



DEWLOGIC

THE COMMUNAL ESTATE

All rights, including the right to reproduce this book in any way, shape or form belong to author and publisher. No reproduction in whatever form or manner may be done without consent.

THE COMMUNAL ESTATE

DEWLOGIC

Copyright © 2015 by Dewlogic

All Rights Reserved.

Making Reading Worth Your While
DEWLOGIC

Non Fiction Books from Dewlogic

Failure&Solitude

The Rudeness of Soul

The Idealism of Soul

Enmity

Trust

Faith&Doubt

Number's Lot

The Communal Estate

THE
COMMUNAL
ESTATE

When I write, life equates fulfillment, a high, a puff purer than air, and my oxygenation fills beyond the brim of the widest oceans, my calling above the grim of death. There is a resurgence of soul; it must be; as that which my mind makes my calling pumps my blood anew.

Beyond the grip of pity, the ideal inclination of empathy, and all such which accommodates the individual in emotional relation to a communal, there is the need beyond any need for the individual to breathe in the purest puff of air, that which is belonging as fulfillment. Without such in the truest essence of it, there is a fight for the resurgence of being, a calling for and against failure and success because subjugation as well as abnegation is a communal property. The rifts are ceaseless.

And the advice goes out like a leaf in the wind: “Find your calling! Find your calling!” There are experts learned, and yet clueless, and thus clueless and yet learned.

While ill-equipped with the sought-after-calling, it is in essential ill-evident to you, rendering you a mere piece of advice; indeed, a leaf in the wind.

Well there is the status quo, that which implies the calling or such things of such kinds are not necessities, but rather an imposition on duty to oneself and the communal at large. And such once found and substantiated by a self, it initiates as a choice in the communal, where socio-economic

status as well as personal ability determines its fulfillment and lack thereof. That it finds itself a necessity depends on the evolution of being in relation to such a calling. The calling itself becomes an ultimate sacrifice for and in life.

Circumstances foster or deny its essential worth, and such is mostly equated to the worth of the individual in the communal. Yet, it must, if it is to have any worth at all, sustain as the ultimate sacrifice for and in life.

It is indulgence. It is resurgence. It is the ultimate pride in life without a shred of evidence to suggest it worthwhile. It is the fragile shrine equipped with the worthless grave. It is the misunderstood epitome of shame and ridicule.

But the ridicule itself a proof of the calling's veracity it may be. Ridicule is an attempt by an external entity to impose a sense of shame. To be required to exhibit a sense of shame is to be a part of an unplanned plot, a victim of unmotivated negative distress or an immoral one. Immorality calls shame. A calling has a deeply known self-sacrificial plot with an insatiable edge for its own becoming. A calling has a soul. Shame never touches a soul without an individual's consent.

In the communal state, this calling with a soul is simply a trade.

Trade is done for and never against the self, unless it is done as a risk, at a risk. In which case it is done both for and against the self knowingly, strictly as a probability return, not as a return;

done, in this instance, as the uncertainty of risk for some hopeful end.

Here I must state that while risk is an essential tool of progress and success, hope can be a terrible thing to dangle. The limitations of hope will be discussed further in the body of this work.

Risk is a tool of business that is more rampant in investments than direct trade. Direct trade, like the sale of products to a customer for instance, has a different level of risks than money invested in stocks and bonds. Direct trades are usually done by a self, in this case the individual, or directly on behalf of the individual. Thus trades, unless otherwise the individual is plagued by some sort of apparent insanity, cannot be done against the self by the self.

An individual trades something owned or created by the self for profit or for otherwise anything else contractible with another on his or her behalf. Such, the inability to sell a product in the marketplace is not a loss in as much as it is not a loss of the product, nor is it a loss of the ability to create it. There is the risk of the inability to sell a product in the marketplace. The risk is not that of the inability to make money. It can only be in the inability to sell.

Money is the major tool of trade for everyone. It can never be more for one than for another or it becomes lawless and meaningless in trade. The product is the commodity of trade. Money is always a means to an end. If it isn't printed paper,

it's some minted coin, some coral shell, or a lion's bone, or some other nonentity or entity called into some sudden value humans can conceive.

To give money a soul is to make the human soulless. And this is inevitable in process.

Unlike the relation of individual labor with direct trade, investment risks, stocks and bonds work differently in that they directly involve indirect risks, a whole lot of it. It is the gambling haven and heaven for gambler's business lots. In both Direct and investments trades, there is always involvement in that risks are staked by the risk taker. The risk taker absorbs risks both as possible failure and possible success at the same time. But in investments risks, risks are usually traded for risks not for direct products.

The power of the individual in individual ownership, which is a necessity in trade, rests mainly in direct products. The power of corporations depends on this as well. That's why people own copyrights and also why products and ideas are patented; to protect individual or corporation-al trade or the ability to trade in the communal state.

