

A MANIFESTO OF METAUMANISM

Copyright © 2019 by Eros Poeta

All rights reserved. This book or any portion thereof may not be reproduced or used in any manner whatsoever without the express written permission of the publisher except for the use of brief quotations in a book review or scholarly journal.

First publishing: 2019

ISBN 978-0-244-79679-2

Powered by Legalizer.it

www.argolands.net

PREMISE

By Humanity we mean the community of individuals of the human race endowed with superior cognitive functions, i.e. the ability to become aware of oneself and consequently direct one's actions.

Humanity is divided into different conscious species.

Each human individual is potentially capable of manifesting a particularity sufficient to define its own species.

A conscious species is such when it manifests peculiarities that affect the primary existential elements:

- HOME
- FOOD
- REPRODUCTION

The model through which each species satisfies its primary existential needs is defined as HABITAT.

A SPECIES, A HABITAT

Among the animal species, that is animated, the human species are the only ones to define an individual biodiversity. The other animal species show biodiversity by differentiating themselves into groups of homogeneous individuals in terms of species, or habitat.

Each of these communities has its own particularity in the way of feeding, sheltering, sleeping, establishing permanent residence, reproducing, socializing...

A (conscious) animal species separates from another only when one or more of the primary existential needs are compromised by coexistence or better by the relationship between individuals. A macaw has different mating codes, i.e. their instinctive analog communication is different, than a gray parrot.

Obviously neither of the two species can in any way be defined as superior or better than the other. It would be improper in a neutral and harmonizing reasoning.

Every human individual has the possibility of expressing his own particularity in terms of habitat, or in other words every person has his own preferential habitat, without obviously being aware of it.

In fact, in the animal kingdom the peculiar habitat of a conscious species is identified, recognised, inhabited and preserved, therefore defended from alterations or appropriations by other species, through instinct. On the other hand, the human individual is generally not able to recognize his preferred habitat, limiting himself to applying learned rational models that are decidedly inadequate and usually misleading.

AN INDIVIDUAL, A HUMAN SPECIES

A single human species is an individual. Individuality can be re-evaluated as a simple manifestation of conscious particularity.

However, humans have the historical tendency to gather in functional communities, where it is not particular and individual elements that represent the criterion of mutual recognition, but cultural beliefs.

Every human therefore generally belongs to different "ideological groups", into which he transposes his own individuality, and from which he draws his own existential meaning, opinions and preferences.

AN EXISTENTIAL MISUNDERSTANDING

Only rarely does it happen that among our "ideological herds" there are also harmonic ones, that is formed in response to atavistic needs in order to satisfy elementary as profound primary existential needs of the human being.

It follows that most human beings do not manifest, if not rarely or incidentally, their individual

peculiarities, which make them significant from an evolutionary point of view as unique beings and distinct from other individuals.

The recognition of the other as presumed to belong to our own species occurs in fact due to a misunderstanding, which imposes a hasty and insubstantial familiarity on our entire system.

This has an explanation in the ordinary psychological mechanisms, which in the mental form of the ordinary person impose a constant supervision of the experience by the computer mind, i.e. the one that elaborates solutions starting from the forfeited data.

The result is a progressive slide towards ideological separations, and this is inevitable following the current common model.

IDENTIFICATIONS AND USELESS WARS

For example and first of all, an ordinary person is identified with their gender, which unconsciously becomes a marker of species. This fallacy cascades into social relationships between men and women, leading to war within gender ideology, and growing aberrations in sexual behavior.

An individual identified with his or her gender will in fact experience numerous discomforts and disagreements, especially on an emotional and physical level, more influenced by the ancestral functions penalized by one's incorrect relational behaviour.

A woman identified in the gender "woman" will unconsciously experience the sensation that only other "women" are of her kind, therefore her psychology will adapt to this belief by altering her perception of reality, producing impulses, emotions and thoughts consistent with this belief .

The same goes for a "man" or a "transsexual"... if an individual is identified simultaneously with the "man" gender and simultaneously with the "progressive" gender and simultaneously with the "father" gender, he will experience numerous cognitive dissonances , which, in order to be remedied, will oblige him to consciously retreat in pitiful compromises, or to abandon some "ideological herds".

For example, a Real Madrid fan could abandon all interest in the team when accepting an important job ("now I'm an entrepreneur"...), perhaps because in the new pack they consider football silly, or because our colleague we like supports Valencia.

Let us not forget that the sexual function, despite the daily messes, remains an atavistic function that must be satisfied without fail, and its correct satisfaction can only take place between individuals of the same species.

SEXUAL MECHANISMS DECEPTED

And so, a very Catholic person looks for his partner within the Catholic circle, or a person very close to his family, requires their approval to start a romantic relationship.

In recent years we have witnessed the progressive effects of the aforementioned tendency to identify oneself in "protospecies" of an ideological cultural stamp. We have been able to pollute, damage, kill, torture both other people and nature itself, leading to current conditions where biodiversity is practically all lost and supplanted by artificial protospecies, hybrids, GMOs, etc.

It is a mistake to think that this drift has not and is not affecting the human species as well.

Human biodiversity, represented by many individuals each of whom is subject to evolutionary stimuli, individuals who aggregate through conscious homogeneity according to temporary models responding to their existential needs, has almost been lost within the cultural fictitious protospecies.

