture industry continues to be directly responsible for forcing indigenous tribes off their ancestral lands, since tribal communities often live on very fertile arable land. Additionally, arable farm land is also decreasing due to climate change, and this will not be offset by arable land becoming available due to thawing permafrost. And if all of these problems weren't bad enough, they will be exacerbated even further if people transition to purchasing organic and ethically grown animal products, which unsurprisingly require more arable land than less humane animal agriculture. The only ethical solution is for arable farmland to be used

first and foremost to grow crops for human consumption, and for all remaining land to be used to grow vegetation capable of offsetting greenhouse gas emissions, increasing biodiversity, and increasing water retention. Anything other than veganism cannot be justified for these reasons alone.

- A vegan diet requires approximately 10% of the water required to produce an animal-based diet. Just a single pound of beef requires 15,000 liters of water to produce, making it the most water-intensive form of protein. One gallon of milk also requires up to 1000 gallons of water to produce. Unsurprisingly, approximately one third of the entire world's freshwater is used by the animal agriculture industry, and very little of this refers directly to rainwater despite what some propagandists have claim. The majority of freshwater in underdeveloped countries is currently being diverted away from impoverished and desperate communities to grow crops, and the majority of these crops are being grown for livestock. Many of the world's freshwater sources are also being contaminated by farm animal waste, and by the synthetic fertilizers and pesticides used to grow crops specifically for animal agriculture, which is further exacerbating water scarcity.

Despite the animal agriculture industry exacerbating water scarcity, the industry continues to grow. However, water scarcity is also being exacerbated by other factors which will worsen this problem substantially moving forward. Water is a major constituent component of concrete, which will be required at an ever increasing rate moving forward as more and more underdeveloped countries are lifted out of poverty. Water is also essential for mining and refining many minerals that are used in electronics, which will be manufactured at an ever increasing rate moving forward. So not only are millions of adults and children dying every year from water mismanagement, but this number could increase moving forward unless the animal agriculture industry comes to an end. Anything other than veganism cannot be justified for this reason alone.

- The prevalence of the animal agriculture industry, which only requires a small variety of crops compared to human diets, and which dominates an overwhelming amount of the earth's arable land, has culminated in most of the world's crops being comprised of a very small number of species. Even most food consumed by humans derives from only 3 crops, and there is very little genetic variety within these crops. These monocultures are consequently very susceptible to new strains of diseases. Just one disease has the potential to wipeout the majority of any one of these crops. Such a catastrophe is entirely possible, and if it were to arise it would culminate in worldwide food shortages, and likely the deaths of tens of millions, particularly in the poorest countries in the world. Anything other than veganism cannot be justified for this reason alone.

- Topsoil is essential for growing crops, and yet the current existential threat of topsoil degradation is occurring predominantly because of the massive amount of crops required by the animal agriculture industry. This is primarily because the amount of crops required for animal agriculture can only realistically be produced with monocultures and synthetic fertilizers and pesticides, which are responsible for killing off essential microorganisms and insects. It is possible to grow crops sustainably using permacultures, which are agricultural ecosystems designed to be completely sustainable long-term, but these are more expensive and require more resources. Realistically however there is no guarantee it will be possible to remediate soil degradation before millions of people starve to death as this problem escalates. Anything other than veganism cannot be justified for this reason alone.

- Many of the most common pesticides used in the agricultural industry are neonicotinoids. These are a collection of chemicals that are a primary cause of colony collapse disorder, which is the phenomenon where the majority of worker bees in a honey bee colony suddenly disappear. Because bees are a primary pollinator of crops, their global decline is yet another serious problem that will exacerbate the existential threat of global food scarcity. Considering

most crops are grown for the animal agriculture industry, and the fact that permacultures are more expensive and require more resources, realistically the only feasible way of reducing the use of neonicotinoids, and thus preventing colony collapse disorder, is to reduce the number of crops grown. Anything other than veganism cannot be justified for this reason alone.

- Commercial fishing is one of the leading causes of the collapse of oceanic ecosystems. This collapse is occurring partly because of the extinction of an increasing number of critically endangered species, which are either caught intentionally for consumption, or caught unavoidably and unintentionally as bycatch. This collapse is also occurring because of the use of trawl nets used to scrape the bottom of the ocean, which is a practice that is now responsible for destroying a larger area of the sea floor than all the forest land destroyed by humans throughout history. This collapse of oceanic ecosystems is having a number of devastating consequences. For example, the rapid decline in whale populations is exacerbating climate change, since whales are a major contributor to the creation of phytoplankton, which are essential for absorbing CO₂ and producing oxygen. Another example is the exacerbated starvation of the hundreds of millions of people in the world that had previously relied upon marine life for sustenance and income. In fact this is the first time coastal communities have suffered from this problem on a large scale in human history. This is not only because of the substantial decline in marine life populations, but also because excessive fishing stymies the maturation of marine animals, which makes them substantially physically smaller. However, despite the common assumption, commercial fishing isn't done just to provide humans with food directly, but also to feed agricultural pigs and fish. To put this into perspective, growing 1 kilogram of farmed fish requires 1.5 to 2 kilograms of wild fish. Anything other than veganism cannot be justified for these reasons alone.

Worker abuse

- Farmers and slaughterhouse workers have no choice but to perform exhausting, painful, and hazardous work that regularly causes them lifelong debilitating health disorders, even when they are not victims of accidents. Slaughterhouse workers in particular are forced to stand on their feet all day, and perform repetitive motions with forceful exertion, which they often have to perform while standing or moving in uncomfortable, strenuous, or harmful positions. It is common for workers to perform up to 30,000 repetitive motions within a single shift. And because workers are not given the time to sharpen their tools, they are forced to exert increasingly greater force throughout the day as their tools become increasingly blunt. These conditions can cause workers musculoskeletal disorders, even within a few days or weeks of employment. Even in America, where working conditions are better than many other countries in the world, one third of meat processing workers go on to develop carpal tunnel syndrome, and two thirds go on to develop nerve disorders. Aside from chronic numbness, tingling, discomfort, and pain, these problems commonly result in such poor motor control that it becomes unsafe for workers to hold or carry basic household objects, such as knives and kettles.

- Workers within the animal agriculture industry suffer from an unusually high rate of accidents. In America, slaughterhouse work is currently the most dangerous occupation in the country. Over one quarter of slaughterhouse workers suffer moderate to severe injuries every single year, and workers have a 50% chance of being seriously injured within just 5 years of employment. However, actual accident rates are likely far worse, since workers are strongly incentivized not to report them. This is partially due to the top-down pressure and threats of the corporations involved, who wish to avoid litigation, bad publicity, and other repercussions that diminish profits. Most workers are also low skilled and impoverished, which makes them particularly vulnerable to repercussions, including being fired. Additionally, a sizable percentage of workers are illegal immigrants, who are often less able to file reports due to language barriers, or are unwilling to file reports or be hospitalized due to fears of deportation.

The injuries these workers face can range substantially in severity. Some injuries can be less severe, such as crushed fingers, minor burns, flayed skin, and head trauma, or can involve more serious consequences, like crushed, mutilated or dismembered hands, arms, and legs, permanent blindness, severe burns that require skin grafts, and even death. And these problems do not just derive from operating dangerous machinery and tools, but also from working with such large, powerful, and frightened animals. For example, cows are often still conscious when they are hung upside-down from their legs and have their throats slit, and workers are often harmed, either by these animals or their own knife, as they attempt to get to the throats of these large writhing animals. It doesn't help that many of these workers do not even receive proper training. Many of these accidents occur because consumers and corporations demand cheap meat, which incentivizes businesses to hire as few workers as possible, and force them to work as quickly as possible.

- Workers within the industry, including farmers, slaughterhouse workers, and maintenance workers, are regularly exposed to caustic and toxic chemicals, including ammonia, chlorine, and hydrogen sulfide. Exposure can cause infections, eye irritation, dizziness, nausea, headaches, diarrhea, chronic coughing, asthma, bronchitis, infertility, cancers, organic dust toxic syndrome, and neurological problems. Many of these more minor problems, such as nausea and headaches, can also persist during most or all hours outside of work. These chemicals can even cause life-threatening problems, like seizures, asphyxiation, comas, and heart attacks. The children of these workers are also more likely to suffer from birth defects. It is also not unheard of for workers' fingernails to peel off due to excessive exposure to this cocktail of chemicals and pathogens. Some workers have even been recorded as having fallen victim to brain, spinal, and nerve damage, due to breathing in particles of pig brain matter. Because the industry is predominantly responsible for the widespread use of synthetic pesticides, due to the massive quantities of crops that need to be grown for agricultural animals, the industry is also predominantly responsible for the 40% of farmers around the world who are poisoned by these pesticides every year,

and the 11,000 farmers who are killed by these pesticides every year.

- The industry is also responsible for inflicting tremendous stress and psychological trauma on workers. The first source is the incredibly dangerous environments they are forced to work in. Workers can spend all of their work hours surrounded by potentially dangerous animals, or loud and fast moving blades and machinery, that are moments or inches away from causing them grievous bodily harm. The repetition and speed of their labor, combined with prolonged and extreme mental and physical fatigue, can substantially increase the possibility of mistakes, and further ensure workers are constantly and overtly aware of the dangers of their occupation.

The second source of stress and trauma is the depressing and demeaning nature of this work. These workers are some of the worse paid workers in society, and have to spend most of their waking hours performing remarkably boring, repetitive, and unfulfilling labor, none of which can be used to improve their economic or career prospects. Many of these workers also have no choice but to wear adult diapers because they are not given enough time to take bathroom breaks. These workers also have to spend their entire workday breathing in rancid stench, and touching and looking at blood, animal waste, and mutilated animal bodies.

The third source of stress and trauma obviously derives from the brutality of this work. Most people fully understand the value and nature of cats and dogs because most people see and interact with them regularly. Understandably farmers and slaughterhouse workers also quickly develop an equal appreciation of the value and nature of farm animals for the same reason. It is therefore unsurprising that workers rapidly develop severe stress and trauma when forced to brutalize and slaughter what are extremely vulnerable, innocent, gentle, inquisitive, and emotional creatures. Workers commonly describe how these animals approach them and affectionately nuzzle them, or alternatively show clear signs of distress and physical anguish, in the moments before they have to brutalize them.

Unsurprisingly, many workers have described crying on the job, and developing cold sweats and tremors as they carry out their work.

Even more tragically, this stress and trauma often continues outside of work. Workers commonly suffer from guilt, depression, anxiety, nightmares, emotional numbness, psychological trauma akin to post-traumatic stress-disorder, and feelings of disassociation from reality. And such conditions can persist for years after workers leave this profession, or even for the rest of their lives. It is subsequently common for workers to develop drug and alcohol dependencies as a coping mechanism, and to become more emotionally and socially withdrawn. However, unlike many instances of trauma, this psychological scarring can be made worse by the fact that these workers are the perpetrators of the abuse, rather than the recipients. Some workers have described having suicidal thoughts because of this guilt, and many do eventually commit suicide. Everyone can appreciate the obvious stress and trauma that would be suffered by someone forced to brutalize hundreds of cats and dogs on a daily basis, so it is surprising that the severe stress and trauma experienced by animal agriculture workers is not more commonly recognized or assumed.

- There is strong evidence that slaughterhouse work can cultivate in workers sociopathic behaviors that persist outside of work, and potentially even after they leave this line of work. A large-scale study conducted by the FBI concluded that when all other variables were accounted for, the existence of slaughterhouses in communities increased crime, and most significantly sexual abuse, child abuse, and violence. It has been theorized that the emotional suppression and violence that workers perform during their work life negatively influences their psyche and instinctual behaviors, and that this can cultivate antisocial behaviors outside of work, particularly when combined with the stress and trauma they experience at work. There are sociological and psychological theories which support this interpretation of the evidence.

- All farmers, including those in developed countries, are terribly exploited by corporations within the industry. If farmers do not fully submit to the exploitative demands of these monopolistic enterprises, they are prevented from selling their produce via traditional avenues, or are sued into bankruptcy using baseless accusations. Farmers are exploited to such an extent that suicides within the industry are a regular occurrence. In fact these suicides have been increasing in recent times, even in developed countries.

Conclusion

The threat posed by the animal agriculture industry cannot be overstated. If veganism is not globally adopted, hundreds of millions of adults and children will suffer, and millions will likely die. This will not only occur directly from all aforementioned reasons, but also through conflicts and wars driven by scarcity. In fact conflicts over freshwater have already begun. And all of this is in addition to the severe problems of animal abuse and environmental pollution.

Describing the transition to veganism as a personal sacrifice would be immoral framing, just as it would be immoral for a slave owner to frame the releasing of their slaves as a "personal sacrifice". However, even if transitioning to a vegan diet can be considered a sacrifice, it is an incredibly minor one considering vegan food can be just as flavorful, albeit differently flavored, with widely available ingredients. Additionally, cultured meat, which was previously called "lab-grown meat", and is now commonly called "synthetic meat", will likely become indistinguishable or near-indistinguishable from real meat sometime in the near future, meaning that this transition will likely only be a short-lived inconvenience. And once people begin living inside HyperVR, they will effectively be able to consume whatever foods and drinks they desire. In the meantime however, humanity has a moral obligation to transition to veganism, no matter how unappealing this may be to certain individuals. Justice always feels like oppression to those that have unjustified privilege at the expense of others, but this has obviously never been a justification for perpetuating the suffering of others, whether humans or animals.

Vertical farms

One likely necessity for achieving a post-scarcity world is the creation of vertical farms. These are buildings within which a variety of crops are grown using artificial sunlight, and which have a number of advantages over conventional forms of agriculture. These advantages include the following.

- They require as little as 0.25% to 2% of the ground space required to produce the same amount of crops as conventional farms.
- They require no pesticides.
- They require very little top soil, or no top soil, depending on the crop and the design.
- They require as little as 1% to 5% of the water required on traditional farms.
- They can grow crops all year round.
- They can grow crops in any country in the world.
- They can grow crops faster.
- They can guarantee consistently higher crop quality.
- They can grow crops with modified and refined qualities, such as taste and texture, due to control over environmental conditions.
- They could potentially provide cheaper food to consumers than conventional farms, but only if provided with cheap electricity.
- They can be built in, or next to, densely populated areas, meaning shorter travel distances between producers and consumers. Among other benefits, this can ensure fresher produce for consumers.
- They can be built in locations which are far away from arable land.
- They can act as an additional safeguard against food shortages caused by climate change.
- Vertical farms that grow synthetic meat, once commercially viable, would use 90% less water and land, and produce 90% fewer emissions, than meat produced by the animal agriculture industry.

An additional version of this concept is vertical ocean farms, which are capable of producing invaluable macroalgae economically and in

abundance. Seaweed, and perhaps most notably kelp, can be used to produce fertilizer and a variety of nutritious foods, and is capable of absorbing extremely high quantities of CO₂, meaning it can also reduce ocean acidification. More research needs to be done into the long-term real-world consequences of vertical ocean farms, but they are worth serious consideration considering their potential.

Conclusion

The increased adoption of vertical farms will likely be a necessary step towards achieving a post-scarcity world. Vertical farms however will not replace conventional agriculture, but merely be an invaluable addition. Aside from the infeasibility of feeding the world's population with vertical farms alone, most of the problems they solve could also be solved for conventional farms if only more sustainable practices were introduced. For example, water scarcity could be addressed via veganism and nuclear power, and top soil degradation could be reversed via veganism and permacultures. However, where vertical farms are appropriate, they will be invaluable in the future.

Part 3: Post-Scarcity: **Conclusion**

There are numerous other approaches that must be utilized to accelerate the speed at which a post-scarcity world is achieved. These include investing massively into public transportation in order to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, maximizing STEM progress in order to increase the efficiency of resource utilization, and reducing consumption by eradicating planned obsolescence and perceived obsolescence. However, nuclear power, veganism, and vertical farms, will be essential in the immediate future for reducing the possibility of the humanitarian disasters that scarcity always creates.

PART 4:

PARAMOUNT

The success of our movement is paramount for all the reasons explored thus far. However, there are other extremely important problems and subsequent goals our movement will focus on. The first goal is to bring an effectual end to all theistic religions. The second goal is to make abortions universally recognized as a fundamental human right. The third goal is to achieve the decriminalization or legalization of the majority of recreational drugs. In addition to these 3 larger issues, there is also a wide range of other problems that our movement hopes to address. A final section will be dedicated to summarizing why our movement is likely the only one capable of addressing these problems.

Theistic religions

If our movement is successful, the global influence of theistic religions will decline substantially over the coming years. This is not stated with hostility, and our movement will always support religious liberties, but this decline is likely inevitable. Theistic religions are already on the decline globally, and our movement's success will massively accelerate this. This will be partly due to an increasing awareness of the ideas explored in this section, partly due to an increase in the critical thinking skills and knowledgeability of people around the world, and partly due to the rapid eradication of global poverty. Aside from the fact that theistic religions contain and rely upon indefensible and contradictory ideas, this prediction is

supported by the fact that better educated and wealthier individuals and countries correlate strongly with agnosticism and atheism. The correlation between poverty and theistic religions likely exists because religions can provide unshakable stability and hope for those in dire circumstances.

Unavoidably harmful

Our movement also believes that the end of theistic religions is highly desirable, which is why we are dedicated to achieving this goal. Theistic religions can provide value to individuals and societies, but this value can be achieved to a greater extent through other means, and without all the problems that can arise from theistic religions. The uncomfortable truth is that as long as theistic religions persist, they will continue to encourage countless otherwise good-natured people to harm themselves or others for irrational reasons. There are innumerable modern-day examples of this.

- Theistic religions often encourage followers to be uncritically minded and uninformed. Even when this doesn't result in dangerous forms of indoctrination, this still makes religious people vulnerable to wasting years of their life, and making poor life-altering decisions, that they deeply regret once they lose their faith. People have a right to not be indoctrinated, and to possess the critical thinking skills and knowledge necessary to make the best decisions possible.
- Many theistic religions encourage their followers to adopt virtue ethics, which is the doctrine that actions should be judged as right or wrong according to whether they develop moral character. This has cultivated within many religious people a perverse reluctance to address societal problems with an appropriate sense of urgency, since they believe such suffering can be invaluable at teaching lessons and building character.
- Most theistic religions throughout history have been misogynistic, and in many religious cultures today this problem still persists.
- All around the world LGBT+ individuals are being persecuted and treated as second class citizens primarily or solely because of theistic religions, even though they have no more control over these aspects

of themselves than anyone else. Many such individuals also internalize this stigma, and develop self-hatred and self-disgust. At worst these individuals can also be banished by their loved ones, harassed, assaulted, and even murdered.

- Many adolescents and adults experience guilt, depression, and sexual repression, for thinking about, or indulging in, perfectly healthy and normal sexual desires and activities.
- Religious people often feel compelled to stay in loveless or toxic marriages because they believe getting divorced goes against God's perfect will. Many individuals stay in these relationships even if this is harmful to their children's wellbeing.
- Many theistic religions place great emphasis on loving and forgiving those that have abused them. This is irrational, immoral, and psychologically harmful. People can overcome trauma, relinquish their anger, and find inner peace, without having to unnecessarily forgive those who have abused them, particularly if their abusers are unrepentant.
- Religious people living in poverty are encouraged to generously donate to religious organizations that enrich their wealthy leaders, even if this comes at the expense of the quality of life of themselves and their children. Such donating can be the result of intentional scamming, or merely the perpetuation of religious tradition.
- Religious organizations and systems often deal with immoral actions and crimes internally, which can result in dangerous and immoral outcomes. An obvious example of this is the Catholic Church's protection of child abusers, which has not only prevented abuse victims from receiving any form of justice, but also resulted in many more children being sexually abused.
- Religious people have often been at the forefront of stymying scientific research, such as stem cell research, which has produced a progress delay that has caused millions of adults and children to needlessly suffer and die. This could be a particular problem for transhumanist technologies and HyperVR moving forward.
- Theistic religions continue to persuade people to decline medical treatments. This can come from a misplaced faith in divine intervention, or from the belief that certain treatments, such as blood transfusions, go against god's divine creation or will. Many followers

are even indoctrinated into believing that physical ailments are due to personal spiritual failings.

- Religious people are the primary advocates for banning or indefensibly restricting access to abortion services, even though such services are a fundamental human right. Many women are also refused medical treatments, including lifesaving treatments, if these can induce abortions. Religious people are also at the forefront of exacerbating the number of abortions required since they disproportionately advocate for abstinence-only sex education, reduced access to contraceptives, and right-wing economic policies which reduce people's ability to afford contraceptives.
- Religious groups continue to be at the forefront of making sex work illegal, which forces sex workers into far more dangerous unregulated black markets. Religious people also disproportionately advocate for right-wing economic policies which perpetuate or exacerbate the very poverty that pushes many people into sex work in the first place.
- Every year millions of girls and boys have immensely sensitive parts of their sex organs mutilated or cut off for the sake of religious tradition. The fact that theistic religions are capable of normalizing something as barbaric and despicable as genital mutilation demonstrates their immense power to indoctrinate people with nonsensical and harmful beliefs.
- Many theistic religions use their influence to convince people that all adults and children are inherently "sinful" and incapable of being "good enough". This can be extremely psychologically harmful, and particularly for children. People can be guided to develop moral character without such condemnations of their most innate nature.
- Millions of children live in fear of an afterlife of eternal torment that either they or their loved ones may one day have to endure. This type of indoctrinated fear and anxiety would be regarded as child abuse outside of religious contexts, but is considered reasonable when a consequence of theistic religions.
- Many children receive physical punishments because of the conservative religiosity of their parents. Causing any amount of physical harm to children as a form of punishment is now known to be both ineffectual and harmful. Most progressive societies have outlawed this practice, so it is reasonable to assume this

conservative practice would have disappeared long ago if not for theistic religions.

- Countless religious people live in ongoing fear, and even develop mental health problems, as a consequence of doubting parts of their religion or entertaining thoughts of leaving their religion, because of the knowledge that they may disappoint or be punished by their god, loved ones, or community. Many people who criticize or leave religions continue to be harassed, assaulted, mutilated, and murdered.
- Many religious people falsely claim or believe that agnostics and atheists live unfulfilling lives devoid of happiness and hope, which can cause many religious people who question their faith to needlessly experience fear and despair, including suicidal thoughts. This is ironic considering studies have shown that countries with the highest rates of agnosticism and atheism are also the happiest.
- Religious missionaries continue to harm the communities they visit and attempt to convert. This includes causing disunity in communities, destroying longstanding cultures, refusing to provide aid unless potential recipients hear sermons or convert, and spreading diseases which these communities are more vulnerable to. This even caused many tribes to suffer from a surge in deaths from COVID-19 during the pandemic.
- Followers of different theistic religions and denominations continue to harm one another in prolonged and dangerous conflicts, rather than being united by their shared humanity. This has resulted in disunity, psychological abuse, physical violence, and even murders, within and between families, communities, and countries.
- Incompetent and corrupt politicians continue to be elected to the highest positions of power because religious followers believe this to be god's will, while policies, experience, competence, integrity, etc. are effectively disregarded. This is one of the main reasons why immoral politicians and fascists keep getting elected to power.
- Theocratic states continue to indoctrinate, oppress, torture, murder, etc. people for religious reasons. If those within these governments did not follow any theistic religion these abuses would be far less likely to occur.

- Millions of religious people, including those in power, are unwilling to tackle global problems, and even existential threats like climate change, because they falsely believe that a god is in control and that an afterlife exists. This irrational contentment is extremely dangerous. As Karl Marx warned, "Religion is the opiate of the masses."
- Many religious people, such as some fundamentalist Christians, are trying to exacerbate the world's problems because they believe that bringing about the "end times" is a necessary step before god intervenes and creates a utopia for his followers.
- Many religious fundamentalist terrorists continue to strive to acquire nuclear and biological weapons, and these fundamentalists will very likely exist as long as theistic religions exist.
- The majority of religious people refuse to boycott the animal agriculture industry, despite being aware that the food and goods they purchase are derived from animals that have suffered abuses that they would consider evil and indefensible if inflicted upon themselves, or upon other equally innocent sentient beings, like children, dogs, and cats.
- Religious people tend to become more radical as their religion dies out. This is because moderate believers tend to leave first, meaning they no longer temper the radical individuals who remain, who are usually inclined to become more radical as a means of counterbalancing what they perceive as societal decline. The end of theistic religions is inevitable, and this radicalism problem means it would be best if theistic religions came to an end as swiftly as possible.

This list encompasses most of the evils and threats that exist in the world as a consequence of theistic religions, and which would be substantially less likely to occur in a world that embraced evidence and reason, including sentience morality. Any theistic religion that causes, or does not outright prevent or condemn, the suffering and abuse of sentient beings, is of no use to societies at best, and a danger to societies at worst. The suffering that has been caused by theistic religions throughout history has been widespread, avoidable, life-altering, and often immensely evil. It should also come as little

surprise that theistic religions have been against scientific progress and most civil rights movements throughout human history, and unfortunately this continues to this day. In fact, historical records indicate that LGBT+ individuals and sexual liberty were predominantly accepted throughout most of human history, and became victims of suppression and “purity” crusades predominantly as a consequence of theistic religions, particularly during the past few centuries.

There are numerous ways people and societies can be incentivized to become mature, noble, moral, and altruistic. Theistic religions could be considered one such way if not for their highly dangerous and unique ability to indoctrinate followers with irrational beliefs, and make otherwise good-natured people behave irrationally and immorally, by virtue of invoking an “infallible” higher being. And once someone believes in the existence of such a perfect higher power, and subsequently the divinity of their religious texts, it can become almost impossible to reason with them, since any rational arguments will always be secondary to, or made irrelevant by, the ultimate authority of their “infallible” god. Religious institutions will also continue to compound this problem by virtue of prioritizing faith and echo chambers over critical thinking and knowledgeability.

Inherently irrational

To help facilitate the end of theistic religions, the following segment is dedicated to exploring the inherent irrationality of theistic religions. This assessment is offered in the form of multiple questions, categorized into a number of broader problems.

- Problem 1: Child safety

Why would god ever allow children to be born into such a brutal world considering how vulnerable they would be to all the suffering that occurs within it? Why are children not raised to adulthood by perfect benevolent beings, and in safe environments far from Earth, prior to being introduced to the rest of humanity? This would not only protect children from harm, but would subsequently bring to an end

the abusive behaviors that adults exhibit as a result of unresolved childhood trauma. This would prevent adults from experiencing the joys of parenthood, but would be a worthy trade-off if it prevented the sexual abuse and torture of children throughout history. Adults would also not miss the experience of parenthood because they would not be aware of its possibility. So why would god ever allow children to be born into a world where they can suffer so needlessly and horrifically?

- Problem 2: Physical pain

Why would a loving god willingly allow all humans to be born into a world in which they can experience immense physical pain? Why would god not simply place all sentient life into something like HyperVR, so that physical pleasure could be maximized, and physical pain would be impossible? At the very least, why does physical harm not at least only elicit mild discomfort, sharp tingling, strong pulsing, or a new and unique sensation, which would entirely eradicate the possibility of physical pain? Alternatively, why would god not allow humans to modulate their own feelings of physical pain? These possibilities would prevent people from experiencing unnecessary pain, including the agonizing pain induced by torture.

If god is unwilling to do this, why would he not at least intervene to heal people? Why would god not cure all individuals who suffer from Fothergill disease, which causes sufferers to regularly experience what is often described as a feeling akin to being stabbed repeatedly in the face for seconds or minutes at a time, and which causes most sufferers to commit suicide within mere months of developing it due to how excruciatingly painful it is? Why would god not cure all children who suffer from epidermolysis bullosa, which is an agonizing lifelong condition that causes all skin covering the body to easily tear and blister, and is so severe that children who suffer from it often develop bloodied and weeping stumps where their fingers and toes should be? Why would a loving god allow adults and children to endure such agonizing conditions considering any parent that intentionally prevented their child from being cured of such conditions would be condemned as monstrously evil? In the case of

terminally ill people, why would god allow them to suffer immense sickness and pain up until the point of death if they have nothing left to learn and their anguish is preventable through divine intervention?

Additionally, why would god worsen the problem of physical pain by placing humans in natural environments that are incredibly hostile to humans? Why would god create, or allow the evolution of, dangerous animals and bacteria that can cause incredible physical harm, and even unimaginable physical agony in the case of life forms like bullet ants and the gympie-gympie suicide plant? Similarly, why would god create, or allow the evolution of, a planet in which natural disasters occur? If it is not possible for galaxies to give rise to planets capable of supporting life without also being susceptible to natural disasters, why would god not create the Earth from scratch himself, and design it so that natural disasters were impossible. At the very least, why would god not reveal to his followers the safest locations on earth, or provide warnings of the times and locations of specific natural disasters? An innumerable number of adults and children have been severely harmed and disfigured, or have died in agonizing pain, because of natural disasters. All of these adults and children could have passed away peacefully in their sleep, or surrounded by loved ones, if it was somehow god's will that they should die.

- Problem 3: Animal suffering

Why would god create a world in which an astronomical number of animals also suffer? Why would god create, or allow the evolution of, septillions of sentient animals throughout the Earth's existence that could only survive by brutally killing other animals? Why would god create a world in which the vast majority of wild animals, from a very young age, have to live in a state of constant vigilance and fear of being hunted by incredibly violent animals, or even being harassed and abused by animals within their own social group? Why would god create a world in which these child-like creatures have to suffer being poisoned, acidified, electrocuted, suffocated, impaled, gashed, crushed, eaten alive, flayed alive, or mauled to death? Why would god not create a universe where anything other than the existence of herbivores is impossible, even with the occurrence of evolution or the

introduction of "sin"? Similarly, why would god create a world where animals could be harmed by humans, who are arguably the most dangerous predators in the world? Why would god allow humans to take animals into battle, or brutalize animals for entertainment, or torture animals in the process of making food?

Additionally, why would god allow animals to suffer naturally even without predators? Why would god allow animals to experience terrifying fear from the sight and sound of lightning, thunder, torrential rain, strong winds, and other natural phenomenon? Why would god allow animals to suffer and die from dehydration, starvation, suffocation, heat stroke, freezing temperatures, hail storms, acid rain, hurricanes, and forest fires? Why would god allow animals to suffer and die slowly from the consequences of accidents, such as infected wounds and broken bones? Why would god allow animals to suffer and die from naturally occurring physiological problems, such as birth defects, cancers, and teeth and curved horns that grow so long that they very slowly penetrate the eyes, mouth, cheeks, or throat, of the animal? And unlike humans, these animals often do not have the ability to commit suicide when their pain becomes unbearable.

If an adult was discovered to have attached to their pet dog a torture device which caused nails to slowly penetrate their dog's eyes or cheeks over the course of a few weeks, this adult would go down as one of the most despicably evil people to make international news that decade. If an adult was discovered to be forcing cats to maul each other to death, or covering cats in gasoline and burning them alive, this adult would similarly be universally recognized as monstrously evil. There is effectively no moral difference between intentionally causing animals to needlessly suffer like this, and intentionally creating a world in which animals will inevitably and needlessly suffer like this. So if god is all powerful and benevolent, why would he create a world where every single day billions of child-like sentient creatures needlessly experience such tremendous fear or agonizing physical pain, and allow such a place to exist for hundreds of millions of years?

- Problem 4: Dangerous freewill

Why would god create the world in such a way that humans have the freewill to commit acts of violence against other sentient beings? Why does god allow humans to commit such evil acts when this freedom has never been required for humans to retain the wide spectrum of freedom necessary to give choices meaning? Why would god not simply give humans the freedom to either love others or do nothing, rather than also giving humans the third option of committing violence against others? If god requires people to have freewill in order to judge them, this would still provide god with enough evidence to determine how compassionate and virtuous people are. The laws of physics already limit human freewill, such as preventing humans from using telekinesis or magic to physically harm others. So if god is so unimaginably powerful and intelligent, why would he not create a world in which violence was impossible? More to the point, why would god not place all sentient life in HyperVR, since this would have maximized personal autonomy while also preventing the physical abuse of all sentient beings throughout history? If god has always been unwilling to make physical violence physically impossible, why would he not at least intervene to prevent humans from physically harming others? If imperfect but loving parents allow their children to interact and play together, but directly intervene when any child tries to harm another, why does a perfect and loving god not do likewise with all humans? Better yet, why would god not make every adult and child as naturally empathic and compassionate as the most loving people who have ever lived, or maybe even more so, considering this would eradicate the majority of suffering in the world without contradicting or reducing freewill?

If god is unwilling to use his powers to prevent violence, why would he not give humans the situational knowledge necessary to do so themselves? Why has god not been revealing to his followers, since the beginning of humanity, the names, locations, and crimes, of all those who deliberately commit evil, or at least its worst incarnations? This would empower humans to track down all criminals, and also prevent innocent people from being wrongly convicted and punished.

More realistically, this approach would probably end the overwhelming majority of crimes, since widespread awareness of this reality would deter the overwhelming majority of people from committing evil. And none of this would limit freewill in any significant or meaningful way, since this would still afford everyone the same massive spectrum of freedom currently experienced by law abiding citizens.

The fear and restraint this would instill in potential evildoers would also not be an argument against it, just as the fear and restraint instilled in criminals by law enforcement agencies and justice systems has never been used as a reason for their abolition. As long as god did not punish thought crimes, people would not lose any meaningful degree of freedom, nor would they fear punishment any more than law abiding citizen's. With god's help humans could have prevented countless instances of abuse throughout history, so why would he continuously refuse to provide humans with such vital information? People do not need to experience or witness evil in order to develop a better appreciation of love and beauty, nor develop any other virtue, so why would god allow such evil to occur?

At the very least why does god not give humans the knowledge necessary to stop the worst forms of evil? Why has god not regularly been giving his followers the names and addresses of all sexually abused children and their abusers, considering such evil is completely unnecessary, and can persist for years? Even if preventing child sexual abuse was not enough to convince people of god's benevolence, this would at least stop countless children from being sexually abused, which would be reason enough. Similarly, during wars and battles, why does god refuse to provide detailed information about enemy plans and movements to the side fighting for justice? Any information would be better than nothing, yet god continues to refuse to intervene with the bare minimum of help even when innocent children fall victim to unimaginable horrors.

- Problem 5: General knowledge

Why would god not give people beneficial general knowledge that humans would discover anyway, even if he refused to give humans knowledge of specific situations as previously described? Reason and science have enabled humans to create safeguards, standards, technologies, medicines, etc. which have dramatically improved the quality of life of countless humans. God could have prevented the needless and sometimes agonizing suffering of billions of adults and children throughout history had he provided humans with knowledge about germs, hygiene, water purification, vaccines, agriculture, engineering, mathematics, etc. Why would god not educate humanity about basic economic ideas, such as democratic socialism, Resource Tokens, and everyone's birthright to the world's resources and technological surplus, considering these ideas have the ability to eradicate most unnecessary suffering in the world, both by fulfilling everyone's material needs, and by elevating human nature through eradicating desperation and systemic exploitation.

Why would god refuse to inform humans about the scientific method from the very beginning, so that humanity could develop anesthetics and medications hundreds or thousands of years ago, which would have prevented billions of adults and children throughout history from suffering excruciatingly painful surgeries, diseases, and lifelong disorders? If god expected people to rely upon his divinity to ease the anguish of adults and children instead, namely through miracles, why would god not also enlighten humanity about the scientific method as a contingency plan considering he knew humans would be so ineffective at helping him manifest his divine will on Earth?

At the very least why would god not provide humanity with general knowledge that could have prevented some of the most evil and avoidable forms of suffering? God could have informed humanity of the fact that newborns can experience physical pain, which would have prevented the countless newborns prior to 1986 that underwent invasive surgery with full body paralytics but without anesthetics because the medical community falsely believed newborns were incapable of experiencing physical pain. Why would god not provide humanity with this singular and crucially important piece of

information considering there is nothing of value any newborn can learn from being kept in a state of excruciating and unimaginable physical agony for hours on end? Similarly, why would god not inform humans about epilepsy and mental illnesses, which would have prevented millions of sufferers throughout history being forced by well-meaning people to go through horrific treatments, such as "exorcisms", that were agonizingly brutal, prolonged, and even deadly?

- Problem 6: Moral systems

Why would god not provide people with a clear, unambiguous, and comprehensive moral system for humans to live by? If god is omnipotent, and thus knows that humans often behave illogically and immorally, even when they believe they are acting logically and morally, why would he not provide absolute clarity regarding the basic rights of all sentient beings to every human who has ever lived? Why would god instead provide moral principles that are so vague or confusing that even followers of the same religion can come to grossly different interpretations, including interpretations which have led well-meaning people to commit atrocities? Why would a perfect god provide moral principles that are so ill-defined that religious people have changed their interpretation of them throughout history, and most often in response to mounting pressure from progressive individuals that have had to work tirelessly across centuries to persuade religious followers to adopt more reasonable positions?

Why would a moral god provide moral laws that are grotesquely immoral, particularly with regards to slavery, women, and homosexuals? Why would a moral god not emphatically state that persecuting people based on superficial traits, such as skin color or intelligence, is a great evil? Why would a moral god not clarify that causing animals to suffer, particularly for unnecessary indulgences, is a great evil that should be avoided wherever possible? Most theistic religions provide a system of morality, and yet not only do many of them contain grossly immoral commands, but not a single theistic religion has ever described the irrefutable logic of sentience morality.

- Problem 7: Religious texts

Why would god provide humans with essential sacred texts that are untrustworthy? Why would god provide these texts without providing an overwhelming abundance of irrefutable evidence of their authenticity, as opposed to the highly contentious and esoteric "evidence" provided by followers? God could have included within his texts detailed theories related to biology, chemistry, physics, and mathematics, that could only be verified gradually over the following centuries and millennia, providing on-going and irrefutable evidence of their authenticity. Why would god instead give humans the unnecessary challenge of having to read and decipher numerous disputable, conflicting, confusing, and highly esoteric religious texts that all claim ultimate authority? Most religious people follow the religion of the family they were born into, or follow the dominant religion of their country, so why would god not ensure everyone eager to understand and follow him was at least reading the correct religious text? Why hasn't god also added to his texts numerous times throughout history in order to avoid confusion and provide upmost clarity? In fact why hasn't god provided yearly, monthly, or even daily updates in order to provide detailed answers to modern ethical issues that even followers of the same theistic religion or denomination disagree upon?

If religious texts are so invaluable, why would god not provide them to every person who has ever lived, rather than create a world where tens of billions of people throughout history would never have access to them? At the very least why would god not directly provide his sacred texts in every known language to avoid mistranslations? More importantly, why would god force humans to rely upon texts in the first place when the overwhelming majority of humans throughout history have been illiterate? This has also introduced the additional problem of enabling educated oligarchs to misrepresent these texts to illiterate masses for personal gain. Why would god not instead talk overtly and directly to every person who has ever lived, just in the same way humans communicate, or alternatively use billions of

human intermediaries throughout history that could also prove their connection to god with irrefutable evidence?

Furthermore, why would god expect us to trust his religious texts if he himself is evidently untrustworthy? If god is so incompetent that he does not understand the obvious problems with his texts described here, or is too incompetent to remediate the numerous unnecessary problems and evils discussed in this section, then why should humans place any value in the texts provided or inspired by him? This is made even worse by the fact that god appears to be unimaginably hubristic and egotistical. Most theistic religions include a god that demands veneration, even though respect is something that has to be earned through virtuous acts, and which definitely cannot be earned by possessing power or intelligence alone? Most theistic religions include a god that demands to be worshipped even though this is something that should only occur after humans have been presented with evidence that god is deserving of being worshipped, rather than presented with evidence which strongly implies that god is despicably evil? In other words, why would god expect us to trust his sacred texts considering his apparent idiocy, immaturity, narcissism, and cruelty? Or to ask a more pertinent question, why are religious texts written as if they are the works of irrational and ignorant humans, rather than humans who were in communication with an infinitely wise and benevolent god?

- Problem 8: Irrefutable miracles

If god cares about humans enough to perform miracles, why is there not an abundance of recorded miracles? Why has there not been an exponential increase in recorded miracles coinciding with the concurrent exponential increase in security cameras and phones with cameras? If hundreds of millions of people around the world believe miracles occur, why are there not regular recorded instances of amputees, thalidomide victims, war veterans, and others with painful and debilitating deformities, having their missing or deformed body parts healed through the divine intervention of a benevolent god? Why would god not provide an abundance of unambiguous evidence of divine physical healings considering spontaneous healings of

physical ailments, and the remission of deadly diseases, have been witnessed in many agnostics and atheists, and which have scientific explanations? Physical pain, and even chronic pain, can also be diminished or eradicated in certain people through psychological techniques, creating an additional burden of proof for claims of supernatural healings. Extraordinary claims require extraordinary evidence, so why does god not use miracles as a means of supporting or proving the extraordinary claims made by himself and his followers?

- Problem 9: The universe

Why would god create a universe that does not necessitate his existence if he wants people to believe he created the universe? If something can't come from nothing, then something must have always existed. In other words, whatever created the universe, or whatever the universe transitioned from, never required all the attributes of a god, but instead merely needed to have no beginning. Additionally, if a universe like ours could have come into existence once, then such an event could have occurred an infinite number of times over the prior expanse of eternity. This is because even if something has an infinitesimally small chance of occurring, then across a prior expanse of eternity it could easily occur an infinite number of times. In fact, if a process repeats an infinite number of times, it is a near certainty that each potential outcome will occur an infinite number of times.

If god is added to this equation, the situation becomes more complicated. God is also eternal, but requires a number of additional incomprehensible attributes to be an equally viable explanation for the existence of our universe. God also has to be sentient, hyper-intelligent, all-knowing, all-powerful, omnipresent, and possess the ability to be immaterial and yet still exist. Using Occam's razor, it can be determined that, because god requires 6 attributes in addition to being eternal, god is the more multifaceted and complex origin of the universe, and hence is the less likely explanation. It may appear that god is the simpler explanation because one universe is simpler than an infinite number of universes, but this is only true in terms of

outcome, not cause. A 10 sided die may have to be rolled an infinite number of times to produce an infinite number of numerical outcomes, but this doesn't change the fact that a die is a very simple object, or cause. Conversely, a computer is capable of creating any specific number instantaneously, but a computer is a substantially more complicated object, or cause. Therefore, if the mechanism that created the universe has to be eternal, then this mechanism repeating a process an infinite number of times is still simpler than a mechanism that requires 6 additional and unnecessary attributes in order to achieve the same outcome. However, even if god was the more likely explanation, it is still reasonable for people to come to the conclusion that our universe could have been the result of something eternal that does not possess or require any of the extraneous traits that are attributed to most religious gods. So why would god not provide irrefutable evidence that he created the universe considering this?

- Problem 10: Biological life

Why would god create a universe that can bring forth biological life, including sentient life, without his assistance, if he wants humans to believe that he is the creator of all life? If god was never created by a sentient creator, then this means that sentience does not inherently require a sentient creator, and hence it is possible our sentience does not require a sentient creator either. Similarly, god is also not necessary for explaining the existence of biological life. Numerous scientific theories and studies, including the theory of evolution and the Lenski experiment, have demonstrated that the existence of all biological life on Earth can be explained without the need for a god, including body parts that were previously thought to be irreducibly complex. Furthermore, why would god provide evidence of human evolution, such as "missing links" like Homo Habilis and Australopithecus, if he wanted humans to believe they were created directly by him? Even if evolution was not true, why would god give critically minded individuals no choice but to spend years or decades studying esoteric scientific theories and evidence in order to come to this conclusion, when he could convince them instantly and easily through a myriad of other ways?

There is also countless evidence of inefficient, ineffective, residual, or unsafe body parts and abilities in the natural world that contradict the idea of an intelligent designer. In humans these include the unnecessary blind spot of the eye, the inferiority of human vision compared to other species, wisdom teeth that don't fit the jaw and can cause immense pain if not surgically removed, misaligned teeth that require braces, the inability of the body to make essential amino acids and vitamins, the residual muscles in human ears, the embryonic tail that grows and disappears in the womb, the precariously fragile weak spots of the spine, knees, and feet, the ability to develop hiccups, the avoidable risk of choking introduced by the esophagus intersecting with the windpipe, and the ability to produce goosebumps, which is an ability that only provides value for animals with fur. None of these are biological or anatomical necessities, which is proven by the fact that they don't even exist in many other species. Poorly designed body parts in animals include, but are not limited to, unusable eyes, ineffectual or purposeless bones, vital but unnecessarily fragile body parts, wings so small they cannot be used for flight or balance, and the location of the laryngeal nerve, particularly in giraffes. And none of this addresses more general physiological issues, such as the existence of junk DNA, the unnecessary complexity of certain body parts, the unnecessary risk of dying that parents and offspring experience during childbirth, or the propensity of biological life forms to naturally develop severe physiological disorders, such as cancers.

The existence of all biological life can be explained by a combination of reasonable scientific inferences. So why would a perfect god allow humans and animals to be created so impersonally and imperfectly that any reasonable person would conclude that biological life doesn't require an intelligent designer, and was most likely never created by one? Why would god not ensure that every human knew, with absolute certainty, that his input was essential for the creation of ourselves and all other biological life? Why would god choose this considering most religious people argue that god desires humans to believe all life was created by him?

- Problem 11: Relational love

Why would god create a world in which critically minded and educated people have overwhelmingly good reasons for doubting his benevolence and his desire to interact with us? If god wants us to believe these things, why would he not provide an abundance of clear and irrefutable evidence, on a daily basis, that is capable of convincing everyone? Why would god not personally communicate with every human to directly, clearly, and efficiently answer the perfectly reasonable, complex, and nuanced questions of those who question his benevolence or his personal interest in us? If a father genuinely wanted to reconnect with their estranged child, he would do everything possible to meet up with and interact with them, rather than remain so distant and silent as to appear uninterested or deceased. If our belief in his benevolence and our relationship with him are so important, why would he allow billions of people throughout history to live and die believing that he doesn't exist, or believing in one of the multitude of other very different gods described in the countless religions that have existed throughout history. And if this wasn't bad enough, why would god allow people to suffer from psychopathy, which makes it effectively impossible to love others, including a god?

Additionally, why would god require humans to rely upon faith in his benevolence and love considering this requires humans to be unwise? Why would god force humans to rely so heavily on faith if rationality, shrewdness, and caution, are essential qualities of peak maturity, and are essential for determining the character and trustworthiness of others, including a god? Why would god extol faith so highly considering that believing in something that contradicts evidence and reason necessitates being foolish, ignorant, and gullible? Why would god expect or tell people to believe that he is loving, while simultaneously forcing people to suffer immensely and unnecessarily, considering that wisdom informs us that this is something only an extremely dangerous gaslighting narcissistic psychopath would do? Why would god provide such overwhelming evidence that he is immensely evil if he wants people to have a relationship with him? If

a wife provides her husband with an abundance of evidence that she is a kind person who loves him, this does not undermine the value or integrity of the relationship or the individuals involved, but instead strengthens the relationship with absolutely no downsides. So why would a loving god do the opposite, ensuring that an ever increasing percentage of the Earth's population has good reasons to doubt his benevolence and his love for us? If god instead expects us to have a relationship with him by commanding us to love him, or by threatening us with an undesirable afterlife, why would he do this considering this is impossible for people who are mature and well-adjusted?

- Problem 12: The afterlife

Why would god not provide an abundance of evidence of his existence, or his benevolence, if respecting, loving, and worshiping him, determines something as important as one's place in an eternal afterlife? Rational people have no choice over what it is they believe, since their beliefs are based on evidence. No matter how much a person tries to believe in the existence of invisible unicorns, no rational person, even under the threat of torture, would be able to believe this without evidence. If rational people cannot choose what it is they believe, or who it is they respect and love, why would god be so unimaginably cruel as to use such criteria to determine a person's place in an eternal afterlife, while simultaneously providing no universally accessible evidence of his existence and benevolence. In fact, why would god take this approach while simultaneously providing overwhelming evidence that he is unimaginably evil? Considering people don't believe in god for evidenced-based reasons, and not because of a "desire to sin" as many apologists claim, why does god not simply provide sufficient evidence of his existence and benevolence?

In fact, why would god not ensure all humans are raised from birth by angelic beings, and then killed instantly and painlessly before reaching adulthood, in order to ensure everyone ends up in an eternal paradise, rather than risk anyone dying and being sent to an afterlife of eternal torment or dying and ceasing to exist? Ending up

in paradise would be the unavoidable outcome under these conditions because a benevolent god would never allow a child to go anywhere other than a paradise after death. If a 10 year old was to die and go to a place of eternal punishment, or die and then cease to exist, particularly after going through something as horrific as sexual abuse or The Holocaust, then god could not be deemed benevolent by any loving parent, nor by any decent human being. This means that if a benevolent god exists, then all children must go to paradise after death. However, all adults would prefer to die as children and spend an eternity in paradise, rather than spend a life suffering on Earth before going to an afterlife of additional suffering or ceasing to exist. So why would a loving god be so cruel as to allow children to grow into adults that could potentially reject him, and suffer an eternal fate of damnation or nothingness, if this is entirely unnecessary for a person to enjoy an eternity in paradise?

Furthermore, considering this is the only logical conclusion, why do religious women, who believe that life begins at or near conception, not spend their lives getting pregnant and having abortions in order to maximize the number of people that can enjoy this eternal paradise? This would also have the added benefit of preventing these aborted individuals from ever having to experience suffering on Earth. In fact more to the point, why would god not simply raise all children in paradise to begin with? It is completely unfeasible that people who live forever in paradise would not eventually become mature, intelligent, compassionate, etc., particularly if everyone experienced the equivalence of intelligence optimization and love optimization, so why would god force people to unnecessarily spend time suffering on Earth? At the very least, why would an omniscient god, who knows the future, not simply prevent fertilization in instances where the eventual human adult would make choices that would eventually prevent them from experiencing an eternal paradise? And none of this addresses the fact that no decent person would even be able to enjoy spending time with god if they knew he had sent their loved ones to a place of eternal suffering, or had needlessly wiped them from existence.

The inescapable truth

The contradictions and suffering encompassed by these problems is too great to comprehend. And yet despite supposedly being all-knowing, all-loving, and all-powerful, god has never supplied answers to these contradictions, nor provided remedies to the countless instances of suffering that adults, children, and animals, have needlessly experienced throughout history. There is no logical or moral justification for this. Sentient life may have done nothing to be deserving of experiencing fulfillment and pleasure, but sentient life has also done nothing to be deserving of needless suffering, especially when that suffering is inescapable in many instances.

Even if it could be argued that some positive outcomes can be derived from some forms of suffering, this doesn't apply to the overwhelming majority of suffering experienced by humans and animals. And even most forms of suffering that can potentially produce positive outcomes are unnecessary since these outcomes could easily be achieved through other means. For example, people can become virtuous and loving simply by being raised by virtuous and loving guardians and social groups in ideal environments. Children do not need to suffer extreme emotional and physical pain due to other humans, such as being beaten or sexually abused, nor do they need to suffer extreme emotional and physical pain due to nature, such as being a victim of a disease or a natural disaster, in order to "learn moral lessons", "build character", or "cultivate gratitude". If most suffering was somehow necessary or uniquely beneficial, then religious parents would abuse their children in an attempt to imbue them with such desirable traits. The fact that all sane religious people want children to have the highest quality of life possible, and abhor the abuse of children because they recognize how valueless and harmful it is, proves that even religious people agree that most suffering is completely unnecessary. And this obviously applies just as much to the needless agonizing suffering that countless animals experience across the world and have experienced throughout history.

Unnecessary suffering also cannot be defended as being “worth it in the long-term”, such as in the context of an eternal afterlife. If a father willingly allowed his young daughter to be beaten and sexually abused before taking her on vacation, no one would argue that this abuse was “worth it” no matter how long and wonderful the vacation was, since this abuse was neither necessary for the vacation nor beneficial for the daughter. Such unimaginable horrors occur every day around the world, and even an eternal afterlife cannot justify these horrors because of how unnecessary they are in the first place. Similarly, suffering also cannot be defended using apologetic arguments, like those related to freewill, because these are attempts at providing explanations, not justifications. So even an extremely generous interpretation of god must conclude that most of the suffering that god allows is completely unnecessary, and therefore completely meaningless and avoidable.

Furthermore, if a god existed, he would have to bare complete responsibility for all the suffering he has allowed to be inflicted upon sentient life. If parents that willingly allow their own children to needlessly experience horrific forms of suffering can be condemned as vile and evil, then this must apply substantially more so to the omnipotent creator of all sentient life. Worse still, god has supposedly not only created this world, but has also demanded adoration from its inhabitants, and all while hypocritically protecting himself from the worst forms of suffering experienced in this world. God has never subjected himself to decades of agonizing physical pain, as experienced by many with lifelong disabilities. God has also never subjected himself to uniquely mortal experiences, such as being born as a child with no memory of godhood, and suffering overwhelming fear and hopelessness from years of emotional and physical abuse, as well as a lifetime of depression and self-loathing that such abuse can lead to. And even if god did experience this type of suffering, this still wouldn't justify all the needless suffering experienced in the world, nor resolve any of the other problems described in this section. When all of this is taken into account, the only conclusion that can be reached through critical analysis is that god is either unfathomably evil, or does not exist.

Inevitable and desirable

Our movement will always ardently defend freedom of religion, and our goal is not to belittle or berate followers of theistic religions. However, the end of theistic religions is both inevitable and desirable. It is inevitable because critical mindedness, knowledgeability, and quality of life, will increase substantially around the world in the future, and it is not necessary or possible for most people to believe in a god, let alone a benevolent god, under these circumstances. The end of theistic religions is also desirable because it will bring an end to the innumerable evils committed as a consequence of their existence, and more easily allow societies to embrace sentience morality.

Humanity has a responsibility to minimize the amount of suffering and death in the world, and this can only be achieved if critical thinking and knowledgeability are universally embraced, and theistic religions are universally acknowledged as irrational. It is simply too dangerous for societies to abstain from pursuing this ideal. This is not only because of how harmful theistic religions can be, but also because this encourages societies to accept the false notion that irrational beliefs are harmless. The truth is that irrational beliefs can be extremely dangerous, and this must become universally acknowledged despite how undiplomatic or insensitive it may initially appear. If it is deemed rational and good to believe that god is wise and benevolent, then the genital mutilation of children and the discrimination of homosexuals, in accordance with gods "divine will", also become equally "rational" and "good". And this doesn't even account for more extreme interpretations of religious texts, such as substituting medical treatment for prayer, committing acid attacks for defying god's will, or killing oneself or others for god's glory.

By treating irrationality as harmless, societies reduce their power to curtail harmful beliefs and practices. The reality is that there are few things more potentially dangerous than people who cannot be reasoned with, and who resort to unfalsifiable arguments to defend their positions. A sizable percentage of followers of theistic religions obviously do not hold harmful beliefs, but this obviously isn't true for

hundreds of millions of followers, and theistic religions are an unavoidable source of this problem. Some people have tried to argue that political, economic, social, and cultural factors other than theistic religions are the only problems, but it is irrefutable that theistic religions are a contributing factor. Many religious people live prosperous lives in wealthy and progressive countries, and yet still hold harmful religious beliefs. The idea that theistic religions are a contributing factor is further evidenced by the varying degrees of harmfulness of different religions. For example, all else being equal, Buddhism, Sikhism, and Jainism, each produce a much lower percentage of followers with harmful beliefs than those of the Abrahamic religions.

Societies consequently have a responsibility to bring theistic religions to an end, and not merely address other potential problems. This may appear uncivil or uncompassionate, but to do anything less would be patronizing to believers, and extremely callous to the millions that will needlessly suffer, and the millions that may needlessly die, if theistic religions don't come to an end. It is simply not possible to end harmful irrational beliefs without ending the broader problem of irrational beliefs. As Voltaire succinctly observed, if a person believes in absurdities, they are all the more likely to commit atrocities.

It will also be possible to achieve world peace more rapidly without theistic religions. Because they are not grounded in reality, theistic religions are consequently not well suited for addressing real-world problems. Billions of people right now are wasting time, and even their entire lives, pursuing endeavors, or engaging in practices, that only have value if their religion is true. Many religious institutions have monumental amounts of wealth, and continue to receive tax exemptions and donations, that are wasted on things that only have value if their religion is true. All of this constitutes time, energy, money, etc. diverted away from more pressing humanitarian problems that could be solved more effectively and efficiently through other means. It is clearly not theistic religions that will be responsible for curing all diseases, or tackling climate change, or

creating the paradise that will be made possible by HyperVR. Humanity cannot afford to waste time, energy, money, etc. on counterproductive, ineffective, or inefficient, endeavors and organizations.

Alternatives

Many may fear that the end of theistic religions will create a vacuum in people's lives and societies, but this will not be the case.

- With regards to ethics, sentience morality, which is completely irrefutable, is all that has ever been needed to reveal the considerably more rational, mature, and loving, moral system that has always existed.
- With regards to the joy that religious followers experience by praising god, this will continue to exist but in different forms, since the love people have for god has always merely been adoration of the incredible marvels and experiences of this world, such as sentience, beauty, love, relationships, and tactile pleasures.
- With regards to the sense of purpose that theistic religions offer, this will increasingly be provided by our movement's initiatives, as well as other humanitarian initiatives. Aside from a person's immediate responsibilities, there are likely few things capable of providing a greater sense of purpose than helping bring to fruition the world and future advocated for by our movement. The truth is that people have never needed theistic religions, only purpose.
- With regards to the pursuit of wisdom and self-improvement, which is a significant part of most theistic religions, there are now more non-religious sources of wisdom and self-help than could ever be utilized in one lifetime. However, this is only in the short-term. People's wisdom will improve exponentially once intelligence optimization becomes possible, and self-improvement will become both easier and less necessary once everyone's capabilities and quality of life are maximized inside HyperVR.
- With regards to the sense of community religions offer, this will be increasingly provided by organized social activities and events, such as classes and clubs catering to particular hobbies, or voluntary

community and charity work. This will occur because people will have an increasing amount of time and energy to partake in and organize such activities as societies adopts proposals like a UBI, a 4 day workweek, and the steady transition to Fully Automated Luxury Communism. Once transhumanism and HyperVR are widely adopted, there will exist an even greater sense of community, particularly considering people will be able to engage in an exponentially greater number of social activities and communities with an exponentially larger number of people.

- With regards to the strength, hope, and peace of mind, that people gain from the thought of a utopian afterlife, consider that biological immortality and HyperVR will make possible an identical paradise, and likely within the next 20 to 30 years. This paradise may not be eternal, but the fact that it should exist for at least a septillion years will be enough to satisfy everyone.
- With regards to the spiritual highs that people experience because of theistic religions, these will be possible to experience in HyperVR, except because of idyllic environments, tailored experiences, synchronized enhancements, brain optimization, and brain expansion, these experiences will be orders of magnitude more powerful and wonderful, and could even last indefinitely.

Conclusion

Theistic religions unavoidably have the potential to be extremely dangerous because of their inherent irrationality, and there is nothing they can provide that cannot be equally or better provided through other means. Fortunately the global influence of theistic religions will decline substantially over the coming years if our movement is successful. People must always have the freedom to practice their religious beliefs in peace, and those who try to persecute followers of theistic religions must always be condemned and prevented from doing so. However, the end of theistic religions is both inevitable and desirable, and it would be best for all humans and animals if this occurred sooner rather than later.

Abortion rights

If our movement is successful, access to abortion services will become far more widely acknowledged as a fundamental human right. This is because the right to bodily autonomy is undeniable, and this right cannot be overridden for the sake of others. In fact not only is bodily autonomy undeniable, but the extent to which women lose this autonomy during pregnancy and childbirth is extreme. This is worth exploring because of how few people truly understand this.

Putting aside instances of sexual abuse, bodily autonomy is first lost during pregnancy, and even this can involve an extreme loss of autonomy. 70% to 80% of pregnant women experience morning sickness during pregnancy, and 50% experience vomiting. This can occur at any time of day, despite what the term morning sickness implies. About 2% of pregnant women experience a severe form of morning sickness called hyperemesis gravidarum. This form of morning sickness often involves severe nausea that lasts the entire day, and vomiting more than 3 times a day. Sufferers can also experience extreme difficulty with keeping food and drink down, and can also suffer from significant weight loss and dehydration. Even under ideal circumstances all women during pregnancy experience physical discomfort, and often pain, as well as mobility difficulties.

The greatest loss of bodily autonomy however is obviously experienced during the 3 stages of labor. In total labor usually lasts 12 to 16 hours for the first birth, and 8 to 10 hours for all subsequent births. Early labor, which is the first phase of labor, lasts 2 to 6 hours, and involves increasingly intense and frequent contractions that last 30 to 45 seconds, and which occur 5 to 20 minutes apart. Active labor, which is the second phase of labor, lasts 2 to 8 hours, and involves increasingly intense and frequent contractions that last 40 to 90 seconds, and which occur 3 to 4 minutes apart. Transitional labor, which is the third phase of labor, lasts 15 to 60 minutes, and involves increasingly intense and frequent contractions that last 60 to

90 seconds, and which occur 2 to 3 minutes apart. On the extreme end, childbirth can even last for days, and the third and most painful phase of labor can last upwards of 3 hours.

