



A LOGOS Imprint logosclubblog.com

SUZERAIN
towards
anthropocentric
immanence
kaiter enless

table of contents

i. Suzerain

- (a) Immanence or Earth?
 1. The Image of Man|Specter of Earth (p.3)
 2. Death of the Specter | Man Reborn (p.14)
 3. If We Do Nothing | Invariable Extinction (p.25)
 4. Notes and Sources (p.27)

Logos in Pan – Pan in Logos.

(a) Immanence or Earth?

*What way went vigor?
Subsumed by vice.
Struggle lost to paradise.*

-

(a.1) The Image of Man | Specter of Earth

In his *Philosophy and the Scientific Image of Man*¹, Wilfrid Sellars posits two competing conceptions of the human subject, that of the “manifest image” and the “scientific image.” The manifest image, as defined by Sellars, constitutes the folk-psychological schema by which man describes himself, to himself, and relates to his fellows (I am, she is, she talks to him because she likes him, etc), what Sellars referred to in his more casual moments as “knowing one’s way around” the map of the world. To quote Sellars: “The ‘manifest’ image of man-in-the-world can be characterized in two ways, which are supplementary rather than alternative. It is, first, the framework in terms of which man came to be aware of himself as man-in-the-world. It is the framework in terms of which, to use an existentialist turn of phrase, man first encountered himself—which is, of course, when he came to be man. For it is no merely incidental feature of man that he has a conception of himself as man-in-the-world, just as it is obvious, on reflection, that ‘if man had a radically different conception of himself he would be a radically different kind of man.’”²

In contrast, the scientific image is that set of things which also constitutes man³ but which cannot be detected by the manifest image (or rather, which cannot be discerned by simply “feeling one’s way around”). He describes the scientific image thusly,

“The scientific image of man-in-the-world is, of course, as much an idealization as the manifest image—even more so, as it is still in the process of coming to be. It will be remembered that the contrast I have in mind is not that between an *unscientific* conception of man-in-the-world and a *scientific* one, but between that conception which limits itself to what correlational techniques can tell us about perceptible and introspectible events and that which postulates imperceptible objects and events for the purpose of explaining correlations among perceptibles.”⁴

Sellar’s takes special care to note that by utilizing the word “image” he is not thereby positing that either the manifest, scientific, or both – as conception of being-in-the-world – are in anywise not of ‘the real.’ Rather, he ‘brackets’⁵ the “images,” thus transmogrifying them into philosophical objects of navigation. The tension between these images is starkly exemplified by such permutations in the humanities as posthumanism and its attendant sub-categories – transhumanism, non-humanism, anti-humanism and so on⁶ – as well as in the popularization of the displacement of *the holocene* by *the anthropocene*, patterned after the *noosphere*⁷ of the Russian geochemist, Vladimir Ivanovich Vernadsky; further refined by de Chardin and Le

1 'Philosophy and the Scientific Image of Man' was a lecture given by Sellars in 1960. It was later transcribed and published in the journal, *Frontiers of Science and Philosophy*.

2 Sellars, 'Philosophy and the Scientific Image of Man,' p. 3

3 We are here utilizing *man* to account for attributions across sexual lines, thus accounting for both males & females.

4 Sellars, 'Philosophy and the Scientific Image of Man', p. 10

5 'Bracketing' was a phenomenological term deployed by the philosopher Edmund Husserl, meaning: to suspend direct engagement with the world in partiality to better focus on some form of analysis of experience therefrom gained.

6 We will touch upon these matters in later explorations of this text.

7 The noosphere was conceived of as a biosphere of human thought. *Nous* = mind, *sphaira* = sphere.

Roy. The anthropocene was utilized as early as the 1960s but was popularized in the early 2000s by Dutch chemist, Paul J. Crutzen. The anthropocene, broadly described, is the geoe- era birthed out of post-industrial human civilization; generally, a human-dominated geological epoch; a time where man has obtained unprecedented power which has, through his ignorance, caused irreparably damaging climate change and ecological devastation. In other words, the anthropocene places *man as geological force* and a singularly destructive force at that. This is a transmogrification of the manifest image; a taking of man from his place as the center of concern and placing him within a system with its own concerns. Such a transformation is the summation of a existential quandary. The end of the world, or, more minimally, the end of the world of man. If you should find this talk of “the end of the world” to be an incredibly over-the-top pronouncement know that it is not *our* pronouncement but rather, a sentiment which is increasingly accepted by much of contemporary academia and mainstream environmentalism.

Consider this excerpt from a 2014 speech given by the urban geographer, Stephanie Wakefield, “The end of the world then is not this or that disaster coming in the future – a flood, a hurricane, the collapse of mid-western agriculture – the end of the world is not a potential extinction of homosapiens. The end of the world is what we are living through right now.”⁸ Now, clearly, this is manifestly false if “the end of the world” is to be taken as a literal and immediate eventuality (as her usage of “now” would connote). The world, either as nature-as-such, or, the-earth-as-such, in totality, is not literally at an end; it was not “ending” back in 2014 when such statements were made, nor is it “ending” now (anymore than it has always been ending). Rather, it is Sellar's *manifest image* that is slipping away – this a failure of synthesis – behind computer screens and into the ever-burgeoning smart-phone matrix, slipping through the cracks in the facade of a world torn open in the new reality birthed by empiricism and modern science, slithering through the fissures of the harmonic concordance which has been shattered by the might of roaring industry, soaring ambition and thunderous will.

Man is no longer merely a clever beast, he has become something else entirely. We are all cyborgs, after all (increasingly, quite literally). All the more reason for synthesis. The crucial question to answer then is whether He – that is Man – has become more or less his constituent parts. Obviously more, provided that one accepts the simple (and I would argue, obvious) conceit that information⁹ acquisition and utilization is central to the constitution of Man. We now add on to the collective armature of the whole of our species increasingly powerful frames – both conceptual and literal – through mass communication and speculative theoretical exploration; no longer captive to the landlocked and resource-scarce existence of our ancestors, oft trapped upon infertile planes or sickly, fetid marshes, nor are we so easily dispatched by meteorites, those great foes from the sky, nor the devastation of hurricanes, mudslides, deluges, nor the marrow-racking ague or the fangs of multifarious and chattering beasts. Hence, the only truly meaningful question left in regard to Man in relation to the earth is: “Should Man continue the process of reifying his immanence, thus synthesizing the

8 Notes on the Anthropocene: “What Must I Do?” At the End of the World, 2014.

9 Here deploying “information” in the broadest possible sense of the term.

manifest and scientific images or should He do away with one or the other, or, should He cease and desist altogether?"

Before we can even begin to answer such a wide-ranging series of questions it is of great importance to critically examine the conceptions of the earth which have been constructed by the *manifest image*, what we shall here collectively refer to as the *specter of earth*. What then is this specter which shrouds our clarity? The answer is: not earth *as-is* but rather, the *idea of earth* which has been collectively crafted out of centuries of our relationship with it, imbued with agency by our own, misattributed and implicitly carried along. Whether the concept takes the form of earth-as-hyperorganism or earth-as-deity; what is fundamental to the foundation of the concept of *the specter* is the idea that the planet is something which *acts*. Additionally, the specter is a being which also has specific interests which its proponents contend broader humanity (or in rarer instances, *all* human action) is actively working against, for in the philosophy of the spectral shamans, Man is nothing more than a virus¹⁰, crawling out upon the whole of the world, siphoning it's lifeforce with vile machinic efficiency for some unstated, hideous and invariably cataclysmic end. The decline of anthropocentric thinking via the rise of new and destabilizing schools (posthumanism, transhumanism, etc) of thought have acted as catalysts to this thought-process which has, in turn, created a vacuum within contemporary intellectualism sufficient for anti-human envirocracy¹¹ to flourish. But is this mindset justified? Is it true? We would affirm that even if such statements were true, that should not mean that man should cease philosophical and technological innovation and simply set himself down into the muck and the mud, scratching about with sticks to carve out a hovel in the hardening clay of some noisome landslide. All of nature wars with us and it is only right and just that man should respond in kind and wage the battle with equal to ever increasing fury. Now as ever. Felix Guattari remarks in *The Three Ecologies*,

"Natural equilibriums will be increasingly reliant upon human intervention, and a time will come when vast programmes will need to be set up in order to regulate the relationship between oxygen, ozone and carbon dioxide in the Earth's atmosphere. We might just as well rename environmental ecology *machinic ecology*, because Cosmic and human praxis has only ever been a question of machines, even, dare I say it, of war machines. From time immemorial "nature" has been at war with life! The pursuit of mastery over the mechanosphere will have to begin immediately if the acceleration of technoscientific progress and the pressure of huge population increases are to be dealt with."

Before we lay out our positive position (what is correct and should be done) we must first finish our negatory enterprise (what is wrong and what should not be done).

What is wrong, principally, with the various notions which we here collectively describe as the

10 It is amusing to note how often viruses are utilized as a point of comparison by radical environmentalists given that viruses have only obtained this position through their detrimental effects to us. An exceedingly anthropocentric (and correct) conceit from those who would seek to conceptually extricate themselves from themselves (which is neither possible nor desirable).

