

Preface

This book begins with an explanation of sorts, of how I come to be writing a book entitled “The Political Manifesto of Ease: Haven't Left Yet”, and what it's really up against in the realm of opinion.

In this book I describe my reasoning, and the foundations that I have built from that reasoning, that makes me the person that I am. All with the current political environment in mind. I intend to enter into politics because we are in dire need of some good judgement, and this book serves as an example of my judgement for the reader to decide for themselves.

This is what I think, in some detail. This is what I stand for, and will act upon.

I am not an economist. I am not considered a “qualified expert” on anything, by anyone that I know of, and yet I have my own excellent learned understanding on many things that I put effort into. As do many others, and I do think that some people, frankly, don't know what the hell they are doing at all, despite their insistence and imposition.

It gets a bit conceptual at times. I have added these aspects in because I believe they are increasingly topical, and relevant. Some of which are new to me, and represent my most recent thinking. Although it doesn't change much in the way of my thinking, it is an interesting extension of it.

Foreword

“No one ever suspects the butterfly” - Bart Simpson

Contents

Introduction

Evil is live backwards. pg 2

Here are a few things I believe and why. pg 4

Their power is their authority and their argument. Pg 8

Justice pg 9

First do no harm and personal responsibility, deferment and authority pg 14

Taxation, Freedom, and Society pg 15

Individual Rights pg 16

The Economy pg 16

The Benefit System pg 22

Immigration pg 23

Superannuation pg 24

Do savings actually have diminishing returns? pg 25

Anti Rich Sentiment pg 26

Privacy pg 27

Extreme privacy violation in law pg 29

Digital Rights and The Law pg 31

Nature and Nuclear pg 31

Veganism, animal rights and animal welfare pg 33

Religion pg 34

Woke/gender/sexuality pg 36

Abortion pg 37

Covid pg 39

Contents (cont.)

Possible vs Plausible	pg 41
The concept of live vs evil:	pg 42
Does this lack of development of the “self” make people a vehicle for other authority?	
Careless is a poor substitute for carefree.	pg 43

Part II Genuinely Pro-Business.

I can think of two legitimate reasons for tax	pg 45
Equality and the definition of fairness	pg 45
Why the tax cycle doesn't work	pg 46
Higher Wages / Taxes / Inflationary Cycle / Govt Revenue Collection (Diagram)	
Power vs Power	pg 48
Big Business	pg 48
Business in general	pg 49
Two wheels of power	pg 50
Predatory system or greed? Let them eat cake.	pg 51
Torque and Exports	pg 52
Capital gains tax	pg 52

Part III Personal Unresolved Grievances, of a particular kind.

IRD	pg 61
The NZ Police	pg 65
Parking tickets	pg 68
Trademe	pg 69

Contents (cont.)

Banks	pg 70
Woolworths and Repco	pg 72
The Coca-Cola Company	pg 72
Moderation and other people's judgement.	pg 74

Part IV The Loose Ends of IVY

I think a lot of us are aware of our limitations when it comes to speaking out on things. We can speak from our personal experience and perspective, but often our understanding and wealth of information is side stepped in favour of the “idea” of expert knowledge.

Expert knowledge is like a skill, it is disproportionately developed relative to other skills so that understanding may reach new heights, but often can lack perspective in relation to other ideas with sometimes disastrous results.

What “science” has become, for example, (or at least my perception of it), is bordering on unscientific. Unless people know something that we do not about the nature of reality, (as if it needed to be pinned down to the highest level of accuracy so as not to be ripped up), then why must they discredit anything that is not “proven” by their own methods?

Evidence is an indication of proof, and can be in various states of proof, and people have well established and well developed foundations with which to filter information and observational evidence.

What we are, mind, body and whatever else, is built with universal concepts. What absolute proof would disprove the amassed knowledge of the human and planetary experience, individually and collectively?

We are experts of our own experience. That doesn't mean everyone is right, but it is still information, and it is still what it is, all things accounted for.

The point of all this, is to share what I have gathered, what I believe, and what my perspective is, for what it is, now.

Even if my understanding has some limitations, if you can account for what you believe I do not know, then it should be helpful and informative to understand my perspective. I am weary that I don't know what understanding other people are operating under.

I try to keep within the realms of what I understand to be true, to the extent that I know it, and would be glad for new information and perspectives, especially if they were to contradict my own understanding, or further it.

Where do I start? Up until recently, my general impression of politics has been that the “left” stood for individual rights and liberties, and the “right” stood for big business and other generally less empathetic policies. The left representing the “individuals perspective”, with welfare and social policies that minimise “collateral damage” and put people in need first. This is a position I generally agree with, up to a point, although “left” and “right” seem little more than labels and each party now represents a mix of values and perspectives.

It is interesting to think that a party might represent a perspective it understands the best. A party might understand right and wrong well from their own perspective. They may, indeed, be correct in knowing that “in any case” they have been wronged, but may be limited in understanding the other relevant perspectives and how to direct and attribute blame, find proportionality, and solutions with everyone in mind, rather than have a tug of war at the expense of the other. You argue for what you understand and hope a path opens up. (1)

I don't agree with the concept of politics representing group loyalty, or sides. That is odd to me, and I haven't been aware of people thinking that way except in loose terms.

I want to start with a concept that is quite new to me; a possible definition of evil. I think, like a lot of people, I have struggled to believe whether evil exists in people, when people are inherently good and are so often victim to circumstances outside their control.

Evil is live backwards.

What if evil is pure, mindless motivation? The weather could be some kind of “evil”, it does what it does, as far as we know it doesn't pay you any mind. It would be wrong to expect it to.

Excessive “evil” in people would be sinister and misplaced, inhuman. Our senses, our thoughts, our reason, is tuned to have meaning, to allow energy to move us, with the reasons “why not” that define who and what we are. I believe people are good-natured, but believe what they are when their reasoning fails them. It helps to be aware of what you believe and why.

If someone was a decent person but often acted instinctively, their actions may be wanton or sporadic. Similar to emotions you may be “blind” to what your motivations are, even if outcomes are ultimately good. I believe emotion is a form of truth, but that your reasoning can misinterpret it, or process it incorrectly, that it is its own form of “true” logic and a basis for reasoning.

Not all thoughts and awareness are in words. Having logical boundaries allows for other sensory determinations, and especially in a world full of lies, people could have more “sense” of what is right even if they can't explain it. Like putting one foot in front of the other, you wouldn't want one form of well established logic to contradict the boundaries of another.

What about mindless evil? Pure cause and effect? How would this manifest? Pure determination in the sense that what is “successful” dictates. This type of force would be attracted to means of power and mechanism. It is limited only by the obstacles in its way, we direct it with our discrimination, like we do our energy and actions.

Power can corrupt and you can see the ways this would manifest in real life. People with money and power will attract people looking to use that money and power, breaking down barriers, putting stress and pressure on beliefs. If what remains is only purely reactionary, then what sense of “self” is left?

What if pressure can be placed on people as outlets of mechanistic forces, much like an artist might interact with the world around them as a collaboration with “truth”?

If the truth can't be erased, (it would be like erasing the “fact” of existence), where does it go when it's suppressed?

Divine will, individual will, collective will, may be “success determination” of a different nature, extending itself beyond our present, congruent with ways of reality, nature, life and purpose, and may be intertwined with other energetic motives. A lot of moving parts with clear directives, through “indirect” mechanism.

What we build up to be important, what we know to be true, is what we must protect. There is the idea of the “selfless”, that may allow these things to play out almost through sense and instinct, but we must define them as humans or lose our humanity.

I do not believe in holding your breath forever, I believe people need self discipline to get them through to the point of knowing something well enough. It is easy not to want something that you truly know you do not want. A world full of fake self discipline just exhausts people.

The reason why I bring up this concept of evil as a driving force, is because I believe it's relevant. There is a danger here if we are up against something incessant that will take whatever it can get away with.

It may be naive to think that it can be reasoned with by our own definition of reason, perhaps only absolute truth. If we reach a tipping point we may get “rolled back”.

Take power companies for example. Take a pure profit, supply and demand model. This is a pure motivation. Supply and demand means it is priced at what people are willing to pay.

Demand does not incentivise generation of supply because at some point, in a profit only system, profits plateau at a point of maximum profit/minimum cost.

More supply does not mean more profit because of both the cost of development, but also because of the expectation of lower prices with increased supply. Like getting over a profit “hump”.

Maximum profit is maintained by control, which can include controlling the public perception.

Public perception and the decreasing social sustainability of high prices may increase supply and/or lower prices, or if it is more profitable, a “pure system” may be motivated to increase control over the population. This is the danger of the “bottom line”.

By dramatically increasing demand, supply will increase if profits increase, but at a maximum profit, minimum cost ratio. Why would they lower the prices unless forced to in a profit only model of this essential supply? Who is left to be convinced or reasoned with? If the directive by people is both short sighted, and abstract to consequences, empty.

It is pure extortion. Generally speaking, people do not use power excessively in my opinion, every reduction is at the expense of a comfort. Comfort matters, ease of use matters. Light and heat, these are things that are supposed to be naturally abundant.

They will crash the system behaving this way. People will need to say never again, and become entirely self reliant. It is the epitome of “this is why we can't have nice things”. We don't want to have to do everything ourselves, we want to benefit from shared efficiency.

You cannot run a power company this way, people in a system that cannot see the forest for the trees, letting it drive itself without understanding the ultimate motivations, or their own part in them.

The idea of shareholder responsibility is a scam. They deliberately create a conflict of interest. A company should make it explicitly clear that profits will not be made at the expense of ethics. If you want to make profits through extortion, don't invest here.

The shareholder excuse is wearing thin, a company can state what they stand for to set expectations before people invest. You do not owe them profits at any cost.

I would cap electricity prices to previous levels. Electricity is a basic necessity, profits should be made from innovation and development, not control.

We do not want to undermine the value of investments, however there is plenty of room for profitable growth without exorbitant prices, and how about attracting investment that doesn't undermine the future of the country.

Meanwhile, individuals should be quietly planning ways to be self sufficient.

I will share a story. I had a business contract with a power company where there was a bonus \$200 free power offered as long as the contract wasn't cancelled before two years. Of course, the contract ended just before the deadline, and I remember wondering; “what if” they had the power to ruin your whole life for a dollar. Does such power exist? What if this potential was calculable and could indeed calculate for such outcomes inherently? What if they couldn't calculate outside of their understanding?

We are people, the systems we build for ourselves should be with people in mind. Otherwise we aren't driving, we aren't “determining” suitable outcomes for ourselves, to our benefit.

Here are a few things I believe and why.

I want to describe these concepts so that you know a bit about me, what I believe, and the policies I would want to implement.

When I was younger, I remember thinking about the truth. I thought about the confusion lies create, the turmoil confusion creates, and the destructive nature of someone believing a lie, being forced to live a lie, and I believed what I still believe, that lies are probably always counter productive to everything.

Do I believe that lying is sometimes ok? Yes I do, when there is no proper expectation of a truthful answer and there is not deceit, and when someone has no right to expect an honest answer that they have no right in asking for, for the sake of privacy and safety.

But as a general rule, I don't think anyone is better off being lied to, and in fact lies can do a great deal of harm and should be avoided. It may be that the truth is always better, even for extreme “would be” paradoxical hypotheticals.

The truth is more than words, sometimes a piece of the truth would misrepresent it. Your “honest opinion” is not always going to be appreciated as the truth if you're wrong, for example, even if it is true that you believe it.

I think the truth is something very akin to reality or existence. If absolute truth is undeniable, while someone still disagrees there is probably still more to it.