Even if childbirth is successful, women also have a 90% chance of tearing their skin and muscles. This most commonly involves tearing of the perineum tissue, the vaginal tissue, and muscle tissue. However, it is also possible for this tearing to extend all the way down to the anal tissue and anal muscles. Although the resulting fissures usually heal within 8 weeks, they can become chronic, in which case a sufferer may experience lifelong problems, including ongoing physical pain and ongoing tearing. In addition to this, 10% to 15% of women also experience postnatal depression within a year of giving birth. Postnatal depression can potentially last for years, and in many cases results in suicide. In addition to all of these problems, pregnancy and childbirth can also be fatal. Even in the developed world, the chances of dying are between 1 in 5000 and 1 in 13,000 depending on the country. Currently in the developed world over a thousand women die every single year from pregnancy and childbirth. In the underdeveloped world, this figure is closer to 300,000. And these figures don't even include indirect deaths, such as women who die from cancer because they are refused chemotherapy while pregnant, or women who commit suicide partly because they don't want to carry their rapist's baby to term, or women who die in prison because they were charged with murder over a miscarriage or abortion. In summary, the consequences of pregnancy and childbirth can be severe, and cannot be dismissed as trivial concerns.

Many anti-abortionists claim couples should just take better safety precautions to prevent unplanned pregnancies, but this is not always feasible. First, no birth control method is 100% effective. Condoms have a failure rate of at least 2%, injections have a failure rate of 6%, and pills and patches have a failure rate of 9%. In terms of the most effective forms of birth control, implants have a failure rate of 0.05%, IUD's have a failure rate of 0.2%, and permanent sterilization methods have a failure rate of 0.15%. This means that

even the most effective form of birth control doesn't work 1 out of every 2000 times.

Second, many of the more effective forms of birth control have negative side effects, meaning women often have no choice but to choose less than ideal forms of birth control. These side effects include abnormally heavy and prolonged periods, abdominal pain, headaches, faintness, fatigue, weakness, nausea, mental fog, anxiety, depression, mood swings, acne, rashes, increased sweating, urinary tract infections, reduced milk production, sensitive and painful breasts, reduced sex drive, discomfort during intercourse, and difficulty in restoring fertility. More serious but rarer symptoms include hair loss, fainting, migraines, vomiting, anaphylaxis, blindness, gallstones, pancreas inflammation, insulin sensitivity, depression, significant weight gain, long-term hormonal regulation problems, and strokes. Hormonal birth control methods can also be dangerous, including life threatening, for women suffering from diabetes, breast cancer, blood clots, liver disease, gallbladder disease, and some heart and blood vessel conditions. Hormonal birth control methods also increase the risk of cancer in most women, and particularly in teenage girls and young women who are not yet fully developed. All of this means many women will become pregnant against their will and for reasons outside of their control. And because bodily autonomy is a fundamental human right, this means these women have a right to access abortion services when this occurs. And the only way to ensure that women who become pregnant, in spite of taking safety precautions, still have access to abortion services, is to ensure that all women who become pregnant have access to abortion services.

When all of this is taken into account, it is both hypocritical and immoral for any anti-abortionist to strive to prevent women from having access to abortion services. This can be proven with a simple hypothetical. Imagine all politicians that planned to restrict abortions had to first suffer through a mock pregnancy and childbirth experience that was the worst type of experience a person can go through. Then imagine that after this experience an 8 year old child

somewhere in the world was saved from a preventable cause of death, such as starvation or a lack of medical care. Because restricting access to abortion services would mean a 100% certainty of forcing many women to carry to term even though they took reasonable safety precautions, and because many of these women would also go through the worse pregnancy and childbirth experiences possible, it would therefore only be fair for each of these politicians to go through these same experiences first.

This mock pregnancy and childbirth experience would involve taking drugs that cause hyperemesis gravidarum symptoms, using a TENS machine to simulate increasingly painful muscle contractions over the course of at least 24 hours, the surgical cutting and tearing apart of genital tissue, perineum tissue, muscle tissue, and anal tissue, and finally consuming a drug, for at least a year, that is capable of inducing severe depression. "Ideally" these politicians would also be entered into a lottery where they would have a 1 in 13,000 chance of being selected and killed after the labor experience but before the postnatal depression experience, but for ethical reasons this would likely not be deemed possible. With all of this said, it is obvious that if this system was introduced, then anti-abortion legislation would never pass in any country in the world. And by this same logic, anti-abortionists who are not politicians should also be forced to go through these experiences, since if their advocacy and voting also guarantees that many women are forced to go through these agonizing experiences against their will to save the life of the fetus they are carrying, then it is only fair that they too should go through these agonizing experiences to save the life of an 8 year old child. Even if 50 children were saved via this mock pregnancy and childbirth experience, very few adults would be willing to participate, further proving that such experiences must always be a choice.

This conclusion is irrefutable because this hypothetical is appropriate along all intended parallels. There is no difference between men and women regarding this hypothetical, so it is reasonable that male politicians also be forced to have these experiences. There is also no meaningful relational difference between a pregnant woman and their

fetus, and a politician and a child they have never met. The fact that a woman and fetus share the same physical location and genetic information does not inherently create a relationship. Many women become attached to their fetus, but many do not, and for those women the fetus remains a stranger for all intents and purposes. This hypothetical is also made even more robust by the fact that an 8 year old stranger would already have a life of their own, including relationships, passions, dreams, etc. and would be aware of what they would lose if they were to die. A fetus by comparison has no awareness of the world, and has no relationships, passions, dreams, etc. Despite what anti-abortionists like to argue, this is different from a person in a coma suffering from brain damage. First, and most importantly, a person in a coma does not require another person to severely suffer to have a possibility of surviving. Second, the brain of the coma victim is a damaged version of a completed system, as opposed to a system that has yet to be completed. If a person in a coma once possessed sentience, it means they had rights, including the right to future pleasure, as proven by sentience morality, and so this right must be guaranteed if at all possible. If a fetus has yet to achieve sentience, then it has no rights, as proven by sentience morality.

Even when a fetus does have a limited amount of sentience, whatever rights it is perceived as possessing must never infringe upon the right to personal autonomy that a fully developed sentient being possesses. The life of a non-sentient or barely sentient being will always be of less value than a sentient being that is capable of experiencing the spectrum of emotions, thoughts, desires, etc. that fully sentient beings are capable of, and all the experiences that come from interacting with the world, such as engaging in loving relationships and marveling at nature. If a choice has to be made between the life of a non-sentient or barely sentient being, and the life of a fully developed sentient being, then the latter must always take priority. If this wasn't true then anti-abortionists would be willing to flip a coin if forced to choose between saving the life of a 4 month old baby and a 4 month old fetus.

The right to access abortion services is also supported by the fact that all children deserve to be raised in stable homes where they are loved. Forcing a child to be born to a parent that does not want them, and then forcing them into the foster care system, is a cruel fate that should not be inflicted upon any child if avoidable. Children raised in foster care can spend many of their most vulnerable years in institutions, and potentially be forced to live unloved, depressing, and even hellish lives. Young children are particularly vulnerable to developing a deep seated conviction that they are unwanted and undeserving of love, since what young children experience is often what they come to believe they are deserving of. Even children who live with foster parents can experience the worst forms of abuse imaginable, and decades of evidence has also proven that foster children are more likely to experience this than children raised by biological parents, which is a phenomenon known as the "Cinderella effect". Unsurprisingly foster children disproportionately suffer from long-term mental health problems, such as depression, and these can culminate in severe addictions, self-harm, and suicide. These mental health problems can sometimes be attributed to the traumatic home lives these children experienced when living with their biological parents, but such homes would also diminish in number if people weren't unnecessarily forced to have children they didn't want. And none of these problems are small scale issues either. In America alone there are over 400,000 children in foster care, with the median age of these children being 7.7 years old. Over 40,000 of these children live in group homes or psychiatric institutions.

The bottom line is that every child that is brought into this world has a fundamental right to the most wonderful childhood possible. Caring only about non-sentient or barely sentient life, while disregarding the quality of life of those who are fully-sentient, is morally despicable. The goal of societies should be to minimize the amount of sentient suffering in the world, not intentionally increase it because of the existence of non-sentient or barely sentient beings. There will always be a finite number of adults in the world capable of providing loving and stable homes for children, and forcing non-sentient or barely sentient fetuses to become fully sentient and live without a loving

and stable home is no better than child abuse. Even more to the point, not only does every child have a right to be raised from birth in a loving and stable home, but this right will always far outweigh the right that a non-sentient or barely sentient fetus has to cause immense physical harm and suffering to a person that is unwilling to experience this.

Some anti-abortionists ignore this argument, and instead argue that adults that could have been aborted usually end up grateful that they were allowed to live. This is not a sound argument, because it uses circular logic. If an adult had been aborted as a fetus, they would never have developed the sentience necessary to later be glad they were never aborted. This point can be easily understood with a *reductio ad absurdum* argument. If women lived in a totalitarian state where they were picked at random and forced to give birth to one child more than they desired, every single one of these children could eventually become an adult that was glad they had been born. Using the original argument's logic, the existence of this totalitarian state would be justified. Obviously this system would be grossly immoral, but it is no different than forcing women to go through with pregnancies in the real-world. The fact that women in the real-world become pregnant against their will because of unavoidable accidents, rather than by state mandate, does not change the evilness of the outcome, because in both situations women lose bodily autonomy against their will for reasons outside of their control. Forcing women against their will to go through the immense suffering of pregnancy and childbirth, and the risk of death, just so adults in a hypothetical future timeline can be grateful they are alive, can therefore not be justified, since otherwise this totalitarian state would also be justified.

It is therefore irrefutable that all women deserve access to abortions services as a fundamental right. The only question that remains is whether or not there is a point at which an abortion becomes indefensible. Sentience morality dictates that it is immoral to cause sentient beings to suffer if this is avoidable, and so the point at which fetuses become capable of experiencing pain is the point at which

abortions become more complicated. Neuroscientists believe the cerebral cortex is essential for consciousness, including pain perception, and that the neurons that connect the cerebral cortex to the rest of the body are not intact before 20 to 24 weeks. Additionally, evidence even suggests that the brain activity necessary to experience sentience is not exhibited in fetuses until about week 30. Fetuses therefore are likely only capable of experiencing pain around week 30, or week 20 at the very earliest. If a medical procedure was capable of ensuring that a fetus could be aborted without experiencing physical pain even after it had developed the ability to experience physical pain, then abortions after this period would also be morally justifiable for all aforementioned reasons.

However, if this is not possible, then it is reasonable to argue that societies should err on the side of caution and ban abortions after 20 weeks, except for exceptional circumstances, such as when the mother's life is in danger, or the child will likely die before being born. If a woman can pursue an abortion prior to this point, but chooses to get an abortion after this point, then they are unnecessarily risking causing immense suffering to an innocent sentient being, which cannot be justified. Therefore, every woman must be afforded every opportunity to access abortion services prior to their fetus becoming sentient, but not after this point. This 20 week limit is both reasonable and generous, particularly considering most women get abortions well before this limit. In America, 92.7% of abortions occur before the 14th week, 6.2% occur between the 14th week and the 20th week, and only 1.1% occur after the 20th week. Those who can experience cryptic pregnancies, or in other words those that can get pregnant but have a condition that prevents them from being aware of this, would need to take pregnancy tests approximately once every 3 to 4 months, but this mild inconvenience would be a reasonable compromise to prevent a sentient fetus from suffering, particularly considering this would only affect a small percentage of the population.

The best way to reduce the number of abortions in the world has always been to reduce the number of unwanted pregnancies. This is

supported by the fact that abortion bans rarely reduce the number of abortions, but instead merely increase the number of illegal and unsafe abortions. This not only increases the number of women that unnecessarily die every year, but also increases the number of children that lose their mother. Despite this, anti-abortionists persistently reject the best solutions for reducing unwanted pregnancies. The first solution would be to improve sex education. Unsurprisingly the countries and regions with the most restrictive sex education also have the highest rates of unplanned pregnancies. A second solution would be to improve access to birth control. This can be done through funding family planning, or other services that provide free education and resources, particularly to teenagers and young adults. Transitioning to democratic socialism, and particularly a UBI, would also ensure everyone could afford contraceptives. A third solution would be to increase funding into better birth control options, such as reversible but long-term male contraceptive technologies, which have shown promise in preliminary trials but lack appropriate funding. A fourth solution would be to increase research into endgame technologies, since once everyone has transitioned to HyperVR, abortions will become a thing of the past. Unfortunately, many of these solutions will be difficult to implement unless our movement is successful. Aside from obvious reasons, this is partially because many anti-abortionists want to control women more than they want to reduce abortions, as evidenced by their efforts to reduce access to female contraceptives while simultaneously not attempting to reduce access to male contraceptives. Many anti-abortionists also want to control women more than they want to help children, as evidenced by their refusal to ensure that parents receive generous paternal support and that children don't live in poverty.

Conclusion

The arguments presented here prove that access to abortion services is a fundamental human right. Forcing a person to suffer through the unpleasant experience of pregnancy, the horrifically painful and sometimes injurious experience of childbirth, and the common experience of postnatal depression, all for the sake of a non-sentient

or barely sentient stranger, cannot be justified. Forcing women to die to save the lives of fetuses can also not be justified. The solution to the abortion issue is to ensure abortion services are easily accessible to everyone prior to a reasonable cutoff date, to allow people to have abortions after this cutoff date under exceptional circumstances, and to take additional measures to reduce the number of unwanted pregnancies that occur in the first place.

Recreational drugs

The decriminalization or legalization of the majority of recreational drugs is one of our movement's most important goals. In modern discourse, decriminalization means the production, transportation, sale, or purchase, or possession, of a recreational drug is no longer legally punishable, while legalization means that all of these actions are also legal, meaning they can be performed by businesses and consumers within legal white markets, as opposed to illegal black markets. By proposing decriminalization and legalization it may appear that our movement is advocating for widespread drug addiction, but nothing could be further from the truth. Our mission is to create societies that are so idyllic that people have little desire to consume recreational drugs, or at least until people are living inside HyperVR. The obvious exceptions to this would be mild relaxants, such as alcohol and cannabis, as well as drugs that have a proven track record of providing psychological benefits under controlled conditions, such as DMT, MDMA, and psilocybin. Our proposal may sound counterproductive to achieving this goal, but the evidence strongly supports our approach. However, before exploring the benefits and necessity of decriminalization and legalization, it is necessary to address 2 common misconceptions. The first relates to morality, and the second relates to addiction.

Morality

The war on drugs has managed to distort and damage society's perception of the morality of recreational drugs. Drug addiction is a tragic occurrence, and societies should do everything within their power to prevent addiction and help those suffering from addiction. However, using recreational drugs is not inherently immoral, and the criminalization of recreational drugs has ironically produced incredibly immoral consequences. The primary reason criminalization is immoral is because it contravenes the inherent human right to self-determination. It is not the burden of citizens to convince the government of the rights they personally deserve, but the responsibility of societies to democratically determine the very rare instances where human freedom should be restricted by the government. It is no one else's business what people do with their own body, nor what state of consciousness they wish to experience. Humans have been taking recreational drugs for spiritual, creative, and recreational purposes, for thousands of years, and no government has ever had the right to bring this to an end.

It is true that using recreational drugs entails certain risks, but none of these risks warrant their criminalization. If potential danger to oneself was a justification for criminalization, then societies would have to outlaw smoking and skydiving. If being a potential danger to others was a justification for criminalization, then societies would have to outlaw alcohol and motorsports. If the potential risk of addiction was a justification for criminalization, then societies would have to outlaw sugary foods and computer games. Just because using recreational drugs entails certain risks, this doesn't mean using them is inherently immoral, let alone immoral enough to be deserving of criminal punishment. In fact if a government started imprisoning people for any of these aforementioned things, violent protests would soon follow. Tragically the normalization of drug criminalization has resulted in a widespread cognitive dissonance that has prevented most people from realizing that this outrage should apply equally to the criminalization of recreational drugs.

In fact, not only is the use of recreational drugs not immoral, but the criminalization of recreational drugs has become one of the most immoral social norms in modern societies. Because of the war on drugs, millions of innocent people and their families have been impoverished, stigmatized, abused, incarcerated, tortured, or killed, and for absolutely no justifiable reason. Because of the war on drugs, governments have needlessly wasted hundreds of billions of dollars, while some of the most dangerous and violent criminal organizations in the world have generated hundreds of billions of dollars. And most ridiculous of all, the criminalization of recreational drugs has in no way prevented people from being able to acquire them. If most recreational drugs had never been criminalized, all of this harm would have been averted, and governments could have improved the lives of their citizens using the astronomical savings and revenue this would have assured them. So not only is the use of recreational drugs not immoral, but their criminalization has now caused consequences that are orders of magnitude more immoral than the harm caused by them. And none of this even addresses the fact that everyone will be using recreational drugs in abundance once inside HyperVR, which makes the immorality of drug criminalization even more extreme.

Addiction

Another common rationale for banning recreational drugs is the problem of addiction. This argument is superficially convincing, but does not address the root problem. The simple truth is that the problem of addiction is far less to do with drugs themselves, and far more to do with people suffering from a low quality of life and possessing poor future prospects. In fact only 1 out of every 5 people who take recreational drugs ever become addicted, with this average increasing only slightly for stronger drugs such as opiates. This shouldn't be surprising considering extremely strong drugs are given all the time to patients in intensive care units and yet most of these people never develop addictions. This same root cause is also true of most other addictions, including addictions to alcohol, nicotine, gambling, work, computer games, pornography, and social media. In

other words, if societies wish to solve the problem of addiction, including drug addiction, then the primary solution should not be to limit access to sources of addiction. Not only is this entirely untenable in most instances, but prohibitions more often than not encourage addicts to either develop addictions to other stimuli, or purchase black market alternatives, which is always extremely risky for a multitude of obvious reasons. Instead the goal of societies should be to improve everyone's quality of life and future prospects to such an extent that the escapist experiences provided by addictions pale in comparison. This is why the majority of people that enjoy their work, have close family and friends, live in safe communities, exist far above the poverty line, and have the time, energy, money, etc. to indulge in a variety of recreational activities, rarely become alcoholics, despite shop shelves being filled with a wide variety and endless supply of cheap high-quality alcohol.

Benefits

The immorality of criminalizing recreational drugs is reason enough for decriminalization and legalization. However, there are also numerous and substantial benefits that could result from this.

- Legalization would save judicial systems valuable resources, and particularly the time and energy of public defenders.
- Legalization would bring an end to the countless number of people that are unnecessarily killed every year because of the war on drugs.
- Legalization would save millions of people from the fear, violence, and torture, that are used by drug gangs to dominate black markets. When one gang is taken out, the resulting power vacuum incentivizes the remaining factions to fight for dominance, which they usually achieve through intimidation and brutal violence.
- Legalization would improve the lives of the impoverished rural farmers that grow the raw ingredients used in recreational drugs.

Because they work within black markets they often fall victim to exploitation and violence.

- Legalization would weaken many terrorist and criminal organizations. Illicit drugs are a major source of funding, and often the primary source of funding, for such nefarious groups.
- Legalization would prevent many minors from getting involved in crime. Drug trafficking is highly profitable, and minors that participate in trafficking can make substantially more money than through most other lines of work. Drug dealers also go to great lengths to prey on minors, such as enticing them with such rewards. Many minors are harmed or killed as a consequence of this line of work. Of those that survive into adulthood, many continue their life of crime, and even get involved in more serious crimes, such as human trafficking.
- Legalization could improve social relations. Even in developed countries tensions between civilians and law enforcement are at extremely high levels, and this is being seriously exacerbated by the war on drugs.
- Legalization could markedly improve prison conditions, particularly by reducing overcrowding.
- Legalization could reduce human trafficking. Drug trafficking and human trafficking commonly involve the same people, organizations, routes, and transportation. Legalization would reduce funding for these networks, which together with increased time and resources for law enforcement agencies, could potentially impede human trafficking.
- Legalization would allow recreational drugs to be regulated, which would reduce harmful side effects, overdoses, and fatalities. Drugs sold on the black market can have extremely high potency, because this enables producers and sellers to dilute their product and still achieve the same potency, which enables them to sell more. This

simultaneously increases the likelihood of users buying more addictive or unintentionally dangerous versions. Drugs can also be laced or diluted with dangerous ingredients, such as fentanyl and laundry detergent. A lack of access to more traditional recreational drugs has also galvanized the creation of cheaper custom made concoctions. These are often made from legally obtainable chemicals, but due to a lack of testing, and the amateur nature of their production, they are often considerably more unpredictable and dangerous. Another consequence of black market drugs is that emergency medical response teams can have a more challenging time treating victims of overdoses and allergic reactions, since they have less knowledge of the constituent ingredients of the drugs involved. Drug legalization, regulation, and standardization, would reduce many of these issues and save lives.

- Legalization would prevent unnecessary deaths in cases where the illegality of recreational drugs creates a disincentive to call emergency services. Under the current system, if a user suffers an adverse reaction, friends and acquaintances may be less willing to call emergency services for fear of investigations, prosecution, or other negative repercussions.
- Legalization could help people move away from more dangerous drugs, since there would be increased availability of less potent or dangerous alternatives. This is supported by the fact that numerous places that have legalized cannabis have witnessed a reduction in the use of more powerful drugs.
- Legalization would likely reduce the transmission of infectious diseases, such as HIV, that are commonly spread through the reuse of needles. Legalization would make it possible to ensure that all establishments that sell intravenous recreational drugs also sell sterile needles.
- Legalization would allow for the introduction of safe injection sites, which allow people to take recreational drugs in clean safe

environments, and which provide onsite medical help in the case of emergencies.

- Legalization would finally allow drug addiction to be recognized as a mental health problem rather than something deserving of punishment, and would allow drug addicts to receive the sympathy and help they both need and deserve. The reduced stigma of using recreational drugs, and the elimination of any fear of being punished or developing a criminal record, would increase the likelihood of addicts coming forward to receive help. Drug stores and safe injection sites could also function as advice centers, helping addicts with organizing therapy and rehabilitation. Legalization would also allow treatment centers to give addicts small quantities of currently illegal drugs as a treatment strategy for weaning them off their drug dependence. This has proven to be an effective strategy for a sizable percentage of addicts in countries where this is legal.

- Legalization could markedly improve public education regarding recreational drugs. This is primarily because recreational drugs could be sold in packaging that contains vital safety information. For example, front covers could contain facts, figures, and pictures related to the use or misuse of these drugs, and back covers could contain information pertaining to safety, such as optimal usage conditions, warning signs of adverse reactions, and advice for medical emergencies.

- Legalization would help many people suffering from health disorders. For example, THC has been shown to help treat chronic pain, seizures, nausea, and autoimmune disorders, among other issues, and shows promise in treating more serious conditions like cancer. Other examples include DMT and other psychedelics, which have demonstrably helped those suffering from depression and bipolar disorder. Despite their life-changing potential, these drugs remain inaccessible to millions who need them, even in supposedly “civil” and “advanced” developed countries.

- Legalization could improve the financial circumstances of users, and particularly addicts. This is because legal recreational drugs would likely be less addictive, and because they could be sold at a far lower price than black market drugs. Many sex workers also engage in their line of work because of drug dependency, so reducing the addictiveness and prices of recreational drugs could go some way towards addressing this problem.
- Legalization would advance scientific progress. This is because research institutions would finally have the opportunity to explore and experiment with the wide range of benefits, including medicinal properties, that recreational drugs possess.
- Legalization could enhance people's compassion and creativity. These are common consequences of many recreational drugs, and particularly psychedelics.

Any potential downsides to making recreational drugs more freely available will never be greater than the combination of all aforementioned benefits, let alone when the immorality of criminalization is also taken into account. Even fears that legalization would increase drug abuse are likely unfounded. Those already desperate enough to take recreational drugs are likely already doing so, or are likely already addicted to alcohol, pornography, computer games, gambling, etc., so it is unlikely legalization would increase drug abuse. Additionally, the improvements to societies and optimism for the future that the success of our movement will guarantee will also reduce the allure of recreational drugs, particularly considering most people will want to avoid dying accidentally from drug-related problems before transitioning to HyperVR.

Implementation

Our movement does not advocate for the unrestricted legalization of all recreational drugs. Decriminalization and legalization will need to

be implemented intelligently, and the following proposals provide an outline for how this could be done.

- A recreational drug should only be illegal to purchase if there is a strong argument against this. However, even some legally purchasable recreational drugs will need to have restrictions placed on them, such as only being purchasable and usable at safe injection sites, or only being usable in private spaces, like homes and regulated nightclubs. An example of a strong argument against legalization would be if the drug in question had a consistently high chance of producing harmful effects even at moderate doses, such as eliciting dangerous behaviors or causing severe physical side effects.
- Places that sell recreational drugs should be required to possess information on local rehabilitation services, and offer help regarding connecting with or making appointments with such services.
- Rehabilitation services for drug addicts should be well funded.
- All recreational drugs should be contained in plain packaging, and this packaging should also show and contain vital safety information.
- People should still be punished for producing, transporting, selling, buying, or possessing illegal recreational drugs. Even if a black market for recreational drugs still exists after decriminalization and legalization, it will be a fraction of its current size.
- People who use legal recreational drugs for illegal purposes, and people who commit crimes as a consequence of being under the influence of legal recreational drugs, should be punished severely in order to incentivize greater personal responsibility. Legalization likely won't increase the number of crimes committed under the influence since the people that would do this likely already engage in this behavior, and will do so far less if our movement is successful.
- The sale of recreational drugs to minors should be illegal, and carry severe punishments.

- Educating children about the risks of taking recreational drugs should be well funded and highly prioritized. However, improving the quality of life of everyone in society, and increasing awareness of endgame technologies, should be enough to dissuade most young people from consuming riskier substances.
- Recreational drug users who are found incapacitated in public from recreational drug use could be forced to report to a clinic to be tested for addiction, after which appropriate action could be taken.
- Illegal recreational drugs should also be made fully available to research institutions. An illegal recreational drug should only be unavailable to research institutions under exceptional circumstances.

These ideas may lack detail, but do offer a reasonable framework from which to construct a workable system. Such policies have already been successfully introduced by countries like Portugal, Switzerland, and the Netherlands, and have produced incredible results. Portugal for example went from having one of the worst drug problems in Europe to having fewer drug problems than practically any developed country in the world. Currently their overdose rate is only 2% of the overdose rate in America. Incidentally, Portugal's situation can be attributed partially to their country having actual socialist and communist politicians, who err on the side of freedom.

Black market criminals

We believe that producers, transporters, and sellers, that continue to operate within the black market after decriminalization and legalization has occurred should be prosecuted and punished. However, we also believe that producers, transporters, and sellers, that were prosecuted in the past, and solely for victimless crimes involving recreational drugs that become decriminalized or legalized, should be released and have their records expunged. If it was wrong to punish recreational drug users in the past, then there is no

justification for punishing those who provided these drugs in the only way that was possible at the time. It is unreasonable to punish people for performing a job that would have been legal under any moral system.

The potential dangerousness of using unregulated black market drugs could be seen as a good justification for punishing those who produced, transported, or sold drugs on the black market prior to decriminalization and legalization, but this is not a reasonable argument. First, if a drug is dangerous because of what it has been contaminated or diluted with, it will nearly always be impossible to prove whether or not the producers, transporters, or sellers, were responsible or aware of this. Assuming guilt cannot be justified. Second, drug users in the past were always aware of the potential dangers of consuming black market drugs, meaning they were always primarily responsible for the risks of their decision. If a person willingly purchases a malfunctioning power tool that they do not need, and which they know has the potential to cause them great harm, it is they that must take primary responsibility for the risks associated with this purchase.

Conclusion

The war on drugs could barely be a more catastrophic failure even if it was designed to be. Using recreational drugs has never been immoral in and of itself, and even addiction was never a justification for criminalizing them, particularly considering addiction is far more to do with a person's quality of life and future prospects. People have always had a fundamental right to access recreational drugs and experience their numerous benefits. However, because of the war on drugs, millions of people around the world have been subjugated to the worst fates imaginable, and for absolutely no benefit. The war on drugs must consequently be seen for the crime against humanity that it is, and must come to an immediate end.

Additional crises

In addition to all aforementioned crises related to theistic religions, abortion rights, and recreational drugs, there are many other crises that our movement will strive to solve, and which further prove the necessity of the success of our movement. The following list covers the most pressing issues that need to become common knowledge within the immediate future.

- Members of the LGBT+ community continue to be persecuted in countries around the world. Homosexuality alone is currently illegal in 71 countries, and in many of these countries homosexuals are regularly tortured and killed by both authorities and civilians. Sexual repression can also seriously harm a person's wellbeing, causing problems such as insomnia, poor sleep quality, lethargy, restlessness, physical tension, headaches, dizziness, irritability, loss of appetite, gastrointestinal problems, weight loss, heart palpitations, shame, anxiety, depression, self-loathing, a reduced libido, difficulty enjoying sexual activities, and all the other secondary problems these issues can lead to.

- 1 in 10 children experience sexual abuse at least once during their childhood. This includes the 14 million underage girls who are forced into marriage every single year. In underdeveloped countries, 1 in 7 girls are married before their 15th birthday.

- Child genital mutilation continues to be a major problem around the world. Over 200 million women and girls in the world today are living with the consequences of female genital mutilation (FGM). FGM can include cutting off the clitoris, the inner labia lips, and the outer labia lips, as well as sewing shut the vulva, so that only urine and menstrual fluid can pass through. This is occurring every single day around the world. Another 30 million women and girls are expected to become victims of this barbaric practice within the next decade alone unless drastic action is taken.

FGM and male circumcision are also not risk-free procedures. Both procedures can cause severe physical pain, severe blood loss, infections, the accidental blocking of the urethra, and even permanent genital deformity. In fact male circumcision should really be acknowledged as causing deformity even when an "ideal" outcome is achieved. Children can also suffer adverse reactions to anesthetics, including reactions they wouldn't experience if they were older. Boys and girls also continue to die from complications caused by genital mutilation surgery, including from shock and blood loss. Even in the developed world approximately 2 boys die out of every 1 million circumcised. In fact this number is likely far higher, since male circumcision has been linked to Sudden Infant Death Syndrome.

Genital mutilation is a disgusting violation of a child's basic rights. Cutting off some of the most sensitive parts of a child's sex organs, and reducing the sexual pleasure they can experience later in life, without their informed consent, is completely indefensible. The continued normalization of this barbaric practice is repulsive, and made even more so by how unnecessary it is. In fact if child circumcision had never existed, and a politician declared today that they were going to introduce it, they would lose their job overnight, and be internationally condemned as irrational, perverse, and evil. Circumcision should always have been illegal for men and boys under the age of 18, and FGM should always have been illegal for women and girls of any age.

- Child corporal punishment continues to be a worldwide problem, despite how immoral and counterproductive it has proven itself to be. Research from the past half century has proven beyond doubt that corporal punishment, such as smacking and paddling, is mentally and emotionally harmful for children. Research has shown that smacking children lowers their self-esteem, harms their cognitive development, and can even cause permanent brain damage in the part of the brain responsible for emotional functioning. This can culminate in emotional problems later in childhood and adulthood, such as depression and anxiety, as well as behavioral problems, such as an

increased propensity towards aggression, violence, and other antisocial behaviors. In fact research has shown that youth violence is 130% more common in countries that have yet to ban this practice, which likely isn't merely coincidence considering other evidence. Children who are physically punished are also more likely to have relationship problems later in life. Physical punishment turns the home from a place of love and safety into a place of fear and physical pain, and can permanently damage the relationship between parent and child. Physical punishment can also lower a child's intelligence, and even though estimates vary, this is likely by at least up to 13 IQ points considering stress alone is capable of doing this.

To make matters worse, studies have also shown that physical punishment is an ineffective long-term solution for teaching children lessons, or modifying their behavior, compared to other methods, and in most cases is completely counterproductive. Parents can achieve better results by communicating diplomatically, providing clear and concise explanations, demonstrating overt self-control, showing unwavering respect, never holding grudges, using age appropriate discipline, making punishments consistent, allowing children to learn from natural consequences, and being constantly aware of potential problems that may be exacerbating bad behavior, such as tiredness, hunger, academic pressures, and bullying. All of these reasons are why child corporal punishment has already been made illegal in 70 countries as of 2024, and why it is considered a human rights violation according to the United Nations. However, there are still approximately 1.8 billion children currently living in countries that do not provide legal protections against corporal punishment both inside and outside of the home, and about 220 million children currently live in countries that provide no legal protections against corporal punishment in any setting.

- Corrupt and broken legal systems and prison systems continue to be responsible for the unnecessary suffering and death of people in almost every country in the world. Millions are currently incarcerated for unjustified reasons, including mandatory minimum sentences, whistleblowing, and crimes related to recreational drugs. This is

obscenely cruel and unjust, particularly considering prisoners are often victims of sexual abuse, physical violence, and even murder. Unnecessarily high incarceration rates also regularly lead to prisons becoming overpopulated, which poses serious risks to both prisoners and guards, and makes it much harder to keep violent and nonviolent prisoners separated, which is an important human rights issue. Most prisons around the world also don't provide rehabilitation services or mental health treatment, which means prisoners are often less able to cope or reintegrate themselves back into society once released, which is unnecessarily cruel considering this comes after they have already paid their dues to society. This problem can be further exacerbated if these individual's criminal records and social stigma prevent them from finding work. These problems also increase recidivism rates, which risks the safety and wellbeing of themselves and others. Prisons are also renowned for effectively operating as criminal education centers, which can further increase recidivism rates. And none of this addresses the incredible toll taken on the families of those unjustly incarcerated.

- Torture continues to be used by governments and criminal gangs around the world. America's use of torture in particular has also become an incredibly powerful recruitment tool for terrorists. Few things encourage people to join terrorist organizations more than witnessing their innocent family members, friends, neighbors, and countrymen, being tortured by a corrupt imperialist superpower. And this doesn't even address the fact that torture produces effectively useless information, and that valuable information has always been possible to acquire through other methods.

- A host of problems over the coming decades, and particularly climate change and resource scarcity, will force over a billion people to flee their homes, communities, and countries. Without radical change, the outcomes of this refugee crisis will be worse than those that occur today. Currently approximately half of all refugees are children. Many of these children become permanently separated from their parents during this process, and many are even trafficked and forced to become slaves, sex workers, and soldiers. Even separated

children who are reunited with their parents nearly always suffer from long-term trauma and other mental health problems, although even child refugees who are never separated from their parents commonly experience these same problems as well. Even when adult and child refugees manage to reach the wealthy countries they are travelling to, they are regularly refused entry, and are commonly forcibly deported to impoverished countries, including those well known for terrible human rights abuses. Even when refugees are allowed entry into these wealthier countries, they often suffer from inhumane living conditions, inadequate legal protections, sexual abuse, physical violence, and can die from a lack of essential medical care, even when this medical care would be very cheap to provide.

This refugee crisis will be exacerbated by right-wing fears that immigration will lead to a loss of culture and shared heritage in Western countries. These concerns are obviously unfounded. All countries benefit from the cuisine, music, fashion, and other cultural influences that are brought over by immigrants, and people have always been connected substantially more by their personality traits, political convictions, moral beliefs, recreational interests, and other highly personal qualities, rather than irrelevant and nebulous things like shared heritage. Additionally, everyone will be living inside HyperVR within the near future, which makes all right-wing concerns about culture and heritage even more unreasonable.

- Fascism is quickly gaining ground and becoming an increasingly dangerous problem. In fact left-wing individuals today are increasingly and correctly diagnosing fascism as one of the most dangerous widespread ideologies in the modern world, particularly because one of the primary strategies of fascists is to overturn democratic systems once in power. To put the problem of fascism into perspective, over the past 10 years 75% of extremist-related killings in America have been caused by right-wing extremists, most of whom are fascists. This figure increases to 95% when Islamic extremists are included. Left-wing extremists by contrast have only been responsible for 4% of extremist-related killings.

The threat fascism poses is going to escalate considerably in the near future without radical change. Poverty and inadequate education have always been fertile grounds for such radicalization, and these two problems are only going to worsen as time progresses. Poverty is also being exacerbated by libertarians, who are some of the most uncritically minded and economically illiterate people in the world. Fascism and poverty are also both being exacerbated by modern-day liberals, and centrists more generally, who are extremely dangerous because of their inability to address right-wing extremism, their severe economic illiteracy, their bizarre conflation of civility and social stability with maturity and justice, and their advocacy for incremental change even as masses of people needlessly suffer and die around the world. Right now fascism is even likely to take over America, since at time of writing Donald Trump has a high chance of winning the 2024 election. This would lock the United States government into a state of ever increasing fascism until at least 2029. Among other serious problems this would substantially exacerbate climate change, worsen the persecution of LGBT+ individuals, and result in elections becoming increasingly rigged in favor of the Republican Party, particularly if The Heritage Foundation's "Project 2025" is implemented. That this is the likely future of the most powerful and influential country in the world should terrify every person who is reading this.

- During and since its creation the Israeli government has been persecuting and murdering Palestinians, and this tyranny has escalated significantly since Hamas's terrorist attack on October 7th 2023. Israel's actions have been so severe that this entry already existed prior to October 7th, and was already twice as long as every other entry. However, in light of recent events we have felt it necessary to expand this section, starting with the past few months.

On October 7th members of Hamas crossed into Israel and killed 373 members of Israel's security forces, and 766 civilians, including 36 children. Since then the Israeli government has responded by killing over 32,000 Palestinian civilians, including over 13,000 children and over 8000 women. Israel has also killed over 100 journalists, which is

over 4 times the number of journalists killed in all other conflicts and wars in all of 2023. Israel has also killed over 850 healthcare workers and almost 200 aid workers, including over 160 UNRWA workers, which is the largest organization supplying aid to Gaza. A further 6000 Gazans are currently missing, most of which are likely buried under rubble. Over 75,000 Palestinians have also been injured, including suffering from third-degree burns, severe brain damage, and lost limbs. Deaths and injuries have not just been the result of indiscriminate bombings, but also Israeli soldiers intentionally shooting unarmed civilians, such as during the "flour massacre" when they intentionally murdered at least 118 Gazans and injured a further 760. Israel has done this while also preventing Gazans from accessing medical supplies, which has forced doctors to perform surgeries on adults and children, including amputations, without anesthetics. Israel has also been intentionally starving Gazans to death, and many adults and children have already starved to death because of this.

This denial of food, water, medical supplies, and other essentials, has not just been the result of the Israeli government and Israeli citizens directly blocking aid, but also the result of the Israeli government preventing UNRWA from operating effectively in Gaza. In January Israel made the unsubstantiated claim that 12 UNRWA workers, out of the 13,000 UNRWA workers operating in Gaza, were involved in the October 7th attacks. This managed to persuade 16 governments to pause \$450 million in funding for UNRWA. Not only was this accusation nowhere near enough to justify pausing funding for the entire organization, but it is now known that Israel tortured UNRWA workers to give false confessions regarding ties to Hamas and the October 7th attack.

Israel has kidnapped and detained over 3800 Palestinians in total, including healthcare workers, women, and children as young as 6, and many of these Palestinians have been tortured. Forms of torture include being physically beaten, electrocuted, waterboarded, mauled by dogs, sexually violated, forced to drink urine, forced to hold stress positions for extended periods, forced to endure cold temperatures

for extended periods, subjected to loud noises and music, deprived of sleep, deprived of food and water, deprived of bathroom breaks, forced to wear metal restraints that are tight enough and worn long enough to result in injuries and amputations, and treated in other ways designed to humiliate, including being forced to act like animals and being urinated on. Physical beatings include blunt force trauma to the head, shoulders, neck, back, legs, and genitals, resulting in, among other injuries, broken bones and dislocated joints. Over 20 Palestinians so far have died from their wounds. Israel has also been pressuring these captives by threatening to kill them, as well as torture or kill their loved ones. Israeli newspapers have also admitted that most detainees are not members of Hamas.

Israel has displaced approximately 85% of the Gazan population, or approximately 1.9 million people. Most of these individuals were displaced when Israel gave 1.1 million Gazans 24 hours to evacuate northern Gaza, which was internationally condemned as completely infeasible, particularly for healthcare workers and their patients. However, even those who have followed orders have not been safe, as Israel has been intentionally bombing the areas where they have been telling Palestinians to seek refuge, as well as killing them en route. Israel has dropped tens of thousands of bombs so far, and has intentionally been using unnecessarily destructive munitions. Israel has also been using white phosphorus munitions, which are incendiary chemical weapons banned under international law. At time of writing about 45% of all buildings in Gaza have been destroyed, and a further 15% have been damaged. This includes over 70% of Gazan homes. There is now only 1 toilet for every 340 displaced Gazans, and only 1 shower for every 1300 displaced Gazans. Israel has also been bombing refugee camps in the West Bank, which is not controlled by Hamas. Israeli soldiers have also been vandalizing Palestinian buildings of historical and cultural significance. And none of this has been done to rescue hostages. Israel has intentionally killed hostages, they have killed more hostages than they have rescued, they are starving hostages to death, and they have refused offers for the release of hostages in exchange for a ceasefire.

None of these crimes against humanity since October 7th can be defended against in isolation, and yet Israel's actions are even more unjustified when placed into historical context. Israel was created in 1948 inside occupied Palestinian territory, meaning its very creation was an act of colonialism. This unavoidably or predictably resulted in ethnic cleansing, extreme violence, the theft of land and property, and the destruction of the Palestinian's national identity, political establishments, economy, society, and culture. Understandably this is known as the Nakba, which is Arabic for "Catastrophe". All of this resulted in 78% of Palestine being captured and controlled, over 750,000 Palestinians being displaced, and over 15,000 Palestinians being murdered in dozens of massacres. The remaining 22% of Palestinian land was divided between the West Bank and Gaza. However, even after 1950, when the new borders of Israel and Palestine were effectively fully established, Israel continued to use their political, economic, and military power, to further colonize Palestinian land. Among other crimes against humanity this involved murdering Palestinians, and forcing Palestinians out of their homes and communities and into impoverished ghettos or out of their country. Today approximately 82% of the West Bank is entirely or partially controlled by Israel.

Prior to October 7th Israel had also been using their complete control of imports and exports to prevent Palestinians from producing or accessing food, water, electricity, medical supplies, and other essentials. Israel even killed livestock and banned fishing to further exacerbate food shortages. Israel would also regularly steal what little resources Palestinians had, and prevent Palestinians from acquiring the permits and materials needed to rebuild essential infrastructures, such as food production facilities, water sanitation facilities, sewage systems, roads, and hospitals, all of which Israel had also been intentionally destroying purely to maximize suffering and death. Palestinians have consequently continually suffered from one of the highest unemployment rates in the world. Israel even prevented Palestinians from being vaccinated against COVID-19. Israel had also been imprisoning Palestinians, including children, without charges and due process, and torturing both adults and

children in the ways described earlier. Israel had also been restricting the ability of Palestinians to travel, and intentionally separating Palestinian family members through this and other measures.

The 2.2 million Palestinians living in Gaza, just under half of which are children, had been the greatest victims of this persecution. Prior to October 7th, not only were 70% of this population refugees displaced by Israel, but they lived inside what has been accurately described as an “open-air prison”, and lived an existence that the Secretary-General of the United Nations described as “hell on Earth”. Palestinians in Gaza regularly engaged in peaceful protests in response, and Israeli forces consistently responded by shooting at these protesters, including intentionally targeting emergency healthcare responders. Hundreds of Palestinians died and tens of thousands were permanently maimed and disfigured as a consequence of this alone.

All of this is made far worse by the inequality between these 2 countries. Israel is a developed country with modern infrastructure, and is the 18th wealthiest country in the world in terms of per capita GDP. Even prior to October 7th Palestine was an impoverished underdeveloped country, and was ranked the 126th wealthiest country in the world by the same metric. It should not be surprising that from 2008, when fighting between Hamas and Israel began in earnest, until October 7th 2023, approximately 95% of all those killed in this conflict were Palestinian, and approximately 20% of these Palestinians were children.

Despite what apologists argue, none of this was ever a reasonable response to Hamas. First, the Israeli government has admitted they want Hamas to exist in order to avoid a two-state peace solution. In fact they have even allowed Hamas to receive millions of dollars in funds, and have even provided security forces to escort the delivery of suitcases filled with cash. Second, Hamas make up less than 0.5% of all Palestinians, and yet Israel has always engaged in collective punishment. In fact, even prior to October 7th, 50% to 70% of Palestinians killed by Israel were civilians. Worse still, less than 10%

of Palestinians alive today voted for Hamas during their last election 18 years ago. Third, Israel's actions violate the Geneva Conventions, which they signed in 1951, although they have refused to sign 2 out of the 3 amendments made since then, which is something only 22 other countries have done out of 198 countries. Palestine by contrast has signed the Geneva Conventions as well as all 3 amendments.

Fourth, Israel was always the original aggressor, and has been the primary aggressor since then. Israel has never been able to justify their actions as self-defense, since they were always the ones engaging in colonialism and genocide. This argument is supported by international law. It is outrageous that anyone would expect people being perpetually occupied and persecuted to not fight back, let alone use this as justification for further oppression. The Israeli government and population have always had the power to at least withdraw to their 1950's borders, and have always had the ability to help Palestinians prosper. This obviously would have produced the best chance of ending the cycle of violence long ago, since history overtly shows that populations that have a high quality of life, have good long-term prospects, and are highly educated and critically minded, very rarely end up radical or dangerous, or at least not on a large enough scale to warrant even a fraction of Israel's actions. This is further supported by the fact that support for Hamas among Palestinians consistently declines when Israel curtails their inhumane behavior. This is also supported by the fact that persecuting and murdering people practically always results in their loved ones wanting to fight back against the oppressor. In other words, this entire conflict has always been a consequence of Israel's actions.

Fifth, if Palestinians were the citizens of a developed country, the argument that Israel's actions are justified as a form of self-defense would be considered sociopathically inhumane, including the flippant argument that Israel has "no choice" because Hamas uses "human shields", such as by hiding in residential buildings, hospitals, and schools. If 1000 Americans killed 100 Mexicans, and the Mexican government responded by bombing American residential buildings, hospitals, and schools, and ended up killing these 1000 Americans in

the process, as well as 600 other American adults and 400 American children, the American government would not defend the deaths of these 1000 additional Americans as unavoidable or justified, and nor would any other politician or political commentator. If Mexico had also been making the lives of these 1000 additional Americans, and 500,000 other Americans, a never-ending living nightmare for their entire lives, this massacre would be deemed even more inexcusable.

Israel's invasion and other crimes against humanity have always violated international law, and Israel has even admitted that they are engaging in colonialism. The famine Israel is intentionally causing, and the explicit calls for genocide that members of the Israeli government and military have made, both individually prove clear genocidal intent, meaning their actions fall under the United Nations definition of genocide. Israel has been condemned by many countries, except of course America, who regularly supplies Israel with billions of dollars in weapons. The Israeli government has been regularly condemned by many of their own citizens, including Jews, who they commonly persecute in response. The Israeli government has also been regularly condemned by Jews from around the world. The specific accusation that Israel has intentionally created an apartheid state, in which discrimination and segregation are systemically enforced, is not only irrefutable, but has been acknowledge by many organizations, including the United Nations and many of the largest human rights organizations in the world, such as Amnesty International and Human Rights Watch. The Israeli government has also gone to great lengths to hide these abuses, including persecuting and murdering journalists. Critics of Israel are regularly suppressed, harassed, and even incorrectly condemned as anti-Semitic, which is itself anti-Semitic, since it relies upon the idea that Israel's actions are the manifested will of all Jews, which is an extreme and false stereotype. All of these injustices should be widely known, but most developed countries, and particularly America, have been flooded with propaganda defending Israel. This is not true of most other countries that commit human rights abuses, which is why Israel had to be given special attention here.

- The world is currently on the brink of a number of major new wars. Perhaps the most noteworthy potential catalysts would be Russia escalating its invasion of Ukraine by accidentally or intentionally attacking NATO countries, China escalating its territorial claims over Taiwan, and of course Israel escalating its genocide against Palestinians. Each of these have the potential to spark wars between a large number of countries, and in a worst-case scenario could result in what could reasonably be called World War 3. Because of these rising tensions and escalating conflicts multiple countries, including developed countries, have either introduced military conscription or started discussing it as a serious possibility.

The ultimate threat however continues to be nuclear war, which is not only one of the greatest existential threats facing humanity, but is close to being a greater risk now than any other time in history. Even though practically all of the world's 8 billion humans want world peace, and even though none of the world's quadrillions of animals want to suffer and die in agonizing pain, right now a few dozen individuals are holding all humans and animals hostage with nuclear weapons, and are even putting in jeopardy the next septillion years of humanity's HyperVR future.

Even a nuclear war between two countries could be enough to kill 500 million to over 1 billion people. There are numerous reasons for this high death toll. First, millions to tens of millions could die directly from the initial blast and radiation fallout. Second, radioactive particles would poison soil and vegetation in surrounding regions, which could cause mass famines. Third, the extreme temperatures produced by these explosions would result in uncontrollable fires that lift massive quantities of dust and smoke into the stratosphere, which is high enough to prevent these particles from being pushed back down to earth by rain. These particles would subsequently envelop the Earth, block out sunlight, and stay in the atmosphere long enough to lower global temperatures by 10 degrees for many years. This nuclear winter would eventually cause crop failures across the planet, causing further mass famines. Fourth, these mass famines would also result in conflicts, which would further increase the death

toll. Fifth, the combination of these problems could also result in disrupted or destroyed global infrastructures and supply chains, which would result in even more deaths.

If a full-scale nuclear war broke out between multiple nations, this could lead to the mass extinction of plant and animal life, the collapse of global ecosystems, and the death of the overwhelming majority of humans due to freezing temperatures, starvation, and wars. It would also be impossible for humanity to recover from this, since the resources that enabled humanity to industrialize are no longer abundant and easily accessible like they were at the beginning of the industrial revolution. Locating, transporting, refining, and utilizing these resources today requires vast global infrastructures, including incredibly advanced technologies, that would be disrupted or destroyed in a nuclear war. Nuclear war has also been made more likely by hypersonic nuclear missiles, which are effectively impossible for modern defense systems to intercept. Worse still, a sizable percentage of nuclear weapon detection systems are old and deteriorating, making them increasingly vulnerable to false alarms.

- Infrastructures around the world are becoming increasingly electrical and digital, making them highly vulnerable to cyberattacks and natural disasters. Possibly the most dangerous form of the latter are geomagnetic storms, and particularly Coronal Mass Ejections. These solar events produce electromagnetic interference, which can not only temporarily disable electrical equipment but destroy it entirely. If an extreme geomagnetic storm hit earth today, it could cause trillions of dollars' worth of damage globally, and destroy hundreds of millions or billions of pieces of electrical equipment across the planet. Even people in wealthy countries could be without electricity for months or years, and it could take a decade for these countries to fully recover. Geomagnetic storms can be protected against, which is why living inside HyperVR will be completely safe, but the world's infrastructures are currently mostly unprotected.

- A possible future calamity that needs addressing is the Kessler Syndrome. This is a scenario in which two satellites in Earth's orbit

accidentally collide, creating an explosion of shrapnel that intercepts and tears apart other satellites, culminating in an unstoppable and exponentially escalating chain reaction. This could eventually destroy all satellites and prevent humans from launching further satellites, which would hinder numerous essential infrastructures. Future space missions would also become impossible for decades or centuries, or at least become extremely costly and risky. This problem could consequently have a devastating effect on mankind's future scientific endeavors. Despite this, international efforts to prevent this occurrence have been woefully inadequate.

- Humanity must solve a large number of societal problems if all technologies in the future are to be utilized appropriately. Technology could pose a serious threat to humanity without strict regulations and without eliminating the conditions that can give rise to terrorism, such as extreme poverty and religious fundamentalism. For example, in the future it may become possible to 3D print illegal weapons, or reprogram robots to commit torture and murder, or manufacture biological weapons capable of wiping out millions or billions. In fact the arrival of advanced AI, and particularly AGI, is now quickly and correctly being recognized as one of the greatest existential threats facing humanity purely because of its ability to assist in the creation of such bioweapons.

However, even if such dangerous outcomes are averted, some technologies may never reach their full potential if mature and critically minded people are not put in charge of their creation. For example, as long as no harm comes to other sentient beings, people inside HyperVR should be allowed to indulge in any activity they desire, including those which are taboo, illegal, or immoral, in the real-world. However, if immature and uncritically minded individuals, such as puritanical fanatics and authoritarians, are able to manipulate or control the development of ASI or HyperVR, then this potential may never be realized.

- Civil disobedience is becoming increasingly stigmatized and suppressed to the point of ineffectiveness, and exactly at a time

when radical action is needed more than ever. To make matters worse, police in many developed countries are becoming increasingly militarized, and police brutality and excessive force are now common place in most parts of the world. And despite what many believe, “peaceful” methods of crowd dispersal, such as rubber bullets, beanbag rounds, smoke grenades, and tear gas canisters, are extremely dangerous. This is obviously because the human body, and particularly the vulnerable areas of the head, are extremely susceptible to pain and injury. Many protestors and innocent bystanders have received severe injuries and lifelong disabilities, and many have even died, from such state violence. Even sonic weapons, which are increasingly being used to disperse crowds, are capable of causing long-term damage to people’s hearing and balance.

Conclusion

There are many other problems in the world that need addressing, but we believe these are some of the most urgent. Despite this, most of them are receiving inadequate international attention or are being inadequately addressed. And even though this list is far from comprehensive, these problems alone prove the need for radical global action, and consequently the need for a radical global movement.

Uniqueness

The objective of solving real-world problems has never been justification enough for the existence of any movement. A movement must justify its existence through its unique ability to solve the problems it attempts to address. Now that we have explored and brought greater attention to urgent global problems that prove the need for radical action, we want to briefly summarize why we believe our movement is uniquely suited for solving these problems.

- Our manifesto

Our movement has quite possibly the most objective and comprehensive founding document ever written for an initiative of our type. This gives our movement an unprecedented ability to explain and justify itself, particularly to critics, which is a problem that even plagues other initiatives that are logically and morally justified.

- Maximally utopian

Our movement has proposed a more utopian future for humanity than any other. This has the potential to cultivate fervent support for our movement's goals, and support which will likely grow until everyone has transitioned to HyperVR.

- Widespread appeal

Our movement has the potential to appeal to far more people on all parts of the political spectrum compared to most other political initiatives. This is primarily because the success of our movement, in both the short-term and long-term, will overtly ensure the highest quality of life possible for everyone.

- Economic literacy

Our movement has an extremely robust and comprehensive understanding of economics. In fact this manifesto could reasonably be considered one of the most essential texts on economics currently available, particularly since it uses a first principles approach to irrefutably prove why democratic socialism is ideal, and why Fully Automated Luxury Communism is both ideal and inevitable.

- Objective morality

Our movement has the most objective moral system ever created, since it is based on first principles, which makes our ethically-focused proposals more irrefutable than those of other initiatives. Sentience morality establishes a moral system that not only proves the rights of all humans, but crucially also the rights of all other sentient beings.

- Prioritizing education

Our movement is the only initiative of its type that has plans to mass educate populations on its rationale, plans, and other essential information. Having a manifesto explaining all of this counts for little unless a sizeable percentage of people learn about its contents.

- Electoral reform

Our movement is one of the only global initiatives that is prioritizing making every country in the world as optimally democratic as possible. Most initiatives downplay or ignore this problem, and consequently fail to achieve meaningful change. Any attempts to meaningfully change societies will always fail unless governments also function to achieve the same goals.

- Economic democratization

Our movement is one of the only global initiatives that is advocating for democratizing all businesses. Only addressing externalities, or only pressuring businesses through collective action, such as boycotts and strikes, are ineffective long-term solutions. The only solution is to transform businesses into worker cooperatives.

- Technological progress

Our movement is one of the only initiatives of its type that truly understands the state of technology, its exponential rate of progress, and its potential to revolutionize the world. Countless politicians, academics, charities, activists, etc. are spending inordinate amounts of time, energy, money, etc. trying to solve problems by pursuing solutions that are either irrelevant now, or will be within the near future, because of technological progress. Our proposals conversely are well-designed to maximize technological progress, and integrate new technologies into economies as smoothly as possible.

- Holistic approach

Our movement is the only initiative that truly recognizes that most of the world's problems must be addressed simultaneously because of how tightly interconnected they are. Aside from the efficiency and aggregate benefits of this approach, this is also necessary for the

success of singular proposals. For example, a UBI will never work if businesses and landlords can just increase their prices and rent costs, and legalizing recreational drugs could do harm without also improving everyone's quality of life and future prospects.

- Financial incentives

Our movement is the only initiative of its type that will offer generous financial rewards, specifically to those who complete certain objectives. Our movement can succeed without these rewards, but they will substantially increase the reach and influence of our movement.

- Multifaceted activism

Our movement will provide the opportunity for more people in the world to contribute to our cause than any other. Different people feel comfortable with different forms of engagement, from armchair activism to public protesting, and our movement has accommodated this by creating initiatives that utilize practically every form of engagement.

- Rapid change

Our movement has the potential to reshape the world faster than any other movement. Our strategies could ensure the widespread support of our proposals within weeks, and the widespread adoption of many of our proposals within months.

- Complete incorruptibility

Our movement is incapable of being corrupted, unlike many other similar initiatives. Our movement has been designed to succeed as an entirely decentralized initiative, meaning there will never be any central organization to corrupt. Everything necessary for our movement's complete success can be achieved through the collaboration of millions of people pursuing our plans.

- International cooperation

Our movement has a better chance of reducing tensions and achieving cooperation between countries than any other. Most

conflicts over territory, resources, and power, are rendered completely irrelevant in the context of the ideas presented within this manifesto. The prospect of HyperVR alone could move societies closer towards world peace faster than anything else, particularly considering HyperVR will only be achieved as rapidly as possible through international cooperation.

- Optimally peaceful

Our movement has the potential to be more peaceful than any other movement in history. Even peaceful movements often escalate and result in property damage and the harm and death of innocent individuals. Our specific strategies will be able to avoid all of these problems.

Conclusion

The aggregate effect of these traits places our movement in a unique position to succeed. Even though our movement is designed to address a wider array of problems than any other initiative, it is likely that our movement also has a better chance of succeeding than any other initiative.

Part 4: Paramount: Conclusion

When the problems discussed in this section are combined with all the other problems explored in this manifesto, there should be no doubt that immediate and drastic global action must be taken. Even though there are countless individuals around the world working diligently to solve the world's problems, the truth is that an immeasurable amount of time, energy, money, etc. is currently being wasted on solutions that are unjustifiably slow, grossly ineffective, or in some cases counterproductive. A global revolution that addresses the root causes of the world's problems is therefore necessary, and

the goal of our movement is to achieve this revolution. Not only can our movement demonstrate, through this manifesto, a deep understanding of the world's problems and the solutions required to solve them, but there are also good reasons to believe our movement's unique traits will enable it to succeed where other initiatives have failed. This is why the success of our movement is paramount.

CHAPTER 2

CONCLUSION

The severity of the world's problems, and the amount of suffering and death these problems are causing now and will continue to cause into the future, is far beyond anyone's ability to truly appreciate. What is easy to understand however is that anything less than urgent and radical action to address these problems cannot be justified. A revolution is absolutely necessary, and it is reasonable to believe our movement can achieve this revolution, as well as begin moving the world rapidly towards a utopian future. And even before our most significant proposals have been implemented, universal awareness of the ideas in this manifesto have the potential to change the world. In the near future it is even possible that most people and countries will unite to achieve our proposed utopian future, rather than continue to be divided and preoccupied by the short-sighted concerns and plans that currently dominate the modern world. In other words, rather than being an impossible task, something resembling world peace could be achieved within a relatively short time frame. However, our movement's unique ability to achieve this future also means that if our movement doesn't succeed, it is unlikely any other initiative will.

CHAPTER 3:

IMMEDIATE

OBJECTIVES

The first chapter of this manifesto explored the world as it currently is, and the second chapter explored the world that could exist in the future and the roadmap required to achieve it. This third chapter will explore the immediate steps that are required to begin this transition. The following objectives are idealistic, and many exist far outside the Overton window, but it has never been the responsibility of those seeking justice to compromise their ideals, but to instead demand what is logically and morally justified. Considering how many adults and children around the world are needlessly suffering and dying, and the number of global crises facing humanity, including ever worsening existential threats, it should go without saying that now is not the time to compromise.

This chapter is divided into 4 categories.

- Businesses
- Governments
- Consumers
- Supporters

PART 1:

BUSINESSES

Company directors

All businesses must ensure that at least 70% of their directors are elected democratically by their workers. This could be achieved by either replacing current directors, or increasing the total number of directors. This latter approach would ensure that all directors with essential expertise could remain in their position. Elected directors could be anyone either inside or outside of the company. It must also be possible for workers to remove their elected directors at any point. If the entirety of this new board of directors does not have the legal power to vote, then the directors that can legally vote must vote in accordance with the will of the entirety of this new board of directors.

