

Chapter IV Method of Thoughts

It was late one day, when working in a library that the most sound basis for an exposition of ethics came to me; that strange assertion which seemed to make a mockery of grammar, yet at the same time it held me in the grip of a most certain and compulsive hope, that here was a base which everyone could grasp, and which no despot, tyrant or obgarch could challenge to replace with their own myth of justification¹ - what were these words? - the inspiration of all this work rests with this assertion, and it is none other than that 'I am an I'. (This I hope will be comprehended by all, and its nature is one which the schools of philosophy may well find hard to grasp - or will not wish to consider - for its compulsive attraction is largely outside the bounds of the academic's 'respectable opinions';² and some may even attack the tenet as circular, or meaningless, or merely define the assertion away as false. Indeed there have been times when it seemed that many learned academics lived by the dictum:- "if in doubt define it out!").

What then, of this grounding? The rest of this work will cover two aspects; one will be an explanation of what that assertion could be said to mean, and the other will be concerned with the ethical considerations which may arise from the assertion and its exposition. I should like to make it clear that I am not only interested in the nature of morality, but also in the nature of moral maxims, directions, commands, expressions, and all other moral intentions whether revealed or held secret; for matters concerning the nature of morality are not separate from the directives or results of holding particular views on morality, be they as wishes, or merely moral 'emotive' desires.

There are many things we take for granted as we go about our affairs,

-
1. A state built on words is a state frightened of words.
 2. The words of one of my past lecturers.

they are thought to be so obvious as to be worthless to worry about.¹

However it is my aim here to show one most neglected problem, which we all face, and which countless philosophers have tried to solve. It is sad that in these days of relative peace for us we seem to have neglected those most important problems, their importance will, I hope, be revealed as the prime example is now examined.

Everything, or at least most things, we know are only known because there are humans with thoughts to have knowledge of the world, yet how limited are we?, whatever we have knowledge of must be from a particular point of view. I once had a nightmare, which left my body covered in sweat, as if I had seen the most terrible of creatures or had fallen off from a high place in my dream, and woken up with that deep pit-like sinking feeling in my stomach; as we are often told that mad people talk to themselves, so it was that my fear arose when at length I realised that I could only think with myself, my thoughts are confined within their own world, they are forever relating to nothing but themselves. When words are heard we have to understand what they mean before they have much significance, but who is it, but for ourselves, and only ourselves, who is responsible for any understanding gained from these words? The 'philosophers' and many other academics may use as many confusing words as they like, but they will never be able to disprove or demonstrate to me, that what I understand is only that which I understand. Yet it is said that there are many simple and most obvious 'facts' in this world which I have a status of being such and such a nature, and this nature is knowable to all people as one nature - as an identical

1. Much of what we assume is as an iceberg under the water, we do not wonder, yet if we look under the water then the significance of the tip above will be known! Much to the amazement of the majority of people, philosophers seem to spend hours under the water and this is why, the only problem is that many never both to re-surface.

understanding, or idea, or concept,¹ which, so the scholars claim, goes by the name of 'objective' truth.

I shall not go into a long demonstration or exposition of the academics' claims, but on page 24 it is hoped lies a demonstration of one illusion which has, like so many other examples, arisen out of the latter day trends in philosophy; to sweep away the great problems of philosophy and of all people under the carpet, and rather than conquer mighty peaks, they have been content to scale molehills; with the skill and steadiness normally seen only in a surgeons hands, they are indeed mighty molehill mountaineers. But let this end with the observation that although there may be many possible explanations of how we have been caused by the outside world; to think in this way or that way, all these explanations depend on OUR own notion of words, our own understanding and thought. It may well be the case that human actions can be explained as a result of the buffets of the world, but still were are limited - limited to how we think we think - from how I think I think, I hope others will find a common bond of human nature, so strong that it will give firm ground for a new understanding of the nature of morality, and I claim for this hope there is already some evidence. When someone claims they are human, they are also claiming they know who they are, from their own point of view, that self-refering word I when said is as 'I am an I'. Our thoughts are always ours and no-one elses.¹²

From these meanderings, I do not reject a notion or belief in the outside world, but I only believe it as it SEEMS to me; I do not base my attempt

1. This is the most common 'philosophers' catchword - but if you ask them what they mean, what is a concept?, in my experience there will be only a very poor reply. In my confusion I decided to consult the 'encyclopedia of philosophy' on this matter - a rigorous precis comes up with the following gems! "It is the latch key to the labyrinth of meaning", and its meaning, "is found by usage".

