

+E0001 - Why The Choice?

Welcome to The Choice - This is Curt Doolittle - Episode 0001 - Why The Choice?

1 - "Why did I start The Choice"

Like many of you, I watched the evolution of the intellectual dark web, its initial success, its limits, and eventual stagnation and failure. I took this limit as evidence that (a) the group was insufficient for the task in no small part because there was only one token ethnic european, and no men of adversarial achievement, responsible for many others, in particular, industry, government, or military, (b) that the group couldn't or wouldn't address the deep questions, and would generally resort to gossiping and complaining, and (c) that perhaps this gossiping and complaining was because the audience wouldn't be able to work with content deep enough to help them understand the crisis of our age and what do do about it.

Then, this fall, Eric Weinstein started his podcast 'the portal', saying that he's discovered enough demand for deep content that it's worth trying. And I felt that given there is enough of an overlap between my work and the topics that interest Eric, I might test the theory as well.

So under the presumption the market for depth exists, I'm going to run an experiment: and rather than talk about

complaints, criticisms, and appeals to reasonableness, by shallow moralizing, we would talk about causes and solutions. And rather than avoid the great conflicts and taboos we would answer them. Because while, we can all feel sentimental agreement with complaints, solutions require us to consider costs to ourselves and others. And discussion of those costs compels us to more intellectually honest discourse.

2 - "What drawbacks are there to deep, causality, honest even if taboo causality, and solutions?"

The internet has been helpful in bypassing the aging institutional media. And We have solid data on what people watch on the internet and don't. First, They watch people they like regardless of the quality of their thoughts, not the best thoughts regardless of who speaks them. Second, they watch what provides them with novelty that in turn provides them with opportunity for more opportunity for novelty. Which means it's largely escapism. Third, they watch what confirms their biases rather than what would change them.

So I'm faced with a set of challenges that will likely limit the audience for The Choice:

- **First**, I don't have any idea whether I'm likable or not. Most public intellectuals share lower trait agreeableness - meaning, we are more comfortable speaking painful truths than others. So while people seem to find me kind and charming in person, in my public work this low need

for agreement, and greater desire for truth regardless of costs, limits likability. That is, unless you also prefer truth before cost (what we call truth before face).

- **Second**, While I'm going to expose you to novelties - quite a few of them - and while that novel understanding will give you far deeper understanding of the world we live in than almost anything else you can learn at present, it's not escapist in the least. It tends to be wordy, and more complicated unless you've studied some basic law, science, economics, and programming. And that's too much to ask of most people. So it's high cost novel understanding not low cost novel entertainment.

- **Third**, Complaints we can empathize with and leave the hard work of producing solutions and implementing them, and learning and changing behavior along with them to others. But when we talk about solutions that require you pay a cost in order to make others pay cost, so that both you and others will benefit from that cost, you change from observer and audience to participant and actor. And it's easy to criticize everything other than 'the others will do it for us'. Until you are the other than has to do it.

- **Fourth**, No matter who you are, I will - somewhere between immediately and eventually - say something that offends you and your existing biases. Because that is what courts of science do for us: it provides decidability regardless of our biases, and preferences. And there is plenty of discomfort to share around the political and moral compass.

Hopefully this open honesty will help people from around the political and moral compass overlook what offends them, invest the effort, and instead, consider the solutions I'm suggesting.

3 - "What is "The Context"?"

We used the windfall of legal, financial, economic, scientific, industrial, technological, and medical revolutions and the european forceful distribution of those revolutions around the world, to run a series of experiments with our newfound knowledge, agency, and wealth.

Some of those experiments succeeded, Those experiments were material. Some of our experiments failed. Those were economic and political. Some of our experiments were catastrophic, those were in psychology, social, educational, and financial.

The culmination of these errors is a restoration of a conflict we had long since settled by institutions in every agrarian urban society: that of the difference in strategy between three competing instincts, over which we have little control: the female equalitarian favoring consumption, and the ascendent male meritocratic favoring production, and the established male hierarchical favoring capitalization. We call these left, libertarian, and right. But they are just evolution's distribution of labor given our reproductive interests.