This initiative will enable all businesses to immediately become worker cooperatives for most intents and purposes, since worker cooperatives are self-managed by the workers, and not necessarily owned by the workers. Once this new board of directors has been created, it will be possible to rapidly introduce many of the other democratic socialist ideas explored in this manifesto, which is obviously an absolute moral necessity. Capitalist businesses are currently responsible for causing billions of adults and children to needlessly suffer, for effectively murdering tens of millions of adults and children every year, for torturing tens of billions of animals, for destroying the planet, and for causing existential threats that could end human civilization as we know it. Democratizing all businesses is the only way to bring all of these injustices to an end as rapidly as possible, which is why this objective must be achieved as rapidly as possible.

PART 2:

GOVERNMENTS

STEM progress

All governments must commit themselves to maximizing STEM progress, particularly with the primary objective of creating all endgame technologies as rapidly as possible. The world's governments must agree to collaborate with one another, and commit an effectively limitless amount of money towards this initiative. Among other things, this money will be used to build and upgrade STEM institutions, to fund 24/7 research, and to provide free high-quality lower education and higher education in every country. Particularly important areas of research are the following.

- Green energy
- Environmental restoration
- Synthetic meat
- Recycling
- Healthcare
- Artificial wombs
- Life support
- Cryonics
- Nanotechnologies
- Molecular assemblers
- Autonomous machines
- Computers
- Artificial Intelligence
- Transhumanism
- HyperVR

Endgame technologies in particular will mark the beginning of a utopia that could last at least a septillion years, and the possibility of

achieving this within the next 20 years is why our movement advocates for the investment of an effectively limitless amount of money. This is reasonable, particularly when put into context. The cost of setting up a scientific research facility, or a microprocessor manufacturing plant, can be between \$5 billion to \$20 billion. The cost of building the next generation Large Hadron Collider is expected to be at least \$23 billion. The cost of renewable energy investments is expected to exceed \$1 trillion per year within the next few years. The cost of the world's militaries now exceeds \$2 trillion a year. The cost of fossil fuel subsidies is about \$500 billion a year, and \$6 trillion a year when externalities are accounted for. The cost of the COVID-19 pandemic on the global economy in 2020 alone was estimated to be over \$11 trillion. Even if the world's governments were to spend \$800 billion a year on researching and developing endgame technologies, this would still be less than 1% of global annual GDP. Any politician that does not immediately come out in full support of this initiative will only be going against their own self interests.

Life extension

Perpetual life support and cryonic freezing services must be guaranteed for every person on the planet by default. This is to ensure that as many people as possible live long enough to experience HyperVR. This is also a basic human right, since self-determination is a basic human right, and death is the ultimate infringement on this right. Every hospital in the world must consequently have all necessary equipment on standby for when patients cannot be saved. Buildings and locations used for the long-term housing of such individuals must also be extremely safe, such as being far away from earthquake zones and having high-level 24/7 security. Although these technologies are imperfect, and need to be further researched and developed, they can at least afford people the possibility of being revived in the future and experiencing a septillion years in a HyperVR paradise, compared to death which is definitively irreversible. In other words, there is nothing to lose from this initiative and everything to gain. Consequently it would be morally inexcusable to delay the implementation of this proposal.

Underdeveloped countries

The governments of developed countries must do everything they can to improve the lives of those in underdeveloped countries. This must include immediately forgiving all debt, immediately ending all exploitative trade deals, and immediately utilizing quantitative easing to help these countries in any way they require.

PART 3:

CONSUMERS

Veganism

Every person that is able to transition to veganism must do so as soon as possible. This is for the numerous and serious reasons already explored within this manifesto, including the fact that vegan diets can be healthier, which is incredibly important for both young and old people who want to live long enough to experience HyperVR. Refraining from veganism can only reasonably be justified in instances where this is impossible, such as when vegan products are genuinely unaffordable or inaccessible, although the affordability and accessibility of vegan products should increase substantially in the near future, particularly if the subsidies that the animal agriculture industry receive are transferred to the vegan industry. Other than such exceptions, half measures cannot be justified for reasons already explored. However, before transitioning we recommend reading the veganism advice that will be provided on the Xova wiki. Like all diets, some vegan diets have the potential to lack certain essential vitamins and minerals, although many vegan foods, like vegan milk substitutes, already come fortified with such essential vitamins and minerals.

PART 4:

SUPPORTERS

If you wish to see our proposed future come to fruition as soon as possible, or even at all, then please support our movement in any way you can. The following describes the most practical ways people can support our movement.

Voting

We would strongly encourage those who support our movement to vote for democratic socialist political candidates during the next elections in their country, and ideally only those who have read our manifesto and support our movement. If you are unable to support our movement in other ways, please at the very least do this.

Awareness: The Xova Movement

We would strongly encourage those who support our movement to spread awareness of our movement with as many people as possible. One invaluable approach would be to hand out copies of our “Xova announcement flyer” in public places or to deliver these to people’s homes. Another invaluable approach would be to spread awareness on social media, and ideally doing so with the hashtag #Xova18.

Xova18 refers to the 18 terms explored in Part 1 of Chapter 1 which succinctly prove why wealth is unfairly distributed under capitalism, and why well-funded public infrastructures and services, and a UBI, are irrefutable human rights. Xova18 refers to the following.

1. Power imbalances
2. Privilege inequalities

3. Structural violence
4. Privatization
5. Rent extraction
6. Interest extraction
7. Technological surplus extraction
8. Democratic surplus extraction
9. Compensation extraction
10. Wage theft
11. Price gouging
12. Coerced consumption
13. Externalities
14. Externality infrastructures
15. Tax evasion
16. Unethical tax avoidance
17. Underfunded support systems
18. Unsustainable fictitious capital

More precisely, power imbalances, privilege inequalities, and structural violence, refer to the personal and environmental conditions necessary for illogical and immoral forms of wealth accumulation under capitalism, and the remaining 15 describe the most prominent and specific ways wealth is illogically and immorally accumulated under capitalism. Xova¹⁸ also references the privatization of the world's resources and the theft of technological surplus, which is why it can also be used to prove why well-funded public infrastructures and services, and a UBI, are irrefutable human rights.

However, of particular importance will be explaining our movement to individuals who protect the ruling class and their interests, such as those who work for intelligence agencies, law enforcement, the military, private security agencies, and legal systems. It is essential that they understand that they and our movement are on the same side. More specifically, our goal is to make them aware that the success of our movement will substantially benefit them, their loved ones, and everyone else in the world, and far more so than anything else. If you know anyone who protects the ruling class and their

interests, please make it one of your highest priorities to make them aware of this.

Awareness: Merchandise

We would strongly encourage those who support our movement to purchase and wear Xova merchandise for the indefinite future.

Awareness: Advertisements

We would strongly encourage our wealthier supporters to pay for advertisements that support our movement, such as television adverts, internet adverts, billboards, sky banners, and skytyping, for the indefinite future. Promotional material for such purposes will be freely available on the Xova wiki.

Awareness: The Xova Manifesto

We would strongly encourage those who support our movement to read this manifesto if they have yet to do so, and to do everything they can to persuade as many people as possible to do likewise. Our manifesto has been designed to contain most of the information that populations require as common knowledge to be able to successfully create and maintain functioning and prosperous societies, including essential and original ideas regarding critical thinking, propaganda, ethics, science, technology, politics, economics, society, culture, global crises, and the future. Most importantly our manifesto proves beyond refute why capitalism is a fundamentally broken system and why democratic socialism must be adopted globally. Reading this manifesto in the immediate future would ideally become one of the highest priorities of most teenagers and adults, since the radical changes that will substantially improve everyone's quality of life will never occur without the mass movement of millions of people who are critically minded and educated on the essential information contained in this manifesto. At the very least, most of the world's teenagers and adults should read the Technology section of our manifesto in the near future. This is because it contains a viable

roadmap for utilizing technology to create a utopian future, and consequently has the potential to make people substantially more objective and hopeful about the future, and consequently may even reduce social tensions and political divisions. It is even reasonable to postulate that awareness of the incredible potential of technology in the near future, combined with a lack of belief in the afterlife, may reduce suicide rates, as well as suicidal endeavors that harm innocent people, such as mass shootings and suicide bombings.

Public protests

We would strongly encourage those who support our movement to begin getting involved in public protests if they have yet to do so. At the very least we would implore our supporters to turn up to protests organized by our movement. In the time between our next major announcement and the end of November there will be a large number of massive public protests around the world, which would ideally be attended by tens of millions of people. Our goal is for this to be the most intense period of activism in human history, since the success of these protests will primarily determine the success of our movement. Please keep in mind that generous financial rewards will be given to those who complete certain initiatives at these protests.

Even if you don't want to partake in certain parts of these protests, simply having an overwhelming number of people at these protests will massively increase the likelihood of their success. At the very least many of these protests will be a very interesting spectacle, and could constitute some of the most significant events in human history if our movement fulfills its potential. However, please remember that all public protests must be civil by default. They must not involve the destruction of property, as this can result in immediate or delayed harmful consequences for innocent individuals. They must also avoid blocking traffic, as this can block emergency services.

Pressuring politicians

We would strongly encourage those who support our movement to pressure politicians to introduce our 12 election reforms, and to hold elections for every electable position in November 2024. Some governments may be unable to fulfill this demand for legitimate reasons, but this ideal must be strived for.

New political leaders

We would strongly encourage those who support our movement to seriously consider running for political office, or encouraging someone they believe has the right personality and skillset to do so. The long-term success of our movement will be proportional to the number of our supporters who end up in government. Maximizing the success of our movement cannot merely be achieved by changing the minds of current politicians, since far too many are corrupt or incompetent.

If you are interested in pursuing this but feel that you are underprepared, please don't be discouraged. If you do the following you will be more qualified than the majority of politicians currently in power. First, read the entirety of our manifesto. Second, read the appendix of our manifesto multiple times. This appendix is dedicated to providing a comprehensive introduction to critical thinking, which is an essential skill for all politicians. Third, read the manual produced by our supporters that covers essential information and skills required for effective governing. This manual should be ready about 4 months prior to the elections taking place in November. Doing these 3 things will empower you to be more economically literate, critically minded, and competent, than the majority of politicians currently in power.

Future announcements

We would strongly encourage those who support our movement to read all of our future announcement documents. This is not only because they are guaranteed to be misrepresented by those opposed

to our movement, but also because our future initiatives are essential for the success of our movement. Please keep in mind that most of these initiatives will also provide generous financial rewards for those who complete certain objectives. These rewards will be provided in Monero, which is a cryptocurrency similar to Bitcoin, but one that maximizes privacy by making all wallets and transactions anonymous and untraceable by default. Monero can most easily be stored using the Monero GUI Wallet, which can be downloaded from getmonero.org. Please be aware however that if you download the Monero blockchain, which you are given the option to do when you first load up the Monero GUI Wallet, this will take up about 180 gigabytes, or about 70 gigabytes if the pruning feature is enabled.

We cannot announce our future initiatives yet because we have no choice but to minimize resistance to our movement as we spread awareness during these early stages. Although all of our future initiatives are legal, and logically and morally justified, they will include increasingly newsworthy spectacles that will massively increase the likelihood of our movement succeeding, and thus increase the likelihood of our website and accounts being sabotaged, which could destroy our entire movement before it even gets off the ground. Additionally, if we announce our future initiatives now, the ruling class will have more time to pursue counter measures that could reduce the success of these initiatives. We do however plan to reveal our future initiatives to multiple trusted public figures immediately after our first announcement, who will be able to attest to the viability of these initiatives, including their ability to rapidly and radically change the world as we have claimed.

Financial support

We would strongly encourage those who support our movement to help finance our cause, as this will greatly increase our movement's success. Our supporters can split their contributions between 2 funds.

The first fund is called the Xova Decentralized Fund. All of the money in this fund will be used to directly financially reward those who participate in our most vital future initiatives. This fund is unique for 2 reasons. The first reason is that people will not donate money to a centralized fund, but will instead store this money themselves, and will send this money directly to those who participate in these future initiatives. The second reason is that this fund will only store Monero.

We appreciate that this initiative may be cumbersome for those who don't already own cryptocurrencies, but please appreciate how much this will increase our movement's success. If 4 million of our supporters purchase just \$10 to \$40 of Monero every month, this would equate to \$100 million every month. This money will be used to compensate volunteers for every month of activism, which indicates how impactful our movement could be.

For those that wish to contribute to this fund, you will first need to download and install the Monero GUI Wallet from getmonero.org. The Monero blockchain does not need to be downloaded in order to participate in this initiative, but keep in mind the size of the Monero blockchain if you choose to download it. You will then need to purchase Monero from a cryptocurrency trading website such as Kraken.com, KuCoin.com, Bitfinex.com, and Crypto.com. If you cannot send Monero to your Monero GUI Wallet from these websites, simply purchase a different cryptocurrency, like Bitcoin, and then exchange this for Monero at an exchange website like SimpleSwap.io, Changelly.com, or Flyp.me. Bitcoin can also be purchased from decentralized peer-to-peer websites like Paxful.com and Hodlhodl.com, many of which offer traditional payment options like cash, debit cards, and PayPal.

The second fund is called the Xova Centralized Fund, and is one that we control. Contributions will primarily be used in the immediate future and over the following months to provide rewards for certain initiatives, and to cover the costs of running the Xova wiki and Xova Rewards Database. Because this fund only accepts Monero and Bitcoin, all incoming and outgoing transactions can be verified online,

which will prove that all contributions are being used as described here.

CAUTION! PLEASE BEWARE OF SCAMMERS, INCLUDING THE POSSIBILITY OF OUR WEBSITE BEING HACKED. ALWAYS VERIFY AT LEAST THE FIRST 12 CHARACTERS OF OUR ADDRESSES USING THE LAST FEW SECONDS OF OUR "ANNOUNCEMENT 1 VIDEO". THESE ADDRESSES WILL NEVER CHANGE, MEANING ANYONE WHO PROVIDES DIFFERENT ADDRESSES IS VERY LIKELY A SCAMMER.

Our Monero address:

493D23sxHYVZKR48tTHpAHGaAoocG2Y7PTmVo1ccJ9FzCyDuCFMEsD
5jJ7jqMHBSmiZHi4qnaLQ3JQdF7yJfqFX49gchSKD

The QR code for our Monero address:



The files required to view all incoming and outgoing transactions to this Monero wallet can be downloaded from TheXovaMovement.com.

Our Bitcoin address:

bc1qaxn5s8re9pdcpcq2kseemhf7nqdyzwjree6netx

The QR code for our Bitcoin address:



If you cannot send Monero or Bitcoin to our addresses from your chosen cryptocurrency trading website, you can easily send them to your own decentralized wallet first, which can easily be created with software like Atomic Wallet, Exodus Wallet, Monero GUI Wallet, and Electrum Bitcoin Wallet. Alternatively you can send your cryptocurrency first to an exchange website like SimpleSwap.io, Changelly.com, or Flyp.me.

Critical thinking

We would strongly encourage those who support our movement to do their best to improve their critical thinking skills, such as reading the appendix of this manifesto at least once. This can be beneficial in many areas of life, including work and relationships, but as far as our movement is concerned this will help our supporters when promoting our movement, and particularly when engaging in debates.

Addressing economic illiteracy

We would strongly encourage those who support our movement to educate and challenge those on social media who demonstrate economic illiteracy, and especially those who spread capitalist

propaganda. This could obviously include personal contacts, such as friends and family, although of particular importance will be educating and challenging well-known individuals and organizations on social media, as well as their millions of followers. This includes mainstream news organizations, like CNN, NBC, ABC, CBS, CNET, and BBC, as well as more right-wing organizations like Fox News, One America News Network, Newsmax, Sky News Australia, The Sun, and Daily Mail. Most daytime and late-night talk shows also support capitalism by default, and many of these are also prominent on social media. Some pro-capitalist economic institutions, like The Heritage Foundation and The Foundation for Economic Education, also have a social media presence. And then of course there are the alternative media individuals and organizations that support capitalism that have quickly become incredibly influential in recent history, such as those mentioned in the "Sources of propaganda" section at the beginning of this manifesto. A list of the most influential right-wing individuals and organizations on the internet will be available on the Xova wiki.

A quick analysis of the comment sections of the content produced by these individuals and organizations reveals effectively zero perspectives or pushback from those who are economically literate. This initiative would ideally be so successful that comments and votes from our supporters would outnumber dissenting voices 5 to 1 on every social media platform, including platforms that appeal to right-wing users, such as BitChute, Gab, Odysee, Rumble, Gettr, and Parler if it returns. Facebook could also be included here due to it being disproportionately popular among older demographics, who are more right-wing than younger demographics. Persuading these right-wing social media users to support democratic socialism, and our movement more generally, will be invaluable considering how passionate many of them are about politics and economics, as well as their ability to influence other right-wingers within their social circles. However, if some of our supporters don't want to engage in online debates, and only wish to vote on videos and user comments, or simply encourage people to read this manifesto, this would still be invaluable. This initiative will also be particularly important in the immediate future since many right-wing individuals and organizations

are likely to do everything they can to undermine our movement during its early stages.

Addressing theistic religions

We would strongly encourage those who support our movement to educate and challenge followers of theistic religions with the goal of reducing the influence of theistic religions in societies. Obviously this must be done diplomatically, and particularly with regards to respecting people's wellbeing and religious liberties, but this initiative is important for all the reasons explained in the "Theistic Religions" section of this manifesto. One of the best ways to do this would be to use social media to engage religious individuals in debates, and where appropriate encourage them to read the "Religion Edition" of this manifesto, which is a version that only includes the "Technology", "Theistic religions", "Sentience morality", and "Abortion rights" sections of this manifesto. Another approach would be to recommend atheist media producers, such as YouTubers, a list of which will be available on the Xova wiki. Such approaches can make a difference because echo chambers are the primary reason why most people follow theistic religions. If our supporters persist in this endeavor, then combined with our other initiatives this could significantly decrease religious extremism in the world over the coming years.

Left-wing media

We would strongly encourage those who support our movement to support independent individuals and organizations that produce left-wing media. A list of recommended individuals and organizations will be available on the Xova wiki. There are 3 main ways our supporters can provide help.

1. Subscribe to these individuals and organizations on numerous social media platforms, and comment, like, and ideally share, their past and future content in order to maximize their visibility to those who are unaware of them.

2. Provide financial support, and ideally ongoing monthly financial support.
3. Offer practical assistance, such as providing subtitles to videos, helping with fact checking, and producing graphics and animations.

The Xova wiki

We would strongly encourage those who support our movement to visit the Xova wiki on a regular basis. This wiki will provide ongoing news regarding our movement, and provide additional ways for people to help our movement. This wiki will also provide citations for all facts presented within this manifesto, as well as corrections for any errors. This wiki will be setup by our supporters soon after our first announcement, so the website address cannot be provided here. As such, please be aware of fake websites that attempt to undermine our movement or scam people. We would also strongly recommend downloading the Tor Browser, which is an internet browser that can be used to access both conventional websites as well as onion websites. If the Xova wiki is taken down the Tor Browser will enable you to access the onion version.

Compensation

For those that wish to compensate us for the 10 years we have been freely working on The Xova Movement, you can do so by donating Monero to our Xova Compensation Fund. This money will also enable us to begin working full-time on The Xova Movement, which will be particularly important over the coming months. We will also need this money to hire legal aid and body guards if such a need arises.

Our Monero address:

42CeTZdoVS8cvwwx2gbAUAh5wagRmVTVwGHWq312BejwJ6AHEj1ju
g12GNWv59tt9YQFqJLVDmQn2hhCRJV7JKhZAuxqGhv

The QR code for our Monero address:



Monero verification signatures

Every message and file released by our movement will be accompanied with a corresponding Monero verification signature, which is simply a code comprised of 93 numbers and letters. These can prove beyond refute that our messages and files are from us because they can only be created by those who have access to the private “keys” necessary for spending the money in our Xova Compensation Fund. And because we are obviously the only ones who have access to these keys, this means that it will be impossible for others to officially speak on our behalf, which is something that could be done by those who want to sabotage our movement or scam our supporters out of money. For those who want to understand how to verify our future messages and files using our Monero verification signatures, please read the “Authenticity verification” section in our “Xova Announcement 1” document.

Tor relay

We would strongly encourage those who support our movement to sacrifice a small amount of their internet bandwidth by setting up a Tor relay. This will strengthen the Tor network, which is an invaluable

and lifesaving tool for activists. The easiest way to do this is to download the Tor “Snowflake” web browser extension for Chrome and Firefox. This is completely safe, and perfectly legal in all but the most authoritarian countries. Additional information on setting up Tor relays will be available on the Xova wiki.

CHAPTER 3

CONCLUSION

There are many other important initiatives our movement could pursue, but for practical reasons it is important that our goals remain narrowly focused. In fact our movement’s immediate initiatives could even be simplified into just 2 objectives. The first objective is to persuade as many people as possible to read this manifesto, or at the very least make people aware of its essential ideas. Radical change will never occur unless populations are highly educated on essential subjects, particularly so that people can make informed voting choices during elections. The second objective is to democratize the world’s governments, which will require introducing our 12 election reforms, and holding elections for every electable position in November 2024, in as many countries as possible. The bottom line is that nothing meaningful will change until the current political ruling class is removed through mass education and election reforms. However, if the lower classes focus their efforts on helping our movement achieve these 2 objectives, then this goal should be possible in many countries. Consequently, if our movement is successful, more radical political and economic progress could be achieved within the next few months than during the past few decades.

FINAL

MESSAGE

Our movement will never be perfect, as this is impossible for any initiative. However, it is reasonable to believe that our movement is not only the best chance of addressing the world's most urgent problems, but likely the only chance. Most current approaches for creating a better future focus on important problems, like global poverty, resource scarcity, and climate change, but all of these are extremely distant secondary problems compared to the greatest problem of all, which is the ruling class, and particularly their enforcement of the capitalist system. Consequently most people and organizations engaged in humanitarian endeavors are effectively wasting inordinate amounts of time, energy, money, etc. because they are struggling to address problems that would be orders of magnitude easier to solve, or can only be solved, through mass education and the democratization of all political and economic organizations and systems. This is why these 2 goals are our movement's highest goals. And because of our movement's unique nature, it also has a far better chance of succeeding than most other initiatives with similar goals. However, this also means that if our movement fails to achieve the revolution we are striving for, there is little reason why any other initiative with similar goals will succeed.

It hopefully goes without saying that a revolution is irrefutably necessary. This is not only because of the obvious necessity of creating a better world, but also the speed with which this must be achieved. Every hour that passes is another hour in which billions of

innocent adults, children, and animals, will suffer completely needlessly, and in which many will needlessly die. And this will only worsen in the future, particularly as existential threats get increasingly worse. Consequently, those who are hesitant to support our movement, or our push for radical change, must ask themselves how much more suffering and death needs to occur before they are willing to take action. And if this wasn't enough, remember that unnecessary dangers in wealthier countries still exist because of capitalism, existential threats, and a lack of life extension technologies and services, meaning even relatively privileged people in developed countries will continue to be at an unnecessary risk of missing out on HyperVR unless a revolution takes place. Because of all this, the only reasonable course of action is for everyone to do everything they can to support our revolutionary ambitions.

It is consequently imperative that the nirvana fallacy, the argument to moderation fallacy, omission bias, compassion fade, and other logical fallacies and cognitive biases, not cloud people's judgment at this critical moment. Some people may believe that our call for rapid and seismic global change makes our movement radical, but nothing could be further from the truth. It is those that reject our movements call for immediate and drastic action that are the true radicals, since they are effectively advocating for perpetuating the severe amount of suffering and death that is needlessly occurring around the world. In fact, considering the unprecedented number of humans and animals that are suffering right now, and the unprecedented danger that existential threats currently pose, those who refuse to support our movement's plan for achieving rapid and seismic global change should not only be recognized as radicals, but as some of the most extreme and dangerous radicals in human history.

Our call for support genuinely extends to everyone. It is essential that centrist and right-wing individuals recognize that our proposed left-wing future is ideal and inevitable both short-term and long-term. Democratic socialism will quickly become recognized as being far superior to capitalism, and that even communism, in the form of Fully Automated Luxury Communism, will likely be the global

economic system in just 15 years. HyperVR will likely be achieved within 20 years, and everyone in the world, including LGBT+ individuals, will subsequently be free to be whatever it is they desire and to effectively engage in whatever relationships and activities they desire. During the intervening 20 years more and more people will become left-wing due to awareness of all of this, as well as other inevitable reasons, such as the rapid decline of theistic religions and the rapid acceptance of abortion rights and recreational drugs. All of these outcomes consequently make redundant most conflicts that divide left-wing, centrist, and right-wing individuals. In other words, the only logical course of action is for all people and societies to stop wasting time and energy being needlessly divided by extremely short-term disagreements, and instead be united in creating as rapidly as possible the utopian future that is within humanity's grasp.

Because of all this, this is not a time for anxiety or hesitancy regarding the dire state of the world, but a time for optimism and zeal regarding humanity's future. In the immediate future our movement could become known around the world, and once our movement has momentum it will likely become unstoppable. In fact, not only could our movement quickly become the largest activist initiative in human history, but 2024 could also go down as one of the most significant years in human history. This is because 2024 could mark the beginning of the end of class warfare, which is a war that has existed since the beginning of human civilization, and because it could mark the beginning of humanity's earnest effort to achieve HyperVR, which is the final destination of human civilization. And remember, most importantly of all is that our movement can easily succeed. We outnumber the ruling class by millions to one, and reason and morality are on our side. And once we are in control, there will be no obstacle capable of preventing humanity from fulfilling its potential, and creating a HyperVR paradise that people will be able to experience for at least a septillion years.

However, to achieve all of this we need as much support as possible.

So please do everything you can to support our movement.

GLOSSARY

Most of the terms provided in this glossary do not need to be understood or memorized in order to understand the main body of this manifesto. These terms have been provided here predominantly to improve the overall political and economic literacy of readers.

Every indented entry is a subtype of the preceding entry that is either not indented or less indented. Parentheses are used after the name of a definition to clarify when this is only one of multiple definitions for that word.

Ad hoc (Latin expression meaning “for this”)

Any impromptu creation that is made for a specific purpose, and usually in response to unexpected circumstances. In other words, a creation is ad hoc if it was not planned in advanced, and is not intended for any general application.

Ideology

A philosophy or belief that is concerned as much with practical issues as with theoretical ideas, and which is consequently not just created to understand the world but also to change it. Ideologies comprise of a body of ideals and ideas that most commonly encompass the political, economic, social, cultural, or religious, views and interests of an individual, community, organization, or country. A commonly recognized danger of ideologies is their power to indoctrinate, including by stigmatizing other ideologies.

Egalitarianism

The belief and doctrine that all people are equal, and are deserving of equal rights and opportunities. Egalitarianism is not the belief in, nor enforcement of, equal outcomes.

Equality and equity

Two approaches for pursuing egalitarian outcomes.

- Equality entails providing everyone with the same resources regardless of their personal circumstances and unique needs.
- Equity entails providing people with different resources depending on their personal circumstances and unique needs.

Equality and equity are both considered appropriate approaches under different circumstances, particularly when practical limitations are accounted for, since equity is far more difficult to implement.

Emergent properties

Properties that manifest as a consequence of system components working together, but which are not properties of the individual components. Consequently, emergent properties can be difficult or impossible to anticipate from analyzing constituent components in isolation. For example, consciousness is an emergent property of the brain because individual atoms do not appear to be conscious.

Positive feedback and negative feedback

- Positive feedback is a process in which a consequence of a feedback loop directly or indirectly results in more of that consequence.
- Negative feedback is a process in which a consequence of a feedback loop directly or indirectly results in less of that consequence.

Existential threat

A threat to something's very existence. In modern discourse the term is most commonly used to describe problems that threaten humanity's existence, humanity's modern way of life, or a large percentage of the human population. Modern existential threats include climate change, ocean acidification, resource scarcity, soil degradation, food insecurity, environmental pollution, ecological collapse, pan-resistant superbugs, bioterrorism pandemics, fascist movements, nuclear war, technological unemployment, asteroid collisions, solar superstorms, and rogue AI.

Ecological footprint

The amount of natural resources required to support the lifestyles of individuals or an economy, as well as the natural resources required to absorb or process all waste subsequently produced. Currently humanity's ecological footprint exceeds the Earth's biocapacity, meaning more resources are being used than can be replenished or recycled over the same time frame.

State and government

A state is an organized political community that lays claim to and controls a defined territory, most commonly through economic systems, legal systems, law enforcement, and military force. A government is the particular people and administrative entities that represent a state or country. A government is therefore the manifested apparatus of the state, and the means by which the power of a state is employed.

In Marxian theory, the state refers to the political organizations and systems that are controlled or utilized by the ruling class to suppress and exploit the lower classes. Because the state is a singular entity, those that control the state apparatus can be said to have monopolistic control over "legitimate" violence. More specifically, the state has complete control over the police, the military, and the laws

which govern a country, giving them the sole power to legally carry out violence against citizens.

Representative (politics)

A representative is someone who represents the interests of another or others. Elected politicians are a type of representative. Representatives can generally be divided into delegates and trustees.

- A delegate is someone who is elected to represent and advocate for the specific interests and decisions of those they represent. Consequently they do not make decisions on behalf of those they represent. A representative democracy that uses delegates utilizes what is called the “delegate model of representation”.

- A trustee is someone who is elected to make decisions on behalf of those they represent. Consequently they most commonly use their judgment to do what they think is best, rather than defer to the guidance of those they represent. A representative democracy that uses trustees utilizes what is called the “trustee model of representation”.

Gerrymandering

The manipulation of electoral district boundaries for the purpose of giving an unfair advantage to a party, or a particular demographic, during an election. It has been described as “politicians picking their voters instead of voters picking their politicians”.

Majority and plurality (voting)

Two different types of voting systems and voting outcomes.

- In a majority voting system, the winner is the candidate who receives over 50% of the votes.

- In a plurality voting system, the winner is the candidate who receives more votes than any other candidate. Consequently, in a 10 person race, a candidate can win with just over 10% of the votes, although this would require that every other candidate only receive just under 10% of the votes.

The terms majority and plurality can also be used to describe voting results regardless of the election system. If a candidate wins with less than 50% of the votes, they can be described as winning with a plurality but not a majority.

Realpolitik

Politics based on practical objectives and considerations rather than those which are ideological or moral.

Real economy and financial economy

- The real economy refers to the production and movement of goods and services within an economy.
- The financial economy refers to the transactions of money and other financial assets which represent the ownership, or claims of ownership, of the goods and services within an economy.

Per capita

A term used in economics and statistical analysis that means per person.

OECD

An acronym that stands for the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. The OECD is an international economic organization, with 36 member countries, with the expressed goal of stimulating economic growth and world trade.

Think tank (a.k.a. policy institute)

A research institute that performs research and advocacy concerning subjects such as social policy, political strategy, economics, military, technology, and culture. This information is not just used by governments, but also businesses, media organizations, social movements, and other interest groups. Think tanks also don't merely publish articles and studies, but can also draft legislation. Most think tanks are non-governmental organizations (NGOs), but some are semi-autonomous agencies that work within governments or directly with specific political parties. Think tanks are funded via government grants, donations from individuals and organizations, or a combination of both. Think tanks can also range from being highly academic and producers of high quality research, to ideologically driven institutions that provide very low quality research for propaganda purposes.

Political capital

The influence political figures and organizations possess to affect political decisions, and which is built up predominantly through relationships and reputation. Political capital can be understood as a type of currency used to mobilize voters, achieve policy reforms, or accomplish other political goals.

Symbolic capital

The resources an individual, organization, or physical object possesses due to honor, prestige, or recognition. For example, a political candidate may have symbolic capital if they are also a war hero, and a building may have symbolic capital if it has a long and prestigious history.

Cultural capital

The social assets of a person that confer social status and empower their social mobility, such as their education, social skills, intellect, style of speech, style of dress, and cultural knowledge.

Social capital

The value and benefits a person can gain through strong interpersonal relationships, a shared sense of identity, shared norms, shared values, trust, cooperation, and reciprocity. Organizations can have social capital in the form of good will.

Human capital

The economic value of a worker. More specifically, it is the value of the personal attributes of a worker, including their knowledge, education, skills, and health.

Ecological capital

The world's stock of natural resources, including water, soil, ore, air, and wild animals, including insects.

Arable land

Land that is capable of being used to grow crops.

The means of production, distribution, and exchange (a.k.a. the means of production)

The physical assets required to produce, distribute, and exchange, goods and services within an economy. The means of production are comprised of "instruments of production" and "subjects of labor". Instruments of production are manmade things such as factories, warehouses, tools, machines, vehicles, and infrastructures, that utilize and transport subjects of labor, which are natural resources such as water, soil, and extracted ore, in order to produce and provide goods and services.

The ownership of the means of production is a defining feature that distinguishes various economic systems. Under capitalism the means of production are predominantly privately owned and controlled by a small percentage of society, referred to as the capitalist class, the

ownership class, or the rentier class. Under socialism the means of production are owned and controlled, to varying degrees, by workers and society as a whole.

The forces of production

The means of production plus human labor.

The relations of production

The sum total of social relationships that people have no choice but to enter into in order to survive and prosper within an economic system. This can include relationships between individuals, between individuals and groups, and between groups. These relationships are not inherently work related, such as between worker and employer, but can include other relationships, such as those based on kinship, social class, ethnicity, and nationality. Under capitalism the most common and dominant relationship of production is work related, and this is the relationship between worker and employer.

The internet of things

A global communication network that uses sensors and the internet to automatically generate and relay information about the physical world, such as natural resources, factory production lines, warehouse inventories, retail stores, vehicles, and electricity grids. The internet of things can be used to automate resource allocation on a global scale, such as businesses using software to automatically reorder supplies from overseas when stocks are low.

Marginal cost

The cost of producing additional units of a product. Zero marginal cost means additional units can be produced at no cost to the producer. In terms of physical commodities, a product with zero marginal costs is possible when freely available raw resources are utilized entirely by automation technologies, notwithstanding the

costs of constructing and maintaining these automation technologies. In terms of digital commodities, such as e-books, zero marginal costs are effectively guaranteed, notwithstanding the costs of constructing and maintaining necessary digital infrastructures.

Economies of scale

The cost advantages that enterprises can obtain due to increases in the scale of their operations. These benefits may arise due to technical, statistical, organizational, or related factors. An example of economies of scale is the ability to purchase in bulk, where the cost of additional units decreases in proportion to the size of the order.

Comparative advantage

The ability to produce a particular product or service at a lower opportunity cost than trading partners and competitors. This term is most commonly used to refer to the advantages countries have over one another. Comparative advantage is made possible because of the particular economic advantages that certain countries have over one another with regards to things like human capital, knowledge, technology, infrastructures, natural resources, and subsidies. When comparative advantage is taken advantage of in international trade, participating countries can benefit by being able to import products or services that are cheaper or superior than those they could otherwise obtain. This approach is the opposite of economic isolationism, in which a country isolates itself from other countries by restricting or banning imports or exports. Many countries use comparative advantage to determine what goods and services they should import or export.

Final goods (a.k.a. consumer goods) and intermediate goods

- Final goods are goods that are purchased by consumers.
- Intermediate goods are goods that are utilized by businesses to produce other goods, including final goods, and to provide services.

Consumer demand

The extent to which a consumer is willing and able to purchase a particular product or service at a specific price.

Market demand

Aggregate consumer demand. In other words, it is the extent to which all consumers within an economy are willing and able to purchase a particular product or service at a specific price.

Aggregate demand

The total demand for all final goods and services in an economy. In other words, it is the amount of goods and services being purchased by consumers at a given time.

Gross domestic product (GDP)

The monetary measure of the market value of all the goods and services produced and provided within a country within a year. GDP doesn't include the sale of the "intermediary goods" that are used by businesses to create "final goods". This is to ensure goods are not double counted when GDP is calculated. GDP also doesn't include the sale of secondhand goods or black market goods.

GDP is calculated by adding up the following.

- Consumer spending
- Government spending
- Investments
- Net exports

Velocity of money

A measurement of the number of times that the average unit of currency is used to purchase goods and services within a given period of time. In other words, it is the speed at which money circulates within the economy. During economic downturns, the

velocity of money slows down as consumers are forced to cut back on spending.

Government bond

A certificate issued by a government, in order to generate revenue, which promises to repay a borrowed sum of money at a specified time, with interest paid out periodically to the lender. For example, if a bondholder purchases a \$20,000 10-year government bond with a 5% annual interest rate; the government would pay the bondholder 5% of this \$20,000 every year, and pay back this \$20,000 in full after 10 years.

Quantitative easing (QE)

The creation of new money by central banks, and usually enacted to stimulate economic growth during economic downturns. QE is often conflated with printing money, but the two are slightly different. First, QE can include the literal printing of bank notes and coins, but is more often a merely digital process. Second, QE is often used to purchase government bonds, company stocks, and the debt of financial institutions, meaning even though the supply of money in the economy technically increases, particularly in the financial sector, the amount of money circulating within the economy may not increase. For example, QE may be used to purchase government bonds, but if the government chooses not to use this money to increase their expenditure, such as on infrastructure and welfare, then this will not increase the amount of money businesses and consumers possess and spend, and hence will not increase the amount of money circulating within the economy. This also means QE does not always lead to inflation for consumer products and services, compared to printing money which often does. More often than not QE only causes inflation and asset bubbles in financial markets and property markets.

Government debt and deficit

- Government deficit is any government spending that exceeds its revenue in a given year. If a government spends more than it receives in revenue, then it has a budget deficit. If a government's revenue is greater than its expenses, then it has a budget surplus.
- Government debt is the total of all the loans a government has yet to repay. For the most part government debt can be understood as the accrument of all government deficits.

Sovereign wealth fund

A state-owned investment fund.

Progressive taxation

A form of taxation in which the tax rate increases as the taxable amount increases. Despite a common misconception, progressive taxation does not mean that the total taxable amount is taxed at the value of the highest threshold reached. For example, consider a progressive tax system where income above \$10,000 is taxed at 10%, and income above \$50,000 is taxed at 50%. In this scenario, someone with an income of \$100,000 would pay zero taxes on their first \$10,000, would pay a 10% tax on every dollar between \$10,000 and \$50,000, and would pay a 50% tax on every dollar above \$50,000.

Tax evasion

Reducing the amount of tax owed using illegal means. Perpetrators often do this by misrepresenting the true state of their financial affairs to tax authorities.

Tax avoidance

Reducing the amount of tax owed using legal means. This can also involve legally reducing one's taxes by dubiously utilizing tax rules in a way they were never intended to be used.

Capital flight

An economic phenomenon in which a large amount of financial assets are moved rapidly out of a geographic region, and most commonly a country. This usually occurs due to economic or political changes or instability, such as tax increases, a government defaulting on its debt, or anything which causes a loss of confidence in the economic strength of a country.

Human capital flight

An economic phenomenon in which a large number of highly skilled workers leave a geographic region, industry, or organization, in order to seek out better prospects elsewhere. In modern discourse human capital flight most commonly refers to workers moving from one country to another. Workers who leave their country may do so not merely for better economic prospects, but also if their home country is suffering from civil unrest, political instability, health risks, and other such problems. This phenomenon often creates social and economic problems when it occurs in geographic regions and industries, due to the potential shortage of essential workers in these areas. When this happens to countries, this can reduce their economic prospects and competitiveness, lower the quality of their essential infrastructures and services, and force them to rely upon exploitative wealthier countries. The term "brain drain" is the informal term for human capital flight. The opposite of "brain drain" is called "brain gain".

Externality

A beneficial or harmful consequence of any economic activity that is not accounted for, and consequently is not included in the price of

the product or service responsible. Because most externalities are harmful, the term is predominantly used in modern economic discourse to refer to negative externalities. Two common examples of negative externalities are air pollution and worker exploitation.

Capacity utilization

The extent to which an organization or country utilizes its productive capabilities, or in other words the extent to which its potential output is achieved. During economic downturns the capacity utilization of a country decreases, primarily due to business closures, workers leaving the workforce, and consumers purchasing fewer goods and services.

Just-in-time supply chains

Supply chains where necessary resources and goods are ordered or manufactured only when, or just before, they are required. This has the advantage of saving money, particularly by reducing warehouse costs. The disadvantage is that supply chain disruptions can quickly escalate into widespread scarcity, which is a particular problem for essential goods and services.

Regulatory capture

The co-opting of a political entity, policymaker, or regulatory agency, by a minor constituency, such as a business or industry, so that their interests can be prioritized above all else. Regulatory capture practically always comes at the expense of others within society, and consequently can be understood as a form of corruption. Under capitalism, corporations regularly achieve regulatory capture through lobbying.

Compensation package

The total sum of payments and benefits an employee receives from an employer. This can include direct compensation, like a salary,

stock options, allowances, and bonuses, and indirect compensation, like insurance, pension plans, and vacation time.

Shareholder (a.k.a. stockholder)

An individual or organization that owns shares of stock in a company.

Stakeholder

An individual or organization that has an interest in, and is usually affected by, the outcomes of a particular course of action. In economics, the term stakeholder more specifically refers to those interested in the actions of a business, particularly shareholders, suppliers, employees, consumers, and those affected by the environmental and societal changes caused by these actions.

Dividend

A portion of a corporation's profits which are paid out periodically to its shareholders. The board of directors is responsible for deciding what percentage of the profits should be paid out to shareholders as dividends, and how much should be reinvested into the company.

Surplus value

The sales revenue of a product or service minus the costs of production, distribution, and exchange.

Surplus value extraction

The act of an employer confiscating the surplus value generated by workers, and consequently preventing workers from determining how this surplus is allocated and utilized. According to Marxism, surplus value extraction is a form of exploitation.

Rent-seeking

The practice of increasing one's wealth without producing new wealth or anything of value. Rent-seeking occurs as a consequence of the privatization of property, such as physical, financial, and intellectual property, and is most commonly received in the form of compensation packages, dividends, interest, and rent. Surplus value extraction is one of the most common examples of rent-seeking. Regulatory capture is commonly used to maximize rent-seeking, since increasing externalities allows costs to be reduced. Rent-seeking results in reduced economic efficiency through the misallocation or sub-optimal allocation of resources, lost government revenue, reduced wealth creation, increased income and wealth inequality, and increased poverty. Rent-seeking is ubiquitous under capitalism because the means of production are privately owned, which is why capitalism is often called a "rentier economy".

Passive income

Income that requires little to no effort to obtain. Progressive passive income is income that increases over time with little to no effort on behalf of the recipient, such as compound interest on savings.

Disposable income and discretionary income

- Disposable income is the income remaining after deducting taxes.
- Discretionary income is the income remaining after deducting both taxes and essential living costs, such as those related to housing, utilities, food, and transportation.

Liquid and non-liquid assets

- Liquid assets are those which can quickly be converted into cash without a loss in value, such as money in the bank, or funds invested in stocks.

- Non-liquid assets are those which cannot be turned into cash quickly, or can be converted into cash reasonably quickly but at a steep cost. This includes wealth invested into land, properties, vehicles, collectibles, and retirement funds.

Purchasing power

The amount of goods and services that can be purchased with a specific amount of money. The more purchasing power a consumer has, the more goods and services they can purchase with the same amount of money.

Price gouging

Increasing the price of a product or service beyond what is considered justifiable.

Inflation

The sustained increase in the general prices of goods and services in an economy over time. Inflation consequently decreases the purchasing power of money.

Greedflation

Inflation caused by price gouging, as opposed to unavoidable market disruptions. Marxists argue that most inflation is caused directly or indirectly by price gouging, and hence constitutes greedflation.

Shrinkflation

The process of reducing the quantity of a product while maintaining the same price. Businesses often do this by retaining the same packaging while reducing the quantity of its contents. Shrinkflation is a particularly common problem within the food and beverage industry. Businesses often prioritize shrinkflation because of the belief that it is less likely to deter consumers than increasing prices.

Skimpflation

The process of reducing the quality of a product or service while maintaining the same price.

Algorithmic pricing

A pricing strategy in which computer algorithms set prices automatically and dynamically in order to maximize profits.

Death spiral (insurance)

A situation in which lower risk individuals choose to become uninsured or change to a lower cost insurance plan, resulting in the price of insurance plans increasing for all remaining customers. This increase in prices causes more people to choose to become uninsured, or change to a lower cost insurance plan, resulting in the price of insurance plans increasing further. This death spiral is a particularly prevalent and harmful problem regarding health insurance in countries that lack free universal health care.

Elasticity (economics)

The relationship between the price of a product or service and its supply or demand. An inelastic product or service is one which has sustained supply or demand regardless of price changes, whereas an elastic product or service is one where the supply or demand changes in accordance with price changes.

- Products or services with inelastic supply include original paintings and concert tickets for one-time events. These are inelastic because more cannot be produced or provided no matter how much demand exists.
- Products or services with elastic supply include electronics and video streaming services, since their availability can be scaled with market demand.

- Products or services with inelastic demand include essentials, such as lifesaving medications and surgeries, since people have effectively no choice but to pay for these regardless of price.
- Products or services with elastic demand include luxuries, such as computer games and cinema trips, since consumers will only purchase these if they are sold at a reasonable price.

Under capitalism goods and services with elastic supply and inelastic demand are ideal for maximizing profits, since a maximum number can be provided and sold even at unreasonably high prices.

Use value and exchange value

Two ways of describing the value of products and services in Marxian theory.

- Use value refers to the ability of a product or service to fulfill the needs or wants of humans, or which more broadly serves some socially beneficial purpose.
- Exchange value refers to the theoretical value, and most commonly the monetary value, of a product or service when traded.

Whether a product or service is created for use value or exchange value is a defining feature that distinguishes various economic systems. Under capitalism products and services are created primarily for their exchange value rather than their use value, meaning they are created primarily for the purpose of creating profit, rather than for the primary purpose of fulfilling human needs or wants for the lowest price possible.

Commodity (Marxism)

A resource, good, or service, created or provided for its exchange value rather than its use value. The process of turning something into a commodity is called "commodification", which is a term most

commonly used by Marxist to describe things they believe should not be commodified.

Conspicuous leisure

Using one's time non-productively for the purpose of publicly flaunting one's personal wealth, in order to maintain or increase one's social status. A modern-day example of this is going on excessively long and lavish holidays and using social media to broadcast this.

Conspicuous consumption

Buying and using goods and services that are excessively priced, or unnecessarily high quality, for the purpose of publicly flaunting one's personal wealth, in order to maintain or increase one's social status.

Invidious consumption

A form of conspicuous consumption pursued specifically to evoke envy, resentment, and even anger, in other people.

Veblen good

A type of luxury good that increases in demand as the price increases, in contradiction to the conventional economic relationship between price and demand. Veblen goods have higher prices usually due to their actual or perceived high-quality, their value as status symbols, or their potential future value.

Planned obsolescence

The business strategy of designing and building products with artificially reduced usability lifespans in order to force or incentivize consumers to make new purchases. An example of this is when software upgrades intentionally cause older consumer electronics to slow down unnecessarily. Smart phone batteries that cannot be

replaced, even though these phones may function perfectly well years after the battery has died, is another example.

Perceived obsolescence

The business strategy of convincing consumers that usable products are out-of-date or out-of-fashion in order to incentivize consumers to make new purchases. Unlike planned obsolescence, perceived obsolescence does not reduce the functionality of products, but instead merely uses psychological tactics to make consumers dissatisfied with their products. Such tactics include imbuing products with a perceived value that exists beyond their functionality, such as making them status and lifestyle symbols. The existence of artificially cultivated fashion trends and the fanfare surrounding the release of new smartphones are common examples of perceived obsolescence.

Right to repair

A consumer's legal right and ability to repair and modify their own products. Anti-consumer manufacturers prevent this by lobbying for laws that make this illegal, and by restricting access to necessary tools, components, software, and documentation. This forces consumers to purchase replacements, or to rely upon a limited number of repair services approved by the manufacturers, which creates monopoly control and enables price gouging.

Patent troll

A derogatory term used to describe a person or organization that attempts to enforce patent rights against accused infringers far beyond the patent's actual value or contribution, and which is usually done using unethical and aggressive legal tactics. Patent trolls usually don't utilize their patents for commercial reasons, but instead pursue this course of action merely to make money and stifle competition. Patent trolls often do this by acquiring preexisting patents or by patenting obvious or simple ideas.

Material conditions

The economic circumstances that determine or influence a person's quality of life. This includes circumstances like housing conditions, working conditions, and financial conditions, such as income and assets.

Social conditions

The societal circumstances that determine or influence a person's quality of life. This includes circumstances like food availability, education, crime levels, and the availability and quality of healthcare.

Gentrification

The process of transforming a city neighborhood to appeal to the tastes of the middle-class and the rich, through the influx of more affluent residents and increased investment. This investment most commonly occurs in the form of property development and new businesses. While this increases the overall economic value of a neighborhood, it often has a negative effect on existing residents, particularly by raising rent and the price of goods and services to the extent that they are priced out of their own neighborhoods, which can subsequently fracture communities and erode local culture. Gentrification disproportionately negatively affects people of color.

Third place

In sociology, a third place is any public or commercial place used for socializing, such as parks, sports centers, shopping malls, community centers, bookstores, games stores, makerspaces, restaurants, cafes, bars, clubs, and places of worship. In this context, a first place refers to a person's home, and a second place refers to a person's workplace. The existence of third places, and possessing the financial and practical means to travel to and utilize third places, are considered by sociologists to be extremely important for individuals and societies, particularly with regards to relationships, relaxation, recreation, and establishing a sense of community.

Hostile architecture (a.k.a. defensive architecture)

An urban design strategy that uses manmade environmental elements to purposefully discourage certain types of behavior in public, such as sleeping, skateboarding, and loitering. Such architecture is termed hostile because it lowers people's quality of life, and particularly disadvantaged individuals, such as young people, poor people, and homeless people. Two common examples of hostile architecture are central armrests on park benches, and metal spikes in the doorways and window sills of businesses, which are both designed to deter homeless people from sleeping at these locations.

Criminogenic

Producing, or tending to produce, crime or criminals.

Recidivism

The act of repeating an undesirable behavior even after experiencing negative consequences for that behavior. In modern discourse the term is most commonly used to refer to the rate at which former prisoners reoffend.

School-to-prison pipeline

A social trend wherein inadequate public schooling inevitably results in children effectively being funneled into the criminal justice system. If children are unable to receive an adequate education, or develop essential life skills at school, or access support from onsite counselors, they may be more likely to develop antisocial behaviors and become involved in crime. Children with learning disabilities, or who come from abusive homes, are more likely to suffer from this problem.

Working poor

Workers who have spent at least 27 weeks in the labor force, either working or looking for work, but who still live below the poverty line due to low income. In modern economic discourse, the term working poor is more commonly used to describe any worker who lives below the poverty line for unjustified economic reasons.

Wage theft

A form of theft wherein a worker is not paid the entirety of the compensation owed to them, as determined by informal agreement, a legal contract, or by law. Wage theft can include unpaid normal hours, unpaid overtime, unpaid bonuses, stolen tips, rest break violations, minimum-wage law violations, misclassifying employees as independent contractors in order to avoid paying out benefits and fair wages, forcing workers to pay for unavoidable repairs to their equipment, and refusing to pay for an hours' worth of labor if an employee arrives to work late by a few minutes.

Wage labor

The socio-economic relationship wherein a worker sells their labor to an employer within a labor market.

Wage slavery

A pejorative term used by critics of capitalism in place of the term wage labor. It is intended to more accurately describe the exploitative relationship that often arises between worker and employer within the capitalist system.

Precarious work

Employment that is often poorly paid, that is insecure or temporary, that requires flexible working hours, and that does not offer traditional employment benefits, such as paid leave or bonuses.

Precarious work can include part-time jobs, self-employment, fixed-term work, temporary work, on-call work, and remote work.

Bullshit jobs

A term created by anthropologist David Graeber to describe any form of paid employment that is so completely pointless, unnecessary, or pernicious, that even the employee cannot justify its existence, even though they feel obliged to pretend their work is valuable out of fear of being made redundant.

Crunch culture

The normalization and ongoing reliance on periods of “crunch”, which refers to a period of extensive overtime, and often unpaid overtime, that workers are forced to do in order to complete a project by a specified deadline. In some businesses crunch occurs increasingly towards the end of a deadline, although many businesses even enforce crunch throughout the entirety of a project, including those that take years to complete. Some companies even go so far as to include crunch as an intentional and integral part of their schedule, as opposed to it arising unintentionally. Crunch culture is known to be responsible for causing extremely low morale, severe physical and mental health problems, and the brain drain of necessary workers from certain industries.

Job lock

An employee’s inability to leave their job because of the resulting loss of financial security or essential benefits. In modern discourse job lock is commonly used when discussing American workers, who are not covered by government funded universal healthcare, and who are consequently often unable to leave their job because they will lose their employer-provided health insurance.

Underemployment

The underutilization of a worker's full capabilities, either because their job is not full-time, or because their job does not fully utilize their skills. Underemployment is known to reduce economic productivity, increase poverty levels, and harm the mental and emotional health of underemployed individuals.

Emotional labor

The process of managing one's feelings and expressions, particularly when interacting with customers and work colleagues, in order to fulfill the requirements of a job.

Invisible labor

Unpaid work that predominantly goes unacknowledged by society. Invisible labor is most commonly used to refer to the work parents do to raise their children. Within the context of employment, invisible labor includes labor performed outside of work which is not compensated even though it is only done for the benefit of the employer, such as commuting to work.

Technological unemployment

Unemployment caused by technology replacing human workers. Usage of this term has become increasingly common in modern discourse due to the ever increasing rate at which jobs are becoming automated.

Universal Basic Income (UBI)

An unconditional monthly income given to everyone in society, regardless of their income level or employment status. A UBI is designed to be enough for a person to be able to meet all of their essential needs.

Means test

A test used to determine whether an individual or family is eligible for government assistance, based on whether the individual or family possesses the means to do without this assistance.

Welfare queen

A pejorative term used to describe women who allegedly, but not necessarily, misuse welfare payments or collect excessive welfare payments through manipulation, fraud, or even child endangerment.

Welfare trap

A situation in which a welfare recipient is incentivized to stay unemployed, or not increase their work hours, because the subsequent reduction in their means-tested welfare would negate the benefit of their new wages. Even if a person has a higher net income upon returning to work, the opportunity cost may not be deemed worth the effort by the recipient. This problem is inherent to all welfare programs that means test based on income, and can be exacerbated by tax systems that disadvantage low paid workers. The welfare trap is entirely avoided with universal welfare programs, like a UBI.

Cost of poverty (a.k.a. ghetto tax)

A cost that is caused by living in poverty or in a poor area, including costs related to money, time, energy, safety, physical health, mental health, intelligence, cultural capital, social capital, opportunities, and justice. These are the costs that are referred to in the expression "the high cost of poverty". The term "costs of poverty" can also refer to the costs to broader society in which poverty exists.

False economy

An action that saves money in the short-term but costs more money in the long-term. For example, purchasing a cheaper product may

save money initially, but may be more expensive overall due to repairs, replacements, inefficiencies, and other costs. Another example is paying for a product or service with a loan, which often costs more in the long-term due to interest payments.

Boots theory (a.k.a. Sam Vimes "Boots" theory of socioeconomic unfairness)

An economic theory which postulates that those living in poverty often have no choice but to engage in false economy, and that this consequently places those living in poverty at an additional disadvantage.

Cycle of poverty

A situation in which positive feedback loops make poverty difficult or impossible to escape without outside intervention. A mechanism that causes someone to enter a cycle of poverty is called a "poverty trap". When the term poverty trap is applied to underdeveloped countries that exist in a cycle of poverty, this is called a "development trap".

Food security

The ability to consistently access and purchase nutritious food that is sufficient enough to meet all of one's dietary needs. A person who is unable to do this at all times is called food insecure. This most often occurs because a person is too poor to be able to afford nutritious food on a consistent basis, or because nutritious food is not available or consistently available to purchase where they live.

Structural violence

A form of harm that occurs when social, economic, or political, organizations and systems disempower people and prevent them from meeting their basic needs. Structural violence can include literal physical violence, such as the police or private security forces suppressing protestors fighting economic injustice. However, more

often than not structural violence is subtle or invisible. For example, people who unnecessarily suffer or die due to homelessness are victims of structural violence. Structural violence affects most people in the world, although it can also afflict particular demographics disproportionately via institutional ageism, sexism, racism, classism, ethnocentrism, nationalism, and other forms of discrimination.

Social murder

A term coined by Karl Marx collaborator Friedrich Engels to describe deaths that occur unnecessarily yet intentionally due to, what would later be described as, structural violence. Engels claimed social murder was effectively built into the capitalist system, and that calls and efforts to address the conditions that cause social murder would always be intentionally ignored or suppressed by the capitalist ruling class.

Deaths of despair (a.k.a. diseases of despair)

Three causes of death that commonly increase in those experiencing despair due to poverty and poor long-term social and economic prospects. These three causes are alcohol-related liver disease, drug overdoses, and suicides.

Shit life syndrome (SLS)

An umbrella term used by Western physicians to describe the wide range of mental and emotional disorders that are caused or exacerbated by poverty and poor long-term social and economic prospects.

Situational depression

A type of depression and adjustment disorder that occurs in response to negative life circumstances, as opposed to other forms of depression which arise due to a combination of biological and environmental factors. Situational depression is typically a short-term

disorder that occurs in response to a specific stressor, such as a traumatic life event, but can also become long-term due to prolonged negative life circumstances. Among other symptoms, situational depression usually involves extreme sadness, hopelessness, and concentration problems.

Status anxiety

The constant tension or fear of being perceived as “unsuccessful” by others in society, particularly in terms of material conditions, social conditions, human capital, and cultural capital. Status anxiety is particularly prevalent in countries with high income and wealth inequality, high rates of poverty, and a culture that idealizes wealth, materialism, and occupational success. Status anxiety can encourage people to engage in impulse buying and invidious consumption, and can cause other mentally and emotionally harmful problems such as snobbery, envy, shame, low self-esteem, sadness, hopelessness, and loneliness.

Alienation

The process whereby people come to feel foreign to, or disconnected from, the world they live in, and often due to a lack of control in some respects. In Marxian theory, alienation more specifically refers to the feelings and experiences of being estranged from one’s humanity and human nature as a consequence of one’s mechanistic role as a worker within modern industrial production under capitalism. Put another way, Marxists argue that workers under capitalism can feel degraded, disenfranchised, dehumanized, and isolated, as a consequence of lacking autonomy in the workplace and living in a society of stratified economic classes.

Marx described 4 ways workers can experience alienation under capitalism.

- Products and services

Workers may feel alienated due to having little to no choice over what types of products they produce or services they provide. This can be exacerbated by the knowledge that what they are producing or providing is not designed for maximizing the happiness of consumers and society at large, but for maximizing the wealth of the ruling class.

- The act of production

Workers may feel alienated due to having little to no control over how they work, such as being forced to perform nothing but repetitive or mundane tasks which offer little to no mental or emotional stimulation or satisfaction.

- Workers

Workers may feel alienated due to being forced to compete unnecessarily against coworkers, and being unable to cooperate with the workers of other businesses. This can be exacerbated by being restricted from socializing with coworkers.

- Species-essence

Workers may feel alienated due to being unable to develop themselves, present themselves, or be creative, in ways that best suit them personally, while being forced to develop personality traits or skills that conflict with who they are or what they want.

Described more informally, alienation makes humans feel like cogs in a machine, mentally and emotionally unfulfilled, isolated from their fellow humans, and detached from what it means to be human. Consequently, alienated workers are likely to end up feeling undignified, humiliated, bored, dissatisfied, apathetic, and fatigued.

The ruling class

Those who possess the greatest amount of wealth and who wield the greatest amount of power and influence over the economy and the political system. This class is predominantly comprised of aristocrats,

powerful politicians, the superrich, and other wealthy members of the ownership class. In most societies the ruling class represents less than 1% of the population.

The bourgeoisie [pronounced boar-jwaha-zee]

In Marxian theory, this term refers to the ownership class, or more specifically those who own the means of production. Many modern Marxists argue that extremely wealthy asset owners, and particularly landlords who own a large number of properties, should also be considered part of this class.

The proletariat

In Marxian theory, this term refers to the working class, or more specifically the working class since the beginning of the industrial revolution.

The underclass

The economic class that occupies the lowest stratum in society, below the core body of the working class. This class is usually comprised predominantly of minorities, such as immigrants and asylum seekers.

The petty bourgeoisie

In Marxian theory, this term refers to the economic class between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. Today it most commonly refers to wealthy middle class workers, which can include small-business owners, self-employed professionals, and high-level managers. Many modern Marxists argue that relatively wealthy asset owners, and particularly landlords who own a small number of properties, should also be considered part of this class. Because of their wealth, status, and lifestyles, Marxists argue that this economic class does not possess the same class interests as the working class.

Reserve army of labor

The pool of desperate unemployed individuals who are capable of working and require paid work to survive. This term is often used by Marxists to reference the conflicting interests between the unemployed, who need work in order to survive, and the ownership class, who can use the threat of unemployment to exploit workers.