2. A school teacher can write the 'objective' upon the blackboard as many times as they like - but each child is a subject and not an objective creature (whatever that could be)! i.e. Each 'objective fact' can only be subjectively grasped and as such is hence rendered subject to subjectivity.

on these beliefs, and it is in our acceptance of these that we hide from ourselves our own powers and limitations, and it is from recognition of our limitations that an understanding of morality will be made more easy. This approach may be destructive but need this be bad? In parts of Manchester there were vallies dirty and covered with the refuse of neglect from the age of waste, they were cleaned up, the rubbish was destroyed! I hope to remove some of the refuse from the last 100 years of "philosophy".

As was mentioned on page 23 here is a demonstration of the problems of one 'claimed to be understood' 'objective truth'. Time is thought to be a thing which goes from the past through the present and into the future; so people say, to themselves, "I have lived for several years doing" this or that; but is this the case? Remembering that the human who uses the words is always experiencing from their point of view as a subject; (incidentally, hence the word 'subjective'). I have never left the present and the present is not in time, but why not?; for some say that the present is a length of time, but if this was so, then the present could be divided into two sections, one would be time past and the other, time to come; but how can this be? the present cannot be the past, it cannot be the future and how much less can it be the past and the future at one and the same time!! This last possibility would cause chaos, for if all the past and all the future were combined to form the present, then what notion¹ of time would result?; a succession of presents would, when considered together only be a present as redness and redness can only lead to redness.²

It is strange that we should lead ouselves into such contradictions, for time cannot be only of the present, otherwise there would either be no time, and it's patently obvious that there is time; or, that there is no present, which is again repulsive to common observation, and that is, to

1. NOTION - note subjectivity here.

2. I do for time what Leibnitz did for extention.

be present¹ one must be present,² in the present.³ I was born in the present and shall die in the present, to the day of my death there shall only be the present for me - I wake in the present and I sleep in the present, yet we use time and talk of the past and the future - but how can this be? Even if by some device I was to be transported to some other time - for me I would still be in the present; even as I step from this device, "I am a human", would still be true; I would still be present in the present, anything else would be absurd. I was a human could lead us to I was an I - but I am present not past! I am always in the present, so how can I be 'was' at all?

Some confusion may be felt here, it may be said that, 'I was an I', or I was someone, does not seem as much of a problem as it is claimed to be, and it seems quite reasonable to say I was someone. To answer this point it is necessary to look at how the words 'cause' and 'effect' will be used. Most would agree, that to effect something it must already be present and lasting to be effected, on the other hand, if something is said to be caused, then it cannot be present before it is caused. Feeling in areas unproven and little examined, I came to the conclusion that the word 'I' has two understandings, one is what it is⁴ and the other is the one of relation.⁵ I can say and know of the self-referring nature of the word I, whenever the wish comes into my head so to do, this seems to be an indication of the permanence of relation of thought to itself of its before mentioned enclosed and self-referring nature - that self-same nature that caused me to sweat when it was first realised, that an understanding can never be related to any other directly, except to those of other thoughts in the same mind.

1. PASSIVE.

2. ACTIVE.

3. Neither Passive not Active. (Innocent).

4. Later expressed - The I of the present and the means of that presence, I time. In reverse order, the means and the end. The means are justified by the end.²

2. See page 35, NOTE 1.

This permanence of relation, as the word permanent suggests, is a relation which is in time; also observable is that time is needed to think of anything, thought takes time - so where is the present nature of I?, if the understanding of relation is in time?

For many hours this problem chased thoughts round and around my head, as if a vortex was forming with a centre; as the axis of a whirlpool, thoughts seem to swirl around this axis and at last I began to feel here was an answer, hidden in metaphor!¹ Could I claim to be any such without thought, clearly not, hence I depend on thought, but thought takes time and I am not of time as I am always present. It seems clear that my expression of uniqueness depends on thought process and/or the act of thinking, the question to answer was demanding some indication of the notion of I which arises from these observations. By now the above observations of cause and effect may be nearly forgotten, but here one shall be used, and that is the one of 'causing'.

