

Oneself as Intended, Not as Packaged

The Intersection of Minimalism with
Censorship & Why Change is Needed.

They say that less is more, that cutting away creates freedom—but why then has the prevalence and “trendiness” of minimalism most often only ever made me feel suffocated and censored, as if pulled down by crabs that insist that if they can’t leave the bucket (or don’t want to) then neither can I? Why allow mediocrity to rule when, in reality, it is *differences* (the abnormal, the unconforming) that have authored most of history?



That to me is the real underlying essence and nature and *de facto* effect of the blight of imposed minimalism that has characterized so much of the last decade or more of so called “tech”. Enforced minimalism does not lighten or liberate: it merely imprisons.

Well, I for one (actually, for a great many people, I suspect—perhaps even the majority now, at this decrepit juncture, when the harm has become ever increasingly apparent) am done acquiescing to the forced tyranny of value-destroying minimalism. What has it got us? Small thoughts and smaller minds: the province of myopia and enforced mediocrity; the empty void of banality: a digitized concrete prison, a world of walls.

One size does *not* fit all, nor indeed hardly anyone *properly* except some random lucky few. True diversity does not fit well inside any prepackaged box. People are better than that, frankly; they are more interesting than that, more uncategorizable than that. In fact, I chafe at even the idea that one’s personhood could be wrapped up in any amount of text, nor that any of these superficialities which purport to be our key distinguishing traits as people even actually mean anything *real* at all.

I’m not convinced that the PhD is worth more than the bumpkin, nor that the person who likes gardening is in any substantive sense a different kind of person than the gamer or the jock or the socialite. I’m not convinced that the character is the actor.

I’m quite frankly sick of this farce, this decades-long charade that others know best what categories and constraints would suit us well when so clearly they do not. A cage can never be a platform for freedom.

When did so many people lose so much of their grip on the underlying nature of reality and what one can plainly see with one’s own eyes and touch with one’s own hands that they can no longer even perceive the blatantly apparent folly of trying to force complexity to fit the mold of simplicity. That isn’t possible and it never will be.

Complexity can be *summarized*, but never truly simplified—because, if complexity were ever truly simplified then it would no longer be what it is, by definition. It would be a self-contradiction (a hot ice cube, a bright darkness) and hence true simplified complexity cannot exist. Failing to keep that distinction clear and respected is a recipe for tyranny of expression: a microcosm of censorious illiberal dystopia wherever its overbearing and overreaching *false economy* of “less is more” touches and taints.

Of course, complexity naturally arises from the interaction and entanglement of simpler things, but that does not make complexity itself simple. A complex world devised by simple rules is still complex. The rules of *Go* are simple; the game is not.

Indeed, it is precisely such complexity that makes life capable of such beauty as it is—the cornucopia of nuance of any microcosm of the world: a loved one’s endearing charms and quirks, a field of study’s bountiful richness and depths, a secluded forest’s verdant freedom and exuberance, a starlit night’s cosmic wonder and mystery.

Why then *suppress* complexity, when you could instead *embrace* it?

Why be *less*, when you could instead be *more*?

Why let the crabs in the bucket hold you back?

Why appease their autocratic egos?

Less is *not* more. Only more can be more, by definition, and on pain of self-contradiction, hence incoherence, hence meaninglessness: the void. We need *more* meaning in these times of endangered freedom and precarious human rights, not less.

That much is clear at this point. Everywhere top-down enforced minimalism has spread in society (especially in “tech”, in that subset of it that one could aptly dub the *parasite economy*) it chokes out freedom.

One can neither hasten nor greaten the process of creating new meaning by forcing others to preemptively fit one’s own preconceptions, nor by imprisoning others inside any specific format or mode of being or doing. That is the great fallacy of those in power, though, alas. Yet, will they ever see it, drunk on their own egos as they are?

It is a mistake akin to supposing that what a forest really needs to thrive is to have itself forcibly arranged strictly into evenly spread linear rows, a so called “perfect” robotic grid. Experience has shown though that such arrangements of plants are far more ecologically fragile and are prone to frequent total collapse and poor outcomes.

