

CAPITALISM

There are companies which train AI data by outsourcing Labor to 3rd world countries' people, hiring them specifically to label data and they always have to see extreme violent content, often with no psychological support at all and they had trauma.

Even then, big companies such as Apple and google all rely on them.

Elon musk was involved in the dismantling of the biggest aid organisation in the world, USAID, which was a USA department, in 2025.

He said that USAID was a criminal organisation and posted images on twitter of terrorists of other countries using USAID supplies, but it is equally possible they had just stolen the USAID supplies, he had no proof of USAID being bad. After USAID was dismantled, immediately a lot of aid to Africans ceased to be given, mortalities did according to science increase in Africa. He even said that: "Zero have died because of DOGE" which sounds absurd, but his point was saying that he didn't think he was responsible for anything that had happened in Afric and instead cast the blame to the remaining humanitarian givers in the world, thinking that the other organisations would immediately be able to

GEOPOLITICS AND SOVEREIGNTY

I think it is arbitrary that people often have no right to decide things if they have no land. Actual countries with actual fixed borders get to control so much, and to "regain control" you must set up countries which includes fighting for borders. fighting. with blood. the reason is because the UN is responsible for so much peace stuff now, but it's the UN. the united NATIONS, emphasis on "nations". why did it have to be nations? that was because it is made to solve disputes between opposing national interests. But to have your problem put in there you have to be a NATION and you have to SPILL BLOOD for INDEPENDENCE which is NOT FAIR, and the right of territoryless entities with more rights previously exclusive to nations shall be allowed to exist. The national interests do not stand for all of Earth. There is a reason why it's called the United Nations and not the United Entities of Earth.

there is a distinction between "true national interests" and the things governments want. true national interests are conscientious,

what citizens want, and oppose affecting others rights for themselves. The citizens' wants paired with eternal principles of ethics that legitimate interests cannot break. (for example you wouldn't call the things jeffrey sahmer did "legitimate"). my idea is that the citizen thing I said is A PART of the government. You are by default a person connected to the government. People working at government are more connected. but just via the things you do such as obtain degrees or help people on ethical grounds but still leaning on "protecting the nation, but at the basic level of protecting what makes the nation the nation" you get more rights to do more things. or if you have an excellent for greater good idea, by all means do it. the government would not have the right to ban someone from doing a greater good activity which they didn't ask for, even if they didn't gain that right yet because their action is GOOD. the government has the right to intervene with unauthorised AND unreasonable activities. Not "or". I mean "and"

I just want ethics. I could actually cover all those citizen efforts in a global NGO which it is easy to apply and it is authorised by world governments, and/or organizations when there is a bad egregious gov like Afghanistan taliban, to be a route for people to do stuff 4 greater good

basically politics should be limited in deciding these things. for example Palestinian lives want those basic things which are being taken away their fates are dragged because of politics. or Ukraine for example. you shouldn't give ur life to a border dispute even if u are a soldier.

We know that the scars are a part of Palestinian identity but we feel that North Korea has dystopia as its only defining characteristic because we didn't hear much about it. If the Kim regime is gone, there is a big chance that we end up with a nation distinct from South Korea like Palestine is distinct from Jordan and Egypt. Also, South Korean culture wouldn't include the dark past, the two wouldn't fit together. And in my opinion North Korea should be against the selfish things of America too. Supporting h u m a n s, which would make sense if it ever is freed from the Kim Regime, because they know that siding with whatever side would cause a nation to be a slave to that other

