ANTI-TECHNOLOGY IS NOT DEAD:

MEDITATIONS UPON MODERNITY, TECHNOLOGY, AND THE FAILURE CIVILIZATION

I've ever seen; optimistically positioning the conclusion of progress as humanity taking control of the matrix from within, as a true work of hopeful bullshit. Maybe there is some desirable quality in bad science-fiction, as an experience of disgust that fuels revolt - akin to how I feel more appreciative of the original Matrix films after seeing how awful Matrix Resurrections is. Likewise, I feel some level of appreciation for transhumanist techno-optimism, but only for how it revolts me to the point of wanting to say "shut the fuck up", intensifying my appreciation for tech-critical and techno-pessimistic thought and philosophy.

Do I believe in the transhumanist vision of machinery? No - my instinct is towards mistrust and revolt.

by an uncaused causer, which is usually called God. As I don't have any experience of this uncaused causer and am disinclined towards accepting dogma simply to make their logic/theory/bullshit work, I don't embrace the notion of causality/causation and, with it, I don't embrace any notion of manifest destiny. I find the idea, which I encounter so often in the transhumanist-faithful, that it is inevitable that machines will eventually all "evolve" (used in an orthogenetic, progressive-evolution, bullshit sense) to be Sonny (I-Robot) and Roy Batty (Blade Runner) like utterly ridiculous - little more than bad science fiction.

I want to consider transhumanism now as bad science-fiction - bad as in aesthetically "poor quality", rather than morally bad. My aesthetic experience comes from the same part of my minded experience as my intuition and instinct - it's felt and true regardless of anyone else's logic or rationale, meaning that, while I am alive, no one can take my aesthetic experience from me. As I encounter science-fiction, the best science-fiction is cosmically inhumanist, technologically and politically pessimistic, and are allegories, fables and parables communicating instinctual mistrust and rejection of the promises of techno-progressivism. The worst science fiction, in my experience, seeks to elevate techno-utopian promises - something beautifully showcased by the 4th Matrix film, Resurrections, which is some of the best trash-cinema

The Myth of Human Weakness

By Kazimir Kharza

There is a prevailing narrative within the walls of civilisation that humans are weak, frail and oversensitive creatures that would never have survived for so long, if it weren't for our superior intelligence that has allowed us to create countless highly specific tools, and eventually civilization itself. This of course couldn't be further from the truth.

During a conversation with several of my friends one of them uttered a set of words I am unfortunately all too familiar with: "Our strong suit isn't being… strong, it's our intelligence. We have developed tools that make us strong everywhere." A classic. The underdog story. It seems that everyone wants to live out a kind of power fantasy; they wish to be the nerdy kid who got bullied by the big, mean, strong kids, but ended up succeeding in life due to his smarts. While it sounds like they are putting themselves down, it's actually the opposite – this is a type of performative humility used to elevate one's sense of importance. It's a way of saying: "I'm so incredibly cognitively developed, that I need absolutely nothing but

much of the perspective that "humanity" isn't Real, but that all the unique individuals who get called "human", with all their uniquely different minds, are Real. As such, I feel entirely rejectful of the concept of sentience, as it is little more than an extension of the illusionary great chain of being hierarchy. (While this is not where I want to go in to this, in any more than I am doing, I do feel a desire to affirm that this rejection of the concept of sentience also includes a rejection of the sentiocentrism that often is found within certain animal-rights, animal-welfare, animal-liberation and political-vegan ideology, positioning the lived experiences of animals as more valuable than that of plants or minerals, simply for being more similar to "humans".)

Following from my rejection of the notion of the great chain of being, I wish to comment on another concept I encounter as illusionary, which I see to be a prevalent theme within transhumanist ideology; though I've no memory of seeing it explicitly stated within the school of thought. This concept is that of "manifest destiny" - an idea from US colonialist expansion, used as a teleology that serves as moral justification for all the abuse that politics involves. As a mode of teleology, transhumanism envisions a future-History wherein techno-utopia/techno-supremacy - including a vision of "sentient machines" - as the "final cause". But, for causation to work logically and there be a final cause, there must be a first cause, caused

which I encounter as ridiculous? This notion strikes me as little more than uninspired fantasy, as well as boring and stupid futurising, devoid of any taste, smell, vision or any other sensual experience of life and the world; the opposite of how myths and stories are often immersed in the feeling of being-here, being-there and being-with.

My mind now turns to the matter of sentience - what the fuck is it? Well, as I encounter it generally being used, sentience refers to the (stereo)"type" of mind that is more similar to the "human" (stereo)"type" of mind. What I mean is that, when individuals describe life as sentient they are generally either gesturing towards, if not outright stating, that "this life is like humans due to blah blah blah reasons". To be sentient, as to be "human" or more similar to "human", is, according to the ideologues of Leviathan/civilisation/techno-progressivism, to be higher on "the great chain of being" - that speciesist hierarchy that positions "humans" as more valuable as non-humans, justifying anthropocentrism, human-supremacy and all that goes with this culture. If you are sentient, then you are higher on the great chain of being, for being closer to humans than other animals - (I've heard) no one describes plants and rocks as sentient, even among other individuals who also affirm the minds of plants and minerals. This entire conceptualisation of superior-minds/consciousnesses rests upon stereotypes regarding what a human-mind and what a human is - I am very

my morbidly obese brain, to be the undisputed king of this world."

This narrative of human weakness complimented by hyper-intelligence is most often bolstered by those who blindly believe that technology is a kind of divine force of ultimate good, our salvation. Technophiles, futurists, transhumanists – these worshipers of scientific research forget all too often how unscientific their beliefs actually are. If they themselves look like and feel like a bunch of reanimated fetuses it does not automatically mean that is the default human bodily condition. Thankfully we have an otherworldly abundance of evidence that points completely against this deluded fantasy.

One of the first things that come to mind when strength and power are mentioned are muscles. "Let's see how strong you are!" my dad often said, expecting me to flex my biceps. Muscle strength is something humans and especially other apes seem to excel at, probably due to a pretty long history of our ancestors living arboreal lifestyles. Chimpanzees (who still mostly dwell in trees) are known for their ridiculous strength, but are only 1.35 times stronger than us (they were thought to have been a

lot stronger) due to higher fast-twitch fiber content.[1] Does this mean that chimps are weaker than we imagine, or does it mean we are stronger than we think? There are many cases of people lifting cars to save others, that's something that comes to my mind often, and I certainly wouldn't call a 60 to 80 kg animal that can lift a ton of metal weak.

"Why are humans so weak compared to other equally sized animals? We don't even stand a chance in a fight against a dog, cat or primate half our size," some curious man wanted to know on an online questions-and-answers forum Quora. I was baffled. This person thinks they can't win against a cat… a fucking cat. If I am correct in my assumption, they were not talking about big cats, even though we can actually stand pretty decent chances against some of those, despite what the Human Weakness Myth dictates.