We had, across western civilization, assumed, under the naive optimism of the enlightenment, under the false promises of the french revolution, and marxist, neo-marxist, postmodernist, and feminist dogmas, that if granted equal opportunity, under our new found material wealth, that our interests would converge into an egalitarian herd like so many de-horned, and belled female bovines.

Instead we discovered that the more luxury we have to pursue our preferences the more we pursue the influences of our genetic interests. This divergence is even more evident in the most equalitarian societies, as it is in the least where the choice doesn't exist.

So, in response, having discovered this, some of us choose to restore the middle eastern world's group strategy of equality and numbers in tribalism and familism - keeping everyone from getting ahead - at the cost of continuous decline. This strategy does not consider the long term future. Or even time itself.

Some of us choose to attempt the old world's communal strategy and its search for equality and numbers - limiting our differences at the cost of stagnation and decline. This strategy promises to drag us all upward but cannot - especially without windfalls. It considers the near term and present.

Some of us choose to continue the eastern old world 'total family' strategy of suppression of disharmony and

controlled imperial development independent of the rest of the world's behavior. This is a very long term strategy as long as one maintains the civilization as a fortress against invaders human, cultural, ideological, religious, and military.

Some of us choose to continue western civilizations group strategy of continuous rapid evolution through limiting our numbers, delaying reproduction, high investment in technology, family and commons, and the cost of suppressing the reproduction of those who are unproductive, and diverting the proceeds to the production of high trust commons. This strategy drags us all upward.

The west's historical strategy was a to use small numbers, technology and maneuver, by a caste of professional warriors, supported by universal military militia, the natural law of Tort by individual sovereignty, interpersonal reciprocity, adversarial competition before jury, and a market in association, cooperation, production, reproduction, commons and politics governed a monarchy as a judge of last resort, houses - juries really- for the classes, a priesthood, together engaging in the domestication of man, as they had wheat, cattle, and horse, from barbarian to slave to serf to freeman to citizen to sovereign, and the suppression of the reproduction of the unproductive so that proceeds could be directed to the production of commons.

Western civilization self domesticated in the Western indo

European, Bronze Age Central European, Ancient Mediterranean, Medieval Continental, and Modern Atlantic age of Sail eras, and into the present age of flight.

This strategy held from the Pontic steppes until the French Revolution, the Bolshevik Revolution, and the American postwar invasion of the 1950's and 60's, despite the Byzantine conquest of Rome, and the efforts of the Church to politically usurp the martial aristocracy in governance of the people some the church kept in superstition and ignorance at all costs until rescued by the reformation.

All of these strategies are currently competing in western civilization because, by design, in the postwar period, our western group strategy was intentionally undermined and destroyed at every level from knowledge, tradition, norm, and institutions.

This postwar destruction of western civilization was made possible by a false promise of continuous growth. The traditional practitioners of western civilization saw our industrial-technological-medical miracle as a windfall that would eventually dissipate. The people who undermined the western civilization used the false promise of eternal growth to institutionalize a dependence upon that continuous growth as a means of claiming they'd been previously oppressed, rather than previously limited, and that we would be free of limits going forward. (Eric Weinstein calls this embedded growth obligation but his purpose is to hide its cause.)

As we have seen since the restoration of the world economy in the 1970s, and as we have seen exacerbated by the restoration of the chinese and indian workforces from their failed experiments with socialism and communism, the windfall of european empirical and scientific revolutions, the windfall of european world expansion of trade, and the windfall of postwar technological revolutions, are exhausted. And the future looks more increasingly like overpopulated supercities, consisting mostly of ghettos, ringed by favelas, than it does the science fiction we imagined only decades ago.

So we are faced with competition of genetic interests, between sexes, classes, races, sub races, secular and theological religions, pseudosciences and sophistries, expressed as moral and political biases; the wealth that eliminates the need to compromise between them; the institution of democracy which liberates them; and an increasingly hostile relationship over the future that few of us are willing to sacrifice - because we perceive our competitors as immoral. And by the separate measures of our strategies they are immoral.