I am a proper effect; a result of causes which cannot be a cause in its turn; the end of a long chain of causes reliant on time factors, even because cause and effect come before and after each other, which in itself is sufficient to show that they are in time. Thinking can only be of thoughts related to thoughts, thus the thinking can only be caused by thoughts relating to thoughts; thus whenever I think I am caused by that thinking all the time I am thinking, as long as there is a whirlpool.² The rest of this exposition will follow later, present uncertainty has obliged me find refuge in metaphor which is not good enough to stand on its own. Let us turn and consider what it is for us to be a member of that

1. Do we not sometimes say:- "I was in a spin", or, "my head was spinning"?

2. Note. It's shape is constant while the volume of material may change and the material itself never stop renewing itself as it also loses itself. Like a fountain, the shape is constant but the water is always changing, and the shape depends on this factor. The nature of character may rest with this shape.

assembly of minds; and with these thoughts in mind my interest leans towards an exposition of the nature of ETHICS.

Chapter V Ideals & their World

All of us have some ideal of the world. The word expresses our notion of the world which is peculiar to each person, and as this is so, each person must have a point of view, and no-one else can share this point, which in turn indicates that each person's ideal of the world is peculiar and unique to them, as also has been seen by the nature of humanity, touched on in previous chapters.

Often ideals have an element of, 'what there ought to be', about them, and as the word is frequently used this element is often present. This is because humans often hypothesise about the future, and in our ideal world time is less of a limitation than it is in the real world. My ideal world has time, but time is no master - here events can be blotted out or welcomed, they can be controlled repeated and changed - in such a world time is of little mastery when events are in concern. Though the actions of thought, which are vital to this world are subservient and under the strict rule of the laws of substance, by a strange quirk we are able to represent events in our lives or possible events¹ in an order NOT restricted by the iron laws.² This ability shows one way in which we are not slaves to the real; it is an expression of our ability to have some freedom over the determinism which the real imposes on all things (which are dead). Rather like the permanence of the relation of I to I when referring to itself - thoughts can also have a permanence of relation, one complete thought to itself. To be more precise these "thoughts" ought to be called 'thinks', and herein lies the nature of memory. These 'thinks' are not final formal effects, as I am, but they are reiterable physical effects, and it is their reiterability which makes them last through time, which seems to make them free from the normal

1. Take care with this word as it tends to make static, what is active. Events cannot be discribed.

2. See note 2 on page 20. Both paragraphs are closely linked.

causes of the world.¹ This gives thought to thinking, and gives thinking a timeless aspect which we associate with 'thoughts'. Thus ideals spring from the nature of our humanity, particularly from that strange present nature, which is so vital a part of the notion of humanness from my own point of view as one asking why I? Why am I a human? Ideals can be desires,² as our thoughts are not servants to the despotism of time, but free as long as they are thoughts, and as long as the substance which supports us manages to withstand the ravages of the real. In this aspect we are a law unto ourselves.

It is interesting to note the strange conjunction of timelessness and time each of us experiences throughout our life. But they are of different natures - the former is not of substance where as the latter is; a notion of the latter depends on the former, and in turn the notion of timelessness depends on time³ for its presence.

From these observations, I hope it is clear that my previous examination of myself is by no means irrelevant to the question of ethics, for ethics are only an expression of inter-subjective agreements. Keeping promises would be a question of ethics⁴ - democracy is not only an ethic - but it is a recognition of our inability to be anything, but so limited to our own subjectivity; and that we can never have firm grounds for claiming, that as subjects we have a notion of what is intersubjective. Democracy, then, is the recognition that the ethics of a society are not possibly formed by one person; it is the recognition that undemocracy, or rule by those more interested in ruling than listening to the opinions of those ruled, is liable to produce laws which may not reflect the ethics and ideology of a

1. Often I have remembered a friend as they were several years before, and seeming them again what surprise! They were changing all the time, but my memory was static. In this there is a ~~sort~~ of freedom from which we can have the ability to contrast and compare characteristics of change in the world when one object moves or turns into another object.

2. NOTE. A feature of desire is to look ahead.

3. And SUBSTANCE.

4. This is 'some claim', but I hope later pages will make it seem more credible. Pages

society; (incidentally, this is the main reason why undemocratic societies have so few, participants, in their formal political structures for decision-making, or even wishing to be participants). Democracy is the best form of rule for it will ensure laws which will reflect that which so many want,¹ ethics and law will become more close to one another than they are today. Democracy should express, or bring out, as much as possible the degree and scope of inter-subjective agreement of an⁵ many of those ruled as possible, those being also members of society. Even in the most miserable of countries and the most despotic, the pressure of these elements so vital of democracy is present - indeed it is through the recognition of, and attempts to satisfy, this pressure, that democracy is evidently the best form of rule. The question may now be - if this is about ethics, what about morals?