powerful nation's decisions made for its own good, and it's already happened since the USA doesn't help North Korean liberation because if there is one Korea there would be instability and if there is a North Korea as a new regime America wouldn't get benefit in return. Those powers really wouldn't mind when people, especially in the global south, are living in authoritarian and morally bad regimes if saving those people affects them because "those countries getting saved would give us nothing in return". This attitude is especially prevalent in America. That's actually why I think the UN isn't enough because it is the United Nations. The UN has been criticized as being useless and here's a reason: nations get lots of privileges in the UN even though nations, by nature, are not the best keepers of peace. Nations, although important in peace processes (and there is a point of choosing nations to be the leaders of world order due to the two World Wars being caused by disputes between nations and also the Westphalian system having existed long before the UN and LON), are still self-prioritizing. A nation could be altruistic and willing to help others with nothing in return theoretically, but then it wouldn't be able to survive. Altruism is bad for nations. But we don't really need to abolish the concept of multiple nations. Just look at the world. The void is that we need an entity which has sufficient power and is also able and willing to help others with nothing in return from an impartial global pov. But the United Nations represents a unity of Nations and this altruistic entity role, if fulfilled by a nation, will endanger that nation. Such entities need a framework that unites them, alongside the United Nations to unite nations. Just a concord of nations cannot stand for peace, we need a concord of these altruistic entities, and a concord of entities which need to speak but don't necessarily have or need land sovereignty.

Indie culture has its own kind of power. Democracy is being impacted by the Westphalian system and corporate greed where it is easy to cheat and means of communication and production is all owned by powerful people who are rich or sovereign government officials who are able to suppress dissent and continue the status quo leaving increasingly little room for opposition to ever be enacted, emphasising the need for a revival of true underground indie communication

THE PROBLEM OF EVIL

When good overcomes evil and society has much more than evil's allure, good will finally overcome evil and no one will object. Whereas evil always contains a silenced voice which, if given sufficient power – and power will come – is bound to upend all that brings terror and restore peace, making a system of evil unsustainable.

THE MIDDLE EAST

I think the existence of hasbara is proof that lack of humility is an important reason why a ceasefire never happens, its because the standard procedure to be taken is when someone asks for them to change their policies all they do is retort using hasbara. The whole point of hasbara is to strategically retort other people's advice. People who do hasbara KNOW that there has been people who purposefully get told to kill innocent people but they make a lie and say it's a mistake to protect their own people, and "what if they're right" never shows up. In fact this kind of mindset is literally the thing which causes the downfall of a lot of emperors in the past. Despite every bad rep and every single "stop the genocide" the knesset doesn't give much attention to it because they want to make it clear their critics have "no brain" instead of just improve and I think it's because they "don't want to show their own weakness and surrender to the crowd" but seriously?? Israeli politicians have already shown their biggest weakness that is the flaw of being so stubborn about their country's agenda that they are going to dismiss everything that asks them to stop the genocide. Their listening to the crowd, not to the point of dismantling their entire state but I mean in a way that at least will give dignity and the living conditions to the oppressed first, is not weakness, it's humility. Not listening to the critics of Zionism is not "strength and having the courage to ignore what others think", it's close mindedness. Literally this distinction is nothing new and not just applying to defending Zionism and dismissing its critics. Defending ANYTHING and assuming things which criticise it are nonsense arguments by default is a mistake in ANY way. Basically just deleting

the "make it hell for the Palestinians" military concept and replace it with "make dignity possible for them" so instead of firing bullets into an innocent starving guy you give the food they need to them. Is that so hard? It's not hard judging by how much a government can do. But nobody enacts it. Why? Being close minded.

The fact that Israel is committing genocide on people and killing innocents is a blatant BETRAYAL of the concept of Israel, which is supposed to stand for the opposition of any more genocide and war crimes. The things that Israel is doing are very un-Israeli. I don't have to be Israeli or a Jew to know this. From history and everything you know it's very obvious that the entire concept of Israel is supposed to be peace and harmony, not war and equating all resistance against Israel as another thing to fight against like antisemitism even if they are just asking for withheld necessities. Somehow everything has become the opposite of the original idea. Now we have a Jewish state which is marred with all its terrible actions and it is supposed to be what happens after the antisemitism of history, but it is not acting like that.