I don't think that the absolute truth is in conflict with anything, that it is innately agreeable and satisfying by definition.

Knowing the absolute truth may not be possible or desirable in reality, so we are talking about a matter of degree and satisfaction. If you are afraid of the truth, perhaps you are afraid of an incomplete truth that would amount to a lie.

I believe in abundance of fundamentals as a healthy baseline. Water, heat, light, good food, ease, comfort, free will, privacy, safety, society, stability, the wealth of shared effort, these are abundant in a natural environment, and should be readily available with minimal moderation.

Too much moderating of basic comforts and natural resources is toxic to human development. Ease is about doing things well; being able to listen, to understand, develop, be flexible, function, thrive, strive. To gain strength and clarity through the enjoyment of living.

If we have a supply issue it should be rectified, as long term “metering” out of these resources is not a solution, and plans to do so, do not have the human condition in mind. Our systems should mimic our healthy, abundant, natural environment, and should be able to scale with the increasing population naturally with innovation.

I believe in things being free. Quite simply as free a society as possible. Where people can work hard and amass wealth based on merit, and wealth is accessible.

Free doesn't mean without value, it is generally without specific conditions or expectations of how that value will be reciprocated.

Free doesn't mean exploit. Free doesn't mean “won't be accounted for”, free doesn't mean no personal responsibility. Giving freely means value can flow under more ideal conditions.

The idea of pushing out the accessibility of money, and then supplementing it back in, increases the stakes for those that miss out. It lessens freedom and increases control and dependency. This is how a lot of social systems want to operate. I believe it is the wrong way to go about things.

I believe in individual property rights in a societal context, that is important, we have a right to choose stability amongst ourselves and as a natural right. In a broader sense, no one can own the land.

Would it not be true that every living person has a claim to a place to live on the planet? A natural born right? How is that “claim” being “managed” by government? How can you be born on this planet and not have a right to live on it?

People quickly encroach on that right, and the system is overrun. We tolerate this “mismanagement”, because we honor the rights of those who came before us, and the value we benefit from while it's still reasonable.

Individual property rights can not buy the planet and erase the individual rights of a free land. If there were a true claim to it in a way that we don't understand, how would anyone begin to account for it?

We need to address Maori land rights, a topic I do not know a lot about, but it seems to be a pressing issue. I am personally concerned that there is a prevailing belief of entitled ownership of land and water etc. I am concerned that there is the intention of “reclaiming” a non-existent right, and “righting” a non-existent wrong.

To be fair, allowing it to go undefended does not speak highly of those who would willfully allow it to occur, or engage in it's active destruction and dissolution. Or their claim to it.

I will tell you my opinion from my limited perspective, I do not believe that anyone “owns” the land. You have a claim to it like everyone else. I do not know about the individual harms, but I do think that cheating is cheating, and if anyone was cheated then that was wrong. This is true in almost anything.

What creates societal ownership of land? Stepping foot on it? Living on it? Investing in a claim to it like people invest their time? their actions?

It is obviously wrong to destroy a person's home, their prospects, the things that they develop and defend. But there is always blood, sweat, and tears, for everyone.

Do you believe it is a free land? Did you believe it was a free land when you or your ancestors first stood on it? At the time, when people arrived in a new place, did they not have a right to a free land that had plenty? How can you have claimed it all?

If a new person set up a home, did they have a right to defend it? Could they have defended it? If the claim was based on the ability to defend the land for themselves, would they have won? For the country's own sake? For the betterment and development of it?

By what definition is the land stolen?

The problem now is that land is used as societal leverage, the problem then is that they may have already known it, but people would always have come and claimed beyond the reach of those already there. It was their deal to make. They made the best choices that they could.

What was the alternative? You can't pick the moment in time most favourable to you to validate all claims, ever.

Lifting people up, getting people out of poverty, could mean a more than fair exchange of wealth took place.

I understand that modern hardships are more about "relative poverty": You can be surrounded by wealth, but if the things you need and want the most are lacking, you are still in poverty.

Society is a constant abuse of this kind while perpetrators refuse to understand it. We are being scammed. So what do we do when we must keep things spinning to prevent harm to those already invested in the system?

We do it because we are honor bound, not because anyone tells us to, and because it is smart and right, and because those two things are interchangeable. At least, that's what I believe. Which leads me to my next point.

I wonder if people with good intentions don't understand people with bad intentions, and vice versa. Good people may be naive to the motives of some, because it genuinely seems implausible to them. They understand why they wouldn't think that way, and know those things so well that it seems crazy.

Good people aren't stupid or gullible, it's because they know better. The difference between doing the right thing because it's smart, and doing the right thing because it's right, might just be the depth to which you understand it. Doing the right thing is smart even when it seems like it's not, if it seems like it's counter to our interests, or even our own life, we believe that it's not, it is the only way. This is a logical belief.

I do not think you can rely on this to be true, logically the motivation to do what's right, because it's right, can be almost blind.

How well does the belief hold that you cannot undermine another person or thing of any shared interests without undermining your own?

A shared interest in existence, something beneath existence? Not betraying everything you are and want to be? What else would you believe in? Denying the truth is not self interest, even if someone acts believing that it is.

I was thinking of a recent example involving UK Police being blindsided by a murderer lying to them at a crime scene, accusing the victim of the crime. If it is possible that police can be made tools of by abusers who use them as weapons, unconscionable lying is almost a furtherance of that to the point of brainwashing.

Outside of the lack of training and responsibility, it's as if it's almost inconceivable to a normal person that someone could lie so brazenly, in the same way that authority can be brainwashing, if it goes straight over your head past your ability to question it.

What is victim blaming? Doing whatever you want or feel like with the “logical” belief that it is their problem? That someone should be strong enough to stop you, and it's their fault if they can't, and their responsibility. The idea that you can keep taking forever and that something must grow and stop you?

Their power is their authority and their argument.

In people this would be a bizarre mentality. First lie is right in front of your face. Abusing people is wrong, it looks wrong, feels wrong, is wrong from the perspective of what you are as a human being. Any justification past this point is out of alignment with reality.

You could argue that abusers have lost their sense of that perhaps, but if human is what you are you might be stuck with it. Human might be the extension of what you are regardless of what you think. You might be doing “you” badly.

How can a human being in a human body cause so much pain? Because you should know better, because you may be at the very limits of “wrongness” by not knowing better.

I do not like the belief that good times create weak people. I understand the conflict that some people have when they know how hard times have made them strong and helped them grow. That is not a justification for deliberately creating hard times.

Hard things will find you, if you can't find purpose or see enough problems that need work, you're not seeing what's right in front of you. I believe that if you think the good that you are is only the product of abuse, then you are giving them credit that they don't deserve and they are stealing your thunder.

Just because good things arose from bad situations, doesn't mean that you wouldn't have otherwise done good things. Like anything, circumstances are a variable, how that occurs in life is one thing, and may even be divine. Using it as a justification for behaviour is another thing entirely.

Say you built a mountain, and you were always going to build a mountain, and something came along and stretched you to capacity, and you built a mountain an inch taller. First of all, is it worth it to you to have a slightly taller mountain, and at what cost?

Would you attribute the value of the whole mountain to the abuser? And when you separate the extra pyramid of mountain and put it on the ground beside the mountain, which is bigger? If you made, or would make, allowances for the sake of something, how much of that is also attributable to you?

There may be a lot of value in new heights, but in my opinion, that is only for the innocent or the “accidental”, not a deliberate justification.

Wrong will always be wrong, even if something claims to be “worth it”, no perspective will ever change the fact that in that moment it was truly wrong, experienced or suffered as wrong, even if further realisation makes it slight.

By the sheer virtue of that fact, I believe that anything a person does, will probably never be as good an outcome, from their perspective, than if they had not justified doing that wrong. That it can never be “justified”.

It will never be as good as if you had just not done that thing, and should not be, but that at some point it could come close, like a mark or scar that fades to almost nothing with time. Whether or not a person was truly wronged may be a matter of debate and, of course, personal perspective.

It is interesting to think that a person trying to help another person by doing “wrong”, may find themselves standing in the way or sabotaging that person by virtue of their actions: that at some point they must then stand opposed, with the difference at their expense, because they can not get what they want through their actions at no cost to their own objectives.

I am going to elaborate loosely on something that might be too conceptual:

If something was acting at the bequest of “God”, in only the truest sense, and couldn't fully account for it's actions, if it were innocent, not acting beyond it's capacity to understand, acting against someone stuck between the line of death, of body or self, and the “divine”, at the very limit between what you choose for yourself, and what you would choose for yourself “if you knew what it meant”, but what was being done against you was wrong, will always be wrong, like scrapping along the line of death. Between a rock and a hard place. If you would not escape it, with no room to change, the balance of contradictions might draw on something you might call “Godspeed”. This might serve as a proof of humanities “innocence”.

It may be that everything is “innocent” somewhere, but relative to where we need to be?

“Why do bad things happen to good people”; how can it ever be ok, how is it within the capacity of what can sustain itself within the limits of reality? What do you draw from when there is nothing left but contradictions?

I can't speak to other people's horror. Only the truth, that what survives was stronger than it. But what about the invisible death of the spirit? The death or erosion of pieces of the “self” that can not/ would not want to exist under the circumstances?

If someones humanity is stolen can they reclaim it? With the truth, relative to what they are? Like the breath of life?

Justice

It seems right that everyone is born equal in some way, you can't assume otherwise. To say that it's equal opportunity out there is obviously not true, at least from our relevant understanding. Is it enough that we are all equal, but different at any given point in time?

What people choose to do is attributable to them, and that has individual value. Constraints are imposed on people unequally by others actions.

If we are judging people fairly, it includes the effect that the actions of others have on them, (a sense of both present and past tense), that are attributable to the individuals perpetrating those actions, and are largely completely unknown. Who can account for it all? It seems better to reserve judgement, and to look past all the distractions with your own clarity.

We can attribute value to what/who a person is now, regardless of how it happened, with the insight that it's not the whole story. If you're a shitty person, you're a shitty person, and that does matter, regardless of the idea of blame. Perception of someone may be your false perception, however.

There is an awareness of whether some circumstances stick to people superficially rather than it being their present, true self.

If the real law is more akin to the limits of reality, some insights of which may be hidden, what is societal law? It is a communication of free will, cause and effect.

We communicate what our terms are to each other. If you do this, we'll do that etc. Communication is not "the law", it is not right and wrong exactly, but we should try to represent it as well as possible. That is it's purpose.

There is a collective understanding of what is required to keep the law robust, but a fake law shouldn't hold. And an absence of "communication" does not negate accountability to right and wrong. There are probably criminals in our society that think both.

Everything is accountable, truth is not erased. So how do we communicate better? What do we do if "societal law" is not communicating well on our behalf, or with our input?

If we must ever say: "I will not allow you to do this, at personal risk of being wrong"?

We encroach on each others freedoms as little as possible, and we stand up for what is right, as best as we understand it. Right and wrong doesn't change, we are surrounded by the reality of it, but we do also ourselves define it, and attribute value to it truthfully via our experience.

The law currently doesn't seem to hold up to these ideals. Too much control, and too much freedom to the wrong people doing the wrong things.

I don't believe in trading freedom for safety, and I don't believe jail is about punishment.

However, we do need longer sentences and better rehabilitation for serious crimes than we currently have, this is realistic.

Some of these types of crimes are exactly the type of thing that would have otherwise gotten someone killed in retaliation, how can shorter sentences properly reflect the gravity of that?

That is not about freedom, it is a deliberate and inappropriate denial of consequences. The denial of people's freedom to seek justice.

