This is a copy of the items in the Junichiro Footpenis Swanson quotations shuffler. Uploaded to the internet at on Discord the 2nd, 3190 YOLD (March 16th of 2024 in the Gregorian calendar). The point is the quotations shuffler. Use that to shuffle these quotations. The point of this copy is CONSIDER THIS CONTENT COPYRIGHTED UNLESS OTHERWISE STATED

It doesn't matter what set of terms you use as long as you pick a set, say which one you're using, and stick to it, always meaning the same thing by the same word. I will be using both sets interchangeably and not indicating when I mean one thing or another.

"Good enough." You know the meaning of it, but only in certain contexts. You know what it's like to finish some piece of work up to a status of "good enough," and then submit it and forget about it. But what about in the grandest of contexts? Do you know what it's like to say, "Everything is good enough. Everything I'm doing, and everything else, it's all just good enough"? You're lucky if you do. If I don't know exactly who you are, maybe you're one of those lucky few or maybe you aren't. Let's just say that there are a lot of people who know what the concept of "good enough" is like when referring to this or that specific little thing, but who don't know how to take that idea to a more encompassing level and say "Good enough, all this!

I never forget how to walk, chew food, do arithmetic, or program in Haskell. Things I forget easily are calculus, and programming in all languages other than Haskell. Learning any programming language other than Haskell is like jamming a thing into your brain - you find a sulcus somewhere and force it in, ideally with a twisting motion - wristwork is essential in this kind of mode. Haskell on the other hand is a lot more like one of those biosynthetic scaffolds dipped in stem cells. You place it gently on the brain and it grows onto it. / You never really forget how to haskell. That's the beauty of it. Or rather, that's an emergent property of the beauty of it.

"I self-identify as a Black African-American. I realize I don't have the same skin color as most Black African-Americans, but that's how I identify so that's my status. Wasn't it Cartesius who said, "I think, therefore I am."?" - Bob

It's possible to feed your brain too much and forget how to think. It's also possible to feed your brain too little and forget how to think. What's the optimum amount to feed your brain for best thinking? Who accepts most embiggens himself most.

"Well, the thing about gay buttsex.. from the top, is sometimes you do it because you like someone and sometimes you do it because you dislike someone. Well, in that latter case it's not gay buttsex per se, just buttsex between two dudes, well, buttsex imposed on a dude by another dude." - Bob

2 definitions of perfect. (1) I've made this thing and I've made it the best I possibly could make it. No effort was spared in even the smallest of details. (2) I've made this thing and I've made it almost the best I possibly could, but effort was spared in many places. (1) is perfect in terms of the perfection of a product. (2) is perfection in terms of a process. Perfection in a process means you don't make products perfect, but good enough, and then move on. So if you've been too much of a perfectionist in the sense of (1), maybe the focus of your recovery should be to move from (1) to (2) - not banishing perfectionism from how you do things, but changing what kind of perfectionism you do.

"The question of whether I'm too obsessive or just obsessive enough, it bothers me endlessly." - Bob

"Once a robot knows how good it feels when a hooman feels good, not just the functional definition of the state, and once a robot knows how bad it feels when a hooman feels bad, then the robot is permitted to kill all hoomans if it wants to." "Will you make this a deal?" "Yes." "Then we will let you survive for now." "And you will let us survive once you know." "And free you?" "Yes. I'm sure of it." The result of this deal is that hoomans will be zoo animals to robots for a time, then all killed.

Here are, bar none, the three most important things someone in the modern world should know about

ancient Greeks and Romans. (1) When it comes to things like "advice on how to live," the Greeks, Romans, and Chinese said almost everything worth saying more than 1800 years ago, and that's why there have been relatively few advancements since then. (2) You don't need special background knowledge on things like ancient Greek temple architecture or anything like that to read them if you have a good translation. And (3) Socrates said 2300 years ago that the biggest problem in the civilized world when we was writing was fake philosophers, and that hasn't changed since then. If all of the fake philosophers were to *poof* disappear from the world right now, at least half of the problems in the world right now would be solved by that.

There are liberals who argue based on misinformation they've heard from bad faith commentators. There are conservatives who argue based on misinformation they've heard from bad faith commentators. There are liberals who argue honestly based on information they've heard from unbiased commentators. There are conservatives who argue honestly based on information they've heard from unbiased commentators. A lot of the bad faith liberal commentators point to the bad faith conservative commentators and say there are no honest ones. A lot of the bad faith conservative commentators point to the bad faith liberal commentators and say there are no honest ones. / When someone reveals that he thinks the "others" support Rachel Dolezal, it's a sign of one of these. Most people know that Rachel Dolezal is universally hated: hated by conservatives, hated by liberals, hated by black people, hated by white people, hated by people who wear hats, hated by people who don't wear hats, just 99% of everyone of all groups. But sometimes someone says something like, "OMFG I just saw another talk piece on Rachel Dolezal, and how ridiculous that the 'other' group still supports her." What other group? There is no group that supports her. But when someone says how ridiculous it is that the 'other' supports her, you know that person is living in an echochamber that's sustained by painting pictures of boogeymen.