Karl Marx

A 19th century philosopher, sociologist, economist, political theorist, and revolutionary. Marx became famous for his theories on economics, and particularly capitalism, socialism, and communism, which collectively came to be described as Marxism. Even though there are many new variants of socialism and communism that have been created since Marx's passing, these can still be accurately described as Marxist economic systems because they are all founded upon the ideas put forward by Marx.

Marx contended that conflicts and struggles between economic classes was the primary cause of manmade suffering in human societies throughout history. More specifically, Marx believed the existence of a ruling class would always result in the exploitation of the working class, which would create emotional and ideological conflicts between the two groups. Marx asserted that capitalism, a system in which the working class sell their labor to the ruling class in exchange for wages, was the latest incarnation of this class conflict. However, Marx predicted that, like previous economic systems, capitalism would eventually self-destruct due to its internal contradictions, its inherent instability, and the escalation of class conflict. Marx believed members of the working class would become increasingly aware of their exploitation and the unfairness of the system, and consequently revolt against the ruling class given enough time. In other words, Marx didn't merely advocate for the overthrowing of capitalism and the ruling class, but also predicted its inevitability.

Marx used the term “communism” to describe post-capitalist economies that had abolished the state and economic classes. In such societies, all political and economic organizations and systems would be controlled by everyone in society, rather than the ruling class, and goods and services would be produced and provided for their use value rather than exchange value. Marx believed that if the abolition of capitalism and the arrival of communism could not be achieved rapidly, then socialism would be required. Socialism was proposed by Marx as a transitional stage in which a democratic government would be required to achieve communism, namely by facilitating the transference of the means of production from private ownership to social ownership. However, today there are various forms of socialism that are finalized economic systems, and serve no transitional purpose.

Class conflict (a.k.a. class warfare, or class struggle)

In Marxian theory, class conflict refers to the political, economic, social, and cultural tensions and violence that can arise between competing classes within society. According to Marxism, class conflict is unavoidable under capitalism, since the privatization of the means of production guarantees the existence of a ruling class and a working class with competing interests.

Class consciousness

In Marxian theory, class consciousness refers to a person’s awareness of classes and conflicting class interests, and particularly awareness of the oppression and exploitation of the lower classes at the hands of the ruling class. According to Marxists, class consciousness is considered essential for economic and social revolutions to occur, since the masses cannot be expected to protest their oppression and exploitation unless they are first aware of this.

False consciousness

In Marxian theory, false consciousness refers to a person's mistaken belief that classes do not have conflicting interests, or a person's mistaken belief that the ruling class does not oppress and exploit the lower classes. Under capitalism false consciousness usually occurs as a consequence of capitalist propaganda.

Class traitor

In Marxian theory, a class traitor is a member of the lower classes who works against the interests of their class. This includes those who do so intentionally for personal gain, and predominantly by defending the ruling class. This also includes those who do so without any intention of benefitting personally, and who often do so at their own expense without realizing it, which under capitalism usually occurs as a consequence of capitalist propaganda.

Dictatorship of the proletariat

In Marxian theory, this term refers to a society in which all political and economic organizations and systems are controlled by everyone in society, rather than the ruling class. In the time of Marx, the term dictatorship did not refer to a government ruled by a dictator, but instead meant "complete authority over something".

The shock doctrine and disaster capitalism

Two ideas proposed by social and political activist Naomi Klein in her 2007 book "The Shock Doctrine: The Rise of Disaster Capitalism". Naomi Klein proposed that both natural and manmade crises, such as natural disasters, economic downturns, terrorist attacks, and military coups, are exploited or created by rich and powerful political and economic leaders in order to introduce unpopular, controversial, or questionable, neoliberal policies. These neoliberal policies can include increased privatization, increased deregulation, corporate bailouts, and cuts to social services. It is common for power grabs, human rights violations, and the suspension of democratic safeguards, to

also occur during these times. The Shock Doctrine proposes that all of this is made possible because populations are far less able to collectivize and respond appropriately when they are excessively distracted, disorientated, emotionally distressed, and physically exhausted. The term "shock doctrine" effectively refers to the political strategy utilized by the political ruling class to achieve and benefit from these outcomes, while the term "disaster capitalism" effectively refers to the economic strategy utilized by the economic ruling class to achieve and benefit from these outcomes.

Accelerationism

The belief that political, economic, social, and cultural problems should be intensified in order to bring about necessary radical societal change. In other words, it is the idea that making circumstances substantially worse for people will cultivate enough backlash that necessary societal change will occur quicker than it otherwise would. A more extreme form of accelerationism advocates for the complete collapse of an existing order, such as a government, an economy, or social stability, in order to create something entirely new, rather than to reform what currently exists. There are both left-wing and right-wing forms of accelerationism, although they differ in terms of theory and proposed strategies. Accelerationism is widely regarded as an extremely dangerous and ineffective ideology, particularly among socialists and communists.

Free market economy

An economic system in which compensation, prices, and resource allocation, are determined by unrestricted competition between independent economic actors, namely privately owned businesses, workers, and consumers, all working in their own self-interest. The allocation and utilization of resources, namely labor, the means of production, goods, and services, is therefore determined through unrestricted competition between these independent economic actors. Free markets are often contrasted with planned economies.

Planned economy

An economic system in which compensation, prices, and resource allocation, are determined according to a comprehensive plan, and enacted by independent economic actors all working in cooperation with one another. Although most modern economies are free market economies, most of these still utilize economic planning, particularly in the form of public infrastructures and services. Economic planning also exists on a spectrum, from centralized to decentralized. Centralized planning is a top-down approach in which planning is determined by a centralized administration. Decentralized planning is a bottom-up approach in which planning is determined by those working closer to the ground level.

All businesses also utilize economic planning within their internal infrastructures, particularly with regards to the internal allocation of resources, such as labor, knowledge, and supplies. Businesses can also be said to effectively use economic planning with regards to compensation and prices whenever workers and consumers have no bargaining power, since compensation and prices under these conditions are no longer determined by unrestricted competition.

Command economy

An economic system in which compensation, prices, and resource allocation, are determined by a centralized administration, who then issue these as commands to all economic actors. Command economies are not a type of planned economy. Within planned economies, economic information, such as supply and demand information, flows freely up and down economic hierarchies, and is updated quickly and continuously. Within planned economies, all economic actors also have degrees of autonomy to influence the enactment of an economic plan in response to such continuously updating economic information. Command economies by contrast effectively operate like a dictatorship. Centralized administrations within command economies do not account for information generated on the ground, either because of incompetence, or because information and communication technologies are not advanced

enough to enable up-to-date or real-time information sharing. The most well-known examples of a command economy are the economies of the Soviet Union and Mao's China.

Social ownership

The various forms of ownership of assets that are not privately owned. Social ownership is consequently the opposite of private ownership. Social ownership can loosely be divided into the two subcategories of collective ownership and public ownership.

Collective ownership

The social ownership of assets, including the means of production, by all members of a group, as opposed to all members of society.

Worker cooperative

A business that is self-managed by its workers, and which operates to benefit its workers, and often wider society as well. Theoretically, a worker cooperative can either be run as a direct democracy, in which all workers vote directly on decisions, or like a republic, in which leaders and managers, who are voted into their positions by the workers, make decisions on behalf of the workers. In practice, most worker cooperatives use a combination of these two approaches. However, these higher-ups are always held to account by the workers, and can be voted out of their positions by the workers at any time. A worker cooperative is consequently a business at its most functionally democratic, and is advocated for by most Marxists for this reason.

Public ownership (Marxism)

The social ownership of assets, including the means of production, by all members of society, as opposed to all members of a group.

State ownership (Marxism)

The social ownership of assets, including the means of production, by the state. However, state ownership in the Marxist sense can only be considered public ownership in the Marxist sense if the state operates for the benefit of society. If the state does not operate for the benefit of society, then state ownership cannot be considered public ownership.

Public property

Assets that are available to the entire public for use, such as public parks and public toilets.

Nationalization and privatization

The two directions of the transference of ownership, such as of an asset or service, between governments and private entities, such as businesses and charities.

- Nationalization is the process of transferring something from private ownership to public ownership.
- Privatization is the process of transferring something from public ownership to private ownership.

Trickledown economics

The economic proposition that financial benefits for the wealthy “trickle down” to everyone else in society. Trickledown economics is

regularly used to justify supply-side economics, and often more specifically tax cuts for businesses and the wealthy.

Supply-side economics

An economic theory which postulates that the best method for stimulating economic growth and achieving full employment is by lowering barriers to production, such as decreasing taxes, regulations, trade barriers, and monetary barriers. Another common method is to cut benefits to incentivize more people to enter into the workforce. The belief underlying this theory is that a greater supply of goods and services increases entrepreneurship, jobs, and labor. Supply-side economics consequently prioritizes helping businesses and the wealthy first and foremost, with the assumption that the resulting wealth will “trickledown” to the rest of society. In modern discourse, supply-side economics is commonly used interchangeably with the terms “trickledown economics” and “Reaganomics”.

Demand-side economics

An economic theory which postulates that the best method for stimulating economic growth and achieving full employment is by creating high demand for goods and services. The belief underlying this theory is that a greater demand for goods and services increases entrepreneurship, jobs, and labor. Demand-side economics consequently prioritizes helping the lower class and middle class directly, with the assumption that high consumer spending will necessitate an increase in workers to meet demand, as well as providing entrepreneurs and in-demand businesses the capital required to research and provide new goods and services.

Zero sum game

A situation in which one's person gain is equivalent to, and a consequence of, another's loss. For example, if a person can only acquire \$10 at the expense of another person losing \$10, then this is

a zero-sum game, since the change in the net value of the situation is \$0.

Corporatism

An ideology which advocates for the economy to be organized into corporate groups, such as agricultural, labor, military, and scientific, or guild associations based on common interests. In modern discourse the term corporatism is commonly used incorrectly to refer to a corporatocracy.

Corporatocracy

A political and economic system controlled or strongly influenced by corporations or corporate interests. A corporatocracy is characterized by excessive compensation for executives and shareholders, exploitation of people and natural resources, tax breaks and subsidies for large businesses, government bailouts for industries, and other similar exploitative practices and special favors. Corporatocracies also usually coincide with monopolized industries.

Crony capitalism

An economic system in which businesses thrive not as a consequence of operating fairly within competitive free markets, but as a consequence of receiving favors from a government due to close ties to individuals within the government. Such favors may be given as a consequence of relationships founded on friendship and familial connections, or because of mutually beneficial exchanges, such as campaign funds being donated in exchange for a government grant or permit. Crony capitalism is a common feature of corporatocracies. Crony capitalism also commonly occurs under fascist regimes.

Corporate welfare

A government's unjustified preferential treatment of businesses, usually taking the form of tax breaks, tax loopholes, bailouts, certain types of subsidies and grants, and favorable trade deals.

The term corporate welfare is sometimes used specifically to refer to direct transfers of wealth from a government to a business, most commonly in the form of bailouts, subsidies, and grants. In these instances the term corporate socialism is often used as a replacement for the original definition of corporate welfare.

Late-stage capitalism (a.k.a. late capitalism)

A pejorative term used to describe what is believed by critics to be the final and most dangerous stage of the inevitable evolution of capitalism. More specifically, this term is used to refer to the inequalities, exploitation, contradictions, absurdities, crises, and other negative consequences, that are believed to increasingly worsen, and inevitably result in global economic collapse, when capitalist economies are allowed to exist for a long period of time.

Smart power (politics)

The combination of hard power and soft power strategies in international relations. In politics, hard power and soft power refer to contrasting and often conflicting methods for influencing the behavior or interests of foreign political bodies, and particularly national governments. Hard power aims to influence via coercive and often aggressive economically and militarily focused strategies. Soft power aims to influence via politically, economically, and culturally focused strategies designed around appeal and attraction, and which usually focus on building mutually beneficial relationships, particularly alliances and partnerships. Hard power is nearly always exploitative in nature. Soft power is far more likely to be benevolent in nature, but can still be exploitative.

Imperialism and colonialism

- Imperialism is the practice of one nation expanding their influence or exercising power over other regions or countries predominantly through hard power, and particularly military force and colonialism. When imperialism takes the form of one country imposing their culture onto another culture, this is called cultural imperialism.
- Colonialism is the practice of one nation expanding their influence or exercising power over other regions or countries through settlers and settlements.

The primary goal of imperialism is the expansion of political and economic power for the purpose of building an empire, while colonialism is the component of imperialism that is more specifically focused on the exploitation of resources. Imperialism is consequently more likely to involve the domination of a region or country from a distance, while colonialism is more likely to involve a more direct form of control due to the creation of settlements. For this reason, native populations are more likely to suffer more invasive and extreme forms of subjugation under colonialism.

Internal colonialism

The application of colonialist practices applied by a particular region or country to itself. Internal colonialism usually disproportionately harms particular demographics, such as racial or ethnic minorities, and usually due to the intentional targeting of these demographics.

Neocolonialism

A term coined in the 1960's to describe the continuation or reimposition of colonial rule via political, economic, social, and cultural influence and control, except with hard power approaches, such as direct military control and direct political control, being replaced with malicious soft power approaches, such as using conditional aid and trade deals to coerce or force countries into spiraling debt obligations. Neocolonialism effectively exists to allow

oppressing nations to give the appearance of ending their colonialist endeavors. Worse still, the use of tactics that appear benevolent, such as using conditional foreign aid to create spiraling debt obligations, allows neocolonialist countries to adopt the superficial appearance of benevolence, even though this neocolonialism is just as exploitative as conventional colonialism. Just as imperialism is often described as the last stage of capitalism, neocolonialism is often described as the last stage of imperialism.

Unequal exchange

In Marxian theory, unequal exchange refers to the imperialist outcome of the unequal transfer of value, particularly labor and natural resources, from poor countries to rich countries.

Monopsony

A market in which there is only one buyer of a particular product or service.

Monopoly

A market in which there is only one producer or seller of a particular product or service. A monopoly creates an absence of competition, and commonly results in price gouging.

Oligopoly

A market in which there are only a small number of producers or sellers of a particular product or service. The term monopoly is commonly used in place of oligopoly in modern informal discourse.

Natural monopoly

A monopoly that exists typically due to high start-up costs, economies of scale, or other barriers to entry, which give the largest producers or sellers of a particular product or service an

overwhelming advantage over competitors. Under these circumstances it becomes effectively impossible for most other competitors to enter into the market.

Cartel

A group of independent and rivalrous market participants who collude with each other to dominate a market, usually for the purpose of increasing the profitability of all members. Cartels predominantly achieve this by coordinating their production, pricing, and marketing. Most jurisdictions consider cartels anti-competitive, which is why they are illegal in most countries.

Natural cartel

Coined by the founders of The Xova Movement, a natural cartel is any economic environment which possesses the same characteristics produced by a cartel but which arises organically without direct collusion. Common examples of natural cartels include businesses simultaneously raising prices in an effort to exploit consumers, and landlords simultaneously raising rents in an effort to exploit renters, but all doing so without any direct coordination.

Cronyism and nepotism

Two types of unjustified favoritism. Cronyism involves showing favoritism to friends and close associates, while nepotism involves showing favoritism to relatives, and most commonly immediate family members. Both terms are most commonly used to refer to corruption within political and economic organizations, particularly in the form of unfair job appointments, promotions, and special privileges.

Meritocracy

An environment in which people advance into positions of success and influence according to personal merit, such as talent, effort, and

accomplishments, as opposed to wealth, social status, and personal connections.

Technocracy

A system of governance in which all decision-makers are experts in the area they are responsible for. Technocrats are usually highly qualified, possess extensive relevant knowledge, and have years of experience within their field. Individuals who do not fulfill these criteria generally cannot be considered technocrats. Technocracies contrast with systems of governance in which elected representatives are the primary decision-makers. Most competent modern governments are run by elected representatives that select technocrats for key positions.

Theocracy

A government controlled by a group of theists who govern according to a particular theistic religion, or more specifically according to the deity or deities that they perceive to be the supreme ruling authority of their government, and from whom they receive instruction, either through religious texts or through "divine guidance".

Authoritarianism

Favoring unquestioning submission and strict obedience to an authority at the expense of the personal freedom of oneself or others. Authoritarian governments are usually characterized by strong centralized power, limited freedom for the general population, restricted freedom for opposing political parties and anti-regime activities, and poorly defined laws and powers that allow for government overreach.

Totalitarianism

A more extreme and intrusive form of authoritarianism. Totalitarian governments are usually characterized by tight control over most or

all economic activities, extreme control over the public and private lives of citizens, and the complete prohibition of opposing political parties and anti-regime activities.

Oligarchy

An organization, society, or government, controlled by a small number of individuals.

Plutocracy

An organization, society, or government, controlled by a group of wealthy individuals. Plutocrats usually come to have power because of their wealth, rather than their wealth being incidental.

Autocracy

An organization, society, or government, controlled by one person who possesses absolute power and who is effectively accountable to no one. The authoritarian monarch is one of the most well-known types of autocrat.

Dictatorship

A type of autocracy, in the form of a government controlled by one autocrat. Dictators and autocrats both possess absolute power, although dictators usually interfere more in the running of their country, meaning they are more likely to be totalitarians than mere authoritarians. Dictators are always cruel and oppressive to some or all of their population, whereas autocrats usually are but not always. Dictators often possess a cult of personality, and usually utilize propaganda to cultivate support, whereas this is not usually implied by the term autocrat.

Despotism

A government that rules in an oppressive and cruel manner.

Kleptocracy

A government that exploits its own people and resources for the benefit of government officials.

Demagogue

A leader who attempts to gain support by appealing to emotions, prejudice, and ignorance, and who shuts down deliberation and dismisses the nuances of issues.

Populism (political science)

A political view that advocates for “the people”, who are perceived as morally good, and condemns “the elite”, who are perceived as corrupt and often incompetent. Populists differ in how “the people” are defined, although they are usually differentiated along class, ethnic, or national lines. Populists also differ in how “the elite” are defined, although they usually include political establishments, powerful economic establishments, and the mainstream news media. Anti-intellectual populists often include academic establishments as part of “the elite”. Populist political leaders usually behave in ways that are atypical for politicians.

Conservatism, ultraconservatism, and reactionism

- Conservatism is a right-wing ideology that favors traditional institutions and values, most commonly with regards to politics, religion, and the traditional family unit. Consequently, conservatives desire to maintain the status quo, or return to the past in certain areas, although they are sometimes willing to accept certain progressive political, economic, social, and cultural changes.

- Ultraconservatism is a far-right ideology and an extreme form of conservatism. Ultraconservatism strongly favors a return to the past, and staunchly rejects practically all progressive political, economic, social, or cultural changes.
- Reactionism is a far-right ideology that strongly favors a return to the past with regards to many issues, and staunchly rejects most progressive political, economic, social, or cultural changes. Reactionism involves the same general attitude as ultraconservatism, but does not always entail adherence to all or most conservative values. For example, a reactionary may be non-religious or anti-religious, and may not hold strong views on gay marriage. In this sense, reactionism can generally be understood as a more selective form of ultraconservatism.

Ultranationalism

An extreme loyalty and devotion to one's country that also tolerates or supports harm inflicted upon other nations in the pursuit of national interests.

White supremacy

The belief that "white people" are inherently superior to all other racial groups. Who is defined as "white" according to white supremacists has varied substantially across history, and varying interpretations of this definition continue to exist to this day. Most white supremacists fear that interracial relationships will lead to the elimination of the "white race".

White nationalism

The belief that "white people" should develop and maintain a white racial and national identity, and should be allowed to live in a country that bans all other racial groups from either visiting or living there. Most white nationalists fear that embracing different heritages and cultures will lead to the elimination of the "white culture", including

all the heralded parts of “white culture” that only exist because of the influence of other cultures, which includes practically all parts of “white culture”.

Alt-right and alt-lite

- Alt-right refers to a far-right white supremacist and white nationalist ideology that believes “white people”, “white countries”, and “white civilization”, are superior, and are under attack by left-wing and multicultural forces. Alt-right individuals are nearly always white supremacists, white nationalists, ultranationalists, ultraconservatives, and populists.
- Alt-lite refers to a far-right ideology that believes Western cultures are superior, and are under attack by left-wing and multicultural forces. Alt-lite individuals are not white nationalists or white supremacists, although they are nearly always ultranationalists, ultraconservatives, and populists.

The terms alt-right and alt-lite are widely recognized as being ill-defined due to being used differently by both right-wing and left-wing individuals, and even differently by academics and the news media. We believe the definitions provided here are the least controversial and also serve the greatest utility. To improve modern discourse, our movement advocates for using the term far-right or ultraconservative by default to reference far-right individuals, and for the terms alt-right and alt-lite to only be used in accordance with the definitions provided above.

Fascism

A far-right, ultranationalistic, authoritarian ideology that arose at the beginning of the 20th century. Unlike other ideologies that can be adequately understood in a few sentences, fascism can only be adequately defined and diagnosed as a combination of a large number of characteristics, which will now be explored.

Fascism embraces traditionalism, and commonly idealizes and mythologizes the past in order to achieve and justify the goal of maintaining the status quo or returning to the past. Fascists believe that people exist, or should exist, in higher or lower positions within social hierarchies as a consequence of a "natural order". Fascists consequently downplay or ignore manmade political, economic, social, and cultural factors, such as classism, sexism, and racism, that cause unjustified and harmful forms of social stratification. Fascists also commonly extend this "natural order" to include Social Darwinism, which encompasses an assortment of immoral beliefs that posit that natural selection and "survival of the fittest" are principles which should also apply to all civil human societies. Fascists usually have an unhealthy idolization of hard work because of this, and commonly condemn the majority of people in society for being too lazy and unproductive.

Fascists claim to be against the ruling class, when in reality they wish to replace or become part of the ruling class so that they can rule over those who they perceive to be part of the out-group, which is usually comprised of marginalized and disempowered demographics. Fascists commonly define the out-group by what they perceive as degeneracy, which is usually anything antithetical to the societal standards and traditions of the past. Fascists consequently oppose Marxists, anarchists, and others who promote progressive ideologies. Fascists believe that the out-group will cause social and moral decay if left unopposed, and this usually includes concerns related to sexuality and gender, such as fears concerning transgenderism, homosexuality, and the dissolution of traditional gender roles. Fascist concerns of moral degeneracy however are usually rooted in fanatical and egotistical purity testing rather than logic or compassion, as evidenced by their willingness to dehumanize and persecute those who are part of the out-group. Fascists are consequently an incredibly dangerous threat to a sizeable percentage of people within the out-group, although they often try to use a façade of civility in order to persuade others that they are diplomatic and well-reasoned.

Fascist regimes, like many right-wing ideologies, incorrectly assume and claim that humans are rational actors, despite the fact that fascist regimes simultaneously require human irrationality in order to survive and prosper. This is because fascist regimes rely upon misinformation, fearmongering, discriminatory rhetoric, and conspiracy theories, to cultivate support. Fascist regimes are authoritarian in nature, and practically always attempt to undermine democracy either before or after attaining power. Fascist regimes usually utilize and idolize top down force and violence as a way to address societal and cultural problems, which always leads to human rights abuses, rather than addressing the root causes of these problems, such as poverty and inadequate education. Fascist regimes often imprison or threaten to imprison opponents, and sometimes have private police forces that are allowed to operate with impunity.

Fascist regimes are usually led by singular authoritarian figures that usually possess a number of distinctive characteristics. Fascist leaders are most commonly men, and usually men who go to great lengths to project a "strong man" image, which they are idolized for by their followers. The "strong man" is effectively a combination of toxic masculinity traits, and usually involves a puerile machismo bravado. Fascist leaders are often bigoted, racist, xenophobic, sexist, homophobic, transphobic, or a combination of such traits. Fascist leaders are often extremely lacking in empathy and compassion, and most are sociopaths, psychopaths, or dark triads, the definition of which is provided later in this glossary. Fascist leaders are often egotistical, anti-intellectual, and commonly claim that they are uniquely gifted for solving their country's problems. Fascist leaders often claim that they will root out corruption, but are usually equally or more corrupt than those they replace. Fascist leaders rarely introduce political or economic reforms that benefit those either inside or outside of their country, but instead use their power to enrich themselves and other members of the ruling class, and nearly always at the short-term or long-term expense of their own supporters. Fascist governments consequently always strongly support the privatization of the means of production, which are controlled either by themselves or by the established ownership

class, which is practically always willing to work with them. The masses who support fascist leaders are usually oblivious to all of this, partially because of economic illiteracy, but also because fascist leaders usually have cult followings. The two best known historical examples of fascist leaders are the Italian dictator Benito Mussolini, and the German dictator Adolf Hitler. Modern-day examples of fascist leaders include former American President Donald Trump, former Brazilian President Jair Bolsonaro, Hungarian President Viktor Orbán, Russian President Vladimir Putin, and Belarusian President Alexander Lukashenko.

Support for fascism usually arises as a response to tumultuous and harmful political and economic conditions. These include, but are certainly not limited to, political corruption, widespread poverty, gross wealth inequality, low economic mobility, poor job opportunities, and worker exploitation, to name some common examples. Such conditions produce a poor quality of life in the present, and ongoing anxieties about the future, which inevitably cultivate in populations the desire for the radical and immediate changes that fascist regimes promise to deliver, but nonetheless are both incapable and unwilling to provide. Socialists have argued that capitalism not only directly causes and exacerbates such conditions, but that the harmful secondary consequences of capitalism, such as resource scarcity, refugee crises, and global imperialism, can ultimately cultivate ultranationalism, which further cultivates fascism.

Because fascism always arises within conservative populations, the desire for action, that most commonly occurs in response to these tumultuous and harmful political and economic conditions, can also occur in response to rapid cultural changes, and particularly progressive changes. Fascism consequently strongly appeals to ultraconservatives, as well as those with an authoritarian personality type. Though more speculative, it is believed fascism appeals predominantly to conservatives who had a difficult or strict upbringing, and specifically those who currently feel compelled to suppress their hedonistic desires, and particularly sexual desires. This is because fascism often involves fetishizing self-control and

self-sacrifice, as well as stigmatizing many forms of pleasure as forms of degeneracy. It has also been speculated that fascism tends to appeal to people whose lives lack mental and emotional stimulation and fulfillment, such as those who are closed-minded about the types of entertainment media they consume, and those who have very few interests and hobbies, either due to personal choice or because they lack access to the resources necessary to pursue potential interests and hobbies.

Despite the common misconception perpetuated by right-wingers, fascism is incapable of being left-wing in any sense. Under undemocratic conditions left-wing regimes and ideologies can be coopted and mutated so that they become authoritarian and tyrannical, but they can never be fascist, because fascism is a far-right ideology by definition. This is evidenced by the fact that fascist governments strongly support privatization and rigid hierarchies, rather than the left-wing ideals of democratization and egalitarianism. One of the reasons commonly cited to support the argument that fascism can be left-wing is the fact that the official name of the Nazi party was The National Socialist German Workers' Party. To say that the Nazi's are socialists, because of the name of their party, is equivalent to saying the Democratic People's Republic of [North] Korea, and the Democratic Republic of the Congo, must be democratic because of their names, despite both being among the most undemocratic countries in the world. The Nazi's were fascists, and fascism is the complete opposite of socialism. In fact, not only were the Nazi's not socialists, they also dismantled worker unions, they received financial support from capitalist business owners, they engaged in more privatization than most other developed countries during their rule, they argued that socialism was a Jewish conspiracy designed to undermine Germany, they burned books that advocated for socialism and communism, and they imprisoned and murdered people for being socialists and communists, which resulted in socialists and communists being among the first people sent to concentration camps. This intentional coopting of left-wing terms was also a form of deception used by Benito Mussolini.

As previously stated, fascism is best understood as a combination of numerous characteristics. However, fascists, fascist leaders, and fascist regimes, do not need to possess all of these characteristics to be accurately described as fascist. Instead, these characteristics exist to describe a dangerous phenomenon where such characteristics often occur simultaneously. The term fascism can best be understood as an umbrella term that is used to reference a reoccurring societal problem that is multifaceted, complex, and sometimes nebulous in nature. To assist in defining and diagnosing fascism, many academics have devised their own lists defining the most common characteristics of fascism. Two such lists have been provided below.

Historian Lawrence Britt's list comprises of 14 characteristics which describe the early warning signs of fascist and protofascist movements.

1. Powerful and continuing nationalism.

Global solidarity and integration is considered a threat. Fascist regimes make constant use of patriotic flags, mottos, slogans, symbols, songs, etc. Criticisms of one's country are stigmatized as unpatriotic or hateful, even though dissent is widely acknowledged in most modern countries as the highest form of patriotism.

2. Distain for the recognition of human rights.

The need for national security is used as justification for ignoring human rights.

3. Identification of enemies and scapegoating them as a unifying cause.

The masses are rallied into a frenzied state over the need to eliminate a perceived threat. Common "threats" derive from, or include, racial groups, ethnic groups, religious groups, immigrants, progressives, socialists, communists, and LGBT+ individuals.

4. Supremacy of the military.

The military is glamorized, and is given unreasonable and disproportionate funding, and often at the expense of more important domestic needs.

5. Rampant sexism.

Fascist governments are usually predominantly or exclusively male-dominated, and traditional gender roles and family structures are idealized, while those who deviate from these ideals are often denigrated.

6. Controlled mass media.

Some or all media organizations give the fascist government biased favorable coverage, either because they are being coerced or controlled by the government, or because they are naturally inclined to support governments with fascist traits, such as those which are conservative or capitalist.

7. Obsession with national security.

Fear is galvanized and used by the government to acquire more control over the masses.

8. Religion and government are intertwined.

Fascist regimes align themselves with the prevailing religion of their country in order to gain passionate and widespread support. Politicians will often do this while implementing policies or making statements which contradict the tenets of the religion.

9. Corporate power is protected.

Governments enact policies which are very favorable to businesses and industries, even at the expense of public interests and the environment.

10. Labor power is suppressed.

Fascist governments suppress workers and unions because the only practical threat to fascist regimes is organized labor power, which can organize strikes and cause widespread economic disruption, as well as pose a threat to corporate power.

11. Disdain for intellectuals and the arts.

Fascist leaders openly deride intellectuals and the highly educated, and the opinions of experts are often ignored or mocked. Education systems and the arts are usually underfunded, primarily because critical thinking and free expression can enable and encourage the exploration and expression of challenging and unconventional ideas, including those that can undermine fascist regimes.

12. Obsession with crime and punishment.

Fascist regimes often obsess over law and order. They usually give law enforcement agents excessive or unlimited powers, and introduce or enforce draconian laws and punishments.

13. Rampant cronyism and corruption.

Fascist regimes usually suffer from extreme nepotism and cronyism, and power is used primarily for the benefit of those at the top, and usually at the expense of the masses.

14. Fraudulent elections.

Elections often entail smear campaigns, misinformation, unnecessarily convoluted voter registration procedures, voter suppression, broken voting systems, gerrymandering, and the outright stealing of elections.

The following list of the 14 defining characteristics of fascism was created by Italian philosopher and political commentator Umberto Eco. This list is currently very likely the most commonly cited set of criteria for defining fascism.

1. "The cult of tradition".

The idealization of traditionalism and a refusal to adapt to reasonable societal and cultural changes.

2. "The rejection of modernism".

A suspicion and rejection of modernism, usually due to the assumption that modernism leads to depravity.

3. "The cult of action for action's sake".

The creation of a culture which promotes action with disregard for achieving definable results. Critical thinking and introspection are deemed emasculating and unproductive.

4. "Disagreement is treason".

The perception that dissent makes someone a traitor to their country. This is in contrast to academic communities, which venerate disagreements as an ideal way to increase knowledge and refine ideas.

5. "Fear of difference".

Hostility towards anyone that is not part of the in-group, who are all perceived as intruders.

6. "Appeal to social frustration".

Appealing to politically humiliated demographics and those suffering from economic turmoil, particularly by placing blame on disempowered social groups.

7. "Obsession with a plot".

Unfounded beliefs that there are powerful enemies, often international ones, that need to be overcome.

8. "The enemy is both strong and weak".

Enemies are perceived as feeble and pathetic, but also somehow strong enough to pose a threat.

9. "Pacifism is trafficking with the enemy".

The perpetuation of the belief that life will and should be a struggle, meaning the goal of creating a world free of conflict and strife is rarely pursued.

10. "Contempt for the weak".

Those of the in-group are seen as superior to outsiders, and pursuing superiority over others is venerated. The vulnerable are condemned as pathetic, and are either ignored or persecuted.

11. "Everybody is educated to become a hero".

The idealization of self-sacrificial heroism, in place of reasonable political and economic reforms that can achieve superior results.

12. "Machismo and weaponry".

An obsession with machismo and the military, including a disdain for women and an intolerance of LGBT+ individuals.

13. "Selective populism".

The desires of the in-group are presented as universally desired. Democratic outcomes, like election results, are delegitimized if they don't align with the supposed will of "The People".

14. "Newspeak".

The ongoing utilization and promotion of Newspeak. A complete definition of Newspeak is provided in the "Essential Psychological Warfare Information" section of the appendix, but it can be summarized as an increasingly limited and simplified language designed to limit critical mindedness and facilitate indoctrination in order to prevent dissent of the established order.

Zionism

A nationalist ideology and movement with the purpose of creating, protecting, and developing, a Jewish national state in Palestine. Following the creation of this state, in the form of Israel, some supporters of Zionism also advocated for the continual expansion of Israel into Palestinian territory. Zionism is not inherently Jewish, as it is opposed by many Jews, and supported by other individuals and demographics, including many right-wing Christians. Consequently, criticism of Zionism does not inherently constitute a form of anti-Semitism.

Crimes against humanity

Certain crimes when committed as part of a large-scale systematic attack against a civilian population. These crimes include discrimination, segregation, displacement, deportation, murder, enslavement, imprisonment, abduction, torture, sexual abuse, forced pregnancy, enforced sterilization, and other inhumane acts that cause serious physical and mental harm. Unlike war crimes, crimes against humanity can be committed during both war and peace time.

Genocide

The intentional and systematic destruction of a people, in whole or in part. The more specific definition provided by the United Nations, which is the most widely recognized definition, defines genocide as any of five acts "committed with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial, or religious group". These five acts include:

1. Killing members of the group
2. Causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group.
3. Inflicting living conditions intended to destroy the group, in whole or in part.
4. Imposing measures intended to prevent births within the group.
5. Forcibly removing children of the group.

Raphael Lemkin, who coined the term genocide, and whose work informed the United Nations definition of genocide, extensively researched the nature of genocide. Lemkin clarified that genocide does not necessitate the immediate eradication of the group, and consequently can take place over years or decades. He also clarified that the effective goal of genocide is not simply mass murder, but to destroy the way of life of the members of the group, including eroding their institutions, economy, culture, language, freedoms, health, and dignity.

The ten stages of genocide

A tool for explaining how genocides begin and escalate.

1. Classification. Divide people into "us and them" groups, and most commonly along national, ethnical, racial, or religious lines.
2. Symbolization. Simplify the targeted group by associating or describing them with a negative signifier.
3. Discrimination. Treat the targeted group disrespectfully or inhumanely, and not just at the social level but also the political.
4. Dehumanization. Denigrate the targeted group as inferior, and even equate them to animals or diseases.
5. Organization. The persecutors begin creating or infiltrating organizations with the goal of increasing their power.
6. Polarization. Propaganda is utilized to further stigmatize the targeted group and justify their persecution.
7. Preparation. Plans and systems are created for systematically persecuting the targeted group.
8. Persecution. Targeted group are systematically persecuted, including by abolishing laws that protect their fundamental rights.
9. Extermination. Members of targeted group are mass murdered, either systematically or through stochastic terrorism.
10. Denial. The persecutors deny any wrongdoing, including by hiding evidence of any immoral actions and by blaming the victims.

Deplatforming

Punishing, or reducing the influence of, an individual or a group, by preventing them from using platforms, such as websites and speaking venues, that are commonly used to publically share information and ideas.

Opponents of deplatforming, and particularly free speech absolutists, argue that everyone has the right to voice their opinion on all platforms, and that only through exchanging perspectives in the "marketplace of ideas" can the best ideas receive widespread attention and rise to the top. Free speech absolutists commonly argue that "sunlight is the best disinfectant", which analogizes the

belief that fallacious ideas, including harmful ones, are more likely to be discredited when people are allowed to openly discuss them. Some opponents, and particularly left-wingers, also argue that deplatforming in modern times is becoming increasingly problematic because it can encourage content creators and their followers to migrate to increasingly large alternative platforms that have far fewer dissenting voices, resulting in harmful echo chambers.

Advocates of deplatforming argue that the practice is essential for protecting the rights of others. This is not only to ensure the majority of people can use platforms without being harassed, but also because dangerous ideas can and do propagate, and are capable of causing genuine and life-altering harm when acted upon. Advocates justify deplatforming by arguing that it is no different to the rationale behind creating laws that prevent people from publically inciting violence, or from shouting "fire" in crowded environments due to the potential risk of injuries and deaths caused by stampedes and crowd crushes. Some advocates argue that the necessity of deplatforming is proportional to the education and critical mindedness of a population, since societies that lack these are more likely to be vulnerable to the widespread adoption and advocacy of harmful beliefs, such as ultranationalism and climate change denialism. Advocates argue that the solution to unjustified instances of deplatforming is to ensure those in power are highly educated and critically minded, similar to how the solution to wrongful imprisonments is not to abolish justice systems but to ensure justice systems are run by those who are highly educated and critically minded.

The paradox of tolerance

The concept that a society that is tolerant without limits will inevitably be taken over and destroyed by intolerance, and therefore a society that wishes to remain generally tolerant must also be intolerant of intolerance. For example, a society that tolerates people openly expressing support for fascism will substantially increase the likelihood of fascists attaining power and subsequently eroding the rights of those they despise, or in other words those they are

unwilling to tolerate. The paradox of tolerance is a particularly apparent phenomenon on social media platforms. Once a platform takes a free speech absolutism approach to moderation, they tend to become dominated by the most reprehensible people in society, such as bullies, racists, and fascists. The extreme intolerance that such individuals express towards others consequently makes these platforms intolerable for everyone else.

Vibes warrior

Coined by the founders of The Xova Movement, a vibes warrior is a pejorative term to describe someone who professes to care about addressing societal problems and achieving justice, but who will accept, delay, or reject a solution primarily because of aesthetics or personal feelings, rather than because of its potential to address the problem. Consequently, a vibes warrior will accept inappropriate solutions because they superficially look or feel appropriate, and reject appropriate solutions because they are superficially unappealing, such as being unconventional, counterintuitive, or controversial in nature. A modern-day example of a vibes warrior is a person who calls for “thoughts and prayers” after mass shootings, and condemns necessary and immediate solutions as forms of “politicizing” or “weaponizing”, even though such delays irrefutably increase the likelihood of more adults and children being harmed and murdered. Another example is a person who refuses to vote for viable political candidates who align most closely with their values but who do not align perfectly, because doing so would go against their sense of personal integrity, even when they know that this decision will increase the likelihood of innocent adults and children suffering or dying due to increasing the likelihood of dangerous political candidates being elected to power.

The optics-attention paradox

Coined by the founders of The Xova Movement, the optics-attention paradox refers to the inverse relationship that exists between the ability of a non-famous person to draw attention to an issue, and

their ability to be appealing to a maximally large percentage of the population while doing so. The more appealing a course of action is, the less likely it is to gain and maintain attention. The more unappealing a course of action is, the more likely it is to gain and maintain attention, but the less likely the public is to sympathize with or support the cause in question. The optics-attention paradox has proven to be an ongoing challenge for activists. This is particularly true in predominantly liberal societies, where civility and social stability are irrationally and dangerously prioritized at the expense of meaningful action, and where justified radicals are condemned in the present and only applauded years or decades after they have been proven right, at which point liberals rewrite history by saying they always supported these radicals. This is not a recent phenomenon, as this sentiment was also expressed by Martin Luther King, Jr. almost 60 years ago when he said the “moderate, who is more devoted to ‘order’ than to justice; who prefers a negative peace which is the absence of tension to a positive peace which is the presence of justice; who constantly says: ‘I agree with you in the goal you seek, but I cannot agree with your methods of direct action’; who paternalistically believes he can set the timetable for another man’s freedom.” Individual instances of extreme injustice can cultivate appropriate attention and support, as demonstrated by the deaths of George Floyd and Mahsa Amini, but outside of such exceptions the optics-attention paradox remains a substantial obstacle to meaningful and desperately needed change. Deciding which approach to take can be referred to as the “optics-attention dilemma”.

Abraham Maslow’s hierarchy of needs

A theory in psychology that attempts to categorize human needs, and consequently help explain human behavior. According to the original theory, humans have 5 levels of needs, and people will rarely feel strongly motivated to direct time, energy, and attention, towards fulfilling higher level needs until most of their lower level needs have been satisfied. Maslow later added the 3 additional needs of “cognitive”, “aesthetic”, and “transcendence”.

- Level 8: Transcendence

The need to commit to activities, or reach states of mind, that reach beyond oneself. This can take the form of altruistic pursuits, or spiritual activities designed to achieve what are often called "higher levels of consciousness".

- Level 7: Self-actualization

The need to reach one's full potential, including exploring one's talents and creative capabilities.

- Level 6: Aesthetic

The need to seek out and enjoy things that are aesthetically appealing, such as music and physical beauty.

- Level 5: Cognitive

The need to pursue one's curiosities, to be intellectually challenged, and to acquire new knowledge and understanding.

- Level 4: Esteem

The need for respect, self-worth, confidence, strength, independence, and freedom.

- Level 3: Love and belonging

The need for friendship, family, intimacy, and a sense of connection to others.

- Level 2: Safety

The need for personal security, emotional security, and financial security.

- Level 1: Physiological

The need for health, nutritious food, clean water, fresh air, rest, sleep, shelter, warmth, clothes, and other physical necessities.

The lowest 4 needs are sometimes referred to as "deficiency needs", while the highest 4 needs are sometimes referred to as "growth needs".

Negative rights and positive rights

Negative rights are those that can be guaranteed without the actions of others. In other words, they can be guaranteed as long as others don't infringe upon these rights through their actions. Examples include the right to free speech and the right to clean air. Positive rights by contrast are those that cannot be guaranteed without the actions of others. Examples include the right to an education and the right to healthcare.

Despite the validity of these two concepts and their value in modern discourse, they can best be understood as theoretical constructs. This is because in the real-world, or at least in the modern world, practically all negative rights require the actions of others to ensure. For example, free speech cannot be guaranteed without organizations and systems designed to protect people from harassment and violence, and clean air cannot be guaranteed without organizations and systems designed to regulate businesses and industries. However, because negative rights can be guaranteed without the actions of others in theory, the distinction between these two concepts remains both valid and valuable.

Negative freedom and positive freedom (a.k.a. negative liberty and positive liberty)

Negative freedom refers to freedom from something negative, such as harassment, invasion of privacy, or external restraints on one's autonomy. Positive freedom refers to the freedom to pursue something positive, or more specifically possessing the necessary resources and opportunities to act upon one's wishes and potential.

Intersectionality

An analytical framework for understanding how aspects of a person's social and political identities can combine to create different types of discrimination and privilege. Intersectional analysis can not only help reveal how a person's different identities can create circumstances that interact, overlap, and exacerbate one another to produce

exaggerated outcomes, but also how the combination of such circumstances can produce unintuitive or unforeseeable consequences. For example, a black woman may suffer negative experiences due to the combination of her gender and race, but these may not be possible to fully understand simply by studying white women who experience sexism and black men who experience racism. However, intersectionality can generally only be used to understand trends that apply to particular demographics, and cannot inherently be applied to specific individuals within those demographics. For example, a particular black woman may experience little to no sexism or racism, or they may experience sexism or racism but also have great privileges, such as wealth and power, that help reduce certain negative consequences of this sexism or racism, or that allow them to be more privileged overall than people who experience no sexism or racism.

Social constructs

Ideas created by human cultures in order to organize and understand the world, but which only exist because of shared and accepted ways of thinking, rather than because they are objective representations of reality. An example of a highly detailed social construct is the categorization of species in the animal kingdom. An example of a less detailed social construct is the categorization of colors, since there is not a universal consensus on how colors should be delineated, and categorization can differ substantially both between cultures and within cultures. Social constructs can be highly beneficial, but also have the potential to be extremely irrational, and even extremely dangerous because of their ability to distort perceptions of reality. A well-known example of this would be race. Different people possess different physical characteristics, but the delineation and categorization of people into groups based on these physical characteristics is entirely arbitrary. In modern cultures most white skinned Westerners are considered part of the same racial group, even though they were sharply delineated along racial lines in the past. For example, Irish-Americans and Italian-Americans were not considered white in America until the 20th century. Today most

people born to one light skinned parent and one dark skinned parent are considered “black”, even though by the same logic they could just as reasonably be considered “white”. Delineating and categorizing people based on race is therefore an entirely arbitrary phenomenon. It is just as possible we could be living in a world where, throughout human history, countless people and cultures ardently defended delineating and categorizing humans based on eye color or hair color, and where the idea of delineating humans based on skin color and facial features seemed completely ridiculous to these people and cultures.

Punching up and punching down (comedy)

With regards to comedy, “punching up” means making a joke at the expense of those with more privilege, such as wealth, power, or status. Conversely, “punching down” means making a joke at the expense of those who are disadvantaged. Critics have argued even though there are exceptions, punching down often has far-reaching, unpredictable, and harmful consequences. More specifically, the continual ridiculing and dehumanizing of a disadvantaged target group can often exacerbate the ostracizing, disenfranchisement, and harassment, of members of that group.

Trigger warnings

A statement cautioning that content, such as text or video, might be disturbing or upsetting, particularly to specific individuals. Such content usually involves subjects such as child abuse, sexual abuse, bullying, violence, self-harm, physical illnesses, psychological disorders, and animal abuse. Trigger warnings are designed to provide an additional layer of control to those susceptible to negative reactions to such content, particularly those who have suffered personal trauma. Such reactions can involve severe physical, mental, and emotional reactions beyond the control of the sufferer, and can include sweating, heart palpitations, nausea, headaches, chest pains, hyperventilating, crying, hypervigilance, vivid flashbacks, memory gaps, concentration problems, insomnia, nightmares, intrusive

thoughts, irritability, anger, apathy, anxiety, depression, and suicidal thoughts, all of which are also common symptoms of post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD). Trigger warnings have existed for decades, and are acknowledged by psychologists as highly valuable, particularly for those suffering from PTSD. To put this into context, about three quarters of people experience trauma at some point during their life, and about 10% of people develop PTSD. Even though exposure to triggers is a good way of processing trauma, this has to be done under controlled conditions, and particularly under the guidance or control of a trained professional, such as a therapist or counselor.

Safe spaces

A place in which a person, or category of people, can feel confident that they will not be exposed to emotionally distressing experiences. Safe spaces are intended to be places free of criticism and conflict, and have proven to be particularly valuable in places where criticism and conflict are regular occurrences, such as college campuses. This is because they can provide respite from what are often perpetually mentally and emotionally exhausting environments. Safe spaces are also particularly valuable for those who are more likely to experience harassment, such as certain minority groups. Safe spaces are not just physical locations but can also be digital spaces, such as online forums and chat rooms. Despite being criticized and ridiculed by many conservatives, safe spaces do not indicate or cultivate oversensitivity in those who use them, and they do not prevent people from being challenged by ideas or other people, particularly since the people who use safe spaces usually spend the majority of their time in mentally and emotionally challenging environments.

Emotional intelligence, empathy, and compassion

- Emotional intelligence is a skill that includes the ability to identify and understand emotions in oneself and others, the ability to control one's emotions, and the ability to be emotionally sensitive, or more specifically the ability to take into account the emotions of others

when pursuing courses of action, particularly when communicating and interacting with them.

- Empathy is the natural ability to instinctively feel and emotionally comprehend what others are feeling.
- Compassion is a sympathetic and often deep concern for the suffering of others.

Although empathy and compassion commonly occur together, all 3 traits are distinct from one another, meaning it is possible for a person to have any combination of these 3 traits, or to have none at all. These traits often complement one another when they occur simultaneously, although unlike emotional intelligence and empathy, compassion is required for a person to have a genuinely caring intent.

Dark triad

In psychology, the dark triad refers to the 3 personality traits of narcissism, Machiavellianism, and psychopathy. The concept of the dark triad was created due to the fact that these traits commonly occur together in individuals. It has been hypothesized that this occurs because they are likely all manifestations of a singular underlying cause that is not yet known.

- Narcissists are characterized by their selfishness, self-entitlement, self-importance, enviousness, boastfulness, arrogance, superiority complex, desire for excessive admiration, and for being impressed by their own “brilliance”. Narcissists tend to be incapable of self-reflection, will rarely hold themselves accountable for their behavior, and will usually play the victim and gaslight people when confronted. Narcissists who possess what could be described as a “malignant” form of narcissism can become physically or emotionally abusive if they do not receive the special adoration and treatment they think they deserve.

- Machiavellians are characterized by their manipulative and deceitful nature, and their willingness to exploit others for personal gain.
- Psychopaths are characterized by their cynicism, callousness, ruthlessness, impulsivity, and their lack of conscience, empathy, compassion, and remorse. Psychopathy is different to sociopathy, even though they share similarities. Psychopathy is not a diagnosis but a combination of personality traits and behaviors, whereas sociopathy most commonly refers to someone with an antisocial personality disorder, which is a diagnosable condition. Psychopaths are likely born with their disorder, whereas sociopaths likely develop theirs due to a combination of biological and environmental factors. Psychopaths have no conscience, empathy, or compassion, whereas sociopaths have a very weak conscience and a very small amount of empathy and compassion, although they usually use their empathy to help them manipulate others. Psychopaths experience little to no emotions, including anxiety and anger, whereas sociopaths can experience very strong emotions. Psychopaths are calculating and organized, and consequently better adept at living normal lives, whereas sociopaths are more erratic and hotheaded, unless they are a "high-functioning sociopath", in which case they are likely to be very adept at living a normal life due to their ability to come across as calm, friendly, charming, caring, gentle, and even humble.

A person can have a dark triad personality even if these personality traits and behaviors are subclinical, meaning they are not visible or severe enough to be detectable and diagnosable by traditional clinical methods. Regardless of severity, any person with a dark triad personality will be capable of incredible callousness and maliciousness, and will say and do anything to get what they desire. However, psychopaths and high-functioning sociopaths are often extremely charismatic and very adept at hiding their true nature, meaning they can be extremely difficult to identify, even to people who have known them for years or decades.

The founders of The Xova Movement have coined the term “sociopathic dark triad” to refer to dark triads who are sociopathic rather than psychopathic.

Dark tetrad

The 3 dark triad personality traits with the additional 4th trait of sadism, which refers to unreasonable levels of pleasure gained from the suffering of other sentient beings, particularly when this suffering is inflicted rather than merely observed.

Sadism is similar to Schadenfreude but the two are definitively different. Sadism is a personality trait that involves gaining pleasure from the severe suffering of others, and most commonly suffering that is intentionally and personally inflicted. Schadenfreude by contrast is a mental and emotional state that involves gaining pleasure from the suffering of those who deserve it, such as a corrupt politician being sent to prison, or gaining pleasure from mild forms of suffering that the victim is not averse to, such as beating a friend at a game. Sadism can therefore partially be distinguished by the victim experiencing physical, mental, or emotional suffering that they neither deserve nor enjoy.

Narcissism, Machiavellianism, and psychopathy, often correlate with sadism, but despite the common misconception none of these traits inherently include or require sadism. Dark triads may be willing to manipulate others for personal gain, and they may lack a conscience, empathy, compassion, and remorse, but they don't gain unreasonable levels of pleasure from the suffering of others, even if they gain pleasure from instances of success that incidentally involve the suffering of others.

The founders of The Xova Movement have coined the term “sociopathic dark tetrad” to refer to dark tetrads who are sociopathic rather than psychopathic.

Toxic masculinity and toxic femininity

Harmful attitudes, behaviors, and traits, that are traditionally thought of as masculine or feminine in nature. It is commonly argued that both forms of toxicity are cultivated and encouraged via cultural norms, rules, and pressures.

- Toxic masculinity can include homophobia, misogyny, repressing one's emotions, refraining from crying, not being emotionally supportive, never asking for help, and resorting to physically intimidating, aggressive, and abusive behaviors. Toxic masculinity does not mean all such examples are inappropriate at all times, since obviously some are appropriate in specific situations, such as engaging in aggressive behavior in order to defend oneself or others. Nor does toxic masculinity mean all masculine attitudes, behaviors, and traits, are inherently toxic. Toxic masculinity is argued to be partially responsible for the high rates of suicide among men.

- Toxic femininity can include an unhealthy obsession with popularity, being overly critical of others, belittling others behind their back, sabotaging and back-stabbing others, sarcastically mocking others directly, talking over other women, overreacting to minor grievances, and engaging in passive-aggressive behaviors, such as inappropriately giving someone the silent treatment. Unlike toxic masculinity, toxic femininity is often described as being more subtle, and predominantly directed towards other women. It is also less regularly acknowledged and discussed in mainstream discourse.

The Bechdel test

A method for measuring the representation of women within fiction. The test asks 3 questions.

1. Are there at least two female characters?
2. Do they speak to each other?
3. Do they speak to each other about something other than a man?

The reverse Bechdel test asks the same 3 questions but applied to male characters.

1. Are there at least two male characters?
2. Do they speak to each other?
3. Do they speak to each other about something other than a woman?

The overwhelming majority of fiction during the past century does not pass the Bechdel test, whereas almost all of this fiction does pass the reverse Bechdel test. The purpose of these tests is to reveal sexism and gender bias within fiction, rather than within any individual work of fiction. It is possible for a work of fiction to pass the Bechdel test and yet still be sexist or have an inappropriate gender bias. It is also possible for a work of fiction to fail the Bechdel test and yet clearly not be sexist nor have an inappropriate gender bias. The Bechdel test is also not designed to assess content, themes, character depth, writing quality, etc., which are also important considerations when exploring proportional representation in fiction. The Bechdel test can also not be used to determine whether the gender bias of a creator over the course of their career is inherently sexist or inappropriate. For example, it is not inherently unreasonable or inappropriate for a writer of historical fiction to write war stories, and particularly semi-autobiographical war stories, with predominantly or entirely male characters if the real-life experiences they are inspired by predominantly or only involved men.

The Bechdel test has also been used in modern discourse to draw attention to the importance of proportional representation in fiction for all demographics, and particularly marginalized groups. This is not to say that proportional representation must be achieved in every piece of fiction, particularly if it causes problems for the internal logic of a story. Instead it means proportional representation should exist within fiction as a whole, including within every medium, such as books, films, TV shows, and computer games.

LGBT+

An umbrella term and acronym that stands for lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender, while the plus sign denotes all other individuals who are not cisgender heterosexual. This entry will explore some of the most prominent terms related to this acronym and the community it represents.

The term "queer" refers to individuals, or the community of individuals, who are not cisgender heterosexual. For this reason the LGBT+ community is sometimes referred to as the queer community.

The term "biological sex" refers to the main categories that humans and most other biological life forms can be divided into based on chromosomes, hormones, and genitalia. The two main categories of biological sex are "male" and "female", although the dividing line between these categories is not always easily determinable. For example, many people designated female do not have XX chromosomes, and many people designated male do not have XY chromosomes. Another example is "intersex" individuals, who are born with a combination of male and female sex organs, or have sex organs that are indeterminable. The term "hermaphrodite" was often used in the past to describe intersex individuals, but this term is now considered antiquated and offensive when applied to humans.

The term "gender" refers to a group of psychological, behavioral, and cultural traits, which can broadly be categorized into "gender identity", "gender expression", and "gender role". Though relatively distinct, these different aspects of gender strongly influence one another. Gender is influenced by both biological factors, such as hormones, anatomy, and brain structure, and environmental factors, such as personal interactions and societal expectations. Gender generally correlates with biological sex, but this is not true for all individuals. While the terms "sex" and "gender" are commonly used interchangeably when discussed informally, contemporary biologists and psychologists, as well as an increasing number of legal systems and government bodies, recognize them as distinct.

The term "gender identity" refers to a person's deeply held sense of which biological sex, gender expression, and gender role, they feel most comfortable with and wish to embrace. Gender identity is partially an emergent property of a person's biology and partially determined by environmental factors. A person who feels their gender identity does not comfortably conform to a male or female gender identity is called "non-binary". A person who feels their gender identity changes over time is called "genderfluid".

A person who feels comfortable living inside a body with the sexual characteristics that their body possesses is called "cisgender". A person who feels uncomfortable living inside a body with the sexual characteristics that their body possesses is called "transgender". Some transgender individuals experience "gender dysphoria", which is a form of mental and emotional distress caused by the dissociation between mind and body. This is similar to how some overweight people wish they were not overweight and experience mental and emotional distress because of this, while others wish they were not overweight but do not experience any mental and emotional distress because of this.

Despite a common right-wing talking point, transgenderism is also not a modern phenomenon. Archeological evidence strongly suggests transgender adults and children existed, and were recognized by society, at least as far back as 3000 BCE, or 5000 years ago. Evidence also strongly suggests that transgenderism was first inscribed into language as far back as 1000 BCE, or 3000 years ago. Additionally, the recent rise in individuals identifying as transgender can also likely be explained by improvements in education and the increasing acceptance of transgender individuals in society, similar to how the number of people in the past who identified as left-handed significantly increased then plateaued as left-handedness gradually lost its irrational stigma. This is also the main reason why transgenderism has been on the rise among adolescents, as opposed to "rapid-onset gender dysphoria", which is the hypothesis that some adolescents identify as transgender due to social pressure and social contagion. This hypothesis is not recognized as a valid diagnosis by

any major psychological association, due to a current lack of scientific evidence and a growing body of scientific evidence to the contrary. Consequently, adolescents transitioning gender due to social pressure and social contagion is very likely extremely rare.

Despite another common right-wing misconception, transgender individuals do not believe or claim that their biological sex is not real. Instead they merely state that their gender identity does not align with their biological sex. And despite another common right-wing misconception, transgenderism is not a phenomenon which is “imaginary” or “delusional” in nature. Neuroscience research has demonstrated that there are quite significant and recognizable differences between most male and female brains, and that these differences can influence numerous traits, including those related to physical senses, emotions, and cognition. Neuroscience research has also demonstrated that transgender individuals possess brains that are similar to, or indistinguishable from, those of the biological sex they say they align with. This is true even before hormone therapy is used, and is also very likely true from birth. Consequently, telling a transgender individual they are confused or in denial, due to the reality of their body, is equivalent to telling a depressed person that they can’t be depressed due to the fact that they smile and laugh.

Despite another common right-wing misconception, detransitioning is also uncommon. This is not surprising considering research shows that transitioning increases wellbeing and lowers the risk of suicide in most cases. When detransitioning does occur, this is most commonly due to a lack of social acceptance and support, particularly among loved ones. Those who detransition after receiving surgery represent an even smaller percentage, which is not surprising considering the hurdles that have to be overcome to receive trans healthcare in most countries, including excessively long waiting lists. In fact, those who regret receiving surgery represent a lower percentage than those who regret receiving most other types of surgeries, including those related to cosmetics. Obviously the methods used for diagnosing transgenderism are capable of being refined, but the substantially

greater problems right now are a lack of healthcare funding and a lack of widespread social acceptance of transgender individuals.

The term “gender expression” refers to the way a person presents their gender to the world. Gender expression can be understood as the external manifestation of one’s internal gender identity. Gender expression is often expressed via one’s clothing, hairstyle, makeup, voice, body language, interests, and the regulation and expression of one’s emotions. Some of these forms of expression are done instinctively, while others are done consciously and intentionally, either for oneself or for others. When the terms “masculine” and “feminine” are used, it is nearly always gender expression that is being described. A person’s chosen form of gender expression may also not conform to conventional stereotypes or expectations of their assumed or actual biological sex or gender identity. A common example is a “tomboy”, whose gender identity is female but whose gender expression is more masculine in nature.

The term “gender role”, more commonly referred to as “gender norm”, refers to the cultural expectations for how people of different genders are expected to behave and be treated. Traditionally most cultures have only held expectations for cisgender men and women, and these expectations have often been rigidly defined and narrow in scope. Consequently, people living in less progressive cultures have often felt compelled to conform to these expectations for fear of negative repercussions, such as being ostracized, reprimanded, or abused. This is despite the fact that gender roles vary substantially across cultures, and have changed significantly across history. For example, in modern Western cultures there is the expectation that parents should dress boys in blue and girls in pink, even though in the early 20th century the opposite was true. However, these gender norms don’t just include expectations regarding gender expression, but also expectations outside of this, such as those related to relationships and work. A common example is the traditional expectation that it is the mother’s responsibility to raise children, even though many cultures in the past considered raising children a man’s job, or the responsibility of the whole community. Another

example is computer programming, which today is predominantly perceived as a male occupation, even though it was a field heavily occupied by women only a few decades ago.