In 2021 an ordinary Indian man, Rajagopal Naik, strangled a leopard to death after it attacked him.[2] Carl Akeley, a man with a gross passion for killing animals and collecting their corpses got attacked by an angry leopard he shot; he was out of bullets and choked the

mean that quite seriously. Is the proposition that technology will gain a soul - the ghost in the machine? If so, then I consider the notion ridiculous, as I do not believe in souls. Is the proposition that a computer will be able to simulate consciousness to the point that it might be believable as a living presence when living individuals encounter it? If so, then I again consider the notion ridiculous, as - in exactly the same way that I don't believe any individual consuming virtual-reality pornography becomes convinced that they are having an experience with actual living beings - I do not believe any simulation can be such an intensity of experience so as to reproduce what it is to be with a living being. Is the proposition that technological advancement will be able to add the "spark" of consciousness in machinery? If so, I consider the notion ridiculous, as I do not believe that mindedness is an added extra, gifted only to a few, but a basic aspect of physicality - hylozoism/panpsychism - and, as there is no way of making more physicality, all the mindedness in the world is already here - this is not to suggest that the metals, plastics and other parts of machines are separate from minded experience, but to reject the notion that technological construction can summon a virtual entity, akin to an act of magical summoning, which creates a new spirit or demon. What does the question "how can we be sure a machine isn't conscious" seek to suggest, as it is more a suggestion, really, than a question; if none of these propositions,

While there are more rational challenges to the notion that I intend to bring here; first and foremost, to me, it is instinctually and intuitively obvious that technology is incapable of "replicating" - generally meaning "creating" in use - what it is to be a bio-organic "sentient" (minded) living being. I wish to stress here my emphasis on instinct and intuition, as these pertain to experiential feeling, which is where I find this to be most easily shared. When reading transhumanist literature, I have often been stunned by the intensity of gymnastic-rationalising, (house of cards) logic-system-constructing and teleological-historising about imaginary futures promised by technology - all seeking to affirm the mode of techno-meliorism that has been the dominant cultural ideology within living memory; contradicting or differentiating from this ideology being to call into question this Reality in a way that is deeply uncomfortable, in much the same way that Nietzsche affirming the death of God was to affirm something deeply uncomfortable. Whilst this ideological Reality is extremely pervasive, my feeling is that what is Real is instinctually and intuitively obvious, in much the same way that authenticity is obvious in those ways. So I am starting here from an instinct of rejection due to instinct.

With regards to the matter of replicating the "sentience", or mindedness, of living beings in machines, the question that comes to me is this - "what are you talking about?". I

large female cat (almost) to death before she could disembowel him.[3] It was in 2005, when a 73-year-old Kenyan grandpa killed an attacking leopard by ripping out its tongue with his bare hands.[4] Leopards are not the only big cats that met their end at the hands of unarmed humans; a Colorado runner choked an attacking mountain lion to death, before running for several miles to get stitches, according to a 2019 article from *The Independent*.[5] Perhaps the most unbelievable case would have to be that of an unarmed deathmatch between a Ugandan man and a male lion, from which the man emerged victorious; he had to visit the hospital, but lived to eat the lion afterwards.[6]

I could go on and on about us absolutely demolishing felines in combat, but there are some other interesting cases I want to highlight. A 48-year-old shepherd from Bosnia and Herzegovina killed a brown bear with his bare hands.[7] In order to protect her son, a 41-year-old mother from Ivujivik, Canada, fought a polar bear unarmed and emerged from the conflict unharmed.[8]

An absolutely pathetic article from 2021, titled "All the Animals American Men Think They Can Beat in a

Fight and Why They Can't" published in *Gizmodo* by an even more pathetic man, Tom McKay, underestimates human bodily strength in the most condescending and uninformed way imaginable. "The human is a weak fleshy sack of TV dinners and incorrect trivia answers and without the coward's advantage of a weapon will lose every time," the author writes.[9] While this statement might be true for the large majority of Westerners, particularly Americans, a lot of humans seem to be quite well equipped for bare-handed killing of some of nature's top tier predators. McKay's inability to do a few web searches, and just assume there is no animal we could fight successfully genuinely saddens me. I agree that fighting a gorilla, a chimp, an elephant, a crocodile, a bear and a lion might be pushing it, but there is little reason to fear most animals discussed in the article (rat, house cat, goose, medium size dog, eagle, large dog, king cobra, kangaroo, wolf), at least so long as it's one-on-one. If Tom thinks he'd get his ass handed to him by a rat that's ok, but I can't say I appreciate him projecting his self-perceived incompetence on everyone else.

Many people probably imagine fighting other animals to death with extreme difficulty, since especially

"sentient AI", named LaMDA, I've seen a corresponding transhumanist ideology push, bringing Nick Bostrom and Nick Land to my attention again (unfortunately) - I originally intended to title this piece either "shut the fuck up Bostrom" or "shut the fuck up Land", but decided on the title I went with so as to not be "mean" to either of the living featherless biped animals I would be being confrontational towards, had I made either transhumanist my target. So rather than being mean towards any living individual either calling themselves transhumanist or being called it by others, I intend to be mean towards an entirely imaginary (virtual?) transhumanist.

Following the "news" regarding Google's AI, the main question, regarding transhumanist thought, I've seen has been essentially "can we know if a machine is or is not thinking" or "is it possible for humanity to build a living computer with its own mind" - or as Sam Leith puts it in his article on Bostrom, published in The Spectator, "how can we be certain a machine isn't conscious" (a question that instantly reminds me of Russell's teapot). In truth, there was a period of my life, where I was far more interested in cyberpunk type narratives, that I was more intrigued by this type of question. Today though, right now, my honest desire is to respond to this question with "shut the fuck up".

My dislike of the question has multiple aspects to it.

everything we build, will eventually go the way of the stone serpent.

Works Cited

Jeffers, Robinson. “The Broken Balance.” *The Selected Poetry of Robinson Jeffers,”*

edited by Tim Hunt, Stanford University Press, 2001, p 164.

Kleban, Nathan. “Towards a Democracy of All Beings.” A Beautiful Resistance, 2022. https://abeautifulresistance.org/site/2022/06/23/towards-a-democracy-of-all-beings

Shut The Fuck Up Transhumanist!

Julian Langer

From the get go I want to be honest and state that I am writing this piece with a confrontational feeling within me. I don’t intend to pretend to be neutral or not be bringing my own subjectivity to this matter. Whilst this might be obvious, by stating it outright I feel more honest about this act of writing.

Following the recent media spectacle regarding Google’s

in the Western world we are conditioned to adopt the mindset of unarmed human’s weakness. When confronted with an aggressive animal countless Western urbanites just freeze in fear. How taboo any sort of “animal cruelty” has become even in cases of self-defense (despite unimaginable animal cruelty that we all know is being done behind the closed doors of animal farms) definitely doesn’t help, as beating an animal of similar size requires extreme ferocity, brutality. People are uncomfortable even thinking about viciously beating a living creature to death, mauling its face off, breaking its bones and tearing muscles off its body – things we are more than capable of doing. When two animals of similar size clash there usually are injuries on both sides, contrary to what some might believe, nobody said you will come out of a fight unscathed; some might think that getting injured automatically equals losing, a false notion.

Chimpanzees, our stronger ape cousins, don’t really have any other natural predators than leopards,[10] the cat that we seem to be capable of dealing with, so long as we see it coming. Though, to their credit, it should be noted that leopards kill 55 people on average every year in Nepal alone.[11] I never claimed we have no natural

predators, the aim of this text is merely to prove that we are not weak defenseless wimps, that stand no chance without tools/weapons.

A few other awesome things about human bodies include being able to run for hours without overheating (pursuit hunting), having extremely tough skin and potentially having a very powerful bite. Human skin has evolved to allow maximum durability and flexibility, according to researchers from Binghamton University.[12] There is naturally a level of variation to this, as the civilised urban humans seem to have much weaker skin compared to contemporary hunter gatherers – another one of civilisation's plights. Anyone that has ever bitten his opponent in a fight can attest to the tough and chewy nature of human skin; not that human bite strength isn't a force to reckon with. The average human bite force is recorded at 162psi, but the most powerful recorded human bite was 975psi,[13] not too far from the bone-crushing bite of a spotted hyena (*crocuta crocuta)* commonly known to be 1100psi strong![14] Noteworthy is also our ability to withstand powerful insect and snake venom, as demonstrated in many Indigenous populations across the globe.

to simply be let alone to go about their desires. One thing we can do is assist time in its slow wash over this civilization. Just as arranging stones upon the face of the earth fits within the anarcho-Goreyist way, so does its opposite. The gardener composts the decaying plants of yesterday's beauty into the rich soil of tomorrow's growth. Destruction, to paraphrase Picasso, precedes creation. Tear the towers down, slowly, piece by piece. Live in a way that the towers tremble at your approach. There are seeds at rest beneath the concrete foundations. There are wolves waiting to return to the wild.