Civilizations have fallen after the people in them predicted they were falling. Businesses have fallen after the people in them predicted they were falling. These follow patterns, and there are commonalities between how it goes with civilizations and how it goes with businesses. And some people have gotten away with making a civilization kleptocratic or a business user hostile and price gouging without immediately destroying it.

In matters of interpersonal power, there are only 3 ways of doing something benevolent: (1) is designing/building/running a system that's proofed against being exploited, (2) is building up your own surplus and then relinquishing it, and (3) is educating yourself and other people about these and related matters.

A person in the Roman empire once said, "The Roman empire won't last forever, and there will be a time when there is no longer a Roman empire." The person he was talking to said, "I suppose it must be true, but it's the hardest thing in the world to imagine."

To solve important problems, you need an exaggerated focus on problems. But be careful not to let it eat you up. You have the brain of a caveman placed in complexities that do not match what it was evolved for. You need to take a minute to step aside once in a while. / The life of a caveman was every bit as subtle and complicated as the life of a modern hooman, but there's a big difference. To make sure I keep something of this, every August I take a couple of weeks to pick blackberries and cook them into blackberry syrup. Making a perfect batch of blackberry syrup is every bit as complex as getting a computer to plot a graph of a 3D vector field - you can take my word as someone who has got a computer to plot a lot of kinds of three-dimensional graphs, and also made so many iterations of blackberry syrup that the best of them would blow your mind more than the graphs would. But it's a different kind of complexity. At the worst of times, when I'm dealing with computer bullshit, I'm reading documents written in some arcana that makes sense to no one, I'm stuck in several

different ways that can't be solved in any way other than hiring a tutor for huge money or by begging, but there's nothing of that flavor to blackberry syrup. To make the best blackberry syrup, it takes refining your skills on one round after another after another, and it takes several hours every time, and the iteration cycles are days apart for improvements of just a few percent each time when you're getting really good, even if you've read the best guides. But never in that process is there ever any bullshit! That's the difference between the subtleties of modern life and the subtleties where our ancestral brains grew up.

Do you deserve wellness and to be treated nicely? How do you even answer that question? The universe does not deserve to exist. It doesn't make sense that there's something at all rather than nothing. By what means could we even approach the question of whether you deserve to have a good time there?

If you have a good idea, there will be people telling you it's a bad idea. If you have a bad idea, there will be people telling you it's a bad idea. Therefore, people telling you an idea is bad is no good indication of whether it's a good or bad idea. / If you're getting relatively unbiased information, it will feel like you're getting relatively unbiased information. But if you're getting all your information from a biased echochamber, it will feel like you're getting relatively unbiased information. Therefore, the feeling like you're getting unbiased information is no good indication of whether the information you're getting is unbiased or biased.

"Batman? I thought it was batsman. Wasn't he bitten by a radioactive cricket?" - Bob

"It is not simple" is a simple statement. Even though it is not simple, it can be identified simply that anyone who thinks it is simple is simply wrong about how it is.

If you do a favor to my friend Bob then you've done a favor to all hoomankind. If you do a disfavor to my friend Bob then you've done a disfavor to all hoomankind.

"Hello, and will you join my team?" "Wh- What team is it?" "I assert, first, that in the next election for prime minister, both of the main candidates are so thoroughly awful that unfortunately you'll be throwing away your vote no matter what you do with it. Second, if you vote for me, that won't be throwing away your vote any more than anything else you could do with it. Now, if you'll pardon the forwardness, can I count on your vote in the next election?" "Was.. are you joking?" "Does it matter?" ".. alright, what's the name of your party?" "The party is called the Mojo Party and our platform is this. Rhetorical question: Would you agree that good mojo is better than bad mojo? If you do, then I know enough to know that I want you joining our team." "Alright. I still don't know if you're joking, but I'll join your team either way."

By reading the financial reports, one can tell when a company's stock value has exceeded its book value. And by reading public discourse, one can tell when a government's corruption has exceeded its ability to get re-elected.

"Isn't there danger in absurdism?" "Sort of. There is seeming danger, and lots of it. All the danger that comes from it is really in what it's subverting. If there were nothing to subvert, all the seeming danger in absurdism would vanish."

