

## **Dreams of a Wrong Past**

### **Theoretical attempt at living well in a dying world**

22/07/2021

“Dreams of a wrong past”:

Where all individuals dream of something; a desire deep within to attain, as a form of fulfilment for their lives.

Perhaps an endpoint in what they see, from that day up, until they achieve that dream – if they do achieve it. Some individuals do not possess any dreams, and simply exist with no string attached to it. Both are selfish, but never in bad ways, less one considers selfishness as inherently “bad” in their own views. Which, for all intent and purpose, is contradictory and is an impossible view to hold without being a hypocrite: For selfishness is inherently part of survival, as the mere act of fulfilling primary needs is the appropriation of resources for one’s own sake. Some form of life will inevitably be deprived of what could have been theirs to survive. And, following this, one’s survival drives another to lack the resources necessary for their own survival. Furthermore, when sharing is seen as “good”, it still is a choice of who has a share. In extreme cases, philanthropy occurs, however the contradiction still takes place. For if one can sustain, another has to suffer. Perhaps not equally – in fact, for many, very much not equally; as one’s survival engenders another one’s loss of life, be it animal or vegetal in nature: All suffer in their own ways and call to distress.

That is most definitely true for the realm outside of what humanity prides itself to act as. However, the trade of survival for suffering occurs nonetheless in the world of what would be human: perhaps less cruel in its intensity, but still present nonetheless.

From human to human, **time** is the primary currency of trade. Where one gives its time in exchange for services or monetary gains, that allow in turn the acquisition of primary means of survival, that mainly being food and water. Sleep has no need to be here for any can sleep wherever and whenever, albeit with questionable comfort sometimes, but the recharging need can still take place without any major negative effect. As well, the human especially can adapt, and eventually, perhaps find discomfort a comforting thing.

But the primary needs tend to, today, be *branded* as products. And even the self-reliant begins its self-reliance from the use of products: Either those things are manufactured, or humans reified as serviced products: All have a price, and that price either is monetary or calculated in time: time for which all is valued as a certain monetary rate. So the system dictates it must run this way to simply work as it was designed to: As not needed as the system is in the need to sustain life, it certainly allows a comfortable life. As long as one is ready to accept the cost of living a “comfortable” life. It goes without saying that said comfortability is a standard metric given by the system one is in, and was not meant to be changed by singular individuals. However, if one can be free of many “comforts”, an exchange rate is present in the form of abstract, sometimes physical, positive changes in being. For those who seek comfort at all times merely bring themselves to be more at the mercy of a system that already jailed their participants, and bring themselves to, just as well – and in the favour of the system they are part of – weaken themselves internally, in many ways.

Strength allows the self to be free of many influences, artificial ones especially. The natural ones however are what made us as we are, and therefore are close to impossible to derive from one's life.

The other trade of suffering is from human to the manufactured (survival) good. Food implies the creation of life in some form, then its death and transformation in edibility. Through time, humanity was able to, and a lot more in modernity, figure out processes of transformation. We now have, and important to note: inter-connected in all places of the world through globalisation; A very exhaustive list of digestible items to ingest for survival.

Until the day meat can be created in a lab from what might as well be nothing, then the trade of cruelty through the exhaustion of life will still occur. However, if we are to one day produce food from very little, what would be that "very little", and how did it grow to be something to be fed to others? Is that a form of life? I am rather certain modern science will find a way to spin it around and say that, in fact, no, these are not forms of life. After all, with many definitions of life going around, only one would be needed to convince many that there is nothing to fear: no suffering occurs! Although even if that were true, let us be reminded that the "human to human" trade would still be something to take into account.

However this thought on a potential future is just that: about a potential future; a possibility that may be. Perhaps when even the rich countries cannot feed their own citizen properly, and in comparison the (*what would be considered*) poor countries have a surplus of food, one could wonder if that would solve the problem highlighted here. Then, there is to add the suffering of the individual through life. For what it needs to survive is to be part of the equations of trade listed here. To give service is to be dutiful towards a something rather than a someone, and in the abstract that said something represent, it gives, as if one were a deity, a way to exchange "pebbles" for a material that allows the self to sustain. The self, or those in a circle we choose to give to, so that themselves can sustain. Nevertheless, the problem still is present, with no answer to it for many in this world: as the system they live in is, itself, flawed to not allow them to actually *be*.

Then, how could one *be*, if they do not have the means necessary to even survive in good health? As well, could good health be someone free of diseases? Free of malnutrition? Free of bodily malfunctions? Mental diseases?