11 Those who place lack of human impact upon the environment at the forefront of all political & philosophical thinking.

specter of earth is that it is just that, a specter; a construct of the mind with no verifiable external reality. This is not to say that mental constructions are not themselves true or that they are not immensely important; they are. Rather, it is to say that there is a profound distinction to be drawn between the conception itself and the way that conception maps onto any given externalities (if any at all). As pertains to usefulness it is crucial to understand that every mental construction is only as useful or useless as its applications within the mind to the individual who contemplates it and the ability of the individual who conceives of it to then utilize that concept to effect “the world” in some way that is conducive to some end. In the case of humanity, that end is (and must always be) an anthropocentric one. The problem with the concept of the specter is that, though it is obviously false (or, in more rare and sophisticated iterations, unfalsifiable), it is not useless; in fact, it is highly useful for a variety of human pursuits. To illustrate this fact and better conceptualize the actual effects of the specter, consider the cult of femininity which sprung up around the archaeological discoveries of Çatalhöyük, Turkey. In 1958 the archaeologist James Mellaart unearthed the remains of a proto-city in southern Anatolia, Konya Province, Turkey. It came to be known as Çatalhöyük¹². Among the ruins of the neolithic settlement were various female figurines which Mellaart believed to be evidence of a cult of some Mother Goddess that was “the basis of our civilization.”¹³ Which echoed the claims of American occult writer, Rosemary Ellen Guiley wrote that goddess worship extends as far back in time as the neolithic and might possibly be even older¹⁴ and the mythologist Joseph Cambell who once cited a discovery that was dated to 6500 BC¹⁵ which he believed to be indicative of mother goddess worship. The validity of Mellaart's theory, however, was somewhat complicated by the fact that not only was the archaeologist possessed of black market connections, he was also a proven forger. Regardless of these facts, Mellaart's theories garnered a following and in short order a new, tentative religion had sprung up around his findings (both real and counterfeit). A similar fixation surrounds the ancient Bronze Age city-site of Knossos in Crete wherein many figurines and frescos were discovered which hinted at nature worship conducted under the auspices of powerful priestesses. Despite widespread denouncement of the idea that either Knossos or Çatalhöyük were, in their time, hotbeds of mother goddess worship, the idea persisted; indeed, both locations are still quite popular tourist designations for dedicated worshippers of “the mother goddess” which has formed into various different internet communities. The “the” here is significant as members of the Knossos and Çatalhöyük mother goddess community believe in a monotheistic conception of the divine; a great and all powerful woman-creator who stands separate from man. It is pertinent to note that many modern devotees of the Mother Goddess believe that during neolithic times (or other proximal ages) womankind lived in tranquility until they were invaded by men who brought chaos into the world through the creation of technology. In it's modern iterations, mother goddess worship tends to arise in, or affix itself to, circles wherein radical feminism, Jungian Psychoanalysis, New Age pantheism and extreme forms of environmentalism are present. Whilst Mellaart's discovery was an important locus in the reknewal of the specter goddess, it

12 The name Catalhoyuk is a combination of the Turkish *catal* (fork) and *hoyuk* (mound).

13 *Evaluation Claims of a Mother Goddess Cult on Prehistoric Malta*, Margaret Creech, 2015.

14 Rosemary Ellen Guiley, *Encyclopedia of Mystical and Paranormal Experiences*, (New York: HarperSanFrancisco, 1991), 239.

15 *The Masks of God*, vii.

was but a portion of the multifarious iterations of modern earth and goddess worship, which re-surfed in the 1960s in tandem with reinvigorated feminist movements, the popularization of ecology and neo-paganism and various non-asatru associated witchcraft and occult movements.

Another important node in the reification of the specter of earth was the work of the independent British scientist, James Ephraim Lovelock. During a joint venture with NASA to discover life on Mars, Lovelock conceived of what he called the Gaia¹⁶ Hypothesis, which postulated that a planet which contained life could be thought of as one, cohesive and self-regulating organism. First put forth in the 1960s, Lovelock's Gaia Hypothesis was elaborated upon in his 1974 paper, *Atmospheric homeostasis by and for the biosphere*¹⁷ and various, subsequent scientific and polemical papers and books. The Gaia Hypothesis, originally conceived of as a new way of modeling the planetary ecosystems, Lovelock took the concept well outside the bounds of the hard sciences when, in his paper, *Science and Christian Belief*, Vol. 4, No. 1, 29, he wrote, "Gaia is Mother Earth. Gaia is immortal. She is the source of life. She is certainly the mother of us all, including Jesus." Therefore it is starkly evident that Lovelock, whatever his initial conceptions, had come to believe the earth to be a literal feminine deity, possessed of vast intelligence, power and agency; sensitive to the workings of man and all the other organisms which take up residence beside, above, below, and within him. Thus, in Lovelock's schema, man is subsumed in the telos of "the world" and must readjust his workings in alignment with it or face *The Revenge of Gaia*¹⁸. Two decades after Lovelock's hypothesis took hold, numerous other earth-centric thinkers and movements began to percolate throughout the increasingly global zeitgeist. We must pause here to take the measure of the thing, the strange convergence of scientific modeling and neolithic mythology, which, we would postulate, might have emerged out of the isolating and uncommunal nature of scientific research; for instance, both Mellaart and Lovelock were academics, given over to isolation in pursuit of furthering their personal knowledge of their particular field of study. It would not be unreasonable to suppose that such habituations occasioned considerable loneliness given the obvious social dimension of the human animal.

New "green" forces, less mystical and considerably more political, began to arise seldom a decade after Lovelock's magnum opus. In the 1970s, the international NGO, Greenpeace, rose to prominence amidst the hippie furor of the 1960s, having no single founder or founders, the group organically coalesced around environmental concerns, gradually becoming both more influential and more radical in their beliefs and tactics. 1987 saw the publication of the book, *The Great Cosmic Mother: Rediscovering the Religion of the Earth*, wherein Monica Sjoo and Barbara Mor declared of the masculine,

"Perhaps the greatest harm patriarchy has done to us is to stifle, coopt, and deform our powers of imagination. Moralism, dualistic dogmas, repressive prohibitions block our imagination. Patriarchal religions keep this fusion from happening, imagination dies, and is

16 Gaia, or, Gaea, is a important primordial Greek deity who is the living embodiment of the earth.

17 Lovelock wrote the paper in co-authorship with the microbiologist Lynn Margulis. The paper was first published in *Tellus* XXVI, 1974.

18 *The Revenge of Gaia: Why the Earth is Fighting Back*, is a book published in 2006 that was written by Lovelock.

replaced by mechanical-linear thought patterns, i.e. indoctrination.”¹⁹

and in another section,

“The world’s definition of God is the self-definition of humanity. The Gods who rule us “from above” are simply mirrors in the sky, faithfully reflecting our own faces. The Gods who rule us ‘from within’ might represent deep truths of the mind and heart, or they might reflect the profound self-distortions of four millennia of ontological misperception. We do not know if a ‘God’ is a true God or a false God until we see what kind of world is created in that God’s image. When we look around today at the world generated by the male Gods of patriarchal rule, we see warfare, degradation, suffering, and sadism on a scale such as earth has never seen, nor will ever see again—for of course if we don’t end it, it will surely end us.”

and later,

“This is all very rudimentary, but once it has been set into motion as world machinery, every living thing on earth is entangled in its gears, all our functions become definitively embodied in its functions—and it’s very hard for those living inside the machinery to stop the machine, because our lives and all their ontological terms have come to depend on the ongoing machinery in all its terms.”²⁰

Thus, we can see, from the mists of prehistory to the present, a consistent familiarity of association; earth to mother, woman as creator and thus God(dess), feminine magicks stultified and routed by vile patriarchal will and the persistent disdain for the horrid masculinity of the machine. If we define *spirit* as that portion of the human mind which motivates, and if we define *the machine* as the concretization of *masculine will*, we can accurately define opposition to the machine as indicative of a *feminine spirit*.

Assignment of *The Feminine*²¹ to *The Earth*²² and *The Masculine*²³ to *that-which-is-machinic* is *not* to ascribe some intrinsic negative value to The Feminine, nor to ascribe some intrinsic positive value to The Masculine, *for the Masculine has also become subsumed into the specter as well*. Consider the work of the Marx-and-Kierkegaard-inspired Christian anarchist²⁴ and sociologist, Jacques Ellul, who, in his *The Technological Society* (henceforth referred to as *TTS*) lays out a broad and emotionally charged description of modern industrial society and elaborates on (and often decries) what he believes to be the principal flaw in the system:

19 Sjoo, Mor, *The Great Cosmic Mother*, p. 427

20 Sjoo, Mor, *Great Cosmic Mother*, p. 217 [PDF ver.]

21 We are here utilizing The Feminine to constitute the total set of all behaviors & appearances which are associated with the female sex.

22 Here we deploy ‘the earth’ as idealization rather than earth-as-is (earth as space-rock).

23 We are here utilizing The Masculine to constitute the total set of all behaviors & appearances which are associated with the male sex.

24 A Christian anarchist is one who believes that societal order must be reject given that God is the one and only authority. Ellul stated that he believed anarchism to be “an absolute rejection of violence” and the “most serious form of socialism.” Due this inclination, Ellul believed state power to be ‘the beast’ which was described in the *Book of Revelations*.