In order to have longer sentences and proper justice, we must improve the standards of prisons. The prison system, including the “process”, can not be about facilitating harm. You cannot expect people to fully support the justice system if you make them complicit in wrong-doing.

It is awful to think that someone will be better off in prison than someone outside of it. That is unacceptable and must be reconciled, but not by making it worse. There has to be some responsibility involved, if people want the ability to pass judgement and take away a person's freedom. That is also realistic.

If no one can account for blame accurately how can we hold people accountable? By being realistic and by a sense of justice. We seek justice within the limits of what is right. Like colouring within the lines of true accountability, we do what we can without overstepping. We alleviate some of the burden of unmet justice for victims, and protect against further harm.

If justice and accountability will be done in any case, we can and should seek some for ourselves, we play a role in the method of it's action. There may additionally be a piece of justice that is only ever defined by the one seeking it, who can truthfully attribute to it the personal cost.

I personally have no tolerance for rape. I understand that there are some blurred lines, but the violence of rape will not be ignored, or denied, and if proven you have proven that you do not understand the horror of what rape is. It is a long way back from there.

The public should have a very low tolerance for risk once unequivocally proven. This is natural accountability. Even if risk was reduced to zero, it would not be right, or justice, to allow a person to walk free without meaningful consequences. This does not mean cruelty.

We ensure that justice is done rather than letting it occur, and take into account the relevant circumstances that may have contributed. Remembering that a person going forward, is not exactly the same person they were, if they themselves were victimised; accountability may not work in reverse.

If we overstep it is at some personal risk, whether we know it or not. A functioning justice system recognises real harm and deals with it appropriately, and does not create more harm.

Why do we have people currently in prison on remand for extended periods who haven't been found guilty of any crime? I do not know enough about this, but since when is this acceptable? When did we stop hearing about it? What extraordinary circumstances could have possibly occurred to allow this?

My thoughts on the death penalty are that I am personally against it. In a different world it might be the only way to ensure safety. That is different, that may or may not be justified, I don't know if it ever is, but I would agree that there are times that the alternative seems unacceptable. Although, you can't use a logic derived from a hypothetical exactly.

We don't live in that world, and because we have the ability to not use the death penalty, I think we have the responsibility not to, and else we might lose it.

I do not think institutions should be killing people; the potential for corruption is dangerous. There is also no personal responsibility. How can a person's life be taken and no one is responsible for it? A slap on the wrist spread out to a million hands does not seem enough.

There is the risk of killing an innocent person. There is the fact that we don't understand life and death. It is even possible that we just release something back into the world unreconciled.

Is it really justice to meet a swift end? For the victim it may help relieve the emotional burden placed on them, and the burden of seemingly unmet justice.

If a victim really needed to, they do have free will to do it themselves as far as I know, but as a society we cannot allow it to go uncondemned, even if we understand, because of the risk of false justice. In my opinion, only the victim could really take that onto themselves because only they know it truly well enough, and are responsible for it. And even then it may create a further burden.

There is something else to remember: a child's sense of justice. A child's want for someone to "know" what they did was wrong. Suffering doesn't really teach that, especially if the person already knows suffering. Is it something that adults have forgotten? We know right and wrong better, we can process it better, and maybe just want the relief that it is dealt with.

A child is more vulnerable to the obnoxiousness of abusers. How does a child signify and define what was done to them?

Maybe only life teaches right and wrong from the perspective of the living. How can a victim gain the relief that the perpetrator might one day truly "know" it was wrong? How can we prevent future harms? Are we thinking only in short terms of our lifespan, when it might not be the only consideration?

What if every human has a flicker of humanity, and for some, even as adults, they are in a form that is the furthest from their reach? No excuses, just the reality that we do not know.

It would not be kind to let them rack up a burden in a world they would wreck havoc in. The risk of that thinking is, of course, encroaching too much.

It might be interesting to think of the idea of fate. Of how we may or may not dodge bullets through our own will, and the grace of the will of others. We think of bad things happening as circumstances that could have been avoided, that it could have so easily gone differently. Maybe we don't understand the workings of that, of how we may already be at the end of our rope. That equation includes what society does, and can successfully make room for.

It may be that if you cannot survive in this world, that it doesn't deserve you; what the best of you represents, not your worst, what your individually amounts to. We do not know why.

I think it might be relevant to define my own basic understanding of why rape is logically wrong, outside of the obvious immediate emotional distress and harm.

I was extremely alarmed to hear that in the USA it has until quite recently been a standard medical practice for training doctors to practice non-consensual pelvic and rectal exams on millions of unconscious patients, women and men.

This is obviously so repulsive and unacceptable, and the lack of fallout that I have heard from this speaks to a level of psychopathic prevalence, and criminal conspiracy, I do not understand the extent of.

If a doctor doesn't understand what rape is they are not fit to practice medicine, they must have the presence of mind. What brainwashing is this? Years of “studying” gives you no authority, and is no particular indication of virtue or intelligence to my knowledge. Bad people can end up in any profession, why would it be a licence for criminals?

Rape is one of the most consequential violations of the right to your own life, freedom, and body. If you don't know how rape is wrong, how can you understand human suffering outside of raw physical pain? Pain is informative, it's purpose is to inform you something is wrong, that damage is being done. Pain is experienced as an expression of wrongness.

The right to one's own physical body is deeply related to your ability to live, and the more intimately that right is violated, the more potentially consequential.

The significance of fertility is deeply intertwined with physical intimacy in women, and physical violation of a person's intimate body, sex and procreation, is deeply consequential for anyone.

Rape is factually wrong, and the truth of that is extremely emotionally burdensome, if not excruciating, with emotion being like pain, a way the body responds and informs. The emotional pain is greater when it cannot be processed well, or reconciled. Like being hit by a train, it may not even be possible to “process” the impact of it fast enough.

Other exacerbating factors are the way sexual abuse affects a persons ability to experience some of the most profound life experiences, aspects of sex, love, procreation, and relationships, and the cost of the value of these experiences being degraded, in the most conflicting way possible, is wrong, and the emotional burden of this extreme wrongness, like physical pain, is inflicted on the victim.

It is never “what you don't know can't hurt you”. Wrongness doesn't go away, emotions can be processed up to a point but the truth remains. A person's ability to respond to it in a true, emotional and informed way does not in any way change the reality and significance of the wrongness of what occurred. That level of rage may even reach a point beyond human capacity to feel.

It is not necessarily less wrong than the worst possible “experience” of it. To think that meaning is an illusion is incorrect.

How wrong the actions of the perpetrator are is also a significant measure. This is about the inescapable burden of injustice placed on someone, emotion is just one of the ways in which we understand it better. Emotions can be a compounding burden, but it is not the source of the burden.

Intimate physical violation doesn't need to be overtly sexualised, it is already sexual in nature by definition of sexual body parts. Losing emotional and sensory sensitivity as a result of abuse is harm being done.

Intimacy and privacy are deeply personal, and when attacked can pose a very real threat and danger to a person's ability to function in a practical world and need protecting. It is as deeply rooted as anything is.

A lot of people understand this intuitively and from their personal experience, but it doesn't seem to be treated with enough seriousness in law.

Physically violating people while they are unconscious is not normal. Neither is cutting people open with a scalpel, actually, but with that there is at least the idea that there is some informed logic behind it, and hopefully a way in which it is possible to be right.

Non-consent by doctors defies basic logic, have they lost their minds? Been stripped of any sense? Do we not understand each others pain? For some involved this must speak to something deeper about existence, humanity, authority and brainwashing, but some of these so called doctors are surely just bad people and rapists. Where are the consequences? Who are these people? What are they doing globally?

First do no harm and personal responsibility, deferment and authority.

What does “first, do no harm” mean to me? I think first do no harm is relevant to everyone, and always has been. It is about the idea of how to act, how to go about your life, how to begin to make decisions. It is about personal responsibility.

How do you know what to do in life? You make decisions based on what you know the best, what has the most relevance to you, and where your responsibility truly lies: your own actions.

It is the conflict of trying to justify outcomes from far away, on matters that you don't understand properly with the idea that it might be “more right” than simply doing the right thing where you are first and foremost. I believe it is everyone's responsibility to “first, do no harm”, to the best of your ability, from the centre of your being, outwards.

How else are “you” calculating or determining? Some balance between how much “self” you have built with your beliefs and experiences, and how well formed and “true” they are, (including via your body and the world around us), along with other “authority”.

When we do not know what is the right thing to do is we defer. We do the best that we can, we try to understand. We hope someone knows what they are doing, we hope we are enough, and we make it so. We recognise when it's not right. We try. We figure it out. (14)

Taxation, Freedom, and Society

It has for a long time made some kind of sense that tax can make society a fairer and more functioning system. Babies need parents like people want a supportive, functioning, engaging environment with which to develop, grow, and live their lives. People are not babies, of course, however.

It does strike a bit of a weird cord when people say things like “taking a cut of my money” in regards to tax. Not because it's not their money, but because it is a number, it is a bit abstract as to what anyone is getting paid exactly in exchange for their time and effort.

If income was not taxed, maybe you'd get paid more, but maybe you'd get paid less. Modern society is such a facilitating, intertwined system, and you'd hope that when working well, it enables greater wealth to occur in the first place, whether this is through education, systems of law, justice and peace keeping, infrastructure, healthcare, shared knowledge and technology, opportunities etc.

That is how that system is supposed to work, you are supposed to be getting paid more value even though you're getting taxed, because we work together to create more value than we could alone and isolated.

This is true for high earners too, that will presumably rely more and more on this “facilitating” to take place as the equation starts to skew further and further away from personal time, effort, skill and talent, and becomes heavily dependent on societies collectively paid for structure.

So, it does make some sense to tax the rich more, not because of “wealth distribution” necessarily, but because it does seem fair and true that high profits require high levels of society and people other than you probably collectively paid for it to an extent.

It's very hard to quantify however. This may not always be the case. Especially when people are struggling just to live their lives. If someone is working their butt off and it's not enough to be comfortable, and live the life they want, then maybe you are taking “their” money. Something doesn't add up.

What if we would occasionally just prefer a dirt road? Does anyone even ask anymore? If it got to the point where the value of a road was just so you could get to work to pay for it's construction?

Why would the government need an ever increasing supply of money only for people to be worse off than if they lived in isolation? Freedom and society are not the same thing.

People have a right to freedom, you do not own their lives for the sake of society. I would argue earnestly that individual rights and freedoms are absolutely in the collective interest, at very high stakes, and that anyone advocating otherwise possibly doesn't have either in mind.

What real freedom is actually still available? The ability to live in the bush, alone, on public land, but only if you don't settle, or build, or grow anything, or make any money? And only if you thought to do it fast enough.

We need to recognise that modern living has become a lie. In reality, if society were to collapse, people would still be able to build shelter, grow food, and entertain themselves. We are not actually helpless and dependent.

All of our obligations and entanglements, everything we have built up to this point, how we have directed our lives, our intent and energy, it means a great deal, it is a lot to lose, it is our life's work. We don't want to have to rebuild.

Individual Rights

A great deal of harm comes from people thinking that they are right in knowing what's best for someone else, and then justifying acting on it. Ultimately, no one is a greater authority on you than yourself.

Some people really like believing they are better than they currently are, perhaps as a means of becoming that thing, but you should want to know the truth, be right because it's proved true, not try to falsify it true that you are right.

Generally speaking, individual rights are only a problem when they come at the expense of another's individual rights, surely? When you run out of room, you figure out what individual rights take precedence with equal measure.