Edward Gorey himself had no qualms about his own return to the Earth. In fact, some of his ashes are spread there in the yard with the stone serpent (and the ashes of many of the beloved cats he spent his twilight years with). Much of his work was concerned with death, often in a humorous way. His arguably most famous work was an alphabet of children who met their early fates in a variety of gruesome ways. Unlike the transhumanist and authoritarian fetish for permanence that's rapidly creating a world of gray death and forcing us to seek ways to expand this unwieldy civilization beyond our biosphere, the anarcho-Goreyist recognizes the dance between the human and the non-human as a dance of partners, not a sadomasochistic orgy of dominance. Like Robinson Jeffers, Gorey kept reminding us that all of us and

have no real permanence. We may one day escape the mostly-closed system of Earth or our solar system, we may escape the flesh prison via silicon means, enabled by the fuels and minerals we disembowel from the earth's belly. We may, but we'll eventually run out of 'resources' to exploit. Earth is not sacrificing itself so we can grow, it's not a mother's love giving her body to her child. That's why we only come by the 'resources' necessary for human expansion at great effort and expense. Rare earth minerals, the rot of ancient fauna and flora, and the filler to make the concrete that's rapidly covering the once-verdant surface of this planet and making everything gray, all extracted with horrific violence. Even the hypothetical possibility of mining asteroids seems horribly violent.

Simply let things be.

Does the anarcho-Goreyist philosophy of just letting things imply that we are to stand by and just watch as the towers are built around us? The towers of gold to honor capitalism? The towers of concrete and fiberglass to harness energy from the wind? The towers of steel to enable telecommunication? Should we simply let these monuments to humanity be? No! Just as self-defense against neo-fascism isn't itself fascism, neither does the philosophy of letting things be mean that we stand by and let the authoritarian drive prevent others from being able

Although I embrace and wish to bring awareness to humans' true powers and physical abilities, it is certainly not my aim to encourage anyone to go and commit pointless violence towards other animals. I would much rather befriend a leopard than fight it to death, even if God himself came down and assured me I'd come out of the brawl without a single scratch. Besides for food acquisition or preserving my own life, there is little to no reason for anyone to do such things – most animals avoid fighting if possible, and for a good reason.

The only actual source of physical (and even more so mental) weakness in humans is something that goes completely against the mainstream narrative: fire, extensive tool use, and civilisation. The very things we wrongfully credit with improving our lives. Research from Cambridge University, done across several thousands of years of human evolution has shown that our bones have become significantly lighter and more fragile since the advent of agriculture, this being a result of more sedentary lifestyles as we shifted from foraging to farming.[15] Overeating, consuming processed foods, and leading a sedentary lifestyle (all staples of civilisation) are terrible for our health when contrasted with eating

reasonable portions of healthy, wholesome foods and regular exercise.[16] Any health advisor will usually recommend a lifestyle that goes in essence very much against the current of civilization. The amount of deformations that result from agricultural mode of subsistence is immense; the shift from wild food consumption to crop production has resulted in malocclusion (improper teeth alignment) affecting one in five people, a consequence of eating cooked cereals and legumes instead of raw vegetables and meat.[17]

Use of fire and clothing has enabled us to inhabit climates we are unfit for with our raw biological being, which results in humans having a very difficult time surviving without them in colder climates. Our lack of ability to live and flourish there without heavy reliance on tools and fire does not mean we are weak animals; no animal is suited to live tens of thousands of miles outside its natural ecosystem. Multiple millennia shaped us to live in a savanna, only for us to venture out into lands of sub-zero temperatures before we could properly adapt to them. When tools and fire became indispensable for human survival they started gradually substituting our biological being, under the guise of enhancement or

reminded of the wonder that Wendell Berry expressed at the way a simple tin can was able to turn years of waste into soil that's much healthier and vibrant than he could accomplish in his own compost pile. The anarcho-Goreyist gardener lets this wisdom grow, lets things be. The wild flourishes and the gardener simply lets things be.

Gorey's stone serpent, while a simple act and only a relatively slight disruption in the geological lives of the stones, was left alone after its creation. The weeds grew, obscuring the serpent, while the weight of the stones, their yearning to return to the Earth, sunk them deeper and deeper each year. This recalls something even larger and more monumental than Gorey's stone serpent, Tor House, the stone house and tower built by hand by Robinson Jeffers on the coast of so-called California. Jeffers made explicit that Tor House was merely a temporary rearranging of the stones from along the coast and that one day they would crumble and return to the fields and the sea, long after his time was spent. This was the essence of Jeffers' philosophy of inhumanism, which shares a great deal with anarcho-Goreyism. The human condition is one of impermanence. Even the great pyramids are slowly dissolving back into the desert sands.

Despite our best efforts, the works of humankind

contravenes the anarcho-Goreyist way, in this simple spread of land, we can witness the authoritarian impulse clash directly with the anarcho-Goreyist way. One can toil away fighting against the flora and fauna that the gardener has deemed undesirable, yanking those ‘weeds,’ building fences, and generally waging war against the wild. On the other hand, one can garden in a way that leaves space for the wild. Some may enjoy the clean lines and ordered paths of a formal English garden, but the anarcho-Goreyist lets their garden grow. They plant what they want and they let the wild do the same. Strawberries mingle with wild blackberries. Buttercups fill the spaces between lilac bushes. The crows and the rabbits know the garden is a place for rest, for food, for bewilderment. The anarcho-Goreyist knows it will be this way in spite of human efforts to control it. The gardener will eventually pass away. The weeds and rats will eventually regain their Eden. Even if the garden is one day covered in a layer of concrete to become a parking lot, in time it will crumble and the dandelions will push through the cracks. The wild will win.

Nathan Kleban, in “Towards a Democracy of All Beings,” put it this way: “But even when we try to assert control, life expresses itself with a wisdom that we have yet to come to grips with, a deeper and wider wisdom that serves a greater variety of lives than we know.” I’m

improvement, channeling the power from us to the zygote of what became the civilizing machine. Diogenes famously threw away his drinking bowl after seeing kids use their hands to drink water, realising there was no need for it; this act seems so much more relevant in an age where everything revolves around property and possessions. Most human individuals have been completely deskilled, made dependent on an outside force, and reversing this will not be easy.

The Myth of Human Weakness is just that: a myth. Myths are usually not without implications and neither is this one. If humans truly were weak, frail, powerless, we would probably have to consider civilisation a blessing, a messianic creation that was born out of our ancestors’ sweat and tears to save us from hitting foodchain’s rock bottom. However, this notion is completely wrong. Civilisation has resulted in nothing but physical, mental and environmental degradation. Civilisation is trying to strip us of any kind of self-reliance and keep us subservient to rulers, clerics and bosses; this is in its best interest. Civilisation prefers weak, defenceless humans over wild and powerful ones, just like people (the creators of civilisation) prefer tame and obedient dogs over free

and untamed wolves. If people realised they can live in the wild just as well or better than they can under civilisation's clutches they'd leave, and many throughout history have.