Morality is a personal affair, it is confined within oneself; whenever a moral action is made its motivation can only come from oneself, the demands of morality are like those of the feeling of duty, very personal, and full of conscience. If I was walking down a street in a foreign country and saw someone being beaten up, it would be a moral question which would first face me. On the other hand if I promised to another, then here is an ethical concern which need not be moral,² but which is marked by communication between two intelligences. But what of someone who would not support democracy? Would they be unethical, immoral or both? This question is not well formed, for 'ethics' and 'morality' refer to some qualities which are part of all our lives, and which are peculiar to humans; denials of these can only amount to a refusal to admit of that which is already there! There is no such

1. 'Want' has a passive and an active sense, these might be said to reflect necessities and wishes. Before anyone can make a wish expressed in words, there must be health and trust to some degree, also vital there must be an ability to use words or some form of communication before expression is possible. Democracy is a prerequisite for the maximisation of wants because its structure is the only political structure which recognises the nature of ethics and morality. In turn morality is reflective of our humanity, thus health is included as a pre-requisite. It is up to democracy to ensure suitable communication - if it does not, then it is not. In my apology I played on 'want' hoping to avoid the charge of crude utilitarianism. "There are some who want to know and others who want the need to know".

2. See page 32 Note 1.

person as one without a morality or one without the ethic, as much as there is ~~no~~-one who has never had contact with others throughout their life; and even for the more bizarre minded, if a human were 'made' in a testube, still there would be contact, in creation and by moral pre-established agreement, i.e. this creature would owe its creation to others, and if it were not it but someone, it would be moral in nature and hence would demand and owe respect as a human amongst humans.

AS I HAVE TRIED TO SHOW SOME OF THE NECESSARY FACETS OF HUMANS BY REFERRING TO MYSELF, SO HAVE I ALSO TRIED TO GIVE EXPOSITION OF THE WORD 'SOCIETY' BY CONSIDERATION OF IDEOLOGY. I HAVE ALSO TRIED TO SHOW THE LATTER TWO DEPEND ON THE FORMER TWO.

On a point of consistency, many argue it is absurd to treat humans unhumanly, and quite right too - but why? It would either involve inconsistency or a blunt rejection of oneself as some one member of society. But this absurdity occurs so how does it arise?

'Propaganda'. This word had largely no bad connotations attached to it before world war II, or at least before the onset of the evil genius of Hitler's propaganda men. Likewise also has 'indoctrinate' suffered a similar fate, which has let moderns to seek other words to fill the same gaps; one example being 'educate'. There are two major aspects, from whence it came, and what it causes, or if taken on the level of human thought, what it effects. As we grow up, and throughout our life, we are to some degree dependant on others for information, but it may be noted that though this may be the case, there are still the birds the bees and the flowers. To learn things we need not always books or others' company; but I make this point here to show that unlike words as 'society' or 'ethic', trees and bees have specific features which we all can imagine, even if only as pictures; but the former type of words cannot be imagined, by their very nature; they are only expressions of relations and results, which come from being human, and being part of a

group of humans, in a real physical sense. Propaganda is not concerned with convincing people that trees are not trees, or bees not bees; when a politician misuses powers, it is with the aim to give a distorted view of people's intersubjective agreement, their basis of commonality - at times this has gone to extremes, often leading to the denial that humans were human. It is in this aspect, to alter people's opinions, that a thorough going purposeful propaganda can be detected, for in this we can see frequent reference, or appeals, to personal leanings, fears and lack of information, from whence so often fear springs, for few like to be lacking that knowledge about others, which helps make their actions understandable. On these grounds it is also to be feared, for with a misplaced propaganda on ethic may grow which may be doomed to die before long, as it could lead to contradictions with the nature of humanity;¹ (already considered above). And this is the essence of so called 'reactionary' beliefs, to hold an incorrect belief in what the nature and content of ethics and ideology may be. The nature of ethics, and how ethics depend on inter-subjective agreement, show us that no-one alone can ever be certain of the content of either ethics or ideology. But this limitation comes only from our subjective nature, thus any respect