This might include fundamental needs the other cannot account for, and the right, need and want, to prioritise those things for yourself. You can't put yourself in direct opposition of another's most fundamental rights without your own equivalent fundamental rights being at stake? Why would it ever come to such a point without one being more right than the other?

Is this really the level people are operating at or is it the guise of it? You must "take" someone's final priorities because of some vague collective argument?

How would it ever be right for every individual's personal stake to be forfeit, up for grabs to the collective argument, (made accurately by whom, with what stake)?

Those things must have meaning or else there is no meaning. If nothing is held dear individually, how can it be so collectively? Being willing to lose something does not mean agreeing to it, or thinking it's best practice.

A collective argument only works when you accurately value the individual stakes, this is dynamic valuing, if you truly do wrong by someone, best believe it doesn't add up.

The Economy

Money is a flow state of value. For those interested that the word "god" is "dog" backwards, "flow" is "wolf" backwards.

Money is not just printed paper, or numbers in a computer, it is not made up, it is a placeholder for real value; that allows value to flow and be exchanged easily.

The idea that somehow it isn't backed by anything real would seem to ignore simple facts, although I would agree that perhaps the “attachment” of any given “money” to its value is not permanently fixed exactly. “Attachment” of true accountability is however, and so it is as fixed as the integrity of the monetary exchange. There is also the fact that money is a number, and a sense of equivalent value, for the purpose of maintaining the fairness of the exchange, is harder to quantify.

Think of all the value that can be exchanged, and of how all the available money can be used to buy what is for sale.

It is a closed bubble of money and value. Generally speaking, all the available money must represent all the available value.

If there were only 4 apples, and only \$4 with which to buy them, \$1 each between 4 people would buy you an apple each. If 12 extra apples were added, \$1 still represents a quarter of the available value, so \$1 will buy you 4 apples instead of 1, because there is more value (apples) in the pool.

Value is indeed a pie of sorts, and money does represent and lock down a percentage of available value. What is available value? How does it ebb and flow? I don't think it can be quantified by us but, loosely, it does encompass everything that can be exchanged for money at any given point in time. (At least in terms of the monetary system.)

Your available time and energy is a resource, when you work hard for money that value is stored relative to all other value, it goes into the pool of value.

Whatever the result of your work was, say you painted a house, the value of that work is “stored” somewhat in the value of the house. Now when the house is sold it includes the value of the work you put into it.

Houses, assets, bank accounts, are stores of value, and their “monetary value” (what the sale price would be) is what percentage of money is stored from the total system. Intrinsic value doesn't really change, a house is still a house. But what that house can buy if sold can change dramatically based on the share of “money”, from all available money, it represents.

Prices are not necessarily going to accurately represent value, but this total value to money ratio is kept in stasis by the fact that exchange is based on availability. If there is no money in circulation, no one can buy anything with it.

If something of extreme value is suddenly added to the market, there is more value to go around, your monetary percentage of the “pie” can buy more value. It is in constant flux, and, importantly, can dip in and out of potential value.

Some people think money just “circulates”. When ten hard working people get drained of their time and effort for that money to then circulate to one person paid an excessive salary

who perhaps does very little of value, it does circulate, it does all get added to the total value pool, but it is like money laundering every time it does: unequal value contribution, unequal distribution of money, over and over again.

To be fair, who is the say what is the “true value” of each exchange, but we can tell that in basic, rudimentary terms, that this is not right, and not harmless “circulation”.

Governments spending large amounts of money thinking it just circulates to people are not considering the effect this mismatched exchange of value has.

It is similar to why printing money causes inflation. By printing money that is indistinguishable from existing money, it dilutes the value of that existing money. Now there is more money in the money pool to represent the same amount of value, the ratio has changed.

The “pie” can grow, value can grow, at least relative to us, from our perspective, and probably even more so through some wider exchange and individual value creation.

Resources circulate, other growth occurs. There is plenty of value.

There is the balance of intrinsic true value that everything has, and the relative value; what someone is willing to pay, what it's worth to them, supply and demand.

If there is plenty of value, what is the problem? Why are the very things that are plentiful and free, that we are reliant on the most, the very things that are restricted?

People don't just need value, they need specific things at specific times. This is how there can be plenty of value but still poverty and suffering.

Some people want to make money from control and extortion. They want to take capital advantage to the extreme. They want to make “money” from leveraging the fact they have money against those that don't have money, and keep it that way. This is not making “value”, it is draining and redistributing existing money from other sources.

How much leverage is fair? I don't believe all money is at the expense of someone else. If someone has a lot of money but didn't do anything wrong to get it, it may just be their time to trade in on their individual value.

Sacrificing, waiting, working hard, or going without “now” to capitalise “later” are also genuine forms of capital gain and leverage. These are no longer available options for a lot of people, there is no room left to make money this way as everyone is barely “surviving”.

Past a certain point, “minimising” is no longer efficient, or productive, or conducive for human development.

If money in circulation is controlled, all the value is “stored” and no one can access it. No one can access existing value.

Capital can be used in ways that are not extortionary, much like a person might support someone with time and effort to allow potential to flourish. Better outcomes and growth of value can be achieved with “capital” resources.

A problem is that there is a lot of desire to make money blindly off of capital leverage without discretion. A lot of people don't know where else to “store” their money and expect easy, high yield returns simply from having money.

This can be manipulated and poverty is incentivised. If you are forced to sell assets for less than you would like, or otherwise would, you get undercut. If you are willing to pay more than what something is worth because you are desperate or in need, you get undercut. If people are desperate for “jobs” and “capital investment” and you compromise where you otherwise wouldn't, you get undercut.

Good deals can exist for healthy reasons in a healthy environment, it's just that this is not a healthy environment.

We have to limit extortionary practices, and we have to recognise what those are, so that people can get to a healthy baseline with which to thrive, and actually create value.

There really is a problem with relative poverty because people will always need their basic needs met first and foremost. This problem centers a lot around property because everyone needs a place to live.

Supposed “well meaning” people may also create enforced poverty because they think if too much money is circulating it will be used on property as it is always a priority, and then it will drive up house prices, further driving up inflation and living costs, sending everything into a spin of uncontrolled chaos.

Even if this were true, if people had time, money and freedom why wouldn't they be able to create solutions to the housing problem? Who is benefiting from all of this? Why does nothing get done?

How does the control of stores of money create the “illusion” of money scarcity to maintain the current “value” of money? It's like if someone printed billions of dollars but never told anyone, maybe it wouldn't visibly cause inflation because no one notices, but it doesn't change the fact that there is a greater money to value ratio, and that money is now worth less.

Is the money accounted for? Are there pockets of “empty” money? Like a bubble that works it's way through a system and might not incorporate properly.

Here are ways that this is happening:

People can't monetise their value. They can't turn the value that they have as a person into money. No one has any money to pay them for their value because they need to use the little money they do have to “survive” themselves.

No one is “allowed” to live without money, alternatives to money are controlled, alternative styles of living are controlled. Money is not accessible, you can't just make flexible money, it is restricted to a “process”. That process can be controlled and managed.

Housing availability. Stability is controlled. People want to live their lives, but no one can do anything they want to do.

Jobs for the sake of jobs. Jobs in of themselves are not value generation, they can facilitate a lot of good things, but they are an exchange of value for your time and effort. Effort that you could spend doing something else productive. Creating problems to solve to keep people busy, or employed, is not good in of itself.

The only aspect of this that I can see that may serve a purpose is if there is an awareness that value will be siphoned off by something else, perhaps leaving people powerless.

The opposite however could be true. If jobs result in profits going overseas, then our time and effort has been monetised only to leave our own system. Profits to people that possibly actually only stifle growth.

Perhaps there is a genuine argument against growth that happens too quickly? Once set on a path, outcomes become a matter of course, and if you want to build well rather than backtrack, or overt disaster, some sense of pacing could be beneficial.

So if scarcity of (specific) value creates inflation because you're willing to do more and pay more, and plenty of money creates inflation because your money is worth less in competition with others... then this is a recipe for inflation of necessities, and no money for anything else, and the answer is to immediately reduce scarcity of necessities (extortion), then money can flow based on merit.

If housing scarcity goes down at the same time that more money circulates, then house prices can remain stable, and can then lower slowly at a complementary rate as living costs go down, in a way that gives people time to adjust, and allowing the loss of inflated values to be offset over time by savings in living costs.

More money circulating can be inflationary if there is not enough competition, because people are willing to pay more for what is available. It seems that “big business” is happy to capitalise on the advantages of scaling up, like brand visibility, reputation, organisational advantage, cash-flow etc but doesn't necessarily like it when small businesses can compete by undercutting prices or organisational costs, or by being a charitable human being.

This is anti-competitive behaviour if it results in the motivated destruction of small business, and the control and enforced poverty of normal people to keep them from competing, and this “profit” driven mind set increases inflation. (Which also increases operational costs and devalues money.)

My very real concern is that there is no discretionary money circulating (exclusive of inflated living costs), and that this situation could become increasingly tighter and tighter. And that this is to the supposed advantage of whatever has a hand in controlling it. (20)

You do not get to make money at the expense of the rights of others. The scales don't tip all the way and never will, it will never be right. This is a plot to price people out of their freedom.

Let's talk about freedom. People do not need to “pay their way” to you. Our very existence is already input/output, it is perfectly unavoidable. Whatever we owe for our very being will work itself out, it is not a matter of society. Our right to exist is not a matter of society that we need to earn, on an increasingly slippery slope. How dare you pretend to give yourself the right to think so.

What happens when the money keeps accumulating on one end, and deliberate corruption means normal people can't keep up with the demands, to keep their own place to live, their own right to their own life and freedom?

Hiding the equation to make it seem like people somehow aren't doing enough just results in less overall value. There is only a bigger share of a smaller pie.

By stifling people's value, I think for all that money, you can't afford the things that don't exist because of your behaviour.

Victim blaming people out of society, or until they “crack” and agree that it is the only way to survive, capitalising on the lie of how our rights and freedoms are actually overwhelmed and stolen.

We think poverty and corruption are “young”, that we couldn't grow into it, that in other places they must at some point “progress out of it”. What happens if it gets in and takes hold? What's left? Why can't other places climb out of a hole?

The Benefit System

What is wrong with the benefit system? It's not money given freely. I do believe people have a right to better circumstances, (which have been taken from them), and for some people they can idealise the system and use it as it “should” be, but unfortunately it's not that.

For a long time, I have viewed the benefit system as something that would be a detrimental experience for me personally, as well as counterproductive, and not actually good. It's not good to take money from people who aren't really offering.

It's not good that the system insists itself as an option, and so can use that as an excuse to force you into it. As long as it's there they can hide that the alternative is also wrong, while taking money out of people's back pockets to “give” to the vulnerable. The truth is that it may be sinister, it may be a trap. Is it designed to really help anyone?

There have been times when I have genuinely needed help, as someone who wouldn't ask for help unless I really needed it, from people I believe I have a right to ask, and yet I think the system is not designed to help people like me, who would use it only as a last resort.

There is the attitude of it, that some of the point of it is actually to humble you, to prove your need to someone who would want to hear it. There are probably decent people working there, but the whole thing is kind of sick, like driving people into a corner by depleting real easy living, and replacing it with an approval process, that you are at the mercy of.

It is actually demoralising to have to compromise on something you think is wrong, bad for you, and bad for other people. No one really acknowledges this, that it actually isn't an option for some people because it just isn't.

People with extreme fortitude are punished for working tirelessly, or suffer without help. Personality trait or not, it isn't fair. These same people can then expect the same fortitude from others which can become toxic and also wrong.

