

Slogans

This section is mainly a joke. I often need to explain this, so you know my intentions. Jokes are culturally defined. In Germany, jokes are usually confined to consenting adults in private. This is denied, but there are no counterexamples. I later found out this is not true. The absence of jokes was a contributory factor in the defeat of Germany in the Second World War.

Clement Freud was an amusing raconteur. He was often perceptive, a trait that would normally exclude him from the BBC, since the BBC represents the establishment, and a perceptive approach to the establishment would reveal its nature, which the BBC takes strenuous efforts to avoid. Centrally, the establishment is fascist, but the BBC wishes to preserve balance, and so conservative and nazi views are allowed equal debate and prominence.

The BBC is very good at humour, provided it is British. They think that there is a substantial market abroad, but like other aspects of the economy, there is not.

At the start of his career Clement Freud with his perceptive views was allocated a slot in a programme discussing cakes and buns. He appears to have been hot on buns of a certain sort.

He was a bit of a pervert, and a subconscious urge may have led him to introduce a phrase I wish to discuss.

First I want to discuss my use of the word pervert. It is clearly prejudicial, but I can think of no general term which is a substitute. The use of prejudicial terms in the language is usually subject to cultural modification. The problem is not the term, but the way it is used.

I recently used the word tramp in a reference to the work *Waiting for Godot* by Samuel Beckett, and was immediately taken to task and told the term was 'homeless person'. This is indeed the term I normally use, the old term is prejudicial nowadays, and maybe always was. The problem is not the term, but the way homeless people are treated, and that our society which is well able to give them a home, denies them their right, and makes them rely on the cash donations of others, which is often pitifully insufficient for them to purchase a night's accommodation at the commercial rate which they are forced to pay. People who wish to donate, even those of considerable wealth, are faced with the realisation that even if they were to supply in the locality all their wealth so that they became bankrupt, the problem would soon revert to what it was originally, and homelessness would be no nearer at all to resolution. The problem is not one of provision of need to relieve destitution, but the acceptance of a society which wishes to impose it in perpetuity.

The reason I used the word 'tramp' is that I had read a commentary many years ago on *Waiting for Godot* which I liked. It used the word tramp when there was no generally accepted alternative. I had quoted the views I had absorbed many years ago. As usual I quoted their meaning and not the text. So automatically I used the word tramp. No shame in that, but an explanation was in order.

Sometimes the change of names can be parodied if taken to excessive extent. The change of name is a good idea, but in the long term I do not think it solves the problem, which arises not in names but in attitudes. The main problem is to change attitudes, changing the name is secondary. Some social groups adopt a prejudicial name in communication between themselves as an icon of their persecution, and as a symbol of their group solidarity.

I once used the name 'follicly challenged' to describe a bald BBC radio presenter. I still think it is amusing. Baldness is a condition which can cause distress. It is not generally thought to be life-threatening and many people, eventually, suffer this condition. It is almost universally thought that it is socially acceptable. So I feel I am able to use it.

If I am subject to racist jokes which I used to laugh at a long time ago despite disapproving of them, and I am expected to join in, the result is now anger and a strong remonstrance with the person making it.

So the use of the word pervert needs looking at, not in terms of its name, but the social attitudes which surround it. Its use indicates ascribing behaviour to someone which is strongly disapproved of socially, even to the extent that open revelation will lead to arrest, and a sequence may follow of trial and imprisonment. There are quite a large number of issues related to perversion. The framework of law which is used to apply sanctions against it is often accompanied by rage of relatives of those subjected to it. The attitudes to perversion and the laws which apply to it are those of a majority against a minority. This raises issues as to by what process the law is adopted, the objectives of imprisonment if that is deemed necessary, subsidiary issues on the role of the press, aftercare, philosophical and practical questions about free will, in particular whether it exists at all, lifting of taboos so that discussion of the topic can be rationally discussed, and even the change of cultural norms so that forms which were previously thought of as perverted are accepted and the contexts in which this can and ought to be accepted. I raise this for discussion and not resolution, because it is not central to the continuation of my argument.