The term “gender non-conforming” refers to people who do not follow gender stereotypes. More specifically, it refers to people whose gender expression or gender role does not conform to the masculine or feminine stereotypes or expectations associated with their assumed or actual biological sex or gender identity.

The term “sexual orientation” most commonly refers to the biological sex, and to a lesser extent the gender, that people are most sexually attracted to. The most well-known sexual orientations are straight, lesbian, and gay, although there are others. The term “polysexual” refers to individuals who are attracted to two or more, but not all, biological sexes, including cisgender men, cisgender women, transgender men, transgender women, and intersex individuals. Although different definitions exist, to maximize utility the term “bisexual” is most commonly used to refer to polysexual individuals who are attracted to both men and women. The term “pansexual” refers to people who are attracted to individuals regardless of their biological sex or gender. The term “demisexual” refers to individuals who do not experience sexual attraction to others unless they have first formed a strong emotional bond with them. The term “asexual”, or just simply “ace”, refers to individuals who experience little to no sexual attraction to others, or who experience little to no interest in sexual activities. The term “aromantic”, or just simply “aro”, refers to individuals who experience little to no romantic attraction to others, or who experience little to no interest in romantic activities. The term “aroace” refers to individuals who are both aromantic and asexual.

Speciesism

The belief that humans are superior to all other sentient life forms to such an extent that humans are morally justified in using and abusing them. This belief is also expressed with terms like “human supremacy” and “human exceptionalism”.

Pescetarianism, vegetarianism, and veganism

Three philosophies and lifestyle choices related to the treatment and use of animals.

- Pescetarianism is the practice of abstaining from consuming meat, except sentient marine life.
- Vegetarianism is the practice of abstaining from consuming meat, including sentient marine life.
- Veganism is the practice of abstaining from buying or using animal products. More broadly speaking, veganism can be understood as a lifestyle that aims to personally avoid, or socially end, all forms of animal exploitation. Veganism includes abstaining from meat, including sentient marine life, as well as all other foods derived from animals, such as milk and eggs. Veganism also includes abstaining from purchasing other products derived from animals, such as those which contain fur and leather, and products that have been tested on animals, such as certain cosmetic products. There is no universal consensus on whether veganism also applies to insects, including insect produce like honey and silk. Veganism is also called "ethical veganism", distinguishing it from "dietary veganism", which involves abstaining from all foods derived from animals but does not involve abstaining from all other animal products, such as non-vegan clothes and hygiene products.

Sentientism (a.k.a. sentiocentrism)

The belief that sentience should be the foundation of any moral system. In other words, all conscious beings capable of experiencing suffering and pleasure must be at the center of all moral considerations. Sentientism consequently holds speciesism to be a morally unjustifiable position. Those who believe in sentientism are called sentientists.

APPENDIX

This appendix is dedicated to providing an overview of essential knowledge required for developing good critical thinking skills. This appendix is not required reading for understanding the main body of this manifesto, but has been included because of the importance of critical thinking in all areas of life, including accurately interpreting the contents of this manifesto. Although some of the information in this appendix may be confusing, please try to persevere, and use this as an opportunity to appreciate how difficult critical thinking truly is.

DEFINITIONS

Critical thinking

Critical thinking is the ability to think objectively and analyze information rationally, so that one can make appropriate connections and reach reasonable conclusions. In terms of its application, critical thinking is an intellectually disciplined and persistent process of actively and skillfully questioning, observing, clarifying, interpreting, conceptualizing, evaluating, organizing, and synthesizing, a wide range of information, including evidence, statements, arguments, and ideas, in order to reach the most objective conclusions possible. Critical thinking can be hindered by cognitive deficiencies, such as intuition, assumptions, deeply held beliefs, a deficiency of critical thinking knowledge, and a lack of practice in utilizing one's critical thinking skills. Critical thinking can also be hindered by personality deficiencies, such as selfishness, arrogance, and egotism.

Logical thinking

Logical thinking is the ability to effectively utilize logic, which is the science of using strict principles to determine the validity of arguments. Logic is so essential to the critical thinking process that it will be described in detail further along in this appendix.

Analytical thinking and synthetic thinking

Analytical thinking is the ability to analyze factual information and tangible ideas, compared to critical thinking which also includes abstract ideas, argumentation, and recognizing personal biases. Analytical thinking is the process of examining and breaking down information into its constituent parts in a systematic manner. For this reason analytical thinking involves following a linear process, similar to a scientific experiment. Critical thinking by contrast is far more holistic, fluid, and cyclical, and consequently requires alternating between different forms of analysis as new information is discovered and considered in real-time.

Analytical thinking is the opposite of synthetic thinking. Whereas analytical thinking involves breaking information down into its constituent parts, synthetic thinking involves combining information into a fully integrated and complete whole. In other words, it involves understanding how different pieces of information connect with one another, and how all of this information fits into broader contexts.

First principle thinking

First principle thinking is the ability to examine and break down propositions and ideas into their first principles. A "first principle" is a foundational proposition or idea that cannot be deduced from, or broken down into, any other proposition or idea. Breaking things down into their first principles can be

invaluable for solving problems and defending positions. Regarding problem-solving, first principle thinking is not a form of problem-solving in and of itself, but can be an invaluable first step. By breaking a problem down into its simplest constituent parts, or “first principles”, prior assumptions can be disregarded, providing the opportunity for novel solutions to be discovered. First principle thinking is therefore usually essential for “thinking outside of the box”. Regarding defending positions, first principle thinking can be advantageous in most circumstances, but is particularly essential for justifying contentious positions, such as human rights, moral standards, and government policies. First principle thinking contrasts starkly with how people more commonly justify their positions, which predominantly involves appealing to the status quo, such as citing traditions, laws, and constitutions, or repeating unquestioned and incorrect arguments.

Second-order thinking

Second-order thinking is the ability to assess the implications of a decision by considering all secondary consequences, or in other words the consequences of a consequence. These secondary consequences can include emergent properties and feedback loops. This is distinct from first-order thinking, which focuses on solving an immediate problem, but ignores all other consequences of potential solutions. The term “second-order consequences” refers to all consequences other than the intended consequences of a decision.

Second-order thinking is not to be confused with second-order logic, which is a principle in mathematics. Nor is it to be confused with higher-order thinking, which is a concept used in education reform.

Divergent thinking and convergent thinking

Critical thinking is different from divergent thinking and convergent thinking. Divergent thinking is the ability to think creatively in a way that is spontaneous, free-flowing, and non-linear in nature, and which involves brainstorming, exploring, building upon, and drawing connections between, a wide range of ideas and solutions, including those which initially appear illogical or unviable. Consequently, divergent thinking often involves thinking outside of the box. Divergent thinking correlates most strongly with individuals who are intelligent, educated, open-minded, curious, imaginative, creative, progressively minded, and daring. Divergent thinking contrasts with convergent thinking, which involves determining or striving to discover the ideal solution to a problem. Convergent thinking can be utilized on its own, such as when answering questions on a standardized school exam, but divergent thinking requires convergent thinking in order for effective solutions to be reached. Divergent and convergent thinking can be considered two essential parts of creative problem-solving, which is why they are deemed invaluable in many tasks and jobs that require creativity. Placed in contrast with one another, critical thinking can be understood as the ability to view the world objectively, while divergent and convergent thinking taken together can be understood as the ability to solve problems effectively. In the real-world, critical thinking and divergent and convergent thinking are often both required in situations where either is primarily required.

Lateral thinking

Lateral thinking is a form of divergent and convergent thinking that is specifically required to solve problems that cannot be solved with conventional solutions. The following are examples of questions that require lateral thinking to solve. The solutions will be given afterwards.

1. A person falls out of a thirty story building and lands on concrete, but they survive. How is this possible?

2. An Australian woman was born in 1954, but only celebrated her 18th birthday recently. How is this possible?

3. A man rode into town on Monday. He stayed for three nights and then left on Tuesday. How is this possible?

4. There are a dozen eggs in a carton. Twelve people each take a single egg, but there is one egg left in the carton. How is this possible?

- The answer to the first question is that the person fell out of a first-story window.

- The answer to the second question is that the woman was born on leap day February 29th.

- The answer to the third question is that the man rode into town on a horse called Monday.

- The answer to the fourth question is that the last person took the carton with the last egg still inside.

There are other possible answers to these questions, but these are the traditional answers.

Intelligence

Critical thinking is different from intelligence. Intelligence, or what can more accurately be called “general intelligence”, refers to one’s capacity to learn and apply knowledge and skills, particularly when dealing with new and challenging problems. Common signs of intelligence include the ability to learn from experience, the ability to perceive things objectively, the ability to understand abstract concepts, the ability to adapt to new situations, the ability to think creatively, and the ability to achieve one’s goals. However, even though a person’s intelligence is generally something they are born with, it can also increase and decrease to a limited extent due to

other factors, such as diet, exercise, stress, sleep, etc. and whether a person regularly challenges themselves to learn new knowledge and skills. Consequently, it is also possible for most people to increase their intelligence to a certain extent if they pursue this intentionally, and if they have the time, energy, money, etc. necessary to do so.

Despite the common misconception, general intelligence cannot easily be measured. First, it is difficult to create tests which holistically and accurately measure general intelligence, rather than very narrow or situation-specific aspects of intelligence. To make matters worse, it is also very difficult to create tests without relying upon culturally specific information and ideas rather than those which are universal to all cultures. Second, numerous variables other than intelligence can affect test scores. For example, people can improve their intelligence tests scores with practice, and the anxiety or calmness people experience in test situations, as opposed to real-world situations, can also affect a person's score. Consequently it is possible for a person to score highly on an intelligence test but also demonstrate a lack of general intelligence in real-world situations.

Critical thinking by contrast refers to a specific skill set that enables a person to analyze and understand the world more objectively, and is generally something that is learned. It is consequently possible, and common, for a person to be born naturally intelligent, but have poor critical thinking skills, or to be born with average or below average intelligence, but learn to become highly critically minded through study and practice. However, despite the distinction between intelligence and critical thinking, it is not unreasonable for the word intelligence to be used in informal discourse as a shorthand way of describing a more holistic intelligence that includes traits like critical thinking and divergent and convergent thinking, since this broader yet less accurate definition still serves great utility.

Knowledge

Critical thinking and intelligence are both different from knowledge. Being knowledgeable in and of itself does not make one critically

mindful or intelligent, even though the ability to learn and remember knowledge is essential for developing robust critical thinking skills, and is an essential component of intelligence. It is consequently possible for a person to be knowledgeable in a wide range of subjects, or be highly knowledgeable in a specific subject, and yet still have extremely poor critical thinking skills and low or average intelligence. Being knowledgeable, or appearing to be so, is one of the main reasons why pseudo-intellectuals are able to successfully maintain the façade of being critically minded and intelligent.

Wisdom

Critical thinking and intelligence are both different from wisdom, which is the knowledge and perspective required for having a grounded and nuanced understanding of the world and for making good judgments, particularly so that one can effectively deal with common life challenges. Wisdom is most commonly acquired through experience, although experience is rarely a necessity. An expression that succinctly explains wisdom is "Knowledge is knowing that tomatoes are a fruit. Wisdom is knowing that tomatoes do not belong in fruit salads." Another useful expression is "Ignorance is believing that Frankenstein was the monster. Knowledge is knowing that Frankenstein was the inventor, not the monster. Wisdom is recognizing that Frankenstein was the real monster."

Metacognition

Critical thinking and intelligence are both different from metacognition, which is an awareness of one's thought processes, learning styles, and current cognitive limitations. Metacognition is an intellectual form of self-awareness that is necessary for maximizing one's ability to avoid biases, comprehend ideas, retain knowledge, develop skills, solve problems, and communicate effectively. Though best pursued intentionally, metacognition can also arise naturally, such as when exploring different ways to learn a particular skill and subsequently discovering one's own learning style in the process.

LOGIC

Logic is the science of using strict principles to determine the validity of arguments. Logic is divided into formal logic and informal logic, although there is no consensus on how these two should be defined and distinguished. One of the most common distinctions is that formal logic refers to deductive reasoning, while informal logic refers to inductive reasoning and abductive reasoning. Before exploring these 3 types of reasoning, it is necessary to define “categorical propositions” and “syllogisms”.

Categorical propositions

In logic, a proposition is a statement that is either true or false. A categorical proposition is a proposition that asserts or denies that members of a category belong to a broader category. For example, the categorical proposition “all men are mortal” asserts that all members of the category “men” are included within the category “mortal”. Most forms of reasoning can be broken down into categorical propositions. Despite the term categorical propositions, the word “class” is often used instead of the word “category” when discussing logic.

A categorical proposition can fall into 1 of 4 categories depending on its quantity and quality. The quantity can either be universal, meaning it applies to every member of a category, or it can be particular, meaning it only applies to particular members of that category. The quality can either be affirmative, which describes the existence of something, or negative, which describes the absence of something. The 4 types are referred to as A, E, I and O.

- Proposition type: A

Quantity and Quality: Universal and Affirmative.

Form: All S are P.

Example: "All men are mortal."

- Proposition type: E

Quantity and Quality: Universal and Negative.

Form: No S are P.

Example: "No men are immortal."

- Proposition type: I

Quantity and Quality: Particular and Affirmative.

Form: Some S are P.

Example: "Some men are blond."

- Proposition type: O

Quantity and Quality: Particular and Negative.

Form: Some S are not P.

Example: "Some men are not blond."

A helpful way of conceptualizing categorical propositions is by visualizing them using Venn diagrams. Venn diagrams contain two or more circles which represent members and categories. Members that belong exclusively to one category would be visualized as a small circle sitting entirely inside a larger circle, with the small circle representing the members, and the large circle representing the category. Members that do not belong to a category would be visualized as a small circle sitting completely outside of a large circle. Members that belong partially to a category would be visualized as a small circle partially overlapping a large circle.

For example, the category "mammal" and the member "cats" would be visualized using a Venn diagram with the small "cats" circle sitting entirely inside the larger "mammal" circle. This is because all cats are mammals, but not all mammals are cats. If all mammals were cats, and all cats were mammals, then the two circles would overlap perfectly with one another. Conversely, the category "black" and the member "cats" would be visualized with the "cats" circle and the "black" circle only partially overlapping each other. This is because

while some cats are black, many cats are not black, and many things that are black are not cats.

Venn diagrams are a helpful way of understanding how different pieces of information relate to each other, and thus can quickly be used to disprove nonsensical ideas. For example, many anti-Semites believe Jewish people control the world, and that they desire this power in order to subjugate others. However, a massive percentage of people with power are not Jewish, and the overwhelming majority of Jewish people do not have power. Similarly, a massive percentage of people who are evil are not Jewish, and the overwhelming majority of Jewish people are not evil. If anti-Semites are against people who want or hold power for evil purposes, then they should simply be against people who want or hold power for evil purposes. The fact that anti-Semitism is grossly irrational aligns perfectly with the past 60 years of research which has revealed that the more racist a person is, the less educated, intelligent, and critically minded, they are likely to be. Venn diagrams can therefore be a useful tool for proving the irrationality of nonsensical ideas, such as racist ideas.

Syllogism

In logic, a syllogism is an argument that has 2 propositions that are assumed or asserted to be true, and from which a conclusion is derived. These propositions can also be called premises. If a syllogism contains 3 or more propositions it is called a polysyllogism. There are 3 common types of syllogism.

- A conditional syllogism asserts that if A is true, then B must also be true.

Example:

Premise 1: Cars cannot move on their own without a power source.

Premise 2: This car has no power source.

Conclusion: This car cannot move on its own.

- A categorical syllogism asserts that if A is part of B, and B is part of C, then A must be part of C.

Example:

Premise 1: Laura is a human.

Premise 2: All humans are mortal.

Conclusion: Laura is mortal.

In a categorical syllogism there are 3 terms. In the example above, the 3 terms are "human", "mortal", and "Laura". Each term will appear twice in a categorical syllogism. The term that appears once in each premise, but not in the conclusion, is called the "middle" term. In the example above the middle term is "human". This is called the middle term because it is the term that sits in-between and connects the other two terms. The other two terms are called the major term and the minor term, and both always appear in the conclusion. Simplified, the major term can be understood as the category, and the minor term can be understood as the member or members that belong to this category. In the example above, the major term is "mortal" and the minor term is "Laura". Additionally, the premise that contains the major term is called the "major premise", and the premise that contains the minor term is called the "minor premise".

The term categorical syllogism is regularly used interchangeably with the term "syllogism". When the term syllogism is used informally, it is most commonly used to describe a categorical syllogism.

- A disjunctive syllogism asserts that either A is true or B is true.

Example:

Premise 1: He will choose soup or he will choose salad.

Premise 2: He will not choose soup.

Conclusion: Therefore he will choose salad.

In a disjunctive syllogism, one of the premises will be a disjunctive proposition, which is the statement which describes the possibilities of the syllogism, and which affirms that only one of these possibilities is true. In this example, the disjunctive proposition is "He will choose soup or he will choose salad".

Now that categorical propositions and syllogisms have been explained, it is now possible to describe deductive, inductive, and abductive reasoning.

Deductive reasoning

The process of reasoning from one or more propositions to reach an irrefutable conclusion. In deductive reasoning the conclusion is always irrefutably correct or irrefutably incorrect, and cannot be somewhere in between. Deductive reasoning does not rely upon any form of abstraction or “thinking outside the box”. Instead the conclusion is already contained entirely within the premises. One of the most common forms of deductive reasoning is the syllogism.

A deductive reasoning argument can fall into 1 of 3 categories depending on its legitimacy.

- Invalid and Unsound
- Valid and Unsound
- Valid and Sound

An argument is valid if the conclusion follows logically from the premises. An argument is sound if it is valid and the premises are also true. In other words, a sound argument is always correct. Therefore an argument can be valid but unsound if the conclusion follows from the premises but at least one of the premises is untrue. If the premises of an argument are true but the conclusion does not follow from the premises, the argument is both invalid and unsound.

- Invalid and Unsound example:

Premise 1: All dogs have 4 legs.

Premise 2: Tim’s cat has 4 legs.

Conclusion: Therefore Tim’s cat is also a dog.

This argument is invalid because the conclusion does not follow from the premises, and because it is invalid it is also unsound. However,

even if this argument reached a valid conclusion it would still be unsound because one of the premises is untrue. More specifically, the proposition “all dogs have 4 legs” is untrue.

Example 2:

Premise 1: All dogs are mammals.

Premise 2: All cats are mammals.

Conclusion: All cats are dogs.

This argument is also invalid because the conclusion does not follow from the premises, even though in this case both premises are true. Because the argument is invalid, it is therefore also unsound.

- Valid and Unsound example:

Premise 1: All dogs have 4 legs.

Premise 2: Tim owns a dog.

Conclusion: Therefore Tim’s dog has 4 legs.

This argument is valid because the conclusion follows from the premises. If all dogs have four legs, and Tim owns a dog, then Tim’s dog must have 4 legs. However, the argument is unsound because it is untrue that “All dogs have 4 legs”. Furthermore, even if Tim’s dog had 4 legs, and thus the conclusion was correct, the argument would still be unsound because one of the premises is untrue. In other words, the conclusion would be correct, but for the wrong reasons.

- Valid and Sound example:

Premise 1: All dogs are mammals.

Premise 2: Tim owns a dog.

Conclusion: Therefore Tim’s dog is a mammal.

This argument is valid because the conclusion follows from the premises, and it is sound because it is valid and the premises are true.

Inductive reasoning

The process of determining the probability of a conclusion being correct using incomplete information. Unlike deductive reasoning, where the conclusion is always definitively correct or incorrect, or in other words black or white, in inductive reasoning the conclusion can be seen to exist somewhere along a gray-scale spectrum, and one where 100% certainty can never be guaranteed.

Inductive arguments cannot be evaluated based on their validity and soundness. Instead inductive arguments are evaluated by their strength and cogency. Consequently inductive arguments fall into 1 of 3 categories.

- Weak and Uncogent
- Strong and Uncogent
- Strong and Cogent

An argument is strong if the conclusion is likely correct, whether or not the premises are true. An argument is cogent if it is strong and the premises are true.

- Weak and Uncogent example:
 Premise 1: Most cats are not ginger.
 Premise 2: Tim has a cat.
 Conclusion: Tim's cat is likely ginger.

This argument is weak, because if most cats are not ginger, then it is unlikely Tim's cat is ginger if nothing else is known about it. This argument is also uncogent by virtue of being weak.

- Strong and Uncogent example:
 Premise 1: Most cats are purple.
 Premise 2: Tim has a cat.
 Conclusion: Tim's cat is likely purple.

This argument is strong because the conclusion follows from the premises. If most cats are purple, then it is likely Tim's cat is purple if nothing else is known about it. However, the argument is uncogent because it is untrue that "Most cats are purple". Furthermore, even if Tim's cat was purple, and thus the conclusion was correct, this argument would still be uncogent because one of the premises is untrue. In other words, the conclusion would be correct, but for the wrong reasons.

- Strong and Cogent example:

Premise 1: Most cats have 4 legs.

Premise 2: Tim has a cat.

Conclusion: Tim's cat likely has 4 legs.

This argument is strong because the conclusion follows from the premises, and it is cogent because it is strong and the premises are true.

Abductive reasoning

The process of using guesswork to determine the likelihood of a conclusion being correct using extremely incomplete information. Abductive reasoning is similar to inductive reason in that conclusions can never be irrefutable. However, there are distinct differences. Inductive reasoning starts with very specific observations, and then attempts to draw conclusions, such as patterns, which can then be extrapolated more broadly. Conversely, abductive reasoning usually involves attempting to generate an explanation for a singular phenomenon. Inductive reasoning also usually requires relatively complete information, from which reasonably accurate conclusions can be reached. Conversely, abductive reasoning usually involves working with far less complete information, which at best can only be used to direct further enquiry.

Because of these differences, inductive reasoning and abductive reasoning are used at different points in the scientific process.

Abductive reasoning is used to guess potential explanations for particular phenomenon, to formulate hypotheses, and to determine what data may need to be collected and how that data should be analyzed. Inductive reasoning is used for interpreting the findings of an experiment, and for formulating or refining theories based upon these findings.

ESSENTIAL

CRITICAL THINKING

INFORMATION

This section provides a basic overview of the most essential information required for developing robust critical thinking skills.

Personality

Critical thinkers usually possess a number of personality traits.

- Skepticism.
- Open-mindedness.
- Inquisitiveness.
- Imaginativeness.
- Humbleness.
- Attentiveness.
- Introspectiveness.
- Emotional self-awareness.
- Methodical.
- Disciplined.

- A wariness of common sense conclusions.
- An unwillingness to reach conclusions easily or quickly.
- An appreciation of nuance and subtlety.
- An appreciation of the unfathomable complexity of reality.
- A willingness to listen to others.
- A willingness to actively educate oneself.
- A willingness to seek out ideas that conflict with one's own.

Procedure

The process of critical thinking can generally be broken down into 7 steps.

1. Identify the problem, and be as precise and narrowly focused as possible.
2. Gather relevant information from a variety of different authoritative sources.
3. Establish the significance and reliability of every piece of information.
4. Organize all important information so that it is contextualized and easy to analyze.
5. Identify key points, patterns, and cause and effect relationships.
6. Reach a conclusion by weighing the strengths and limitations of all possibilities.
7. Continue to question and update all conclusions.

Accuracy and context

There are two goals critical thinkers strive for when analyzing information. The first is accuracy, which involves identifying and objectively understanding all relevant details. The second goal is to contextualize this information, which involves understanding how this information connects together and how it fits within broader frameworks.

With regards to accuracy, critical thinkers strive to be knowledgeable and correct about as many relevant details as is realistically possible

before reaching conclusions. No problem can be solved, and no debate can be resolved, unless the issue in question has been well researched or contemplated. Accuracy consequently requires analyzing issues in depth, with an appreciation for nuance and complexity, rather than analyzing issues at a superficial level, and relying upon assumptions and generalizations. Accuracy also requires the ability to clearly identify and delineate details into their constituent components. One of the most important consequences of this level of analysis is the ability to recognize that most variables can best be understood as existing on a spectrum rather than being reducible to binaries or categories. Consequently, most variables are best mentally visualized as lines on a graph with an x and y axis, rather than items in a table with clearly delineated columns and rows. This appreciation of spectrums also applies to the relationship between variables, since it is often less accurate to say A caused B, and more accurate to say the occurrence of B was partially or predominantly proportional to the occurrence of A. This appreciation of spectrums also applies to certainty and predictions, since it is often less accurate to say X is true, and more accurate to say X has a "high likelihood" or "a 90% chance" of being true.

Accuracy is also incredibly important with regards to how ideas are expressed. The meaning of statements can change substantially when words are used interchangeably carelessly, such as adverbs like "always", "often", "generally", "sometimes", "occasionally", "rarely", etc. Avoiding exaggerated terms when more nuanced words are required is especially vital for clear communication. In debates, accuracy also means all relevant terms and arguments are precisely defined and agreed upon. Words can mean different things to different people, and as new terms and ideas enter the public discourse, the need for accuracy becomes increasingly paramount. In fact accuracy is likely one of the skills and necessities most underappreciated in modern culture. A sizable percentage of arguments do not arise from genuine disagreements, but instead misunderstandings of positions and terms, resulting in debaters speaking past each other. This problem and subsequent solution was best expressed by Voltaire, who stated "If you wish to converse with

me, define your terms." This is also why it is essential that languages evolve to become more detailed, nuanced, descriptive, and clear, and that words and terms have singular and sharply defined meanings. The need for accuracy also applies to symbols, such as flags, since these too represent different things to different people.

Accuracy is also essential for defining and isolating problems. This necessity is expressed in the adage "If I had only one hour to save the world, I would spend 55 minutes defining the problem, and only 5 minutes finding the solution." This is commonly, although likely mistakenly, attributed to Albert Einstein. Accuracy is also essential when comparing ideas. A helpful expression for facilitating accuracy in this regard is "With all else being equal...", which can help define an area of contention by isolating it from all other variables.

With regards to context, critical thinkers not only understand its importance, but also the numerous consequences of putting information into context in the real-world. There are countless ways this can manifest in the real-world. A piece of information may be relevant on a micro scale, but be irrelevant on a macro scale. A belief may have a reasonable internal logic when analyzed in isolation, but be irrational when framed more broadly. A conclusion may be true or appear true when applying a general, superficial, low resolution interpretation of a situation, but also be untrue when a detailed, in-depth, high resolution analysis is applied. An argument designed to support a conclusion may be incorrect, but the conclusion may still be correct. An idea can have 100 problems, but still be superior to another idea that only has 1 problem. A threshold may seem reasonable in one situation, but be rightfully recognized as pitifully low or unreasonably high when viewed holistically. A trait may be innocuous or virtuous in isolation, but the broader trend that it contributes to may be problematic because of a resulting lack of balance or proportionality. A person's choice may create an initial problem or the conditions for a problem to occur, but may be inconsequential compared to doing nothing or pursuing alternatives. An action may be harmless or healthy when proportional or done in moderation, but have devastating consequences when done

disproportionately or in excess. A proposal may be immoral or unjustifiable when viewed hypothetically, but may be moral or justifiable as a pragmatic solution when applied to the real-world. A possibility may be highly likely while another possibility may be highly unlikely, but the former may be worthy of little consideration because the outcome would only be mildly inconvenient, while the latter may be worthy of great consideration because the outcome would be catastrophic. It is only through putting information into context, and consequently having the ability to put information into perspective, that reasonable or objective conclusions can be reached.

In summary, critically minded individuals always strive to collect as much accurate information as possible, and then contextualize this information by integrating it into cohesive and comprehensive frameworks. However, the ability to do this, and particularly maintain perspective, is made challenging by one's own mental and emotional state, and one's personal investment in the situation. Doing this is difficult even at the best of times, but is essential for critical thinking.

Knowability

Critical thinking requires the ability to understand the extent to which something can be known. Knowability can be divided into 3 categories.

1. Known to be true or false.
2. Not yet known but potentially knowable.
3. Known to be unknowable.

A person who is uncritically minded can misinterpret each of these categories in the following ways.

1. Believing a true claim is false, or a false claim is true.
2. Believing a claim is true or false when this is not known but may be knowable.
3. Believing a claim is true, false, or knowable, when it is known to be unknowable.

Provided below are examples for each category error.

1. Example of "Believing a true claim is false, or a false claim is true":

"Anthropogenic climate change hasn't been proven to be true so it must be false."

The problem with this statement is that it demonstrates ignorance of the scientific method, the current scientific consensus on anthropogenic climate change, or both. In most situations the only reasonable approach is to assume one's own ignorance, and then research and trust the academic consensus, particularly for subjects that are well researched and incredibly complicated.

2. Example of "Believing a claim is true or false when this is not known but may be knowable":

"This new drug hasn't harmed anyone yet so it must be safe."

If a new drug has not been tested then one should acknowledge it is not possible to know the truth until peer reviewed scientific studies have been released in trustworthy scientific journals.

3. Example of "Believing a claim is true, false, or knowable, when it is known to be unknowable":

"I believe it is possible to communicate with beings that live beyond this universe."

It is unreasonable to believe in something which is unknowable unless circumstances change and the phenomenon in question has extremely strong evidence supporting its existence or it can be demonstrated to exist under scientific conditions.

Cause and effect

Essential to critical thinking is the ability to comprehend the numerous ways variables can potentially interact. For example, the

statement “violent videogames cause violent behavior” assumes A causes B, whereas in reality A may reduce B, or have no connection with B. The following list describes the primary ways 3 variables can interact. It can be helpful to visualize the following variables A, B, and C, each residing at the corner of a triangle, with arrows and other appropriate symbols flowing between them.

- A causes C (direct causation).
- C causes A (reverse causation).
- A causes C, and C causes A (bidirectional or cyclic causation).
- A causes B, and B causes C (indirect causation).
- A causes C directly, but only because B is present.
- A causes C, but B partially reduces the effect of A.
- A causes C, but B exaggerates the effect of A.
- A would cause C, but B makes A inactive.
- A would cause C, but B isolates C from the effect of A.
- A would cause C, but B negates the effect of A.
- A would cause C, but B inverts the effect of A.
- A causes both B and C directly.
- A and B both contribute to C, but either A or B can cause C on their own.
- A and B both contribute to C, but C can only occur with both A and B present.
- A has no effect on B or C.

These interactions may also be contingent upon certain conditions being met. For example, A may cause C, but only once a certain amount of A is present, or only once A has been present for a certain period of time, or only once A has appeared and then disappeared for a certain period of time. These interactions may also not be linear. For example, at lower levels A may cause C to increase, but at higher levels A may cause C to decrease. A could also have no noticeable effect on C, only to then have an exponential effect on C once a particular threshold has been reached. In the real-world there are often countless variables which influence outcomes, and these variables can be known or unknown, knowable or unknowable,

measurable or immeasurable, overt or hidden, clear or counterintuitive, etc.

Also important to remember is that each point in a chain of causation can possess unique attributes, and that an entire chain of causation must be understood if outcomes are to be accurately diagnosed. For example, cause A could be a form of racism. This racism may result in outcome B, which is poverty for the demographic being discriminated against. Outcome B may then cause outcome C, which is an increase in crime in the impoverished regions where these individuals live. Because outcome B, poverty, is not an inherently racist phenomenon, it may be inaccurately concluded that outcome C, increased crime, has no origin related to racism. Acknowledging cause A is therefore essential for understanding that racism is one cause of outcome C. Understanding this could also be essential for solving problem C, since introducing any solution could be inadequate or counterproductive without also addressing cause A.

Logical razors

A logical razor is a principle used to quickly “shave off” unlikely explanations for a given phenomenon. Presented here are 4 common and useful razors.

- Occam’s razor: “Plurality should not be posited without necessity.”
In other words, the explanation that makes the fewest assumptions is generally the best answer for a given phenomenon.
- Hitchens’s razor: “That which can be asserted without evidence can be dismissed without evidence.”
In other words, if a claim is made which demands evidence, and no evidence is presented, then the claim can be ignored.
- Sagan’s Standard: “Extraordinary claims require extraordinary evidence.”
In other words, the more unlikely a claim is, the more evidence is required to justify it.

- Hanlon's razor: "Never attribute to malice that which is adequately explained by stupidity."

Rhetoric and appeals

Rhetoric is the art of persuasion. Persuasion involves convincing an audience using one or more of the following types of appeal.

- Logos: An appeal to logic.
- Pathos: An appeal to emotion.
- Ethos: An appeal to credibility, such as a person's character or their authority on a subject.

These 3 forms of appeal are referred to as The Rhetorical Triangle.

These appeals can all be validly utilized, even within a single argument. For example, attempting to convince someone to refrain from purchasing animal produce because of cruelty within the animal agriculture industry may require using all 3 appeal types. It may require ethos in the form of citing scientists who have reasonably demonstrated that animals can experience emotional and physical suffering. It may require logos in the form of providing an ethical framework which can prove why allowing animals to suffer needlessly is immoral. It may require pathos in the form of cultivating enough empathy in a listener for them to fully appreciate the true horror of the suffering that farm animals can experience.

Despite the common misconception, appealing to a listener's emotions to help convince them of an argument, or a listener inadvertently having an emotional reaction to an argument, does not mean the argument is flawed or inadequate. One common way this misconception manifests is when a debater condemns their opponent for "guilt tripping" them. If an argument is sound, but makes a listener experience feelings of guilt in the process, either as an unintentional byproduct of the conclusion of the argument, or as a deliberate and legitimate appeal to emotion, this emotional response

is irrelevant as far as the soundness of the argument is concerned. Despite this, the condemnation of “guilt tripping” is a common response to sound arguments. Similarly, if a sound argument contains a reasonable appeal to emotion, but fails to elicit an emotional or appropriate response from a listener, this does not mean this appeal or the overall argument is flawed or inadequate, but that the listener is not responding appropriately.

Statement types

Most statements can be placed into 1 of 3 categories.

- A descriptive statement describes what something is.
- A normative statement describes how something should be.
- A prescriptive statement describes how to achieve something.

Examples:

- Descriptive: “Your dog is molting fur.”
- Normative: “You should do something about your dog molting fur.”
- Prescriptive: “You should brush your dog to stop it molting fur.”

Prescriptive statements are generally considered a subcategory of normative statements. However, a person can use a prescriptive statement to explain how to achieve a goal without actually endorsing or agreeing with the course of action or the goal, although this usually requires a clearly expressed disclaimer, since most prescriptive statements on their own imply advocacy.

Statements can also be a combination of 2 or 3 of these statement types.

Example:

“Don’t touch that hot iron because you’ll burn yourself.”

This statement is all 3 statement types. It is descriptive because it accurately describes how the action will lead to an outcome. It is

normative because it asserts that the action should be avoided. It is prescriptive because it explains how the outcome can be avoided.

A common mistake in debates and popular discourse is the conflation of these statement types, either in how a statement is interpreted, or using one statement type when another statement type is more applicable. For example, one person may say "This is morally abhorrent", and the respondent may say "But it's in the constitution". The first statement is normative, while the response is descriptive. Even if the first person is aware that the problem under discussion is legal according to the constitution, the normative nature of their argument makes it clear they believe the morality of the subject to be of greater importance. Conversely, the respondent's statement is unproductive because it does not engage with the moral concerns of the first speaker's statement, and ignores the fact that describing the status quo can never be used as a defense of the status quo. The inability to distinguish between descriptive statements, normative statements, and prescriptive statements, is a common reason why debates become unproductive.

These statement types can also be replaced with one another during debates in order to give the false impression of presenting a stronger or less controversial argument. For example, someone who believes women should not be priests for normative reasons may argue their point using the unsubstantiated descriptive argument that "research shows that congregations prefer listening to men", rather than their actual yet equally unsubstantiated normative argument that "female priests go against God's natural order". This is because certain statement types can appear more convincing than other statement types in different contexts.

Tautology (logic)

In logic, a tautology is a statement that is true by logical necessity. A tautology is true in every conceivable situation, and does not need to be broken down into its constituent components to be proven true.

Example:

“The equation ‘ $A = B$ ’ is either true or false, and cannot be true and false simultaneously.”

This example is a tautological statement because there is no conceivable way this statement could ever be considered untrue.

A tautological statement is not the same as an axiomatic statement. An axiom is a statement which is universally regarded as being true, even if this can't be proven. Axioms are commonly used as a premise or starting point for arguments, and this is true even when “first principle thinking” is being utilized, since even first principles often rest upon necessary assumptions about the nature of reality.

Tautological and axiomatic statements are also not the same as presuppositions, which are implicit assumptions inferred from statements, and which are required for the sake of coherence. For example, the presupposition of the statement “Jennifer no longer writes fiction” is the assumption that Jennifer once wrote fiction.

Analytic statements vs synthetic statements

The “analytic-synthetic distinction” is a semantic distinction, used primarily in philosophy, to distinguish between the two types of propositions.

- An analytic proposition is one that is true or not true based solely on the definitions of the words used. The statement “All bachelors are unmarried men” is an analytic statement because it is true by its very definition. All analytic statements are therefore tautological.
- A synthetic proposition is one that is true or not true based solely on information derived from observations of the real-world. The statement “Most bachelors are lonely” is a synthetic statement because it can only be determined to be true or untrue by studying the real-world.

Prescriptivism vs descriptivism (linguistics)

Two approaches for understanding and using language.

- Prescriptivism is the belief that words and grammar should be understood and utilized according to their dictionary definition.
- Descriptivism is the belief that words and grammar should be understood and utilized according to their common usage.

Prescriptivism and descriptivism both have advantages and disadvantages depending on context. A prescriptivist approach is generally ideal in academia and formal debates. A descriptivist approach on the other hand is usually necessary for removing the stigma of certain language within certain cultures, and allowing for increased creativity and utility with regards to the evolution of language. Regardless of the approach, languages should always evolve to become more detailed, nuanced, descriptive, and clear.

Denotation vs connotation

Two approaches for interpreting language.

- Denotation refers to the standard definition and literal interpretation of a word.
- Connotation refers to the cultural interpretations and emotional evocations of a word.

The denotation of the words "house" and "home" are effectively the same, with both referring to a physical shelter where people live. However, the connotation of the word "house" conjures up thoughts of a physical structure, whereas in many cultures the word "home" conjures up thoughts and feelings of belonging and comfort.

The letter vs the spirit

Two approaches for interpreting language.

- To interpret a statement in terms of “the letter” is to do so literally, which may not be in accordance with the intentions of the original author.
- To interpret a statement in terms of “the spirit” is to attempt to understand the intentions of the original author, even if this interpretation does not adhere to a literal interpretation of the statement.

The terms “the letter” and “the spirit” originated from the expanded terms “The letter of the law” and “The spirit of the law”, which originally applied only to interpretations of the law. In modern informal discourse however these terms are mostly applied to situations outside of the law, and are consequently abbreviated to just “the letter” and “the spirit”.

Explicit vs implicit

Two different ways in which information can be expressed.

- Something is explicit if it is direct and unambiguous.
- Something is implicit if it is indirect or ambiguous, but can still be understood or reasonably inferred.

The difference can be more easily remember with the adage, “Explicit things are explained, implicit things are implied”.

Analogy

A comparison of two otherwise dissimilar things for the purpose of drawing attention to a specific shared similarity that can help explain or clarify. Despite a common misconception, analogies are only meant to be interpreted with regards to their singular intended similarity. In other words, an analogy being dissimilar outside of the intended similarity does not mean the analogy is flawed, even if it is

inappropriate in other ways, such as being too extreme or insensitive.

The most common types of analogy are similes, metaphors, allegories, and parables.

- Simile

A figure of speech that asserts that two things are similar, and consequently often necessitates words such as “like” and “as”.

Examples:

“He is like a lazy cat.”

“She was as beautiful as a rose.”

“They have the gentleness of a warm breeze.”

- Metaphor

A figure of speech that asserts that two things are one and the same, and consequently often necessitates words such as “is” and “was”.

Examples:

“He is a couch potato.”

“She was a shining light.”

“They have hearts of gold.”

Metaphors are comprised of two elements. The “tenor” is the subject that the metaphor is trying to explain or clarify, albeit abstractly, while the “vehicle” is the subject that is used to describe the nature of the tenor. In the expression “Love is a battlefield”, “love” is the tenor, and “battlefield” is the vehicle.

- Allegory

An extended metaphor, usually within a full story, poem, or picture, that is usually intended to illustrate an important idea.

- Parable

An extended metaphor, usually in the form of a short story, that is usually intended to teach a moral lesson or religious principle.

Non sequitur (Latin expression meaning "it does not follow")

Any statement that does not follow logically from previous statements. Most commonly this takes the form of an invalid argument, or in other words an argument in which the conclusion does not follow logically from its premises.

Epistemology

The branch of philosophy concerned with knowledge, and which focuses on studying its nature, scope, sources, and verifiability. The two most noteworthy schools of thought in modern epistemology are rationalism and empiricism, which represent two different but complementary philosophies for acquiring and verifying knowledge.

- Rationalism involves acquiring and verifying knowledge via reason, and primarily relies upon logic, mathematics, thought experiments, and argumentation.
- Empiricism involves acquiring and verifying knowledge via experience, and primarily relies upon observations and measurements, such as the scientific method when studying physical phenomenon, and academic standards when studying history.

Anecdotal evidence

Evidence in the form of personal accounts and cultural narratives. Anecdotal evidence can be useful for discovering or determining a subject or phenomenon that is worthy of enquiry, but is substantially less robust than empirical evidence for drawing reliable or reasonable conclusions. Anecdotal evidence is often erroneously used to refute scientific evidence and conclusions, or to prematurely form conclusions where scientific research is first required. Anecdotal

evidence is often highly convincing to those who are not scientifically literate, and particularly if the evidence sounds intriguing or intuitive, or if a person has a propensity to believe evidence that confirms their preexisting beliefs.

Alief

An automatic or habitual belief-like feeling or attitude that is distinct from a person's explicit beliefs and knowledge, and which is consequently capable of conflicting with their explicit beliefs and knowledge. For example, a person standing on a transparent balcony may believe that they are safe, but alieve that they are in danger. A person watching a work of fiction may know the characters are fictional, but may experience strong emotional reactions to the characters experiences because of the alief that the characters are real.

De jure vs de facto

- De jure refers to something that is official, legitimate, or sanctioned by law, but not necessarily the current state of affairs in reality.
- De facto refers to a state of affairs that is true in reality, but not necessarily official, legitimate, or sanctioned by law.

If a government is taken over in a military coup, then the original legally recognized ruler of the country could be referred to as the de jure leader, while the self-installed military ruler could be referred to as the de facto leader.

Philosophical ethics

The area of philosophy that studies ethics. Philosophical ethics is comprised of the following three branches.

- Meta-ethics, which involves studying the nature and essence of morality.

- Normative ethics, which involves studying the standards that should be used for determining the rightness and wrongness of actions. Normative ethics is sometimes called “prescriptive ethics” for this reason.
- Applied ethics, which involves studying the practical application of normative ethics in the real-world.

With regards to the issues of abortion and euthanasia, each of these approaches would serve a different function.

- Meta-ethics would involve studying whether morality exists or whether it is knowable.
- Normative ethics would involve studying whether abortions and euthanasia are morally permissible, and particularly from a theoretical perspective.
- Applied ethics would involve studying the moral questions that arise from allowing abortions and euthanasia to occur in the real-world, and particularly with regards to situations and outcomes that are complex and contentious.

Normative ethics

Within normative ethics there are three primary competing moral standards.

- Virtue ethics is the doctrine that actions should be judged as right or wrong according to whether they develop moral character in individuals. Virtue ethics tends to be most popular among right-wing individuals, and particularly far-right individuals.
- Deontological ethics (a.k.a. deontology) is the doctrine that actions should be judged as right or wrong according to a

series of rules, rather than according to their consequences. It is sometimes described as duty, obligation, or rule-based ethics. Deontological ethics tends to be most popular among centrists and right-wing individuals.

- Consequentialist ethics (a.k.a. consequentialism) is the doctrine that actions should be judged as right or wrong according to their consequences. The most common form of consequentialism is utilitarianism, which asserts that an action should be judged as right or wrong according to whether it maximizes net happiness and wellbeing in the world. Consequentialist ethics, and specifically utilitarianism, tends to be most popular among left-wing individuals.

Hume's Guillotine (a.k.a. the is-ought problem)

Hume's Guillotine is a philosophical idea asserting an inherent limitation to the ability of humans to determine morality. Hume's Guillotine states that a normative or prescriptive claim cannot be derived from a descriptive claim, or in other words what is morally right or wrong cannot be determined by what occurs in reality. For example, an advocate of Hume's Guillotine would argue that just because an experience is desired by humans, this does not mean that this can be used to determine whether or not it is morally permissible or morally good for humans to have this experience. Hume's Guillotine is referred to as the is-ought problem because an "is" statement is a descriptive claim, an "ought" statement is a normative or prescriptive claim, and according to Hume's Guillotine the two will always remain fundamentally separate, which is why this idea proposes that a normative or prescriptive claim can never be extrapolated from a descriptive claim.

The original position (a.k.a. the veil of ignorance)

A thought experiment designed to determine the principles that would be required to structure a society based on solidarity, and one that could consequently be considered just and fair. It asserts that

decision-makers should make choices about social issues by assuming the possibility that they could be any of the individuals affected by their decisions, including those completely different to themselves. For example, if a politician is drafting policies that will affect everyone in society, they should first appreciate that they could have been born with low social capital, low cultural capital, low intelligence, or physical and mental disabilities. Philosopher John Rawls, who coined the terms “the original position” and “the veil of ignorance”, asserted that if decision-makers operated from behind this “veil of ignorance”, it would always result in the fairest possible outcomes for everyone in society. Even though “the original position” is the official name for this thought experiment, it is more commonly referred to as “the veil of ignorance”.

The precautionary principle

The idea that decision-makers should anticipate harm before it occurs, and choose the course of action that is anticipated to result in the least amount of harm. The precautionary principle effectively states that decision-makers should err on the side of caution as a general rule.

Chesterton’s fence

The principle that reforms should not be made until the reasoning behind the status quo is understood. In other words, a change should not be made to something, such as a policy or procedure, without first understanding what it does and why it was introduced in the first place. The application of Chesterton’s fence often necessitates second-order thinking, since something that may initially appear redundant or even harmful may in fact produce secondary consequences that are beneficial or essential.

The law of unintended consequences

The idea that actions often produce consequences, and particularly second-order consequences, that are unintended, and most often

unanticipated or unforeseeable. This idea is most commonly used to draw attention to potential negative consequences, and particularly consequences that could be far-reaching.

Unintended consequences can be divided into 3 categories.

1. "Unexpected benefit", or in other words the action produced an unintended positive consequence, whether or not the action achieved its intended goal.
2. "Unexpected drawback", or in other words the action achieved its intended goal but also produced an unintended negative consequence.
3. "Perverse result", or in other words the action did not achieve its intended goal but instead produced an unintended negative consequence that was the opposite of the intended goal.

A wicked problem

Any problem that is difficult or impossible to solve due to its ever-changing or ill-defined nature, or because of its large number of complex and interconnected causes and contributing factors, many of which may also be ever-changing or ill-defined. Wicked problems often require solutions that are unavoidably incomplete, multifaceted, or ever-changing in nature, or which cause further problems that also need addressing. Wicked problems are therefore considered wicked in the sense that they are extremely challenging to solve, and not because they are necessarily evil in nature. Wicked problems require strong critical thinking skills and strong divergent and convergent thinking skills to adequately address, and often require the consideration of solutions that may be unconventional, counterintuitive, or controversial in nature. An example of a solvable wicked problem is climate change, since even though it is a complex problem, it is also possible to solve. An example of an unsolvable wicked problem is child abuse, since as well as being a complex problem, it is also not possible to eradicate entirely.

Woo (a.k.a. woo-woo)

A pejorative term referring to beliefs and explanations that are not supported by evidence or reason. The term is most commonly used to refer to New Age ideas such as astrology, Tarot cards, witchcraft, Reiki, psychic powers, astral projection, crystal energy, orgone energy, sacred geometry, and numerology.

Most woo beliefs and explanations share common characteristics, such as relying upon quote mining, anecdotal evidence, appeals to authority, supernatural ideas, and attempts to appear scientific, particularly by using scientific jargon such as "quantum", "energy", and "fields". Those who advocate for woo beliefs and explanations, and particularly grifters who make money from woo, are often called "woo peddlers".

Motivated reasoning

The psychological phenomenon where conscious or unconscious emotional biases cause evidence and arguments to be sought after, evaluated, constructed, remembered, and trusted, and for justifications and decisions to be made, according to their desirability, rather than their accuracy, legitimacy, or truthfulness.

Cognitive dissonance

The experience of possessing beliefs, feelings, ideas, or values, that contradict one another. Cognitive dissonance is often accompanied with denial, and a persistent unwillingness to rectify the real cause of the dissonance. Cognitive dissonance usually gives rise to mental and emotional anguish, such as anxiety and stress.

Cognitive dissonance theory proposes that people seek psychological consistency between their expectations and reality, and consequently continually strive to reduce any cognitive dissonance they experience, but not necessarily honestly. People do this in 4 ways.

1. Change one's belief or behavior.

Example: "I'm trying to lose weight so I won't eat any more of this doughnut."

2. Justify one's belief or behavior by modifying the conflict.

Example: "I'm trying to lose weight but I'm allowed to cheat my diet every so often."

3. Justify one's belief or behavior by adding new beliefs or behaviors.

Example: "I'm trying to lose weight but I went jogging today so this doughnut doesn't count."

4. Ignore or deny information that conflicts with one's belief or behavior.

Example: "I'm trying to lose weight but this doughnut is fine since doughnuts are not high in sugar."

Pseudoskepticism

An unreasonable degree of skepticism. At its most extreme, this can include a refusal to accept something as true regardless of evidence or reason. Pseudoskepticism can be understood as denialism masquerading as critical mindedness and academic rigor. Pseudoskepticism is common among those who hold irrational views regarding science and religion.

Anti-intellectualism

Mistrust of, and often hostility towards, intellectuals and intellectualism. Stated more informally, it is effectively the glorification of stupidity, and the embracing of intuition and common sense over critical mindedness and academic rigor. Anti-intellectuals consequently commonly dismiss or deride education institutions, qualified experts, scientific studies, history books, and even the arts. Anti-intellectualism is common among fascists, conspiracy theorists, and woo peddlers. Anti-intellectualism is not the same as being reasonably skeptic.

Pseudo-intellectualism

Possessing the superficial veneer of being intelligent, critically minded, and knowledgeable. Pseudo-intellectuals often desire to be perceived as possessing these traits while being unwilling to put in the effort required to attain them. Pseudo-intellectuals rely upon a combination of tactics to create this veneer, such as pseudoskepticism, logical fallacies, deceptive debate tactics, and language that is unnecessarily technical, jargonistic, esoteric, unconventional, confusing, vague, abstract, flowery, or pretentious. Probably the most well-known and extreme modern-day pseudo-intellectual is Jordan Peterson, predominantly because of his poor critical thinking skills, his aversion to using clear and precise language, his insistence on interpreting statements and questions uncharitably, his reluctance to stay on topic during debates, his refusal to give direct and honest answers, and his willingness to speak confidently about a wide range of subjects he knows nothing about, which encompasses most subjects that he publically speaks on.

Academic idiocy

Coined by the founders of The Xova Movement, academic idiocy is the phenomenon wherein a person who is adept at researching, understanding, and citing, arguments and supporting facts, also lacks the critical thinking skills necessary to objectively analyze and contextualize this information, resulting in them reaching unsound conclusions. Academic idiocy often results in people being highly educated on the minutia of a subject but failing to reach accurate broad conclusions on the subject. Some of the most prominent modern-day victims of academic idiocy are flat-Earthers and capitalist economists, who often study their respective subjects in great detail and yet completely fail to formulate or understand some of the most obvious and irrefutable ideas in existence.

Blurry reasoning

Coined by the founders of The Xova Movement, blurry reasoning refers to the vague and inaccurate forms of reasoning and conclusions that commonly occur when critical thinking is disregarded or underutilized, and particularly the accuracy that critical thinking requires. More specifically, blurry reasoning occurs when information is inaccurately analyzed and connected, and illogical conclusions are consequently reached, due to the incorrect perception or belief that two or more variables are more dissimilar or similar than they actually are. This is the opposite of critical thinking, which requires analyzing information in detail to determine its accuracy and relevancy, defining and separating information into its constituent variables, finding appropriate connections between these variables, and evaluating everything within context in order to draw reasonable conclusions. Blurry reasoning can be highly deceptive due to its ability to appear superficially reasonable, particularly to those who are not critically minded.

One example of blurry reasoning in modern Western culture is the inaccurate belief that teaching children about gender, biological sex, sexual orientations, and sexual activities, is equivalent to child grooming, which specifically refers to the act of psychologically manipulating a child for the purpose of sexually abusing them. Evidence shows that teaching children about such subjects from an early age is necessary for their mental and emotional wellbeing, and for protecting them from sexual abuse by providing them with the knowledge and language necessary to understand and describe their abuse. Such education is also necessary because many children live with, or regularly interact with, individuals who are homophobic, transphobic, puritanical, or highly misinformed on such subjects. It is no coincidence that countries and regions that provide more progressive sex education have lower rates of child sexual abuse, lower rates of unplanned teenage pregnancies, and lower rates of discrimination against LGBT+ children. The incorrect belief that sex education is a form of child grooming, due to the fact that both involve talking to children about sexual subjects, is a perfect example of blurry reasoning.

Another example of blurry reasoning in modern Western culture is the commonly inaccurate use of the words "racist" and "racism", particularly through their attribution to things that are not racist. There are numerous ways this can manifest in the real-world that can easily be debunked through critical thinking. If someone is the beneficiary of racism, this does not mean that they themselves are racist. If someone uses a talking point commonly used by racists, this does not necessarily mean that the talking point, the argument, the conclusion, or the person speaking, is racist. If a person is uneducated or misinformed about racial issues, this does not necessarily mean they are racist. If someone has a racial preference with regards to dating, this does not necessarily mean they are racist. If racism is accurately depicted in entertainment media, such as films and TV shows, this does not necessarily mean the media or its creators are racist. If an outcome is racist in nature, this does not necessarily mean the direct causes were racist. If racism manifests in its worse forms as a result of power imbalances, this does not mean that a person has to have power to be racist. These problems don't merely arise from the inaccurate assumption that certain things with racial characteristics are also racist in nature, but also from the inappropriate use of the words "racist" and "racism" when other terms would be more accurate, such as "racist origin", "racial inequality", "racial bias", "racial preference", "racial ignorance", "manifest racism", and "structural racism". Taking words like "racist" and "racism", which have universally understood meanings, and changing them or adding to them, creates unnecessary confusion, which is the complete opposite of what the evolution of any language should achieve. This is why it's important to understand blurry reasoning and the problems it can cause.

Blurry reasoning is not to be confused with fuzzy logic, which is a concept in mathematics.

The 5 basic laws of human stupidity

A partially satirical yet predominantly serious list that attempts to outline the 5 most noteworthy pieces of information regarding human stupidity, as proposed by Carlo Cipolla in his book "The Basic Laws of Human Stupidity".

1. "Every person underestimates the number of stupid people in the world."
2. "The probability of a person being stupid is independent of any other characteristic of that person."
3. "Stupid people harm or cause losses to others without obtaining any benefit themselves, and often even harm or incur losses themselves."
4. "Non-stupid people always underestimate the harmful potential of stupid people."
5. "Stupid people are the most dangerous people in existence."

Most problems in the world are caused by populations that lack robust critical thinking skills, particularly because this leads to corrupt or incompetent politicians being elected and empowered, flawed economic ideas being embraced and enforced, immoral ethical systems being adopted and normalized, and communication being grossly ineffective and discordant. The only way humanity will ever overcome this problem is for countries to recognize its extreme severity and to put in place systems capable of addressing it, and for humans to stop venerating and defending pseudoskepticism, anti-intellectualism, pseudo-intellectualism, blurry reasoning, and the many other forms of human stupidity that are now extremely commonplace, even in supposedly advanced Western societies.

Memory-based conclusion

Coined by the founders of The Xova Movement, a memory-based conclusion is any conclusion that a person remembers reaching despite not remembering the details of the evidence or reasons that lead them to that conclusion.

Passive vs active information gathering

Two different approaches to gathering information.

- Passive information gathering involves acquiring information without any concerted effort, such as relying upon headlines and social media posts without engaging in any further reading or research.
- Active information gathering involves acquiring information through active participation using information literacy skills.

Information literacy

The set of skills necessary for effectively and efficiently locating, evaluating, and using information. Information literacy is essential in academia, but also an essential life skill for achieving personal and social goals, such as when searching to buy a home and determining who to vote for during elections. A subcategory of information literacy is media literacy, which refers specifically to mass communication media, and particularly news, advertisements, and entertainment. Those who are informationally literate possess the following knowledge and abilities.

- Understanding the importance of becoming familiar with the meanings of words and expressions.
- Understanding how to organize and contextualize information, particularly for determining which information is relevant and for making analysis easier.
- Understanding that one's world view and assumptions will affect how one interprets information, and consequently understanding the importance of developing robust critical thinking skills.
- Understanding the importance of being informed, and of refraining from holding beliefs or coming to conclusions without first conducting research. Waiting for relatively complete information to come out

before reaching conclusions is particularly important with regards to breaking news, and events that are unfolding in real-time.

- Understanding that research can be a lengthy and challenging process, and one which generally requires patience, persistence, and flexibility. It also means understanding that research is rarely a simple and straightforward process that leads to definitive or clear-cut answers, but is more often an ongoing, iterative, open-ended, and messy process in which new questions continually need to be asked, and in which finding answers also often leads to new questions. Information literacy also means understanding that reading encyclopedia entries is an efficient and invaluable starting point for developing a broad understanding of a subject, but also understanding that further research is often required with most subjects.

- Understanding the importance of gathering information from a variety of different authoritative sources. Information literacy also means understanding that not all information is created equal, and that how, what, when, and why, information is sourced, selected, organized, and presented, can shape its value and credibility. Information can be authoritative, up-to-date, and reliable, while other information can be biased, out-of-date, misleading, or false. The creation of information can be influenced by numerous factors, such as financial incentives, ideological agendas, systemic biases, power structures, and practical imitations. Information literacy also means understanding the difference in value between different sources. Generally reliable sources of information include dictionaries, reputable encyclopedias, reputable scientific journals, reputable history books, reputable video essayists, and reputable news sources, such as Reuters and the Associated Press. A reliable source for discovering the bias of specific news organizations is [MediaBiasFactCheck.com](https://www.mediabiasfactcheck.com/), and a reliable source for discovering the bias of both specific news organizations and specific instances of news coverage is [Ground News](https://www.groundnews.com/). Less reliable sources of information include most mainstream and alternative news media. The least reliable sources of information are generally social media posts.

- Understanding what specific information is most valuable for answering a particular question. For example, under specific circumstances subjective personal accounts, such as interviews and diaries, can be more valuable for coming to objective conclusions than relying primarily on facts and statistics.
- Understanding how to use computers and the internet. This includes knowing how to effectively and efficiently use different databases and search engines, including using search concepts, using appropriate search terms, using advanced settings, and using specialized search engines, such as Google Scholar and scientific journal search engines. Examples of search concepts include searching for a primary source, searching for the history and credibility of authors, and searching for both sides of an argument, such as searching for an idea or argument one believes to be true followed by the words “disproven”, “debunked”, “false”, “fake”, or “harmful”.

Historical literacy

The term historical literacy does not have a formal definition. However, it can reasonably be summarized as being fluent in both the subject matter and the discipline of history. In other words, being historically literate means possessing a general understanding of history, or a specific period of history, which is grounded in a basic understanding of how to conceptualize and evaluate historical information. Historical literacy concepts include perspective, continuity and change, cause and effect, significance, contestability, and empathy. The following questions are examples of the types of questions historically literate individuals, and particularly academics, will ask themselves when analyzing historical information.

- Is this source an original or a copy?
- What were the personal circumstances and historical contexts of the creation of this source?
- Why was this source created?

- Who was this source originally produced for?
- How does this source relate to broader historical trends and themes?
- Are any interpretations offered supported or contradicted by the evidence? Are reasonable counterarguments addressed?
- Who are the authors of this source and what is their background? Did the authors have biases or hidden agendas? Are the authors qualified, and if so, are there other authors who are more qualified on this subject?
- Is the information a primary, secondary, or tertiary source? Primary sources include original sources like personal diaries, letters, court proceedings, legislative debates, and art. Secondary sources are those produced by historians, such as books, articles, maps, timelines, diagrams, monographs, documentaries, and articles in history journals. Tertiary sources are those based on secondary sources, such as encyclopedia entries, newspaper articles, library databases, and books not written by historians. Secondary sources can often be more accurate than primary sources because the authors can cross-reference information with other sources and place all information within historical contexts.