I advocate for the realistic analytical approach for Israel to start saving Palestinian LIVES instead of blocking access although in the long run I believe that people should advocate for a radical structural reform of Israel to decrease its statehood concept greatly and kill Zionism but then it is better to support radical reforms and within-structure reforms both then just radical reforms? And also believing that "complicity in genocide" comes in levels and that people who consider within-system reforms are not inherently more complicit compared to those who advocate for radical reforms to eliminate Zionism and nothing else?

i support aliyah like regular immigration to a palestinian led palestine, as everyone should have the right to immigrate everywhere? and I support communication between aliyah makers to be its own subculture as well as Jews using the word Israel. the Ottoman Empire did embrace Jews with open arms. but I believe a state inherently causes resources to be made exclusive to certain groups so I do not support a Jewish state. that said, i believe a radical reform of Israel to end the statehood concept is the most ideal situation and

certainly the most ethical one but radical reforms are so hard to push that we should also have Israel stop its hostilities to Palestinians to end the human rights problems of oppressed Palestinians while maintaining its statehood (effective altruism). but instead of instantly pushing for radical reform, as it will delay the progress to saving lives while protesters have to do their work to an extreme extent to make a radical reform possible.

So some people think this would be Zionist. I'm not Zionist. I think that Jews should be allowed to move to the Holy Land not because they have a right to get there, but because people have a right to migrate, which i believe on the basis that it is not fair for countries to discriminate against immigrants. Jews have a right to migrate to the Holy Land as they do to migrate anywhere else.

its a bit like how Chinese Canadians can migrate to Canada and tend to live in specific places, like Richmond, which have intense collaboration with Chinese people and they feel like it's a Chinese city away from China. but it's not like China is trying to annex Richmond. and no one is complaining about the Chinese people in Richmond except maybe the rare anti immigrant far right who claim that Chinese people there are harming Richmond even though the numbers say they are not.

Jews do not have a specific right to migrate to and/or start a country in the Holy Land. For migration, they have a right to any place on earth about equally unless the mere presence of outsiders is unethical like in North Sentinel Island where we could introduce diseases the Sentinelese are not immune to. For starting a country, Jews have the right to do so in a place where there are no people, or there is already an exclusively Jewish presence with no one else at all except possibly a few allies who have grown accustomed to the Jews and don't mind the new country. "But the ottoman Jews existed" They didn't gather in a specific area but shared the towns and cities with the ancestors of today's Palestinians.

"Israel has a right to exist" Come on. India could say it has a right to annex Uzbekistan because Uzbekistan is its ancestral (Mughal) homeland and it also needs compensation for its past being colonised.

but we think such a claim is absurd. "Why? the Mughals are ancient history!" "Where did the right of Uzbeks to exist go?"

I get it, peoples have to be protected from harm as they are sentient beings and destruction of culture destroys aspects of humanity. But no group of people can ever have a right to make a decision which puts more people at risk. Do Jews have a right to exist? Yes. Does Israel have a right to exist? No. Israel's "right to exist" undermines Palestinians' right to exist. No country has a right to exist. Does Palestine have a right to exist? "It doesn't have one, it's too immoral to thrive" Israel is immoral too. Sentient people and their culture have rights to exist, but no one has a right to put others at risk and deny their right to exist no matter what.

POINTS OF AN ETHICAL SOCIETY

1. Everyone, by default, is a person with the right to contribute to their community, like a government official.
2. Merit shall be given to those who are just think of the needs of others first; those who effectively contribute to society without seeking any personal gain.
3. The state shall be managed by a collection of those most merited by justice.
4. The state shall be governed by a party of such altruistic minds.
5. There should be a constitution which guarantees the right of unsolicited community service and administration.
6. The constitution shall denote a right for the individual to point out flaws of the state. The state shall consider criticism a guideline to improve.
7. Ethical and philosophical principles shall be considered by a judge equally as the law. When laws do not help well with the scenario, the judge can apply an ethical analysis to determine the outcome.
8. Death penalties or death punishments shall be forbidden at all costs.