Working yourself to the bone and expecting others to do the same doesn't target the problem, the real opponent. Anything that takes you away from freedom and easy living is probably a trap.

This is not about rejecting hard work, it is about choosing it as it suits you perfectly, or it will find you. Or you will lose. We stand opposed to our own failure, living is effort that we enjoy.

If you have children or a disability, I think the money is there exactly for that purpose. I also think people should have access to real help and options, not just systematically.

I am concerned that there is an equation for what is actually good, and feasible, even with the best of intentions, and that this is continually undercut to promote the idea of blame, and a system based on predation. The definition of "success" is in question.

It would be my policy to insist on a "work for the benefit" system. If you are a job seeker on a benefit, you should have the opportunity to work the hours you are getting paid for.

I think it is very important that this is done well, and in a way that has a good understanding of what is reasonable. With gentle implementation. The work available should be well suited to the person, we shouldn't be forcing anyone into difficult circumstances. We can create opportunities for people by working with businesses to provide suitable options that will also support business with an extra workforce.

At the very least people can put in the time. At the very least we can find them a chance to further their individual development, instead of doing nothing about it. We can avoid the awkward situation people currently deal with by being worse off when attempting work.

If successful it should increase benefits, this could be a popular option, especially if it means more money in hand. I will personally find them something to do if need be. Why are small businesses being destroyed and all the work opportunities disappearing?

A student allowance is a good example of the difference between a benefit and a generally accepted entitlement, something that is offered to everyone in good will.

Immigration

What are the motives behind immigration? I think there is a moral argument that is driving it, and possibly an agenda of some kind, that benefits others at our expense.

What is fairness? We struggle to believe that it can be fair for someone to be born into unfortunate circumstances. I think it is correct to recognise this. It is correct to do what you can about it. Ignoring it doesn't seem right, and focusing just on the problems we can solve now can seem like a never ending excuse.

It is my thinking, that even with maximum effort towards a goal, if you are doing something good towards that goal, where you can, where it is most relevant and appropriate to your understanding and responsibility, then you are moving toward that goal in the best way possible.

If you are doing what's right in the best way possible, then it should be enough to know you are doing the most good you can, and doing it well.

It doesn't necessarily mean taking your eye off the problem, or not giving attention to it. We want to help, but it is not right to justify very real harm to New Zealanders here and now.

I will use an extreme example of the perception of fairness: If an old person and a young person stood side by side, someone might think it is unfair for one to have more than the other. It can lead to warped thinking. We do not know why, or how it works out.

We want people to have opportunities to travel, we want global freedom, for everyone, in principle. If we have something that other places don't have, that they want, we must ask; why don't they have those things? Is it really just about resources?

Why would someone need to leave where they are instead of improving where they are? Allowing ourselves to be overrun is not a moral argument. It is not actually on our doorstep, and we cannot see all the ways this has occurred, what the real problem is, or how to fix it. Yet our quality of life and our future is on the line.

Honestly, if the same problems establish themselves here, where will there be left to turn?

What does real help look like? If we truly have a place to live that people would want for themselves, why would we not protect what it is and try to share the ability to recreate what is great about it, instead of unrealistically thinking it can sustain an influx of people who may only see it as a resource?

I don't believe we actually need immigration for a skilled workforce, we have people, it is just a perpetual cycle of excuses keeping it that way. If we work out how much immigration is actually good for the country, then whatever quota we can allow, we can assess based on suitability, including any skills, plans to integrate, and a NZ citizen qualification.

If you import brand new citizens directly into “skilled” positions (of money, power, and influence), you are supplanting your current “unskilled” population. (23)

If the people willfully doing this have no regard for the rights of the people already here, and no regard for the harm incurred to them, then they do not acknowledge those rights exist, they do not acknowledge the claim of anyone who was here before, and what they lived for, died for, and contributed, as if that personal effort is just a free for all.

Is that the attitude of a “globalist agenda”: ignoring the reality of what they cannot, or do not care to, account for? In the name of fairness?

If people are already willing to study a qualification to immigrate here, there should be a NZ citizen qualification to teach a deep understanding of our values, and what better way to impart whatever wisdom we have onto people inspired enough by our country to want to live here.

In an ideal world such a test would be free, accessible, and someone could pass it from the goodness of their heart, and in their own language, to remove barriers to entry, before being given the opportunity to make appropriate plans.

But obviously, we currently need people who speak English, and have the skills required to contribute to our society.

Keeping in mind, we are also pushing out people that we have invested a lot of our resources into, only to have them leave due to a lack of opportunities. This is probably not a net gain in terms of our own expenditure.

Superannuation

I don't really think Super is welfare. This is fundamentally about the right for someone to live their life after the age of 65 without needing to contribute more to society.

Is it ideal that this “right” exists only through money, and not lifestyle? No, it's not ideal.

Is it a looming problem that we can't sustain in our current system? Possibly.

We have made it about money because we have a monetary system, but where does the money go? To basic living costs. A lot of which is circular, so where is it going?

How is it possible that we cannot afford to look after older people? Did the ground disappear from beneath our feet?

People work themselves into ill health, so they can afford that ill health in old age, because we will not secure them a place in the world. Shutting them out with the excuse of “money”, is that what we are planning for?

We need to be aware of how things are monetised and made accessible, for easy removal from our circulating value.

We use a monetary system to help facilitate normal life, but it is now disrupting normal life. Can we remember what normal is?

I think we should be uncomfortable with the fact that if the arrangement for Super is changed it takes potentially \$30k+ of actual money per year from someone. This is not smoke and mirrors, it is real money straight from their income.

If we really, truly, needed some wiggle room, perhaps allowing over 65s to choose to keep working while delaying, (and guaranteeing), those funds, could supply some extra cash-flow, but we should be weary that constant “tinkering” with people's money is problematic.

Do savings actually have diminishing returns?

What is happening when you “make” money from money? Interest rates are really the want and need of money and value. This is the capital leverage.

Interest rates have a cause and effect relationship with inflation. They are used to manipulate the flow of money and they represent the current need of money.

What is inflation but a change in the ratio of money to value? It can be seen in “constricted” pockets (supply vs demand), and in overall inflation.

You don't particularly want stores of money sitting idle because it's “equivalent value” diminishes as it's relevancy diminishes.

This affects the overall ratio of money to value, and all money is “laundered” by being indistinguishable once in the exchange process.

Money can stagnate. Trying to retain the value of money is like storing food on a shelf. The way to maintain the value of money is to put it to good use. This is because “money” is often a representation of the value of people's time and effort.

Think of the metaphor of the painted house, eventually the value of the work fades, it needs to be repainted. Even if the true value of it will not be diminished, relative to us we cannot necessarily appreciate value that has come and gone. It is no longer “available value”. In a sense, value is still relative, largely, to whatever can appreciate it.

When money “maintains” it's monetary value through “capital advantage” alone, it can just mean moving money around through leverage, while at the same time creating inflation, (through scarcity, harm, and it's own diminishing value), which reduces overall monetary value. A vacuum that stifles value generation and society.

The ratio of overall available value, in relation to money, is reducing over time if people can't thrive. “Good use” of money is a matter of definition, but avoiding harm and “counterproductive” activities generally, and developing true individual value seems like a pure form of value.

Money is good because it's free flowing, without it there might be other less acceptable or accessible societal “buy-ins”, but money can lose it's flexibility when it's controlled. The best use of money, ideally, may indeed be on yourself and the people around you, and on the things you are trying to create and build, now.

What options are there for long term capital investment involving people and projects, with successful, wholesome outcomes?

What is the value of the security of “savings”, versus the security of incorporating value into functionality, personal growth, and societal stability and development?

It is good to be prepared and resilient to future possibilities, my concern with savings schemes is that they remove much needed money and value from circulation, and have diminishing returns if that money is not invested in people and growth.

Realistically, there are not a lot of available options for investment that aren't a part of the problem. Imagine investing in a company thinking you're getting great returns, only to figure out you're paying more back through living costs.

Anti Rich Sentiment

Is it fair to target wealth generally, rather than targeting problematic behaviour? If government becomes a machine, is it a wealth vacuum? Is it like another rich person?

What does the government do with that money, and is it really helping, is it making good choices when it redistributes wealth? Is it that, the more money that circulates indiscriminately through bad channels, the more money disappears through the holes in the boat? Where are the holes, do we recognise them?

If somebody does or creates something from their individual value, and if a lot of people appreciate that, and pay a modest amount for what it's worth to them, it could generate a lot of money.

That hasn't come at the expense of anyone. It is just a fair exchange, many times over, where a lot of people get to experience a piece of that person's individual value. There is nothing to say that this wealth “belongs” to society. In fact, the individuals in society decided, for their part in it, that it was worth the money they spent. Is that really “hoarding” money?

If the system was controlled to limit opportunities for anyone else it might be different, but being successful in a fair competition is kind of the point. (All or nothing, in terms of success, talent and competition, may create an unfair disparity in real people's lives if taken to the extreme, however.)

What they choose to do with their money and how it affects other people's “unrealised” value and potential, of course, matters.

It is understandable to question how, and why, do these people then hold onto that wealth in the face of other people's need. Or how do we understand all the invisible ways society may feed into success, and the need, and perhaps duty, to further the continuation of this process for everyone else.

What if they generate a lot of money but can't find worthwhile ways to spend it as fast as they made it? What's holding them back? Security? Advantage? Planning? Logistics? (26)

Why tax value generation that doesn't come at the expense of anything? Is this about making a blind guess as to what is fair compensation to society for communal resources?

As an individual, with individual usage, or as a business? Is it that we ask for that compensation only once it doesn't hinder that person or their success? Do we assume that compensation isn't already paid, disadvantaging those who would do so naturally?

Is it not already reflected in the original exchange? If profits are already a reflection of supply and demand, does demand not already naturally sequester a portion of resources, is it inbuilt?

It is shortsighted not to share, to take advantage of being first in line. We recognise this as being, potentially, incredibly selfish. Perhaps these people's talents do not lie in recognising and solving the world's problems. Are they genuinely too busy to focus on it? Is something coming into your awareness a method of determination?

Is wealth “justified status”, that only becomes problematic when there is a failure to bow to the obvious unacceptable poverty of others?

How do we reconcile this? Does it seem wrong to allow earned status to be forfeited because of other people's actions? Can we recognise the conflict this poses to wealthy people as not being insignificant, to lose the status perhaps due, in theory, or in isolation, because the world is a mess?

If not all wealth is corrupt now, will it be too late to do anything about it if or when it is? And, does taxing the wealthy help, or does it filter wealth, cornering it, until what remains as “successful” is unapologetically exploitative?

If money is circular, why take a cut of every exchange? Why not use better discretion? If the government is money hungry but cycles money continually at scale, and without any proportionate ability for discrimination, are they part of the problem?

The advantage of government is delegating skill and organisation. Organisation is already a natural capital advantage. Extreme capital advantage incentivises and perpetuates the necessity of it's existence, and overqualifies government with too much control.

There is something to be said for having wealth you can utilise. Often we are busy, and it is enough to have the things that are a part of our current plans, as long as we don't lack for what we want while we are working on them. We want things to be there when needed.

This is not an excuse for taking wealth away from people as if they would “waste” it, or don't need it, but often our requirements grow with our capacity for use. The most effective planning or utilisation isn't necessarily linear, and is personal.

If someone is happy, and if the situation benefits them, if they're where they want to be, doing what they want to do, without lack, it isn't always dependent on extra resources. The system isn't functioning like this currently. People's money doesn't match their capacity for building the life they want, or their sense of pacing for themselves.