Historical literacy also requires understanding the importance of recording history using appropriate methods. Despite the common misconception, statues of historical figures are not an appropriate method for recording history, and their removal or destruction does not constitute the erasure of history. Monuments are first and foremost, and unavoidably, a symbol of veneration and admiration of the subjects in question. Removing or destroying monuments is appropriate under many circumstances for this reason alone. Monuments are also sometimes built as a form of antagonism, such as in the case of most American Confederate monuments that were built in the 20th century to intimidate black Americans who were gradually acquiring more rights. Additionally, the removal or destruction of a monument that possesses negative societal value is just as much a part of history as the creation of the monument, and is recorded as such by historians and historical texts.

ESSENTIAL

PSYCHOLOGICAL

WARFARE

INFORMATION

This section provides a basic overview of the most essential information required for understanding psychological warfare. This includes information about propaganda, which refers to the creation and spreading of information designed to convince others of a particular idea or cause, and most commonly information designed to mislead. This section will place a particular focus on how the ruling class controls populations by manipulating their views about politics, economics, society, and culture.

The Overton window

The range of ideas, and particularly policies, that are considered acceptable in mainstream politics at any given time. Ideas outside the Overton window will appear as too unusual, unacceptable, or extreme, to most people. In fact it is common for ideas outside the Overton window to elicit strongly negative emotional responses, and for those who advocate for them to be ridiculed, even if these ideas come to be widely accepted eventually. Politicians who advocate for such ideas often run the risk of damaging their reputations, which usually prevents radical but necessary policies from being pursued.

Creeping normality

The process of a major change coming to be perceived as normal as a consequence of unnoticeable incremental changes. This term is usually applied to emerging situations or phenomenon that would be considered highly objectionable or controversial if they emerged in a single step. For example, consumers may come to accept exploitative business practices if these practices are introduced gradually over the course of years. Creeping normality has also come to be understood as one explanation for why otherwise mentally sound and seemingly moral people can end up committing, or being complicit in, grossly immoral acts.

Echo chamber

In the context of political discourse, an echo chamber is a metaphorical description of any insular environment in which particular ideas, beliefs, and information, are repeated, amplified, and reinforced, without the pushback of dissenting voices. Echo chambers are considered harmful because of their ability to encourage the adoption of unsubstantiated and sometimes dangerous beliefs. Societies can limit the harmful influence of echo chambers by ensuring their populations are critically minded and highly educated, by persuading people outside of echo chambers to educate and challenge those inside them, and by encouraging people to consume information from a wide variety of authoritative sources, or at least a wide variety of sources that offer different or opposing perspectives.

White, gray, and black propaganda

- White propaganda is propaganda that does not hide its origin. It is the most common type of propaganda.
- Gray propaganda is propaganda that does not identify its origin.
- Black propaganda is propaganda that hides its origin, and pretends to be created by those it is designed to discredit. It is typically used

to vilify, embarrass, or discredit, an opponent through misrepresentation.

Misinformation and disinformation

Two types of false or misleading information that is created and disseminated for the purpose of changing people's minds. Misinformation is defined by a lack of deceitful intent, while disinformation is defined by the presence of deceitful intent.

Factoid

An unverified or inaccurate piece of information that is presented as fact, particularly by the news media, and which usually becomes widely accepted as true because of frequent repetition. More recently, a factoid has also come to describe any true piece of information, and particularly one propagated by the news media, that is considered too trivial or briefly relevant to be deserving of the attention it is given.

Obscurantism

Deliberately restricting access to information, or deliberately presenting information in an incomplete, imprecise, or confusing manner, in order to limit understanding and further inquiry. Obscurantism is a tactic used in many forms of propaganda.

Sophistry

The art of utilizing superficially plausible but fallacious arguments, particularly to deceive others.

Dogma

A belief or principle that is declared by a perceived authority, or accepted by individuals, to be irrefutable, regardless of evidence and reason. A person who makes such assertions can be called dogmatic.

Classical conditioning (a.k.a. Pavlovian conditioning) and operant conditioning (a.k.a. instrumental conditioning)

Two founding theories of "behaviorism", which is an area of psychology dedicated to understanding human behavior through manipulating and studying measurable human behaviors, as opposed to studying thoughts and feelings. Classical conditioning and operant conditioning are utilized in many forms of propaganda.

Classical conditioning involves changing a person's involuntary behavior, whereas operant conditioning involves changing a person's voluntary behavior. Classical conditioning achieves behavioral change by associating a neutral stimulus with a stimulus that produces a particular physiological response, whereas operant conditioning achieves behavioral change by rewarding or punishing a particular behavior.

An example of classical conditioning would be manipulating a person to squint their eyes whenever they hear a particular sound. If a particular sound always or regularly played a second before a person had a bright flashlight shone in their eyes, they may gradually begin instinctively squinting their eyes after hearing the sound but before the flashlight is turned on. This would be an example of classical conditioning, because the automatic response of squinting would have become so intrinsically associated with this particular sound that this behavioral outcome would occur even in the absence of the flashlight. A real-world example of classical conditioning would be a person getting emotional upon hearing a particular song because they once heard the song during a highly emotional moment in their life.

An example of operant conditioning would be manipulating a person to raise their hand whenever they hear a particular sound. If a person was rewarded with money every time they raised their hand after a particular sound was played, they may gradually begin raising their hand after hearing the sound but before the money has been offered or guaranteed. This would be an example of operant conditioning because the person's behavior would not be a natural

physiological response like squinting, and because they would have learned to change their behavior in response to a reward. A real-world example of operant conditioning would be an employee choosing to work harder because their colleagues received bonuses for working harder.

Gaslighting

An insidious form of psychological manipulation and emotional abuse that involves attempting to undermine and reshape a person's understanding of reality, particularly by sowing seeds of doubt which make them question their own memory, perception, or sanity. Gaslighting overlaps with lying, but they are not one and the same. Gaslighting predominantly involves lying about information the target is already aware of, and doing so in a persistent and unwavering manner for the purpose of gaining power over the target. Unlike lying, gaslighting also usually involves attacking and placing blame on the target, and is often done in the knowledge that this will inflict psychological harm. In interpersonal relationships, gaslighting also usually involves belittling the other person, trivializing their concerns, diverting attention away to less relevant or irrelevant issues, and refusing to properly engage in conversations. While gaslighting predominantly occurs in interpersonal relationships, it is not uncommon for it to be utilized in parasocial relationships, such as when politicians or newscasters repeatedly lie to the public.

Base and superstructure

Two linked theoretical concepts proposed by Karl Marx.

- The base broadly refers to a society's economic system, including the relations of production, and the power dynamics these lead to.
- The superstructure refers to a society's organizations, relationships, and ideas, that are not directly related to production, such as its culture, religions, values, ideologies, media, education institutions, justice systems, and political establishments.

According to Marx, these two parts of society support and influence each other, although the base affects the superstructure more so than the other way around. In this way, the economic system that a society adopts, and the relationships, wealth distribution, status, etc. that this leads to, can shape all other areas of society. Under capitalism, the base gives rise to a ruling class, who control and manipulate the superstructure to benefit themselves, which subsequently results in the reinforcement and refinement of the base, which is capitalism.

Milieu control

Attempting to control the social environment of a target, primarily through social pressure and limiting access to information, in order to isolate and manipulate them.

Psychopolitics

A form of psychological warfare used to achieve political goals. Most commonly it is used to describe the psychological techniques that the ruling class uses to influence the thoughts, and consequently the loyalties, of the masses. Psychopolitics does not merely involve influencing people's beliefs regarding political subjects, but also economic, social, and cultural subjects. Psychopolitics is also sometimes used by the ruling class of one country to influence the citizens of another country.

Cultural hegemony

The inordinate influence or domination of one culture over another, either intentionally or as an unintentional byproduct of unavoidable cross-cultural influences. This influence or domination can include political and economic ideologies.

In Marxian theory, cultural hegemony refers more specifically to a culturally diverse society where the ideas that protect and empower

the ruling class become so deeply integrated into the fabric of society that they become normalized, unquestioned, and accepted as common sense by the masses. In other words, cultural hegemony in the Marxist sense is the consequence of the successful indoctrination of the masses by the ruling class.

Agenda-setting

A theory regarding mass communication that describes the ability of the news media to determine the public agenda due to their power to ignore or highlight political, economic, social, and cultural issues. The theory postulates that the news media, and particularly the mainstream media, act as gatekeepers, since they are often the primary interface between the public and the wider world. According to this theory, the news media possesses immense power to influence the public. When used to intentionally manipulate the public, this can be understood as a form of psychopolitics.

Manufacturing consent

A specific form of psychopolitics in which the profit-driven news media uses propaganda to shape public opinion and ensure people unquestioningly accept and willingly obey the political, economic, social, and cultural narratives advocated for by their owners, shareholders, and advertisers. This is primarily achieved through rich and powerful individuals acquiring monopoly control of the media, hiring only those that are willing to promote their interests, and then using far-reaching and sophisticated communication technologies to indoctrinate as many people as possible. This is sometimes done through outright lying, but is more often achieved through more subtle tactics, such as distorting the truth, lying by omission, suppressing important information, mischaracterizing the opposition, and distracting audiences with engaging but comparatively irrelevant content. Manufacturing consent predominantly occurs via centrist and right-wing mainstream and alternative news media, but also occurs through other means, such as social media algorithms, the

entertainment industry, education systems, think tanks, and political establishments.

Manufacturing consent is effectively the means by which the ruling class uses soft power to subdue dissent and persuade people to act against their own interests. Instead of having to control the masses directly through threats, harassment, imprisonment, violence, etc. manufacturing consent enables the ruling class to control the masses without people realizing it, and therefore without fear of reprisal. Manufacturing consent is imperceptible to most people because its pervasiveness and effectiveness usually leads to cultural hegemony. The widespread promotion and acceptance of capitalism and capitalist propaganda is one of the most prominent ways manufacturing consent has manifested in modern societies.

Recuperation (politics)

The process by which politically critical or radical ideas and images are co-opted, defused, repurposed, commodified, and reincorporated back into media and society. Recuperation is used by the ruling class to take ideas that threaten their wealth and power and refashion them into docile and unthreatening versions that can replace the original. Recuperation has the effect of hindering people's ability to critique established norms and conceive of viable alternatives. Recuperation is most commonly used by the ruling class to legitimize in the eyes of the public what would otherwise be perceived as unjustified wealth and power.

An extreme example of recuperation is the overtly impossible expression "pick yourself up by your bootstraps". This is because the original expression was designed to describe absurdly impossible actions, and was most commonly used to describe how difficult it can be for people to lift themselves out of dire financial circumstances. This saying was consequently meant to be used to mock those who failed to understand this. This is an extreme example of recuperation because the sentiment expressed is clearly illogical, both literally and figuratively, and yet recuperation has convinced many people that it

is logical, which is why it is now commonly used to tell people to lift themselves out of circumstances where this is impossible, or where this advice is grossly misplaced and unreasonable.

Attitude inoculation (a.k.a. inoculation, or inoculation theory)

A strategy designed to protect opinions and attitudes from being influenced or changed by others. It involves presenting misleading information about, or unsound preemptive counterarguments to, a stated position before any arguments or clarifications can be offered by proponents of that position. A common example of this in modern discourse is the use of misinformation by capitalist propagandists to stigmatize socialism and communism, resulting in inoculated listeners being far less likely to seriously engage with people or arguments that defend these systems.

False balance (a.k.a. bothsidesism)

A media bias in which journalists present both sides of an issue, usually in an attempt to avoid appearing biased, but which implies both sides are more equally valid than they actually are. Bothsideism creates a public perception that positions supported by evidence and reason are contentious, and gives positions that are unsupported and dubious a quality of unwarranted legitimacy and respectability. It is considered a cause of misinformation for this reason. Well-known outcomes of this phenomenon in modern societies include the common yet unscientific belief that climate change is either not manmade or not an existential threat, and the common yet unscientific belief that being vaccinated is more dangerous to oneself and others than being unvaccinated.

Uncertainty tactic

Intentionally and disingenuously creating doubt regarding a conclusion, and commonly the scientific consensus, by contrasting this conclusion with a conclusion espoused by an unqualified, and often fringe, group of opposing critics. The uncertainty tactic is very

similar to bothsidesism in terms of outcomes, but differs in that the outcomes are intentional and desired, and is often pursued with the goal of entirely discrediting legitimate positions, rather than merely balancing them with alternatives. A well-known example of this tactic is portraying “intelligent design” theory as more reasonable than, or equally reasonable as, the theory of evolution, rather than as a completely unscientific idea. Another example includes portraying transgender de-transitioning as a common occurrence, rather than a rare occurrence that predominantly occurs due to social pressures and a lack of support.

Card stacking

Presenting one side of an issue or argument favorably while presenting the opposing side of the issue or argument unfavorably.

Managing the news

Deliberately influencing when and how news is distributed to the public for the purpose of manipulating public perceptions. For example, people or organizations may release information to the public late on a Friday to give journalists less time to pursue the story. Another example would be releasing information only once a major negative event occurs so that the news media and the public are too distracted to focus on anything else.

Newspeak and doublespeak

Two methods for facilitating the indoctrination of populations first described by George Orwell in his novel Nineteen Eighty-Four. They are both forms of language manipulation utilized by the ruling class in the real-world to help indoctrinate the lower classes. Orwell created these two terms to advance his belief that detailed, nuanced, descriptive, and clear language, was essential for critical thinking and for empowering the oppressed.

- Newspeak is the official language of Oceania, the totalitarian superstate in Nineteen Eighty-Four. Newspeak is a limited and simplified language characterized by its continuously depleting vocabulary. Newspeak is designed to limit critical mindedness and facilitate indoctrination, in order to prevent dissent of the established order. Newspeak encourages the use of imprecise language, hyperbolic words, vapid rhetoric, unhelpful metaphors, unnecessary abstractions, empty platitudes, meaningless clichés, and anything else that hinders objective and nuanced analysis and expression. Unsurprisingly Newspeak is most commonly ascribed to the language of politics. When politicians rely upon vague and meaningless rhetoric and campaign slogans, and refuse to answer questions or explain their policies in detail, this can be understood as the manifestation of Newspeak in the real-world.

- Doublespeak describes language that is deliberately utilized to disguise, obscure, distort, dilute, or invert, the truth. Doublespeak commonly involves the use of words and expressions that are vague or ambiguous in nature, or which have been intentionally modified, in order to achieve this aim. Doublespeak is most often used with ill intent, such as to evade, deceive, and confuse, but can also be used for tactful or amiable purposes. This can be better understood by understanding the different types of doublespeak. In 1989 linguist William Lutz published what he believed to be the four most common types of doublespeak, which he categorized as euphemisms, inflated language, jargon, and gobbledygook, also called "bureaucratese".

Euphemisms are designed to make situations more palatable. Examples would include saying "Good effort but needs some improvement" instead of "That was terrible", or saying "They passed away" instead of "They died".

Inflated language is used to make something sound better than it is by using over-the-top language. Examples would include saying "That was the best meal ever" instead of "That was a great meal", or saying "New and improved" instead of "Ever so slightly refined".

Jargon refers to terms that are understood by insiders, such as experts within a particular profession, but which are used to hide or misrepresent the truth when used for outsiders. Examples would include saying "Enhanced interrogation" instead of "Torture", or saying "Restructuring" instead of "Cutting jobs to maximize profits".

Gobbledygook involves using meaningless or confusing language, and usually overly technical language, as a way to make the truth difficult to discern. Examples would include saying "Communication deficiencies hindered our civic duties" instead of saying "We intentionally ignored our constituents", or saying "Regrettable miscalculations arose from engineering inefficiencies" instead of saying "We're not going to apologize to our customers who were harmed due to our cost cutting measures".

Doublethink

A process of indoctrination first described in the novel Nineteen Eighty-Four. Doublethink involves persuading targets to ardently believe two mutually contradictory beliefs simultaneously. Doublethink consequently requires targets to deny reality, rather than think critically about reality.

Love bombing (psychological warfare)

Attempting to influence a person by lavishing them with feigned demonstrations of attention and affection, with the intention of making them easier to manipulate. Cults commonly utilize this technique as a way of creating a sense of unity and acceptance, while the wider society is often portrayed as hostile by contrast. Love bombing inside cults is done as a coordinated effort, and is achieved through long-term members overwhelming newer members with attention, flattery, verbal seduction, and physical affection that is most commonly non-sexual in nature. Cults usually combine love bombing with attempts to cut new members off from their existing social support network, such as family and friends, so that this network is replaced entirely by cult members.

Love bombing also has a benign form, in which genuine attention and affection is given without any abusive intent. This is common and healthy in romantic relationships and parent-child relationships.

Euphoria (psychological warfare)

Cultivating a sense of euphoria in an audience so that they are more likely to comply or increase their support. This is most commonly achieved at large-scale social events, and often by using a combination of speeches, music, lighting, flag-waving, and spectacles. Examples of such social events include military parades, campaign rallies, and religious services.

Cult of personality (psychological warfare)

Creating an irrationally passionate base of support for a person so that they can more easily manipulate their supporters. This is most commonly achieved by the news media through unquestioning flattery and praise of this person, and particularly by heralding them as a heroic figure that is capable of being an ideal leader. One of the most well-known modern-day examples of a cult of personality figure is Donald Trump, whose cult of personality was created primarily through a combination of capitalist propaganda, Trump's personal public branding, and the biased coverage of right-wing news organizations like Fox News and One America News Network.

Demoralization (psychological warfare)

Attempting to erode the hope and determination of an opponent in order to make them give up, and ideally defect.

Latitudes of acceptance

Manipulating a target to make an unacceptable idea appear more acceptable. There are 2 primary techniques for increasing the boundaries of acceptance. The first is to initially propose a more

extreme idea so that the original idea appears more acceptable by contrast. The second is to propose an idea which is acceptable but as close as possible to the edge of acceptability, and then incrementally change the idea until it has been modified into the original idea.

Door-in-the-face technique

Presenting a worse offer before providing a better offer in order to make the second offer appear more appealing by contrast. For example, if a salesperson wants to sell an item for \$100 when the public is only willing to pay \$50, the salesperson can use this technique by first offering the item for \$200, and then reducing it to \$100.

Foot-in-the-door technique

Attempting to persuade a person to agree to perform a small request so that they are more likely to agree to perform a larger request at a later point. Psychological experiments have proven this technique to be highly effective.

Transfer (a.k.a. association) (psychological warfare)

Attempting to project positive or negative qualities, and most commonly praise or blame, onto something in order to make it appear as if it also possesses those same qualities. An example of this technique being used to encourage a positive connection would be a politician being photographed in front of their country's flag. An example of this technique being used to encourage a negative connection would be a socialist being superimposed over an image of impoverished people queuing in breadlines.

Virtue words

A word or phrase with a positive meaning or connotation that is intentionally associated with something in order to imbue it with this positive quality. Examples include words and

phrases such as “peaceful”, “sacred”, “hopeful”, “secure”, “original”, “cutting-edge”, “greatest”, and “The Truth”.

Beautiful people (psychological warfare)

Using people that possess conventionally idealized traits to promote or sell something, such as a product or an idea. This most commonly involves using outwardly happy, successful, and physically attractive people, and often celebrities, in conjunction with whatever is being promoted or sold. In the case of selling products and services this also commonly involves sexually suggestive or overt visuals or audio.

Common man (a.k.a. plain folks) (psychological warfare)

Attempting to appeal to those traditionally thought of as “common people” through various forms of association. The “common people” in this instance are generally defined through contrast with a perceived or real “elite”. An example of this technique would be a business trying to convince an audience that their product or service is desirable to “common people”. A politician may use this technique by trying to convince an audience that they are one of the “common people”, or that their position is shared by “common people”. They may do this by trying to communicate in the same manner and style of the target audience, including using language, adopting body language, and wearing clothes, commonly associated with that audience.

Bandwagon (psychological warfare)

Attempting to persuade a target to agree to something by drawing attention to its popularity. This technique works by appealing to the idea of the wisdom of crowds, and by taking advantage of people’s desire to avoid missing out on something special or be part of the winning side.

Silent majority (psychological warfare)

Attempting to persuade a target by trying to convince them that the majority of people quietly agree with their position, whether or not this is true. The silent majority technique takes advantage of the same psychological vulnerabilities as the bandwagon technique.

Unstated assumption (psychological warfare)

Refusing to overtly state an idea that an argument relies upon because doing so would undermine the strength of the argument. An example would be someone defending the right of the Confederate States of America to secede from United States, and yet simultaneously refusing to state the underlying idea that these Confederate states would have used their sovereignty for benign purposes, when in reality these states obviously and primarily wanted sovereignty so that they could maintain slavery.

Minimization (psychological warfare)

Downplaying the significance of something. Minimization is most commonly used when complete denial is impossible. Common synonyms for minimization include "belittling", "devaluing", "trivializing", "understating", "underplaying", and "making light of".

Fear, uncertainty, and doubt (a.k.a. FUD)

Attempting to undermine the credibility of something through the dissemination of disinformation that is designed to create fear, uncertainty, and doubt.

Hyperbole [pronounced hi-purr-bur-lee]

Using deliberate exaggeration to make something appear better or worse than it actually is. This commonly involves using black-and-white terms, such as "best", "worst", "always", "never", "vital", and "irrelevant". Hyperbole is a common characteristic of Newspeak.

Oversimplification

Simplifying something to the extent that the argument that it supports is made redundant. This commonly manifests in the form of providing simple answers to complex problems. Oversimplification also commonly involves making emotional appeals in place of sound arguments.

Deepity

A statement that appears profound but is so simple it is effectively meaningless, even if true in some sense. For example, the statement "love is just a word" may superficially appear deep and meaningful, but the sentiment being expressed is devoid of substance or value. Another example is the fascist expression "Hard times create strong men, strong men create good times, good times create weak men, weak men create hard times". Not only is there no evidence to support this sentiment, but historically the opposite has been true. "Hard times" often lead to societal problems, such as an increase in mental health problems, drug abuse, violent crimes, dangerous radicalism, moral regression, and poor education, which are far more likely to produce people with low intelligence, critical mindedness, humility, integrity, compassion, patience, and most other socially desirable traits. In comparison, "good times" have traditionally avoided these problems, and have instead empowered people with the time, energy, money, opportunities, education, etc. to self-actualize and contribute their best to society. The statement "strong men create good times" may be the only part that is true, since brave and noble activists and revolutionaries have traditionally been necessary during "hard times" to fight for the large-scale societal changes necessary for creating "good times". However, even this statement is problematic, since the term "strong men" is also vague enough to produce very different interpretations, including contradictory interpretations, among a population. This is evidenced by the fact that socialists and fascists, and particularly their leaders,

are considered “very weak” or “very strong” according to different people.

Sloganeering (psychological warfare)

Using a slogan to convince others, rather than relying upon a sound argument. These slogans are usually deepity statements that convey a vague and agreeable sentiment, but which lack substance or relevancy. Politicians commonly use sloganeering to cultivate support from audiences during rallies and debates, giving the superficial impression of making valid points but without saying anything of value. Sloganeering often involves using weasel words, and is a common characteristic of Newspeak.

Glittering generality

A word or phrase that is so vague that it cannot reasonably be used to support an argument on its own, and yet is nonetheless used for this purpose because it is highly emotionally appealing to a particular audience due to being closely associated with ideas and beliefs that are highly valued by that audience. Examples include words and phrases such as “liberty”, “freedom”, “patriotism”, “glory”, “honor”, “strength”, “courage”, “hope”, “justice”, and “tough on crime”. Glittering generalities can help cultivate support without the need to offer anything detailed, intelligent, or valuable, in return.

Glittering generalities and virtue words appear similar but are nonetheless different. Virtue words involve using a word or phrase to imbue something with a positive quality in the eyes of a target, while glittering generalities involve using a word or phrase to represent an oversimplified idea in place of an actual argument.

Labeling (psychological warfare)

Describing something, such as a person, ideology, or argument, with a word or phrase in order to simplify it and attribute it with the positive or negative traits associated with that word or phrase.

Stereotyping (psychological warfare)

Attempting to argue that a target is part of a group, and must therefore also possess the traits correctly or incorrectly attributed to that group.

Information overload (psychological warfare)

Presenting too much information for a target to process, making it difficult for them to understand and make an appropriate decision.

The firehose of falsehood (a.k.a. firehosing)

A propaganda technique in which a large number of messages, and particularly those which are deceptive, untrue, or controversial, are broadcast to the public rapidly, repetitively, and continuously, particularly via the news media and social media. These messages do not always present a consistent and unified message or perspective, but can instead contradict one another. The aim of firehosing is not merely to indoctrinate audiences, but to confuse and overwhelm audiences to such an extent that they have neither the time nor mental energy to critically assess or verify the messages presented. As Garry Kasparov famously said, "The point of modern propaganda isn't only to misinform or push an agenda. It is to exhaust your critical thinking, to annihilate truth." Just like many other forms of propaganda, firehosing also serves to distract society from important issues, to cause people to doubt reality, to stigmatize or dehumanize out-groups, and to cultivate infighting and create disunity in opposition forces. Firehosing has been used most

prominently and successfully in recent history by Russian President Vladimir Putin, particularly during the 2014 annexation of Crimea, and by former American President Donald Trump during his campaigns and presidency.

Dead cat strategy (a.k.a. deadcatting)

The political strategy of deliberately performing a shocking act or making a shocking announcement in order to divert media and public attention away from a perceived failing that is a focus of attention.

Repetition (psychological warfare)

Repeating a word, phrase, or theme, multiple times in a short space of time, and particularly in a single sentence, paragraph, or speech, in order to increase the likelihood of an audience remembering it or perceiving it as significant. This technique is commonly used in rhymes and jingles.

Ad nauseam (psychological warfare)

Repeating an idea to an excessive degree with the purpose of convincing people that it is true. Evidence demonstrates that this technique can work under many circumstances, particularly when used by a source that is perceived as an authority.

Lying by omission

Leaving out vital information, or failing to correct misconceptions, as a means of hiding the truth.

Half-truth

Using information that includes some element of truth but is deceptive due to omitting vital information. This can be achieved in numerous ways, such as presenting information that is partially true, or which is entirely true but which lacks

important context, or which includes a deceptive element, such as ambiguous language. While half-truths are often used maliciously, they can also be used benignly, such as when being diplomatic and wishing to avoid offending someone.

Paltering

Using a selectively chosen truthful statement in order to mislead. This can include using a truthful statement to convince a target that something that is false is true, or merely using a truthful statement to distract from a more important truth.

Limited hangout

Revealing a limited amount of information about a subject that was previously kept secret in order to appease a target and distract them from more important information about the subject.

Big lie

Grossly distorting or misrepresenting the truth in order to rally support for, or simply justify, an unjustifiable action. For audiences to be convinced of such an extreme lie generally requires the lie to be repeated ad nauseam across various forms of media. A well-known historical example was the lie perpetuated by the Nazis that the Jews were responsible for starting the First World War and for the conditions of the Treaty of Versailles, which the Nazis used to rally support for, and justify, the persecution and mass extermination of Jews. A well-known modern example is the lie perpetuated by Donald Trump and his allies that the 2020 U.S. presidential election was stolen through widespread voter and electoral fraud, which they used to rally support for, and justify, their illegal attempt to overturn the results of the election.

Phobia indoctrination

Instilling irrational fears in an individual or group for the purpose of manipulating and controlling them. Phobia indoctrination is usually enacted intentionally for the purpose of rallying support for a cause, and dissuading group members from questioning or leaving the group. Phobia indoctrination commonly manifests in religions and cults as a fear of an undesirable afterlife or of god's disapproval, although it is also not uncommon outside of religion. For example, under capitalism phobia indoctrination is commonly used to cultivate irrational fears of socialism and communism.

Dog whistling

Using coded or suggestive language that implies one meaning to laypeople, but intentionally implies an additional meaning to a smaller targeted audience. It is used to convey ideas that are likely to provoke controversy but without attracting negative attention, particularly because dog whistling allows speakers to maintain plausible deniability. Accusations of dog whistling are often criticized, either accurately or inaccurately, for projecting onto statements secondary meanings that cannot reasonably be inferred, or which can be reasonably inferred but which were not intended by the speaker.

Stochastic terrorism

The use of mass media to incite random actors to carry out violent or terrorist acts that are statistically predictable but whose specifics cannot be predicted. More specifically, stochastic terrorism involves the public demonization of an individual or group, and which is guaranteed to result in acts of violence or terrorism against these individuals or groups, even though the time, location, or perpetrators, of such acts are effectively impossible to predict. Stochastic terrorism therefore doesn't just refer to those who engage in violence or terrorism, but also those who incite these acts through mass media.

Agitators of stochastic terrorism can do so overtly, or through more subtle methods such as dog whistling. An example of the former would be a terrorist releasing a video encouraging their supporters to commit random acts of terrorism on their behalf. An example of the latter would be a political commentator who regularly denounces a minority group and calls them a danger to society, and therefore does not directly advocate for random acts of terrorism against them but nonetheless indirectly encourages this. Stochastic terrorism can also occur slowly and extremely indirectly, such as through the continual dehumanization or demonization of a targeted group. One of the most dangerous and common examples of this in the modern world is the ongoing dehumanization and demonization of LGBT+ individuals and those who defend them, which among other problems is resulting in these individuals being victims of harassment, violence, and even murder, as well as resulting in many of these individuals committing suicide.

Third-party technique

Using a third-party to present information that is favorable to a person or organization, in the hope that the public will perceive this information with greater legitimacy. This technique works on the principle that people are more likely to perceive information as less biased if it originates from an independent source. This technique can take many forms, such as hiring journalists to publish articles that are favorable, or hiring scientists to produce “scientific studies” that are favorable. Industry-sponsored groups that relay this favorable information to the public are known as “front groups”. These groups imply or claim that they are objective and work in the public’s interests, but in reality they operate to facilitate the hidden interests of the organizations that sponsor them.

Astroturfing

Hiding the sponsors of, or paying people to publically support, a message, person, or organization, in order to give the misleading impression of grassroots support. The term

astroturfing is derived from AstroTurf, a brand of synthetic carpeting designed to resemble natural grass, and is a play on the word "grassroots".

Humane washing

Conveying a false impression or using misleading information to convince others that something is more respectful of animal rights than it actually is. It is commonly used in marketing campaigns for products and services derived from exploited and abused animals.

Greenwashing

Conveying a false impression or using misleading information to convince others that something is more environmentally friendly than it actually is. It is commonly used in marketing campaigns for products and services that are environmentally harmful at some point in their lifecycle.

Redwashing

Conveying a false impression or using misleading information to convince others that something is more progressive and concerned about social equality and justice than it actually is. With regards to politics, redwashing is most commonly used to criticize centrist and right-wing populists who coopt left-wing terms and ideas in their rhetoric, but who do not fight for or introduce left-wing policies when in a position to do so.

Pinkwashing

Conveying a false impression or using misleading information to convince others that something is more supportive of LGBT+ issues than it actually is. While this practice has brought attention to important LGBT+ issues in the past, the term is predominantly used as a pejorative, since the politicians and organizations who engage in pinkwashing

usually do not support the LGBT+ community in other equally or more important ways, and may even marginalize or oppress them.

Rainbow capitalism

Pinkwashing when it is used exclusively by capitalist institutions for profit-seeking purposes. More specifically, it refers to the incorporation of aspects of the LGBT+ aesthetics, community, movement, history, etc. into capitalist products, services, and marketing, in order to capitalize on the purchasing power of members and supporters of the LGBT+ community. Rainbow capitalism is criticized for being little more than a form of commodification and virtue signaling.

Perseverance porn

Portraying horrific situations as positive, and commonly inspirational and heart-warming, because of the virtuous nature and actions of the individuals involved, while simultaneously ignoring the underlying political and economic problems responsible for creating such situations in the first place. Under capitalism it is commonly employed by news media organizations to distract from capitalism's flaws. For example, a news organization may portray as inspirational and heartwarming the story of a child being able to afford essential medical treatment because of a fundraiser held by their classmates. If this news organization was not grossly incompetent or corrupt, it would instead portray such stories as damning evidence of the brokenness of the government or the economy for failing to protect the most vulnerable members of society.

Poverty porn (politics)

In modern discourse, poverty porn most commonly refers to inaccurate and exploitative portrayals of poverty that are designed to misinform or entertain audiences, and usually for a political or profit-

seeking agenda. It treats those in poverty as subjects to be critiqued and entertained by, rather than vulnerable and complex humans deserving of empathy and dignity. It also treats poverty as a simple problem caused predominantly by the personal failings of those living in poverty, rather than as an unnecessary and intentional problem created by political and economic organizations and systems controlled by the ruling class. Poverty porn is commonly utilized by right-wing news and entertainment media organizations to accuse the poor of being self-entitled, envious, and lazy, and to argue that welfare programs should be cut back to discourage such behavior.

This modern political interpretation of the term poverty porn slightly differs from its historical meaning, which referred more generally to any type of media that exploits the circumstances of the poor to generate a strong emotional response in audiences in order to encourage them to support a profitable or charitable endeavor. Examples of this include news and entertainment media organizations engaging in this practice to increase viewership, and charities engaging in this practice to increase donations. Poverty porn in this sense is also often criticized for simplifying the causes of poverty, but also for potentially being unnecessarily intrusive and demeaning under specific circumstances.

Conscious capitalism

The pro-capitalist economic philosophy that capitalist enterprises should operate ethically while pursuing profits, and that this is both a feasible and ideal economic model. Conscious capitalism is strongly criticized by Marxists as an untenable large-scale approach for addressing capitalism's problems, and that its origins and modern advocacy amount to little more than capitalist propaganda.

Capitalist realism

The term "capitalist realism" has a number of definitions, but in contemporary economic discourse the term most commonly refers to Mark Fishers definition, as described in his 2009 book "Capitalist

Realism: Is There No Alternative". Fisher uses the term to describe the widespread sense that capitalism is the only viable economic system, even to the point that viable alternatives effectively become impossible to imagine. In other words, capitalist realism effectively describes the widespread belief that capitalism is the natural manifestation and refinement of economic processes within society, rather than being an entirely manmade system which is forced upon the masses by the ruling class. A common consequence of capitalist realism is that most people develop the incorrect belief that the negative consequences of capitalism, such as recessions, climate change, and unsustainable resource depletion, are natural and unavoidable consequences of economic activity, rather than consequences of capitalism that could be avoided in alternative systems. The sentiment that capitalist realism expresses is summarized in the well-known Fredric Jameson quote "It is easier to imagine the end of the world than to imagine the end of capitalism."

Captive audience meeting

A mandatory meeting organized by an employer with the purpose of discouraging employees from organizing or joining a labor union. Captive audience meetings commonly utilize propaganda and veiled threats.

The alt-right pipeline

A system that encourages individuals to adopt increasingly right-wing and alt-right beliefs. More specifically, it refers to internet ecosystems and infrastructures, and particularly the YouTube algorithm, that slowly desensitize and radicalize people through exposure to increasingly right-wing and alt-right content. This content usually starts off as humorous and superficially innocuous, but is nonetheless conservative or ultraconservative in nature. As viewers are recommended new content, they become increasingly exposed to content that is hostile towards left-wing individuals, organizations, media, ideologies, etc., until they become fully

immersed within right-wing echo chambers. This pipeline commonly results in people adopting extreme and harmful right-wing beliefs.

A list of well-known right-wing individuals and organizations that are generally considered part of the alt-right pipeline, but are predominantly not alt-right themselves, are included within Chapter 1 of this manifesto, within the section titled "Sources of propaganda". There are also well-known individuals who exist closer to the center, or who are believed or profess to exist closer to the center, but who are nonetheless criticized for moving people over to the right, such as Joe Rogan, Bill Maher, Jimmy Dore, and Russell Brand. Individuals actually considered alt-right include figures such as Richard Spencer, Nick Fuentes, Paul Joseph Watson, Jared Taylor, Jack Posobiec, Owen Benjamin, James Allsup, Milo Yiannopoulos, and Steve Bannon. It should go without saying that these alt-right individuals should never be listened to, and should be considered a danger to society.

The BITE Model

A system developed by clinical psychologist Steven Hassan for analyzing and recognizing cults, or organizations which exhibit cultish traits. The BITE model uses 4 criteria for determining the extent to which an organization can be considered a cult. These include behavioral control, information control, thought control, and emotional control. These types of control are also often used to some degree by religious organizations, human trafficking organizations, and terrorist groups.

- Behavioral control involves controlling a person's physical life. This can include dictating who they are allowed to interact with, how they are allowed to dress and present themselves, what they are allowed to eat and drink, when they are allowed to sleep, and what recreational activities they are allowed to engage in. Behavioral control often includes the enforcement of very rigid rules, and permission is usually required for major personal decisions. Behavioral control commonly includes financial exploitation and manipulation, usually for the purpose of creating dependency.

Rewards, threats, and punishments, are also commonly used to shape behavior.

- Information control is used to minimize access to non-cult sources, and use cult-generated information and propaganda to deceive and manipulate members. This type of control also includes encouraging personal confessions and spying on other cult members, with the hidden purpose of using this information to manipulate members, including threatening them if they express a desire to leave.
- Thought control includes facilitating the internalization of cult doctrines, discouraging questioning, and using Newspeak to simplify complex thoughts and ideas in order to hinder critical mindedness. This type of control also includes attitude inoculation by labeling alternative belief systems and ideas as illegitimate or evil.
- Emotional control is used in a multitude of different ways by cults. Members are usually made to believe that certain healthy emotions are selfish and evil, and that certain harmful emotions are noble and good. Members are usually made to feel guilty and unworthy in order to push them to engage more fully with the cult. Members are taught emotion-stopping techniques to block feelings of homesickness, anger, doubt, and other reasonable yet unpleasant emotions that could encourage them to question or leave the cult. Members are commonly instilled with phobias of the outside world and non-members, as well as fear of the consequences of doubting cult doctrines or leaving the cult. Cult leaders also commonly intentionally put members through extreme emotional highs and lows, usually by love bombing and praising them one moment, and then declaring them a horrible person or sinner the next.

ESSENTIAL

DEBATING

INFORMATION

This section provides a basic overview of the most essential information required for having productive debates, and for identifying manipulative debate tactics.

General advice

The following is a summary of widely accepted advice for persuading others during debates. Some of this advice is based on the principles of “deep canvassing” and the “Socratic method”.

- Strive to achieve understanding, rather than striving to win.
- Respect your opponent, and avoid patronizing or judging them.
- Give your opponent plenty of room to talk, especially in order to discover and understand their underlying beliefs and assumptions.
- Show genuine interest in your opponent’s opinions.
- Overtly acknowledge and legitimize your opponent’s concerns.
- If your opponent expresses strong negative emotions, attempt to label and acknowledge their emotions to demonstrate empathy.
- Describe your opponent’s position until they agree with your interpretation.
- Pinpoint the reasons why your opponent disagrees with you.
- Address your opponent’s most important arguments first.
- Keep asking questions in an attempt to find contradictions and unreasonable assumptions in your opponent’s beliefs.
- Try to lead your opponent to reach your conclusions on their own, especially by asking questions that encourage critical self-reflection.

- Take your opponents incorrect beliefs to their logical extremes.
- Highlight the risks and dangers of your opponent's incorrect beliefs.
- Give your opponent the opportunity to retreat from their positions and change their mind while maintaining their dignity.
- Agree with your opponent where possible, and concede when uncertain or wrong, but contextualize this if this is irrelevant.
- Structure your arguments like a well-structured essay so that they are easier to follow.
- Make one point at a time, making it easier for your opponent to respond.
- Try to stay on topic, rather than jumping from topic to topic.
- Always remain focused on your strongest arguments.
- Only use analogies and evidence that are relevant and high-quality.
- Appeal to your opponent's empathy and values, and use anecdotes to ground and humanize your position where appropriate.
- Attempt to normalize your position in the eyes of your opponent.
- Attempt to examine issues from every angle.
- Regularly contextualize the topic within broader contexts, and not just to maintain perspective but also to reestablish common ground.
- Keep the tone conversational, rather than heated, where possible.
- Avoid words that could come across as judgmental or insulting.
- Keep your points and statements as short and succinct as possible.
- Be intentional and extremely precise with your language.
- Use nuanced rather than exaggerated language.
- Use standard terminology, rather than less common words or definitions.
- Use clear and simple language, rather than impressive but confusing language.

Please keep in mind that these tactics only work with opponents and audiences that are willing to change their mind. In public debates with bigots, ideologues, and propagandists, disparaging tactics like sarcasm and mockery can often be better suited for convincing their supporters of the irrationality of their positions. This is because these individuals commonly cultivate followings because of the aesthetics of their rhetoric and persona, meaning that disparaging and humiliating such individuals, while also defeating their arguments via

evidence and reason, can be necessary for defeating them in the eyes of their supporters. However, this generally takes great skill to do effectively.

Reductio ad absurdum (a.k.a. argument to absurdity)

A form of argument that attempts to demonstrate the irrationality of an argument by taking it to its eventual logical conclusion or logical extreme. Alternatively, it can be used to defend an argument by demonstrating an absurdity if the argument wasn't true.

An example that attacks an argument:

Child: "This sign says don't pick any flowers, but I only want to pick one."

Adult: "But if everyone only picked one flower, soon there wouldn't be any flowers."

An example that defends an argument:

Person 1: "We need to place some restrictions on everyone's right to bear arms."

Person 2: "That's an infringement on people's basic rights and freedom."

Person 1: "But if there aren't restrictions then we would have to allow people to access nuclear and biological weapons, and allow children to access guns."

Reductio ad absurdum arguments can also be used fallaciously to give the superficial appearance of undermining an argument. The slippery slope fallacy and the appeal to ridicule fallacy are two such inappropriate applications.

Fallacious example:

"If you want to raise the minimum wage then why not triple it, or increase it tenfold?"

This reductio ad absurdum argument fails because it ignores the intricacies of the real-world. Something that is irrational or harmful

when taken to an extreme does not negate the possibility that it may be ideal in moderation.

Brandolini's law (a.k.a. the bullshit asymmetry principle)

The principle that the time and energy required to refute an unsound argument or accusation is orders of magnitude greater than the time and energy required to make such an argument or accusation.

The politeness-efficiency paradox

Coined by the founders of The Xova Movement, the politeness-efficiency paradox refers to the phenomenon wherein a debate between two unequally matched opponents is incapable of being both optimally polite and optimally efficient simultaneously. This phenomenon arises from the fact that a constructive debate will often necessitate that the more critically minded or informed debater regularly interrupt and speak substantially longer than their opponent in order to correct their fallacious arguments and ideas, which also increases the likelihood of appearing disrespectful or arrogant. The alternative is politer but usually wastes substantial time and energy. Consequently, interruptions and disproportionate speaking time are not always signs of disrespect or arrogance, but often necessary for maximally productive discussions. This problem is exacerbated by Brandolini's law. Deciding which approach to take in any given debate can be referred to as the "politeness-efficiency dilemma".

Intellectual honesty and intellectual dishonesty

- Intellectual honesty refers to an intentionally unbiased and open approach to knowledge acquisition and problem-solving, and pursuing the truth regardless of whether it agrees or disagrees with one's current knowledge, beliefs, or agenda. Intellectual honesty involves not just avoiding lying, but seeking and defending truth.
- Intellectual dishonesty refers to an intentionally biased and deceptive approach to knowledge acquisition and problem-solving,

and attempting to appear correct rather than seek the truth. Intellectual dishonesty doesn't merely involve being dishonest, but being dishonest specifically with regards to analyzing information, such as examining an opponent's arguments with greater intellectual rigor than one's own arguments. Consequently intellectual dishonesty often occurs alongside close-mindedness and bigotry.

Good faith and bad faith

Good faith refers to the intention of behaving fairly and honestly, regardless of the outcome. Bad faith refers to a persistent attempt to deceive others by pretending to hold a belief that is different to one's genuine belief. Examples of bad faith include a company representative pretending to be willing to compromise with union workers, or an insurer using deceptive language in their advertising or paperwork to avoid having to pay out claims at a later date.

When used intentionally during debates, bad faith most commonly manifests in the following ways.

- Pretending to be ignorant or naïve.
- Dismissing questions as unimportant.
- Attempting to change topic.
- Refusing to listen.
- Refusing to accept evidence or well-reasoned arguments.
- Refusing to appreciate nuance.
- Refusing to educate oneself.
- Refusing to admit when wrong.
- Refusing to acknowledge one's ignorance.
- Making unsubstantiated claims, including using anecdotal evidence.
- Asserting unknowable things as knowable, or uncertain things as certain.
- Incorrectly implying that particular evidence or ideas are obvious.
- Insisting that an exception to a rule or idea makes the rule or idea completely invalid.
- Being uncharitable when interpreting an opponent's statements and arguments.

- Being pedantic, including by unnecessarily arguing semantics.
- Using the unclear and imprecise language of a pseudo-intellectual.
- Playing the victim when this is not the case.
- Treating an opponent like an idiot.

Bad faith also commonly manifests as a form of harassment.

Example:

Person 1: "Mr. Johnson is so corrupt."

Person 2: "Well of course Mr. Johnson is corrupt you idiot. Anyone can see that!"

In this example the first speaker is intentionally interpreting the second speaker in bad faith by implying that this is their real interpretation of the original statement, when in reality this is obviously a disingenuous interpretation done for the sake of harassment.

Because of the difficulty of being consistent while being deceptive, bad faith actors usually end up expressing contradictory positions. One of the best tactics for dealing with bad faith actors during conversations is to stay on topic and ask the same question again and again until they provide enough information to reveal their true belief, and consequently prove that they are acting in bad faith.

Manipulative debate tactics

Many of the following tactics also constitute logical fallacies and are used in psychological warfare, although they've been compiled here because they are used most commonly as manipulative debate tactics.

- The Gish Gallop (a.k.a. Gish Galloping)

Overwhelming an opponent with as many arguments as possible, with no regard for their accuracy, strength, or relevance. To an uninformed audience, an opponent's hesitation or stuttering in

response to being Gish Galloped can be inaccurately interpreted as a sign of losing the debate.

- One-way hash argument

Making a simple yet typically dishonest assertion that is difficult and time consuming for an opponent to refute. In other words, a one-way hash argument is the intentional and manipulative exploitation of Brandolini's law.

- The Chewbacca defense (debate strategy)

Confusing an audience or opponent with nonsensical arguments, often in a chaotically disruptive manner, and sometimes with some degree of pageantry and showmanship, in order to disorientate and draw attention away from all legitimate opposition. The Chewbacca defense produces a similar effect to Gish Galloping but through different means. Whereas Gish Galloping only involves overwhelming an opponent with arguments, and usually arguments that remain relatively on topic, the Chewbacca defense attempts to distract and obfuscate predominantly by using unrelated and irrational evidence, statements, questions, ideas, and rhetorical devices. This can include using Newspeak and doublespeak, being intellectually dishonest, acting in bad faith, Gish Galloping, using one-way hash arguments, making overtly nonsensical arguments, repeating points ad nauseam, talking nonstop, interrupting, shouting, relying upon style over substance, and using all the other tactics detailed in this section.

- Argumentum ad nauseam

Repeating an argument until nobody cares to discuss it anymore.

- Apophasis

Disingenuously reminding or informing an audience about an opponent's flaw by declaring an unwillingness to acknowledge or discuss this flaw. An example of this would be a debater saying unprompted "I refuse to discuss my opponent's history of infidelity as it is irrelevant to this debate". Apophasis is effectively a passive-aggressive form of character assassination in which the user feigns innocence of their intent to defame their opponent.

- Just asking questions

Attempting to make controversial suggestions and wild accusations appear reasonable and acceptable by framing them as questions stemming from curiosity. By implying something via the form of a question, rather than outright stating it, the speaker can retain plausible deniability. This tactic has become more widely known in recent history due to its regular use by Fox News hosts, and particularly former host Tucker Carlson. Similar to apophasis, “just asking questions” can also be used as a passive-aggressive form of character assassination.

A common form of “just asking questions” is “Betteridge’s law of headlines”, which states that any headline that asks a question can usually be answered with a “no”. For example, the headline “Was the board of directors involved in the journalist’s murder?” implies that there may be evidence connecting the two. However, if this example were real it is unlikely any evidence would exist, since otherwise it would be a near absolute certainty that the headline would be assertive and accusatory, such as reading “Evidence reveals board of directors connected with journalist’s murder”.

“Just asking questions” can also take a form of harassment called “Sealioning”, which is also similar to the argumentum ad nauseam debate tactic. This involves jumping into conversations and endlessly asking seemingly polite and reasonable questions, but doing so with the express purpose of derailing the discussion, or receiving criticism in order to play the victim and vilify the target, or overwhelming the target into quitting the conversation and then declaring victory.

- Hearsay

Stating as reliable or true that which cannot be substantiated. Rumors are a form of hearsay.

- Presumed false premise

An argument that assumes an unproven fact has already been proven.

- Style over substance

Attempting to convince using compelling language and presentation instead of evidence and reason. Style over substance is a common characteristic of Newspeak.

- Loaded language

Biased language intended to produce an emotional response from an audience in order to directly affect their view on a subject. Loaded language is commonly used to manipulate audiences while retaining plausible deniability. An example would be a journalist using the word "terrorist" when "freedom fighter" would be more applicable. Another example would be using the term "violent riots" to describe justifiable protests, while using the term "maintaining order" to describe unjustifiable police brutality.

- Loaded question

A question that is designed to confuse a target into acknowledging and agreeing with a false or misleading claim. Loaded questions can exist either in the form of a leading question or a trick question.

A leading question includes a claim that is designed to persuade respondents to give a desired answer. An example would be "Experts agree this Amendment will protect workers like yourself. Are you going to side with the experts and support this Amendment?" A respondent would feel compelled to support the Amendment as so not to appear foolish, even though the questioner may believe that the Amendment would infringe upon workers' rights.

A trick question by contrast does not coax a particular answer from a respondent, but instead creates a situation where the mere act of answering the question directly implies agreement with a false claim. The question "Have you stopped beating your partner?" is a classic example. The question demands a yes or no answer, but both of these answers imply that the respondent agrees with the false presupposition that they used to beat their partner.

In other words, a leading question includes a claim or sentiment which is designed to “lead” a respondent into giving a particular answer, whereas a trick question attempts to “trick” a respondent into agreeing with a claim regardless of how they answer.

- Bait-and-Switch (rhetoric)

Offering something appealing to gain favor, such as a palatable solution, before defying expectations and presenting something less desirable, such as an unappealing truth. Politicians, cultists, and quacks, are known to commonly use this tactic to sell ideas and acquire followers.

- Motte-and-Bailey

Stating a position which is difficult to defend, but then responding to criticism by retreating to a similar but different position that is easier to defend. The bailey refers to the position which is difficult to defend, while the motte refers to the position which is easier to defend. Those who are called out for this tactic will often argue that the first position and second position are effectively or actually one and the same, or that the two positions are different but the first position was actually the second position all along and their opponent just misunderstood.

- Straw man fallacy (a.k.a. strawmanning)

Misrepresenting a person’s position, and then attempting to discredit this misrepresentation rather than their actual position. This misrepresented argument can be called a “straw man argument”. The opposite of strawmanning is steelmanning, in which a debater first attempts to accurately define a person’s position before addressing it.

- Whataboutism (a.k.a. whataboutery)

Deflecting criticism by criticizing something which is supposedly equally bad or worse, but which is actually irrelevant to the immediate discussion.

- What’s the harm?

An appeal used by quacks to encourage or justify the use of whatever they are advocating for. Often the thing in question is either directly harmful, used in place of something necessary, or at the very least a waste of time and money.

- Science was wrong before

The claim that scientific consensus and predictions can be dismissed because science was wrong in the past. This is often accompanied with pseudoscience, anecdotal evidence, and fringe ideas. This tactic is commonly used by those who deny evolution and anthropogenic climate change.

- One single proof

Attempting to dismiss a reasonable theory, and the incomplete but robust evidence that supports it, by claiming that without a particular proof, the entire theory is invalid. This tactic is commonly used by scientifically illiterate individuals and bad faith actors.

- Quote mining

Taking quotes out of context in order to inappropriately make them appear to support an argument, or to make the quoted person appear to hold views they actually don't.

- Appeal to censorship

Censoring dissenting information on a webpage, including user comments, in order to give the impression that very few people disagree with the information presented.

- If-by-whiskey

Using deliberately ambiguous language in an attempt to affirm whichever point a listener holds. This is commonly used by politicians and spokespersons to avoid stating their actual opinion, while simultaneously attempting to appease listeners by appearing to agree with them.

- Friend argument

Justifying assertions about a group, and particularly for the purpose of defending a prejudice towards that group, by stating that one has a friend belonging to that group. A person can have a friend that is part of a particular demographic, while still believing that their assertions apply to the majority of that demographic, or at least disproportionately so compared to other demographics. This tactic is commonly used to justify racist and xenophobic beliefs.

- Escape hatch

Attempting to give the superficial appearance of evading defeat or achieving victory when backed into a corner by shutting down the debate with a statement that cannot be refuted or a question that cannot be answered, such as an unfalsifiable claim, a circular argument, or an unreasonable demand for evidence. A common example is the statement “god moves in mysterious ways”, which is often used to dismiss all criticisms of god’s absence during times of suffering. Another example is the sentiment “It’s just a bit of fun”, which is often used to justify inappropriate behavior. An escape hatch commonly used by conspiracy theorists is to declare that any experts that disagree with them must be on the payroll of a corrupt organization.

If this tactic is used prior to a debate or situation, this is called a pre-escape hatch. This is common among “psychics” and practitioners of alternative medicines, who explain beforehand that their methods don’t always work, which gives them the rhetorical power to justify their beliefs under all circumstances regardless of outcome.

- Thought-terminating cliché

A commonly used phrase, sometimes passed as folk wisdom, used to end a debate, rather than with a point, in order to disengage from discussing the nuances of an argument or to stop an argument entirely.

Examples:

“So what?”

“Fake news.”

"Here we go again."

"You're too negative."

"Stop overthinking things."

"The ends don't justify the means."

"The road to hell is paved with good intentions."

- Ad hominem

Attacking a person's character, motive, or some other attribute, rather than addressing the substance of the argument the person is presenting. When an ad hominem is used not merely to distract from an argument, but to specifically disprove an argument by claiming that the argument is flawed because of the person making it, this is more specifically an "ad hominem fallacy".

- Demonization

Inappropriately framing an opponent as evil, corrupt, malicious, or intent on causing destruction. This commonly involves dehumanizing the opponent so that they are perceived as subhuman, and consequently undeserving of the same rights and respect as other humans.

- Name-calling

Referring to an opponent by a term that is designed to humiliate and offend. This commonly involves dehumanizing the opponent.

- Ridiculing

Mocking a person or their statements in order to derail a debate and avoid addressing the subject under discussion. This tactic is a common last line of defense for those attempting to defend an indefensible position. This commonly involves dehumanizing the opponent.

- Labeling

Describing someone with word or phrase in order to stigmatize them with the negative traits associated with that

category. This can also include stereotyping them for this same purpose.

- Blaming the victim

Attempting to divert blame away from a perpetrator and towards the victim. One of the most common examples of this in recent history has been to blame instances of sexual harassment or assault on the victims, such as by drawing attention to their “provocative” clothing or makeup.

- Denying the victim

Attempting to argue that a victim is not actually a victim.

- DARVO

An acronym that stands for Deny, Attack, and Reverse Victim and Offender. This tactic involves denying an accusation, attacking a scapegoat, and finally arguing that the real victim is the accused. The scapegoat in question is usually the accuser. This tactic is very commonly used by abusers to defend themselves.

- Scapegoating

Diverting attention away from the cause of a problem and only blaming an individual who was not responsible or was only partially responsible.

ESSENTIAL **SCIENTIFIC** **INFORMATION**

This section provides a basic overview of the most essential information required for understanding science. To put into context how basic this overview is, becoming truly scientifically literate requires years of academic training, particularly for learning specialized knowledge required in specific fields, and years of experience in addition to this. Being qualified to understand one field also doesn't make one qualified to understand any other field.

Branches of science

There are three major branches of science, also known as "scientific disciplines".

- Natural sciences

The study of the natural world. This includes fields such as biology, chemistry, physics, geology, and cosmology.

- Social sciences

The study of human behavior, including interactions, relationships, and societal dynamics. This includes fields such as psychology, sociology, anthropology, criminology, and some branches of political and economics science.

- Formal sciences

The study of systems. This includes fields such as computer science, logic, mathematics, statistics, and some aspects of linguistics.

Consequently formal sciences are far less concerned with observing the real-world.

The term “applied sciences” refers to the application of scientific knowledge in the real-world, such as engineering, applied computer science, applied mathematics, and medicine.

The scientific process

Science is the process of acquiring knowledge through observation and experimentation, coupled with critical thinking. The scientific method follows a set of core procedures, which among other benefits can facilitate openness and accountability, which are core strengths of the scientific process. The following is the standard procedure used in most scientific research.

1. Question

A question is formulated that asks why a particular phenomenon is occurring, or how to achieve a particular goal. An example of the former would be “Why is the sky blue?”, and an example of the latter would be “How can we cure this disease?”

2. Research

This is necessary for determining what is currently known about the subject. This can include previous scientific research on the subject, or anecdotal evidence, such as personal observations. If the question has already been answered, then repeating a previous study, or asking a slightly different question that can be used to build upon what is already known, are both potentially valuable options.

3. Hypothesis

A hypothesis is a conjecture based on knowledge obtained during research. In other words, it is an educated guess at one possible explanation or answer. The hypothesis can be broad or specific depending on how much is already known about the subject being studied.

4. Prediction

This involves determining the logical consequences of the hypothesis as it relates to the results of the study. The prediction must be detailed enough to be unique to the current hypothesis, otherwise the subsequent experiment may confirm 2 or more conflicting hypotheses simultaneously, effectively invalidating the results or wasting the potential of the experiment.

5. Design

This stage involves designing the experiment that will test the prediction. The experiment must use scientific controls to accurately measure the variable being tested. This means it must address all additional variables that may potentially but unintentionally distort the results of the experiment.

6. Testing

At this stage the experiment is conducted. Even if the experiment does not go as planned, or is not completed, the results still have the potential to provide invaluable insights. When ethically approved studies have to be terminated early due to practical or ethical considerations, it usually occurs at this stage.

7. Analysis

The data collected from the experiment is analyzed, and often using complicated mathematical equations and procedures that further account for potential extraneous variables and other problems, although this occurs less often in the social sciences.

8. Interpretation

The results are interpreted in order to understand their meaning, and to place them in the context of what is already known about the subject. Even if the prediction is not borne out by the experiment, and thus the hypothesis is not proven, the results can still be invaluable by virtue of expanding human knowledge, and by narrowing the focus or providing a direction for future research. A proven or unproven hypothesis also doesn't mean the hypothesis is

definitively correct or incorrect, since the results may be a consequence of a faulty design or flawed implementation.

After a study has been completed, further steps are taken by the wider scientific community.

1. External peer reviews

Experts in the field evaluate whether or not a study was legitimately designed and implemented. Studies are usually peer reviewed before they are published in journals, although this is not always the case, particularly with less legitimate studies and journals. A scientific study that is released to the public without going through the peer review process is called a "preprint". Preprints serve little to no value to the general public, and often produce negative outcomes because they are commonly misinterpreted by those who are not scientifically literate.

2. Replication

Studies need to be repeated, and their results need to be reliably reproducible, in order to be deemed valid. The more the results of a study can be replicated in subsequent studies, the more likely the hypothesis is true. If the results cannot be replicated, this implies the original results might have been in error. Even changing a single variable in a study can lead to completely different results. It is therefore common for a single experiment to be performed multiple times.

3. Data sharing

Sometimes other scientists may request unpublished data produced by a study. This data recording and sharing may be necessary for the review process or for replicating a study.

Qualitative vs quantitative

Two types of data collection and analysis, both of which are necessary and complementary within science as a whole.

- Quantitative

Quantitative research attempts to collect data which can be analyzed using statistical analysis. Studies are usually highly controlled, can be scaled to include large amounts of data and participants, and are designed to draw objective conclusions that can be generalized to a larger population.

- Qualitative

Qualitative research involves recording or subjectively interpreting data that cannot be simplified into mathematical variables. Studies are usually less focused on control, and instead more concerned with acquiring an in-depth understanding of a small data set, and usually in a relatively unobtrusive manner. Consequently, conclusions may be more tentative, and may be less applicable to larger populations, at least during the initial stages of studying a phenomenon. Qualitative research can take the form of interviews, open ended surveys, diaries, case studies, or other subjective forms of data collection.

Independent, dependent, and extraneous variables

The three types of variables that exist in scientific studies.

- An independent variable is any variable that is manipulated in order to determine if it affects the dependent variable, and to what extent. It is called an independent variable because it can be freely manipulated or selected by the scientists for the purpose of the experiment.

- The dependent variable is the variable that is studied in order to determine if it is affected by the independent variable, and to what extent. It is called the dependent variable because its potential change depends on the independent variable.

- An extraneous variable is any variable other than the independent variable that has the potential to affect the dependent variable unless addressed, which can be achieved by mitigating them during the

testing stage or by accounting for them during the analysis or interpretation stage.