In one of his programmes Clement Freud used the phrase 'If you like that sort of thing, it is just the sort of thing you like'. I was immediately enamoured of this beautiful and amusing idea. I do not know why, it has remained with me ever since. It is one of the slogans I wish to promote, as a joke, for people in a society which aims for perfection.

A slogan is a sentence. It is shorter than a Japanese haiku poem, and more intense. They are very difficult to construct, and their adoption may be an encapsulation of a society or a civilisation, its aims and the idea of what it is. Karl Marx in the *Communist Manifesto* wrote the slogan 'Workers of the world unite, you have nothing to lose but your chains'. Mao in the little red book says 'Power flows from the barrel of a gun'. MacLuhan gives a phrase, not a sentence 'the global village'. Slogans provoke. We realise they are true and we must act on them. They induce civilizational change from the perspective which they promote. They are essential when we realise that society must change and what existed before no longer exists. We are in a new world.

If you like that sort of thing, it is just the sort of thing you like. Slogans introduce reflection. What does this mean? I can choose to think and enjoy thinking what I like. That is to the benefit of me, and this is to the benefit of everyone else. It may be challenged by others. If this idea is universally adopted and I do not want to impose my will on everyone, or at least everyone near my level, then I allow them this idea too. They can choose to think and enjoy thinking what they like. This is to the benefit of them, and the other person assumes it is to the benefit of me.

What does this entail? Firstly, if I say what I think or enjoy, the other person knows this. We exchange experiences.

I used to think that if I had an idea and it was good, then everyone should agree with me and we should work together towards common objectives. We would deliver common and therefore stronger action on implementing a plan or activity to the benefit of both of us. It has come late to me in life that very often behaviour is in-built. It is useless in these situations to presume a negotiation can proceed on a rational basis. An approach I need to pursue is to determine the behavioural characteristics of the person I am dealing with. If I find there is a match of these characteristics so that it seems fruitful that there are areas we can work together, then this can be explored. To ask someone to defy instantly their in-built personality I find has similar utility to banging my head on a brick wall.

I am of the opinion that the sharing is of benefit. I do not know where this benefit lies. It does not mean we move anywhere nearer to each other in what we think or enjoy. What it means is we have understanding of each other. This is of great advantage. We treat each other as humans. If we have been told to assign labels to each other which means we are not dealing with someone else but a label, and we are allowed to do violence to the label and destroy it, then we treat one another as humans and not labels. Knowing one another, we know something of the other person inside ourselves. Not a label, but a meaning of what we are. This is the meaning of being a conscious human.

My objective is that we extend our humanity. We do this by extending our understanding of each other, even when we do not accept other people's behaviour, or the way they build their behaviour from the way they think or are taught to think. If the object of society is the socialisation of behaviour, then we are less liable to kill one another. In understanding of parts of our other humanity, in our acceptance of one another, we may find ways of negotiating common action and finding common understanding. That is why this is a beautiful idea.

The second joke, but it is not a joke, it is my own idea and therefore cannot be a joke, is the phrase 'Getting it wrong is the first stage in getting it right'. I sometimes mess this up and put 'Getting it right is the first stage in getting it wrong'. This is also possible. I have met people for whom I ascribe getting it wrong is one of their aims, which they maintain implacably against remonstrations to the contrary. Surely this is due to a cognitive mismatch. Their behaviour results from their thinking. I have no direct contact with any politician whose aim I believe is to mess everything up. The proof of the nonexistence of such individuals is contingent on the study of numerous examples, and its assertion is precarious.

If we admit we are human, and we have a correct cognitive map, we must admit we get it wrong sometimes. An attribute of the human brain is that it learns. Some aspects of it are not hard-wired. Hard-wiring might be the only connections in some insects. But the thinking process of insects would be improved by being able to learn from their environment, without having all their behaviour conditioned by natural selection of automatic processes. When the brain receives pain, a person may adjust their behaviour so that the experience does not recur. I can remember at the age of three having a little tricycle and peddling it into the wall of our house. I learnt from that the generalisation that you cannot walk through walls. It is amazing as humans we have to learn this basic thing. Our condition is not hard-wired. Behaviour is modifiable. It can be changed by responses to pleasure and pain. Also humans have interior representations of our environment. We can reason why we have pleasure or pain. Strangely, it is not forbidden by evolution. It is the substance of a new mode of behaviour in our society. We can reason

about reason. This modification from wrong to right, defined cognitively as a representation and not necessarily in terms of pleasure and pain, is a fundamental feature of humanity and its social systems.

