

Request Consent / Edits / Objections:

EOP RADICAL HONOURSTY FACTUAL REALITY

[eop-rh-fr¹]

EoP Scientific and Cultural law [eop-sciicultlaw²] – based on EoP Footprint [eop-footprint³] – is the Ecology of Peace culture’s answer to the EoP John Brown⁴ – how to get along without deceiving, overbreeding and overconsuming – Question: What is a Sustainable Procreation and Consumption footprint? EoP RH FR: EoP Radical Honoursty Factual Reality [eop-rh-fr⁵] is the recommended objective reality socio-legal cultural frame of orientation process for implementing EoP SciCult law [eop-sciicultlaw⁶] as international law.

EoP Radical Honoursty Functional Interpretation of Objective Reality Transforming the World Constraints for Sincere Peaceniks / Honourable Warriors:

[1] Ecology of Peace Radical Honoursty Factual Reality [eop-rh-fr⁷] and EoP Scientific and Cultural Law [eop-sciicultlaw⁸] are EoP culture’s functional group shared system of thought and action frame of orientation and object of inter-species relating devotion interpretation of global geopolitical reality for individuals whose object of devotion/values include: (i) honest – race, religious, gender and cultural – relationships; (ii) an ecological carrying capacity based perspective of observable factual social contract reality; and (iii) non-violent cooperative root cause problem solving.

[2] EoP RH FR: Ecology of Peace Radical Honoursty Factual Reality⁹:

[2.1] Factual Reality:

[A] Earth is round, not flat.

[B] Resources are finite.

¹ <http://eop-miled-clerk.tygae.org.za/eop-rh-fr/> archive.is/BSOAb

² <http://eop-nwo-scf.tygae.org.za/scientific-cultural-law/> archive.is/QneCw

³ <http://eop-nwo-sco.tygae.org.za/eop-nwo-scp/eop-footprint/> archive.is/Guli3

⁴ [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/John_Brown_\(abolitionist\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/John_Brown_(abolitionist))

⁵ <http://eop-miled-clerk.tygae.org.za/eop-rh-fr/> archive.is/BSOAb

⁶ <http://eop-nwo-scf.tygae.org.za/scientific-cultural-law/> archive.is/QneCw

⁷ <http://eop-miled-clerk.tygae.org.za/eop-rh-fr/> archive.is/BSOAb

⁸ <http://eop-nwo-scf.tygae.org.za/scientific-cultural-law/> archive.is/QneCw

⁹ <http://eop-miled-clerk.tygae.org.za/eop-rh-fr/> archive.is/BSOAb

- [C] When beings who call themselves humans breed or consume above ecological carrying capacity limits, it results in ecological overshoot, resource depletion and resource conflict.
- [D] Some of the socio-cultural and psycho-political consequences of overpopulation & consumption collision with declining resources include: poverty, slavery, unemployment, food shortages, food inflation, cost of living increases, urban sprawl, traffic jams, toxic waste, pollution, peak oil, peak water, peak food, peak population, species extinction, loss of biodiversity, peak resources, racial, religious, class, gender resource war conflict, militarized police, psycho-social and cultural conformity pressures on free speech, etc; inter-cultural conflict; legal, political and corporate corruption, etc.
- [E] The root cause of humans breeding and consuming above ecological carrying capacity limits are the Masonic War is Peace clauses of international law allowing individuals who call themselves humans to breed and consume above carrying capacity limits.

[2.2] Interpretive Reality:

- [A] If individuals, families, tribes, races, religions, political parties, corporations and/or nations sincerely want to (a) sustainably protect natural resources for future generations; and/or (b) reduce class, racial and/or religious local, national and international resource war conflict; and/or (c) enable honourable, transparent and humane international cooperative de-industrialization and depopulation of the planet to return to living in accordance to ecological carrying capacity limits; they should (d) cooperate to nullify the 'right to breed and consume with total disregard for ecological carrying capacity limits' clauses and replace them with Ecology of Peace – EoP Scientific and Cultural law [eop-sciicultlaw¹⁰] – clauses that restricts all the worlds citizens to breed and consume below ecological carrying capacity limits; or be humanely eliminated from the planetary genepool.

Functional and Dysfunctional – Cultural, Religious, Class and Gender – Interpretations of Objective Reality.