-
1. This note will be better understood on the second reading. To avoid confusion 'The' ethic, refers to the potential agreement amongst humans, and not to the claimed agreement. Thus "The Ethic" obeys the law of non-transgression, as what comes first for everyone is what is closest to them; i.e. their humanity or moral nature without which we would not be ourselves. This "Ethic" express "The Good" it also contains other elements concerning the maximum satisfaction of unessential preferences; those wishes, desires etc., which we all have to some degree which are unessential to our continuing presence. In this latter area is scope and permission for choice, the exercise of taste, etc.

But when the definite article is not attached to the word 'Ethic', then here 'an ethic' expresses the outcome of inter-subjective agreements amongst those who have broken the law of non-transgression - either on purpose or as a result of inadequate thought on a subject to VITAL. For me the Greek word for a private citizen, from which we derive 'IDIOT', reflects two senses both closely linked to each other. On the one hand, those who take no interest in what happens to them show no self-respect for their ability to choose such a stance; for it may be that the exercise of choice for apathy, might in future lead to restriction of that same ability which was necessary to become an 'appathist'. On the other hand the second charge is more serious, by ignoring chances to express opinions the appathite is ignoring a major feature of democracy, the nature of the Ethic. On a simple turn of phrase, unless this person expresses the griefs or wishes in their heart, for as many as is reasonable to hear, then how can anyone know of this malaise in the law? Laws are not intended to bring grief, but peace and contentment, yet how can they if those in grief do not stand up and weep for all to see?? Laws can only be made better with certainty, by the active expression of belief and opinion which would help make law more

for the Ethic¹ must also include a respect for persons upon whom, and due to whose natures, the ethic depends and subsists. In some of the worse forms of propaganda, this 'respect' for persons is either forgotten or remains unconsidered. The propagandist is mainly concerned with spreading abroad a point of view, or some record of an agreement among one or more people, or even the opinion of just one person. The question immediately arises, how can more than one person have a point of view, surely this contradicts previous claims that each point of view is unique? Strictly, this is a just and correct complaint - there can only be unique "points of view", and it is a trick of language which draws us to think, or claim, that an agreement about a series of opinions can have a 'point of view'; for it is quite obvious that mere agreements, or general expressions of common agreement cannot express any one point of view. These do not exist as humans do - they cannot be touched or seen, they are as murky monsters unknown and unimaginable yet whose effects are claimed to be present. It is from such slips of language that many have claimed that society, the state, or even 'classes', exist!² They do not exist, not a part of the real, they only belong to the realm of ethics, and they are words used in recognition of ethical matters. (Expressions of inter-subjective agreement of people about those rules which we consider as right or necessary, under which we should live). The murky beasts do not exist, who has seen society?, yet they are crucial elements involved when making an exposition of ideology.³

-
1. NOTE. INTERSUBJECTIVE AGREEMENTS NEED NOT BE MUTUALLY CONSISTENT. Whereas argument demands consistency, there is no such restriction on inter-subjective matters except in a state of DEMOCRACY. Agreement tacit or active is a major pre-requisite before 'Society' can be applied to, or even used amongst people; and this contradictory facet, is what has made 'Society' so difficult to understand.
 2. Class does not exist, not as an object and a thing, therefore the term can only be used as a reference, not as a description. The problems are multiplied, when class is talked about as if it were a thing for then the laws of things, which are absolute, are applied to matters inter-subjective. Many say that 'class' can be identified by cause; e.g. money. This

is not sufficient for two reasons:

i) There are an indefinite number of causes to each effect.

ii) Identification of cause presumes effect. See pages 45 and 46

Note 2.

On the other hand effects can be treated in isolation without 'begging' the cause. The effects, or some such may be:- of accent; of language otherwise; of custom or of ethic. (As opposed to other inter-subjective agreements of other groups of people).

What made so many of the nineteenth century industrialists so 'hard', was not directly cash or capital, but more these above effects - possibly the effects of money or capital but not only, and not necessarily. This is another area where social engineers have frequently 'slipped up'; we may never be able to identify all the causes, but the effects can be seen more easily. The social engineers confuse cause with effect, and hence are not exact, even where they could be, in the examination of effects. Also their proposals to remove these causes are dangerous even because they are not all known. (Some say the power of knowledge is greater than the power of cash). Best rather the effects be studied, and then contested as opinions with others' opinions, and should they fall short in a state of democracy, they will not last for long. We are not a democracy, but this should anyway be tried, so long as trust is NOT diminished.