I do not know of any detailed account of this simple and elementary idea as a blueprint for a new society. I am aware of the book by Dawkins *The blind watchmaker*. It is unread on my bookshelf. It may represent a contrary or a distantly related idea.

I do not believe that an aircraft is wholly developed, even if it may be partly, by evolutionary processes. Surely an aircraft is not developed by random mutations, and then the aircraft which do not crash are selected for further development. My cousin was in the aircraft industry a long time ago, and she asserts, unfortunately, that my ideas are incorrect. I continue to say that an aircraft is a complicated mechanism. It is designed, it is planned. It is developed by principles which understand what is happening theoretically, and therefore designs are developed not randomly, but by reasoned processes that end up eventually with a complicated mechanism that works. Aircraft were not developed over tens or hundreds of millions of years in an evolutionary process. They are recent, representing a new principle. They are postevolutionary objects.

An objective of a new society is that it should be a postevolutionary system based on reason. This reason will define theoretical structures for its own self-understanding. This structure of reason, if it is optimised, will supplant other structures of society that have existed hitherto. The effective implementation of reason requires the observance of theoretical understandings which reflect very closely or exactly the real world. The understanding of this real world, if effectively applied, will give rise to new forms of organisation replacing those in existence today.

The maximum application of systems of reasoning requires its development. This thinking will be applied to explore new possibilities. Maximising innovation means the abandonment of structures of authority. The new idea is subversive to the social structures of today. Authority structure is usually top-down or rule-based. Innovation breaks rules and cannot be maintained as a rules-based system. In art, universities cannot innovate, but introduce from outside sources. The university structure of thinking is orthodox. Internal subversion threatens the authority of what is taught. This teaching is dogmatic and because of the primitive nature of our society it is almost always wrong.

I do not think this society needs to be destroyed. Systems of pleasure and pain will remain. They are evolutionary processes that gave rise to us. Systems based on reason can exist as separate entities on our planet. Just as lions should be allowed to roam, and of necessity they will eat meat, and just as sheep graze, these societies must be allowed to remain as part of the diversity of living systems. They have a right to maintain their stability and their existence.

What I propose, for those who wish to do so, is to build new entities based on reason. Their many structures comprising human beings, living things and our computers, as they are called in the current era, will be postevolutionary systems. Their authority will be reason based on truth and the investigation of fact. This will be the primary authority, in a sense not a human one.

In many ways these postevolutionary systems are with us today, but we have not recognised them. This idea can be implemented. With many others and even with you this can be part of our common endeavour.

You are free to ignore, reject, modify or accept what I say. That is part of my methodology. It is essential in the pursuit of truth that ideas can be challenged, including my own. Let us go on to the third slogan.

The initials DIY are a TLA. A TLA is a three letter acronym. DIY stands for Do It Yourself. What I am proposing is DIY politics. Let us go into a little more detail.

I am not sure of the exact details right now. My understanding is as follows. The class structure in the UK regime is often commented on by visitors. Originally, it was found expedient to give education to children in the UK because of German education, which gave access for its population to scientific and technological knowledge. This was a technological threat to British Imperial dominance. The performance of British manufactured goods was challenged by technological superiority, say in the Victorian era by German toys. Further, technological innovation allowed the development of more efficient, and therefore cheaper, products. This directly affected the British system not only in quality but also on price.

The views of Marx are interesting. His works went from Germany to Russia, where an orthodox and restricted set of documents became available. Marx is an innovative thinker. His views elsewhere go beyond the boring multiple drafts in one work of Capital, where labour value is the labour time taken to produce an artefact. This replaces the scalar value of money as the representation of what capitalism seeks to optimise. Marx was interested in technology. He had to be. He was in England. He was well aware of technological innovation and its effect. He does not have this simple idea of labour value. His ideas, as for any other authoritarian system, either Stalinist Russia, or the Catholic Church supressing the teaching, life and principles of Jesus to almost, but not quite, obliterate them, have been supressed by orthodoxy. They can be located. They are interesting.