One *is* as they *are*, and all of this amounts to the simplicity of that fact. Human ingenuity, in all its potential grace, has allowed diseases to disappear. But, in a grand drawn-out spectacle, allowed at the same time diseases to appear. Perhaps this way one could make the argument that the medicine now cancels out the diseases created by Man. I would put this argument forward, as I find it rather hilarious in its own contained tragedy.

If one were to truly wish for a disease-free society, then one should arm itself to have a purging cycle. Just as well, a suffering-free society is impossible to maintain. Vanitas ought to not apply to the temporary nature of select concepts or things in reality, but I would say that it should apply as well to, overall, man-made systems of any descriptions. Ergo, a painting or a photo that represents in some way a system of any description created by the hands of Man, would inevitably reference its own past or future end through its very symbolic existence. It is not the role of History to teach us past mistakes; to not repeat them. Rather its role is to make us remember: The ever-growing antique with a marble plaque on which is marked in all languages, "the remembrance of ends"; and all of them.

Here even, one could push further and say that History contains patterns: Patterns of Men

and Nature, one step after the other, going backwards then forwards, perhaps a few steps back, but then always a small step forward. The direction of “forward” in the sense of “progress”, in all capacities, here stays. Whether or not they sidestep – this gives way to the morality of questions that do not even need to be questioned, but ideas that sustain a current historical system certainly make for interesting movements in themselves.

All this calls forward and backwards at the same time, given the current timeframe on which one focuses its attention in History. May it be before or after the rise of Man: the birth, rise, life and death of all systems, biological or artificial, material or abstract. But, as Time is linear in the reality we act in at every step, it goes without a needed explanation that History is bound to this very fact, as much as any thing would be, in the present moment. And what started always ended, which has been true for every living or abstract creations, whether or not they came from Nature or Man, although the argument could be made that all came from Nature; whether or not that is true has ultimately no consequence on our situation here.

Finally, and as it started it ends with the same: Time, in History, is on our systems of calculations and understanding of this system, delimits itself with most commonly years. On specific recent History, months, and as we move onto more precise recordings of events, days.

Truthfully, all of this was to make sense of a very short sentence in one of my poems, “*Sustenance*”, which ends with the words “*Dance end years.*” I believe this very much encapsulates Time as far as we can recall to calculate it within our own time. I’d like to also say that it sounds pretty and poetic, but that is up to the reader to decide. And to proclaim that it would be true, when it comes to art, it certainly would seem more to be the words of a narcissist delusional “artist” than someone with talent. Nevertheless, I like the words for what they mean. After everything is said and done, they also speak of my philosophy and my being in great simplifications, and it would be hard for me not to enjoy this fact. One ought to at the very least like themselves a little bit, to keep going with a clear head in this evermore suffocating world. I believe something that many could agree, even those who may be living great times. In which case I would be one to wonder why they would be reading these writings. While their aim is to understand Truth through the deciphering of Time and Nature in minor (and likely full of shortcomings) ways, the reality of it is, today, that they merely allowed the understanding of existential suffering and the place of Man after its soul was ripped apart from himself by himself.

Now, if one is to be in good health, which is achieved by not having any heavy innate handicap, and living a hygienic life (*good sleep, regular workouts, good food intake, positive outlook, and for many: fulfilment<sup>1</sup> in regards to something or someone*), the individual would still be of course subject to this *Promethean Divide*, as it exists within any modern system to this date. But perhaps there is something good in that: To not know where one belongs allows one to take as many journeys as it would desire to go through. To have more experience within life than most, and to achieve a potential that differs from what was Humanity before. However, to not be able to truly

---

1 Fulfilment here ought to be defined by the individual itself, and what drives it to exist in a way that repels one’s abyss from interfering with day-to-day life. To stay busy is the easiest way; perhaps the most effective one, to achieve that. However the hows and the strength of that, belong as well to the individual: there is no one-for-all solution. In recent times however, one can note that merely working for the sake of earning money (*bullshit jobs, to use David Graeber’s term*) has averse effects on the self, mainly impacting self-fulfilment and the in-built innate sense of usefulness to the world one belongs to.

specialize (*even if one specializes in reality, again the subject of uncertainty and the pull of a fragmented time would not allow it to be efficient in any subjective or linear capacity*) is limiting in an unintended way. Perhaps then, this experience of anything and everything allows a sort of a different way to be, unheard of before. A sort of a never-finished, as its natural impossibility dictates it, ongoing and never-ending growth until the end of one's eternity (*i.e. its life*).