Technique. Ellul's *technique* is distinct from both its folk-psychological and scientific usages as it is, in brief: *a collection of mental processes which arose from the utilization of machines which is implicit in every aspect of society that works through men only to further efficiency of ordering.* Ellul describes technique in his own words as: "the totality of methods rationally arrived at and having absolute efficiency (for a given stage of development) in every field of human activity."²⁵

In the aforementioned work Ellul states, "It will not do for him [the reader] to challenge factual analysis on the basis of his own ethical or metaphysical presuppositions²⁶. The reader deserves and has my assurance that I have not set out to prove anything. I do not seek to show, say, that man is determined, or that technique is bad, or anything else of the kind." This is rather contrary to declarations he makes later on in the *TTS* which clearly show that he believes technique to be the very root of all the ills of modern (or postmodern), civilized society.

Furthermore, there is the issue of Ellul's peculiar and non-individuating sociological methodology which must be taken into account before further examinations can be made. He writes, "I do not deny the existence of individual action or of some inner sphere of freedom. I merely hold that these are not discernible at the most general level of analysis, and that the individual's acts or ideas do not here and now exert any influence on social, political, or economic mechanisms. By making this statement, I explicitly take a partisan position in a dispute between schools of sociology. To me the sociological does not consist of the addition and combination of individual actions. I believe that there is a collective sociological reality, which is independent of the individual."²⁷ This laying-out of methodology is instrumental in understanding all that follows (as well as in understanding Ellul's latter-day followers who we shall touch upon in later chapters) given that he never states as to *why* he believes this in any truly cogent way; it would have been immensely helpful to his case if he had made, at least some small effort to sketch out and concretize his methodology in his book. Speaking of this methodology, Ellul's "partisan position" relies on attuning his representations to but a single strata of analysis; that of *the crowd*. Yet, a crowd is nothing without its constituent parts; without the individuals which make it up. To say that a group can be a group without individuals is the same as saying that capitalism can exist without capitalists or that an army can fight without warriors. One need not eliminate the individual altogether in pursuit of a clear and concise method for broad-range analysis of social phenomena, yet Ellul does just that; indeed, he goes even further than the mere elimination of the individual and eliminates individuation altogether in strange outpouring of poetically vague dialectical materialism (which he likely took from Karl Marx who he noted as one of his principal inspirations). This is clearly demonstrated in the line "I believe that there is a collective sociological reality which is independent of the individual." What does this even mean? Ellul himself does not really say. It is one thing to say that there is a sociological reality which is *co-dependent* upon the individual, but it is rather another to say *that the individual contributes nothing to the crowd*. Ellul effectively postulates that there is some reality which simply emerges from the ether,

25 *The Technological Society*, xxv.

26 Echoing the concept of 'false consciousness.'

27 *The Technological Society*, xxix.

unmoored from any given individual, solely existing upon, but separate from, any given group; this essentially positing *technique* as a self-replicating emergent process borne, not of consciousness, but of the machine. If you should be skeptical of the veracity of our assessment so far, if one is of the mind that Ellul could not possibly have believed that a human conception was created by machines, consider the following, “-let the machine have its head, and it topples everything that cannot support its enormous weight. Thus everything had to be reconsidered in terms of the machine. And that is precisely the role technique plays. In all fields it made an inventory of what it could use, of everything that could be brought into line with the machine. The machine could not integrate itself into nineteenth century society; technique integrated it. Old houses that were not suited to the workers were torn down; and the new world technique required was built in their place. Technique has enough of the mechanical in its nature to enable it to cope with the machine, but it surpasses and transcends the machine because it remains in close touch with the human order. The metal monster could not go on forever torturing mankind. It found in technique a rule as hard and inflexible as itself. Technique integrates the machine into society, It constructs the kind of world the machine needs and introduces order where the incoherent banging of machinery heaped up ruins. It clarifies, arranges, and rationalizes; it does in the domain of the abstract what the machine did in the domain of labor. It is efficient and brings efficiency to everything. Moreover, technique is sparing in the use of the machine, which has traditionally been exploited to conceal defects of organization. "Machines sanctioned social inefficiency," says Mumford²⁸. Technique, on the other hand, leads to a more rational and less indiscriminate use of machines. It places machines exactly where they ought to be and requires of them just what they ought to do.”

Here we come to the crux of the issue; when Ellul writes that “it [technique] places machines exactly where they ought to be and requires of them just what they ought to do” he is saying that technique itself is controlling machines! Technique has requirements of machines? To place this argument, this bizarre claim, into a concrete and real-world context, it would be analogous to saying that chrioscuro controlled a paintbrush which, in turn, controlled a painter. Now a painter might well adopt different techniques based upon different kinds of brushes but it means absolutely nothing at all to say that such techniques are controlling those instruments which are, in turn, controlling the aforementioned painter. The most you could say is that the painter is constrained by the techniques available for the design, manufacturing and dissemination of his instruments as well as by the number and variations of brushes available to him. To conflate acting and constraint, will and pure conditions of possibility is to render all as agents, which is to eliminate the world of man when man himself, as such, is the object which Ellul wishes to safeguard (even if it is from his own devices).

This methodological quandary, this profound anthropomorphization, then, cannot help but lead our erstwhile hand-wringer astray as he is looking at machines as agents who created yet another agent – technique – which then proceeded to overtake it's creator and rule over mankind like some kind of conjured demon. Somewhat later Ellul writes, “It is said (and

28 Here Ellul references the American historian and sociologist, Lewis Mumford.

everyone agrees) that the machine has created an inhuman atmosphere.”²⁹ No context is provided for this, it is merely asserted that everyone already agrees with him, well, let us politely disagree, for the machine is, in brief summary, the tool for the transformation of the world in the image of man himself. Later still he let's further cats out of the bag and exposes the whole of his game, “Think of our dehumanized factories, our unsatisfied senses, our working women, our estrangement from nature. Life in such an environment has no meaning.”³⁰ Like as not you saw this coming. It was only a matter of time before “nature” reared it's ugly head! How woesomely predictable! How dreadfully tiresome to ever wear these shackles of naturality! Whilst Ellul, in his rambling and effete introduction to *TTS*, goes to great lengths to assure the reader that it is not his intention to prove or even make a point, insisting that the text is merely a sociological survey which is meant to awaken the sleeping, yet what then is with all this talk of *dehumanization* and *estrangement from nature*? He goes so far as to refer to industrialized society as a “metal monster” - such an emotion-laden pronouncements and references can hardly be described as merely descriptive, quite the contrary. In the text we also witness a integral feature of *the specter* – the enclosure of the future. Given that *the specter* is conceived of as that which is eternally commensurate with the design of the earth, the field of possibility is intensely and rationally whittled away with ever increasing regularity. In defense of The Earth or Nature or The Natural, its defenders must always hew away at man's potential, his will must be tempered, his creativity must be tamped down, his innovations, discarded, and so on and so on until every future project which is not ratified as aligned with the “needs” of Gaia are declared verboten. Yet, the natural is not given, it has no intrinsic qualia (least not that can in anywise be discerned – and that is a crucial thing), no externality beyond the mental landscape where it has grown and grown and now looms titanic, overshadowing and threatening to interred all futurity by hemming man into one and only one modality of being: concordance with “the planet.”

If the cult of The Mother Goddess (qua Sjoo & Mor³¹) defines the promise of the specter (earthly paradise); Ellul's anthropomorphic *technique* acts as a ancillary theology that defines the reasons why one should move away from the-world-of-man (human creation and construction) and instead retreat into the mists of prehistory, for, in those swirling depths, the “metal monster” holds no sway. Ellul errs in that in any endeavor, where a technique is found wanting, inferior to some challenge, the solution is not the decimation of technique-as-such, but rather, *superior technique*.

In closing, it is important to preempt a likely line of criticism, that of conflating *the specter* with Ellul's *technique*. Technique, is fundamentally anthropomorphic (and well covered above) whereas the *specter of earth* is no such thing, rather, it is the recognition, the bracketing, of all misattributed anthropomorphisms which are transposed from the mind of man unto the face of all the earth. Here we have seized the thread, here we understand the opposition and here we declare that nature as enclosure of the future must be changed or, failing that, destroyed. For the conceptual invariably informs the performative.

29 *The Technological Society*, p. 4

30 *Ibid.*, p. 5

31 Authors of the anthropological and religious text, *Great Cosmic Mother*.

The realization of the trend-association between The Feminine, The Masculine and The Earth³², from prehistory to (post)modernity, is important in so far as it stands in opposition to synthetic union of the two (male and female) and vice-versa, for no stable and self-improving social ordering (if that is to be the project) can be achieved in the midst of such an eventuality. Thus, a firm understanding of such concepts will allow those who are so inclined to shape the synthesis of these battered, archaic and spectral excogitations.

