

The Eidoist Manifesto

No Author

No Time

In early human societies, especially tribal communities, social life was largely egalitarian. There were no significant differences between people—no owners and non-owners, no powerful and powerless. The social fabric was shaped by the shared necessity of survival. A functional division of labor already existed—between gatherers, hunters, and caregivers—but this division had meaning and was not structured hierarchically. Everyone participated equally in the tasks of daily life. The idea that the entire clan was responsible for sustenance and child-rearing was a self-evident expression of social cohesion. Today, however, we are confronted with a fundamentally different reality.

With the emergence of larger social structures came the development of hierarchies, shaped by increasingly complex group dynamics. The evolutionary drive for affirmation and recognition—once essential for self-learning and social orientation—now led to the formation of hierarchical group orders. This marked the beginning of structural inequality and systematic exploitation—a new social epoch had begun. With slavery, a fundamental rupture was institutionalized: the ownership of humans by others became possible—justified by power, born from an insatiable need for recognition. Examples can be found in nearly all early civilizations. In feudalism (9th–15th centuries), this took the form of dependency on lords; in the 18th and 19th centuries, wage dependency emerged in the industrial age.

The Industrial Revolution drastically intensified this dynamic. It transformed agrarian and artisanal societies into mechanized factory systems. Driven by machines, new energy sources, and radically altered organizational structures, productivity soared—at the expense of the working individual. Labor became a mere commodity, detached from identity and self-efficacy. The human became an appendage of the machine, their creativity devalued, their product expropriated. This alienation gave rise to a sense of powerlessness and meaninglessness. People were locked into a system that offered neither freedom nor the possibility of self-realization.

Despite technological change, one thing remained constant: asymmetry. The worker always produces more than they consume. The surplus—added value—is expropriated. Once by feudal lords, today by investors, shareholders, and owners who extract profits

without contributing any productive labor. Ownership generates income—not through performance, but through possession. Neither socialist systems nor the social market economy have altered this; all operate within the framework of capitalist logic. Politics acts as a mediator between capital and labor—but its negotiations are one-sided: securing social calm, not justice. Communist and Maoist revolutions attempted redistribution—and failed. The existing order remains in the interest of the owning class. Institutions such as education, media, and politics reproduce this inequality—not by addressing it, but by masking it as a promise of individual ascent.

In the digital age, two new actors emerge. First, the creative worker: knowledge workers, developers, start-ups. Equipped with education and capital, individuals can rise to oligarchic status through the scalability of digital products. Digital goods can be distributed globally at virtually no marginal cost. Whoever owns the platforms owns the market. Network effects, lock-ins, and automation lead to rapid concentrations of power—no longer over land or machines, but over digital infrastructure. A new oligarchy is emerging, with resources that are immaterial but globally powerful—raising profound questions of justice and the distribution of power in the digital age.

Second, the machine itself steps onto the stage: robots, algorithms, AI systems take over work in factories, offices, and logistics centers. Humans are replaced—not because they fail, but because they are unreliable: they get sick, strike, demand rights. Machines do not. For capital, this is the ideal: production becomes fully detached from the human. As long as capital depended on human labor, it was limited. Robots lift that constraint. Capital can now multiply itself—without the detour of social relations or political negotiation. The human, once a necessary condition of value creation, becomes redundant.

But this reveals a fundamental contradiction: If machines produce, who consumes? Who buys the goods when people no longer work—and thus have no income? Here, capitalism meets its systemic limit. It is based not just on production, but on exchange, on consumption, on demand. Machines produce, but do not purchase. They have no desire, no dreams, no needs. The human, once the bearer of value, becomes economically decoupled—and with them, the system's meaning collapses. Capitalism can generate wealth without humans—but not social meaning.

This is precisely where Eidoism begins. It recognizes: the problem is not only economic, but epistemic. Humans were never valued in capitalism for their own sake, but as function—as producer, consumer, status symbol. When these functions are taken over by machines, a void remains. This void cannot be filled by redistribution or policy—it demands a new understanding of the human being.

Eidoism begins with a radical insight: the human does not need to be needed in order to be. Their value lies not in their function, but in their form. In what is necessary—not in what makes them visible. The drive for recognition, deeply embedded in our neural self-model, is the core of our social loop—and the root of inequality. Capitalism has perfected and externalized this loop—through advertising, competition, consumption. But when machines free humans from labor, this mechanism collapses. What remains is the human—without mirror, without role, without purpose.

Eidoism is not an ideology of the future, but a technique of the present. A method to break the loop of desire and return to what is essential: form. Not as dogma, but as a practice of perception. The human is no longer needed—but can be enough. This is where true freedom begins.