- A confounding variable is a type of extraneous variable that interacts with both the independent and dependent variables. A confounding variable will be affected by the independent variable, meaning it will either correlate with, or have a negative correlation with, the independent variable. A confounding variable will consequently affect the dependent variable in both the control group and the experimental group or groups, making it challenging to determine if any effect or lack of effect is being caused by the independent variable or a confounding variable.

To understand how all of these can exist within an experiment, consider a study in which scientists attempt to determine the effectiveness of a new fertilizer on a particular crop. In this study the control group would contain the crop that does not receive the new fertilizer, while the experimental group would contain the crop that does receive the new fertilizer. The study could also contain multiple experimental groups, such as each group receiving different quantities of the new fertilizer. In this study the independent variable would be the new fertilizer, and the dependent variable would be the biomass or quality of the crops. Extraneous variables would include variables such as sunlight, rain, temperature, pesticides, soil quality, crop quality, and crop-eating insects, all of which could affect all groups differently or equally unless properly controlled for. A confounding variable would be crop-eating insects that are either less likely or more likely to be attracted to the crops depending on the amount of new fertilizer used.

Double-blinding

An experimental procedure in which neither the subjects nor researchers know whether subjects have been allocated to the experimental group or the control group. Double-blinding reduces or

eliminates biases that arise from participant or researcher expectations. A single-blind experiment would involve the researchers knowing how subjects have been allocated while the subjects remain unaware. However, single-blind experiments rarely occur, as double-blinding is now considered a minimal requirement of any legitimately designed experimental study.

Placebo and nocebo

A placebo is anything that appears to be a real medical treatment to a user but does not in fact possess any known medicinal properties. If a person takes a placebo and they experience positive side effects as a result, this is known as the placebo effect. In other words, the mere belief that one is receiving treatment can be enough to positively affect the body. The placebo effect is a phenomenon that needs to be accounted for in medical trials in order to determine the genuine effectiveness of a treatment. If an experimental medical study does not have a control group that is given a placebo, then there is nothing to contrast the experimental group with, meaning it is not possible to determine whether or not any benefits to participants in the experimental group are the result of the experimental treatment or the placebo effect.

A nocebo is anything that appears to cause harm to a user but does not in fact possess any known harmful properties. If a person takes a nocebo and they experience negative side effects as a result, or experience less benefits than they otherwise would have, this is known as "the nocebo effect".

Disaggregated data

Data that has been broken down into subcategories. Disaggregating data can reveal patterns that are masked by aggregation. For example, disaggregated data may reveal that one set of data is positively affected by a variable, and that a second set of data is negatively affected by the same variable, but when aggregated the

two data sets may cancel each other out, giving the misleading impression that the variable in question had no effect.

Correlation (statistics)

Any statistical relationship between two variables, such that a change in one variable is reflected by a similar or inverse change in the other. An example of a positive correlation is the increase in outdoor swimming that occurs as outdoor temperatures increase. An example of a negative correlation is the decrease in child mortality rates that occurs as child vaccination rates increase.

A “spurious correlation” is a correlation that is not causally related, but occurs due to coincidence or the influence of a connective yet unknown variable.

Statistical significance

The measure of the probability that a result in a scientific study is a consequence of the independent variable being studied. A statistically significant result means that the result was very likely caused by the independent variable. For example, if a well-designed study testing an unproven medicine produces a statistically significant result, it means the medicine was likely responsible for the effect observed. Statistical significance is often essential for determining cause and effect relationships, despite how appealing or convincing anecdotal evidence can be.

Type I errors and type II errors

Two types of errors that can occur in scientific studies.

- A type I error is the scientific name for a false positive. It occurs when a scientific study incorrectly concludes that an effect has occurred. For example, if a new medicine being tested is concluded to work when it in fact doesn't, this would be a type 1 error. This

error is more likely to occur if the sample size being tested is too small, or if the threshold for confirmation is set too low.

- A type II error is the scientific name for a false negative. It occurs when a scientific study incorrectly concludes that an effect has not occurred. For example, if a new medicine being tested is concluded to do nothing when it in fact does, this would be a type 2 error. This error is more likely to occur if the threshold for confirmation is set too high.

Accuracy

Within science, the most technically correct definition is that accuracy describes the overall trueness and precision of a measurement. For a measurement to be accurate, it must therefore have both high trueness and high precision.

- Trueness refers to how close or far the average of a given set of measurements is to the true value of the phenomenon being measured.
- Precision refers to how narrow or dispersed a given set of measurements are.

Trueness and precision can be completely independent from one another in real-world situations.

A measurement can have high trueness but low precision if the data set is widely spread out but the average of the data corresponds with the true value of whatever is being measured. For example, if the true value of something is 50, and the data set is comprised of the two numbers 0 and 100, then the measurement has high trueness because the average is 50, but it also has low precision because the numbers 0 and 100 are widely spread out.

A measurement can have low trueness but high precision if the data set is very narrowly focused but the average of the data does not

correspond with the true value of whatever is being measured. For example, if the true value of something is 50, and the data set is comprised of the two numbers 90 and 92, then the measurement has low trueness because the average is far from 50, but it also has high precision because the numbers 90 and 92 are narrowly spread out.

Despite the standardization of these words, it is currently common within academic fields for the word accuracy to be used in place of the word trueness.

Percentage point vs percentage

A percentage point is the difference between two percentages, while a percentage is the ratio expressed as a fraction of 100. For example, an increase from 30% to 60% could be described as a 30 percentage point increase, or a 100% increase. A decrease from 60% to 30% could be described as a 30 percentage point decrease, or a 50% decrease.

The inability to clarify or understand this difference commonly causes misunderstandings, and is often used by propagandists to intentionally mislead and manipulate others. A drug could be described as having “a massive 400% greater chance of curing cancer”, but this could in fact be an increase from 0.01% to 0.05%. A drug could be described as having a “pitiful 5 percentage point increase of curing cancer”, but this could in fact be an increase from 0.01% to 5.01%, which would be an incredible increase for a lifesaving drug.

Central tendency

A single value designed to summarize the center or the average of a dataset. Within statistics, the mean, median, and mode, are the 3 most common measures of central tendency.

- The mean is the average value of a data set. More specifically, it is the sum total of the values within a data set divided by the number of values within that data set.

- The median is the middle value in a data set.
- The mode is the value that appears the most frequently in a data set.

Different central tendencies are beneficial in different circumstances, but they are also all capable of being grossly misleading. Consider the following 10 numbers, each representing the wages of 10 workers in U.S. dollars: 1, 2, 3, 4, 25, 25, 100, 100, 100, and 1000. Here the mean is 136, the median is 25, and the mode is 100. All of these central tendencies fail to accurately represent this data set, since each implies that all workers are very well paid. The mean average is the most misleading, despite being the central tendency that is most commonly used in society.

Falsifiability

The potential for a theory to be proven wrong. A theory is falsifiable if evidence that refutes it, or makes it less likely, could hypothetically exist. A theory cannot be described as scientific unless it is falsifiable, because the scientific method requires the ability to test theories. Falsifiability is also essential for determining the validity of non-scientific theories, such as those used to support religious beliefs.

Hitchens's razor, which states "That which can be asserted without evidence can be dismissed without evidence", is a direct refutation to unfalsifiable theories. In other words, if a theory cannot be falsified, there is usually no point in examining it. Similarly, if a theory cannot be falsified, there is usually no reason to believe it. This does not mean that there is no value in holding beliefs that have yet to be proven true, only that there is usually no value in holding beliefs that cannot be proven to be true or likely under any circumstance. All else being equal, those who believe in unfalsifiable theories often have an increased likelihood of causing harm to themselves or others, since not only are their beliefs more likely to be irrational, but the underlying irrationality that causes them to have these irrational beliefs also means that they are often less able to be reasoned with, at least within short time frames.

Unfalsifiable argument example:

"This homeopathic treatment can cure the flu in a single day, but only works with people who have the right aura."

This argument is unfalsifiable, because there is no experiment that can be performed to measure "aura". If a recipient's flu is cured, the homeopath can declare that the treatment worked, even though this could have occurred for other reasons. If the recipient's flu is not cured, the homeopath can use this "aura" excuse as a convenient "escape hatch". In other words, the homeopath's theory is unfalsifiable because it can neither be proven nor disproven.

Data dredging

A manipulative form of data analysis designed to find patterns in data that can be presented as statistically significant, and which consequently substantially increases the likelihood of false positives. Data dredging involves performing many statistical tests on a data set and only reporting those that come back with significant results. Data dredging is consequently a form of cherry picking.

Data dredging is not to be confused with the "look-elsewhere effect". Data dredging is an intentional form of manipulation. The look-elsewhere effect is a phenomenon in statistical analysis that achieves the same outcome, but as an accidental consequence of scientists performing a large number of analyses on data sets with large sample sizes or large parameters. The look-elsewhere effect, and to a slightly lesser extent data-dredging, are both possible because of the "law of truly large numbers", which describes the fact that with a large enough data set it is highly probable that statistically significant spurious correlations, including highly implausible spurious correlations, will exist purely due to sheer coincidence. This is also the explanation for "Littlewood's law of miracles", which is a mathematical conjecture which states that a person can expect to experience events that have a one in a million chance of occurring at the rate of approximately once per month. Littlewood's law, as it is

more commonly known, was created to debunk claims of supernatural causes, such as “miracles”, that are commonly attributed to events that appear unlikely, despite the fact that extremely unlikely events occur all the time due to the sheer number of events that occur. The “law of truly large numbers” is not to be confused with the “law of large numbers”, which is a mathematical theorem which states that the average of a large number of samples will generally converge on the actual average of the population sampled, and will increasingly converge as the sample size increases.

Meta-analyses

A statistical analysis of the results of multiple scientific studies which address the same question or which are similar in some relevant way. Because of this they can provide more reliable results. For example, 10 studies may show that a particular medical treatment is ineffective, because none of the studies produced a statistically significant result. However, a meta-analysis may discover that the conclusions of each study point in one direction, and that most of the studies were very close to a statistically significant result. A meta-analysis would therefore reveal that the medical treatment is possibly or likely effective, but that it could not be confirmed by the individual experiments because they were not finely tuned or large-scale enough. However, meta-analyses must still go through the peer review process to be deemed reliable, as meta-analyses can also be vulnerable to the same problems as other scientific studies, and particularly cherry-picking.

Scientific consensus

The collective judgment, position, and opinion, of the community of scientists within a particular scientific field. Consensus generally implies agreement of the supermajority, and therefore does not require unanimous agreement. Scientific consensus is achieved primarily through the peer review process, scholarly debate, and communication at conferences. A conference meant to create a consensus is called a “consensus conference”.

Ad hoc hypothesis

Adding a hypothesis to a theory in an attempt to save it from being falsified. Ad hoc hypotheses can be justifiable when only minor alterations are made to a theory, but they can very quickly become problematic by making theories unfalsifiable. For example, consider someone who states they have a unicorn living in their basement. When a critic says they can't see it, the owner says the unicorn can choose to become invisible. When the critic says they should cover the floor in powder to reveal where the unicorn is standing, the owner says the unicorn can fly. When the critic says they should fling paint at the unicorn to reveal its body, the owner says the unicorn can teleport. These continuous ad hoc hypotheses consequently make the original theory and every subsequent theory unfalsifiable. Ad hoc hypotheses are commonly used by woo peddlers and pseudoscientists.

Pseudoscience

Unscientific ideas which are mistakenly considered scientific. Pseudoscientific ideas are often superficially convincing and easy to understand. They commonly rely upon large amounts of highly detailed evidence that can only be debunked by those who are scientifically literate, or those with a comprehensive knowledge of the subject. A common tactic of pseudoscientists is to use scientific evidence and theories to support vague or irrational conclusions. Advocates of pseudoscience commonly misquote the opinions of experts, or correctly quote the opinions of experts that are controversial within their field or experts of unrelated fields. Because of all this, pseudoscience can be highly convincing to people not formally educated in science, people with poor critical thinking skills, and people who are inclined to believe in conspiracy theories. Examples of pseudoscientific beliefs and practices include conversion therapy, polygraph tests, "expert" body language analysis, anti-vaccine theories, chiropractic healing, homeopathy, irrationally restrictive diets, and any form of woo-woo that is justified using pseudoscientific arguments.

Unscientific theory vs scientific theory

Two different types of theories that are often inaccurately conflated with one another by those who are scientifically illiterate. The informal use of the term theory refers to an explanation, and most commonly a hunch, that is not scientific in nature, and is not necessarily supported by evidence or research. A scientific theory by contrast is a tested and well substantiated model, or a group of propositions, formulated to explain a particular phenomenon or fact. A scientific theory is not to be confused with a scientific hypothesis, which is an educated guess used to direct further scientific enquiry. A scientific theory is also not to be confused with a scientific law, which merely describes a phenomenon or fact, rather than providing an explanation for why it occurs. The term scientific theory does not mean a theory must be complete, nor does it preclude the possibility that better theories exist, but instead it merely denotes that the explanation has been tested and is substantiated to a reasonable degree. Even if a theory has no rival theories, and has been proven to be true to the greatest extent possible, it is still referred to as a theory.

One scientific theory that has been particularly prone to this misunderstanding is the theory of evolution. Those unfamiliar with scientific terminology assume the word "theory" in this instance means evolution is unproven, and little more than guesswork. If this was true it would be referred to as "the evolution hypothesis", or "the evolution conjecture". On the contrary, evolution has been demonstrated to be the best explanation for explaining the natural world due to decades of research in a multitude of scientific fields. Furthermore, there are no alternative scientific theories that explain what the theory of evolution can explain. This example perfectly illustrates how a lack of scientific literacy has led to the widespread misconception that the term "scientific theory" is merely a placeholder for "unsubstantiated", even though in reality scientific theories are the most reliable way of explaining phenomena and facts.

LOGICAL FALLACIES

A logical fallacy is an instance of flawed reasoning. If a fallacy occurs by accident, it is called an "error". If a fallacy occurs due to intentional manipulation, it is called a "trick". Although fallacies most commonly occur in arguments used to persuade others, they also often occur due to subconscious or conscious efforts to convince and deceive oneself.

All logical fallacies fall into one of two subcategories.

- Formal fallacies. These are flaws related to the structure of arguments.
- Informal fallacies. These are flaws related to the contents of arguments and ways of reasoning.

Formal fallacies always result in arguments that are merely unsound. Informal fallacies always result in arguments that are unsound, incomplete, or unconvincing, as well as ways of reasoning that are flawed, due to problems such as incorrect assumptions, irrelevant information, inaccurate language, misinterpreted evidence, and other similar problems. The distinctions between these two types of fallacies will become clearer in the following lists of formal and informal fallacies.

The following is a list of the most useful fallacies to be aware of. Examples have been provided for fallacies that require further clarification.

Formal fallacies

Propositional fallacies

Fallacies in which an incorrect connection between two statements is reached. Propositional fallacies always occur within compound propositions, which are propositions that contain two or more statements that are connected in some way. There are 5 different connections that can occur between two statements.

1. And (Conjunction)

Example: "I'll buy you a car and a dog"

2. Or (Disjunction)

Example: "I'll buy you a car or a dog"

3. Not (Negation)

Example: "I will not buy you a car"

4. Only if (Conditional)

In logic, but not in informal discourse, "only if" is a conditional statement. This means one condition can only be true if the other condition is true, but this is not true the other way around.

Example: "I'll buy you a car only if I win the lottery this week."

This is conditional, since the purchase requires winning the lottery, but whether or not the person wins the lottery is unaffected by them buying or planning to buy a car.

5. If and only if (Biconditional)

In logic, but not in informal discourse, "if and only if" is a biconditional statement. This means each condition can only be true if the other condition is true.

Example: "I'll buy you a car if and only if you are grateful for it."

This is biconditional, since the purchase requires that the recipient is grateful for the car, and the gratitude of the recipient requires that the car is purchased.

A propositional fallacy occurs when an incorrect inference is made from the connection being used in a compound proposition. For example, if an argument confuses “not” and “only if”, this will cause it to contain a propositional fallacy. Similarly, if an argument assumes a connection is only “and”, rather than potentially either “and” or “or”, this will also cause it to contain a propositional fallacy.

The following list is comprised of the most common propositional fallacies.

- Affirming a disjunct

A or B.

A, therefore not B.

Example:

1. If a person is rich enough to own a private island, then they must have earned that wealth or married into that wealth.

2. Ted owns a private island which he purchased with earned wealth.

Conclusion: Therefore Ted never married into wealth.

Just because Ted purchased the island with earned wealth, it does not follow that he cannot also have married into wealth.

- Denying a conjunct

If A, then not B

Not A, therefore B

Example:

1. If a person is extremely rich, then they are not extremely poor.

2. Ted is not extremely rich.

Conclusion: Therefore Ted is extremely poor.

Just because Ted is not extremely rich it does not follow that he must be extremely poor, since people can exist somewhere in between.

- Affirming the consequent (a.k.a. converse error)

If A, then B.

B, therefore A.

Example:

1. If a person owns a private island then they must be rich.

2. Ted is rich.

Conclusion: Therefore Ted owns a private island.

Just because owning a private island makes a person rich, it does not follow that being rich also necessitates owning a private island.

- Denying the antecedent

If A, then B.

Not A, therefore not B.

Example:

1. If a person owns a private island, then they must be rich.

2. Ted does not own a private island.

Conclusion: Therefore Ted is not rich.

Just because Ted does not own a private island, it does not follow that Ted cannot be rich.

Quantification fallacies

Fallacies in which the expressed or measured quantity in the premises contradicts the quantity that appears in the conclusion.

- Existential fallacy

The assertion that a category contains members simply because it is hypothetically possible for it to contain members.

Example:

Premise: All trespassers are prosecuted.

Conclusion: Therefore, trespassers have been prosecuted.

Just because all trespassers will be prosecuted, it does not follow that there have been any trespassers in the past. Even if there have been trespassers, it would still be a fallacy for a person to assert this based on the knowledge of the first premise alone.

Syllogistic fallacies

Fallacies in which the argument fails to correctly understand the relationship between different categories, or between categories and members of categories.

Example:

1. All dogs are mammals.
2. Cats are not dogs.

Conclusion: Therefore cats are not mammals.

The easiest way to understand syllogistic fallacies is by visualizing them as a Venn diagram, in which the middle term, major term, and minor term, are each represented as a circle. Because the difficulty of explaining and understanding syllogistic fallacies goes beyond the scope of this manifesto's intended purpose, only one easily understandable example is provided here.

- **Modal scope fallacy**

A degree of unwarranted necessity is placed within the conclusion of an argument.

Example 1:

1. Bachelors are unmarried.
2. John is a bachelor.

Conclusion: John cannot marry.

This conclusion incorrectly asserts that John cannot marry under any circumstance, whereas a sound conclusion would state that John is merely not married currently. This fallacy comes from incorrectly assuming that the original “narrow scope” conclusion is actually a “wide scope” conclusion that applies under all hypothetical circumstances.

Example 2:

1: If John has two sons then he must have at least 1 son.

2: John has 2 sons.

Conclusion: John must have at least 1 son.

This conclusion is generally correct when interpreted in good faith, but it nonetheless incorrectly implies that John must have a son under all circumstances, as if John not having a son is impossible. A more appropriate conclusion would state that John must have at least 1 son only within the context of the first premise.

Miscellaneous formal fallacies

- Appeal to probability

Assuming that if something is likely to occur under certain conditions, it is therefore extremely likely to occur under these conditions.

Example:

1. Planets are capable of giving rise to intelligent life since our planet did so.

2. There are billions of planets in our galaxy.

Conclusion: Many planets in our galaxy must possess intelligent life.

Even if it turns out that intelligent life does exist on other planets in our galaxy, this argument is still a fallacy, because it does not follow that intelligent life must exist on other planets in our galaxy just because it is likely.

When this is used in informal discourse to describe negative possibilities, this is referred to as “Murphy’s Law”, which states that “If something can go wrong, it will go wrong”.

- Argument from fallacy (a.k.a. the fallacy fallacy)

Incorrectly asserting that if an argument for a conclusion is incorrect, then the conclusion itself must also be incorrect.

Example:

Fallacious argument: It is raining outside because I clapped my hands.

Fallacious counter-argument: Clapping is not responsible for the rain, therefore you are wrong that it is raining outside.

Whether or not it is raining outside is irrelevant with regards to this fallacy. The counter-argument contains the fallacy fallacy regardless since it incorrectly asserts that whether or not it is raining outside can be determined by the soundness of the argument presented, which is obviously untrue. An argument’s conclusion can be correct even if the argument itself is unsound.

- Masked-man fallacy (a.k.a. illicit substitution of identicals)

The substitution of identical designators, due to a lack of knowledge, resulting in a false conclusion. This leads to the unsound conclusion that if something is known to possess or lack a trait, then something that appears to be inconsistent with this understanding must be something entirely different.

Example:

1. I know who Harry is.

2. I do not know who the masked-man is.

Conclusion: Therefore Harry is not the masked-man.

Informal fallacies

While these fallacies have each been accurately categorized into a single category, some of these fallacies belong to more than one category. Additionally, many informal fallacies are also conditional fallacies, meaning they can only be considered fallacies under specific conditions. This will be explored in greater detail with a few fallacies where this is particularly noteworthy.

Improper premise fallacies

Fallacies in which the premises of an argument are invalid.

- **Circular reasoning**

An argument that assumes to be true what it is trying to prove. In other words, an argument that only works if it is first assumed that the conclusion is true. This is sometimes informally referred to as “assuming the question”.

In its simplest form, this fallacy can be described as “A is true because B is true, and B is true because A is true”.

Example 1:

“God exists because the Bible says so. And the Bible is true because it is the word of God.”

Both of these statements support each other, but neither statement can be considered true or reasonable unless there is evidence or an argument external to this argument.

Example 2:

“Whatever is less dense than water will float because objects that float are less dense than water.”

It is generally correct that whatever is less dense than water will float, but this example attempts to explain this phenomenon by repeating its conclusion within its argument.

- Begging the question

Circular reasoning, except the fallacy occurs in one step instead of two or more steps.

In its simplest form, this fallacy can be described as “A is true because A is true”.

Example:

“Alcohol induces relaxation because it is a relaxant.”

Faulty generalization fallacies

Fallacies in which a conclusion is drawn about all or many instances of a phenomenon on the basis of a limited selection of instances that are too few in number for a sound conclusion to be reached.

- Black swan fallacy (a.k.a. hasty generalization, unrepresentative sample, or the law of small numbers)

Incorrectly reasoning that a broad conclusion can be derived from evidence that is known to be limited in nature, and that contradictory evidence cannot exist even though it possibly could.

The name of this fallacy comes from the idea of only being aware of white swans and coming to the unsound conclusion that black swans don't exist. In reality black swans exist, but this conclusion would still be a black swan fallacy even if they did not exist. This is because it would be impossible to verify that black swans did not exist, since this would require omniscience or omnipresence, or in other words being all-knowing or being present everywhere simultaneously.

The black swan fallacy is not to be confused with the black swan theory, which describes how extremely impactful rare and

unpredictable events are often rationalized, with the benefit of hindsight, with inappropriately simplistic explanations.

- Special pleading

Excluding a valid member from a category by inappropriately changing the definition of the member.

Example:

“This isn’t gambling because the odds of me winning are extremely high.”

Extremely high odds of winning may justify gambling in particular situations, but this cannot be used to make the claim that the action is not gambling if it still falls under the definition of gambling.

However, something can appear to be an exception, and yet still not contradict a principle when contextualized. For example, if the rule is that “Loving parents are kind to their children”, and someone argues that “David is not kind to his children but he is still a loving parent”, this would not constitute special pleading if a justification can be made for David’s absence of kindness. If it turned out David had been imprisoned in a foreign country, and this is why he is unable to show his children kindness, this would be a valid exception, and would not constitute a form of special pleading.

It is important to remember that an exception to a rule is only ever required if the rule is incomplete, but that sometimes a rule may be incomplete in order to serve a greater purpose, such as being easier to remember or apply.

- No true Scotsman

Excluding a valid member from a category by inappropriately changing the definition of the category, or more specifically the parameters of the category.

Example:

Person 1: "No Scotsman puts sugar on their porridge."

Person 2: "My uncle is Scottish and he does."

Person 1: "Well no *true* Scotsman puts sugar on their porridge."

- Chinese robber fallacy

Using a generic problem to attack a specific individual or group, while simultaneously refusing to acknowledge or attack other individuals or groups that have the problem to a similar or even greater degree. Depending on how the argument is formulated, the Chinese robber fallacy will occur either as a special pleading fallacy, a no true Scotsman fallacy, or a combination of both, with the difference being that the Chinese robber fallacy involves inaccurately categorizing the members of two categories simultaneously, rather than the members of just one category.

An example of this fallacy is arguing that immigrants shouldn't be allowed into a country because they commit crime, even when they commit crime at the same rate or a lower rate than the native population. In this example, if the person making this argument wanted to remain consistent rather than concede defeat, they would also have to argue that immigrants who don't commit crimes should be allowed into the country, and that natives who commit crimes should be forced to leave the country. If they refused to argue for this, then they would be committing the Chinese robber fallacy.

- Accident fallacy

Including an invalid member in a category by inappropriately changing the definition of the member.

Example:

1. Cutting people with knives is a crime.

2. Surgeons cut people with knives.

Conclusion: Surgeons are criminals.

- Converse accident fallacy (a.k.a. reverse accident)

Including an invalid member in a category by inappropriately changing the definition of the category, or more specifically the parameters of the category.

Example:

1. Cutting people with knives is a crime.
2. Surgeons cut people with knives.

Conclusion: The term criminals should be broadened to include surgeons.

- Supremacist fallacy

Coined by the founders of The Xova Movement, the supremacist fallacy occurs when the definitions of members and categories are inappropriately modified to ensure favored members are solely or disproportionately included within a category perceived as being superior in some regard. Consequently, this fallacy can include any combination of the special pleading fallacy, the no true Scotsman fallacy, the accident fallacy, and the converse accident fallacy, but with the additional fallacious reasoning that it is possible for an individual to be considered superior simply by virtue of belonging to a group that is perceived as superior, as opposed to becoming superior at something through personal effort.

Example:

“Us white people should stand up and take credit for building the modern world.”

This is fallacious because it attempts to take all the members of the category “white people” and include them within a category that only some white people belong to. This example ignores all the contributions non-white people have made, and all the white people who that have not made contributions or made the world worse. It also ignores the innumerable complex real-world factors, such as imperialism, that has given different demographics different

advantages and disadvantages with regards to contributing to the world. Additionally, taking credit for the works of other people because of shared skin tone is as arbitrary and irrational as taking credit for the works of other people because of shared eye color or hair color.

- Cherry picking (a.k.a. suppressing evidence)

Highlighting individual cases or data that appear to confirm a particular position, while omitting or downplaying related cases or data that may contradict that position. In other words, it involves attempting to force evidence to conform to a theory, rather than creating a theory that conforms to the evidence.

Cherry picking is a common hallmark of poor science and pseudoscience. For example, climate change deniers carefully select data that appears to refute anthropogenic climate change, or discredit climate science, while ignoring the overwhelming amount of evidence that supports anthropogenic climate change, such as high-quality and comprehensive meta-analyses.

- Nutpicking fallacy

Picking out and showcasing the “nuttiest” member or members of a group, and presenting them as a typical representative of that group. This is commonly used in politics to smear opponents or ideas.

Example 1:

“Those violent socialists reported in the news prove that socialists are inherently violent.”

This fallacy is commonly combined with the accident fallacy by selecting extremists unrelated to a group, and incorrectly attributing them to that group.

- Survivorship bias

A small number of successes of a given process are cherry picked while the large number of failures are ignored.

Example:

"You only need to work hard to succeed."

This example acknowledges the importance of hard work, but presents a conclusion that ignores the countless number of real-world instances where hard work has not been enough to enable people to achieve success, or even escape poverty in a substantial number of cases.

- Toupee fallacy

Data is ignored because it is rendered invisible by a flawed method of analysis. This fallacy can most easily be summed up by the phrase "All toupees look fake, since I've never seen one that I couldn't tell was fake". Obviously this conclusion is flawed, because if the observer saw a toupee that looked real, they would not realize it was a toupee.

- False analogy

Using an analogy which is poorly suited.

In its simplest form, this fallacy can be described as:

1. A and B both possess property X.
2. A also possesses property Y.

Conclusion: Therefore B must also possess property Y.

Example:

"Computers and the human body are both physically complex. And since a computer was designed, that means the human body was also designed."

Just because computers have always required a designer, it does not follow that the human body also required a designer simply because computers and the human body are both physically complex. Unlike computers, organic life forms can evolve through genetic mutations and natural selection.

- McNamara fallacy (a.k.a. the quantitative fallacy)

Incorrectly reasoning that a decision can be based on quantifiable information alone, and that all other information can be discounted. When assessing situations in the real-world, variables that cannot be measured or easily measured can often be of equal or greater importance than variables that can be measured. Sociologist Daniel Yankelovitch, who coined the term, described the various degrees of severity of this fallacy in the context of war. "The first step is to measure whatever can be easily measured. This is OK as far as it goes. The second step is to disregard that which can't be easily measured or to give it an arbitrary quantitative value. This is artificial and misleading. The third step is to presume that what can't be measured easily really isn't important. This is blindness. The fourth step is to say that what can't be easily measured really doesn't exist. This is suicide." This fallacy can be very problematic if it occurs during the design of scientific experiments, since disregarding important variables has the potential to completely invalidate results.

- Misleading vividness

Describing an occurrence in vivid detail, even if it is an exceptional occurrence, to convince someone that it warrants greater attention than it deserves, or is more significant than it actually is. This fallacy often involves giving disproportionate attention or significance to anecdotal evidence at the expense of more reliable information and important contexts.

- Overwhelming exception

An accurate generalization that comes with qualifications that eliminate so many cases that what remains is much less impressive than what the initial statement might have led people to assume.

Example:

“Our foreign policy has always helped other countries, except of course when it went against our national interest.”

In this example, the country in question could hypothetically have never helped another country, and could have exploited or destroyed many countries. However, the misleading phrasing of the statement gives the opposite impression.

- Slothful induction (a.k.a. appeal to coincidence)

Refusing to accept a reasonable inference despite strong evidence, and instead arguing that coincidence is a better explanation. Those who fall for this fallacy sometimes use the expression “correlation does not imply causation” to justify their position, which is a true statement but one that is not applicable when this fallacy occurs.

Questionable cause fallacies (a.k.a. causal fallacies, or false cause fallacies)

Fallacies in which a phenomenon is attributed with an incorrect cause.

- Animistic fallacy

Incorrectly reasoning that an event or situation must have arisen because someone intentionally caused it, even though this may not be the case. It is also possible a person unintentionally caused it or that it arose by chance.

- Cum hoc ergo propter hoc (Latin expression meaning “With this, therefore because of this”)

Incorrectly reasoning that because two things occurred simultaneously, or occurred one after the other, there must therefore be a causal relationship between the two. This is commonly refuted with the expression "correlation does not imply causation". This fallacy is a common cause of the incorrect diagnosis and treatment of medical and psychological conditions.

- Post hoc ergo propter hoc (Latin expression meaning "after this, therefore because of this") (a.k.a. post hoc fallacy)
Incorrectly reasoning that because A happened before B, A caused B.

Example:

"Many children that play violent video games go on to become violent. Therefore violent video games cause or exacerbate these children's violent behavior."

This is an incorrect assumption. There may be no causal link between violent video games and violent behavior. A child may be violent because of difficulties at school or at home, and may even seek out violent video games because of this. There may be a reverse causation, where violent children are more likely to seek out violent video games. There may even be an inverse correlation, where violent videogames subdue the violent tendencies of violent children by providing a safe outlet for their negative emotions.

- Wrong direction

Incorrectly reasoning that because A and B occurred at the same time, B therefore caused A.

Example:

"Windmills move fast when the wind moves fast. Therefore windmills cause the wind."

- Ignoring a common cause (a.k.a. the third-cause fallacy)
Incorrectly reasoning that A causes B, when in fact A and B are both caused by C, or C and D, or a host of other variables.

Example:

“As ice cream sales rise, rates of drowning also rise. Therefore ice cream consumption causes drowning.”

In reality both of these are caused by variable C, the weather. During hotter weather, populations generally consume more ice cream and spend more time swimming.

- Fallacy of the single cause (a.k.a. causal oversimplification, or causal reductionism)
Incorrectly reasoning that there is a single cause of an outcome, when in reality there may be many.

Example:

“Inflation is caused solely by the reckless behavior of governments.”

- Furtive fallacy

Incorrectly reasoning that an outcome was caused by the malfeasance of decision-makers. This fallacy does not merely involve asserting this as a possibility, but that this is the only explanation.

- Gambler’s fallacy

Incorrectly reasoning that separate, independent events can affect the likelihood of future events when this is not the case. An example would be parents assuming that because their first child was a girl, their next child is more likely to be a boy. In reality, the possibility of having 4 daughters is effectively just as likely as having 2 daughters and 2 sons.

The gambler's fallacy often occurs because of the belief or alief that events in the universe must "balance out", or that certain events are more unique than they actually are. For example, if a coin lands on heads 10 times in a row, it may be intuited that the 11th coin flip must have something closer to a 90% chance of landing on tails due to how unlikely it is for a coin to land on heads 11 times in a row. In reality, the 11th coin flip still has a 50% chance of landing on either heads or tails.

The reason for the occurrence of this fallacy is because of the assumed odds involved. The odds of getting heads 11 times in a row is 1 in 2048, which is why it seems so unlikely that the 11th flip will be heads again. However, the possibility of getting heads 10 times in a row followed by tails is also 1 in 2048. And every other combination of 11 coin flips also has a 1 in 2048 chance of occurring. However, because flipping heads 11 times in a row is such a recognizable and linear pattern, rather than a more forgettable or random pattern, it feels like it must be extra unlikely.

- Magical thinking (a.k.a. superstitious thinking)

Incorrectly reasoning that someone or something can influence the external world in ways that defy laws of causality. The most common form of magical thinking is the belief that one's thoughts and wishes can influence the external world. Magical thinking is common within religions and the New Age movement.

- Regression fallacy

Incorrectly reasoning that something has returned to normal because of a corrective action, rather than being the result of natural fluctuations. This is also a special kind of post hoc fallacy. The term "regression" refers to a regression towards the mean average. This is commonly described as "regression to the mean".

Example:

“The introduction of speed cameras this year has really helped reduce the high number of traffic accidents that occurred last year.”

If the speed cameras were installed due to an unusually high number of traffic accidents in the previous year, the drop in traffic accidents could also or solely be the result of a regression to the mean.

This fallacy can sometimes take the form of superstition. A real-world example of this was the Sports Illustrated cover jinx, in which the subsequent decline in performance of athletes that appeared on the front cover of the magazine was regularly attributed to a jinx. This phenomenon is explained by the fact that an athlete that performed well enough to appear on the cover would need to have performed exceptionally well to beat out the competition. This would also likely be at the peak of their career, meaning it would be expected that their performance would be in terminal decline from that point onwards.

- Texas sharpshooter fallacy

Ignoring differences in data while overemphasizing similarities in order to incorrectly imply that the data is clustered together, and that this pattern must consequently have a common cause. The term originates from an anecdote about a Texan who fires gunshots at his barn, then paints a shooting target over the bullet holes that are most clustered together, and uses this as evidence that they are a sharpshooter.

When this occurs unintentionally, it is the result of the “clustering illusion”, which is a type of cognitive bias that involves seeing patterns where none exist.

Relevance fallacies

Fallacies in which the premises of an argument are irrelevant, even if the argument is valid, or in other words even if the conclusion of the argument follows logically from the premises.

- Argument from ignorance (a.k.a. appeal to ignorance)

Incorrectly reasoning that something must be true because it has not yet been shown to be false, or that something must be false because it has not yet been shown to be true.

This fallacy is refuted by the expression “absence of evidence is not evidence of absence”. In other words, just because there is no evidence for something, this does not mean that this something does not exist.

- Argument from incredulity (a.k.a. appeal to common sense)

Incorrectly reasoning that one’s ability to understand an idea determines the validity of that idea.

Example:

“I can’t understand how evolution could possibly be true. Therefore it must be untrue.”

This fallacy effectively derives from the belief that the complexity of the world is limited by one’s ability to comprehend it. This is a consequence of the negative form of the Dunning-Kruger effect.

- Argument from repetition fallacy (a.k.a. Argumentum ad nauseam fallacy)

Repeating an argument until nobody cares to discuss it anymore, and then using this outcome as evidence that no one is capable of refuting the argument and that it must therefore be correct.

- Argument from silence

Incorrectly reasoning that far more can be inferred from an absence of spoken or textual evidence than can actually be inferred. There are different forms of this fallacy.

One form of this fallacy occurs when a person's silence is misinterpreted as agreement or disagreement.

Example:

"Sarah didn't interject when I was speaking so she must have agreed with me."

The argument from silence fallacy and the argument from ignorance fallacy appear similar but are nonetheless different. The argument from ignorance fallacy assumes that absence of evidence equals evidence of absence, while the argument from silence fallacy assumes that absence of evidence equals evidence of something, and usually something one wants to believe.

Another form of this fallacy occurs in the analysis of historical texts. This involves assuming that the absence of an account of something in a historical text means that this something did not occur or exist, or that the author was unaware of it.

Example:

"Marco Polo never mentioned the Great Wall of China in his writings. Therefore he never visited China."

This conclusion ignores the evidence that Marco Polo visited China, and instead assumes that an absence of evidence equals evidence of absence. This is different from an argument from ignorance fallacy however because the argument from silence does not involve ignorance on behalf of the historian, but instead the historians mistaken assumption that the writer's ignorance of something is evidence of absence in some form or another.

- Ignoratio elenchi (a.k.a. irrelevant conclusion)

An argument that may in itself be sound, but does not address the subject under discussion.

- Invincible ignorance fallacy

Refusing to believe something, regardless of the strength of the evidence or argument available. This is the inevitable fallacy outcome of pseudoskepticism.

Relevance fallacies: Red herring fallacies

Fallacies in which the premises of an argument are not only irrelevant, but also intentionally or unintentionally distract from the main point or topic.

- Genetic fallacy

Incorrectly reasoning that only the history or origin of something is necessary for determining its current value or defining traits.

Example 1:

“Wedding rings originally symbolized the ankle chains women were forced to wear to prevent them from running away. Any man who advocates for their continued usage is sexist.”

Example 2:

“This medicine was originally discovered via experiments that unnecessarily caused animals to suffer, therefore nobody should be allowed to use it.”

Example 3:

“This idea about environmentalism would be valuable if not for the fact that it was originally proposed by a white supremacist.”

All of these examples are genetic fallacies because they ignore the fact that things from the past can have a different value or different defining traits in a modern context, and that utilizing them in some capacity is not the same as justifying or condoning their history or origin.

An ad hominem fallacy can be understood as a genetic fallacy specifically applied to arguments and the people who make them.

- Ad hominem fallacy

Attempting to disprove an argument by trying to discredit the person making it.

Example:

“You’re not a climate scientist, and therefore none of your climate change arguments can be trusted.”

It doesn’t matter if a person isn’t an expert in a subject, as long as their argument is based on the consensus of experts, or at least the expertise of an individual who is an expert in the subject and who is highly respected by other experts in the same subject.

Despite a common misconception, criticizing someone does not always constitute an ad hominem fallacy. Criticizing someone can be appropriate if that person is the topic under discussion, or directly relevant to the topic under discussion. For example, calling someone unqualified may provide useful context before explaining why their argument is flawed.

- Circumstantial ad hominem

Attempting to disprove an argument by pointing out that the person making it is predisposed to adopting their particular position because of their circumstances. This can also be described as an “appeal to bias fallacy”.

- Appeal to motive

Attempting to disprove an argument by bringing into question the motives of the person making it. The appeal to motive fallacy is the most common type of circumstantial ad hominem.

- Poisoning the well

Attempting to disprove an argument by maliciously stigmatizing the person making it.

- Shill gambit

Attempting to disprove an argument by asserting that the person making it must have been paid to support their position. This can also be described as an “appeal to bias fallacy”.

- Kafka-trapping

Attempting to disprove an argument by inducing a sense of guilt in the person making it, and using their denial of guilt as further evidence of guilt.

- Tone policing (fallacy)

Attempting to disprove an argument by criticizing the emotional state of the person making it. In other words, it involves attacking the tone in which the argument is expressed rather than addressing the argument itself.

Example:

“She’s too hysterical to be thinking clearly. She’s clearly not being objective.”

Aside from the fact that the emotional way in which an argument is presented has nothing to do with its soundness, many subjects are understandably emotive in nature, making tone policing unreasonable under many circumstances. Additionally, a person’s willingness to tone police is often evidence of bad faith, which can often be a major contributor to a person’s emotional state in the first place. However, this fallacy is not to be confused with temporarily addressing inappropriate forms of communication, such as unnecessarily

hostile language, speech volume, or body language, which can often be necessary for ensuring a conversation is as productive and amicable as possible.

- Traitorous critic fallacy

Attempting to disprove an argument by accusing the person making it of an undisclosed favorability or affiliation to an out-group. As such the person making the argument is commonly told to stay away from the issue altogether, and may even be told to leave the in-group to which they belong.

Example:

Person 1: "The welfare systems in the Nordic countries are better than our system."

Person 2: "Well if you don't like it here then why don't you just move! Clearly your argument is untrue otherwise you would have emigrated already."

This example is a fallacy because the first speaker's willingness to move to a different country has nothing to do with the strength of their initial argument. Arguments containing this fallacy also commonly ignore the numerous reasons why a person may not wish to belong to an out-group even when they view them favorably or are affiliated with them. In this example, the first speaker may be unwilling to move for reasons that are outweighed by issues related to welfare, such as family and work.

This fallacy is often used as a defense mechanism by in-groups in order to avoid criticism or self-reflection. In modern societies this fallacy is particularly common among self-described so-called "patriots".

- Tu quoque [pronounced "too kwoh kway']

Attempting to disprove an argument by asserting it is unsound because of the perceived failure of the person making the argument to act in accordance with its conclusion.

This is the fallacy form of calling someone a hypocrite. It is also commonly referred to as an "appeal to hypocrisy fallacy" for this reason.

Example:

"If smoking really caused cancer then you wouldn't be a smoker."

This fallacy commonly occurs because of an inability to understand that hypocrisy can often be unavoidable, and can even be necessary in the short-term for achieving long-term change. For example, a socialist may live in a capitalist country because their family and friends live there, and a political candidate who wishes to address climate change may have no choice but to take a substantial number of plane trips if they are to have any realistic chance of being elected.

This is a conditional fallacy however, since there are times when the issue of hypocrisy may be relevant. For example, a person's hypocrisy may reveal the impracticality of implementing their ideas in the real-world. Alternatively, if an accusation of hypocrisy is used to draw attention to a person's double standards, this would not be a fallacy if this person's integrity is relevant to the discussion at hand.

- Bulverism

Asserting that a person's argument is incorrect by attempting to explain why this person supports their argument but without first discussing or proving why their argument is incorrect. Consequently Bulverism always entails presumptuousness and condescension.

Example:

“The only reason you deny the existence of God is because you want to sin.”

This argument fails to engage with any of the arguments that explain why someone may not believe in god, and instead asserts they are wrong by skipping all arguments and instead jumping directly to why they hold their belief.

The Bulverism fallacy and the ad hominem fallacy appear similar but are nonetheless different. The ad hominem fallacy attempts to disprove a person’s argument by discrediting them, while the Bulverism fallacy involves implying that a person’s argument has already been disproven, which is achieved by jumping directly to asserting the reason why this person believes their argument.

- Appeal to authority fallacy (a.k.a. argument from authority fallacy)
Incorrectly reasoning that a claim is true by referencing a source that is not an authority on the particular issue being addressed.

This is a conditional fallacy, since whether or not the fallacy is occurring is dependent on the authority, the subject, and the context. Providing credentials is not an appeal to authority fallacy if this is done simply to provide useful context prior to presenting an argument. If the authority in question is indeed an expert with regards to the subject under discussion, then appealing to their authority is not always a fallacy. This becomes increasingly true the more the authority’s position agrees with the consensus of experts, and the more that specialized knowledge is required to fully understand the subject under discussion. In most instances the occurrence of this fallacy is not black or white, and exists somewhere along a spectrum.

Example:

“Professor Smith has a PhD in physics, and has done dozens of lectures and interviews debunking the myth of anthropogenic climate change.”

This would constitute an appeal to authority fallacy because the authority specializes in physics, not climatology, and his opinion runs counter to the agreed upon consensus reached by the thousands of scientists that are experts in climate change.

- Appeal to confidence

Incorrectly reasoning that a person's confidence when making an argument partially determines the soundness of their argument.

- Appeal to accomplishment

Incorrectly reasoning that a person's accomplishments partially determine the soundness of their argument.

Example:

"I'll take your opinion on music seriously once you've produced your own album."

This statement is fallacious because it falsely assumes that one has to have accomplished something within a particular field in order to possess the ability to objectively judge the works of others within that field. Accomplishing something and critiquing something often require different skills.

- Courtier's reply

Incorrectly reasoning that a person's perceived lack of knowledge or training partially determines the soundness of their argument.

Example:

"How do you know the Earth isn't flat if you haven't even researched most of the evidence?"

In this example, knowing that billions of pieces of technology, and tens of thousands of scientists in hundreds of fields, rely upon scientific principles that only function if the world is spherical, means it is not plausible that the Earth is flat. Therefore, a person who knows this does not need to research most of the "evidence" that the earth is flat in order to reach the reasonable conclusion that it is not flat.

This fallacy involves incorrectly reasoning that one needs to research a subject extensively to refute a position on that subject. Being educated to a limited extent can be sufficient to reach reasonable conclusions under many circumstances.

- Appeal to consequences

Incorrectly reasoning that the soundness of an argument is partially determined by the desirability of its consequences.

When this fallacy is used to convince others of an argument, it commonly includes an "appeal to emotion fallacy".

- Appeal to emotion

Attempting to convince someone by using emotional manipulation instead of evidence and reason.

This is a conditional fallacy, since appealing to someone's empathy to help them appreciate the emotional dimensions of a well-reasoned argument is often reasonable, and sometimes essential.

- Appeal to disgust (a.k.a. the wisdom of repugnance)

Attempting to convince someone by making them irrationally disgusted by something, or by arguing that others are disgusted by it.

- Appeal to fear

Attempting to convince someone by making them irrationally fearful of something, or by arguing that others are fearful of it.

This tactic is commonly used in politics, and has proven to be highly effective.

- Appeal to spite

Attempting to convince someone by making them irrationally spiteful of something, or by arguing that others are spiteful towards it.

Example:

"It doesn't matter if these prisoners are being abused by the guards, they shouldn't have broken the law in the first place. We've got better things to spend taxpayer money on."

This is an appeal to spite fallacy since all legal punishments should be intentionally determined and implemented, and not left to random chance, such as the whims of individual guards. Contempt towards criminals does not give anyone the right to disregard their human rights, particularly when so many people in both developed and underdeveloped countries are currently imprisoned for completely unjustifiable reasons.

- Appeal to pity

Attempting to convince someone by making them irrationally compassionate of something, or by arguing that others have compassion towards it.

Example:

"We can't have sex education in schools. Won't somebody please think of the children!"

- Appeal to ridicule

Attempting to convince someone by making something seem ridiculous.

Example:

“Democracy is like 2 wolves and a sheep deciding what to have for dinner.”

From a theoretical perspective this argument is flawed because it ignores that laws, constitutions, systems, etc. can be instituted to protect the rights of everyone in society, including minorities, regardless of how people vote. From a practical perspective this example ignores all of the countries that have successfully ensured their democracy has not been used to disenfranchise or harm minorities.

- Judgmental language

Attempting to convince someone by using insulting or pejorative language.

Example:

“Psychiatrists are just overpaid quacks.”

This is a judgmental language fallacy because even if it could reasonably be argued that psychiatrists are “overpaid quacks”, this could not be argued by using pejorative insults.

- Appeal to flattery

Attempting to convince someone by using flattery.

Example:

“Surely someone as smart as you understands the brilliance of this proposal.”

This is commonly referred to informally as apple polishing, brown nosing, wheel greasing, appeal to price, and appeal to vanity.

- Wishful thinking

Attempting to convince someone by making something seem more desirable than is reasonable to conclude. Wishful thinking can therefore be understood as a form of denial. Practically every logical fallacy is capable of being a form of wishful thinking when used intentionally for the purpose of self-deception.

- Appeal to nature

Incorrectly reasoning that if something is natural then it must be good or moral, and if something is unnatural then it must be bad or immoral.

This fallacy is sometimes used out of ignorance, but is also commonly used knowingly to justify immoral behavior.

Example 1:

“Vaccines are unnatural and therefore shouldn’t be given to children. Natural remedies are all you need.”

This argument ignores the innumerable number of naturally occurring diseases that harm and kill adults and children, and which also cannot be remedied with natural methods. It also ignores the fact that unnatural medical interventions are the main reason why most children today are able to survive into adulthood, unlike in the past.

Example 2:

“Animals experience immense suffering in the wild, and they also used to suffer when they were hunted by our ancestors. Therefore it doesn’t matter if animals in the animal agriculture industry also suffer, since this is just the natural way of the world.”

This is clearly an irrational argument. Sexual assaults also occur in the animal kingdom, and were a much more common occurrence in many societies in the past. Therefore according to this fallacious logic, sexually assaulting others can also be morally justified.

Example 3:

“Everyone else in society behaves this way, so it’s not a problem if I behave this way as well.”

Just because other people behave a particular way, this does not abdicate a person from their moral responsibility to use what autonomy they have to behave morally.

This fallacy is considered the inverse of the “moralistic fallacy”. The appeal to nature fallacy is also not to be confused with the “naturalistic fallacy”.

- Moralistic fallacy

Incorrectly reasoning that if something is good or moral then it must be natural, and if something is bad or immoral then it must be unnatural.

This is the inverse of the appeal to nature fallacy. Whereas the appeal to nature fallacy starts from an observational perspective, and contorts morality to conform to the natural world, the moralistic fallacy starts from a morally idealistic perspective, and contorts nature to conform to that morality.

Example 1:

Moralistic fallacy: Violence is immoral, therefore it is not natural for humans to be violent.

Appeal to nature fallacy: Violence occurs naturally, therefore it is morally acceptable.

Example 2:

Moralistic fallacy: Consuming meat is moral, therefore it is natural to eat animals.

Appeal to nature fallacy: Consuming meat is natural, therefore it is morally acceptable to eat animals.

In the first example the two fallacies result in different conclusions, whereas in the second example the two fallacies result in the same conclusion.

The moralistic fallacy is most commonly used when attempting to challenge immoral behavior, but results in the incorrect argument that because the behavior is immoral it cannot therefore be natural. Conversely the appeal to nature fallacy is most commonly used when attempting to justify immoral behavior, but results in the incorrect argument that because the behavior is natural it must therefore be moral.

The moralistic fallacy and the appeal to nature fallacy often occur because of wishful thinking, meaning they can be considered forms of denial under this circumstance. However, whereas the moralistic fallacy usually involves being in denial about the nature of the world, the appeal to nature fallacy usually involves being in denial about oneself. In other words, people will often use the moralistic fallacy to convince themselves that the unjust world around them is in fact just, and use the appeal to nature fallacy to convince themselves that their immoral behaviors are in fact moral.

- Naturalistic fallacy

Incorrectly reasoning that the concepts of good or moral, and bad or immoral, are the same as positive experiences and negative experiences, respectively. For example, it assumes that if something is good or moral, then it must be pleasant, and if something is pleasant, then this is evidence that it is good or moral.

The naturalistic fallacy and appeal to nature fallacy appear similar but are nonetheless different. The appeal to nature fallacy naïvely

idealizes the natural world, and mistakenly assumes that whatever is natural must be good or moral, and that whatever is unnatural must be bad or immoral, while the naturalistic fallacy idealizes sentient experiences, and mistakenly assumes that whatever is enjoyable must be good or moral, and that whatever is not enjoyable must be bad or immoral.

- Appeal to novelty

Incorrectly reasoning that something must be good or superior because it is novel.

Example:

“This weight loss diet is completely original so it must be something special.”

This is a conditional fallacy, since there are times when it is reasonable to assume that something is likely better because it is novel. This is particularly true when it comes to things that generally improve over time, like computers and medicine.

This fallacy is the opposite of the “appeal to tradition fallacy”.

- Appeal to tradition

Incorrectly reasoning that something must be good or superior because it has long been believed to be true or of value.

Example:

“Marriage has always been between a man and a woman, and therefore it should stay that way.”

This fallacy relies on two assumptions. The first is that the idea under discussion was true or of value in the past, and the second is that the idea is still applicable today.

- Chronological snobbery

Incorrectly reasoning that something from the past is inherently bad or inferior because it is from the past. This fallacy assumes that because many things are more advanced today than they were in the past this must automatically apply to everything.

Example:

“Ancient practices like yoga have no place in a modern societies founded on reason and science.”

Even though many ideas or practices from the past have proven to be untrue, irrelevant, or harmful, this cannot be applied as a blanket conclusion to everything from the past.

- Appeal to poverty

Incorrectly reasoning that a conclusion is true if the proponent is poor, or untrue if the proponent is wealthy.

- Appeal to wealth

Incorrectly reasoning that a conclusion is true if the proponent is wealthy, or untrue if the proponent is poor.

The appeal to wealth fallacy is commonly used in capitalist propaganda.

- Argumentum ad populum

Incorrectly reasoning that something must be true or good because a majority or many people believe it to be so.

Example:

“This artist is popular so they must be good.”

This fallacy is known by many different names, including “appeal to the masses”, “appeal to belief”, “appeal to the majority”, “appeal to

democracy”, “appeal to popularity”, “argument from consensus”, “consensus fallacy”, “authority of the many”, and “the bandwagon fallacy”.

This fallacy doesn’t apply to scientific consensus because scientific consensus is based far less on personal opinion and far more on peer reviewed research.

An ad populum fallacy can also be reversed, so that the popularity of something is used as a reason to discredit it. This is often referred to as an “ad populum reversal”.

Example:

“The fact that The Beatles were so popular is evidence that they were overrated.”

- Galileo fallacy

Incorrectly reasoning that an idea must be correct because the idea, or the proponents of the idea, are actually or supposedly being vilified or censored by an establishment or the masses.

- Association fallacy

Incorrectly reasoning that because two things share or appear to share a trait they must also share other traits.

Example:

“If this film is bad then the director’s other films must also be bad.”

- Guilt by association

Unjustifiably discrediting someone by associating them with something negative.

Example:

“This politician was just endorsed by that infamous racist, so he must be problematic.”

- Honor by association

Unjustifiably crediting someone by associating them with something positive.

Example:

“Her parents were wonderful philanthropists, so she must be a very generous person as well.”

- Fallacy of relative privation (a.k.a. appeal to worse problems)

Incorrectly reasoning that an argument or problem is unimportant due to the existence of more important problems in the world.

The derisive criticism “First World problems” can sometimes entail this fallacy. Even though certain First World problems may be less serious than other problems in the world, this does not preclude the possibility that they may still be genuinely important.

- I’m entitled to my opinion

Discrediting any opposition by claiming entitlement to one’s opinion.

Whether a person has a legal or moral right to hold or express an opinion has nothing to do with whether or not the argument that supports their opinion is sound.

- Ipse dixit (a.k.a. bare assertion fallacy)

Dogmatically asserting something without evidence even when evidence is required. This often entails arguing that something is common sense or self-evidently true when this is not the case.

- Not even wrong

An argument that is unfalsifiable due to being so irrelevant that it cannot be assessed as correct or incorrect within the context of the discussion. This can include someone making a sound argument, but one that is nonetheless irrelevant to the subject under discussion.

- Vacuous truth

A claim that is technically true but meaningless in context because it cannot be practically applied to the situation.

If a person with no pets says “none of my pets are cats”, or “all of my pets are cats”, these would be examples of vacuous truths.

- On the spot fallacy

Incorrectly reasoning that a person’s argument is wrong if they cannot recite specific data or technical minutiae on the subject under discussion.

This is a conditional fallacy, since whether or not detailed information is required depends on the nature of the subject under discussion.

- Politician's syllogism (a.k.a. politician's fallacy)

Incorrectly reasoning that a particular action must be taken simply because it is believed, correctly or incorrectly, that action of some kind must be taken. This fallacy commonly leads to the belief that once a course of action is being pursued, no further action or course correction is required.

- Problem validity fallacy

Coined by the founders of The Xova Movement, the problem validity fallacy occurs when it is incorrectly assumed that a proposed diagnosis or solution is valid simply because the proposer acknowledges the problem. For example, people often support

politicians because they acknowledge certain problems, even when their diagnoses and solutions are clearly flawed or counterproductive.

- Retroactive unfairness fallacy

Coined by the founders of The Xova Movement, the retroactive unfairness fallacy occurs when it is incorrectly reasoned that something beneficial shouldn't occur in the present or future because it would be unfair to those in the past who didn't experience the same benefit.

Example:

"People don't deserve to have their student loan debts or medical debts forgiven because this would be unfair to all the people in the past that had to pay theirs off."

If people are underserving of their student loan debts or medical debts being forgiven, then this would have to be due to justifiable economic reasons. It cannot have anything to do with being unfair to people in the past, since by this logic systemic progress would never be allowed to occur. For example, governments would never be allowed to do anything that helps people, and medical institutions would never be allowed to research new treatments and cures, since this would be "unfair" to everyone in the past who never experienced the same benefits. This fallacy is tantamount to wanting people to suffer in the present and future simply because people suffered unavoidably or unnecessarily in the past.

- Unreasonable criteria fallacy

Coined by the founders of The Xova Movement, the unreasonable criteria fallacy occurs when an argument inappropriately critiques something according to criteria that are ill-suited for this purpose. This often involves critiquing a member of a category only or primarily according to criteria that is generally applicable to members of that category, but is not reasonably applicable to that member.

Example 1:

“Samuel isn’t doing well in his school exams, so he likely won’t have a successful career.”

This argument fails to understand that Samuel may have unique gifts that cannot be measured by his school exams, even if these exams are adept at predicting the future success of most students. It may even be impossible to measure Samuel’s unique gifts with any exam.

Example 2:

“This romantic drama is a terrible movie due to its historical inaccuracies, its sentimental dialogue, its simplistic villain, and its unoriginal plot.”

Even though the film in question may be poor-quality by conventional standards, it may succeed exceptionally well at its primary goal of being a romantic drama. It is even possible that rectifying certain perceived flaws in the film could counteract the qualities that make it an exceptional romantic drama. It is therefore partially or completely inaccurate to say that the film is “terrible” when judged according to more reasonable criteria. This is why it is sometimes necessary to judge things based on their own terms.

Example 3:

“I would support this activist movement if only they would stop being so disruptive. Plenty of initiatives in the past have achieved their goals through more peaceful means.”

The immense complexity of addressing large-scale real-world problems often necessitates the use of unconventional solutions, which can appear bizarre, controversial, or inappropriate, compared to methods that are more conventional but nonetheless limited in their viability. If conventional methods were the only solutions required then most large-scale real-world problems would not have continued to persist for as long as they have. This is why using conventional criteria to judge unavoidably unconventional solutions often results in unsound conclusions.

Miscellaneous informal fallacies

- Argument to moderation (a.k.a. false compromise)

Incorrectly reasoning that the best approach is a compromise between two positions.

Example:

“Imprisoning drug users is considered wrong by some, and morally justified by others. Therefore the solution should be to reduce the punishment they receive rather than eradicate punishment all together.”

The founders of The Xova Movement believe this appendix entry to be one of the most important ideas in the entirety of this manifesto. This is because the argument to moderation fallacy is one of the most dangerous fallacies that exists, since it prevents the genuine consideration of drastic action when such action is necessary, and orders of magnitude more moral than compromising. The argument to moderation fallacy is a defining feature of modern-day liberalism, and centrism more generally, which is why they are fundamentally flawed and extremely dangerous ideologies.

- Continuum fallacy

Incorrectly reasoning that an argument can be rejected merely because some part of it is imprecise or subjectively precise. It involves the assumption that because a spectrum cannot easily be delineated into categories, particularly because adjacent points on the spectrum are indistinguishable from one another, that it is impossible or useless to delineate points on that spectrum.

Example of a continuum fallacy applied to an imprecise delineation:

“There is no way of definitively knowing when orange becomes red, therefore we should get rid of these terms entirely.”

Example of a continuum fallacy applied to a precise delineation:

“We should not have age of consent laws because it’s arbitrary. Why 16? Why not 21? Or 30?”

The imprecise or subjectively precise nature of something does not invalidate it, particularly if the alternative is impractical or reprehensible.

- Loki's Wager

Incorrectly reasoning that a concept cannot be defined, and therefore can be considered irrelevant in the context of an argument.

The Loki's Wager fallacy and the continuum fallacy appear similar but are nonetheless different. The continuum fallacy involves reasoning that if something cannot be precisely defined it should be considered effectively the same thing as that which it appears next to on the same continuum, while the Loki's Wager fallacy involves acknowledging that something is distinct but that this is irrelevant and can be ignored if it cannot be precisely defined.