The Feminine and The Masculine aspects of the manifest image which we have hitherto excavated should not be thought of as mere aesthetic conventions but rather as mutably valid descriptor-encapsulations; that is to say, non-static and continuously modulated aggregations of normative gender behavior. Thomas Haigh's *Masculinity and Machine Man: Gender in the History of Data Processing*³³ here is useful for the purposes of reifying the validity of our basic conceptual structure. It is a widely held belief that women are rarely to be found within STEM³⁴ work due to the instantiation of exclusionary norms initiated by the western, largely white and Christian patriarchal monastic system upon which modern universities are based³⁵; whilst there is some truth to this, such a schema can not account in the slightest for gender parceling in science work which has risen up outside of the university system (nor can it account for any other field of work which arose outside of the monastic influence, either past or present). One science field which is not deeply tied to the university system is data processing. In *Masculinity and Machine Man*, Haigh illustrates the fact that women were present but scarce in STEM computing fields since the inception of the field, citing a 1960 survey conducted by *Business Automation* which looked at 500 data processing company's and discovered that out of that number only two companies had female managers and only one company reported a female as a programming supervisor. Slightly under 15% of all programmers in the survey were women. Structural reasons account for the mass of male labor in the field, given that both forerunning fields to administrative programming – punched card operation and system analysis – were staffed primarily by men; hence, a preexisting gender surplus. Yet, the fact that there are so few women in STEM cannot be adequately explained by only looking to one environmental factor in one particular field at one particular time, especially since women have, in more recent decades, proceeding the 60s, been highly encouraged and incentivized to take up positions in the sciences which were primarily the domain of men. Though the body of research on this issue is vast, much of it ignores potential or realized biological inclinations as a possible reason why, though roughly equally present in high-school science classes, women tend to pursue STEM majors in significantly lower numbers than their male counterparts³⁶. As a general rule, women tend towards people-oriented fields whilst men tend towards mechanically-oriented fields; this is clearly a biological impulse with a number of evolutionary advantages but it is upon the issue of biology that many past and contemporary scholars falter. The aforementioned Mr. Haigh,

32 Here deployed as concept, not “as is.”

33 Chapter for 'Gender Codes,' ed. Tom Misa, IEEE Press, 2010.

34 STEM stands for: Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics.

35 Some worshipers of the Mother Goddess believe that neolithic societies were completely gender-egalitarian due in part or whole to the nature of their religion. Due this belief, they thus look to such societies as models for the future.

36 Catherine Hill, et al., Why So Few? Women In Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics, p. xiv

for instance, only looks to environmental explanations (pay differentials, gender discrimination due to traditionalist attitudes, ego-spatial issues, corporate culture, etc) to account for why so few women in the 60s were to be found in elevated positions within the field of data processing.

For females on the plains of our ancestors, a proclivity towards people-orientation would be required for child-rearing and the mitigation of inter-tribal strife (proto-counseling); for males, a proclivity towards machinic invention would invariably aid the development of hunting, defense, warfare, foraging and domicile construction techniques. Then there is the matter of childbirth; women can get pregnant, men cannot, thus, in so far as a given population has sexual intermingling there will always be coupling and thus pregnancy and thus less women in the workforce, as they will need to take time off to have and care for their nestlings. Before proceeding we must deal with the false binary commonly referred to as “nature vs. nurture” when both attributions are part of a more complex whole; that is, genes express themselves differently in disparate environments³⁷ (hence, race and along great timescales, species), but do not markedly differ along short-timescales. Consider the famous study of mono-zygotic identical twins Harold and Bernard Shapiro, both of whom went on to become the heads of major universities, Princeton for former and McGill for the latter³⁸. Then there is the case of Ann Landers and Abigail Van Buren; not only did both take up careers in newspapers, both specialized as advice columnists and bore remarkably similar political opinions³⁹. Why these cases are so compelling for the purposes of demonstrating the centrality of the composition of the organism is through the fact that mono-zygotic twins are those who developed out of a single sperm which fertilized a single egg, which means they share the same genetic makeup. We shall not belabor the point; the biological expresses itself in tandem with its environment but the biological is the locus of any and all changes which can conceivably take place, whether it is expressed or not. Those who would contest this conclusion can only do so by spuriously transcending the mind (or biology generally), by reconceptualizing the human brain and its production (thought) as something nebulous which is, at most, only tangential to the organ.

Machines are the generative nexus for the multiplication of brutishness. This is not to aver a negative character to that which is brutish but rather to affirm that those who can most successfully multiply such raw power will always maintain an advantage in those applicable spheres over those who can not provided it is intelligently cultivated, managed and applied.

37 For further reading on this subject see, Garland Science, Chapter 8, Control of Gene Expression.

38 *Twin Studies: What Can They Tell Us About Nature & Nurture*. p. 1

39 *Ibid.*, p. 1

(a.2) Death of the Specter | Man, Reborn

“Nature doesn’t give us a stable, safe climate that we make dangerous. It gives us an ever-changing, dangerous climate that we need to make safe.”

-Alex Epstein

We have hitherto concretized *the specter of earth*; recognizing it as that aggregation of views which subtend the view that man has separated himself from nature (Sjoo's patriarchy, the abandonment of nature, the nurturing mother, the earth goddess) and has thus – through horrific machinations (Ellul's *technique*) - become nothing but a virus, crawling out upon the face of all the world, mindlessly consuming and destroying; endlessly; pointlessly. Forever unsated. It is the summation of all beliefs that posit man-as-locust, a ceaselessly rapacious being which has, through the acquisition of forbidden knowledge and its ruthless implementation, cut himself off from some predetermined essence; the key, according to the cultists of the earth, to right and proper being (harmonic accord with some idealization of “nature”). We, however, recognize this idea for what it really is, anti-human philosophy and nothing else besides. But why should philosophy even be utilized for the advancement of humanity in any wise? In section a.1 we posed the question: “Should Man continue the process of reifying his immanence, thus synthesizing the manifest and scientific images. Or should he do away with one or the other? Or should he cease and desist altogether?” The answer to the question lies in a sound understanding of whether or not one cares for all that one can conceivably care for within and of oneself, first and foremost. The answer, in short, is to be found in one's standard of evaluation, one's hierarchy of values (elseways there can be no *values* but only *a value*); that is, to interrogate the placement of humanity (or some portion thereof) as the highest value, or, the placement of some other notion as the highest standard, such as some neo-platonic notion of “the good,” or “god,” or “the goddess” or, “nature.” Ellul's declaration that, “Life in such an environment [technological society] has no meaning,”⁴⁰ is symptomatic of his belief that all meaning can only come from god who made the natural world, thus, man's dominion over nature (in effect, over god) is somehow “unnatural” and thus, meaningless, or worse, evil. This is a consequence of his hierarchy of values; which, it needs to be said, everyone implicitly possesses (for instance, everywhere is wanton and ceaseless slaughter condemned⁴¹), whether they are aware of it or not. The task of making such *implicit* values *explicit* is a useful one, given that a proper cognizance of one's values thus allows one to re-evaluate them. Failing this, one will be, by and large, at the mercy of his passions, his drives and the passions and drives of the crowd and the cognized philosophies of those that conduct them. Upon reflection it is clear that one must hold *some* value(s), for even the most contrarian of philosophical systems of non-evaluation require it. For instance, nihilism is widely considered to be the greatest expression of negation, but this position is not actually one which can be logically held, for in declaring that everything is

40 Ellul, *The Technological Society*, p. 5

41 “Wanton” and “ceaseless” here meaning those instances which are wanton and ceaseless to those particular societies wherein such instances occur. Clarification is here required given that what is deemed taboo to a westerner may not be to an easterner, what is unacceptable to do to a dog in the United States, for further instance, is very different than what is unacceptable to do to a dog in China.

meaningless one is also, simultaneously, declaring that that very proclamation is itself *meaningful*, as the statement “everything is meaningless” *is itself a statement of meaning*. This is true of many such positions which attempt near or total value-negation; for instance, total relativism, just as with nihilism, is not a position which can be logically held due to the fact that the statement “everything is relative,” *is, itself, a non-relativistic statement*. One could continue on at length but the picture is well and clear enough. Thus, if meaning is inescapable it is merely a question of where best to allocate such meaning (the allocation of meaning being the basis of value). If a man is to allocate, at the first, significance towards anything other than survival of the organism and its propagation, then he has made a grievous mistake and is likely not long for this world, for it is survival of the organism which must, of necessity, take precedence over all other values for any other values to, of necessity, be at all possible, for the dead are afforded no valuations of their own. This axiom bares no circumnavigation, for if no humans were to exist, no value (at least no human generated value) would – or even could – exist. What, after all, would it mean to say that a world which consisted of nothing but hydrogen sealed within a radiation filled vacuum had value or meaning? What would it have meaning *to*? If a given thing is to have meaning it must, minimally, be meaningful *to some thing*. There are no values without a valuer. Therefore, a world without something(s) which could establish realization(s) (thus implying qualia) would be unable to initiate intrinsic valuation and thus would also be barred from creating extrinsic, normative conceptions of value-relation (to themselves or other things), hence, meaning-as-such would be rendered impossible. Therefore, meaning-as-such, can only be found in the (self)relational dynamics of qualitative entities (organic or otherwise). The originary grounding of being then can only be found in, not consciousness itself, *but in sufficiently complex⁴² consciousness which is capable of realizing itself as conscious*. Given that humans are the only animals who we can be certain are conscious of their consciousness (due the fact we possess it), anthropocentrism must be taken up and vigorously defended against the agrestic advances of the anti-humans⁴³ if there is to be any valuation at all; which is to say, *if the organism is to survive*. Thus, if one's highest value or values are contained within survival then one is also for the promulgation and spread of humanity (or some portion thereof) for that, as well, is part of survival, as the concept is not one whose interests are confined solely to the present. The application and continuation of meaning into the future then, is the ratification of those actions at a latter point in time. To further this end, to solidify this value, then, we posit the project of *reifying anthropocentric immanence⁴⁴*. We reject and decry those who should attempt to sabotage this project by pathetic appeals to “nature” or some deity or deities. They are the whining baggage of a desiccated age that has passed them by. Away with all of them. We, in contrast, affirm that unity subordinated by intelligence and its direction of theoretical exploration towards practical application, is the basis of all earthly power which man has hitherto achieved and that this is a laudable undertaking but that its magnification and ultimate terminus is to be found in the consolidation of celestial, rather than merely earthly,

42 This term is meant to denote the minimum level or levels of cognition required to form concepts of meaning.

43 We stress 'anti-human' as opposed to 'post-human' as those are not necessarily in opposition to man, though they are both opposed to man-as-is, though not, man-as-such; man, after all, is an idealization (ie. “be a man!” - “man up!”), a goal; not to be conflated with 'humanity.'