History shows: revolutions fail when they misidentify the root of the problem. They swap systems, not structures. Without understanding the neural loops that govern our behavior, every new order is merely a new mask for old inequality. Anyone who speaks today of justice, freedom, or democracy must be willing to look deeper—to the root of our desire to be seen. That is where transformation begins. That is where Eidoism begins.

Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Mao all offered bold, profound critiques of society. They recognized the suffering of the working class, the mechanisms of exploitation, and the structural injustices produced by capitalism. Their critiques were not superficial—they reached into the core of power relations: class domination, value appropriation, ideological control. They understood that the existing order was not natural, but constructed—and therefore changeable.

But all of them failed. Not because their insights were false, but because their revolutions remained on the structural level. They diagnosed the system but misidentified its deeper cause. Their solutions remained trapped within the very loop they sought to escape: the loop of recognition, status, symbolic power. In trying to abolish hierarchy, they reproduced it—in new forms, with new titles, new enemies, and new elites. Capitalists were replaced by party officials, private ownership by state ideology—but the fundamental pattern endured: visibility became power, obedience became currency, and the collective became a stage for individual recognition-seeking.

Their revolutions altered ownership, but not ontology. They redistributed material goods without questioning the architecture of the self. They overlooked the deeper engine of inequality—not property, but the unconscious neural loop that equates being with being

seen. As long as this loop remains intact, all systems inevitably relapse into hierarchy—no matter how egalitarian their blueprints.

This is where the Eidoist Manifesto begins. It offers no external revolution—not in politics, not in property, not in production—but an inner disentanglement. It goes beneath economy to neurology, beneath class to cognition. It names the hidden operator behind all systems: the evolutionary imprint that makes recognition feel like life.

Eidoism does not reject Marx or Mao—it inherits their courage and critique. But it transforms their legacy by going one step deeper. It does not only ask: Who owns what? It asks: Why must we be seen when we own? It does not merely seek redistribution, but liberation from the compulsive need for recognition that reproduces inequality, competition, and ideological theater. Their work was a beginning. Eidoism continues it—by shifting the struggle from the visible arena of class to the invisible architecture of the self.

Still, the idea of growth is considered indispensable in today's economic system. States, corporations, and individuals alike measure success by how much more they produce, consume, or own. Growth is equated with progress, stability, and prosperity. But this idea is deceptive. In a world of finite resources, infinite growth inevitably leads to destruction—ecologically, socially, psychologically. Growth always requires new markets, new desires, new forms of scarcity that must be artificially created. The human being becomes the product—their attention, time, and longing for recognition turned into commodities. Growth is not a neutral process, but a structural compulsion based on expansion, acceleration, and exhaustion.

Worse still: the idea of growth replaces the question of meaning with the pursuit of more. It no longer matters whether something is necessary, meaningful, or sustainable—only whether it grows. This produces a world where form gives way to format, depth to efficiency, and relationship to utility. Growth-centered thinking eradicates moderation, silence, balance. It turns the Earth into a balance sheet, life into a project, and the human into a means. The false idea of growth prevents a return to the essential—and this is precisely where Eidoism intervenes: with the question of what remains, when "more" no longer serves.

The official narrative of global capitalism claims that division of labor and world trade are the natural results of specialization, productivity, and the pursuit of the lowest price. Every country, it is said, produces what it does best—and through free trade, everyone benefits. But this narrative is ideology, not reality. In truth, the structure of global trade does not follow the logic of efficiency but the dynamics of outsourced responsibility. It is not about where something can be best produced, but where resistance to exploitation is weakest.

Global price competition is, in reality, a race to the bottom—on wages, environmental protections, and labor rights.

Capital does not go where labor is most productive—it goes where it is cheapest and easiest to control. Entire regions have been forced into dependency as low-cost production zones, while others specialize in controlling technology, finance, and consumption. This artificial geography of labor separates value creation from responsibility. Labor is burned out where protest is weakest; resources are plundered where corruption opens the gate. The promise of prosperity through global market integration often turns out to be a new form of colonial control—this time by corporations, not states.

What appears as a "cheap price" is in fact the result of externalized costs. The price of a T-shirt from Bangladesh or a smartphone from China does not reflect the true effort—it reflects the absence of rights, the neglect of ecology, the invisibility of suffering. Capitalism presents the market as a neutral mechanism—but it is in fact a morally blind apparatus that transforms every inequality into profit. The global trade model does not follow the logic of efficiency, but the logic of concealment: it hides the true conditions of production behind labels, figures, and growth forecasts. And this is precisely where Eidoism takes a stand—with the demand for visibility of form, transparency of structure, and the dismantling of the economic lie that growth equals justice.