

For a human being, contradiction is as easy to come by as it is for one to claim cleanliness after jumping in a pool of mud. To be clean is a certain psychological comfort, as long as one blinds itself to the organic needs of the body and its secretions. Bodily fluid and matters are far from inert, and some are even disease-inducing. It's supposed that life begets life, and even microscopic bacteria is perhaps still to be considered life. As the definition of what life is currently has no actual clear cut finality to it, perhaps due to the roaring origins of Nature giving perpetual doubt to those who would define life as what it is not. There's then a case to be made for anything that looks alive but has no life in a proper sense, from a virus to a fetus (*to be clear, this is not a comparison between the two, merely two subjects that carry much weight in the current socio-ontological-political climate. Apologies for the word here, but at the very least it explains what is meant*).

Due to the fact that logic today is the sole ruler of the world, as dangerous as it clearly is, any extreme would lead to a similar slope. While one would believe logic to be the great conclusion to Humanity, and it will inevitably lead to great heights never reached before, I would point towards mainly "**Lure and woe of transhumanism**" by Olivier Rey for an overview of many a counter-argument made by arguments in favour of the future of whatever "humanity" is today. There's much to go in-depth to beyond this mind you, but a few hundred pages should do well to give an overall solid foundation, even with little context that History can provide (*I believe important context can be found in some solid world encyclopedias by philosophers. They tend to be a great source, as biased as it might end up being; at least it makes no qualms about being neutral*).

There we can start with a clear contradiction. The pull towards both the past and the future, a *Promethean divide*, and the forgotten present time. Always to look beyond in either directions, but very rarely in what is now. Justified as well, who would want to look at the present when it is noticeably worse than the past in many aspects, and the future "promises" (*as long as some say*) to be better and better. The only metric being technology mind you, and maybe nature **if** it can be saved. Though you can certainly believe that if technology can replace nature in any sustainable way, it will be so.

A lot of people say that "there's no better time to live than now". Because there is less wars. Because there is more food. More comfort. Less diseases. More this, less that. New technology! Stating the status quo as good does not justify it: Here with no vision of the future, which might be the worst one, there's a blinded vision of both the past and the present as well. The existence of something does not justify its stance, if it is "good" or "bad" based on whatever morals are to be applied in this decade. But, most importantly here, all of what this paragraph possesses, it has no incentive in existence. Kant existed and solidified morality, giving the chance for humankind to realize its positive metaphysical potential. Instead we obtained a "beyond good and evil". What would today be branded as "common morality" has no roots, deriving onto an ocean with no coast (*to partially quote Günther Anders*). If nominating examples are of worth, then the singular domination of capitalism, and the auto-reification of the human as a product, even in its own mind, accepted whole, is very much the proof of that. An illusion taken advantage by, and those who do are more and more rarely punished, until the very existence of old world justice dissolves itself and

auto-reifies itself just as well. Only a matter of time, already in motion towards completion.

This not to say that tradition is good, that would be adding words to what is not being said here. Tradition is more sustainable in the long term, but is blinded by whatever faith it brings to the table. Neither the future nor the past are good for humankind, though the past certainly was good for Nature, up until it wasn't:

This would be the principal subject of this text. Nature, I believe, as explored in "*Anchors of Nature and Time*", and in the three texts relating directly to Ruin (*Rebuilding the Self Towards Truth | Vanity and Primordial Forces in Relation to Ruin | Aspect of Ruin – Extinction*), and finally touched upon first in "*Time as Regent*"; Nature is inhabiting all of its creations. All serve to exist under the same banner, to *Be*, and to be alive. We and our fellows, plants or animals, and even to extrapolate the notion, microscopic beings; even viruses, are very much part of Nature, and very much exist, and are alive, in this very notion. As already stated, morality has very little to no effect in the whole of things, as it stands today and until the end, less a balance is struck and present has found itself anew. Obviously there's an extremely low chance of this happening, and so we might as well just act upon instinct and an illusion of the past, trying to re-iterate it in the present and dilute it in the future. Nevertheless, this also gives an answer to any and all moral questions. Luckily, in a way, we still hold suffering as "evil", and are very reluctant upon perpetrating "evil deeds" upon other forms of life. As long as they're humans, that is.