44 The word *immanence* means, some presence which is manifested in, and encompassing of, the material world. We utilize this word to distinguish our project from that of transcendent philosophy which, at base, always seeks to flee the word.

power. We affirm that we do not exist for the earth, but that the earth exists and thus is to be used or discarded or destroyed should we so declare. Our whim alone decides its fate. We affirm that there is no harmonic accord to be found within the natural order of things in relation to the dynamics of species on the whole; it matters not how many times one fawns and praises and aids a centipede, it will, given sufficient proximity, bite one all the same; it will tear into one's flesh with its terrible mandibles without hesitation, without empathy and, were it of comparable size to a man, think nothing of tearing one's head free of the rest of the body, swallowing it and ripping open the abdominal cavity to better sup upon the marrow. One may bow at the altar of the willowy wood or the babbling brook with ceaseless adoration, it matters not to the yellow-fanged and dark-shrouded denizens of the former and the slithering, parasitic assassins of the latter. Be not seduced, there is seldom any living organism which will hesitate to slaughter and devour if a sufficiently exigent situation arises. It has been said that dogs are "man's best friend," yet this friendship is so tenuous that it is discarded the moment that pangs of hunger echo throughout the quadruped's gullet. Were one to fall ill before their pet-dog and that pet was sufficiently hungry, it would think nothing of sinking its fangs into the face of its former master and devouring rending his flesh and basking in blood.

Man, the whole of nature turns against you! Know this and rejoice! For what do you owe the *holos*? "You owe it all," says the envirocrat, that slavish whipping boy of the specter, "and, given our safeguarding thereof, you owe us likewise, we the heralds of the new law!" Our reply: We owe nothing to the savage, ceaseless vortex, to the endless, gnawing void; we owe our allegiance only to all who share our dream of overcoming and suborning it in totality.

Despite the elucidation of such realizations, the opinion of man-as-locust is – and likely will remain – a common one. Consider the words of research biologist for the National Park Service, David M. Graber, who, in his *Los Angeles Times* review of *The End of Nature*, a book by the American environmentalist, Bill McKibben, describes mankind as "a plague." Graber begins his piece ominously, "If you feel a wrench in the gut when both American and Soviet astronauts remark that from their space perches the Earth today appears pockmarked with deforestation, dulled by smoke and everywhere marred by human activity-"⁴⁵

That last portion is really quite revealing about Graber's rabid, anti-human attitudes. "Marred by human activity." Marred? What of all the activity of the ants or the beavers? Both species are possessed of those destructive and constructive elements inherent to humanity at large; both take from their constitutive environments all that is necessary to build their domiciles – the ant-hill and the beaver-dam – because it services *them*. Yet to the envirocrat, such deconstructive/reconstructive processes are not decried, not even remarked upon; it is not to be supposed that they do not object due to the scale (though the crucial issue should be principality), for there are many examples of ecologically transformative species who are far more numerous than human-kind. Beetles, which account for approximately 40% of all known and cataloged arthropod species, can be incredibly destructive to many inhabitants of their local environments. Take, for instance, the Mountain Pine Beetle (*Dendroctonus ponderosae*), small and black they burrow into and hollow out trees, dispensing fungus which, given time,

45 Graber, *Mother Nature as a Hothouse Flower*, p. 1

degrade and ultimately kills the occupied ligneous plants. According to the science-writer, Daniel Strain, the Mountain Pine Beetle has been responsible for the destruction of 13 million hectares⁴⁶ of forest in British Canada in the past decade⁴⁷. Every year this voracious little creature decimates 16,000 hectares of mature timber in the Kamloops of Canada alone, the primary victim being lodgepole pine, though, where it can, it will also invade and destroy *poderosa*, whitebark pines and western white pines⁴⁸. The FIDS annual report with ancillary MOF data for the Kamloops region shows that from 1987 to 2000 tree mortality rates incurred by the beetles has remained relatively consistent, sometimes falling slightly lower than average (1990, 6000 trees destroyed) and sometimes rising much higher than average (1999, 30, 700 trees destroyed). The timber loss effectuated by the pine beetles invariably proceeds to effect the entire ecology, often having profound effects upon fisheries due to the change-ups in the watershed brought about by the destruction of so many trees. This type of ecological transformation might be bad for the fish and other wildlife which rely on particularities of water-flow, but it is certainly in the interest of the pine beetles and those creatures that have formed parasitic and symbiotic relationships with them, who, through the construction of bore-tunnels, create what are referred to as brood galleries, elaborate tunnel-systems which are made within the phloem tissue of a given pine which are so distinctive that they can be used to differentiate the work of *Dendroctonus ponderosae* from various other types of wood-boring beetles, such as the *Ips pini* (whose tunnel architecture is considerably less daedal). Yet one is very, very unlikely to hear – with any regularity – environmentalists calling these beetles “a plague.” Why? The answer is either that such green-dreaming meliorists are not familiar with *D. ponderosae* or they are familiar with them but they simply consider the actions of the beetle to be “natural” and thus “good” (in contrast to Man who is “unnatural” and thus “bad” - a popular and enduring dogma borne out of the tradition of the specter).

Later in his piece, after quoting a tract by McKibben⁴⁹ bemoaning man's self-imposed separation from the “sweet and wild garden” of nature, Graber notes, “McKibben is saying that we have crossed some invisible line in our relationship with the Earth⁵⁰. For better or worse, we now are living on a man-made planet⁵¹. Until anthropogenic global warming, the changes we wrought on the landscape were local, however grand. Whether we hunted and fished, cleared land and farmed it, or built cities, planetary forces continued to operate as they always had. The seasons, the wind and rain, the sunlight operated beyond the scope of human meddling. If, God willing, a tract of land was abandoned, nature reclaimed it. Nature was boss.”

If here “nature” is meant to mean “all that is” or “all that can be perceived” then it is pertinent to remind Graber and McKibben that Man is a part of it. But the fact that he writes “nature

46 A hectare is a measurement of area equivalent to 2.47 acres or 100 ares. For further context, 1 sq. mile = 259.0 hectares.

47 Daniel Strain, *Climate Change Sends Beetles into Overdrive*, Science (journal), 2012.

48 Furniss and Caroline, 1980.

49 McKibben is from Vermont. Explains much.

50 The fact that McKibben states the line which has been crossed is “invisible” implies that he doesn't really know what “the line” even is, else he'd be able to articulate it.

51 Good! Would McKibben and Graber prefer a solely Cheetah-made planet or perhaps a ant-made planet?

reclaimed it” gives us pause, surely, by his usage of “nature” he is not referring to “all that is” but rather to “all that is outside of the immediate purview of man on the planet” (in essence, the wilderness). In one of the most ridiculous passages in Graber's review, he notes, “Our growing skill at genetic manipulation may enable us to tailor the life forms we wish to survive our altered planet. 'What will it mean to come across a rabbit in the woods, once genetically engineered *rabbits* are widespread? Why would we have any more reverence or affection for such a rabbit than we would for a *Coke bottle*?⁵²” At the first, we can readily remark that a Coke bottle differs from a rabbit in several important factors, the first and most stark of those factors is that a Coke bottle is not alive, it can not feel pleasure or pain, or indeed, anything at all. A piece of plastic is not cognizant of itself, thus there is no reason to have any concern whatsoever about the Coke bottle whereas there is reason for concern for the rabbit due to the fact that humans intrinsically understand that rabbits are alive and are sufficiently cognizant to exhibit behavioral characteristics which we recognize in ourselves. Fear, for instance, being chief among these emotions (like many other small mammals, rabbits can literally be spooked to death). Furthermore, one must take into consideration precisely *how* the rabbit has been genetically engineered; this is crucial, for the value of the rabbit is extrinsic (since we cannot evaluate the rabbit on it's own terms), thus, the nature of the changes wrought upon it are not trivial. If, for instance, these hypothetical rabbits had been modified such that their strength was bolstered to better pull sleds loaded with human goods, their extrinsic value would be markedly improved over that of the common rabbit. Whereas, if the engineering made the rabbits rabid and violent, their value would be lowered, as they would become a potentially dangerous pest to human beings (principally via disease transmission). But to Graber and other envirocrats who think like him, to evaluate how other species in our ecosystems actually effect us is irrelevant and to evaluate them in such a fashion is not just bad, but somehow vile.