If there is any form of prejudice, racism, sexism, economic/political divide etc. involved in trade, it is usually administered in the ability to trade. Any form of prejudice in the communal is always against an individual or a corporation based on some prejudice or divide.

Thus, the communal state loses its commoner essence, the soul projected, in governance. Governance can be as much a tool of progress as it can be of prejudice against the individual. How can something capable of losing its commoner soul project a communal estate?

We come to the commoner state.

There is an unprecedented trial of a self against a self when the individual confronts the communal state a commoner.

A commoner assumes an integral assimilation which enables a common state. A common state is a state extended and accepted as belonging. It is unprecedented because it doesn't directly extend from the self (as there can never be two selves extended as one self, or two physical traits extended as one and same), and it is a trial because it has to be accepted or rejected by the self, consciously or rather intellectually.

The commoner sensations often extends a sense of communal estate, and the socio-political-economic states is used as a means of pronouncing and enforcing such precedents in a manner such as voting and appointment of representation. The unprecedented trial the self may have is exchanged for a sense of privilege in derivation and achievement of the political-social-economic states.

This commoner state: Is it a convenient, a comforting state, a state of a state, a median state,

an inclined failed state, an inclined success state, an ordinary state, some extraordinary state?

What it is usually or usually sought for is its inclusiveness, or rather a sense of its inclusiveness. What it has in reality is an inclusive-exclusive dynamic; that which I will call a “Common-None” state.

It extends a Commoner stance on a pedestal above all else, and while on landing on the base level which equates all the commoners, the individual finds him or herself in none state. Such it holds its flag with arrows in differing directions, one going up and the other going down, neither of which ever truly meets. It sometimes holds an affirmation that could in its very essence in process, be demeaning, a habitual rather than a precision call for a state.

Yet it isn't unruly, and depending on the level of inclusiveness may alter a mind state like a second skin would a chameleon. It is a seeming dainty, yet fleeting state. In other words, it usually thrives on consent, sometimes based on varying reasons founded from communalized traits to mildly to mostly emotional/intellectual/fantasized/imposed or self-imposed binding and blinding sense of belonging.

The Commoner-None state engages dynamics which holds strains on every strand of prejudice possible within the communal state. It is often rendered and proclaimed as transforming; it is rather adoptive and counterfeit.

People around the world often say it, as a figurative emblematic statement of appeasement usually—that fingers are not equal. But in what aspects are they truly together?

Is there any standard to the commoner state as a state of commonality within the communal state?

Commonality as a shared estate is an essential paradox; one calling dynamics within dynamics. It invokes the standard of not having standards. This is not necessarily a bad thing; in fact, it may be argued to be a very good thing in an idealistic state. It calls an incongruous whole towards a superfluous unprecedented continuous sovereignty, and disavows standards while pulling dynamics. It is a functionality without a truly bonding force-scope, extending movement in infinite directions without the reality of it.

And here you may ask it with some thoughtful enthusiasm; “What is it?” Is it a monster, a human, an egg, a dog, a pig, a Neanderthal?

I will address this differently.

What a fate? And if there is such a fate, it must first be proclaimed from the unprecedented and then maintained through some sort of forcible socio-political means. It is by no means or standard, a natural fate.

If nature and real freedom are logically aligned; what are the standards of freedom in the communal state and its effect on the estimation of personal stakes in the communal estate?

The communal state usually stands on the notion of freedom, even if it is derivative, that is, if it is derived at the expense of another set or class of the communal state. And sometimes this freedom in the communal state comes at the expense of variety at the commoner's stake or the expense of the commoner at the individual's stake.

That something is free is a reference to its being: that it has the internalized ability to be and is enabled to be its natural self. By this very notion, if something is free in the natural or scientific sense, it is already free to be against all set standards. This scientific plights are simply scientific.

Salt is salt by all testable standards, and by a variant of testable standards can never be mistaken for sugar. Sugar is sugar by a set of standards salt doesn't have to abide by. The test for salt is not the test for sugar. The set of natural reactions for salt is not the set of natural reactions for sugars. Nature seems to obey standards in scientific terms, and the common-to-none variation need not apply. The communal estates for variants necessitate standards. That is, if some element were to hold a pronouncement, "I am salt," then by all standard testable for salt it must stand as salt and not sugar. The same goes for sugar if it were to suddenly proclaim to be salt.

In the reality of the communal state, freedom, especially that which is invested in a commoner's

communal estate sets sails against standards while setting sails for it at the same time.

The Common-None dynamic has no set scope thus it cannot be truly engaged. One ideal state of commoner statehood may achieve a true commoner status in the commoner dynamic, but a set of traits or abilities within the individual dynamic cannot. Such within a set dynamic within an unknown scope, the individual has an extremely high probability of having a Common-None dynamic.