Because of it, to give human characteristics to other beings is as much a fault of animalists as it is of transhumanists. They form a pair, though one is clearly blind to the goals of the other. But they are made from the same fibre: anti-humanism. This sounds like a tangent, and it might as well be, though it serves a purpose to bridge towards the following:

Just the same, to see suffering as "evil", anything to alleviate it is "good". Going back on the status quo then, and further back to another notion, the act of domination, in any way or form. All things, we learn through life, have an intrinsic positive value to them, as they have a negative one. This goes for everything, all that is good as much as all that is bad – as considered by any being at any time. Of all horrendous acts, they may have an effect in time that justifies their occurrence. From what was "evil" brought upon "good" in some form, and vice-versa. Hard to see, hard to acknowledge a lot of times, but present nonetheless, in time.

All of what can be said here can be attributed to Nature as well. Perhaps one could see "God" in these words, but it is of a limited scope, for Nature has no existence if Time is not present. But there is no question of "who came first", for it is a pre-requisite that Time arrived first. In all fabrications of our myths of creation, either they attribute Time as a requirement for anything and everything to *Be*, inert or not, components of Nature or not; or they deem it as a creation from Gods. That they would "exist outside of Time itself". To prop one's concepts to the highest degree is an understandable thing to do, and easy to empathise with, but I see this in no way to be true. How could it be, after all? Even the godless have their God(s), and those who lose it all have no justifications for existence itself, and end their lives. There it could be attributed that Time is mine, and Nature follows closely, but it is hard to see Time as a God, when I have stated and explained, as strange as it is to do so, and reading back, as shaky as it seems, that Time is regent of all that is, in all senses.

Now, to go back on Nature's contradiction. We mimic it at every moment, where even the

cycle of life and death itself is one. Our own cells do so. Our considerations of other lifeforms, using the abstract “definition” given here, or any scientific one, is as well. To and from our fellows, consideration of worth, just as well. Superiority and inferiority, even egalitarianism, is the same. It would be impossible for one to live with all, with an equal sense of *Being* towards all, without acknowledging every single contradictions that occur. As well, to go beyond morals, we still retain them in some way, as fragile and stretchable as they are. Here, the mere fact that they are malleable to extremes and to even their own destruction, before or after the present time, indicates a contradiction as well. Being aware of all waking contradictions takes time, and is seemingly impossible to full accept, and so (*contradictory statement*), it does not take time. Even in our works, our words, our arts, there lies contradiction. The sense of the abstract, its reification through art for example, dictates by nature a contradiction, where one does not feel the same way as another, or an individual produces art that means something entirely different than the spectator, or consumer (*depending on the timeframe of Humanity*). Even where one that creates have thoughts on what part does the consumer plays in it all. Through relations, there it exists. And, even in art itself, in the creation, contradiction exists. The reification of anything is a contradiction by nature. Something that was abstract now exists in physicality, in some form of it.

Nature does not even see itself as equal, as all feed from the one below, sometimes above – rarely, very rarely above: The weak, above, might as well be below then. And below it all is the past of what was alive. Corpses feed the living and from it breeds new life. Contradicting yet again. The cycle is contradictory in its essence, for it cannot be without it.

It is a core belief of mine that, to understand what exists, one must go beyond what *is*. This is the idea that brought upon Ruin, or what a friendly fellow attributed it the name: “Ruinism”, as if it were a belief to hold with tenants to exert in thoughts and in life. Of course it is true, and anyone with a fervent set of belief, named or not, it is as true for the one who holds them as it is wrong for the one who does not. But here: The pursuit of Truth is affected by Time primarily, and Nature secondarily. The first response to such a thing is a **part** of what we have now at present. Yet in truth it has nothing to do with it. We exist as we do and there is no answer to what we can give to ourselves that would satisfy the curiosity as implicitly and explicitly as it would be to give way to Nature, and all its names and denominations, as the rule to life: for it regulates itself and justifies itself merely through its existence. And as the sole consciousness that derived itself from the inert, this consciousness usurped the inert to make it alive: A part of Nature, in some way or form.

Nature is a hold of all abstractions, for they are not without it.

An argument could be made that Nature is Time, and Time is Nature. But if both are indissociable, then the fate of it all is grimmer than any could imagine. Where Nature might die, it could very well leave itself to birth again eternally or until Time itself ends. That is the singular hope in it all; But even here I have to ponder about eternity as a concept, and its possibility to even exist, though it would take many wonders to have an answer of Time. Perhaps it would ample justification to go beyond, and maybe that would be the goal of understanding. Yet, as it stands today, would there truly be a need for it? To understand it all would have to regress itself to understanding Nature, and though it goes with the need to understand Time, it does not have the need, explicitly or implicitly, to do so: Nature was birthed into this universe in some way, and if it is a will from Time, then it would not change much, less it gave it the rule to die out; then it would prove nonetheless Truth of Being. Beyond it all, Nature is as temporary as the life it gives out.