The passage of time in the life of modern individuals induces personal development/growth, if one is willing to be more than they were yesterday. Where "free time" has been greatly reduced, and the concept of "work" has changed and been made a *misery party* through modernisation in more than one way: here then people attempt to reach upon an old grief lost through automation.

The desire to find fulfilment in their actions towards something concrete or abstract, much as any ancestor of ours would have done so. From fishermen feeding their villages to artisans creating tools to make work easier. Work never was easy, but work had a purpose that was important towards more than simply a fleeting desire or need. It has always been the case that, people being as they are, social goals and safekeeping – here we might as well call it empathy – has reigned as victor onto the human world for long periods of time. Destruction of human circles or the denting of it through artificial (*wars, violences, dishonesty...*) or natural ways (*accidents, diseases, disasters...*), has always been present as well. It has worked in History, and always will work, for as long as we are social creatures. While the human can be bent, and some do not have much or any need for social interaction, the world would not be as it is if it wasn't for a desire to make the species better off than the day before. Much akin to the level of growth an individual would seek, the promulgation of a "better tomorrow" can work in the favour of personal development, which then doubles as community development. Eventually leading to what we have today, with a sort of global development. However, there is a major issue that arises from it, and was always present. Those who seek to better their community do so implicitly to better themselves as well. While selfish in part, it is not entirely so. Nevertheless, those who simply profit off the efforts and achievements of the contributions of others, as much as it was intended to be this way, could be seen, with a naked perception of things as they are, as "parasites". A gross oversimplification, and not exactly true to reality, however more than a handful of individuals are very much that in any system that try to englobe many without great care: Such is the cause of being remnants of tribal lives, where each person was an actual individual within their system, it being their tribe. Some were not tribes but close communities. Eventually villages but the same rules of individualism through communities happened.

Having lived for entire millenniums in such a way that allowed slow and steady growth, we are today, and for centuries forward if it is to be so, remnants of this very ancestral mode of being. Modernity has seeped into the crevices of all existing systems, attempting to modify them by promoting function alongside machine: efficiency in its purest form, at the cost of what is "humanity" in what it stood for. This aspect of "humanity", certainly had flaws (*such as empathy would have innate flaws – for which empathy is a part of "humanity"*), and the attempt to retract them was the simple removal through digestion. An acidic digestion still occurring today, but as more aspect of reality are automated, so are more aspects of humanity dissipated.

Not forever, they are so only within the system that made it so they saw the humans more as tools than people. Very much a transference of what animals and plants were seen as into the human. Perhaps then it became inevitable through the rise of machines.

What today humanity is faced with, is the attempt to co-exist wholly with their own inhumane creations. Of course, the easiest way to do so would be to be inhumane. Naturally, that is the way that threw us to who and where we are now: Under a veil of lies we accepted the death of who we were and the inability to access a potential that was brought upon us for thousands of years.

To accept our fate now is, however, not to give in hedonism and destroy the rest of what makes the human humane. Rather I would suggest a balanced approach. The invention and vision of modern machines and modernity was to, at some point, help out Humanity. It was no different from those who help their communities to grow alongside themselves. Perhaps more corruption and selfishness originated from the project, or perhaps the nature of it merely allowed the propagation of grand corruption and selfishness.

What would a “balanced approach” to living in modern days be like, exactly? Would it even be possible?

If one is to live within a city or town, they will be bombarded by afflictions of modernity. One being in the form of hedonistic places and activities, from bars to shops. The other is the bombardment of ads: a plight upon the brain. As well, forms of habitation within these places are akin to, especially in cities and town centres or in specific areas, farm enclosures. Individualism there is an illusion: The space has no exact need to be spacious, however what of those next to the self? Some even go as far as to live with unknowns for years so that the resources necessary to survive and/or to live at a somewhat comfortable level, depending on the individual, are lowered. On one hand, being asked to provide payment to be kept out a hostile environment that simply does not permit survival through natural means – as in, what nature had for us, is simply unheard of. If one is to be homeless, I would suggest them to learn how to live in nature. Of course, today it has been made impossible to do so in many places around the world.

To avoid this situation, one can acquire the means to be proprietary of their own home. Would it not be better to construct one’s own place to live? But here as well, I am astounded by the fact that land is a commodity. What need is there to have it if naught is done with it? Wouldn’t it be better to have empty land merely made unavailable, to let nature be? Obviously, that is a fool’s dream. For as many people live in this world, it occurs clearly to me that there is impossibility to “let nature be”: The human is more important, for the human. But to everything else, hardly. Of course, our self-importance is well justified. After all, we are the most intelligent beings here. Yet not the most empathetic, and perhaps here we miss that. For all its faults, to remove or subtract one aspect of humanity can only lead to, first, localized and individual disaster, then communal, then (*as the world allows it to be so*) global.