Privacy

I think privacy is about the need and right to protect yourself. Some people like to think that if you have nothing to hide, you should have nothing to fear. This is absolutely not true.

My thinking is that, those that actually have nothing to hide, maybe also have nothing to prove, and don't necessarily feel the need to say so. Because it isn't the point of privacy.

People are dangerous. A lack of privacy is the very real threat of people, and the extent of their irrational actions. It is as dangerous as anything.

A lack of privacy is not about the truth, quite the opposite, people will never know the whole truth, you are always protecting yourself from the lie of the incomplete truth that someone else believes.

The problem with a lack of privacy is that it can remove the buffer of doubt in people's minds and position them to place false judgement upon you. Other people's actions affect us greatly. Their judgements affect us greatly because it is what they base their actions on. They can have an inability to even contemplate their total lack of understanding.

It is always about the lie, and our vulnerability to it.

Even something as simple as an embarrassing detail that will never be reconciled in someone's mind, that they will never unknot, or unsee, can loom large in every interaction. It can take a toll. There is a difference between what the "eye" can appreciate and reality. This effects us all, these are simple logistics of a practical reality. We don't live in a world of complete truth and understanding.

It is the constant danger of people who think they know enough to justify imposing themselves, their judgement, and their actions upon you, and removing privacy is like removing barriers for those people.

You also cannot "assume", without expecting that to be challenged, on principle. People are wrong all the time, and their ability to determine that they might be wrong can go hand in hand with the rest of their skill set.

This could result in being controlled by the inability of people, rather than the best of people, because power itself is a "senseless" form of determination, it tests boundaries, it is not itself "logical" or "human".

Ultimately, it is setting up the same system of power vs humanity, putting ourselves in a position of maximum opposition. It is not a great way to live. We build systems to move away from this dynamic like we build shelter, allowing privacy to be removed is like being exposed to the elements, we won't survive it if it becomes extreme.

As people, we don't necessarily want to "adapt" to being completely impervious to all threats to our existence. There is value in vulnerability and meaning, in fact to recognise value is to recognise that there is something to lose.

It is wrong to have the right to your own life forcibly controlled or violated by someone that has no right to do so. This includes the right to your body, to yourself, and the right to protect those things.

The value of the personal and the intimate can be stolen and degraded, and devalued, and there are very real consequences of a lack of privacy that can impact a person's life tangibly.

Privacy is a need, it gives room for value, and for function.

I'm not sure if physical reality as we know it can exist without privacy, or that we could survive a world without it, so a plan to limit or remove privacy from society would be very problematic.

People have always needed room to work within. It is not physically practical to need to explain yourself, or avoid being misinterpreted, constantly. Even the time it takes to do so is a practical metric.

Physical interaction is full of all the things we don't say, all the things we reserve judgement on, that we leave open and unknown. These are our physical restrictions, while our sense of "spirit" is soaring and expansive, full of possibility. Our ability to speak freely and with the ease of our true selves can be detracted from by practicalities, circumstances, and distractions. We are very limited in this way by our physicality, even though it is a great basis for our experiences.

A world without privacy might even place restrictions on reality that we don't understand. What is the cause and effect of an ever imposing mix of stark truths and crucial missing details? My impression is of something very tightly wound.

We must protect privacy rights, it is very dangerous to lose them. We should not allow ourselves to be controlled by raw power, it is a perpetual undercutting of what we are.

There may even be an eventual curse involved in seriously violating another person's privacy, as the only way to acclimatise might be either regression, or a sufficient amount of "truth" to reconcile the "lies" of inadequate understanding and judgement.

As a result, there is probably some blessed freedom in not knowing things that are not in your awareness through no fault, (or lack), of your own. And, a better method of growth toward understanding.

Extreme privacy violation in law

Watching illegal explicit material does more harm than just supporting the creation of that material and the criminals that make it.

Watching explicit illegal material, is a form of sexual assault on that person. You are violating that person's privacy by even watching it, you are adding to the harm inflicted on that person.

This includes any explicit material that you do not have the consent of that person to watch. As an individual, you have violated that person's rights and freedoms, degraded and devalued their privacy. You have threatened them. You have taken intimate knowledge of them that they do not want you to know of. And you have done it in the emotionally burdensome and consequential form of a sexual nature.

Putting this information into physical formats, including tangible “information” formats, is extreme additional harm. It is an extreme method of facilitating this harm by easily increasing the individual violations, and their real consequences. It allows people to violate privacy in extreme detail, in ways that are not even possible otherwise, or natural. And it poses a constant perpetual threat through its material existence.

Abstractness is a form of privacy. A spider in the bathroom, as far as I know, doesn't pose the same threat to privacy because it doesn't understand or relate to what it's observing. A person thinking of another person in an explicit way, while potentially disrespectful to that person's image, is not the same level of harm, it has natural limitations. It does not expose anything true that can be used against someone. Although, the more that false information is confused for the “truth” the more likely it will pose a threat.

I do think some normal, decent people have been brainwashed and numbed to this reality, where the real extent of the crime has been removed from its natural context. For example, people watching explicit material online might be grossly careless of the knowledge of the origin of that material, but the risk is high that you have committed a form of sexual assault on an innocent victim.

We must get very serious about it logically, because we are removed from our senses and better judgement in these situations. If our knowledge of the risk of real harm is high, then we cannot negate our own responsibility to it like we can in low risk situations.

We need to educate people, and we need to put systems in place to tidy up explicit content online. It is all very loose and this fosters criminal behaviour, and isn't healthy for anyone.

If decent people become aware, as they should, that if they are unreasonably careless online with explicit material that they could be held accountable for victimising that person, systems should naturally form to validate the origin of source material. Use some discretion at a bare minimum.

I would work to introduce serious sentences for extreme privacy abuses including deliberating watching, creating, and distributing non-consensual explicit material including “revenge porn”, and “hidden camera” material. As well as any illegal abuse material. This is real harm.

Whether it would be appropriate to replace “extreme” material with verified “fake” or “generated” material as a possible alternative, that may also eradicate the market for real abuse, is a question of debate. It may perpetuate self destructive tendencies much like extreme drug addiction can hollow out a person of their self worth and self control.

Digital Rights and The Law

We must also deal with the impending privacy and control crisis. Facial recognition technology for general use must be made illegal immediately. Surveillance must be kept to the bare minimum. Requirements for digitalisation must be stopped. We must say no to all of it, and protect the rights of people to live without technology.

We must address the legality of “data” collection. Just because something is not “written” or “communicated” in law does not mean that wrong is right or up is down.

We don't know what is happening to our rights. We know that violating our rights is illegal, and should be illegal. These people should know that if it should be illegal, then it better damn well be, because they are accountable.

The only difference to accountability, is whether actual responsibility is changed through awareness and logical reasoning. It makes it hard to judge, it does not make it impossible. Societal law is a construct of communication and power, and is about the execution of the collective and individual will of people, in the name of what is “just”.

Who needs it to be a maze of overcomplicated logistics and administration except those abusing its power? You cannot do things in the name of power and call it justice. They have no respect for what the law actually is.

What is corruption? When everything that an establishment has stood for, or should stand for, can no longer maintain and direct its truest purposes, for the ignorance, and motives, of its moving parts.

It is all a matter of what is fair, what is right, who can judge it, and when.

How do we begin to do something about it if others think they can commandeer societal law for their own purposes? We would much prefer societal law to represent actual justice.

When someone clicks “I agree” on a computer screen, they have innately entrusted the law, with the correct belief that justice is its true purpose. You can not legally be coerced into giving consent, no one is agreeing to anything that they wouldn't agree to.

If you want explicit consent you must make it explicitly clear, and consent must be informed. Consent is a 1:1 ratio. You need awareness of what you are participating in.

Relying on deliberately doing unknown things in the shadows, with the idea that people can give away their rights without understanding them, without awareness, is not legal. It is just opportunistic delay and distraction.

Nature and Nuclear

I believe in nature, that we are adapted to nature, and that the further afield we go from nature, the greater the risk there is of being unprepared for something that we are not adapted for, or can deal with well.

I do not think that what is the most “natural” is always necessarily the best option. I do believe in having an occasional “crutch”, and that progressing can mean the development of ways of incorporating things with nature, if done well.

In a way, everything we do is probably still within the bounds of “nature”, even when they seem like foreign materials or technology, but these are more extreme.

This “adaptive” theory is a bit of a personal philosophy that natural is best generally. Things that are “naturalised” have gone through some kind of process of incorporating with nature, settling into a kind of balance and proportionality.

I certainly trust this process much more than I trust people that purport to be “experts”. While I respect skills and knowledge, I do not think these people have any idea what they are doing in comparison to nature. Even the idea that they think they do is extremely alarming.

They are just so far out of their league. Scientists carefully accumulating knowledge and applying it is one thing, them thinking that they are better developed than, or can “improve” nature, is another.

Meddling with genes, for example, and thinking that they can cut and paste, trial and error, engineer future genetics, without understanding them, is not smart.

If people weren't puppets before, they would surely risk being made one to allow such activity to take place. Maybe they are not in control, and are somehow an afterthought for what is “allowed” to happen, a useful “tool” of nature. How do we avoid near misses when everyone has their hand on the button?

It's like letting a toddler rebuild your plane's engine. Yet they go full steam ahead, as if nothing bad could happen. I don't think we should rely on that being true. Perhaps they expect nature to incorporate it for them. We would not want to overwhelm nature past the point of unfeasibility.

There could come a time when understanding could become so nuanced, that it would allow for truly informed, naturalised expertise, but I just don't think that's where we're at. I can't be the only person that thinks this.

When it comes to nuclear, my opinion is that it is too far afield, based on the highly technical way the technology exists, and the extremely negative effects of radiation exposure if the worst happens.

When it comes to risk, I do not believe you should bet more than you are willing to lose, or more than you can handle if it goes wrong, if you can help it. I do not think that a high amount of risk with a “low probability” is a good choice. We are firm on this issue and it should probably stay that way.

We get to choose the foundations we build upon, and what we choose to rely upon. It makes sense to draw a line with the type of risk that we build our very future upon. (32)

Veganism, animal rights and animal welfare

I don't believe that people believe animal cruelty is ok. I do not understand the nature of life and death enough to impose myself personally, but I do worry that I don't do enough.

I think a lot of people probably think that because it is nature, and within the bounds of reality, that it must be ok, and they work their logic back from there. If there is a way that this is true, I don't think it is simply because of the idea that, if you think you are better than something, then you can do what you want with it. This is a toxic mentality and needs to be addressed, especially because you really don't want that as your argument when “whomever” wants to start a hierarchical system.

I imagine the argument is more akin to an argument about form and function, and live and let live. In order to live we must all make allowances for something else's shared desire to live.

I don't know what it's like to be a different creature, perhaps somewhere a deal is being struck, but wouldn't you want to know what it is? I don't think accountability is avoidable, so it is something to be aware of.

Some of the horror of death is in our human entanglements, which may not apply the same to animals, but I don't think killing is that normal either. This is to say the least.

It isn't reality to me to look at an animal and liken it to a plant. I hope that if something was suffering, there is a limit to that suffering, that nature represents itself in some kind of way that allows for form and function, so that something could communicate or run away or protect itself. Animals blur this line in some people's minds.

Hope like hell it's ok, at risk of being wrong? For some this may be a leap of faith. What really carries the burden of our actions beyond our capacity for personal responsibility?

Perhaps you really are what you eat, just like when we take on new information, we grow with it. It is also interesting to me that lean animals are carnivores, yet people try to eat protein to gain muscle.

