



Pandora
Books

MIND MATTERS

Insanity: The New Social Norm

Rendered From The Original Text by
Téodoro Rampalé

MIND MATTERS


Insanity: The New Social Norm

Rendered From The Original Text By T  odoro Rampal  

Pandora
Books

The logo for Pandora Books features the word "Pandora" in a large, stylized, serif font with a drop shadow effect. Below it, the word "Books" is written in a smaller, simpler serif font. A decorative flourish or scrollwork element is positioned at the bottom of the logo.

Pandora Books



No copyright has been established for this manuscript, none is pending and none is sought. Reasonable free use applies.

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION	v
I. The Anatomy Of Language	1
II. Epistimology: How Do You Know What You Know?	6
III. Mind: It's Your Business	14
IV. Dichotomy: Mind Against Itself	29
V. Word Games	34
VI. The God Concept	40
VII. The Sacred Idea	45
VIII. Gods And Governments: The TwinPerils	51
IX. Ownership And Rights	59
X. The Illusion Of Universal Good And Universal Evil: The Myth Of Morality	62
XI. Economics: Goods And Services	66
XII. Inflation: The Invisible Thief	72
XIII. The Myth Of Altruism	82
XIV. The Illusion Of Categorical Identity (Racism)	86
XV. Law And Disorder	94
XVI. Nobody's Fault	100
XVII. The Fear Of Freedom	105

INTRODUCTION

In an overview of all known history of mankind, we see unceasing conflict and war broken only by brief reprieves filled with apprehension and fear of what is yet to come. This common mark, this common effect that stretches through the centuries, must, by the underlying order of the universe, be derived from common cause. There is no denying this truth without denying truth altogether. No matter what labels are put upon it, nor what subjective claims of difference accompany them, the objective fact remains: the cause of war is the cause of war is the cause of war.

It is human individuals that engage in these violent conflicts. Human individuals are creatures of volition and it is by choice that they pursue war. They claim a distaste for it and claim to seek an end to it, but without surcease, they battle on. Are we to think that individuals have no control over it, that it is the “destiny of mankind” to maim and kill? “Destiny” is by choice and choice is made. This is the truth of it.

In human affairs, as surely as effect is preceded by action, action is preceded by belief, and belief is preceded by thought and conclusions. Perpetual war leaves no doubt that conclusions held are manifested in acts of war. Reality is the final arbiter. It yields not at all to desires, hopes, wishes, expectations, or number of believers. War is reality’s judgment upon the means employed and the thought that precedes and selects. If peace is the desired end, the thought employed and means selected are obviously not appropriate to the goal sought.

Through the same centuries stagnated in hostility and war, technology, although often encountering zealot resistance, has advanced in leaps and bounds. Advance in technology is an ongoing process of goal sought and goal achieved. It is as much evidence of right thinking as perpetual war is evidence of wrong thinking. It behooves us to know the difference. As primary illustration, one example will suffice: If a medical scientist states that he is seeking or has found an infinite germ or non-dimensional virus, all would conclude that he is mentally unbalanced and out of touch with reality. In the social realm of an “omni god”, “national interest”, “society’s values” and other “infinite entities”, if one protests such absurdity,

it is the protester that is considered aberrant.

Two modes of thought, exact opposites, are employed in a singular and orderly universe. Can two thinking modes one eighty out of phase with each other both conform to reality? One succeeds, the other fails. Can any answer be more clear? The primary choice each individual must make is not what to think, but how to think. If the circumstance is to be turned from war to peace, thinking must be turned from infinity to one. Herein lies identity, truth, and peace.

Each and every human individual is by nature a volitional, valuing, goal-seeking entity. The achievement of a goal (value sought) results in a state of mind commonly referred to as happiness. Ergo, happiness is a condition that all constantly seek to create and/or sustain. Technically, since happiness is derived from the achievement of any goal (change of a set of circumstances), happiness is a constant of consciousness. This means that, definitively, happiness is actually a matter of more or less. However, instead of dealing with immeasurable degrees, communication may be better served if we regard the terms, happiness and unhappiness, as “either-or” as they are usually used in personal judgment of one’s state of mind.

The natural condition described above is accompanied by a potential for both inter- and intra-personal conflicts. Values and goals at odds with each other cannot co-exist as achievements and must necessarily culminate in mental and/or physical conflict. The manifestations of this potential are saturated in our philosophical and physical environment. Understanding the underlying cause is a prerequisite to dealing with it in a manner conducive to happiness.

We are all aware of perpetual war between “countries” derived from the conflict of values and goals of differing individuals. We are no less aware of violent conflicts of every description and scope that are not labeled as war. Nevertheless, the conditions of “street crime”, “domestic violence”, “racial conflicts”, etc., are fundamentally identical in common effect. Is not common cause indicated as well?

National mental health organizations, thousands, if not millions, of psychiatrists, psychologists, and therapists of every description is certainly evidence of awareness of certain types of extensive mental conflicts suffered by millions of individuals. Are the conflicts that are grouped under different labels actually derived from different causes as implied by the labeling? Or is there a connecting thread that ties them together and links them to other conflicts entwined with the eternal quest for happiness? If so, how and why does the natural quest for happiness so often result in horror and misery?

First, an overview: One or several persons could spend hours, days, or even months, just compiling a list of “peace treaties”, “accords”, and “summit conferences”; all ostensibly for the purpose of establishing a “lasting peace.” I dare say that such a list would create a very large book with many thousands of entries. If

such a list were made and each item evaluated in respect of the declared purpose, literally every one would receive the same judgment: FAILURE.

