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PART 2

In Search Of A Socialist Aristocracy
In lieu of sounding contradictory, I would propose that the working and rural classes are not impotent as to not bring themselves revolution but I would propose an alternative hypothesis to the fact that many of my reader, whom live in the United States, who have not lived under a monarchy or aristocracy, albeit we as such have had semblances of royal families such as the Kennedys and the Trump family but I digress, neither either or really represented the interests of the average working man (or woman, albeit a disgusting platitude in the modern age, but that’s neither here nor there).

One time in France there was a pre-Marxist socialist by the name of Louis-Auguste Blanqui who attempted an insurrection as to bring socialism to the people through an elite group, hence the term 'Aristocratic Socialism'. He was arrested multiple times and thrown in jail and died penniless. History has not been kind to him, and many people, mostly of the anarchist persuasion, have used the pejorative 'Blanquist' as an epithet. That ends today. For many in the United States, we are spread far and wide and with technology (even though in the final strike it shall be paired down to bare minimum as to retain the state), we can inspire groups, such as trade unions or various other uprisings throughout the nation state to bring Socialism to the people through Aristocratic, Elitist formations. For we are the bread basket, and historically speaking, in the 19th century, plenty of farmer's uprisings have brought change through hoarding of consumer goods to the outlier populace.

For starters, many cannot fathom a day without food (I know I can't, I love food), but in order to bring the beast of capitalism to its knees we must starve the beast. Now one could say, well, Justin, they will oursorce their labor to foreign goods, and while that may be true, we cannot understate the influence that our trade has to the rest of the world. To use the myth of violence to fend off any corporate influences from taking our crops by force and inspiring rebellion through the fly-over states would be a sight to
behold, most of the issue would lie with military bases around the area. many of them, government property but do you not think they have family that is in the business of farming? this breadbasket could be OUR basket, starve the beast until it bends the knee, refuse shipping supplies for soldiers who are off to fight pointless wars. the Hutterite and Amish people have the right ideas but still sell their wares since they do not believe in causing a stir for nothing, but they are contentious objectors and will not fight in foreign, useless wars for big money and corporate interests and prefer pastoral, outside the grid living. The more that we form these 'communes' to hoard grain from the corrupt capitalist state, the better off the nation will be because a nation needs to eat and drink and be merry.

One can recall Joseph Stalin and the kulaks though I suspect that since this state is not socialist, he would see no issue with starving the beast from the inside because it hasn't realized the personal wealth it would bring to the United States, socialism that is, by personal wealth we can recall the Mohists of China who believed in wealth not meaning of money but of character, goodwill, love for one's nation, and contributing to the community through charitous acts. I have no issue with private charity as long as it benefits the state as a whole. I am willing to compromise on a few things be it that eventually Socialism will be realized, to build a new hierarchy, where the corporate glass and steel of big money must answer to the down to earth peasants who feed them and export food, and to the greater world. One issue I had with Mohism was its lack of aesthetics and ritual practice. To be honest I don't think any of them ever thought of self-criticism. I will strike out at anyone who says I am not worthy of criticism, as self-criticism can weed out potential opportunists who may seize the moment for themselves. I realize the irony considering Blanqui was one of them but he did not have the backing of his comrades for his adventure. He died in vain. To fight the Nietzschean struggle for socialist dominance one must have militant egalitarianism towards one's brethren, a phalanx of sorts so that the striking line may not be broken by scabs and one thing that we can learn from Mao (not Mohism, different ideology) is to self criticize before, during, and after the revolution as to keep us awakened to the Aristocracy of Socialism. If one hears of another, another can be established, and so on and so on. once the Farmers are liberated we can take it to the next level and weed out the undesirables and make sure we follow our predestined path, so that the next ruling class will be of artisans, craftsmen, farmers and rural volk.
A Likely Response To Jorjani
From A Christian Perspective
In Prometheus And Atlas, Jorjani attempts to deconstruct an idealized vision of a democratic afterlife proposed by Immanuel Kant. Jorjani is a known occultist and I figured I would give my take as to why he is right and wrong at the same time. If such an afterlife exists, would it not be that only the god ordained monarchs would live in aristocracy of his peers among God, would the working class be forever condemned to purgatory, or worse hell? Be it the criminals who make up the 9th circle, for as I not know Jorjani personally but I'd wager even as someone who dabbles in the occult and not of the aristocratic class would he make his platitudes among the Gods or in hell with the Demons? If such an afterlife exists would the people who were governed under democratic republics daliance with Satan because they were not led by a man of God? For I see that if such class distinctions would remain in the afterlife, it bears much on me that most Marxists and certain communists would be atheists since they would hate the afteraffects of not only being of lower class and not among the Godly, but I would be inclined to figure if one lives by works and deeds (being the fact they are 'working class' in the material world) that they would get a place in heaven. Insofar that many who work against the spread of religion, such as Emel’ian Yaroslavskii and his followers are being sodomized by the labor they endured as working class peasantry, an elongated torture, a work for nothing, being that they tooled so hard in spite of God, instead of works within God. For not all Aristocrats would be of noble bearing since many, albeit a incorrigible example, since Rome was thought of as an early Republic, that Caligula and Nero, especially the latter would reign in fire since they disrespected God’s creation and did not accept Jesus and persecuted Christians in ancient Rome? For if a demos, meaning "people" in Greece, ocracy meaning "society or rule" (need citation) that would be achieved in the afterlife who is to judge but not I, but God himself. I would imagine that a shake up in structure would occur that only the pious would exist among God’s disciples and those who worked against him, rich or poor. (footnote: albeit most of the Soviet intellectuals were not poor but gave an objectifying gaze towards the peasantry as Foucault would state, and were nothing if at all, grassroots and were mere astroturf as to a real revolution, the revolution unrealized until Pol Pot’s grand declaration). As it goes, God is the one who determines the social credit of a person after entering the astral plane, not Jorjani or Kant.
Spectacle Or Spectres?
(The Debord Question)