We humans are not so different I think. Aren’t the past several years proof of that? Can’t you feel the noxious and suffocating quality of being forced to live in this contrived way?

Yet, what does one see in recent decades in excess in society but precisely that: meaning being systematically snuffed out of existence in the public square (and increasingly in private too, as the digital equivalent of peeping toms and perverts, a.k.a. big “tech” companies, enhance the intrusiveness of their binoculars with every passing month) by being forced to fit some myopic format designed to cram the burgeoning uncontainable *more* of personhood into the preconceived and ill-begotten *less* of

some “tech” company’s contrived notion of “what’s best for us” when—in reality—no such box could ever contain us, not any of us, no matter how falsely labeled as “below” or “above” or “of a different type of person” than any other.

It was in such a mood, with such long pent-up feelings and contemplations swirling in the currents and eddies of my state of mind that I thought to initiate an online "newsletter" (really: an article collection—relatively timeless and hence not “news”). In pursuit of that goal, I thought perhaps to use one of the (ostensibly) prominent platforms for such things, and identified Substack and Medium as prospects.

Specifically though, the precipitating event that kicked off the tangent/inspiration to write this present article was in fact my original attempt to write my bio on Substack. Substack didn’t bother telling me the character limit (250) until after I’d already put a lot of time and refinement into what I wrote.

Side-Note: I later also tried Medium but then within a few days decided to leave it too, more so (though not only) for moral reasons caused by the clearly evident hypocrisy of how all of Medium's "Staff Picks" articles that were featured (hence *pushed aggressively upon readers*) were nauseatingly disingenuous propaganda in favor of theft-based AI (something which I find to be ethically unconscionable) while simultaneously their official posts about their policies on theft-based AI pretended that the platform was for humans only. This discrepancy was/is a clear sign of deceit and weakness. I do not trust them not to steal authors' work, etc.

I recall a case recently (reported by [Ted Gioia](#)) of Spotify "generating"/plagiarizing music very similar to trending/popular pieces in order to rob the associated musicians of almost all of the payout of any music that has a breakout success. The ambivalent wording and "we'll see what happens in the future" kind of energy of Medium's statements reek of a high chance of them later on (or already...) systematically stealing authors' work in a similar way potentially.

This is a tangent though. The *de facto* censorious effects of minimalism (etc) is the focus here.

Yet: Misfortune can often be a serendipitous path to better luck, ironically.

Thus, here I am now, with that slight ordeal having led to a new trajectory.

In truth though, the “bio” I wrote was more of an *anti-bio* than a bio.

I do not care what “distinguishes” me particularly, in this context, but rather I just want what all people of good intent want in some sense: to face and embrace the wonders of the world and to amply share those experiences and thoughts, when desired, with others along the way, striving always for the greater good, keeping wholesomeness of intent and prudence of outcome as one’s ideal in mind.

What more can any truly sane and freethinking person in these times ask for but that?

As such, the following is the original "bio" (*anti-bio*) that I had intended to use to express and embody some of the principles of magnanimity and nuance that have guided my thoughts of late, provided both for context and because the text is similar in spirit and relevance to the rest of the article anyway:

I'm a creative generalist and a renaissance man: a thinker from first principles—a person of science and sincerity in equal measure. My mind is a procession of tandems: nature and numbers; trees and technology; aesthetics and analysis; magnanimity and mastery; befuddlement and brilliance; ethics and excess; downturns and dedications. I'm a microcosm in a bottle: an ocean in a puddle. Aren't we all?

Every person is a ripple in a pond and our waves are felt by all. From one domino to another, I wish you warmth and good fortune as we all fall together into the future. There's no pavement on the road to the unknown, but we can still hold each other's hands. So, fellow friends of freedom, earnest evangelists of effort, a call to clarity: face the unknown and grace the unsown.

Good is a journey where every step is treated as an end of itself, whereas evil is a journey where only the final end is treated as mattering. There is no final end though. Now is all that there is or ever will be. Thus: live now and live well. See what's in front of you. Light the way. Respect the sanctity of now. Others are not our stepping stones.