3. May I emphasise; no one person, or limited group whose members are part of a larger group, has the position or inter-subjective scope to judge on these matters - only democracy can do this, but anyone is entitled to submit suggestions to be tested by democracy.

Bad propaganda is 'seen', when it attempts to express aims and ends, other than those pointed to by the ideology - bad propaganda usually arises from trends in pressure groups which use devices to attract fellow travellers; (which in turn leads to misinformation of those really involved with its original intentions, when they were first publicly expressed); or from a knowledge that support is waning, subsequently devices are used to maintain position by misinformation; it often also arises, because the canis in people leads leaders of pressure groups to indulge in political word games, to match the present imperfect political arrangements'. "The means"; those who misinform, those whose interests they claim to represent, will lean over and say:- "The means are justified by the end!"¹ But at what cost? The political system will remain as imperfect as it was before, and the canis in people will be given another piece of evidence for its presence; but more serious, the leaders will have broken the rules on which they depend for their office, for if people see propaganda used in such a way - then where remains there any trust? In a small group this can have immediate and serious effects on its unity of ethic or ideals, for the ground on which any group is formed is some area of agreement; even if only by chance or circumstance people are brought together, agreement must either be accepted or found.² Any doubt of this agreement will only weaken the ground on which the group was formed, and the smaller the group, proportionally greater will the effect be, as each member begins to distrust the ground on which its ideology is said to be based.

With the threat of greater proportionate effect, when members leave small groups, or find much wanting in their group, often smaller groups are run on more democratic lines than larger ones. The danger of overlooking

1. See NOTE 2, on page 25. The confusion here is most interesting - being between matters of ethics and morality.

2. Note, agreements can be TACIT, or active³; pre-established or established.

3. A note best understood on second reading. Only the deformed ethic needs constant active agreement. (One reason why undemocratic states are inherently unstable).

the demand of democracy becomes more crucial, the more large the immediate repercussion seems to become, and this tends to rise as groups become smaller.¹ Though this is the case, there is one area where central government, maybe of the whole world, if feasible, and this would be restricted to the law required for maintenance of "The Good". This will be later examined in some detail.²

To return to the subject of propaganda. Should the leaders misuse propaganda to keep their members, then this device is mere illusion, for in the long-term their efforts to maintain their position of power will also decrease the reason why they had power, i.e. because they were trusted to reflect and express the ideology of a group whose leaders they were. There are some who would argue that the method of propaganda can be responsible for the creation, or warping of, the ideals of many - this is possible, but the effect is not permanent - the weakness of this argument whereby the end seems to have justified the means, lies in the relation between democracy and an effective expression of the ethics of a society, which would be mirrored in the laws of the same. The argument is like this:- should an ideology be 'implanted' in the minds of many, due to the misinformation of the many by bad propaganda - then should the new system which arises as a result of this propaganda make no sufficient attempts, to ensure a continuing reflection of the ethics of the members of the new system, then by the very creation of a system unable to reflect its peoples' ethics,³ that system is doomed to become inefficient, disliked and with many troubles. At length the

1. Of very small groups, say the size of a circle of friends, more will be said later in connection with consideration of Mental brutality. Cross Reference Page 67 Note 1.

2. On pages 60ff, especially page 61 and see Page 32, Note 1.

3. But surely not so, if the system implanted is the "right" one? Ethics are not constant, they change and even the best of societies must recognise this - see later page 40 NOTE 2.

leaders who, like most people, prefer the quiet life will change the system.¹ Hence it is that any attempt to foist opinions onto large numbers of people may be self-defeating, unless by chance these opinions are what the Ethic already requires to express itself, and this would be mere chance. No-one could ever be justified in using any system but a democratic one to justify a belief that propaganda of a type was ethical; no limited group or single person will ever be justified in deliberate misinformation or suppression of other people's opinions, except where the pre-requisites for the expression of opinion are at risk, these being matters related more closely to morality; and discussion of matters to identify what is and is not moral, MUST NEVER be suppressed. A purposeful indoctrination and propaganda campaign which refuses to recognise the above, and especially the last point, is never justifiable, and is very likely to be self-defeating, in effect, and of itself.