Another aspect of this myth's consequences is also the creation of an anti-nature mindset. If we were the weakest of animals, almost destined to die and suffer, the world of wilderness would seem like some great adversary to overcome. Many thinkers saw nature as something we need to triumph over, ignoring the simple truth that what remains our essence can only be overcome by our annihilation. Descartes and the like have imagined other animals to be mindless automatons contrasted to the thinking self-conscious man; we began to view the world through a false dichotomy that cuts us and our creation from the rest of the world. This dichotomy consists of intelligence and the realm of weak humans on one side, pitted against the unintelligent bio-machines of strength and endurance from the realm of animality on the other. The stereotypes of scrawny smart nerd and his opposite, a dumb muscly jock perhaps best embody this seeming incompatibility and strength and wits, both of which most mammals possess in large quantities.

transhumanist fetish of finding a path to immortality, either physically via life extension or in the sense of an eternal consciousness via digital means, is a stark display of permanence fetishism. A desire for permanence is intrinsic to the authoritarian project. Stroll the streets of any nation's capital and you will notice the monuments to authority, erected in stone and meant to stand for all time. An 'eternal' consciousness digitally stored in integrated silicon circuits may have a very small resource input when measured for that particular consciousness, but it's still part of the vast undead creation we call Leviathan and thus in concert with its machinery of death. Perpetuity by biosphere annihilation.

The authoritarian impulse resides in us all and with it, that impulse toward permanence. The anarcho-Goreyist project is one of recognizing this inclination and extinguishing the spark before it consumes us. To leave aside the more extreme efforts to shape the world and our part in it, let's return to the stone serpent and the type of small garden in which it resides. A corner of the Earth is set aside to grow things pleasing to the gardener. Flowers, vegetables, fruit trees, and all manner of plants are tended to the will of the gardener. So-called weeds are pulled and so-called vermin are ushered away, back into the wild that exists beyond the garden's edge. Even disregarding the initial enclosure and claim of ownership that first

assessment, of course, but in anarchy there aren't any hard or fast rules, even at the most basic and foundational levels. Besides, human beings are fundamentally a part of what we consider nature and our comings and goings about the Earth are part of the wider fabric of letting things be.

It's when we seek to extend our comings and goings in ever-expanding directions that we begin to seriously violate the soft dictum of simply letting things be. This applies to much of our current lifeways as we continuously reach further and further into areas previously untouched by human meddling. We push our fingers into the deepest cracks of the earth, placing our feet on its highest peaks. A current example is the push to step off our home planet and colonize Mars and other off-world sites. I need not waste the reader's time reminding them of the horrors that result from the colonial impulse and what the project requires in raw input.

It's in the temporal sense, however, that the most destructive aspect of the will to dominate shows its tentacles. Humankind has always longed to slow the creep of decrepitude, if not halt it altogether. This is nothing new. We battle disease and the slow rundown of our bodies with technologies of medicine. We battle the elements with technologies of infrastructure. The

A human weakness exists in our times, but rather than from our bodies it comes from our mindsets and lifestyles, things that we can luckily turn around. We don't have powerful minds imprisoned in inherently weak bodies, we have minds weakened by conditioning that imprison powerful bodies.

Notes

1. O'Neill, Matthew C., et al. "Chimpanzee Super Strength and Human Skeletal Muscle Evolution." Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, vol. 114, no. 28, 2017, pp. 7343–48. Crossref, https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1619071114.
2. India.com News Desk. "Karnataka Man Strangles Leopard to Death in Battle of Survival, Hailed as Real Life George Kutty." India.Com, 25 Feb. 2021, https://www.india.com/news/india/karnataka-man-strangles-leopard-to-death-save-family-hailed-george-kutty-hassan-leopard-attack-video-4451382.
3. McCarthy, Erin. "The Time Carl Akeley Killed a Leopard With His Bare Hands." Mental Floss, 19 May 2018, https://www.mentalfloss.com/article/80239/time-carl-akeley-killed-leopard-his-bare-hands.

4. NBC Universal. “Kenyan, 73, Kills Leopard with Bare Hands.” NBC News, 22 June 2005, https://www.nbcnews.com/id/wbna8317484.
5. Cockburn, Harry. “Colorado Runner Who Choked Mountain Lion to Death Describes How It Attacked Him.” The Independent, 15 Feb. 2019, https://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/americas/colorado-runner-mountain-lion-attack-choke-video-travis-kauffman-fight-injuries-a8780381.html.
6. Wade-Palmer, Charles. “Man Kills Lion with His ‘bare Hands’ in Brutal Fight before Cooking and Eating Beast.” Dailystar.Co.Uk, 10 Apr. 2022, https://www.dailystar.co.uk/news/world-news/man-kills-lion-bare-hands-26678809.
7. Croatiaweek. “Herzegovina Man Kills Bear With Bare Hands.” Croatia Week, 26 May 2013, https://www.croatiaweek.com/herzegovina-man-kills-bear-with-bare-hands.
8. George, Jane. “Polar Bear No Match for Fearsome Mother in Ivujivik.” Nunatsiaq News, 17 Feb. 2006, https://web.archive.org/web/20070927011557/http:/www.nunatsiaq.com/archives/60217/news/nunavut/60217_03.html.
9. McKay, Tom. “All the Animals American Men

my way of being, and my ‘anarchism’ is one that is deeply rooted in this sense of simply letting things be.

There’s really no reason to label this sort of praxis at all as it is among the most basic aspects of living your life in anarchy, but for the sake of this essay, let’s call this sort of anarcho-taoist rejection of meddling in the affairs of others ‘Anarcho-Goreyism.’ I imagine Gorey, with his long beard and bejeweled hands lugging the stones up his driveway, placing them and rearranging them until he was pleased. The years pass, Gorey likely nodding solemnly to the serpent when he passed it, perhaps wishing it a good morning or good evening as the weeds did their thing and the serpent slowly sunk back into the earth.

A simple act of creation, a monument built, and then left to the mercy of the New England soil, the weeds, and the desire of stones to return to the depths of the earth.

One could argue, of course, that the act of gathering stones from their resting places and arranging them in a way that is aesthetically pleasing to the artist goes counter to this philosophy of just letting things be. The stones that make up the serpent were perhaps carried there by the movement of glaciers millennia ago and had been resting peacefully for thousands and thousands of years before the tall, eccentric artist carried them away to his house on Strawberry Lane. One would be correct in this

called Yarmouth, Massachusetts lies a serpent made of a series of round stones arranged by the late artist to approximate a large snake lying in the grass. Visitors likely wouldn't even notice it were it not for a simple paper sign pointing it out. The sign reads

> "Both the interior and exterior of Strawberry Lane was decorated by Edward Gorey with rocks of all shapes and sizes, almost all of them in no particular order or arrangement of any meaning to anyone except for Edward himself.
>
> In his lifetime, this particular part of the yard was very much overgrown, intentionally left so by Edward who had a penchant for allowing everything he shared his home with to go about its business. He included his lawn in that philosophy of simply letting things be.
>
> For some time, with regular lawn cutting, Edward's stone serpent was quite visible, but it continued to sink into the Earth. This is pretty much the fate of all serpents."

The sign itself is quite withered, being subject to the harsh New England winters, words nearly illegible, but this aspect of the artist's philosophy profoundly struck me as one startlingly close to my own. Although I loathe to call myself an anarchist these days, anarchy is where I draw

Think They Can Beat in a Fight and Why They Can't." Gizmodo, 15 May 2021, https://gizmodo.com/all-the-animals-american-men-think-they-can-beat-in-a-f-1846900005.