The UK education system expanded under the post war Attlee Labour government. An outcome of the early expansion of education was the UK middle class, an administrative mechanism for transmission of power and maybe services derogated from the überwealthy to the working underclass, became occupied by two layers. The upper middle class had roots in the ownership of wealth. The lower middle class were brought up under a new education system. Further, they had knowledge of manual work and knew how to fix a plug. They were prepared to work directly to improve their homes and possessions, and were not always culturally disposed to employ workers to do things for them. Places where DIY was available became the in-thing. In intercommunication the upper middle class occasionally joined in. It merged to a certain extent, but not completely.

We need not stop here, but it is enough. Education has much expanded since then. A major problem currently in UK education is the millstone of debt which accumulates in acquiring higher education. A vivid feature of British society today is not only its class basis, but its age segmentation. Grey haired people like me dominate the political system. The attitudes of this age generation, rooted in the past, preclude provision of services, including financial support, to the young underclass. Like the gerontocracy that eventually collapsed in its own death as the

ruling communist class in the Russian Soviet system, today the UK is ruled collectively by a gerontocracy. The gerontocracy do not understand the world of today. The misunderstanding of a class based country with an Empire ruled under principles taught in Eton as to how the Roman Empire organised itself, this system is under collapse. These people know intimate day-to-day details of the movements of Roman Emperors. Its gerontocracy does not understand modernity. In particular, this class does not understand technology, which gave birth to the gigantic entity of the British Empire. They think of politics as about administration for their personal benefit, as a Roman Emperor would. They do not understand that by applying fascist principles to the management and selection of technological processes which they have never understood, they are designing their own doom.

The UK no longer instructs the world, The EU instructs the UK regime how to behave, but it does not obey, it has never learnt to obey. The UK, despite its military magnitude and financial embezzlement system based on the City of London, is a minor entity. They do not realise they have decided to reduce it considerably further. Their vile incompetence, which is legendary, will finally lead to the collapse of UK society. This society, according to these Roman Emperors, is due to progress to one ruled by a Prime Minister under Henry VIII powers. A big reason for leaving the EU is to get rid of its human rights legislation. This can and will be challenged. The young who neither read the press nor watch television, are immune to fascist propaganda. They google their information and text their friends in Australia. They are dissociated from the gerontocracy who do not represent their interests.

The UK regime is a violent society. This violence is most often exhibited abroad. An implication of Brexit is that the system will collapse. The majority of the young wish to remove this system, but feel paralysed in representing their views and immobile in a political system that excludes them. It is implicit in this dissociation of society that the UK regime will apply its violent machine internally.

Reflecting on Nazi Germany, the cognitive impossibility amongst Germans in the 1920's was that Jews could be anything other than a permanent and desired cultural feature of society. Its antithesis occurred in the 1930's and the Second World War. I am wondering on the position of Muslims in contemporary Britain. We see intimations already, but it is still a speculation outside cognitive realisation. The extermination of Muslims in England and Wales is an impossibility. I am suddenly horrified by the thought. The document I am writing from contains a discussion, but this disturbing idea needs further reflection.

The idea of DIY politics is that the system does not serve us. The purpose of DIY politics is to do it ourselves. I think it has mighty possibilities.

To conclude, we introduce a perfect society by introducing, or arguing against, three funny principles

If you like that sort of thing, it is just the sort of thing you like.

Getting it wrong is the first stage in getting it right.

DIY politics.

In a lifetime's endeavour, if I have reached the stage of being Jesus, and these principles and the principles of innovation I have developed, involving rejection of ideas including my own, can be easily taught, then these Jesuses will have sex with one another, will breed, will occupy

the planet, and we will end up with 100 million Jesuses. Authority structures had great problems in dealing with one Jesus. They eventually succeeded in containing him and supporting their violent and authoritarian societies. With 100 million Jesuses on their plate, they will have more than they can cope. These structures of authority will collapse. An innovative society introduces the idea of exchange and accumulation of intelligence. This is effective in nullifying military systems based on violence. Put your hands up authority. Robin Hood has won and is stealing your underpants.