This stems from the belief, again, that we are in the image of Nature. And would it not make sense? All of our understandings begin from this, and end with this. The end of Nature through any mean is still a natural end to Nature, because it was willed to be so. However that happens is up to either Time or those who seek blindly another “state of being”, without even knowing the ontological impossibility of it. Only the technology; not even the technique, proven to be fatal to the soul, sole explicit carrier of Nature. And it may prevail, it may still exist even after all the butchering that will be done, in any manner of perverted morality it will be coveted as. But there is no will, seemingly of anyone that I have known in any form, past or present, that looked beyond it all. Or perhaps there were ones, but they understood a part of Nature, and decided to end it for themselves whenever they desired, such as Philipp Mainländer. Others, many in fact, accepted death to happen whenever it had to occur to them. A very fatalistic, yet turned to optimism very easily, attitude towards life.

Now in the past many decades we have had the evermore growing proof that as a whole life will extinguish itself, through our hands, sooner rather than later or never. It could have been Time, doing so mercifully, rather than the agonising metallic hand of a fleeting product of creation that evolved to be this way.

And eventually, we found ourselves at the conclusion that perhaps it was meant to be this way. But it could have been something else. To re-iterate some of the words off of my essay “*On the Death of Man*”, it could have been warm and welcoming, rather than cold and unforgiving. At the very least, now we could go in the middle, have both. The coldness of what is and the warmth of what will be: as cold as will be, still, comfort in the end of all suffering. And here is a logical conclusion as well to all the “evil” that is considered suffering. Growing concept, growing state, even through all the well-meaning individuals who push against it whenever they can, hedonists or not.

Flipping the idea and very real state of “suffering”, abstractly or in reality, has no effect on the outcome of it all. But the outcome must be found, someplace, sometime, before it all ends. And epiphanies close to death are merely hallucinations to give comfort. We are not yet close to it, our souls may waver in complete uncertainty and some may start to drown, but still we sail on a bottomless ocean of an obsidian colour. The grey skies and the night winds push us in all directions, always still away from shores; as if there were any before. Maybe there never were. And it is the conclusion to give here as well.

“Maybe” will transform itself to be a certainty, giving both Nature and Time give enough to reach Truth as it is, and as it always was. In here I say that Ruin is the answer to inconclusive conclusions from all acts and parts of life, both the starting and end point of Nature. The beginning of an understanding of Time: the annihilation of the realities we inhabit and reach, except the one given by Time.

Truthfully, I would like to reach this answer before my end. But to do so would be to hold reification and make it so. It will happen no matter what, and with an end to all we have and will have, it doesn't seem like it would be impossible to make it so. To accelerate towards the end, is to accelerate the end of suffering as well. Some will find it agreeable as long as they void themselves of our intrinsic moral guidance, even through the perversion it goes through, even now more than ever, and more later; yet even then I would disagree. This will not be the end of suffering, nor the beginning, nor a stepping stone. An end to suffering signifies an end to all of Nature. Of all spirits

that might be believed in, of everything besides Time and the inert, lifeless, soulless. Nothingness would simply be more present than today.

Reaching this in a lifetime does not have to be, for it will be eventually. But to make it happen faster, would there then be anything wrong with it whatsoever?

It is easy to understand that anyone doing something like this would be making the whole of humanity as an enemy. But Nature knows, beyond it all, even it itself has to end. There is horror in knowing this, if probed properly. An end is hard to conceive, and I would be one to believe that this horror is simply a shield to not explore beyond it all. Not because we cannot comprehend, but because to comprehend would be to spell an end to Nature as a whole before Time makes it so. And it might be difficult to accept then, that your own would kill yourself for itself. Until then we work hand in hand with Nature, until this horror is breached and understood. And perhaps, even then, it was meant to be by Nature. Perhaps it had this plan, or desire, since the beginning of it, to stop being by its own hands, rather than by the hands of Time. Cruel fate either way, and in reality, both seem to have the same gravity. Only the living now, ending it? Catastrophic to others alive now only.

If Ruin is to be, as it is; extinction and annihilation follow: they exist as real, abstract and logical conclusions to Nature.