- Definist fallacy

Redefining a term to make a position easier to defend or attack.

Example:

"Taxes are a form of theft."

This is a definist fallacy because it disingenuously redefines the word "tax" so that it loses its distinctive meaning.

- Divine fallacy

Incorrectly reasoning that something is so incredible it could only have occurred as the result of a superior agent, such as aliens, spirits, or a God.

- Double barreled question

A question that includes more than one issue but which necessitates one answer even though the question may require different answers for each of the issues included.

Example:

"How satisfied are you with your pay and job conditions?"

- Ecological fallacy

Incorrectly reasoning that the nature of a specific thing can be determined solely from aggregate data about the group to which that thing belongs.

Example 1:

"Most children are immature, so Helen's daughter must also be immature."

Just because many children are immature, it does not follow that this applies to all children.

Example 2:

"White privilege exists, therefore every white person is more privileged than every non-white person."

The term "white privilege" refers to the fact that under specific circumstances a white person is more likely to have an advantage than their non-white peers, all else being equal. However, just because some white people may be more privileged in specific circumstances, it does not mean that every white person must be more privileged in these circumstances, or more privileged under all circumstances, or more privileged overall. Similarly, this term also doesn't mean that every non-white person is more disadvantaged in these circumstances, or more disadvantaged under all circumstances, or more disadvantaged overall. This term also doesn't preclude the possibility that people can have privileges because they are not white. The term "white privilege" refers to the existence of a trend, or in other words a statistical average, and therefore cannot be

extrapolated to every individual or individual instance without evidence. To do so would constitute an ecological fallacy.

- Etymological fallacy

Incorrectly reasoning that the original or historical meaning of a word or phrase is identical or similar to its actual present-day usage.

- Fallacy of ambiguity

Reaching an unsound conclusion due to unclear premises.

Example:

“All living things originate from other living things. Therefore all life on earth must have originated from a living god.”

It is not true that “all living things originate from other living things”, since scientific research has revealed how the earliest forms of life could have evolved from non-living components. The conclusion is therefore false, since even if this premise is generally accurate it is still too vague to be of value within the context of this argument.

- Equivocation fallacy

Misinterpreting or misusing something because it has more than one meaning. This often involves using 1 term to have 2 different meanings within the same argument.

Example:

1. Man is the only rational animal.

2. A woman is not a man.

Conclusion: Therefore women are not rational.

This is an equivocation fallacy because the term “man” in the first premise refers to “mankind”, while the term in the second premise refers to the gender.

- Fallacy of accent

Interpreting a sentence incorrectly due to the ambiguous placement of prosodic stress, or due to ambiguous sentence structure. When the fallacy of accent occurs due to ambiguous sentence structure, this can be understood as the fallacy form of "syntactic ambiguity".

Example of fallacy caused by ambiguous prosodic stress:

"I didn't take the test yesterday."

This spoken sentence can be interpreted in different ways depending on one's interpretation of the prosodic stress.

"*I* didn't take the test yesterday."

In other words, someone else took the test.

"I *didn't* take the test yesterday."

In other words, I never took the test.

"I didn't *take* the test yesterday."

In other words, I did something else with the test.

"I didn't take *the* test yesterday."

In other words, I took a different test.

"I didn't take the *test* yesterday."

In other words, I took something other than the test.

"I didn't take the test *yesterday*."

In other words, I took the test on a different day.

Example of fallacy caused by ambiguous sentence structure:

"John saw the man on the mountain with a telescope."

This written sentence can be interpreted in different ways depending on one's interpretation of the structure of the sentence.

1. John, using a telescope, saw a man on a mountain.
2. John saw a man on a mountain, and the mountain had a telescope on it.
3. John saw a man on a mountain, and the man had a telescope.
4. John, on a mountain, and using a telescope, saw a man.
5. John, on a mountain, saw a man who had a telescope.

- False attribution

Incorrectly reasoning by using sources that are irrelevant, unqualified, unidentified, biased, or fabricated.

- False equivalence

Incorrectly reasoning that two things are similar when this is not the case. More often than not this involves finding one or more shared traits between two things, and falsely arguing that these two things must therefore be similar in another way as well.

Example:

"Cats and dogs are both kept as pets and both have similar physiology. Therefore anyone who likes cats must also like dogs."

In internet discourse the inclination to use false equivalencies is one of the reasons for the occurrence of Godwin's law, which states that the longer an online disagreement persists, the greater the probability that someone will be compared to Hitler.

It is also common for a reasonable equivalence to be incorrectly interpreted as a false equivalence because the two things being compared are not equivalent in other ways, even though they are equivalent in the way that is relevant within the context of the argument.

Example:

Person 1: "The harm inflicted on animals within the animal agriculture industry is just as immoral as if it was inflicted on dogs, because both are sentient creatures capable of experiencing immense pain."

Person 2: "This is a false equivalence because dogs are pets."

The second person is incorrect that this is a false equivalence. The comparison is valid because both animals are sentient, and it is this sentience which determines the immorality of the abuse. The fact that farm animals and dogs may not share other traits does not invalidate the point made by comparing them using a single trait which they share. Keeping this in mind is particularly important for accurately or fairly interpreting extreme analogies, such as those which employ a comparison to Hitler. This is because extreme analogies make themselves easy targets for bad faith interpretations, and yet are also invaluable for clarifying the problems of certain positions, especially when used to assist reductio ad absurdum arguments in revealing the absurdity of positions when taken to their logical extreme.

- Illicit transference

Incorrectly reasoning that what is true of a member of a category must also be true of the category itself, and vice versa.

- Fallacy of composition

Incorrectly reasoning that what is true of all or some parts or members must be true of the whole.

Example:

Atoms are not sentient. Therefore nothing made of atoms can be sentient.

- Fallacy of division

Incorrectly reasoning that what is true of the whole must be true of all or some of its parts or members.

Example:

Humans are sentient and humans are made of atoms.
Therefore atoms must also be sentient.

- False dilemma (a.k.a. false dichotomy, or the black-or-white fallacy)

Incorrectly reasoning that there are fewer options than actually exist. This most commonly involves reasoning that there are only two options when there are actually more.

Example:

"You are either with us or against us."

This is a false dilemma because people may be neutral, or they may support the end goal of the speaker, particularly compared to the alternative, and yet simultaneously disagree with some or all of the methods proposed for achieving this goal.

This fallacy is the opposite of the "denying the correlative fallacy".

- Denying the correlative

Incorrectly reasoning that there is an alternative option that does not exist.

Example:

Police officer: "So did you kill this man or not?"

Suspect: "I fought with him."

- Incomplete comparison

Incorrectly reasoning that a reasonable comparison can be made even though insufficient information is being used.

Example:

"This company said their products are superior to all others on the market so it must be true."

Even though the product may be superior, far more information, such as fact sheets and independent product comparison reviews, would obviously be required to determine this.

- Inconsistent comparison

Incorrectly reasoning that a reasonable comparison can be made even though this is not possible because of the inappropriate combination of different methods of comparison.

Example:

"Our product X is cheaper than product A, better quality than product B, and has more features than product C."

This example would imply that this is the best possible product, but this may be misleading on every measure. Product X may be cheaper than product A, but product A may be unreasonably expensive. Product X may be better quality than product B, but product B may have the lowest quality on the market. Product X may have more features than product C, but product C may be intentionally designed to have few features in order to suit to a particular demographic. So product X may in fact be extremely expensive or overpriced, be very low-quality, and have very few features or more features than anyone would reasonably want. Similar to the incomplete comparison, this fallacy is commonly used in advertising.

- Explanation justification conflation fallacy

Coined by the founders of The Xova Movement, the explanation justification conflation fallacy occurs when it is incorrectly assumed

that an explanation is simultaneously being provided as a justification. This fallacy commonly leads to the criticism or condemnation of the person providing the explanation, due to the incorrect belief that they are attempting to justify something that is perceived to be unjustifiable. This can occur when the explanation is providing either a reason or a clarification.

Example in which the explanation is providing a reason:

Person 1: "One of the reasons they may have been attacked is that they were walking home alone. This is why it's important that students always walk home with others at night."

Person 2: "Oh, so you're blaming the victim and saying they deserved to be attacked."

Example in which the explanation is providing a clarification:

Person 1: "No, the murderer didn't say they killed them out of jealousy. They said they did it out of self-defense."

Person 2: "Oh, so you're defending the murder now and saying it was self-defense."

Person 1: "I never said they did it out of self-defense. I said that *they* said they did it out of self-defense. I'm not defending the person, I'm defending the truth."

- Kettle logic

Using multiple inconsistent or contradictory premises to defend an argument.

Example:

"The kettle was already broken before I borrowed it. And besides I never even borrowed it."

- Knowledge fallacy

Coined by the founders of The Xova Movement, the knowledge fallacy occurs when it is incorrectly assumed that information that is known to oneself, or others, is also known by a specific individual,

even when this is unreasonable to assume. This can even include information that the specific individual would only know if they were omniscient, or in other words all-knowing.

One common example of this in modern societies is the argument made by people in romantic relationships that their partner should trust that they are faithful, and will always be faithful, even when the level of trust being expected would only be reasonable if their partner was omniscient. In isolation this expectation of trust may appear reasonable, but in context is unreasonable. In isolation a person may provide their partner with evidence, including overwhelming evidence, that they are faithful, and will never have a physical or emotional affair. This evidence may even be enough to convince those who are highly intelligent, critically minded, and wise. In context however there also exists irrefutable evidence throughout the world, and throughout history, that countless people that have provided evidence, including overwhelming evidence, that they are faithful, have turned out to be unfaithful. In fact such people's behavior often doesn't noticeably change even when they begin having an affair. The irrefutable evidence within this context is of greater value and importance than any evidence that can be provided in isolation, meaning that in context it is reasonable to assume that even those who provide overwhelming evidence that they are faithful could still be unfaithful. Despite this obvious context, it is common for people to expect their romantic partner to trust them implicitly, or in other words to an extent that would only be reasonable if their partner was omniscient. In fact this expectation has become so prevalent and extreme that it is common for people to take great personal offence to their romantic partner recognizing the possibility, no matter how small, that they may be anything other than completely trustworthy, even when this lack of complete trust is reasonable considering this fallacy and context.

- Historian's fallacy

Incorrectly reasoning that decision-makers of the past had the same information as those analyzing the decision at a

later date. Historian's fallacy is not limited by time scale, meaning it can apply to those who made decisions 10 seconds ago just as much as those who lived 1000 years ago.

The historian's fallacy usually results in unfair appraisals of people's decision-making capabilities. In other words, people are often accused of incompetence due to the poor outcome of their decision, even if the decision was the best that could have been made with the available information at the time.

- Historical fallacy

Incorrectly reasoning that a process can be appraised according to the outcome of the process even when the process may not be responsible, or may only be partially responsible, for the outcome.

An example of this would be someone losing their keys, and upon finding them in the first place they searched subsequently coming to the conclusion that this was the most reasonable place to search, even though this may have been an unreasonable choice that only resulted in a positive outcome because they were lucky. Even a process that is successful during multiple initial uses does not necessarily prove that it is well designed, even if these initial uses produce successful results. A process may be badly designed but still produce successful results for a limited time simply because of random chance, or other variables unaccounted for.

- Mind projection fallacy

Incorrectly reasoning that subjective judgments of something are actually inherent properties.

An example of this is believing a person to be more intelligent or kind-hearted than they actually are simply because they are physically attractive. This particular example has been studied and replicated in scientific studies.

- Moving the goalposts

Unnecessarily changing the criteria needed to demonstrate the validity of an argument. This often involves dismissing evidence that validates an argument and demanding unnecessary further evidence. This often occurs when an opponent wishes to avoid admitting defeat.

- Ad hoc fallacy

Adding new but unreasonable justifications and defenses to a flawed argument in an attempt to avoid admitting defeat. An ad hoc fallacy is effectively the argumentation form of the ad hoc hypothesis.

The ad hoc fallacy and the moving the goalposts fallacy appear similar but are nonetheless different. The moving the goalposts fallacy can be understood as making unreasonable changes to one's validation criteria in order to weaken an opponent's reasonable argument, while the ad hoc fallacy can be understood as making unreasonable changes to one's own unreasonable argument in order to strengthen it against an opponent's reasonable validation criteria.

- Nirvana fallacy (a.k.a. perfect solution fallacy)

Incorrectly reasoning that a problem has or requires a perfect solution, and rejecting any solution because it is not perfect. This can occur even when the presented solution is overtly superior to the status quo or all other proposed solutions. The nirvana fallacy is countered by the common expression "Don't let the perfect be the enemy of the good".

- Psychologist's fallacy

Incorrectly reasoning that one's subjective interpretation of a person's behavior is objective and without bias.

- Intersubjective confusion (a.k.a. confusion of standpoints)
Failing to take into account the potentially different perspectives of other people.

Example:

"She must have been angry with him because of the inappropriate joke he made earlier."

In this example the observer is assuming that the woman is angry because of a joke, whereas the woman may have liked the joke but been angry for personal reasons unknown to the observer.

- Attribution of reflectiveness
Falsely assuming that the person they are observing is aware of the same thing they are.

Example:

"I don't know why she kept feeling a need to make such inappropriate jokes."

In this example the observer is assuming that the woman making the jokes was aware of how inappropriate their jokes were, and was consequently making these jokes intentionally. In reality this woman could be embarrassed to discover that their jokes were considered inappropriate.

- Proving too much
An argument that results in an overly generalized conclusion. This usually results in conclusions being taken to illogical extremes.

Example 1:

"Drinking alcohol is inherently bad because it can lead to car accidents."

Drinking alcohol only leads to car accidents under specific and avoidable circumstances, therefore it cannot be considered "inherently bad".

Example 2:

"Slavery is wrong because it creates a situation where one human can abuse another."

This argument reaches the correct conclusion that slavery is morally wrong, but does so for an incorrect reason that creates an absurdity if taken to its logical extreme. If this argument was true, then parenting would also be wrong, because the gross power imbalance between parent and child also allows for abuse. In fact according to this argument all human interactions are wrong, since all interactions present an opportunity for one human to abuse another.

- Relative size fallacy

Coined by the founders of The Xova Movement, the relative size fallacy occurs when an analysis of a trait among contrasted categories reaches an inaccurate conclusion due to a failure to account for the comparatively different sizes of these categories.

Example:

"Most of the people who are dying from COVID-19 are vaccinated. Therefore being vaccinated is more dangerous."

This argument fails to understand that as the number of people vaccinated against COVID-19 increases, so to do the chances that the greatest number of deaths will occur within this vaccinated group. If COVID-19 vaccines were perfect then this would be untrue, but because they don't provide absolute immunity and because their effectiveness diminishes over time, it is inevitable that vaccinated individuals will also die from COVID-19. This means that if 99.99% of people were vaccinated, then theoretically 100% of deaths from COVID-19 could occur within the vaccinated group, which could lead some people to the incorrect belief that being unvaccinated is safer.

- Retrospective determinism

Incorrectly reasoning that because an event occurred under a certain circumstance, the circumstance must therefore have made its occurrence inevitable. In other words, it involves falsely assuming retroactively that an event was inevitable even though this may not have been the case.

Example:

"It's obvious he was never going to win with that strategy."

It is not only possible that the player could have won with his chosen strategy, but it could also be true that this was the best strategy they could have chosen. In fact the chances of them losing with this strategy could have been extremely low, but this just happened to be one of the rare occasions when it failed.

- Slippery slope

Incorrectly reasoning that a relatively small first step will inevitably lead to a chain of related events culminating in an undesirable outcome, and that the first step should therefore not be taken.

This is a conditional fallacy, since in the real-world undesirable slippery slope situations, including incredibly dangerous ones, can and do occur. When this criticism is attributed to an action, this action is often described informally as "the thin end of the wedge".

- Sunk-cost fallacy

Incorrectly reasoning that continued or increased investment into a decision is reasonable because of cumulative prior investment, despite evidence suggesting this is likely a poor decision. This investment can take many forms, such as time, energy, money, resources, and emotions. The investment that cannot be recovered can be called a "sunk cost".

COGNITIVE BIASES

A cognitive bias is the persistent tendency to assess information in a specific uncritical way, although certain people are more susceptible to them than others. These biases can occur even when a person has access to all the necessary information to come to an objective conclusion. These biases can be a consequence of the natural limitations of people's mental processing capabilities, or the artificial limitations created as an unfortunate side effect of the mental shortcuts people commonly utilize in order to assess information quickly. Cognitive biases lead to inaccurate interpretations and illogical judgments. The best known method for controlling for cognitive biases is the scientific method. The remainder of this appendix will explore the most useful cognitive biases to be aware of. While these biases have each been accurately categorized into a single category, some of these biases belong to more than one category.

Belief, decision-making, and behavioral biases

These biases affect reasoning processes, belief formation, and general human behaviors.

Anchoring bias (a.k.a. focalism)

The tendency to be influenced too heavily by, or "anchor" on, one trait or piece of information when making a decision. For example, an individual may be more likely to purchase a car if it is placed

alongside a more expensive model, with the expensive car acting as the anchor. This trait or piece of information is often the first thing discovered when analyzing something new.

- Conservatism bias (a.k.a. belief revision)

The tendency to insufficiently revise one's belief when presented with new evidence.

- Functional fixedness

The tendency to limit the use of an object to the way it is traditionally used, even though it may have multiple other uses, including obvious ones.

- Law of the instrument

The tendency to over-rely on a familiar tool or method, ignoring or under-valuing alternative approaches. A consequence of this bias is summarized in the expression "If all you have is a hammer, everything looks like a nail".

Apophenia bias

The tendency to perceive meaningful connections between unrelated things, or patterns where they don't exist.

- Clustering illusion

The tendency to overestimate the importance of small runs, streaks, or other types of clusters, in large samples of random data.

- Hot hand fallacy (a.k.a. the hot hand phenomenon)

The tendency to believe that a person who has experienced a level of success that is attributable to random chance has a greater chance of achieving further success in additional attempts. This bias is commonly experienced by those who engage in gambling.

- Illusory correlation

The tendency to inaccurately perceive a relationship between two unrelated events.

- Pareidolia

The tendency to perceive a vague and random stimulus as significant. Examples of this include seeing the shape of animals or faces in clouds, or hearing non-existent hidden messages when playing records backwards.

Availability bias (a.k.a. availability heuristic)

The tendency to over rely upon mental shortcuts, and particularly shortcuts that are used when making quick decisions.

- Anthropocentric thinking

The tendency to view humans as the most important entity in the world, particularly with regards to other sentient life. Anthropocentrism is sometimes used interchangeably with the terms “human supremacy” and “human exceptionalism”.

- Anthropomorphism (a.k.a. personification)

The tendency to characterize animals, objects, and abstract concepts, as possessing human-like traits, emotions, and intentions.

- Attentional bias

The tendency to perceive things differently because of recurring thoughts. For example, a person who regularly has negative thoughts will view situations differently to someone who generally has more positive thoughts.

- The frequency illusion (a.k.a. the Baader-Meinhof phenomenon)

The tendency to believe that something is appearing with improbable frequency after noticing it for the first time, even though this is actually occurring due to selection bias more than anything else.

- Salience bias

The tendency to focus on items that are more prominent or emotionally striking and ignore those that are unremarkable, even when this difference is effectively irrelevant by objective standards.

- The well-travelled road effect

The tendency to underestimate the time it takes to travel more familiar routes, and overestimate the time it takes to travel less familiar routes.

Cognitive dissonance bias

The tendency to hold beliefs that are contradictory to one another.

- Ben Franklin effect

The tendency to be more likely to perform a favor for someone if one has already done a favor for them rather than received a favor from them.

- Effort justification

The tendency to attribute a greater value to an outcome than is objectively warranted due to the effort put into achieving it. This often occurs because it is easier to justify sacrifices if the attractiveness of a goal is elevated.

- The IKEA effect

The tendency to place a disproportionately high value on objects that are personally assembled, such as furniture from IKEA, regardless of the quality of the end product.

- Normalcy bias

The tendency to be less likely to plan for, or react to, a disaster that has never happened before, but which is known to be a possibility, and which may even have a far higher likelihood of occurring than previously experienced disasters.

Confirmation bias

The tendency to search for, evaluate, construct, remember, and trust, information that confirms one's beliefs. Consequently, information that contradicts one's beliefs is more likely to be ignored, forgotten, or devalued, meaning that superficially coherent yet incomplete and flawed conclusions are far more likely to be reached.

Confirmation bias and motivated reasoning appear similar but are nonetheless different. Motivated reasoning is an emotional phenomenon that occurs for the purpose of appeasing one's desires and mitigating one's fears, while confirmation bias is a cognitive phenomenon that occurs for the purpose of validating one's preexisting beliefs.

- **Backfire effect**

The tendency to hold more firmly to one's beliefs in reaction to disconfirming evidence.

One potential contributing factor for this bias is the shame and embarrassment people can feel upon realizing they have fallen for a falsehood, including falsehoods they may have confidently or defiantly expressed to others. Another potential contributing factor is the sunk-cost fallacy. Because the backfire effect bias hinders people's ability to change their mind even when presented with sound arguments, including strong evidence, it can be understood as one of the most powerful and problematic cognitive biases, and one of the most common hallmarks of low intelligence.

- **Semmelweis reflex**

The tendency to reject new evidence that contradicts established norms, beliefs, or paradigms. This bias often occurs simultaneously with the backfire effect bias. These biases are the main reason for belief perseverance, in which a belief is held despite evidence, and even overwhelming evidence, to the contrary.

- **Congruence bias**

The tendency to over-rely upon testing one's initial hypothesis, and neglecting to test alternative hypotheses. Consequently, a person will be more inclined to prove their beliefs to be true, rather than taking the far more scientific approach of rigorously attempting to disprove their beliefs.

- Hostile media effect

The tendency to inaccurately perceive media bias against one's group if the information presented conflicts with a strongly held belief related to one's group.

- Selective perception

The tendency to perceive things differently because of expectations. The phrase "love is blind" is an allusion to this bias.

Egocentric bias

The tendency to give far too much credence to one's own perspective, or believe that one is more unique or important, than is reasonable.

- Bias blind spot

The tendency to see oneself as less biased than other people, or more adept at identifying cognitive biases in others than in oneself.

- False uniqueness bias

The tendency to see oneself and one's projects as more unique than is reasonable.

- The Barnum effect (a.k.a. the Forer effect)

The tendency to view positive descriptions of one's personality as highly accurate if one believes those descriptions are tailor-made for oneself, even when these descriptions are general enough to apply to everyone.

For example, the statement "Can be quite introverted at times, but enjoys spending time with others" sounds specific enough that a

person may believe it was written specifically for them if they were told that this was the case. In reality, this statement is vague enough that most people would identify with it. This effect can provide a partial explanation for the widespread acceptance of irrational beliefs and practices, such as horoscopes, fortune telling, psychic readings, aura readings, and pseudoscientific personality tests.

- Illusion of asymmetric insight

The tendency to believe that one's knowledge of one's peers surpasses one's peers' knowledge of oneself. This can also lead to the assumption that one's behavior reveals less about oneself than the behavior of others reveals about them.

- Illusion of control

The tendency to overestimate one's degree of influence over external events.

- Illusion of transparency

The tendency to overestimate how much one's mental state is known by others, and to overestimate how much one understands the mental state of others. This bias is a common reason for misunderstandings and breakdowns in communication, since people overestimate how much everyone understands each other.

- Illusion of validity

The tendency to overestimate one's ability to accurately interpret and predict data, especially when the information being analyzed appears consistent.

- Illusory superiority (a.k.a. above-average effect)

The tendency to overestimate one's desirable qualities and capabilities, and to underestimate one's undesirable qualities and capabilities, relative to others.

- Naïve cynicism

The tendency to believe that others suffer from more egocentric bias than they actually do. Consequently, the actions of others may be

perceived as more self-serving than they actually are. Although not always unwarranted, in modern discourse this bias is commonly displayed by those who overly default to describing publically visible noble acts as “virtue signaling”.

- Naïve realism

The tendency to believe that oneself is more objective and unbiased than others. Consequently, one’s knowledge or beliefs are more likely to be perceived as being more common or true than they actually are, and those who disagree are more likely to be perceived as irrational, uneducated, lazy, or biased.

- Overconfidence effect

The tendency to have unreasonable confidence in one’s conclusions. One study showed that for certain types of questions, answers that participants said they were 99% certain of ended up being incorrect 40% of the time.

- Planning fallacy

The tendency to underestimate the time it takes to complete tasks.

- Restraint bias

The tendency to overestimate one’s ability to show restraint in the face of temptation.

- Self-licensing (a.k.a. moral self-licensing, moral licensing, or licensing effect)

The tendency to be less concerned about the consequences of behaving immorally if one has an increased confidence and security in one’s self-image or self-concept. This bias consequently increases the likelihood of acting immorally, or refusing to act morally when required.

- Trait ascription bias

The tendency to view oneself as relatively variable in terms of personality, behavior, and mood, while viewing others as much more predictable.

- Third-person effect

The tendency to believe that mass communication media messages have a greater effect on others than on oneself.

Extension neglect bias

The tendency to ignore sample size.

- Base rate fallacy (a.k.a. base rate neglect)

The tendency to ignore general information and focus on information only pertaining to a specific case, even when general information is more important.

- Compassion fade (a.k.a. the identifiable victim effect)

The tendency to experience more compassion towards a small number of victims than a large number of victims. This bias is described in the expression "A single death is a tragedy, a million deaths is a statistic".

Compassion fade is not to be confused with compassion fatigue, which is a condition where individuals experience a diminished ability to empathize or feel compassion for others as a consequence of mental, emotional, or physical exhaustion.

Compassion fade is also not to be confused with psychic numbing, which is the tendency for individuals and societies to ignore, or withdraw attention from, past events or future possibilities that are capable of being mentally and emotionally exhausting. Psychic numbing effectively describes the phenomenon where people unconsciously become desensitized to, or consciously choose not to focus on, issues that cause distress. This can include personal traumatic experiences, like instances of harassment and physical violence, or large-scale existential issues, like global poverty and climate change. So whereas compassion fade refers to a mental and emotional limitation that prevents an appropriate or proportional degree of comprehension, psychic numbing refers to a psychological

self-defense mechanism that is used to avoid mental and emotional discomfort.

- Conjunction fallacy (a.k.a. the Linda problem)

The tendency to assume that specific conditions are more probable than a single general condition, despite the fact that multiple conditions being true is less likely than one condition being true.

For example, consider the following statement, which was used in the study from which this fallacy originated:

“Linda is 31 years old, single, outspoken, and very bright. She majored in philosophy. As a student, she was deeply concerned with issues of discrimination and social justice, and also participated in anti-nuclear demonstrations.”

In the original study participants were asked if Linda was more likely to be “A bank teller”, or “A bank teller who is also active in the feminist movement”. In this study most participants said the latter proposition was more likely, despite the fact that the former proposition is objectively more likely since it requires fewer conditions be fulfilled. If the first option was “A bank teller who is not active in the feminist movement”, and the second option remained the same, only then would the second option be the more reasonable choice.

- Duration neglect

The tendency to neglect the duration of something when determining its value.

- Hyperbolic discounting (a.k.a. present bias)

The tendency to prefer more immediate payoffs relative to later payoffs. This often results in making decisions that one later regrets.

- Insensitivity to sample size

The tendency to under-expect variation in small samples. This is because small samples are more likely to give rise to greater variance due to being more vulnerable to anomalous outcomes, whereas large sample sizes are more likely to experience a

regression towards the mean average. For example, in a small hospital where 5 babies are born every day, it is far more likely that 80% of babies delivered on any given day will be female compared to a hospital where 100 babies are born every day.

- Less-is-better effect

The tendency to prefer the lesser of two options in particular contexts when those options are assessed separately. For example, many bronze medalists have been shown to be happier with their medal than silver medalists, since silver invites comparisons to gold whereas bronze invites comparisons to receiving no medal.

- Neglect of probability

The tendency to completely disregard probability when making a decision under uncertainty. A consequence is that small risks are often neglected entirely or hugely exaggerated.

- Scope neglect (a.k.a. scope insensitivity)

The tendency to underappreciate the size of a problem when evaluating it.

- Streetlight effect

The tendency to prioritize searching for something in the place that is easiest to look, rather than the place that is most logical.

- Zero-risk bias

The tendency to be more likely to reduce a small risk to zero than to reduce a larger risk by an even greater amount. For example, a person is consequently more likely to choose to reduce a mild hazard from 10% down to 0%, rather than reduce a more dangerous hazard from 80% down to 65%.

False priors bias

The tendency to rely upon unfounded assumptions.

- Agent detection

The tendency to presume the purposeful intervention of a conscious agent, rather than something like random chance or an automated system. This bias may partially explain people's tendency to believe in conspiracy theories and gods.

- Illusion of external agency

The tendency to believe that a self-generated positive outcome did not occur because of one's personal effort, but because of the effective and insightful actions of others.

- Automation bias

The tendency to have unwarranted confidence in automated systems, and consequently favoring suggestions from such systems over contradictory information made without automation, or refusing to engage in appropriate forms of non-automated analysis. Automation bias can include mundane issues, like trusting a spell-check program enough to bypass proof reading, or serious matters, like trusting a vehicle's self-driving capabilities enough to ignore safety precautions advised by the manufacturer.

- Einstellung effect

The tendency to rely upon specific problem-solving approaches, particularly when these approaches were effective in the past, to solve future problems that have better solutions that would be recognized if not for this bias.

- Just-world hypothesis

The tendency to believe that the world is fundamentally fair and just. This bias is expressed in the sentiment "everything happens for a reason", which is obviously untrue. This can lead people to justify injustice, such as believing that many or most impoverished adults in the developed world live in poverty solely or primarily because they aren't willing to put in the necessary work, and consequently are deserving of their circumstances. Such "victim blaming" and "victim shaming" is a common consequence of the just-world hypothesis. This bias can also result in people not realizing that they are victims, or perceiving themselves as deserving of being a victim, since they

assume that whatever has happened to them must have happened for justified reasons. Children are particularly vulnerable to this bias, and are highly vulnerable to psychological harm as a consequence of this. It has been speculated that people often succumb to this bias because the idea of the world being lawless and random, and consequently unfair and unjust, is too difficult or painful to comprehend or tolerate.

- Sexual overperception bias and sexual underperception bias

The tendency to overestimate or underestimate the sexual interest others have towards oneself.

- Stereotyping

The tendency to assume correctly or incorrectly that a person belongs to a group, and then expecting this person to possess certain characteristics sometimes associated with members of that group but without having relevant information about that particular person.

- The arrival fallacy

The tendency to incorrectly believe that the happiness experienced from achieving a goal will be everlasting, or greater and longer lasting than will actually be experienced. The consequence of this bias is that the happiness experienced from achieving a goal either does not occur, is less overwhelming than anticipated, or dissipates into feelings of deflation, disappointment, and even hopelessness.

Framing effect bias

The tendency to draw different conclusions from the same information depending on how that information is presented.

- Contrast effect

The tendency to perceive an enhancement or diminishment in a stimulus due to it being irrationally contrasted with a previously observed or simultaneously observed stimulus. For example, thinking of the name "Hitler" can result in other people being viewed as more friendly than they otherwise would be.

- Decoy effect

The tendency to change one's preference for either of two equally desirable options when presented with an irrelevant or inferior third option.

- Default effect

The tendency to choose the default option when presented with several options.

- Denomination effect

The tendency to spend more money when it is denominated into small amounts, such as coins, rather than large amounts, such as banknotes.

- Distinction bias

The tendency to view two options as more dissimilar when evaluating them simultaneously than when evaluating them separately.

Logical fallacy bias

The tendency to unintentionally fall victim to a logical fallacy when creating or interpreting an argument.

- Berkson's paradox

The tendency to misinterpret statistical experiments by falsely assuming specially selected data is representative of all data. This is particularly problematic if the data being analyzed is skewed because of "selection bias", which occurs when data is not selected randomly, and consequently results in the data being less representative or entirely unrepresentative of the population being analyzed.

An example of Berkson's paradox would be a woman who only dates men whose kindness or handsomeness exceeds a particular threshold, and where the more a man fulfills one criterion the more lenient she is with the other criterion. She will subsequently be attracted to many kind men who are less handsome, and many

handsome men who are less kind. Because of this, she may mistakenly come to the conclusion that kind men are less likely to be handsome, and handsome men are less likely to be kind, even though there may be no such correlation in the real-world.

- Escalation of commitment

The tendency to fall victim to the sunk-cost fallacy. This tendency usually arises from a desire to convince oneself or others that one's previous investment was not wasted.

- Plan continuation bias

The tendency to fail to recognize that an original plan of action is no longer appropriate for a changing situation or for a situation that is different than anticipated.

- Subadditivity effect

The tendency to judge the probability of the whole to be less than the probability of each of its parts.

- Zero-sum bias

The tendency to incorrectly perceive a situation to be a zero-sum game when this is not the case.

Prospect theory bias

The tendency to judge gains and losses in an asymmetrical manner, leading to choices that are suboptimal or unreasonable according to objective standards. One common consequence of this is that people tend to avoid options for which the probability of a favorable outcome is unknown, even when that favorable outcome is known to be statistically more likely than other options with known outcomes.

- Dread aversion

The tendency to experience double the emotional impact from losses compared to gains, and to experience double the emotional impact from dread compared to savoring.

- Endowment effect

The tendency to place greater value on an object if it is a personal possession. Consequently, people are often more willing to make greater sacrifices to keep an object that they possess than to acquire the exact same object that they have never possessed, even if the desire for the object is the same in both instances.

- Loss aversion

The tendency to prefer avoiding losses than acquiring equivalent gains. For example, the actions people take to avoid losing \$5 are usually greater than those taken to gain \$5.

- Pseudocertainty effect

The tendency to make risk-averse choices if the expected outcome is positive, but make risk-seeking choices if the expected outcome is negative. This tendency is commonly exploited in marketing. If a business wants consumers to make a less risky purchase, they can best achieve this by emphasizing the positive consequences of making the purchase. If a business wants consumers to make a riskier purchase, they can best achieve this by emphasizing the negative consequences of not making the purchase.

- Status quo bias

The tendency to desire things to stay as they are, and to desire default options, even when this is disadvantageous to oneself or others, and even when changing the status quo poses no risk to oneself or others.

- System justification

The tendency to possess a deep-seated need to defend, justify, and reinforce, the status quo, even when this is disadvantageous to oneself or others, and even when changing the status quo poses no risk to oneself or others.

System justification bias can be understood as a more extreme form of the status quo bias, where the status quo is not merely preferred, but ardently protected. System justification bias often manifests not

just as a feeling, but commonly evolves into the belief that the status quo is desirable, fair, justifiable, or unavoidable, which can consequently also lead people to support ideologies that maintain political, economic, social, and cultural norms. System-justification helps explain why victims may defend, justify, and reinforce, their circumstances, and even attempt to protect and empower those primarily responsible for these circumstances. System justification bias is believed to arise from a desire for order, stability, safety, and in some cases social harmony.

System-justification contrasts with two other forms of justification. The first is ego-justification, which is the desire to hold favorable beliefs about oneself. The second is group-justification, which is the desire to hold favorable beliefs about the groups to which one belongs. System-justification by contrast describes the desire to hold favorable beliefs about the overarching social structures that one exists within.

The founders of The Xova Movement believe this appendix entry to be one of the most important ideas in the entirety of this manifesto. This is because system justification bias is one of the most dangerous biases that exists, since it prevents the genuine consideration of drastic action when such action is necessary, and orders of magnitude more moral than maintaining the status quo. System justification bias consequently explains why most people inaccurately perceive radicals who demand extreme but necessary changes as being more dangerous than those who demand zero or incremental changes even when this leads to more dangerous outcomes. This is why moderates are rarely seen as extremists or dangerous, even though advocating for doing nothing or very little is often one of the most extreme and dangerous positions any person can take.

Self-assessment bias

The tendency to assess oneself inaccurately.

- Dunning-Kruger effect

The tendency to overestimate one's understanding and abilities in a given area if one is unknowledgeable or unskilled in this area, and to underestimate one's understanding and abilities in a given area if one is knowledgeable or skilled in this area. This occurs because those who lack a comprehensive understanding of something will consequently lack the knowledge necessary to understand its true complexity and how much they still don't know, while those who have extensive knowledge will consequently understand its true complexity and how much they or experts still don't know. In informal discourse the term Dunning-Kruger is used more commonly to refer exclusively to its negative form, or in other words those who overestimate their own understanding and abilities.

Technically speaking, the tendency to overestimate one's understanding of something is called the "illusion of explanatory depth" bias, while the Dunning-Kruger effect exclusively refers to the tendency to overestimate one's abilities. However, in modern discourse the term "Dunning-Kruger effect" is very commonly used to refer to both understanding and abilities, and the illusion of explanatory depth bias is known and referenced to a substantially lesser extent. To better facilitate social discourse, the founders of The Xova Movement advocate for the term "Dunning-Kruger effect" to be used to refer to both understanding and abilities. For this reason, all other parts of this manifesto will use this easier and more common definition.

The negative form of the Dunning-Kruger effect most commonly affects those who are partially knowledgeable on a subject, rather than those who are completely ignorant, and who are consequently more likely to be humble. However, it is important to remember that the negative form of the Dunning-Kruger effect can affect anyone, including experts within their own field, since no one is perfectly knowledgeable or skilled. That said, people who are critically minded and highly educated are less likely to suffer from this bias, since they are more likely to start with the correct assumption that the world is unfathomably complicated and extremely difficult to understand.

One of the most common manifestations of the negative form of the Dunning-Kruger effect is the belief that everyone should do their own research into incredibly complex scientific subjects and come to their own conclusions, rather than relying upon the consensus of experts. This occurs due to a lack of appreciation of the incredible complexity of most modern scientific fields. Even those with a PhD in one scientific field do not possess the scientific knowledge necessary to reach more objective conclusions about a second scientific field than the experts within that second scientific field. This is why academic consensus should generally be respected, and especially for extensively researched and esoteric subjects.

A common consequence of the negative form of the Dunning-Kruger effect is Ultracrepidarianism, which is the tendency to confidently make authoritative pronouncements about subjects one knows little about. Another common consequence is increased hostility towards people one disagrees with, since those who fail to appreciate the complexity of a subject are more at risk of becoming frustrated with those who hold different opinions, due to the mistaken belief that the truth is simple or obvious. A common consequence of the positive form of the Dunning-Kruger effect is "imposter syndrome", which is the feeling that highly competent people experience when they believe that they are not as competent as others believe them to be, and which can cause them to feel like a fraud that is undeserving of such veneration.

- Hot-cold empathy gap

The tendency to underestimate the influence of visceral drives, such as hunger, thirst, tiredness, stress, and anger, on one's thoughts, preferences, and behaviors.

- Hard-easy effect

The tendency to overestimate the probability of one's success at tasks perceived as hard, and underestimate the probability of one's success at tasks perceived as easy.

- Objectivity illusion

The tendency to believe that oneself is objective and unbiased.

The objectivity illusion bias and the naïve realism bias appear similar but are nonetheless different. The naïve realism bias involves believing that oneself is more objective and unbiased than others, while the objectivity illusion bias involves believing that one is more objective and unbiased than one actually is.

Truthiness bias

The tendency to believe things that are easier to interpret or comprehend, rather than believe things based on evidence and reason.

- Belief bias

The tendency to evaluate an argument based on how intuitively believable it is. Consequently, evidence and arguments that align with one's preexisting beliefs are more likely to be accepted.

- Rhyme as reason effect

The tendency to perceive rhyming statements as more truthful. For example, the statement "what sobriety conceals, alcohol reveals" has been shown to be perceived as more accurate than "what sobriety conceals, alcohol unmasks".

- Subjective validation

The tendency to believe something is true if one's beliefs or actions need it to be true. In other words, a person will be more likely to believe something is true if it personally benefits them.

Social biases: Association bias

The tendency to perceive something inaccurately based on its perceived association to something else that one has an opinion of.

- Authority bias

The tendency to attribute greater accuracy to the opinion of an authority figure, and be more influenced by that opinion, even when that opinion is unrelated to the authority figure's area of expertise.

- Cheerleader effect

The tendency to appear more attractive in a group than in isolation.

- Halo effect

The tendency to perceive a person's other traits more positively if they have a perceived positive trait, and to perceive a person's other traits more negatively if they have a perceived negative trait. In this sense, the perception of one trait effectively "spills over" into other traits. One example is the common tendency to assume that attractive people are also more intelligent or kind-hearted.

Social biases: Attribution bias

The tendency to inaccurately attribute the origins of the behavior of others and oneself.

- Defensive attribution bias

The tendency to attribute the causes of negative occurrences to something irrational or unknown, in order to protect one's preferred beliefs about oneself, others, or the world. This bias is the source of many other biases, including some of the following biases.

- Fundamental attribution error

The tendency to overemphasize dispositional and personality factors, and underemphasize situational factors, when explaining the behavior of others. For example, a person will be more likely to falsely attribute a person's road rage to a personality flaw, and ignore the possibility that their road rage may be due more to situational stressors that could make even calm and mature people experience road rage.

- Actor-observer bias

Identical to fundamental attribution error, except the bias is also applied to oneself and inverted. In other words, actor-observer bias is the tendency to overemphasize dispositional and personality factors, and underemphasize situational factors, when explaining the behavior of others, while simultaneously underemphasizing dispositional and personality factors, and overemphasizing situational factors, when explaining one's own behavior. For example, instead of an observer merely attributing a person's road rage to a personality flaw, actor-observer bias would also involve the observer attributing their own road rage to situational stressors.

- Ultimate attribution error

Similar to actor-observer bias, except instead of being applied to individuals it is applied to groups, resulting in in-groups being viewed favorably and out-groups being viewed unfavorably.

- Extrinsic incentives bias

An exception to, and inversion of, the actor-observer bias. In other words, extrinsic incentives bias is the tendency to underemphasize dispositional and personality factors, and overemphasize situational factors, when explaining the behavior of others, while simultaneously overemphasizing dispositional and personality factors, and underemphasizing situational factors, when explaining one's own behavior.

- Group attribution error

The tendency to believe that the characteristics or preferences of individual or multiple group members are representative of most or all group members, even when this is clearly not reasonable.

- Hostile attribution bias

The tendency to interpret the behavior of others as having hostile intent, even when the behavior is ambiguous or benign.

- Self-serving bias

The tendency to claim more responsibility for successes than failures. This bias can also manifest itself as the tendency to evaluate ambiguous information in a way that is beneficial to oneself.

Social biases: Conformity bias

The tendency to believe something based on whether or not it conforms to one's environment, and most commonly the opinions of others within one's environment.

- Availability cascade

The tendency to perceive a collective belief as more and more plausible the more it is repeated in public discourse. This bias is expressed in the sentiment "Repeat a lie often enough and it becomes the truth".

- Bandwagon effect

The tendency to believe or do something because it is common or popular. This is one contributing factor to herd behavior and groupthink.

- Groupthink

The tendency to accept an irrational group consensus in order to maintain or maximize harmony and conformity within one's group. In practical terms this means that every person within the group may be unwilling to challenge others or engage in the rigorous debating that is required to reach objective conclusions due to fear of raising tensions, creating discord, feeling isolated, or in a worst-case scenario being ostracized from the group. Consequently, dissenting viewpoints are effectively suppressed, and outside influences are minimized, resulting in uncritical consensus and poor decision making. This phenomenon is particularly dangerous when a group has power over others, and when their decisions have far-reaching consequences. This phenomenon doesn't merely occur within groups responsible for formal decision making, such as government committees and boards of directors, but all other groups as well, such as friendship groups and amateur sports teams. One strategy

for combating groupthink is “The Tenth Man Rule”, in which at least one individual within a group is designated the role of “devil’s advocate”, and consequently argues for contrarian positions.

- Social desirability bias

The tendency to answer questions in a manner that will be viewed favorably by others, most commonly by over-reporting one’s socially desirable characteristics or behaviors and under-reporting one’s socially undesirable characteristics or behaviors. This bias is one of the greatest hindrances to collecting usable data in studies that rely upon self-reporting.

- Courtesy bias

The tendency to give an opinion that is more socially acceptable than one’s true opinion, in order to avoid offending others.

- Truth bias

The tendency to believe others to an unreasonable degree.

- Gell-Mann amnesia effect

The tendency to believe statements made by people who are presumed to be experts, such as journalists and professional commentators, even after discovering that they made completely incorrect statements in the past.

Social biases: In-group bias

The tendency to perceive members of one’s group more favorably than members of other groups.

- Not invented here

The tendency to avoid products, research, standards, or knowledge, developed outside of one’s group.

- Out-group homogeneity bias

The tendency to see members of one’s group as being relatively more varied than members of other groups.

Social biases: Miscellaneous biases

- Empathy gap

The tendency to be less able to recognize, understand, or share, mental and emotional states that are different from one's present state. Consequently the empathy gap bias often leads to a reduction in empathy.

- False consensus effect

The tendency to overestimate the degree to which others agree with oneself. This assumed widespread acceptance of one's belief is likely one reason why people hold onto controversial beliefs with unwarranted certainty. This bias is the opposite of the pluralistic ignorance bias.

- Pluralistic ignorance

The tendency to underestimate the degree to which others agree with oneself. This assumed widespread rejection of one's belief is likely one reason why people choose not to publically criticize beliefs they disagree with.

- Pygmalion effect

The tendency to perform better in response to perceived high expectations. This bias can be understood as a psychological form of a self-fulfilling prophecy.

- Golem effect

The tendency to perform worse in response to perceived low expectations. This bias can be understood as a psychological form of a self-fulfilling prophecy.

- Reactance (a.k.a. boomerang effect)

The tendency to want to do the opposite of what is asked, out of a desire to resist perceived limitations to one's personal agency. This is one of the reasons why adolescents in Western cultures often rebel against their parents and societal norms. This is also one of the reasons why reverse psychology works.

- Reactive devaluation

The tendency to devalue a proposal because it originated from, or appeared to originate from, an adversary.

- Shared information bias

The tendency to spend more time and energy discussing information that all members of a group are already familiar with, and less time and energy discussing information that only some members are familiar with. This can result in groups making poor decisions.

- Worse-than-average effect

The tendency to underestimate one's desirable qualities and capabilities relative to others, and to overestimate one's undesirable qualities and capabilities relative to others. This bias is the opposite of the illusory superiority bias.

Miscellaneous belief, decision-making, and behavioral biases

- Action bias

The tendency to act when faced with a perceived problem even when inaction would be preferable, either because the problem requires inaction or because the problem doesn't exist. This bias tends to be proportional to the severity of the perceived problem, meaning that the greater the severity of the perceived problem, the greater the tendency to act in response even when inaction would be preferable.

The action bias and the politician's fallacy appear similar but are nonetheless different. The politician's fallacy is the incorrect reasoning that a particular action must be taken when inaction or a different action would be preferable, while the action bias is the tendency to pursue action more generally, and solely when inaction would be preferable. It is consequently common for people to feel compelled to pursue action of some kind because of the action bias, and then choose a specific yet irrational course of action because of the politician's fallacy.

- Additive bias

The tendency to solve problems through addition, even when subtraction would be preferable.

- Curse of knowledge

The tendency to experience extreme difficulty in thinking about problems from the perspective of lesser-informed people when one is better-informed. This consequently results in better-informed people unknowingly assuming that others are more knowledgeable than they actually are.

- Declinism

The tendency to view the past favorably and the future negatively.

- End-of-history illusion

The tendency to believe that oneself has experienced significant personal growth, including changes in taste, up to the present moment, but will grow or change substantially less in the future. Consequently, a person is likely to acknowledge how much their opinions have changed over time, but doubt that these will change much in the future.

- Exaggerated expectation

The tendency to expect or predict more extreme outcomes than are actually likely to occur.

- Hindsight bias (a.k.a. the “I-knew-it-all-along” effect)

The tendency to believe past events were more predictable than they actually were at the time they occurred. This bias usually entails the historian’s fallacy, and similarly usually results in unfair appraisals of people’s decision-making capabilities.

- Outcome bias

The tendency to judge a decision by its eventual outcome instead of by the quality of the decision at the time it was made. This bias usually entails the historian’s fallacy, and similarly usually results in unfair appraisals of people’s decision-making capabilities.

- Moral luck

The tendency to ascribe greater or lesser moral standing based on the outcome of an event. Taken to an extreme, this means that an immoral action will be perceived as moral if the outcome attributed to it is positive, while a moral action will be perceived as immoral if the outcome attributed to it is negative.

- Non-adaptive choice switching (a.k.a. the hot stove effect)

The tendency to avoid a choice because the same choice produced a bad outcome when previously used to address the same problem, even though it may have been a reasonable or optimal choice at the time, and even though it may still be a reasonable or optimal choice.

- Illusory truth effect

The tendency to believe that a statement is true after repeated exposure, regardless of its actual veracity. This bias is sometimes exacerbated by the mere exposure effect bias.

- Mere exposure effect

The tendency to express undue liking for things merely because of their familiarity. Researchers have discovered that this bias can occur even if a person cannot consciously remember the object of familiarity.

- Impact bias

The tendency to overestimate the length, or the intensity of the impact, of feelings experienced in the future. For example, a person may predict that being turned down for a job interview will have a more prolonged and negative impact on their emotions than would actually occur.

- Information bias

The tendency to seek information even when doing so is unnecessary or counterproductive.

- Interoceptive bias (a.k.a. the hungry judge effect)

The tendency to underestimate the influence of visceral drives, such as hunger, thirst, tiredness, stress, and anger, on one's judgment about external, unrelated circumstances. This can be understood as the "hot-cold empathy gap fallacy" except applied to the world around oneself as opposed to oneself. An example of the interoceptive bias would be a person experiencing anger towards their spouse and not realizing that their anger is being caused or exacerbated by their hunger and tiredness. In fact the reason for the alternative name of this bias is due to the discovery that parole judges who are hungry and tired are likely to be less lenient. A consequence of interoceptive bias is that a person being influenced by visceral drives will also feel that their emotions are completely justified, because they will believe their emotions are entirely the result of an objective assessment of the situation at hand.

- Moral credential effect

The tendency to give oneself permission to be less good in the future after having done something good in the past or present. This can even occur to the extent where the future act outweighs the benefit or virtue of the past or present act.

- Omission bias

The tendency to judge harmful actions as worse, or less moral, than equally harmful or more harmful inactions.

The founders of The Xova Movement believe this appendix entry to be one of the most important ideas in the entirety of this manifesto. This is because omission bias is one of the most dangerous biases that exists, since it prevents the genuine consideration of drastic action when such action is necessary, and orders of magnitude more moral than doing nothing.

- Optimism bias

The tendency to overestimate the likelihood of positive things occurring. This is more commonly described as "wishful thinking".

- Pessimism bias

The tendency to overestimate the likelihood of negative things occurring. This is common among those suffering from depression.

- Ostrich effect

The tendency to ignore information that may cause psychological discomfort, even if the information is important.

- Projection bias

The tendency to overestimate how much one's future self shares thoughts, preferences, and values, with one's current self, thus leading to sub-optimal choices.

- Proportionality bias

The tendency to assume big events have big causes. This bias may partially explain people's tendency to believe in conspiracy theories and gods.

- Recency illusion

The tendency to feel or believe that a phenomenon one has only noticed recently is itself recent.

- Risk compensation (a.k.a. the Peltzman effect)

The tendency to take greater risks when perceived safety increases, as opposed to taking the same risk with greater peace of mind.

- Surrogation

The tendency to lose sight of the strategic value a measurement is intended to represent, and subsequently acting as though the measurement itself is more important. For example, a manager may begin to believe that a customer satisfaction survey is the same as customer satisfaction, resulting in the manager attempting to increase the score of the survey even at the expense of customer satisfaction. Another example is a politician who prioritizes GDP growth at the expense of what they believe that growth represents, such as improvements in the quality of life of their electorate.

- Parkinson's law of triviality (a.k.a. bikeshedding)

The tendency to give disproportionate time or weight to trivial issues, particularly when those issues are easier to grasp or deal with than more important issues. This problem is commonly experienced by those who procrastinate. This bias is sometimes exacerbated by the attribute substitution bias.

- Attribute substitution

The tendency to substitute a computationally complex variable with one that is less complex. Consequently, a person will be more likely to use their intuition in place of careful consideration. This bias is one of the main causes of stereotyping.

- Technological progress bias

Coined by the founders of The Xova Movement, the technological progress bias is the tendency to underestimate the speed of technological progress. This predominantly occurs because technology improves at an exponential rate, while humans are only naturally adept at understanding linear progression.

- Unit bias

The tendency to desire to complete whole units of a given task. This can be because the perception of completion is more satisfying than other metrics, including metrics that are more important. For example, a person attempting to lose weight may finish the last few mouthfuls of their meal partially for the sake of "completeness", even though this may be detrimental to their goal of losing weight.

- Weber-Fechner law

The tendency to experience difficulty in comparing small differences in large quantities.

- Women are wonderful effect

The tendency to associate more positive attributes with women than with men.

Memory biases

These biases either enhance a memory, alter the content of a memory, or impair the recall of a memory.

Misattribution of memory bias

The tendency to misidentify the origins of a personal memory.

- False memory

The tendency to mistake one's imagination for a memory. The fabrication of experiences to fill in gaps in one's memory is known as confabulation in psychology. This bias is the inverse of cryptomnesia.

- Cryptomnesia

The tendency to mistake a memory for one's imagination. For example, a musician may create what they believe is an original song, not realizing it is a memory of a song they had previously heard.

- Social cryptomnesia

The tendency to fail to remember the origins of change within society. This is a common reason why the contributions and sacrifices of minorities in the past are often forgotten by societies compared to the contributions and sacrifices of majorities. This is one of the reasons why people mistakenly believe that major societal changes, such as the social and legal recognition of the rights of previously oppressed demographics, were the consequence of mass social movements, when in reality such changes or movements have usually only occurred because of immense sacrifices made by small percentages of populations.

- Source confusion

The tendency to confuse a memory with other information. This can result in memories being blurred together, or an inability to

distinguish the truth or likelihood of a memory. For example, American President Ronald Reagan recounted on numerous occasions the story of a pilot whose plane crashed, but the final words he mistakenly attributed to the pilot were actually lines from a movie called "Wing and a Prayer".

- Suggestibility

The tendency to remember information differently, and particularly events, due to suggestions made by others, and the tendency to remember suggestions made by others as personal memories, particularly when it comes to gaps within one's memories.

Miscellaneous memory biases

- Bizarreness effect

The tendency to remember information better if it is bizarre in some way.

- The von Restorff effect (a.k.a. isolation effect)

The tendency to more easily remember information if it sticks out in relation to other information. For example, if a written list of stationary objects also includes an animal, that animal is more likely to be remembered than if the list was comprised of other animals.

- Choice-supportive bias

The tendency to remember one's choices as being better than they actually were, particularly by retroactively increasing the value of one's chosen options and decreasing the value of all other options.

- Egocentric bias (Memory bias)

The tendency to recall the past in a self-serving manner, particularly by recalling oneself or one's actions as being more significant than they actually were. An example of this would be remembering a caught fish as being larger than it actually was.

- Euphoric recall

The tendency to remember past experiences in an unrealistically positive light, and consequently overlook or underplay the negative aspects of those experiences.

- Positivity effect

The tendency to experience fewer negative emotions to the same events, and to perceive the past more positively, as one grows older.

- Rosy retrospection

The tendency to judge the past disproportionately more positively than one judges the present.

- Negativity bias (a.k.a. negativity effect)

The tendency to recall unpleasant memories better than positive memories.

- Persistence

The tendency to unwillingly recall memories of traumatic events.

- Conservatism (a.k.a. regressive bias)

The tendency to remember high values, likelihoods, probabilities, or frequencies, as lower than they actually were, and remember low values, likelihoods, probabilities, or frequencies, as higher than they actually were.

- Consistency bias

The tendency to incorrectly remember one's past attitudes and behaviors as being identical to, or more similar to, one's present attitudes and behaviors.

- Continued influence effect

The tendency to have one's memories be influenced by incorrect information even after discovering this information is incorrect.

The continued influence effect bias and the backfire effect bias appear similar but are nonetheless different. The backfire effect bias involves believing even more firmly that something is true even after

discovering that it is untrue, and occurs due to one's personal investment, while the continued influence effect bias involves continuing to have one's memory be influenced by something after discovering that it is untrue, and occurs due to one's memory.

- Context effect (a.k.a. cue-dependent forgetting)

The tendency to fail to recall memories without contextual cues. For example, a person is more likely to remember work-related memories quicker and more accurately when at work than when at home. This bias is one reason why a piece of information may only be remembered when tangentially related information is provided first.

- Cross-race effect

The tendency to experience difficulty identifying members of other races.

- Generation effect (a.k.a. self-generation effect)

The tendency to better remember information if it is generated from one's thoughts as opposed to being heard or read.

- Google effect (a.k.a. digital amnesia)

The tendency to forget information that can easily be found online using internet search engines.

- Humor effect

The tendency to remember humorous items more easily than non-humorous ones. This may be due to the comparative distinctiveness of the humor, the increased cognitive processing time required to understand the humor, or the emotional arousal caused by the humor.

- Leveling and sharpening

The tendency to reduce or amplify parts of memories. Leveling is the process of excluding or toning down details within a memory, while sharpening is the process of refining or highlighting details within a

memory. These processes occur automatically, and can cause memories to be recalled inaccurately.

- List-length effect

The tendency to remember a smaller percentage but a greater number of pieces of information as the amount of information that needs to be remembered increases. For example, a person may only remember 15 items from a list of 30 items, but may remember 30 items from a list of 90 items.

- Misinformation effect

The tendency to remember things differently due to the influence of post-event information. For example, in a study that showed participants a video of a car crash, the participants that were asked how fast the car "hit" the other vehicle estimated a lower speed on average. whereas the participants that were asked how fast the car "smashed" into the other vehicle estimated a higher speed on average, and were also more likely to incorrectly recall seeing broken glass at the scene when interviewed a week later.

The misinformation effect bias and the continued influence effect bias appear similar but are nonetheless different. The continued influence effect bias involves having one's memory be influenced by incorrect information even after discovering it is incorrect, while the misinformation effect bias involves having one's memory be influenced by either correct or incorrect information but without being aware of whether this information is correct or incorrect.

- Mood-congruent memory bias

The tendency to better recall information if the information is congruent with one's current mood.

- Next-in-line effect

The tendency to experience greater difficulty recalling information if it is presented immediately prior to an anticipated public performance.

- Spotlight effect

The tendency to overestimate the amount other people notice our appearance or behavior. This is one reason why people fear public speaking.

- Peak-end rule

The tendency to judge an experience disproportionately based on how it felt at its most intense moments and at its end, rather than based on the total sum or average of the overall experience.

- Picture superiority effect

The tendency to more easily remember concepts learned through visuals than the same concepts learned through words.

- Placement bias

The tendency to remember being better than others at tasks that one believes oneself to be above average at performing, and to remember being worse than others at tasks that one believes oneself to be below average at performing.

- Serial position effect

The tendency to better remember the first and last pieces of information acquired. For example, people often have a higher chance of remembering the first and last items in a list than those in the middle of the list.

- Primacy effect

The tendency to better remember information that was acquired first.

- Recency effect

The tendency to better remember information that was acquired last.

- Stereotype bias (Memory bias)

The tendency to distort memories to fit stereotypes.

- Tachypsychia

The tendency to experience time as lengthening, making events feel longer than they actually are, or experience time as contracting, making events feel shorter than they actually are.

- Telescoping effect

The tendency to displace recent events backwards in time and remote events forwards in time, so that recent events appear more remote, and remote events appear more recent. The former is known as backwards telescoping, and the latter is known as forwards telescoping.

- Verbatim effect

The tendency to remember the “gist” of an idea better than the complete idea itself or specific details of the idea. This is because memories are representations, and not exact copies.

- Processing difficulty effect

The tendency to more easily remember information if it takes longer to read and is harder to process.

- Lag effect

The tendency to more easily understand and remember information if exposure to it is spread out over a longer period of time.

- Spacing effect

The tendency to more easily recall information if exposure to it is spread out over a longer period of time.

- Testing effect

The tendency to more easily remember information if one spends time retrieving it from memory rather than relearning it.

- Zeigarnik effect

The tendency to better remember the details of incomplete tasks, or tasks that are interrupted by unrelated activities, than those that have been completed.

APPENDIX:

CONCLUSION

Critical thinking is not something that comes naturally, but instead requires extensive knowledge, years of practice, and a willingness to continually educate oneself. Reading through this appendix just once is not enough to become truly critically minded, although it is an invaluable starting point. Even memorizing all critical thinking information does not guarantee consistently effective utilization of this information in the heat of the moment. Critical thinking is so difficult because it requires a host of difficult traits and abilities, such as emotional self-awareness, perpetual humility, mental multitasking, a good memory, and careful attention and consideration at all stages of analysis. Even when a person has developed good critical thinking skills, they will continue to make mistakes, and the process of thinking critically will continue to remain a mentally taxing one.