10. Boesch, Christophe. "The Effects of Leopard Predation On Grouping Patterns in Forest Chimpanzees." Behaviour, vol. 117, no. 3–4, 1991, pp. 220–41. Crossref, https://doi.org/10.1163/156853991x00544.
11. Baral, Kedar, et al. "Characterization and Management of Human-Wildlife Conflicts in Mid-Hills Outside Protected Areas of Gandaki Province, Nepal." PLOS ONE, edited by Lalit Kumar Sharma, vol. 16, no. 11, 2021, p. e0260307. Crossref, https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0260307.
12. Maiorana, Christopher H., et al. "Biomechanical Fracture Mechanics of Composite Layered Skin-like Materials." Soft Matter, vol. 18, no. 10, 2022, pp. 2104–12. Crossref, https://doi.org/10.1039/d1sm01187a.
13. Gibbs, Charles H., et al. "Limits of Human Bite Strength." The Journal of Prosthetic Dentistry, vol. 56, no. 2, 1986, pp. 226–29. Crossref, https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-3913(86)90480-4.

14. Spanner, Holly. “Top 10: Which Animals Have the Strongest Bite?” Science Focus, 20 June 2022, https://www.sciencefocus.com/nature/top-10-which-animals-have-the-strongest-bite.
15. “Hunter-Gatherer Past Shows Our Fragile Bones Result from Inactivity since Invention of Farming.” ScienceDaily, 22 Dec. 2014, https://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2014/12/141222165033.htm.
16. Gallagher, Susan. “What Can Hunter-Gatherers Teach Us about Staying Healthy?” Duke Global Health Institute, 21 Apr. 2019, https://globalhealth.duke.edu/news/what-can-hunter-gatherers-teach-us-about-staying-healthy#:%7E:text=But%20Pontzer%2C%20an%20evolutionary%20anthropologist,the%20healthiest%20people%20on%20Earth.
17. Clark, Laura. “Before Agriculture, Human Jaws Were a Perfect Fit for Human Teeth.” Smithsonian Magazine, 6 Feb. 2015, https://www.smithsonianmag.com/smart-news/how-dawn-farming-changed-our-mouths-worst-180954167.

Young, Britt H. “I Have One of the Most Advanced Prosthetic Arms in the World - and I Hate It.” *Input*, Input, 4 Mar. 2021, https://www.inputmag.com/culture/cyborg-chic-bionic-prosthetic-arm-sucks.

“Rethinking the Apocalypse: An Indigenous Anti-Futurist Manifesto.” Distributed by Indigenous Action

THE WAY OF THE STONE SERPENT

By: Abrum Ahul

The ocean winter after winter gnaws at its earth, the wheels and the feet

Summer after summer encroach and destroy.

Stubborn green life, for the cliff-eater I cannot comfort you, ignorant which color,

Gray-blue or pale-green, will please the late stars;

But laugh at the other, your seed shall enjoy wonderful vengeance and suck

The arteries and walk in triumph on the faces.

-Robinson Jeffers, “The Broken Balance”

On the grounds of the Edward Gorey house in so-

compatible with Anarchy, let alone Indigenous Liberation and Land Back! The answer, you will find, isn't there. Colonialism cannot be combated with a philosophy that assumes that ecocide will continue/won't be a problem with so-called Green Tech.

Your utopian solar panels are made with the materials ripped from the ground by people under the crushing foot of Neo-Colonialism. It gets to your comfortable neighborhood by global supply chains that pollute the air and sea. It gets processed in factories owned by mega corporations that Leftists claim to hate, yet their only solution is to collectivize them???? The entire production process of high tech is inseparable from colonialism, and Anarcho-Leftists, let alone Transhumanists, would do damn well to learn that.

Sources

Chau, Tom T, and Elaine A Biddiss. "Upper Limb Prosthesis Use and Abandonment: A Survey of the... : Prosthetics and Orthotics International." *LWW*, 1 Sept. 2007, https://doi.org/10.1080/03093640600994581.

Hiking Trails Towards Civilization: Escaping the spectacle of Nature and Shattering the Civil Lens

By: N/A

I have spent quite a while trough the paths of nature walks and hiking trails, with a backpack full of protein bars, trail mix, water bottles, rain coats etc. In hopes that I might, even just momentarily, leave behind the gears of civilization. Saying hi to countless people as I walk up a poorly kept rocky path nearing the top of the hike, so that I can finally witness this breathtaking view i've heard so much about. All of this so that I can "enjoy nature". However I never enjoy it. It always feels like such a pain in the neck, to drive up to the trail on your day off, hope to god you find parking, fill out a form for a hiking permit, pass by people blasting loud shitty music, follow a predetermined path, signs saying no camping, and for what? So at the end you can see some view that never leads up to the hype just to walk back down? This is not nature. The whole reason I even came out here was to try and escape the hustle and bustle of advanced techno civilization, however with seeing this I can hardly tell between the trees and a skyscraper.

Hiking is a spectacle of nature, a safe mediated image

without substance; a lie. The spectacle of nature is packaged and sold to you like any other ideological commodity, this plastic nature does not subvert civilization, but rather becomes an extension of it, populated, safe, clean, pretty, predetermined, predictable, and so on. This is in polar opposite to the adventures wilderness of real nature that stands in confidant rebellion against civilized minds. All one needs to realize this is to see the frustration in people at a just slightly more rugged path then they are used to, when the trail is “ill kempt” or as I like to call it, “natural”, when it's slightly too hot or too cold for them, or when their expensive patagonia jacket gets dirty, and they step in mud with their brand new hiking boots, as if they expected the forest ground to be made of sidewalk. If this is your reaction to nature, than you do not in fact want nature, you want the idea of nature, sold in “crunchy/granola” aesthetics to superficially “fulfill” the need for adventure. They want cleanly paved paths beside pretty trees with a 4 bar cell reception and a cafe at the end.

So what is the point of this? The point is to move beyond hiking for our reconnection with nature and as a step towards further rewilding. To stop limiting ourselves to a pathed nature walk as our method of stepping away from the gears of techno industrial civilization. For as much is that futured imaginary our captors would have us perpetuate and be a part. The merciless imposition of this dead world was driven by an idealized utopia as Charnel House, it was “for our own good” an act of ‘civilization.’

Killing the ‘Indian’; killing our past and with it our future. “Saving the man”; imposing another past and with it another future.

These are the apocalyptic ideals of abusers, racists and hetero-patriarchs. The doctrinal blind faith of those who can only see life through a prism, a fractured kaleidoscope of an endless and total war.

If you take *anything* from this piece it should be that you should read “Rethinking the Apocalypse: The Indigneous Anti-Futurist Manifesto.” The idea that Anarcho-Leftism will/can avert an apocalypse is extremely ignorant to the reality of colonialism at best. The measurably worse idea that liberation will come from extractive, Transhumanist technologies is a continuation of colonial relations. Tell me, with a straight-face, that Landback and Indigenous Liberation are compatible with Anarcho-Transhumanism. Enlighten me on how a school of thought founded by a eugenist, Julian Huxley, is

or me. The ever expanding network of tech that has its tyrannical grip on our lives was built on the back of it. Centuries of colonial expansion into regions rich in silicon and gold have been plundered to acquire the material necessary for us settlers to have our 3D printers and iPhones. Countless bodies of Indigneous peoples of the so called Americas piled up on the land that was stolen for them to expand the American Empire, perfect land to establish tech companies that are responsible for pillaging that continues to this very day. See the following passage from “Rethinking the Apocalypse: The Indigneous Anti-Futurist Manifesto”:

Biowarfare blankets, the slaughter of our relative the buffalo, the damming of lifegiving rivers, the scorching of untarnished earth, the forced marches, the treatied imprisonment, coercive education through abuse and violence.

