

The Is-Ought Fallacy

History

There only IS, there is no ought. There can't be an ought outside of an idea, which is a conclusion subjectively derived either mentally or biologically to perpetuate a belief system or evolutionary process, respectively and very generally speaking in a mind and matter dialectic. We know evolution of any physical system is propagated on a survival trajectory, *not on truth*.

We have not been participants of this eternal and inextricably intricate dance between the evolved and adapted and the *process* of evolution and adaptation according to some higher truth that can be achieved, at least not in the way we normally conceive of achievement. Put simply, evolution is about winning, not being right. Winning (i.e., survival) has been the driving force behind evolution of Life from its origins, and while that agenda was necessary in the human animals rise to apex predator, there is no longer any need for it. Survival is not a concern in the way it was when we were cavemen. Survival is primarily an issue for, say, 3rd-world countries where inhabitants in absolute (versus relative) poverty starve and are often sickly because now the predation of that survival agenda has directed it's aggressive drives towards those perceived weaker according to obsolete standards. We have enough resources for everyone in the world, by far. For the first time in human history we also have the means and technological advances to provide every living person (and animal for that matter) with those resources. Further, we can provide a higher quality life than has ever been the case in human history, *and provide it to everyone!* Yet we do not because the cold, purportedly efficient, and patronizingly defined fairness of survival-based evolution has plagued the organisms who have now evolved past it, but have not yet realized the ongoing transition to the new agenda of evolution, *wisdom*.

Because of this concentric holography of evolution, our current transitional state is likely to result in the breakdown of existing physical systems due to the brain's evolutionary superiority to the rest of the body. In other words, because our mental systems (e.g., thoughts and feelings about oneself, the world, and others) are inherently more complex on an evolutionary scale than our human physical systems, they are 'stronger.' However, because this transition to a fully wisdom-based evolutionary trajectory is not yet complete, the survival-based evolutionary agenda still 'holds the chips' and thus uses the advanced mental operations which allowed humans to become the apex predator (IMO the limit of survival-based evolution before we started to get diminishing returns) to establish intra-species dominance (i.e., class and race warfare), the antithesis of the wisdom-based evolutionary agenda. This is the opposite of the synthesis between the survival-wisdom dialectic we've now established, meaning, in strictly biological terms, we will (are) experiencing a decomposition reaction in which the entropy of the old evolution must run its course before we can properly align our values as demonstrated by the way our societies operate (e.g., up with Game B, down with Game A) with the wisdom-based evolutionary agenda, thereby provoking a synthesis reaction that represents our transcendence of the survival-based evolutionary agenda while retaining (including) the

efficiency and unrealized potentials (biological, humanitarian, ecological, etc) of the brain and mind that stage of evolution resulted in.

Here's the rub: "We" as an outside perceiver of these processes are in fact a product of these processes, the construct of "we," which includes I/Me, is on the inside feeling as though it's looking out, when it's really not looking out but looking at itself, for there can be no "out" of experience. This is the problem of what Alan Watts called "The Quaking Mess." We cannot change ourselves. I cannot improve myself. It is impossible physically and theoretically unless we are to anthropomorphize natural processes. This is so because the "I" that wants to be changed and believes it knows what needs to be changed, *is itself the "I" that needs to be changed!* This is inescapable, it's like trying to pull oneself up into the air by one's own bootstraps. If this was physically possible, then by changing ourselves we would be destroying ourselves, or at the very least an aspect of us that is integral to the composition of that "I" such that they are now a different "I." The examples are endless, but the implications most profound in the evolutionary play of existence that we are mutually witness to and participant of. Participant in the sense that we can't not be a part of it, we cannot remove ourselves from the natural laws of existence on the dualistic level of reality. We act as if we are a participant in a way that we are able to control the outcome, or even the method, like a wave trying to separate itself from the ocean. We are in a position to experience, and not much else can be said with a consensus on metaphysical clarity.

A more psychoanalytic (and really psychological on the whole) way of seeing this is that humankind has been reaching various developmental accomplishments, milestones, and stages. As we come to the limits of our most recent stage, the survival-based stage of human development, we must first accomplish the milestones and achievements necessary for the wisdom-based stage of human development. All of our current global crises are simply a manifestation of that process; as a species we are getting the last of our temper tantrums out of our system (literally) and growing up. Growing up tends to hurt, we must burn away that which is not needed to be more in our nature and away from the games of modernity and post-modernity, romanticism, mysticism, rigid intellectualism (MENS), capitalism and communism, organized religion, institutionalized greed, etc., which represent our unwillingness to let go of what we know is unsustainable and are at this point doing far more harm than they ever did good.