¹⁰ <http://eop-nwo-scf.tygae.org.za/scientific-cultural-law/> archive.is/QneCw

[3] **Although there are a very large number of interpretations of the world; there are unbelievably severe constraints; on the number of functional interpretations there are in the world:**

[4] The postmodernists were actually wrestling with quite a difficult problem. The founders of postmodernism were by no means unintelligent and they actually put their finger on quite an important problem. The important problem that they put their finger on was the fact that any set of phenomena has a near infinite number of potential interpretations. That actually happens to be the case. That fact, let's say, was discovered simultaneously in a number of different disciplines ... One of the disciplines was artificial intelligence ... It was much more difficult to make a machine that could perceive the world, than it had originally been supposed. .. Part of the reason for the lack of artificial intelligence robots back in the 60's was that the artificial intelligence researchers, when they were starting to instantiate perception into their machines, learned that charting your course in the world might be a trivial problem, in comparison to determining how to perceive the world, and the reason for that is that there is a very large number of ways to perceive the world. The postmodernists actually cottoned on to this, and the claims they made was that there is a near infinite number of ways to interpret any given text; and that actually also happens to be the case. Then they said, well if there is a near infinite number of ways to interpret any text, how do you know if any given interpretation should take precedence over any other interpretation, which is also a perfectly reasonable issue. **The error in postmodernism is the failure to recognize that there are a finite number of credible interpretations of phenomena; and also a refusal to engage with the intellectual problem to determine to engage to find out what the finite number may actually consist of.** I will give you a brief overview of how we happened to solve this problem as human beings. We do it partly biologically because we inhabit a biological framework that's been developed over the course of about 3.5 million years; that severely constrains the manner in which we interpret the world. It constrains it such that we only tend to spontaneously manifest interpretations of the world that don't result in undue suffering and our demise. There is plenty of ways to be stupid enough to perish and there are plenty of ways to be stupid enough to suffer without meaning; but there aren't very many ways to live properly and carefully for a long period of time; in a manner that doesn't also simultaneously do harm to other people. So that is the second set of constraints. You have biological constraints on your perception and they are built in, as a consequence of the Darwinian process; and the second part is that you are forced to interact with

yourself now in this week, next week, and the month after. So you have to conduct yourself in a way that doesn't interfere with your future life as you are living now. And simultaneously you have to conduct yourself in a way that makes all the people around you want to cooperate with you and compete with you; and maintain the relationship with you and do that today, and next week and next month. **So although there are a very large number of interpretations of the world; there are unbelievably severe constraints; on the number of functional interpretations there are in the world.** And one of the things that the humanities was supposed to be educating the people with regards towards understanding was: what the universe of those finite functional interpretations might be; and that has been more or less abandoned by the universities; under the values of postmodernism. – Jordan Peterson: Postmodern NeoMarxism: Diagnosis and Cure¹¹.

Definition: Culture / Religion: Frame of Orientation:

[5] Erich Fromm: To Have or to Be: A Culture/Religion is a Group-Shared System of Thought and Action that Offers the Individual a Frame of Orientation and an Object of Devotion:

[5.1] “To clarify, “religion” as I use it here does not refer to a system that has necessarily to do with a concept of God or with idols or even to a system perceived as religion, but to any group-shared system of thought and action that offers the individual a frame of orientation and an object of devotion. Indeed, in this broad sense of the world no culture of the past or present, and it seems no culture in the future, can be considered as not having religion. This definition does not tell us anything about its specific content. People may worship animals, trees, idols of gold or stone, an invisible god, a saintly person, or a diabolical leader; they may worship their ancestors, their nation, their class or party, money or success. Their religion may be conducive to the development of destructiveness or of love, of domination or of solidarity; it may further their power of reason or paralyze it. .. A specific religion, provided it is effective in motivating conduct, is not a sum total of doctrines and beliefs; it is rooted in a specific character structure of the individual and, inasmuch as it is the religion of a group, in the social character. Thus, our religious attitude may be considered an aspect of our character

¹¹ <http://ss-defcon.tygae.org.za/2017/07/09-jul-jpeterson/> archive.is/R1Hy4

structure, for we are what we are devoted to, and what we are devoted to is what motivates our conduct. Often however, individuals are not even aware of the real objects of their personal devotion and mistake their “official” beliefs for their real, though secret religion. If, for instance, a man worships power while professing a religion of love, the religion of power is his secret religion, while his so-called official religion, for example Christianity, is only an ideology.”