

Modern philosophy as rationalized bureaucratism

The modern philosophical establishment is a bureaucracy, and all of the philosophy it produces is an attempt to disguise (and legitimate) that fact.

Skepticism—‘I don’t know, I need more information.’ This is not philosophy. It’s a slimy bureaucrat trying to wriggle off the hook.

But that’s what epistemology is, at least in the hands of philosophy professors. Their focus is not knowledge, but in discouraging attempts to acquire it, like a corrupt police officer who doesn’t want people to ask questions.

And no, there is no substance there. ‘No explanation is better than an explanation’ is all it comes to. Which tells you what you need to know.

Let’s look at ‘logic’ (i.e. what is referred to as such by philosophy professors). The ratio of form to substance in this discipline is around 20-to-1. First of all, getting the apparatus of symbolic logic to adjudicate a given argument---on the rare occasions that it can do so---is a million times harder than it is to adjudicate that argument *ad hoc*. Which means that symbolic logic is the very definition of mathematical failure.

And that system isn’t even the real focus of ‘logic’ classes. Those classes are really about using that apparatus—that already clumsy and useless apparatus---as an excuse to fuss about annotations and system-internal procedures, which obfuscate the little bit of substance that is there. Those classes are about bureaucracy for the sake of bureaucracy, in other words.

There is such a thing as logic—as real logic, I mean. Real logic is about organizing useful statement-sets in a useful-way. (More precisely, it is about producing recursive definitions of such sets.) But that isn’t what logic classes are about. Those classes aren’t even about the Russell-Frege system of logic that they are supposedly about. After all, the entire of that system of logic could be covered in a few hours. That system is just a pretext for wasting the students’ time with system-specific notation-related protocols—for bureaucratic dead-end-ism, in other words.

And ethics—what do we have there? A lot of rot about ‘killing vs. letting die’—about being a faceless bureaucrat, in other words, who would rather do nothing, and therefore be nothing, than actually take a stand. More bureaucratism, in other words.

Then there is the open secret that nobody reads philosophy journals. Ever. They don’t read them because they are not meant to be read. Because bureaucratic memos are not meant to be read. Because being read is a precursor to getting things done, and the purpose of those memos is not too get things done but is rather to *not* get things done.

Their purpose is to hide the eating up of resources that they themselves are.

The ultimate circularity, the ultimate bureaucratism.

Ultimately things appear as what they are. Useless bureaucrats posing as professors can hide what they are for a while, but eventually they will confess through their ‘work.’ And that’s what’s happening here.

There is actually a lot of demand for philosophy. Philosophy is about producing insight. That’s its job. That’s its only job. And people want insight. They will pay for it, handsomely. I personally am paid handsomely for it. But nobody wants what philosophy professors have to offer, because what they are offering is not insight. What they are offering is the opposite of insight. It’s a bulwark against insight.

What they are telling you, what their ‘work’ is telling you, is to *not* ask questions. ‘You can’t know’ (skepticism). ‘Don’t be a hero’ (ethics). ‘It’s unprovable’ (logic). Meaning, respectively, ‘it is not *for you* to know’, ‘it is not *for you* to act’, and ‘it is not *for you* to prove.’

What they are offering to the world, in other words, is—nothing. They are eating up resources, wasting people's time, getting paid for it, and telling you that you are wrong to investigate--- the 'philosophy' they are producing being so much squid ink to this effect.