The point here being that we have no incentive to compromise with one another. There is no need to compromise with one another. And the only thing preventing us from pursuing our differing interests is the rather 'antique' demand that the american empire, the Canadian empire, the Australian empire, and the european project seeking to imitate that American

empire, and less so Russians who are too small in population and economy to hold an empire - we are all trying to do the opposite of what made us successful. Many, Small, low power distance, homogenous, states producing commons demanded by the needs and demographics of our populations, but sharing in large part our ancestral group strategy, myths, traditions, institutions, laws.

We are all different. We have different needs. We differed by:

- ... (a) rate and depth of maturity,
- ... (b) degree of sexual dimorphism
- ... (c) degree of neoteny
- ... (d) size of our underclasses.

And by:

- ... (a) Truth or Face or Virtue in Deceit.
- ... (b) Natural (science), Wisdom, Ancestor, Mythological, Supernormal, Supernatural, and Authoritarian Religion.
- ... (c) Empiricism, Reasonableness, Tradition, or Superstition
- ... (d) Familism, Tribalism, Nationalism, Universalism
- ... (e) Mating, Family and Marriage Composition
- ... (f) Organization by Hierarchy, Markets, Equality
- ... (g) Organization by Individual, familial, clan, tribal, national, or universal property.
-(h) Ethical and Moral differences in
- ... (i) Investment in commons, investment in clan, investment in individual consumption.
- ... (j) Dysgenic or Eugenic reproduction.

And So;

We birth, grow, mature, evolve, adapt, innovate at different rates. And so we have different needs we have different wants. The experiment with uniting our races and cultures has failed.

Every single attempt at integration has failed. And our country is dying one city at a time from that failure.

The western presumption that we could create an aristocracy of everyone, was as disastrous as the jewish and muslim presumption that we could create a universal religious underclass of everyone.

And So;

The experiment is over. The west failed to complete the colonial program of dragging humanity kicking and screaming out of ignorance, superstition, poverty, starvation, hard labor, child mortality, early death, suffering, disease, despotism, and the vicissitudes of a nature all but hostile to life.

In the post colonial period we tried to create a middle class world where trade was a sufficient means of order. But primitive people held to superstition, to sophism, to pseudoscience, to the familiar, to the comforting, rather than the continuously competitive market for change.

3 - "What is "The Choice"?"

The left, right, and status quo are competing over how to us this inflection point in time to recast America, and the Anglosphere of Britain, America, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand, as well as Western, Central, Southern, Eastern and Russian Europe In response to the current crisis, the current election cycles, the end of the postwar Pax Americana, and the near future inability of traditional Americans, English, and Canadians to win an election given overwhelming second and third world immigration, and the subsequent near future eradication of western people and their civilization. An event which if successful will add western civilization to the lost peoples, cultures, arts, letters, institutions and values of North African, Egyptian, levantine, byzantine, greek, Persian and north West Indian civilization.

The left will not willingly surrender. The right will not willingly surrender. An elected or unelected majority over either will not be tolerated by either. The Government - especially the deep state - will not willingly reform. The europeans will not reform. The global financial network will not willingly reform.

And no empire in history has every been as fragile as America and the west as a consequence. All civilizational collapses are the result of mass migrations, the reorganization of political power, the seizure of opportunity to control territory, markets and trade routes, and demographic change.

So I'd like to recommend a compromise solution that

will satisfy all parties. A set of constitutional amendments that will provide all of us with most of what we want, if not everything we want.

We can peacefully return to the original intention of the American experiment as a repeat of diverse European states, and separate into 'Immigrant City States' and 'European Territorial States' and devolve the federal government to the states, preserving the necessary functions of military, treasury, and insurer of last resort; And I have done most of the work to get us there.