If I were to chop down a 100 year old tree, it might make me nervous, not because I think it's wrong, or that anyone should think that way, but because it's not nothing. Moderation is a strange concept, I prefer to be carefree and believe in abundance of what's good and right.

It's either right or wrong, and with clarity I can rest somewhat assured in the sense of freedom in that, I'm not as blind. To me there is a clear line I do not think I should cross of my own accord unless I find out any different.

When it comes to animal cruelty and animal testing, I truly believe that the more you compromise on this the worse your outcomes. That in a functioning society there are better solutions to be found when psychopaths and pharmaceutical companies don't “progress” your healthcare system. This is my opinion.

I understand no one wants their loved one to die without a cure, but these people have done enough harm that to save a child would seem to come at the expense of poisoning another with toxic chemicals, dysfunctional systems and avoidance of real solutions.

I have no policy for this except to offer my opinion, and promote ethical alternatives generally and take a strong stance on removing cruelty.

When it comes to farming, I genuinely believe farmers are decent and good people. I think that compromising on animal welfare standards actually sabotages farmers and forces good people to compete with bad ethical practices, pushing good people out of profitability.

We must recognise this, why do we need ever increasing profits just to make a living? Why would a farmer need to keep scaling to remain viable? What is actually going on? When a restaurant expands it doesn't out scale the towns population, it recognises how it can scale effectively and what the limitations of that are. Environmental concerns around our waterways also must have acceptable solutions.

Animals have a right to exist, nature has a right to flourish. Humans will not circumvent the will to live. I understand that native birds suit the objectives of maintaining the ecosystem, but it does bother me, the attitude of wanting to distinguish between types of animals with bias, as if it is a valid argument for throwing one type “under the bus” and treating it poorly.

Labelling and catagorising something as “food” does not change anything, unless it has subsequently grown accustomed, or adapted itself, and hopefully not forcibly for the worst.

Just because it makes you more comfortable, and is convenient, does not make it an honest example of “form and function”.

It's more like turning on a dime whenever it suits. That is a “predatory class” belief system. “Because I said so, because I can, because I want to” logic.

And we should be careful of how pervasive this type of attitude can be, because people who treat animals this way may also think to treat fellow humans this way.

Religion

I do not know a lot about the specifics of any religion. I do recognise the themes of religion, when I have encountered them, as being an apt description of morality in general.

I do not prescribe to any belief that doesn't make sense or seem true to me. I think the truth of existence is everywhere.

I think you can seek the truth without religion, and that it might be preferable to, although it may contain insights and teachings that I am currently unaware of, and exposure to the basic concepts seems healthy.

I am under the impression that a lot of it is interpretive, and that it is maybe limited by it's interpretation.

I am against religious and cultural practices that cross a line in reality and violate the rights of other people.

It is unacceptable and wrong to perform significant body modification on people for the purpose of religion, culture, cosmetics, or personal gain, where it would impose itself on the natural will of that person before they can give proper informed consent.

Religion cannot impose itself on reality and expect reality to conform to its purposes. Religion is derivative of existence and nature, and must have respect for these foundations.

First, do no harm. Why would any religion reject nature and obvious truths? We can judge these things best by this measure.

It is so obviously wrong for adults to allow children to be exploited for the sake of “beliefs”.

The natural will of a person is the natural extension of who and what they are. Fundamentally altering someone through damage, or injury, or an act of wrongness, might render the person changed and disassociated from the harm that was done to them.

It doesn't magically erase the significance of the loss, just because a person is comfortable with, or even likes, who they have become. It also doesn't remedy the natural dysfunction of the disassociation from your natural origins.

I am worried about this because I am worried that there is a prevailing belief, that harm doesn't matter if the person would be ok with it after the fact, after it has changed them. Even if they are no longer really the same person, and the loss becomes invisible.

This is where it is really important that reality is the guide, and that the course of action is not being determined by actions that are fundamentally wrong in reality.

Not all change can be considered natural growth. It seems like a careless disregard for the past, and for nature, and the natural state, and possibly a disregard for a higher order, purpose, and timing, generally speaking. Our choices make a difference in that.

An example of this is with current medical trans practices. Giving people hormones affects their brain development. A person who has altered the way that they think, probably likes the way they think, and they don't know the alternative. No one really wants to reject what they are and how they became that person, it is not really an option. That does not necessarily make it “good”.

I have heard the term “self affirming” in relation to gender affirming care. This is the idea that a person has a natural “sense” of who they are.

If there is a natural pull or magnetism of “outcomes” that self affirm, or self perpetuate, then offering no resistance to that, (when it would be appropriate to), could be a trap not befitting of nature or reality.

Physical reality offers natural, proportionate limitations on our wants, this is not a bad thing.

It is not right to modify the bodies of developing young people. They cannot give proper informed consent and you are robbing them of their natural growth.

Even if natural outcomes had somehow become an affliction, there is so much risk of harm involved with this issue that there is no way that this is responsible medical care.

I am against the coercive exploitation of children that is the medical trans movement.

I am against the forced circumcision of children.

If it ever served a purpose as a leap of faith of any kind, if it holds a place until we are strong enough to say stop, then we must say stop, it is wrong, it is an unknown burden placed on innocent children and we condemn it.

Woke/gender/sexuality

I don't know what the woke movement is. It does seem like some people's behaviour defies explanation. Nothing really quite adds up, as if it alludes to something more.

To me, it seems like there could be a lot that is spiritually, fashionably, instinctually motivated. I can only really hazard a guess, or vibe off of what the deeper motivations are, if any.

I don't know of any ethical reason why a person's gender or sexuality can't be what they think and feel it is. If somebody wants to be referred to as a specific gender casually, then that's fine, it would probably be rude to insist otherwise, or to make a spectacle of their personal choices.

A lot of what I've heard about this seems to be about wanting care and respect, but not reciprocating when it comes to encroaching on other people's rights to get it.

Who knows what a pronoun is? I don't think natural English speakers are that technical or finicky with language. It would be weird to insist past the point of politeness because it's too complicated.

Male born athletes in women's sports is obviously cheating. Hormones are not the only thing that influences sex differences. I do not believe that it eliminates the natural born physical advantages inherent in their physical make up or DNA. It would be great if everyone can compete, but this is like anything, you have to deal with the hand you're dealt until you can make it happen fairly.

A woman is a woman. This is defined by nature first. Suspension of disbelief, or absence of specifics, can be as appropriate as the situation allows for. The gender a person was born will never be erased, or become totally irrelevant.

For the purposes of the law, a woman can be defined by biological sex, or, to a lesser degree, a sense of gender, as applicable.

It is correct to acknowledge the threat that men, and specifically male sexual predators, can pose to women. This includes motivated threats to privacy, physical dominance, and sexual harm.

Any place where it would be inappropriate for a biological man to be, “for reasons of safety”, is the same consideration (of biological sex).

Allowances should be made where possible for any unnecessary social awkwardness or discomfort, or lack of fairness and facilities, experienced for the transgender individual.

As well as the same safety considerations for gender specific threats, posed to transgender females, as exists for biological females. Threats to privacy from the opposite sex are applicable to both genders to various degrees.

I am not sure that I agree that the definition of a woman should be defined exactly as a “biological female” for all legal applications, as this could “lock out” very specific instances where a sense of gender would be more appropriate.

The problem is not a lack of definition in the law so much as a total failure in the application of it as it is. We need to be very careful that every misstep doesn't bring us closer to a worse outcome.

What is the real purpose of this? It's dehumanising to nullify natural gender by force, and it leans toward the misogynistic.

Abortion

It worries me when good people are against abortion rights. I do not think abortion is a “necessary evil” and I do not like it when it is framed that way. I could be wrong, but I will fight for this, because I think the alternative is some kind of horror of logic.

I do not think there is anything wrong with abortion. In my opinion, a developing baby is a woman's body parts, more than anything else, until it can be considered a separate person. It is impossible to know when that is, or what it means.

When I was younger, I thought about the logical conclusions that you could come to if you believed abortion was truly wrong. If someone really believed that, what actions would they “justify” to stop the “murder” of a “baby”?

Good people with good judgement are held powerless by the limitations of “justifying” horrific acts. But still, there is the horror of the lie, of believing someone is a murderer of babies when they are no such thing.

What hypothetical horrors could exist? Chaining a woman in a basement, coveting all of her eggs? How about forcing her to grow a baby with her body, altering the course of her whole life, her whole heart, potentially all her future time and resources, and if she can't look after that baby for some reason, taking that baby from her, and acting like that is an option, when for some it wouldn't be?

Separating a woman from her child is probably one of the cruelest acts I can think of. How sure do you have to be about the truth of conception to insist on such a horror, when the truth might be that, actually, she really didn't need to go through all that, after all?

That maybe cells dividing is a lot like a woman's period. That maybe it is fine, and ridiculous to insist otherwise.

There is nothing natural about modern abortion. But in theory, is abortion itself really unnatural? Realistically, across time, if a woman were in the wilderness, fending for herself, or in any situation where she knew there was no way she would be able to have a baby, in all seriousness, would she risk life and limb, poison herself, starve, do whatever it took, to avoid growing a child that would actually be a bad situation if brought into the world? Or if she was overcome by fear, or panic? Or had a single mindedness?

It's either wrong or it isn't. How can something so necessary be wrong? You are not being serious. If you were to look at a woman who is a loved one, perhaps your own wife, and if there was a possible situation, even just one, in which they would make that exact decision and you would tell her to her face that she was a murderer of her own child. No, I cannot agree with that deduction.

I even wonder about the lie of it, if the only answer to such a despicable lie was the truth of creation itself. A perfect checkmate.

It is interesting from a religious perspective, that the nature of conception and creation is unknown to us, we are actually blind to it, and yet of all things, when it is hidden, that the religious position is to believe that it is not ok. Instead of relinquishing to faith itself that it must be ok, that it has to be. What is the alternative? A baby is murdered or a woman is forced or tortured?

It is probably good for a person to know of both arguments. How strongly others believe, and how they might have a better sense of it. They might be right in some way. But it has bothered me, the idea of someone being convinced it is something it's not, when they have an actual choice.

I don't think that a potential life is nothing. I just don't think that you can think that way about every possible outcome. The exact combination of DNA of a "potential person" could exist "in possibility" anytime there's an egg and a #1 sperm in contention, even without conception.

I certainly think forced abortion is extremely wrong, and is not nothing. In the same way mutilating someone's body is wrong, and taking someone's choices for their own future and their future child. If they would have had that child of their own accord then that "potential" becomes a tangible loss.

From the male perspective it may be an unreconcilable betrayal to not have a say in their own future, but ultimately a woman's body is her own, she doesn't have to choose you. This is where two individuals need to know what they themselves are prepared for with the person they have sex with.

Sex is a morality issue, always has been, the reality is still that, conventionally, if you have sex, you can get pregnant. In our modern society that means you have to be willing to have a baby or have an abortion, if pregnancy happens.

Men are equally responsible for the choice to partake, and in some ways are blatantly risking more. For some women abortion or adoption is not an option, to suggest otherwise is so wrong, and to transfer responsibility for the outcome often seems cruel.

This might be their version of “adoption” for their part in it. The thing is, that does also mean, in a lot of cases, that they adopted their half of financial responsibility out to the taxpayer: the time, effort, and money.

If nature representing itself were an indication, later in pregnancy, it becomes apparent that a woman is having a baby, and it starts to look less like just her body, and like something more. It seems that then it is maybe too bold for medical intervention, and this is where the lines are blurred to our eyes. When a baby would survive naturally on it's own is another. An ultrasound is accurate, but the technology is not necessarily “natural” or an indication of what we should be privy to if trying to discern based only on nature.