The day to day post-war, post-genocide, trading post-colonial humiliation of our slow mass suicide on the altar of capitalism; work, income, pay rent, drink, fuck, breed, retire, die. It’s on the roadside, it’s on sale at Indian markets, serving drinks at the casino, restocking Bashas, it’s nice Indians behind you. These are the gifts of infesting manifest destinies, this

time i've spent on the trails I found out about from a book I got at REI, I've spent equal time wandering the forest without a path, no people to pass, no park rangers, or signs telling me I cant camp, If I wish to set up camp right where I stand Im able to. The freedom of being alone in the woods is one of the most liberating feelings i've ever felt, If I decide I wish to build a small shelter I can do that, If I want to climb a tree I can do that, If I want to pick berries or forage for other plants I can do that, no viewpoint to see at the summit, only the intoxicating beauty of a horizon of trees without end. In wild nature, if only for a moment I've truly escaped civilization.

However, to just spend time in the deep forest alone may decivilize your environment, however this still fails to decivilize your mind. This is because we're still viewing nature through the lens of civilization. We view nature as a negative force, a lack of civilization, we think of it as the absolute, when in reality it's the opposite, walk around downtown and realize this used to be grass and trees, civilization is the lack of nature. The very dichotomy of human/civilization and animal/nature only exists in the civil lens. The need for order, monatinay, predictability, hierarchy, and uniformity is what perpetuates this civil lens, the “evil chaos” of nature then serves as a boogie man, only to be engaged with in small

amounts and always through the spectacle. Spontaneity is the negation of civilization, it is completely unable to ever hold chaos, thus civilization raises a mass ideology opposing any form of wildness, purely from the fact that if it didn't, it would die.

If we can begin to start acting on our spontaneity and unfettered desire, destroy the dichotomy of human and wilderness, and finally get off the hiking trails and into the forest to rewild, we may begin to dismantle the gears in our head, as well as our environment.

Against Transhumanism, For Anarchism!
By: Artxmis Graham Thoreau

WHAT IS TRANSHUMANISM?

Wesley J. Smith of the Discovery Institute's Center on Human Exceptionalism wrote of Transhumanism:

> *Transhumanism, boiled down to its bones, is pure eugenics. It calls itself "H+," for more or better than human. Which, of course, is what eugenics is all about.*
>
> *Alarmingly, transhumanist values are being embraced at the highest strata of society, including*

can technology truly mimic the complexity of the mechanics of the human body?

I am by no means suggesting that nothing should be done to assist amputees or people otherwise missing limbs. Brit Young's cover photo on Twitter is an image that reads "End QWERTY Hegemony" in reference to the standard keyboard layout for the four limbed and able-bodied majority. It's that type of lens that must be applied: creating a world where loss/lack of a limb isn't as debilitating as it is currently. End over specialized labor that requires two arms to perform properly. End stigmatization of those missing limbs. Genuinely taking care of those missing limbs and allowing them to live a life where they aren't reliant on a limited job market or disability checks.

Futurity and Apocalypse

It burdens me to no end to be the bearer of this horrific news. Are you ready to hear? It's as simple as this: The Apocalypse we have in our heads that "will happen" is already fucking here, just probably not for you

> At the end of the night, the Bebionic — with me attached — cut the celebratory chocolate cake. And that was one of the last times I ever used it.

It's worth noting that Brit Young is not an amputee or someone who otherwise lost her arm later in life. She was born without an arm. She goes on to write that:

> Prosthetic arm technology is still so limited that I become *more disabled* when I wear one. There are very few, special tasks I can do better with it (case in point: using a potato ricer). But mostly what it does is helps me mimic two-handed people. I realized that my excitement about my new hand was mostly about being able to be something other than disabled — a cyborg."

The Transhumanist who is (probably not) reading this is probably yelling at the text saying that "The author of the piece admits that it's limited!" Sure, I'll grant you that, imaginary Transhumanist who, for whatever reason, has decided to read a collection of works critical of your worldview. But it just goes back to my original point. How advanced can technology of this type be? Will it require new materials? More mining, perhaps? How much

> *in Big Tech, in universities, and among the Davos crowd of globalist would-be technocrats. That being so, it is worth listening in to what they are saying under the theory that forewarned is forearmed.* [1]

Smith is himself a technocrat and a human supremacist, having defended the exceptional nature of Humanity and attacking the notion of animal rights in his 2010 *A Rat is a Pig is a Dog is a Boy*. However, what he states above is a perfect place to begin when arguing why a synthesis of Transhumanism and Anarchism (Transhumanist-Anarchism, Anarcho-Transhumanism, etc) is impossible.

What are the intellectual roots for transhumanism? Let us ask the one who coined the term, Julian Huxley. Huxley stated in his 1957 work *Transhumanism*, "Up till now human life has generally been, as Hobbes described it, 'nasty, brutish and short'; the great majority of human beings (if they have not already died young) have been afflicted with misery in one form or another—poverty, disease, ill-health, over-work, cruelty, or oppression." [2] So, we begin with the notion that life was overall, pretty shitty. This is true of the thousands of years of history of *class society, ie, civilization.*

We also cannot overlook that Hobbes himself argued this in the context of the aftermath of the English Civil War, the fight between aristocratic agro-privilege and

bourgeois industrial wealth. The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy described the outlook of Hobbes as, “Because virtually any government would be better than a civil war, and, according to Hobbes’s analysis, all but absolute governments are systematically prone to dissolution into civil war, people ought to submit themselves to an absolute political authority.”[3]

The intellectual roots of Transhumanism then finds itself in the premise established by an authoritarian state worshiper. How anarchist, indeed! But alas, the problem goes much further, as Huxley didn’t just think life was “nasty, brutish, and short,” but that the human condition had to be directly improved by rational thinkers, a technocracy of sorts. Another way to say this is that Huxley was a eugenicist, a president of the British Eugenics Society, no less. He was a Social Darwinist and a free market capitalist, who believed that the lower classes (lumpenproletariat in particular) should, “not have too easy access to relief or hospital treatment lest the removal of the last check on natural selection should make it too easy for children to be produced or to survive; long unemployment should be a ground for sterilization, or at least relief should be contingent upon no further children being brought into the world; and so on.” [4]

I imagine some Left-wing transhumanists will respond that most of his later focus was on altering the social environment, providing a social net to the lower

our current place in prosthetics as a good point of reference. A study from 2007 found that 44% of upper body amputees are not satisfied with prosthetics (Biddiss and Chaus). It may be unfair for me to cite a study from 2007, but how about something more recent, and perhaps more personal. An article written by Brit Young published in Input Magazine, which cites the same study as I did, titled “I have one of the most advanced prosthetic arms in the world — and I hate it” is about as straightforward as it gets, the title of the article should tell all. Young writes:

When my new, 21st-century arm arrived, I hosted an “arm party,” an absurdist celebration of the new device as well as a farewell for a pile of old, passive arms with broken silicone fingers held on with Band-Aids. We had cocktails with arm puns: Armageddon, Pink Armadillo. And we played prosthetic arm Twister during which you could use any of the old prosthetic arms in the pile to help you reach. We got high and set up a makeshift photo booth with a bedsheet so everyone could take surreal pictures with way too many arms.

It was the first time in my life my arms were fun and the basis for shared hilarity, not just me being weird.

about Transhumanism is its upholding of industrial extraction. Nearly all of the technologies Transhumanists advocate for are necessarily ecocidal. As pointed out by many folks who are smarter than me, much of the resources for microchips aren't available in all parts of the world. If you think that African children will go back into the mines in your classless society for the greater good of the cyborg-working class, you're *dead* wrong. If you think we can automate the process of mining said materials, again, I urge you to think about how we would go about doing such a thing. Even in an ideal scenario where African children aren't being exploited and robots would mine the materials needed for your carpal tunnel cure, it would still be ecocidal. In other words: the maiming of civilization would persist. Even so-called Green Energy would still cause harm and injury to the biosphere, and thus, you. With this mode of critique, which is to say, pointing out the obvious ecocidal implications of Transhumanism, I really say much that hasn't already been said. Ecocide bad, end of.