And so, to achieve a more balanced place in an ever-changing and hostile – more than hostile, in insidious ways with no clear signs as to how – environment, one can still hide. One can act as a parasite, either by itself or with others. To live off a system that implicitly hated them when they were part of it, only now they can make it clear. May we point that out: only then truly, would the modern system of life would be honest with what and who it encompasses.

To feed off of it and not to give back to it, such would be a great way to live a more balanced life, between forgotten ancestry of *Being*, and modern ways of life that make us unable to be as we were. Any can do so, as many would still feed in the system of modernity until its destruction. As the system assumes every being is part of it, dissidents would be invisible, if they do not pull the levers

too hard and too often. To understand and live in such a way, in community or not, one must understand the system in which they live. Like a child almost, testing the limits of rules, attempting to bend them until they cannot be bent anymore, but never too much so that the rules are enforced.

In such a balanced way of life, personal growth is possible as this new type of human being that we are. I wish to talk about this in a certain manner: If whether or not it would be too late for someone to achieve a modern life that permits great growth. Here hear, that the issue at hand for most is that growth is close to impossible, for the mere nature of survival today does not heed the calls of the self, only those of the machines that must be fed. Where the machine changes its nature from time to time, the essence of it still remains. Sometimes the machine even becomes the human that we are required to work with or work for. Merely avatars of an entanglement; a leviathan of modern woes.

On the topic at hand: “free time” and “work” function independently for growth. To be precise, the growth of the individual is only hindered if one ignores him or herself; where even with “infinite” “free time”, compared to someone with any amount of “work”, the growth is similar. It will be however easier to navigate for someone who’s given themselves to exist for themselves, rather than for the sake of something or someone else. Something being here the system, especially modern system. Someone would be anyone, although there is something to be said about people attempting to reach (or reaching) for someone else desperately, sometimes both accepting and clinging onto one another as if their life depended on it. Not anything more than a symptom of our ever-expanding *Promethean Divide*, as the search for partnership is not supposed to be an end by itself. Family would be one to come along, as to give a goal to a relationship, although a family entrapped by modern systems is hardly a family at all, rather a shadow of what it could be. Presented as the greatest achievement of anyone’s life as well, to have a family is parroted as the end-all be-all of not any society, but the systems that provide. Without question, more hands to operate and control, to give themselves to itself, that is worth supporting: assets of living flesh, created from its own subjects. A perverted goal of assuring *survival and growth* of the species for the *efficacy* of the machine.

Going back on growth in “free time” and “work”: The identification of the self occurs through the state of being in the present universal context. It is a relationship to the world as it stands now. This means that, as long as one is aware of time passing, and its own existence as an individual, it can exist, it can *Be*, and can act. An individual that simply goes through the motions of its life still exists, but in a limited capacity. It acts as it is told it should act, rather than as he would act if given a chance to not exist within a “computing” system (*a situation worsened if someone is a workaholic*). A parallel to reality in which the world is conceived by humans, rather than by Nature. While that is not a modern issue, it still is one that rose to prominence and aggravated itself, although it may have been, like most other things, an unintended consequence. Should not one not be given the chance to Be in all its potential? I would argue so, however now, as we see the effects on nature and Nature of modernity and how people, blind as they were made to be, handle the consequences of modernity, I would rather not any with no eyes or ears to achieve their potential in such a way. There is no doubt in my mind however, that the individual that emancipates themselves will inevitably reach inner greatness.

All of this to reach a point of self-contentment, or contentment within a community, free from overarching powers and hands. While they would still exist with the system, they would not exist within. Sadly, modernity made itself a requirement anywhere, except for the temporary escapees of what could be called “Deep Earth” (lost in nature). Inevitably, modern systems will catch up to those who hide, except only by accident. What made it so modernity could stomp everything and anything was the power of “progress”, from the promises it made to its delivery, whether or not it did happen as predicted (*or happen at all*). I already talked about it in another essay<sup>2</sup>, so I will not keep going about this specific.

Nevertheless, there is a fault to those who hide completely: One day, they will be uncovered. That is today’s reality. Then I suggest again, to “hide” in plain sight. To achieve this, again, one must know the system that it will profit off of for their own life, and to do so, must have been subject to the system until it broke off of it. While not every modern system allows “tribute” in such a way, many do. If all else fail, nature still would allow one to survive if they can, but the individual would have to find a place that allows for it to even be possible without being shut down soon after debuting such a life – May it be lived fully, or even partially.