The truth might be that a baby is still an extension of the mother even after birth. I think that is too great a leap. One of the most horrific things I could think of happening would be a newborn plucked from it's mother and killed, my heart wrenching goes to the mother, that is my personal instinct as to the true horror of it.

Covid

I am going to detail what I experienced during the covid period, my perception of it as it happened, and what my impression of it is now. I was not aware of what was going on for other people, so I am just going to describe what I can, I have not researched, and I am not focusing on specifics or dates. These are my opinions based only on the information I have currently.

I had the unfortunate experience of being on a visit to Australia when the first border restriction was announced back in New Zealand. My flight was booked for the day after a quarantine period would start to be enforced. I remember being upset about the dynamic of power, and the level of care required, and that I didn't think it fit the situation well.

I had to book a new flight, but I don't recall enough to about it beyond the need for nuance when people are powerless. Even though I made it back before the deadline, I still ended up quasi-quarantining “just in case”, which caused problems. None of this I dwell on much. It did possibly change the course of my life.

My general impression of the covid period was one of a double edged sword; of minor disruptions that also felt like time off. My general impression of the government response was that it was dealt with well, that there was overwhelming public consensus at the time, that we had good results, minimal deaths, and ultimately, the least amount of time possible was restricted. I did not think that we spent very long in temporary lockdowns, and that we had relative normalcy and freedom. This was my experience based on what I knew of it. (39)

I don't agree that hindsight is 20/20. I think it is very hard to make predictions based on events that didn't happen. You can draw false conclusions by thinking that, because the worst didn't eventuate under one set of circumstances, that it also would never have under different circumstances. It's speculation either way.

Protections and compensation was available to businesses, with the idea that alternative strategies would only result in more disruptions.

People cite study difficulties for students because of the disruptions, which I myself experienced, but the disruptions were minor enough that if children can't take time off from school and still succeed, I think we have bigger problems. Time off isn't a death sentence.

Any child should be able to handle relatively short breaks in routine and environment. This is my opinion. That doesn't mean that the system didn't do them a disservice and wasn't teetering on the brink already. I just don't think that childhood and "the system" should be that fragile, and it probably wasn't lockdowns that did it.

Now some caveats. I understand that in the last stages of lockdowns, Auckland experienced a more prolonged lockdown period than the rest of the country. I cannot speak to this, or whether it was justified, it was in my periphery. The alternative is hard to predict in hindsight.

There are situations that it seems like the most crucial question is whether due care was taken. Individuals with individual harms understand when they were not being dealt with personably, with the level of care and reason required. An example of this is when individuals were refused access to dying loved ones.

Government cannot be impenetrable to reason at the scale of an individual. It is fair for an individual to expect to be able to negotiate based on the significance of the harm. If they would have done what was necessary to be with that person, if it was reasonable, then a level of nuance is required. Not doing the utmost to minimise harm in this way, and make allowances where possible, was probably a mistake.

In an emergency, I think it is fair to expect people to pitch in. This has limitations. No one should be forced or coerced into doing anything that they are strongly opposed to.

Vaccine mandates are unequivocally wrong except under specific circumstances where it is unavoidable and strictly necessary for the job. If this became prolonged then I was unaware of it. The only time I got asked for a vaccine passport was at a movie. I might have been asked if I was vaccinated while studying and working, I'm not sure.

I do not think that a person is entitled to their job. I do not think that it is unreasonable to manage a situation on a temporary basis. For example, if someone is sick or a risk to others, if they had the plague, I don't think that they just get to come in to work and continue as normal.

However, it is unreasonable not to make the possible allowances for a person's right to make their own personal choices without duress.

I had thought that this had been protected, and that employees were offered paid leave on a temporary basis if they were not vaccinated, where it was required, and that the government compensated businesses for this leave, so that it was considered unacceptable for a business to discriminate on this basis.

The reason why I got vaccinated was certainly not because I especially trust modern medicine, or because I was worried about getting sick. My thinking was that, if it was highly likely that I would get covid, that even if the vaccine had risks, those risks would not be as bad as the virus itself. That it would make it less likely to get long covid, and I thought it helped contribute to lower transmission rates.

A vaccine is not technology, is it? It is a concept. You expose yourself to a pathogen under ideal conditions, and your body has the best chance of creating a healthy defense to it without being overwhelmed. It is a carefully controlled, natural, learned immunity. This means a small amount of exposure while you are prepared, and as healthy as possible. It's a sneeze in a tissue, dirt under your fingernails, a small amount of virus that is weak. It is not that complicated.

When I got vaccinated, I had heard that it was controversial because of it being an “mRNA vaccine”, I don't know what that means. Am I supposed to study human biology to the point that I can understand and differentiate between the different biological processes, so that I can assess whether I personally believe it will produce abnormal results?

I have never thought that scientists have the level of expertise required to dabble in any kind of genetic sequencing, and truly understand the effects. If I had understood the level of intricate “technology” involved, then I probably would not have taken it.

I don't believe the public was offered an informed choice in this regard.

It has come to my attention, that a significant number of people are concerned over amyloid fibrin blood clotting, and other post-covid vaccine health effects, and I would like the general public to be properly informed as to whether this is being followed up adequately, or whether it is being actively suppressed.

I do not think that people who got vaccinated are compliant or complacent, and I do not think that “anti-vaxxers” are wrong to speculate.

Possible vs Plausible

When we think of extreme possibilities we think of how plausible they are.

All it takes for something to be “possible” is one person wanting to do it who has the means to make it happen. Often times, people have done a lot worse, for a lot less.

We recognise that a “conspiracy” requires a great many things to occur to make it “plausible”. This defies belief because of the fact that real people are involved at every stage. There may come a time when “what is plausible” is only limited by what is “possible”.

The concept of live vs evil:

What of the saying “selling your soul”? I do not believe you can “sell” your “soul”. But what about becoming removed from it, distant from who you inherently are or could be, trading off of the loss of the development of the “self”?

All the things you can't afford to believe in.

If you were to do things because you don't care, eventually learning and understanding the reality of why other people do care, could become unthinkable or unbearable. If the reasoning is that other people are simply incorrect, or that you don't want to know.

This could make it difficult to become “smarter”, putting a self imposed limit on your capacity for understanding. Creating a conflict, and otherwise recoiling from the reality of what you have become and it's attachment to you. Maybe only the truth and it's precision, and a path forward, may free you to acceptance and continued advancement.

Does this lack of development of the “self” make people a vehicle for other authority?

A lot of people being “ruled” by the authority of raw power could be like humanity playing a chess match against something that wants to destroy us. I am worried that we do not realise the danger of something that cannot be reasoned with.

That there is actually no enemy, except the obstacle of our own collective ineptitude threatening to overthrow us. Like a snowball of momentum.

The authority of raw mechanistic power is not necessarily what built us up to what we are.

Even if humanity is one of the manifestations of life, of a greater authority and power, people not recognising their own part to play as humans is a faltering of that power to something maybe more short sighted and less human. The alternative might be nothing.

Think of conductivity, except if it was based on the ability of electricity to flow without destroying it's own existence, a “non-starter” to a flow state.

If you look around at some of the ways power is manifest in the world, there is a real danger that people are losing their minds. There is the worry of mechanistic power taking a “form” of orchestration by whatever means is possible. If it is possible for mindless power to “organise”, why wouldn't it? The way water might flow into a shape.

In people this might be the space they give to their own desire for carelessness. The desire to hold onto mindless freedom over conscious effort.

Think of the feeling of letting go of effort, or letting go of caring about something for the sake of pleasure or reward, of letting go of logical reasoning you actually do believe in because it's easier not to know or care.

The feeling of relaxed effort or of getting what you want unabated, without restriction or conscious effort, can be like a rush. Once that rush of happiness is gone, you might find yourself in conflict with yourself if you compromised yourself more than you would otherwise want to, without the incentive to do so.

There is something normal about this process of degradation, regression, and erosion. It is healthy to challenge these concepts to test them and discover what is actually important to you, but holding onto this mindlessness could become toxic and extremely diminishing to your self worth, and to who and what you are as a person.

I believe there is fake self discipline and shame directed at people that will never be reconciled in this way because it is simply incorrect, and people can find themselves fighting their bodies for something they think they want because logically their motivations are off target.

Careless is a poor substitute for carefree.

I believe the thrill of life is good, that there is nothing wrong in pursuing pure thrills. The problem is recognising something good and cutting a bad path to it, only to find the result empty. The classic metaphor of the siren song.

Everything good in the world that you enjoy and want is there, you can see it, sense it, but it will disappear like a mirage without a real path to it.

The love of money is probably about the love of being able to live your life well. I don't think that's wrong, what's wrong is when you allow that to motivate you to do wrong in the world. People attracted to power may be motivated by their own vulnerability. That can be more about a lack of ability.

Taking too much is a downward spiral. Not taking enough may become unsustainable if you cannot make allowances for yourself like you would for other people, although that is not an excuse, and many would think to cut more than they should, and insist, wrongly, that you do the same. What is actually the correct line?

It is interesting to think of the words “profit”, and the divine concept of “prophet”, and the idea that if no true value can come from “wrongness”, that deliberate, “justified harm” doesn't pay off, and real value comes from genuine good will, and interaction in alignment with the world around us.

This is obvious, in a way, if you simply think of how counter productive harm is in general.

People who don't believe in true value creation might insist on perpetuating a downward spiral and vie for themselves in a “us or them” type belief system. Regardless of any proof as to how we got to where we are, as if we have happened upon, and are perpetually, at the crest of a wave.

Purpose is abundant. People that don't know this might not realise by looking elsewhere, that they are the problem they are trying to solve.

Avoidance could be a sense; of good timing, of being ready, but you have to work to be ready, you have to recognise the answers if you are waiting for them to appear, you have to want to know.

I think there is some fear in wanting to know because it is also about survival. About whether you can deal with the truth, and what it means for your actions; if you think something is wrong but still can't follow through.

I don't think that it is wrong to prioritise survival. There is some appropriateness and truth to that. It doesn't seem true to me that it is wrong to survive. Life is good. But what is survival?

At a certain point you are talking about survival of what you are, what you want to be, what you believe in.

Your sense of what you are, that you can hold like a thought, and extend outward into vague, recognisable possibilities.

This is probably similar to the informational, or some idea of the spirit. If you erode your beliefs, are you surviving? Are you surviving as you are, your body included? As an embodiment of what you are?

What are you surviving into? Something functional, or something that will ultimately lead to the downfall of everything that you have built and believed in, up to this point?

Perhaps we have a sense for wanting to know what is right, up to the point that we can sustain our own existence, with the belief that surviving and living is not inherently wrong, and with the doubt that we could apply it correctly, and the rest we throw to something greater, or to the back of our mind, like we did as children.

Perhaps there is some grace to our own awareness. The concept of grace here being the meaningful elegance of good fortune.

Maybe some try more than others, within their own capabilities, and this is a measure of some kind. Maybe we all try our best but it isn't the point.

Regardless, we are in danger of having something slam shut if we are not collectively capable enough of resisting our own destruction. Life must be worth living.

Thinking of the terms “self centered” and “selfless” in this context, it is a strange hypocrisy, someone thinking that doing “whatever” is noble or righteous, as if turning themselves over to the authority of power.

I am curious as to whether this is the thinking of some people. I do not think this is true in the midst of it, but perhaps once the real cost of that loss is realised, there is some way in which it could be true. It is kind of spooky.

Religious people may be more familiar with the concept. I do not see how this could be true when it comes at the direct expense of others.