Another question one could raise is how practical Transhumanist technology truly is, but not in your favorite Sci-Fi film/comic/show/whatever. We can look to classes, as well as other programs to them. However, it should quickly become obvious they mean that "Huxley was a liberal eugencist, not really a Nazi..." They may be quick to refer to him as a Humanist, and not a true eugenicist, as he also used this label to define himself. Regardless of labels, we know what he stands for.

Further, and beyond modern Eugenics, is Pierre Teilhard de Chardin's theory of Transhumanism. An article from the Journal of Evolution and Technology describes Teilhard as, "(discussing) the spread of human intelligence into the universe and its amplification into a cosmic-intelligence." [5] Teilhard was a Jesuit who "combined his scientific study of the fossil record with his Christian faith to produce a general theory of evolution." [6]

Teilhard writes of Eugenics as well, showing the relationship between individual alterations and that of society:

> *So far we have certainly allowed our race to develop at random, and we have given too little thought to the question of what medical and moral factors must replace the crude forces of natural selection should we suppress them. In the course of the coming centuries it is indispensable that a nobly human form of eugenics, on a standard worthy of our personalities, should be discovered and developed.* ***Eugenics applied to individuals leads to eugenics***

applied to society. *[7] (My emphasis)*

One may say that his ideas of eugenics are incidental to his ideas of Singularity and technological development. However, like Huxley, I argue they are connected at the hip. A website dedicated to the analysis of AI, describes Teilhard's intellectual ideas as follows:

> *Teilhard crafted a new theology that was wholly dependent on Darwin's evolutionary narrative that the cosmos — birthed in chaos — was steadily evolving toward eternal perfection.* ***This perfection could only be achieved by tethering the current state of imperfect anthropology to the future hope of a perfect cosmic singularity. It must not be overlooked, however, that Teilhard's method of transforming humanity was grounded in his commitment to eugenics****.[8] (My emphasis).*

So now we have two major Transhumanist thinkers, with a view of Eugenics at the core of their ideas. One is a Humanist, the other a Jesuit. Two fundamentally anti-liberatory ideas finding common ground in the control of Nature and individuals. Ironically, during my reading of Teilhard, I found people viewed him as a more moderate or progressive thinker, even in regards to his eugenics and Christian faith. What that translates to, in my mind, is "not a Nazi," much how I imagine Leftists defending Huxley.

action to back up its critique and anyone living in industrial civilization is at least passively aware of its attacks on our health. But how about we address these problems in a less overarching way? Suggesting out of touch and myopic solutions, of course.

A product of "Save the World"ist Thought and hanging onto old Eurochristian myths of millenarianism Transhumanim has become a common current among Anarchists. But why? Well, naturally, Transhumanism is usually accompanied by a futurist outlook on Anarchism, keeping the ism. The utopian idea that "The Apocalypse" (more on this later) will be averted and we will all live in a classless society where your carpal tunnel syndrome can be fixed with robot hands! General abstractions such as these are present within, usually Leftist, Anarchist circles. They argue that within a classless communism, Tranhumanism would be desirable since the tech would not be in the hands of greedy corporations. Even in the hypothetical where this society is somehow achieved, how desirable would it be?

If you'll allow me to go on Easy Mode, so to speak, the best and probably easiest issue one could point out

industrial civilization depends on context, the less cancerous instruments of civilization, the better. The critical and destructive urge may be a creative one, too. Agriculture is prone to droughts, so build a community garden or cultivate a food forest. Our grievances with the modern world should not be contained in these writings alone.

I am by no means suggesting that cultivating food forests, ecotage and the like are the only things we do to address the very existential need to fight against civilization, and thus for our health. I will take it as a given that practical solidarity for our disabled and incarcerated comrades are a part of the general anarchist project, and that stealing HRT, insulin, wheelchairs, and eyeglasses are simply myths made up by our detractors, and certainly not Transhumanist as many of that school of thought have suggested.

The Transhumanist…. Alternative?

None of the things I have pointed out are novel. Yes, obviously, Anarchy is nothing but abstraction without

ANARCHIST TRANSHUMANISM?

Where does the notion of *Anarchist* Transhumanism come from? How can an idea of technocratic, rational control over the world and people be synthesized into a philosophical idea of freedom? It can't be! But, stretching an olive branch across the aisle, let's investigate the ideas of Transhumanist "Anarchism."

Many Transhumanists see their roots in a link of individualist anarchism and cyber-feminism and other technological-social justice ideas pertaining to gender, sexuality, disability, and identity. While the root cause of seeking social justice is noble, one that all Anarchists should strive for, I think that Transhumanism of the Anarchist persuasion simply fails to rectify these goals with their ideological tradition. **

H+Pedia, a Wikipedia site for various Transhumanist ideas, has a page for Anarcho-Transhumanism that does not mention eugenics, even in a negative light. Do the editors wish to eliminate that less than delightful part of their ideological history? [9] William Gillis' "What is Anarcho-Transhumanism?" also denies any connection to this tradition. Gillis (who is part of C4SS, a Left-Wing Market Anarchism thinktank) defines Anarcho-Transhumanism as

> *Anarcho-Transhumanism is the recognition that social liberty is inherently bound up with material*

> *liberty, and that freedom is ultimately a matter of expanding our capacity and opportunities to engage with the world around us. It is the realization that our resistance against those social forces that would subjugate and limit us is but part of a spectrum of efforts to expand human agency—to facilitate our inquiry and creativity.* [10]

Let's engage with this through the Anarchist tradition. Bakunin, who arguably helped shape anarchism from a reformist social analysis to a revolutionary theory, said that the only laws he recognized as legitimate were natural laws, laws of nature (physics, chemistry, etc).[11] He doesn't see this as humiliating or a matter of limiting our Anarchist ideas, instead, we find our place in reality through them,

> *But in such slavery there is no humiliation, or, rather, it is not slavery at all. For slavery supposes an external master, a legislator outside of him whom he commands, while these laws are not outside of us; they are inherent in us; they constitute our being, our whole being, physically, intellectually, and morally; we live, we breathe, we act, we think, we wish only through these laws. Without them we are nothing, we are not. Whence, then, could we derive the power and the wish to rebel against them?* [12]

I don't mean to imply we dogmatically follow unable to walk or worse. Coal mining is one of the most unhealthy careers, as many coal miners get black lung. A factory not too far from me had a billboard for filing claims of lung cancer from inhaling a chemical from the ingredients of the popcorn they produce. I worked for the same company, but in a different plant. They are notorious for dishing out occupational hearing loss. I can recall working next to a machine that used compressed air to get shredded wheat cereal off of its belt and onto the assembly line and into the oven. The noise it made was constant, monotonous and loud, so loud, that it can be heard from outside the building. I haven't even scratched the surface on how industrial civilization makes people less healthy, and could leave them maimed and/or killed.

Critique in action

With the self-evidently corrosive nature of industrial civilization on our health in mind, how do we act? Those with Insurrectionist leanings would suggest tearing down those things that cause harm. Pre-figurists may replace them with less destructive things. Communists would simply suggest collectivizing the instruments of maiming and ecocide! I prefer the first. While each act against

something! I want you to hold onto this mode of analysis as we examine the main topic of this essay: Transhumanism, a part of the Anarchist milieu I'm not particularly impressed with.