However, the question may arise, what if someone, say a person convinced that murder on a large scale was a political requirement, went around 'blasting off' such opinions? Would we not be justified in a little suppression? This extreme example will be treated in two lights. The act of killing another, involves a total rejection of the notion of humanity, otherwise absurdity - and no person but a made creature can have a notion of absurdity; although it is quite possible to think at one time I thought and at another another, it is not possible to think a thought and its opposite or another, at one and the same time - and that is the nature of the absurd; in other words absurdity, or some lunacy renders people's subjects up to inhumanity; and in this state they should be treated as inhuman, perchance till it become human again, and that should be the aim. However, if the killing is suggested by one who has rejected the notion of humanity, then

1. In a state of war, or internal trouble, a nation suddenly is made aware of inconsistencies of ideology, and this can happen between nations. A civil war arises from internal inconsistencies peculiar to a nation, and wars arise when the actual State is envisaged in as far as its presence is shown by one nation admitting contact with others.

they must be rejected - or could be justifiably rejected,¹ as inhuman themselves, or if not that, as a danger to the presence of humans not only physically, but as the ones who reject trust, totally reject ethics,² and scorn democracy.

The other light of this action, of one so inclined with such murderous opinions, these should not be rejected on the above grounds along^e, for if these be unethical then the majority or general opinion of a democracy will show it so. This is the strength of democracy, it always succeeds in showing the way, and as long as it is realised that the democratic way is the best mirror³ of the Ethics and ideology - then no opinion which attacks this will gain ground; for in a democracy, where the laws reflect the ethics such discontent will gain little support!; indeed, they may give a continuing show of the vital importance of democracy, or with such people as devils advocates, wielding their grizzley cudgels, disguised with slimy jargon, democracy will always shine the brightest, made even more brilliant by the infernal out-pourings of potential murderers; indeed, only those who fear that democracy is an insufficient, or an ineffective system, will be frightened by these threats; and often these same faint hearts are those who make the fatal mistake of resorting to misinformation to solve these problems. Thus it is, that those who abuse propaganda, or who suppress any opinion, are attacking the spirit of democracy; ~~either~~ they reject the basis of Ethics, and their unperceivable character, or they show doubts as to the strengths, and fine qualities,⁴ which are intrinsic to any system which tries to be democratic - either way such people are not real supporters of democracy.

1. What is just need not be prudent, justice should be tempered with prudence.

2. Both ~~The~~ The Ethic and an ethic.

3. See later pages 62ff especially Note 1 on the deformed ethic.

4. Loose USE.

In ending this section on propaganda, it would be well to make a short comment on the differences of expression, of a person's sincere belief, and of a purposeful propaganda.¹ The latter is never believed by the originator(s), it is only the means to an end, it has little evidence of moral opinion in it, and apart from its form, it is merely intended to change the ethics, or the ideals, of as many others as possible, within the group of people at which the purpose is directed. On the other hand, the sincere belief of someone, and their exposition thereof, ⁵ should never be suppressed or condemned; for here is an innocence of belief which must not be attacked; for all need belief to live. Without belief, or when we are forced away from belief, what is the result? Matters inter-subjective depend on belief, as also does trust - we could not learn how to speak without trust and belief!² If a person be thought wrong, then persuade, discuss and listen; on a small scale this may show ^{ow} common ground for understanding, or may correct hasty ill-conceived opinions, and on a large scale these discussions are the bedrock of democracy and the doom of despotism.

Despotism. That vile and sad word, for thousands of years people have wept, slaved, wasted away and died, under the domination of a thousand despots, and a thousand despotic powers. This sad state has continued for so long, that many have begun to despair, and accept its necessity as a disposition of our own nature - a pathetic acceptance of fatalism has crept into the minds of so many; as if it travelled like a virus from the unhappy positioned as despots or trapped within a despotic 'charisma' of some 'Leviathan', chained like miserable slaves to do as it wills, even to their last breath. But why this thing at all, people do not make things they do not want, on

-
1. By this I mean a propaganda which does not recognise that purpose and means are not separable. 'Purposeful' is used to indicate the same line of thought as those who might say:- "The means are justified by the Ends".
 2. The liar's paradox:- "A Creton has said all Cretans are liars", is the evidence we have for certain subjectivity in language, and its presumptions of trust.