And what happens once this potential to Be is reached? What is the exact purpose of it all? This all seem, after all is said and done, more like a definite goal with a potentially arduous journey, with a post-achievement that would be shaky at best.

Indeed, this is not something for everyone. The individual must be willing to “sacrifice” what they knows, what they grew up with. For modernity allowed many things, even novel and new things that are impossible to exist in. As well, here why I justify the “balanced life” that is not much more than parasitising off-centre of a modern system. For it would allow certain components of modernity while disabling others, as well as doing a reverse for Nature. A switch, if you will. A... Balance, more accurately, but that sounds too much like the actual argument. Yet that’s what it actually is, hence the name... Not exactly poetic.

In any event, the individual not willing to part ways with aspects of what modern life allows would not do well off-road. They should instead, then, keep running the trail, being guided by materials that are withstanding temporarily, rather than the eternity of Nature and what it allowed and allows. Time will have the last word, as usual. To be remembered then, is of no consequence whatsoever. The belief that humanity will survive beyond Time is an incredible statement, blind to reality, worse than dreams. Self-destructive in its intentions, as it has shown itself to be through generations of progress. We allow it to happen under pretences of accepting comfort and easier ways of lives; even as it introduces more difficulties. The dice roll as epochs pass are in our favours however, that is at the very least, true.

“To live in accordance to nature” is a saying held dear by Stoics. That is something I would agree with to an extent, but I would not fool myself to think that eternity awaits in any capacity. To live in accordance to nature is, I find as well that many tend to forget, to accept death as well.

Yet it does not go far enough, it does not see beyond what it taught, back before we knew all that we do. Given the History of the philosophy, that is deeply understandable. Indeed, and to go back one last time on it, modernity allowed knowledge to extend itself to the micro of the macro, giving a detailed overview of most things material. And in this material, while it trapped itself there blind, the observant individual can see beyond the material and understand reality for what it will be,

---

2 *On the Death of Man*

rather than “just” what it is. Although certainly, one cannot be without the other, hence the quotation marks.

No more do I believe in virtues and morals within a given societal system. Things are as they are, and ancestral legacies kept a core of things as they ought to be. *Ought to be*, because they worked then, and still work now whenever applied, as rarely or feebly as they can be. While they erode, and again we still keep this part somewhere, and this “kept” frail humanity allows individuals to still navigate signs of Nature, rather than signs of Man. The core of the human and what makes us as such is still there in any, as long as one was birthed to be at the very least “neutral” in the mind, in regards to itself and its fellows. Malice is strangely unique to humans, but cannot make any place to exist within, proper as it is. As well, savagery/hedonism works only if contained, and something like this is a boon of modernity (*I suppose it wasn't the last time I would talk about it then, apologies*), in a certain way, if one was so deeply hopeless about the human that it would allow it to give in to its animalistic side. But, the cost of it is to promulgate these useless needs that only satisfy the Id, is that hedonism inevitably becomes a virtue in some capacity, and those who reject it are considered to “reject their humanity”. Perhaps there and then, there is a show of force of the change in definition of what humanity is. Not as it was to be, rather it is now as it is by the means of Man and what it seeks: to be machine, to not have to worry, to give up the difficulties of what it is to live. Hedonism is the realm of this modern reality. Pleasure may be the drive of all, but there is a degree of it that goes beyond it all, that consumes it all: that would be hedonism. Yet, paradoxically, those who seem to thrive deeply in said systems are those who reject it in such a capacity. In fact, it needs those who reject hedonism to be able to be more than what it is. It may not need it to be maintained, but it also seeks to extend its vertical reach.

In all of this, what is there to say? What does the individual that removed itself from the promises of its previous false gods, has to say about it all? Perhaps nothing, for none will hear. And perhaps it should be this way. Things are as they are, and will keep on going as they will. A dream is that a single individual can build and destroy by oneself. But when the potential is recycled and moulded to be what it cannot be, where could that take place? Nowhere at all but in an immediate circle that is not completely consumed by its own overarching system that it is part of. Once one can see things for what they are, rather than how they are presented as; when one can see Nature in its naked form, its perhaps monstrous form for some, the fear will either overtake or recede. If the former, one comes back from whence it came. If the latter, the road is unmarked and those who may have walked it before are nowhere to be seen, and their footprints have long disappeared.

To be human without being human, is to exist in Time without existing in Nature.