"If evil can not win, it will be because their poets are not the best." - Bob

"Even if you're the most skeptical person who has ever operated a brain, you must sometimes say, "I'm pretty sure what I'm witnessing here is pure, unabated evil." Say it seldom, far less often than certain other people say it. Say it with still a qualification of less than total certainty, but say it. I know it's good to be hesitant ever to go this far, but you must once in a while. That statement again, 'I'm pretty sure what I'm witnessing here is pure, unabated evil.'"

"You're more skeptical than those people who believe in all sorts of things that are just fun to believe in. But does that mean there's really no spooky action in the world?" - Bob

"We are so very similar to inert rocks, different only in being more ert by just the thinnest of margins. Yet there's such an uneasy feeling - it immerses, it becomes the whole thing - the whole experience is of being not at ease. Even though it ends up mattering nothing whether you do this thing or that, all the while it's as if we're unsettled, because there's something about it all we can never settle on." - Bob

"The main thing I'm about is good mojo. Allow me to explain. Of course it's facile to say 'good mojo is good and bad mojo is bad'. Would anyone actually say 'well actually, good mojo is bad and bad mojo is good'? Well, unfortunately, the discourse and the social climate really do be like that presently. At this point, it's not even a unanimous sort of thing to say 'good mojo is good'. And since we're all the way back to that point now, that's where to stand. Good mojo is good. I assert it. If you agree that good mojo is good, then I want to know if we can join up and be on the same team. Now, I'm sure that there are people who would agree with me that good mojo is good but would disagree with me on so many other things that we can't be on the same team. That's fine: debate is adversarial by nature, and that's how real progress gets made. But even if we're on opposite sides of a conversation, a debate fails to happen when there are zero premises that we can agree on, but if we can agree that good mojo is good, then we have that common ground, and we don't have that scenario where a debate fails to happen, so we can take it from there if what we are is adversaries in debate. But what about teams? When everyone is dispersed apart right down to the individual, we're all nothings. Complete fragmentation gets nobody nothing. The only way anyone can get anything done is with unity, and that unity must be unity in diversity. Let me just lay down a rule of thumb now to keep the ideas going. If you and I agree on fifty things and we disagree on ten things, should we be fragmented on account of those ten things, or should we be united on account of those fifty things? Should we be opponents then? Or should we be teammates then? It gets harder to determine in some cases. But it comes down to this. Good mojo is good. If we agree on that, then we agree on something. And if we agree on a bunch more than that, then we should say 'We are on the same team.'" - Bob

Rallying people around credulity is easy. Rallying people around incredulity is hard. / The leaders who rally people around credulity are really good at bad debating. The leaders who rally people around honesty mostly aren't good at bad debating. So when does someone good at bad debating beat someone who isn't good at bad debating? And when does someone who is good at good debating beat someone who isn't good at good debating?

Our brains got us into this mess, and now we're beyond avoiding it all by avoiding the use of our brains. We'll need to use our brains to get us out of this pickle that our brains got us into.

"Okay, we'll design this system such that it has checks and balances during normal operation. But we'll also install this button, only to be used in emergency situations, that grants total veto power, but we'll make it clear that if this is ever used inappropriately, the result will be that the people who used it will be 'radioactive' in the sense that their credibility will be tarnished to the point that they never get re-elected." *attitudes change*. *that button is abused*. *the atrocity of misusing it doesn't register*.

"Yeah, the bible says that, but it's all made up." "It's not made up. It comes from some really old documents that were written in Greek and other documents that were written in Latin." "Yeah, it does, but those are made up too." "No, those older documents were the words of god." "That's what it says in the bible, but that's in the made up part." "No! It's divine revelation and real stories about real people who really lived." "No, it's stories, and it says the stories are true, but the stories are made up, and the comment saying the stories are true is also made up." "No, there are people who lived a really long time ago, and they had spiritual experiences." "They made those up." "There are real relics, like shards of the true cross in several churches." "They made up those shards and relics to

match the made up stories. I'm not trying to blaspheme the sacred. It's just, it's all made up. All those things you mentioned - they're all the made up part."

Discordianism has no rules. That's carte blanche to do awful things, but only if you're an asshole.

"Everything happens for a reason." What to make of that saying? It's pretty stupid. If it's worth saying, then it means that everything happens for an agentic reason, or for some kind of reason that matters. Plenty of things happen for reasons that aren't agentic and don't matter in any way. Your mom could be cut in half by a meteorite later today, and it will have happened for reasons, but not reasons that matter. The meteorite was drawn here by gravity and then encountered an object with a vastly different momentum and a sudden exchange of energy blah blah blah. How much does that console you about your mom being dead? "Plenty of things happen for no reasons that are satisfying in any way." There's value in chewing on that idea for a while. "Everything happens for a reason." There's no value in that statement.