Or;

We can begin with conflict;

... That will escalate to politicide;

... ... That will escalate into ethnocide;

... That will escalate into genocide

... In the bloodiest house to house combination of revolutionary and civil war in human history - the consequences of which will be worse than the world wars, equal in scale to the Arab destruction of the ancient world, or the bronze age collapse - because not only here at home, but the pent-up demand for civilizational expansion around the world held in check by American military power, is pensively waiting for an opportunity to seize given the world wide return to normal: as civilizations and their core states, and the nations led by them, competing against one another - just as Huntington had predicted. ...

... A war that will leave a third of the population dead, every major urban center smoking rubble, the economy with it, and continent reduced to the 19th century if not dark ages without a population knowing how to rebuild it.

And those who are overly confident, secure in island America have no idea how easy it is to make that war happen, and have no knowledge of current fragility of this nation, its infrastructure, and the hatred of one another brewing on each end of the spectrum, nor their passion for using violence against one another, nor how vigorously men will fight for the opportunity to improve his and his people's lot.

Those very men who have been intentionally ostracized by the left by design and with forethought are the largest army on earth many more than an order of magnitude. And the only reason they haven't acted is because they will not act until they have to. And very shortly they will understand the must - every day the window of opportunity shifts over them.

4 - "What Do I Hope To Explain To You?"

So instead, To enact non-violent change, Moral people need a moral license to alter their governments; a solution structured as a set of demands, a plan of transition; and a threat of successful overthrow if necessary.

My work, besides a formal logic of social science, at it's

core, is an improvement on historical tradition of european, germanic, British, and american, common law. As a technology of law, it is as great an advancement over the written american constitution as the american was over the unwritten British, and the unwritten British over the traditions that came before it.

This work repairs most of the holes in the existing constitution, implements and uses a formal jurisprudence - ending the debate - as well as the fixing the weaknesses in the law itself. It updates our rights under that law, and the requirements within that body of law to end the great problems of our age, and explains why those problems were possible. My work is to law as writing is to programming. It creates strictly constructed law from first principles closed to interpretation.

But the law is one thing and the institutions of government by which we cooperate despite our differences in demands for commons, is another.

So, using that law I hope to explain to you a set of options, and to work with you, to produce that peaceful means of transition over the objections of those who will pay the price for their... abuse of our people. Especially those in the State, Finance, Industrial, Academy, and Media.

They are small in number but they have used the false promise of continued growth to destroy everything both socialist, libertarian, and conservative hold dear.

They will fight at every opportunity. Because they know they are guilty. And they know the consequences if we must prosecute them.

We cannot make everyone happy, but we can make most people other than elites happy. Because it is the elites that will suffer as we perform the greatest restoration of power to people in human history.

But for all but elites it will be revolutionary.

5 - "And so what is the purpose of The Choice?"

I'd like us to have a founding fathers discussion for the next iteration of western civilization - something we seem to do with regularity: reform our constitution and the system of laws within it.

We had the Federalist Papers the last time on the printing press. We can have them once again this time in bits and bytes.

And we can create not a sacrifice, but a renaissance, and a better world than we leave behind, because of our differences, not in spite of them.

Otherwise, I'm just as happy to rally my fellows to return to our most successful tradition, mount up, or hoist the sail, raise the jolly roger, and slit throats, take scalps, hang, impale, crucify, flay, and burn and carve a our

names and a new statistic into the monument of history.

After all, war of conquest is the most profitable of entrepreneurial enterprises. And there is nothing more natural to man than hunting man.

My ancestors conquered Normandy, England, Scotland, France, founded american colonies, fought the Indians, commanded Washington's left, sadly, fought our brothers in the civil war, and even bombed Tokyo for the first time, and I will not betray my inheritance nor the family tradition - I and the millions like me will revel in it the opportunity.

So help me god.

IN CLOSING

Please follow John Mark and In Truth Victorious on Youtube if you want to understand our project in neurotypical terms.

We call this project Strictly constructed Natural law, The Natural Law of European Civilization, The Law of Sovereignty, or Propertarianism, or the group strategy of european people.

Thanks for listening.