In his next paragraph, Graber gets rather conceptually messy, “Books like this [McKibben's] are supposed to end with an escape hatch. If we should all agree to use less energy and pollute less and . . . and then nature will survive. But as McKibben points out, it is too late. Global warming is already entrained; we are in for the ride, ready or not, and so are our innocent fellow travelers. Of course, as bad as things are, we always can make them worse. Nature may be finished, but there is still our own goose to cook. The climate will continue to heat until we sharply curtail the production of carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases. Barring cold fusion or other nonexistent technologies, that requires a "reversal--not a cessation" of industrial growth.”⁵³

Graber's ending paragraphs are the most disturbing, “That makes what is happening no less tragic for those of us who *value wildness for its own sake*⁵⁴, not for what value it confers upon mankind. I, for one, cannot wish upon either my children or the rest of Earth's biota a tame planet, a human-managed planet, be it monstrous or--however unlikely--benign. McKibben is a biocentrist, and so am I. We are not interested in the utility of a particular species, or free-flowing river, or ecosystem, to mankind. They have intrinsic value, more value--to me--than

52 Italicization my own.

53 Graber, *Mother Nature as a Hothouse Flower*, p.1

54 Italicization mine. A rather telling line.

another human body, or a billion of them.”

This is really quite something! It's pure Singerism through and through. He lays out quite plainly and concisely that he does not believe that neither he nor McKibben care very much at all about “another human body or a billion of them.” If we are to take Graber at his word (and there is no reason not to) then he clearly believes that he, you, reading this now, and indeed the whole population of the United States of America is no more valuable than the ecosystem of a small tributary in Missouri. He continues,

“Human happiness, and certainly human fecundity, are not as important as a wild and healthy planet. I know social scientists who remind me that people are part of nature, but it isn't true⁵⁵. Somewhere along the line--at about a billion years ago, maybe half that--we quit the contract and became a cancer. We have become a plague upon ourselves and upon the Earth. It is cosmically unlikely that the developed world will choose to end its orgy of fossil-energy consumption, and the Third World its suicidal consumption of landscape. Until such time as *Homo sapiens* should decide to rejoin nature, some of us can only hope for the right virus to come along.”⁵⁶

Up until this last line, one might have reasonably assumed that Graber meant well, but he reveals here that he means anything but; when he writes that “some of us” should hope for “the right virus to come along” he is taking a decidedly genocidal stance, however fanciful. What a disgusting thing to wish for. If one did not know anything of Graber's philosophy one might think him mad. Both McKibben and Graber display a very odd kind of overactive empathy which, if taken seriously enough to be acted upon, would mean the deaths of millions, possibly billions, of people given that their plan for deindustrialization would be worse – far worse – than all-out nuclear war between Russia and America. Then there is the muddiness of it all, the self-defeating ambiguity; for instance, what is it that he means when he writes that “until such time as *Homo sapiens* should decide to rejoin nature”? What does *rejoining nature* entail, precisely? Deindustrialization and the cessation of any and all reliable forms of energy is certainly a part of this vague, propositional process, but, in detail, what would it mean to 'rejoin nature'? How have we been removed therefrom? Graber does not give us answers to these questions and neither does McKibben, both only mouth blackened doomsayings and anti-human propaganda.

What is further important to note is that Graber and McKibben are in no wise peculiar in this regard, indeed, what is truly disturbing (or rather, what should be) is the fact that these ideas have so permeated the membrane of public discourse in almost every industrial western society that they no longer elicit a sustained, negative response. To elaborate, consider a scenario wherein a public intellectual declares that he hopes “the right virus” comes along for any reason *other* than climate change or some similar eco-catastrophe; there would be an immediate public outcry! “What is the matter with that guy?” The crowd would mouth and type with frenetic concern, “Is he crazy?” Yet, curiously, when a public intellectual makes it known that he hopes some millions or billions of people die in a catastrophe, it is considered not just

55 We're supernatural apparently!

56 Ibid., p.2

permissible but noble if such a insane statement is made in defense of “nature.”

This is the power of the specter.

*

The specter seems to owe allegiance to neither the political left or right, to neither the rich nor the poor, to neither the faithful nor the skeptical, to neither the intelligent nor the mentally lame. Further complicating the issue is the fact that the envirocrats who worship the specter – most of whom, it should be said, are fine and upstanding people – are not principally driven by *logos*, but by *pathos*. This pathos isn't just reactive, but idealized and speculative, which makes it all the more stubborn and potentially dangerous (as it is the difference between systematizing a random expulsion and rationally directing a construct). For example, one of the envirocrats favorite issues is climate change. What is important to disentangle is not whether or not climate change is real (the climate is and always has been changing) but rather, whether or not the climate change which is occurring will be – or has become – catastrophic. That is to inquire: How precisely is the climate changing and what will be the effects? What constitutes catastrophe? Here framework is crucial, for the lack of a rigorous structure for how to think about any given issue will invariably lead to unrigorous conclusions.

Unrigorous conclusions are starkly evidenced by envirocrats, who, often regardless of the evidence in a given situation, advocate that human activity has caused, and is causing, one of three particular eventualities: catastrophic resource scarcity (from say, overpopulation), mass and devastating pollution (from factories, mines and energy production facilities) and, the mainstay, disastrous climate change (which is generally ascribed to CO2 emissions). All of these eventualities merge and blend into one another and are often grouped under the blandly melodramatic heading of those set of actions which are “killing the planet.” Putting aside literal claims of a “dying planet” (which doesn't really mean anything and, again, places “the planet” - a vague anthropomorphization – over humanity or some portion thereof), issues of desertification, flora and fauna dissipation and pollution of bodies of water are all important issues but what one should also take pains to examine is whether or not such claims are actually true and, if so, to what extent.

Resource depletion

Let us tackle the first issue: resource depletion. This issue is somewhat vexed due to problems inherent in the language that is used to describe it; one of the most problematic of these pieces of language is contained within the phrase “natural resources” which is generally taken to mean something or things which exists independent of man but that can also be plucked from that natural spot wherein it lays to further some end. Apples, for instance, would fulfill this definition. But oil or coal bare very little similarities to an apple as they are not “given” but made. “Natural resources” is a vexed phrase due to the fact that everything which exists, whether wild apples or compressed hydrocarbons, require work to acquire. In the wilderness, *nothing is given, everything is acquired*, which is to say, *labored for*. One does not

simply move out over an oil field and scoop the black stuff from off the ground into a bucket⁵⁷, rather, one must drill, drain, remove, contain, refine (typically via fractional distillation or chemical processing), treat, combine and transport the fuel. Every step of this process requires some form of labor, whether man-powered or machine-powered, and this takes further energy, but more crucially, ingenuity. This is to say that the hydrocarbons laying in the ground are completely useless (to humans) until someone figures out how to utilize them. *They are not a resource until we make them one.*

In 1595, the lauded English explorer, Sir Walter Raleigh⁵⁸ – with the help of some natives – discovered⁵⁹ the Pitch Lake of Trinidad⁶⁰. The Pitch Lake contained around 10 million tons of bitumen (asphalt⁶¹) which could be distilled into kerosene⁶², however, no one had yet developed a method for the process of fractional distillation⁶³ which would allow for the extraction of kerosene from petroleum and thus the Pitch Lake was rendered useless as a fuel source (though Raleigh was able to utilize the tar to fix his ship). In the absence of a distillation process (and a technique to utilize it) black goo in the ground was just that and very little more. Until it wasn't. Until men *made it* a resource. Thus, the transmogrification of *raw material to resource* is limited only by ingenuity and the means to implement the innovative processes which arise because of it. Thus, there is, in theory, really no such thing as even the potential for “natural” (wild) resource depletion (given that energy is contained within everything). There is no natural resource scarcity but *a scarcity of human innovation.*

Pollution

To tackle the second issue, that of pollution, we must begin by stating at the outset the glaringly obvious fact that conversations surrounding this issue are almost entirely one-sided; with the dominant view being that the aggregate effects of industrialized human impact are “polluting the planet” or, more vaguely, “killing the planet.” Several things need to be said about this, the first of which is that phrases such as “polluting the planet” are nebulous; in the case of pollution it is more useful to examine the by-product or by-products of a particular form of energy-production and then critically examine their effects in the broadest possible ecological context, given that every form of energy-production has *some* kind of by-product which could be described as “pollution.” Even the most “nature friendly” of fuel sources, the primordial bonfire – so oft depicted in quaint and idyllic scenes of romantic media – releases smoke up into the atmosphere and could be, if it was set up within confined spaces, inhaled to the detriment of one's health or the health of some allotment of other potentially effected organisms.

57 Settled ground oil – or, bubbling crude – is a naturally occurring phenomenon but it is so rare as to be unreliable and even were it reliable one would still have to process the oil before utilizing it.

58 Sir Walter Raleigh was a English spy, man-of-letters & explorer who popularized tobacco in his homeland.

59 The natives knew well of the lake. “Discovered” here means, “The English discovered.”

60 See, Paul R. Sellin, *Treasure, Treason and the Tower: El Dorado & The Murder of Sir Walter Raleigh*. 2011.

61 A black, semi-solid form of petroleum. Also referred to less commonly as asphaltum. Popular in waterproof roofing.

62 Kerosene is a combustible liquid-hydrocarbon which can be created from petroleum widely used as jet fuel.

63 Fractional distillation is a old technique for the separation of useful hydrocarbons from crude oil which involves heating the crude substance to boiling point & then collecting the differential vapors (which are referred to as 'fractions').