Is there such a fate, a state that may make the individual merged into a Common-None fate lose a sense of reasonability and rationality of self in the communal mind state, one which may deprive him or her of the only essence generalizable in the communal state: humanity? Must the Darwinian evolutionary theory be reevaluated in order to assess the individual's Commoner state, make room for a personalized state? Must the drag on the nature-nurture dynamic be absorbed? Is time essential for the Common-None dynamic or for individual evolution? Who is, where is, the individual in the communal state?

When a compound mind state is infused onto a sense of self, what may become of personal strife must be infused with an unprecedented sense of privilege for progress and survival for that self or rather a fallow sense of hope without the supposed sense of precedence. If everyone's hope were to be realizable with precedence, the law which enables

individuality and reasonability will become senseless.

Such, we come to hope. It does demand reasonability.

The assurances of faith in a self or any aspect presumable in a self is in that of work as much as that of fate is in actions. Work is faith. Work is fated. But the implementation of hope is in that of expectations. And when work is ever invested in hope it evades personhood. It is enslaved in process.

Hope is either a symbol of expectation or that of despair. There is no healthier aspect to the scope. Pray not while you can work. Hope is the least of what life can afford you, never the best. Hope is a plague, never a blessing, especially when the answer is sought not from us but from others. It is unqualified burden to expect something from nothing.

A source is always its own will.

Such if you have none, you hope the lender has, as you must hope to work and pay back. If you cannot work or pay back, the hope is one sided. And the hope to get without being able to produce or/and give back is that of despair; a worse fate than that related with mere expectations.

Babies hope and expect because their parents already conceived, gave birth to, and had taken responsibilities for their lives and being. And because they have learned to expect in process—in

that process. Have a baby, dump him or her in the dumpster, and the baby can hope forever...before dying. Here, there is great expectation in process, no fulfilment to come.

Such, hope and expectations must know the reality of fulfillment on all avenues. There must be real parents or parent alongside a real conception, real birthing process, and thus a real sense of fulfillment. Such, hope can foster a communal, but in what form is it real or realizable?

Hope in essence doesn't involve strife. It is a state of perpetual expectations, though sometimes driven by circumstances beyond personal scopes; it is mainly sustained by a dreamlike mental state. And dreams, as we'll discuss in this book, has its Common-None quirks as well.

The very implication of hope is passive. Thus any implication of active hope is absurd. Hope, in consciousness like other essential abstractions like faith is an abstract thought or recurrent stream; one in a class of its own.

As mere thought can achieve nothing in reality, one which depends solely on the contention of another reality is in a class of its own.

Faith is better than hope as it is based directly on the belief in a supreme being. Prayers for instance are actions that are faith based. Prayers involve actions! And hope usually comes into the sequence of abstractions and actions as an end; a mostly infinite end engaging perpetual expectations as well, depending on the source on

which the expectation is based in relation to religion or otherwise.

Hope is never its own pedestal, but always its own end. And neither its end nor its beginning is ever distinct. Hope is the expectations of possibilities or a set of possibilities from a universal range of probabilities.

Where is the individual?

Who is the individual?

Let's mainly hope she exists?

Let's just hope he exists?

Ah! What a denigrating fate!

Is there a worse fate for the individual and his or her burdensome calling than a communal state or projected estate deciding who he or she is with some unintelligible, unintelligent design, some hope-machine, a consignment of faith based on possibilities?

When insanity deranges a multitude, the multitude is a derangement. Ideals are strives for reality, never the other way round. Thus ideals can never be initial or prevalent. The Common-None dynamic has neither a shoe nor a standing. And sometimes in relation to some much unexpected state (as in that of a shoe one can never put oneself in), may have no standing at all, Can there be a positive postulate of a communal estate?

NEW BOOKS TO ORDER

Ignorance

The Celebrity of Being

SEESCAPES: GROSS PARADISE

THOSE WHO MADE IT
The Case of the Angstrom Scalar
POP: the Shadow Offspring Upstream
The Redeemer's Breach
The Anionic Animus
The Quasi Quaver Predicament
The Deviant X Transgression
The Precipitous Callous Edge
The Half-Center Homicide

Making Reading Worth Your While

DEWLOGIC

Non Fiction Books from Dewlogic

Failure&Solitude
The Rudeness of Soul
The Idealism of Soul
Enmity
Trust
Faith&Doubt
Number's Lot
The Communal Estate

Fiction Books from Dewlogic

Tell the Hour by the Sun
The Reclaimers' Reprieve
The Salamander Recourse
A Regular Oddity

Fiction Series Books from Dewlogic

Dawnbreaker
The Phoenix Risers
Roma&Retina
The Adventures of Silli Page
Transverse
Parable Play
Seescapes
Becky Alloy
Han&Sam

Rin
Web Angledrop
Quean