From Sickle to Smog

Perhaps we should begin with a critique of our own, and one that I hinted at before. In the introduction, I mentioned how Primitivists have pointed out how unhealthy civilization has made humans. Neolithic remains of early humans found in sites where agriculture was practiced have shown injuries related to working in agriculture. Dental health in these remains also shows a sharp decline as food that contained processed sugar such as early forms of beer began to appear. These hail in comparison to present civilization. Industrial smog fills the air in many places, many unfortunate children and adults have been inhaling nicotine fumes voluntarily (or involuntarily if they're a child) for generations as the tobacco industry grew. The food we find in supermarkets often is unhealthy. Produce is made from exploited labor in the Global South and can be sprinkled with pesticides. Car accidents have left multiple people I know personally

historic thinkers on the issue of what is or is not Anarchism. What I mean is to show a root understanding of authority. While this notion has certainly developed, and there is still disagreement on what authority in social relations truly is (Ie, Bakunin believed deferring to a specialist is essentially a "justified hierarchy", while people like Zerzan see specialization as a root to modern oppression), can we really say with integrity that gravity is some authority to rebel against? Is death itself against the notion of Freedom? Of course not, as that would assume we must force this "advancement" upon animals, and even the non-living aspects of the universe, like minerals and viruses, otherwise, we would only believe in Conditional Freedom.

I find some Transhumanists, across all political lines, see their ideas as "expanding complexity of life," to paraphrase. How is the elimination of differentiation of life and diverse relations to the world adding complexity and uniqueness? The issues of Transhumanist Anarchism open up far too many problems such as these and we find ourselves stuck in engaging in a history of eugenics and faulty understandings of freedom that are radical for radicalism's sake.

NO GOOD PARTS WITHOUT THE BAD

A thought I always had when engaging with Marxists, especially those interested in Soviet propaganda

of Space exploration is how we obtain such a high level of technological development with a limited level of impact on the environment and highest level of autonomy for those engaged in that production. Marxists have a better answer (meaning, more consistent answer in regards to their totalitarian ideas) than Anarchists do. Their centralizing system doesn't do away with a literal division of labor, only their particular issue; they uphold specialization, but dismiss class society. They see, even against the idea of Marx's conception of ecological equilibrium / metabolic rift, [12] a supremacy of man's needs over that of the rest of the world. Of course, there's some chimera of "Eco-Marxism," but we'll ignore that to stay within the bounds of reality.

Anarchists on the other hand, believe that a non-dominating society (which, logically extends to all life, not just human social relations) can exist in relation to a technologically complex civilization, complete with cities (or some resemblance of them), resource extractivism, and the definitely-not-division-of-labor! There is a deep sense of utopianism that we can have a system of technologies and techniques similar to or beyond our current form under such a context. How they imagine this would occur without forced / compulsory labor, a highly developed administrative bureaucracy (which they assure us is *not a party)*, and ecological collapse is beyond me. At best, they say we'll gain the resources from asteroids

demographic who are effected by the SCOTUS ruling. Historically and presently, colonialism has been accompanied by ecocide. From the destruction of forests across the continents, as well as pipelines attempting to be built in Canada and the US. Again, another example of where two, seemingly separate things, come together and are practically the same thing.

Applying practical action in accordance with critique is where theory and practice meet. They meet in a constant present, a presentness of rebellion, a perpetual application of critique in the real world. In a critique of industrial civilization, a primitivist may point out that living under such deprivations as we see today has made us less healthy, psychologically and physically. They may point out how overspecialized (deskilling) wage labor has made the average person, and may suggest rewilding/relearning survival skills. This is by no means the only primitivist praxis one could apply, nor is primitivism the only valid mode of analysis, I am just using a relevant example for this piece. A communist may suggest seizing the means of production. While I highly disagree with the antique approach of "seizing the means." their critique of capitalism actually manifests into

13. Hays, Sean A.. "transhumanism". *Encyclopedia Britannica*, 15 July 2022. https://www.britannica.com/topic/transhumanism.
14. Zerzan, John. “The Nihilist's Dictionary .” *Future Primitive and Other Essays*, Autonomedia, Brooklyn (NY), 1994.

Metallic Bandages of The Future

By Anonymous

Introduction

The Anarchist milieu impresses me with its critiques on every facet of life. Be it the unheard and deliberately overlooked critiques on institutions such as schools, to the more overarching critique of industrial civilization. To be an Anarchist that is consistent, one must look at the bigger picture, as opposed to issues in a vacuum, that’s my personal outlook on critique. A practical critique of all that is, in a bigger context; most issues are intersectional. Right now (2022, post-Roe v Wade), the hot button issues on everyone’s minds are reproductive autonomy being taken away and trans/gnc folk’s existence being threatened across the country. Both of these things are practically the same issue, cis women aren’t the only

and other extraterrestrial bodies. How do we get there? How are the rockets and mining equipment built? Who will do such labor, in mines and refining sites?

Even without the ideological baggage of Eugenics, Transhumanism is an extension of these hypocrisies in the fullest. The move to Singularity, a culmination of Civilization, is described as:

> …as the point at which artificial intelligence surpasses that of humanity, which will allow the convergence of human and machine consciousness. That convergence will herald the increase in human consciousness, physical strength, emotional well-being, and overall health and greatly extend the length of human lifetimes. [13]

This is just another, higher development of the “band-aid” logic of technology, in which each new development is a solution to a problem caused by a previous development, which itself was justified as a solution, and so on and so on. It becomes worse in the understanding in which we sacrifice our bodies and join together in a cyber-chorus, in which each individual mind is but a stream of data in a database. Is this freedom? Or is it just another step to totalizing logic of the factory, where every worker is a cog in the machine (but only so much more literal this time!).

As Zerzan wrote, “To the question, 'How much

division of labor should we jettison?' returns, I believe, the answer, 'How much wholeness for ourselves and the planet do we want?'"[14]

NOTES & CITATIONS

This is a quote heavy text, and with purpose. I find that by paraphrasing or referencing ideas, one can easily fall into misrepresenting ideas (or being accused of it, in the least). The ideas of the people I quote are complex and I want to ensure intellectual honesty by referencing these ideas by quotations.

1. Smith, Wesley J. "Transhumanism Is Pure Eugenics." *Evolution News*, Discovery Institute , 27 Apr. 2022, https://evolutionnews.org/2022/04/transhumanism-is-pure-eugenics/.
2. Huxley, Julian. "Transhumanism ." *New Bottles for New Wine: Essays*, Harper, New York, 1957.
3. Lloyd, Sharon A., and Susanne Sreedhar. "Hobbes's Moral and Political Philosophy." *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, Stanford University, 30 Apr. 2018, https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/hobbes-moral/.
4. Huxley J.S. 1947. *Man in the Modern World*. Chatto & Windus, London. Originally published in *The Uniqueness of Man*, 1941, p.66
5. Steinhart, Eric (2008). Teilhard de Chardin and Transhumanism. _Journal of Evolution and Technology_ 20 (1):1-22.
6. Ibid.
7. As quoted in the previous source
8. Miller, J.R. "Eugenics, Transhumanism, and Artificial Intelligence." *Mind Matters*, Discovery Institute , 22 Mar. 2022, https://mindmatters.ai/2022/01/eugenics-transhumanism-and-artificial-intelligence/.

** I would suggest looking into "Civilization Will Stunt Your Growth: Defending Primitivism from Accusations of Ableism," by Ian Erik Smith in addressing some issues that would likely come up in regards to social justice and anti-civilization anarchism (anarcho-primitivism, primal anarchy..)

9. "Anarcho-Transhumanism." *Anarcho-Transhumanism - H+Pedia*, https://hpluspedia.org/wiki/Anarcho-transhumanism.
10. Gillis , William. "What Is Anarcho-Transhumanism?" *The Anarchist Library*, 1 June 2012, https://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/william-gillis-what-is-anarcho-transhumanism
11. Bakunin, Mikhail. *What is Authority?* 1870.
12. I suggest reading: Marx Memorial Library (Posted Apr 02. "What Is the 'Metabolic Rift'?" *MR Online*, 2 Apr. 2020, https://mronline.org/2020/04/02/what-is-the-metabolic-rift/.