Thus, it is not enough to talk of pollution-as-such, rather, to be clear-headed on this issue, we must look to the particular *kinds* of pollution, *their effects* and *the acceptable and unacceptable thresholds* thereof. The first and most obvious negative pollution threshold would be any kind of by-product which reliably ended human life within human settlements; mass quantities of ceaseless bonfire smoke, for instance, in tightly confined and poorly filtered areas, would clearly be beyond the bounds of threshold acceptability as it would, given sufficient time, cause all of the inhabitants to suffocate from cerebral hypoxia⁶⁴. However, if there was a by-product caused by some energy production facility or machine that was unpleasant but considerably mild, one might judge the “pollution” to be worth it (as is the case for many with car exhaust). Thus, in summary, the correct way of viewing pollution is not whether or not there is any at all, but rather, by the amount of by-product produced via a given venture worth the venture itself.

Anthropogenic Catastrophic Climate Change

“The claim of man-made global warming represents the descent of science from the pursuit of truth into politicized propaganda. The fact that it is endorsed by the top scientist in the British government shows how deep this rot has gone.”

-Melanie Phillips, Daily Mail, 12 January 2004.

Unlike the relatively simple (at least conceptually) issues of pollution and resource depletion, climate change is a considerably more complicated issue. At the outset it must be stated that the history of discursive modalities surrounding this intensely politicized subject are fraught with difficulties; those who believe humans are bringing about the end of the world through climate change have a tendency to declare that any who challenge their claims are “climate deniers.” Such a ridiculous phrase must be promptly rebuffed; obviously climate is real. One would be quite hard-pressed to find a man or woman living with a fully functional brain who truly believed that the climate was an utter fiction. But then, the phrase is never actually meant literally (which itself is unfortunate). What is actually entailed in the phrase “climate denier” is denial of a certain kind of climate change, not the climate changing as-such. The climate is obviously and observably changing, indeed, it changes every season, from warm to mild to cold and back once more to warmth and all that is gold and green and skittering. The crucial questions to be answered are what is the degree of climate change and is this change dangerous to mankind and, if it is determined that such changes are dangerous to mankind, what can and should be done about them? For example, every winter, one realizes the dangers posed to the human organism by frostbite and, to gird against it, one deploys additional heating within one's domicile and without, one dons furs and gloves and all manner of coating to protect against the elements. This is a reasonable approach to climate change, however, the climate catastrophists are not quite so sanguine.

For example: During the 1960s and 1970s, the world witnessed a surge in claims of

⁶⁴ Condition characterized by the complete oxygen deprivation of the brain.

impending catastrophic climate change. To give a brisk listing:

- i. 1970, Kenneth E. Watt, noted ecologist of the University of California claimed that the global mean temperature would drop four degrees by 1990 and 11 degrees by 2000. He claimed this change would bring about another ice age.⁶⁵
- ii. Earth Day, 1970, Harvard biologist George Wald declared that civilization would come to an end in “15 to 30” years, barring “immediate action.”⁶⁶
- iii. 1970, May Bethel publishes *How To Live In Our Polluted World*. Upon the very first paragraph of the very first page she writes, “It is impossible to isolate ourselves entirely from this menace of civilization.”⁶⁷
- iv. 1971, Paul Ehrlich, ecologist of Stanford University prognosticated that by the year 2000 the UK would be utterly decimated and fragmented by famine as a consequence of anthropogenic “global cooling,” he further went on to say that were he a betting man he would put money on Britain not existing by the year 2000.
- v. 1971, John Paul Holdren and Paul Ehrlich wrote the 6th chapter for *Global Ecology: Readings Towards a Rational Strategy for Man* wherein they claimed that human activity, such as jet exhaust, pollution, drainage and so forth, would bring about a new ice age. Holdren would go on to become the “science czar” to the Obama Administration.
- vi. 1975, Newsweek published an article entitled, *The Cooling World*, which put forth the hypothesis that the earth's aggregate temperature had been steadily dropping for decades due to human activity.⁶⁸
- vii. 1978, Paul Ehrlich, Anne Ehrlich & John Paul Holdren publish *Ecoscience*, a tome which calls for the creation of a “planetary regime” that would have dominion over nearly all resources on the earth and would also enforce population control via coercive sterilization and abortion to protect the ecology.⁶⁹
- viii. 2000, David Viner of Climate Research Unit (CRU) claimed that in a matter of years, snowfall would become so scarce that it would be considered “rare” and “exciting” whenever it was beheld. He further went on to say that children would have no conception of what snow even was and that snowfall would be a “thing of the past.”⁷⁰
- ix. 2003, The Pentagon released a paper entitled, *An Abrupt Climate Change Scenario and its Implications for United States Security*. The 22 page document, penned by Peter Schwartz and Doug Randall, laid out a hypothesis, based upon then-current research, that it was likely that climate warming would cause slowing of the thermohaline conveyor of the world's oceans which would in turn cause increasingly frigid winters, soil desiccation and wild storms. In the view of the authors this climatic upheaval would be gradual and would leave North Europe, America and Russia relatively untouched for sometime, whereas Southern Europe, Africa and Central and

65 Ronald Bailey *Earth Day, Now & Then*, May 1, 2000. Also see, Alex Newman, *Embarrassing Predictions Haunt the Global-Warming Industry*, *New American*, 2014.

66 Ronald Bailey, *Earth Day, Now & Then*, May 1, 2000.

67 May Bethel, *How To Live In Our Polluted World*, Introduction, p. 6

68 Peter Gwynne, *The Cooling World*, *Newsweek*, April 28, 1975.

69 See, Holdren et al. *Ecoscience: Population, Resources, Environment*. 1978

70 Alex Newman, *Embarrassing Predictions Haunt The Global-Warming Industry*, *The New American*, 2014.

- South America would suffer from production shortages in short order.⁷¹
- x. 2004, the speculative science fiction film *The Day After Tomorrow* is released. Directed by Roland Emmerich (best known for *Independence Day*), the motion picture is based off of the book *The Coming Global Superstorm*, by Art Bell and Whitley Strieber, which warned of catastrophic climate change bringing about a storm that would amass around the Northern Hemisphere which would then freeze over. Many of the scenarios within the book are portrayed in Emmerich's film.
 - xi. 2005, UNEP⁷² notified the world that in five years humanity would face catastrophe due to anthropogenic warming which would bring about mass desertification and death. They claimed that the Pacific Islands and the Caribbean and various other coastal regions were at the greatest risk of this looming threat and would produce 50 million "climate refugees." 2010 came and went with no record of any "climate refugees" fleeing either the Pacific Islands or Caribbean; rather, their native populations markedly increased.⁷³
 - xii. 2013, The Friends of Science release a study concerning a predictive climate model created by the Canadian Centre for Climate Modeling and Analysis which was used by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change⁷⁴ to craft a narrative of climate eschatology; disaster, they proclaimed, was imminent. The Friends of Science study, however, found that the latter's model predictions were incorrect by 590%. Ken Gregory, the director of Friends of Science noted, "Taxpayers in Canada should be appalled at how their money has ended up funding faulty science that has driven climate change terror around the world."⁷⁵

Every single one of the aforementioned proclamations and projections turned out to be false, often glaringly so (as with example xii). What this tells us is that though climate science is extremely important, the reliability of period climate modeling was highly unreliable. Thus, when such proclamations are made, it behooves one to ask first, *cui bono?* Who benefits? Secondly, one should ask the questions: What is the model and what is the data and how was the data obtained? Additionally, who is conducting the research and who is funding it? What are the researchers and funders motivations? What do their track-records tell us about them? Do they have incentive to lie about the results of their research? Etc.

To conclude: The prospect of 'environmental catastrophe' (almost invariably overstated, when not outright false) should be viewed as an exciting new challenge to be overcome rather than some gloomy and incontestable eventuality. The mentality of the doomsayer is that of a masterless slave, for that which is *thought* impossible is *made* impossible in the thinking.

71 Peter Schwartz, Dough Randall, *An Abrupt Climate Change Scenario and its Implications for United States national Security*.

72 UNEP stands for the United Nations Environment Programme.

73 Alex Newman, *Embarrassing Predictions Haunt Global-Warming Industry*, The New American, 2014.

74 Also known more simply as 'IPCC.'

75 *Canadian Climate Change Predictions Fail by 590% Costing Global Consumers a Bundle Says Friends of Science Study*, October 31, 2013.

(a.3) If We Do Nothing | Invariable Extinction

Whilst it is obvious that the “the world” is not ending in any meaningful, immediate way, despite the doomsaying of catastrophists such as Al Gore and Stephanie Wakefield, the world will, eventually, come to disintegration given sufficient time. Nothing extant is without an end. Even stars perish at the last. Our own sun, no exception to this rule. By aggregate estimate, the average age of a star is predicted to be around several billion years; the precise number of these years is difficult to determine given that celestial burn-out is predicated upon the amount of hydrogen contained within the core of any given celestial body. Our own star – the sun – is classed as a “main sequence” body which describes the fact that it is currently in it's most stable period wherein it continuously converts it's hydrogen core into helium. After around 8 billion years of this process the hydrogen will have been exhausted and as a consequence, the helium still in the core will cause the sun to utilize hydrogen outside of the core as a heat source, as this occurs, gravitational forces take over from the burning process thus causing the shell to expand and the surface to cool from white to red; when a star enters this stage it is referred to as a red giant due to it's sanguine hue and significantly increased size. Given sufficient time this process will bring the red giant into contact with the earth which will swiftly be disintegrated. Before that occurs, however, the heat from the rapidly expanding sun will boil the oceans, causing all water on earth to become trapped in the atmosphere where it will be molecularly splinted by the sun's energy, causing it to bleed out into the void of space as hydrogen and oxygen, thus leaving a barren, desiccated husk⁷⁶. Amun-Ra's wrath. Given that our galaxy is 4.5 billion years old, our sun has exhausted around about half of its total, estimated lifetime, this is to say humans have around 5 to 6.5 billion years left to inhabit the earth before the sun reaches it's red giant phase⁷⁷.