Looking at it another way, we can note with horror that a simple war between two countries requires a destructive pawn from the point of view of the evolution of consciousness: individuals of different species, aggregated by nationalistic ideology, kill other individuals aggregated by another nationalistic ideology, but among the individuals we are killing, there are here and there true fellows of our own, truly individuals of our kind!

RELATIONAL CONFUSION, WAR

And so every day, unknowingly, we find ourselves hiring workers by assessing whether or not the protospecies to which they belong are at war with those to which we belong.

So a feminist manager will gladly hire a gay man, but not a Catholic fundamentalist; if she did so, daily clashes and relational difficulties, misunderstandings and bad moods would in all likelihood arise.

The same tendency to use the word "I am" with respect to professions, or genders, or ideologies (I'm straight, I'm a teacher, I'm a patriot, I'm modern, I'm traditionalist, I'm sporty, I'm vegan, I'm young, I'm a mother, I'm an expert...) shows the real situation with intuitive evidence: our mind, of a "television" nature, identifies itself with the social role, reaching extreme and delusional actions in response to this conviction and identification.

The progressive division and subdivision of sexual genders, far from being a sign of "progress", is actually an indicator of conscious involution.

The lost ability to recognize individuals of their own natural conscious species leads us to continuous and incremental failures, and to self-referential but thin justifications.

SIGNS OF INVOLUTION AND ABUSE ON MINORITY SPECIES

Anyone can notice the progressive loss of well-being, sense of life and enthusiasm of the most technologically "advanced" societies. The presence of the technology represents a fairly faithful indicator of the level of conscious degeneration of a protospecies.

"Society" is obviously a very broad protospecies. Many individuals believe they belong to this surrogate species or protospecies.

Of course, not everyone experiences this. Contrary to what an ordinary person might think, a Tibetan nomad, or an Amazonian native, or simply some Irish communities, do not consider themselves "part of society". Cultural differences testify to this, which often tell the story of a species by deforming and filtering it to make it coherent and enhance it. For example, throughout the East the figure of Genghis Khan is considered an enlightened one, like Jesus, and what they mainly talk about is how he unified and interrupted a bloody, femicidal and infanticide circle, while in Europe the schools they describe the character in a decidedly different way.

But there are plenty of examples. Many religious experience feelings of profound and generalized extraneousness to "everyone else", and we are talking about religions that encompass the majority of the world's population.

Welfarism itself, promoted by some religions under the bias of "brotherhood", is based on a profound arrogance of the species, and foresees the cultural colonization of the assisted population.

Each protospecies has its own survival patterns; from the rigid initial selection ("only those with the right blood can be with us") to television colonization, passing from intimidation, exhaustion, up to siege, isolation, and the criminalization of individual characteristics dissimilar from its norm.

A HOUSE IN IMAGE AND LIKENESS

In general, any species, human or animal, needs a specific habitat to thrive.

Even an artificial protospecies has its own habitat. The ordinary person, accustomed to the comforts of the city, is indeed accustomed to an unnatural habitat, characterized by a crust of human activities, plants, concrete slabs, sewers, placed on top of nature as a substitute.

Indeed, an artificial protospecies cannot survive in a natural habitat. Its habitat is also artificial, therefore the model through which a protospecies satisfies its primary existential needs is artificial.

The habitat can be inhabited passively, as in the case of many insects, or more or less actively, by digging holes, building structures, or simply altering the olfactory carpet or other subtle elements of the habitat.

The balance between the species populating a habitat is called biocenosis, and represents a prosperous harmonious model within which these species can progress evolutionarily, even and sometimes to the detriment of another species, while maintaining the biocenosis of the habitat as a constant element.

The complexity of the human being places him in the possibility of making profound changes in the habitat he occupies.

The modifications of a habitat obviously respond to a species need. But what happens in the human kingdom, where individuals usually aggregate into cultural "protospecies"?

Exactly what is predictable happens: the most numerous and invasive protospecies are also the least evolved, and tend to assume collective relational and reproductive models, forming colonies.

A LETHAL CHILDREN'S UTOPIA

Cities are easily comparable to colonies similar to those of insects, or mice.

Calhoun's famous and always topical experiment is interesting and illuminating.

Cities are clearly the scientific example of an anti-ecological social model, and directly antagonistic to the creation of a biocenosis harmonic with other plant and animal species.

The cultural protospecies are in fact incapable of making their relationship with nature conscious, and they no longer act as complementary entities, but rather as surrogate alternatives.

So the cultural protospecies, not being real human species, create non-autonomous sustaining habitats (no city could survive without the surrounding countryside and elsewhere) positioned above nature rather than in nature.

THE PERSON OPENS THEIR EYES, THE CHARACTER CLOSES THEM

Any individual allegedly belonging to one or more protospecies can modify his or her state of consciousness at any time, renouncing one or more dependencies offered by these protospecies.

When we look at an individual identified in a protospecies we are looking at a character; as such he will respond, love and die.

This also applies to looking at ourselves.

When we begin to see in ourselves the person beyond the character, or rather a complex mystery made up of sensations, fires and lights, which demands modesty and self-responsibility, then we will also be able to see others as persons and no longer as characters, and then we will instinctively know whether the person before us is our kind or not, without wars, obsessions, or endless accidents.

Only people truly know love and friendship. The characters are required to mystify their characteristics, in accordance with the protospecies to which we currently belong.

For any question to the author: erpoeta@gmail.com