Like candles in the dark, only a river of light can mirror the tapestry of the stars. Isn't such a world, a world bejeweled by wholesomeness, worth fighting for? Thus: I am here, as are we all—to be another candle in your dark, and likewise.

Anyway, that's not really the point though. I'm bringing it up because it gives context and expresses similar ideas as what I want to here. It proved to be a serendipitously useful jumping off point for this article's tangent, whose existence is owed to the precipitating inconvenient event.

Honestly, the bio could apply to anybody who has a similarly diverse range of interests across technology, creativity, philosophy, and/or nature. I suspect there are a great many people whose dispositions are along those lines, and hence I see fit to try my hand at helping such fellow kindred spirits out. That seems like quite a worthwhile endeavor to pursue!

Indeed, I have come to reason that it seems that the only real path forward for us as a society is to liberate ourselves from the strictures of "tech" overreach and such and to instead embrace a kind of farsighted and nature-inspired reconception of what technology and creativity and the way we think and live should look like if ethical and interpersonal imperatives are to be fully accounted for adequately for the future of humanity and for the essential well-being of the Earth as a whole.

If our pursuit of such noble long-term goals for society are to bear fruit, if we are truly to overcome the needless suffering and wasted potential our species has so crassly had inflicted upon itself by the misguided few—that special group of powerful people who falsely attribute their luck in power to genius—then it is foremost imperative to extricate ourselves from the multitude of false assumptions that misguide us, which exist in abundance and now risk drowning out authentic and morally responsible thought.

Modern life could be so much more wholesome and so much more considerate of the future. Tech could be engineered to be in harmony with the way of nature instead of in opposition to it. Farsighted choices are essential. Imagine if society was rearchitected in light of that!

Human rights and creativity likewise must be fostered and nurtured for the greater good. Along the way, I also wish to share personal creative, intellectual, technical, philosophical, and emotional ponderings as seems fit or when the mood strikes me. Both breadth and depth empower change.

It is with all the above in mind that I chose a fitting name for my nascent "newsletter" (ongoing article collection) that prospectively embodies much of the underlying spark of these kinds of thoughts — ***Elven IT: Reimagining Society in Light of Nature & Nurture***. The mnemonic/commemorative idea is to ask oneself: *What if society were redesigned as if by Tolkien's elves—exuding farsightedness, longevity, wisdom, and benevolence, and thereby brought in harmony with nature and nurture?*

I will be publishing some additional articles in the future along these lines of inspiration and I hope that such articles will play at least some substantive role in shifting the future towards a better world, one small step at a time, insofar as I can as an individual, whether in the large (by mindfully reexamining, questioning, and posing alternatives to society's biggest false assumptions) or in the small (by sharing one's own personal creative work and philosophical contemplations, and so on, in whatever arbitrary and unconstrained medium seems fit to carry the point, as one's whims will). One needn't stifle change.

It is thus, by never giving in to defeatism and by firmly refusing to be crammed into false and preemptive boxes in all aspects of who we are that perhaps, together, the brighter future that so many of us now hope for may one day alight the horizon. Thus, one is wise to blaze new trails into the dark.

Our horizons move whenever we do. Every step we make is change, always.

Owing to the fact that I ended up abandoning both Substack and Medium, I've had to alter the nature of my plans for the "newsletter" (articles). I do not trust either platform enough to put my material on really, as far as I can see it now, and there are also practical problems and stifling expressive constraints that doing so would impose on me.

Instead, my new plan is currently to post these articles on my own independent website (WraithGlade.com), where I am better protected against systematic exploitation. In order to potentially offer recurring readers a means of being updated automatically (and hence more conveniently) of new things I do though, I perhaps may find a more conventional email list system of some kind and may use that in the future, as a reasonable balance.

Either way though, I will publish more articles along these lines, among other things, though it is not yet clear whether I'll put them all under an official "***Elven IT***" moniker.



WraithGlade.com