Yet even abandoning any concerns about sun-death, humanity, whether collectively or in some portion, will still need to contend with what many environmentalists and scientists have begun referring to as the sixth great extinction event. A research paper published in *Science Advances* in 2015 by the well known American biologist, Paul R. Ehrlich, and others, comparing past extinction rates to modern extinction rates states that animals are vanishing at a rate unprecedented since the fifth mass extinction period⁷⁸ which occurred over 66 million years ago⁷⁹ and brought about an end to the dinosaurs (save for that which became avians). The problem with these studies (and assertions which echo the sentiments contained within such studies) is that it is incredibly difficult to determine, with any accuracy, the rate of extinction of species that no longer exist. Ehrlich notes as much within his study when he writes, “-biologists cannot say precisely how many species there are, or exactly how many have gone extinct in any time interval-⁸⁰.” He further states what should be obvious to everyone in the proceeding page, “Population extinction cannot be reliably assessed from the

76 Nearly all animal species will die once the oceans boil with the possible exception of the tardigrade. Fascinatingly resilient organisms!

77 See the work of Enjar Hertzprung and Henry Norris Russel, specifically as pertains to the *Hertzprung-Russel diagram*.

78 K-Pg extinction event which occurred between the Cretaceous and Paleogene epochs and ended 75% of all life on earth.

79 Time interval calculated from *Time Scales of Critical Events Around the Cretaceous-Paleogene Boundary*, Paul R. Renne et al, Science 339, 684, (2013).

80 Ceballos et al., Sci. Adv. 2015, p. 3

fossil record-⁸¹” the study also abstains from making any statement on organisms other than vertebrates; “-we have not considered animals other than vertebrates because of data deficiencies-⁸².” The latter point should also be rather obvious, there are simply too many different species on the planet to plug them all into an extrapolating extinction matrix in a 6 page paper. It would be astounding if, say, tardigrades were on the verge of extinction (they aren't). However, we should not wax whistful about the prospect of extinction as there are decidedly certain types of organisms which we would be better off without. Whilst it is still dubious to classify viruses as a form of life, there are numerous types of viruses, such as HIV⁸³. HIV is but one of many of the genus *lentivirus* which are, across the board, harmful – and often deadly – to mammalians such as humans, apes, cows and goats. More terrifyingly, viruses of the genus *lentivirus* can become endogenous to the host, meaning that they can incorporate their genome into the occupied organism's genome such that the virus will henceforth be inherited by the host's descendants. Pathogenic bacteria (those types of bacteria which cause disease and death) also occupy a similar position in relation to humans.

A common rebuttal to such a position as that which we have sketched out above is to take aim at centering either one's personal or societies collective concern on humans-as-such and attempt to deconstruct so-called anthropocentric thinking. But what would it mean to center one's concerns on anything other than one's species? At a certain point one would be forced to make the decision between expanding a settlement and displacing some wildlife and simply not expanding and settling at all. If this queer notion had been taken up from the first it is highly unlikely that humanity would share the masterful command over the world that it does to this day. If we had refused to slay a charging beast upon the plains, if we had refused to eat the feral herds, if we had refused to burn the forests and there kindle them a'fire, if we had refused to dam the rivers and drain the swamps and level the land how sleek our chances would have been! How like as not we'd have passed away into the dustbin of history like the Neanderthal and homo erectus before us!

81 Ceballos et al., Sci. Adv. 2015, p. 4

82 Ceballos et al., Sci. Adv. 2015, p. 4

83 HIV stands for Human Immunodeficiency Virus.

Note on footnotes: page numbers cited may differ depending upon whether one is reading from a PDF or hard-copy version of the named text. For instance, a hardcopy version of a particular, cited text may well have 400 pages, yet only around half of that in PDF format.

Sources – alphabetized via title, not author:

1. A Field Guide To Anti-Technology Movements, Past And Present, Carolyn Gregoire.
2. Accelerated modern human-induced species losses: Entering the sixth mass extinction, Ceballos, Ehrlich, Barnosky, Garcia, Pringle, Palmer, Science Magazine, Environmental Science, 2015.
3. Beyond Belief: The Cults of Burning Man/AfterBurn: Reflections on Burning Man (Counterculture Series), Lee Gilmore, Mark Van Proyen, 2005.
4. Captain Swing and the Threshing Machines, Antony Rudgard-Redsell.
5. Climate Change 2014 Synthesis Report: A Report of the Governmental Panel on Climate Change, Rajendra K. Pachauri, et al, 2014.
6. Climate Change Prediction: A Challenging Scientific Problem, Prof. Alan J. Thorpe, Institute of Physics, 2005.
7. Coal and the Industrial Revolution 1700-1869, Gregory Clark, UC-Davis, Economics.
8. Communization and It's Discontents, Benjamin Noys, 2011.
9. Conceptualizing the Anthropocene: A Story of Culture and Climate Change, Brian Hoffstein, 2016.
10. 'Folk' Representations of Mother Goddess in Eastern India, Rajesh Purohit, Allahabad Museum, India, 2014.
11. History of Science and Technology – A New Perspective, Infinity Foundation, Princeton (HIST Project).
12. How Stars Work, Craig Freudenrich, PH.D. How Stuff Works.
13. Immigration, Industrial Revolution and Urban Growth in the United States of America, 1820-1920, Sukko Kim, Washington University, 2007.
14. Learning Leaders: Ecoterrorism, 2017.
15. Machine, The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language, 4th Edition.
16. Masculinity and the Machine Man: Gender in the History of Data Processing, Thomas Haigh, University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, 2010.
17. Mother Nature as a Hothouse Flower: The End of Nature by Bill McKibben, David M. Graber, Los Angeles Times, Oct 22, 1989.
18. New Approaches Narrow Global Species Estimate For Beetles, Insects, and Terrestrial Arthropods, Nigel E. Stork et al., University of Mexico, May 5, 2015.
19. New light on our Sun's fate, Jason Kalirai, Astronomy Magazine, 2014.
20. Kaczynski Wanted To Be A Woman, Report Says, Seth Rosenfeld, The Examiner Staff, SFGATE, Sep 12, 1998.
21. Philosophy and the Scientific Image of Man, Wilfrid Sellars, Frontiers of Science and Philosophy, University of Pittsburgh Press, 1962.
22. Rage Against The Machines: Labor-saving Technology and Social Unrest in England, 1830-32, Bruno Caperttini and Hans-Joachim Voth, University of Zurich, 2016-2017.
23. Rebels Against The Future: Witnessing The Birth of the Global Anti-Technology Movement, Ronald Bailey.

24. Strategies and Tactics for Managing The Mountain Pine Beetle, Forest Service of British Columbia.
25. Sun Lore of All Ages, William Tyler Olcott, 1914.
26. Time Scales of Critical Events Around the Cretaceous-Paleogene Boundary, Paul R. Renne et al., Science mag, Vol. 339, 2013.
27. The Anthropocene as Fetishism, Daniel Cunha, Mediations, Journal of the Marxist Literary Group, 28.2, Spring 2015, 65-77.
28. The Causes of Napoleon Bonaparte's Loss at Waterloo 1815, Eric Huh, Emory Endeavours in History, 2013.
29. The Goddess of Anatolia, Book Review by Murray Eiland, Oriental Rug Review, Vol. 10 #6, 1990.
30. The Great Mother Goddess: Rediscovering the Religion of the Earth, Monica Sjoo, Barbara Mor, Harper & Row publishing, 1987.
31. The Luddite Tradition in America (and elsewhere), or, The Critique of the Technological Paradigm, Robert Riversong, Turning the Tide: Shifting the Paradigm of Human Culture.
32. The Modern Industrial Revolution, Exit, and the Failure of Internal Control Systems, Michael C. Jensen, 1993, 1999, 2000.
33. The Mother Goddess in Prehistory: Debates and Perspectives, Lauren Talalay, 2012.
34. The Planet Has Never Been A Safer Place To Live, Alex Epstein, Market Watch, 2016.
35. The Secret History of the Industrial Revolution, Gregory Clarke, Department of Economics, UCD, CA, 2001.
36. The Social Dynamics of Riots: Evidence From The Captain Swing Riots, 1830-31, Toke Aidt, Gabriel Leon, Max Satchell, 2017.
37. The Sun Won't Die For 5 Billion Years, So Why Do Humans Have Only 1 Billion Years Left On Earth, Jillian Scudder, February 12, 2015.
38. The Technological Society, Jacques Ellul.
39. Treasure, Treason & The Tower: El Dorado & The Murder of Sir Walter Raleigh, Paul R. Sellin, Ashgate Publishing, 2011.
40. Utterly Unkillable Tardigrades Will Live To See Our Sun Die, Michael Irving, July 14th, 2017.
41. Watchman Fellowship Profile: Goddess Worship, Rick Branch, 1994.
42. Will 2018 be the year of the neo-luddite?, Jamie Bartlett, The Guardian, Sun 4th, 2018.