Guy Debord, a Frankfurt School associate claimed that man was doomed to a "Society Of The Spectacle", every part of life, from political to the personal to the financial was
"speculation. While I digress Debord was a devout atheist, I beg to differ that this extends to religious matters. If one sees and participates in a spectacle on the mortal plane, how does one do it in the immortal realm, for priests and laymen may have a third eye as to see past consumerism as a devil's advocacy, a mere material substance that sustains us until we end up on the other side of the astral plane. Do priests have a third eye? For material gains mean nothing in the immaterial plane, as they do on this mortal coil. As scripture states: "How hard it is for the rich to enter the kingdom of heaven! Indeed, it is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for someone who is rich to enter the kingdom of heaven." (Mark 10:17-31), for as stated previously, God is the social credit master, he who counts your deeds and works before entering the astral plane. for we no longer spectate, we experience. A mere distraction before death. No longer are we a part of spectacle of a society that never places us as special, in the other realm, heaven, We are all. But lest we speak of those who spend most of our time spectating and not enough time speculating, with few material goods and being thankful for what we have, and a dissolving of ego, our wants and needs ever so lessened, that we begin to appreciate what we have. What if our world ended tomorrow? what if we entered a new Year Zero? What if we had to begin again, and cycle and recycle til we got it correct? The man oftentimes, but not always, who has little to lose, but everything to gain.

J.
One of the key principles of John Dewey was his insistence that everything in the classroom is constructivist, literally letting every child "judge for themselves". We are in the educational mess we are into today, when "Everything is a matter of opinion", when there are essential truths that cannot be denied, I came across this subject matter in my first essay, over Ethical Solipsism, which is the only way the Aryan man can try and overcome his own obstacles in the circles of "progressive education". But when it affects the non-Aryan man or woman, it circles around a falsified sense of self-importance to further dishonorable goals, to subvert the founders, as they see them as usurpers of education. Do not expect them to self-criticize because they are in and of themselves masters of Sophistry, as you should act towards them. While Dewey was correct in assessing a child's natural impulse to learn, some, in and of their own volition, refuse to learn anything and will project their ethnic inferiority on those willing to learn. While I am, in all regards against intellectualism for the sake of intellectualism, it is not, a priori
for someone to learn the basic nature of man and spring ideas from it, if it helps those of his own tribe or circle gain intellect for self-growth. Self-criticism is necessary to, for an individual to weed out useless ideas. Mao understood this but I feel as if such that certain ethnic lines refuse to, as Hegel put it, "Africa has contributed nothing of value to society" while Popper’s biggest advocate, Soros, wants us to open our borders, and at a behest our behinds, to such savagery. There is honorable, forward thinking savagery and there is savagery that accomplishes nothing. To think and act, to sense and feel, when the time is appropriate, to gain knowledge of those against you and use it against them. Since effeminate men, women and those of certain racial castes, they refuse to self reflect and self-criticize to weed out bad elements so they seep into our sewage and infect our waters.
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