Doesn't the 100% failure rate lead you at least suspect that something is wrong at the core, that perhaps there is a common error and common cause at the root of it all? No matter what "reasons" are given, or what excuses are offered, the inescapable fact is that centuries of such efforts at peace by millions of individuals have produced nothing but failure. The wars go on. It may be philosophically and psychologically convenient and emotionally palatable to name a lone dictator here and there as cause, but consciously everyone knows that a lone dictator could not and cannot unilaterally carry out such massive atrocities. Such things require the voluntary psychological support and voluntary physical participation of many. It requires the same general thinking, the same basic ideology, the same fundamental values and goals. The questions are: What is this same general thinking? What is this basic ideology? What are these fundamental values and goals? From what beliefs are they derived? Are the beliefs true or false? These are the questions that must necessarily be accurately answered to understand cause and deal with it in a manner to end the endless violent conflicts. If the present violent circumstance is derived from truth, then we have no hope, for truth cannot be changed. It is only by recognition of the fallacies inherent in the prevailing philosophy and value system, and recognition of their destructive nature, that there is any chance of peace.

On the more directly personal level, what of the mental health organizations, the psychiatrists, psychologists, counselors, and therapists of every ilk? What is their success rate? Or failure rate? Are the causes of domestic violence, depression, suicidal behavior, and myriad other intra- and inter-personal conflicts really rooted out and understood? Or is it just a situation of occasionally masking symptoms and claiming success even as the vast majority of cases are openly admitted failures.

There is no lack of very personal awareness of many of these conflicts. Many seek assistance in resolving their problems by turning to licensed therapists, support groups, and counseling of various types. A few decades ago, not many engaged in these activities. Now, self-help books, tapes, lectures, and seminars are a multi-million-dollar commercial industry. Do they work? Check their track record and you will find that they are expensive and dismal failures. That's why more and supposedly different ones pop up frequently. Most openly admit their efforts fail to bring about the state of mind they seek. Not knowing why their efforts fail, they blame themselves and deepen the very problem they sought to resolve. To be sure, here and there are a few individuals singing the praises of their particular experiences, but such successes are rare, superficial, and temporary. The symptoms are masked, but the cause remains. These instances serve only to delude and draw the unsuspecting into the web of deception and disappointment.

Although few are aware of it, the prevailing dominant beliefs held by most of the population of the world consciously and/or unconsciously direct the mind to distrust conscious conclusion in deference to feelings derived from said dominant beliefs. This condition will be directly and indirectly addressed throughout this book. I deceive you not when I say that it will take much mental effort on your part to grasp what I have to say. The difficulty lies not in the complexities of the conclusions and beliefs, for they are the essence of simplicity and elementary logic. The difficulty is derived from a long standing and deeply ingrained resistance to any idea that challenges the status quo of what “everybody knows”, the shield of the sacred idea, as it were. Perhaps this barrier will weaken somewhat if you keep in mind that what “everybody knows” and the revered “unquestionable” beliefs underlie perpetual war and other personal misery as described above. We certainly cannot logically blame hostility and war on beliefs not held. To understand these directive beliefs and why they culminate in resentment, hostility, and war, we need to examine them and the underlying psychology independently of their influence. Not necessarily an easy task, but one that is required and quite possible if you so desire.

MIND MATTERS

CHAPTER I

THE ANATOMY OF LANGUAGE

Since the success of this effort depends entirely upon communicating exactly *what* I believe and *why* I believe it, it is certainly prudent to examine the central means of communication: Language. I know of nothing more used, more abused, and less thought about than words, the component parts of language. Oh yes, there is much taught about nouns, verbs, prepositions, infinitives, participles, etc. This is about rules. The principles of language usage that determine its communicative value are rarely mentioned, if at all. There seems to be a near universal belief that words have some mystical indestructible power to communicate which can never be lost nor diminished by manner of usage. Directly relative to this belief is the belief that the meaning of a word, that is, its definition, is determined by agreement and "common usage." The issue poses two fundamental questions: 1. What does it mean to define a word or term? 2. How does the defining of a word or term relate to your thinking, beliefs, and values and the achievement of the ends that you consciously desire? These questions can be answered only by understanding the principles of language and what happens to thinking, beliefs, and values when these principles are ignored.

What is the purpose of language? To communicate? If so, what is required to accomplish this end? Why is there more than one word in a language? Why are there different words in a language? I dare say, most, if not all, would in their own words answer that the many and different words are need to separate, to differentiate. Why do we need differentiation? Need for what? What then is to be differentiated? And how is it to be differentiated? Ans: Differentiate one entity from another entity or all other entities. Differentiate one relationship from another relationship and differentiate an entity from a relationship. While we usually talk about defining a subjectively created word, actual definition always connects to something objectively real.

A most popular fallacy is that "one may define his terms anyway he chooses." While original symbolic representation is indeed arbitrary, to fulfill the purpose of communication and/or to communicate truth, certain objective criteria must be

MIND MATTERS

met. It all begins, of course, by the invention of language, the connecting of a sound or writing to an entity or a relationship. Then, by definition, i.e. by word arrangements that conform to reality, communication can be achieved. To meet the need of constancy in meaning, a definition is always attached to an objective referent that is not subject to dismissal or alteration by personal preferences. If terms, such as a hamburger, were in one instant held to mean a food product that one may eat, and in the next instant meant a two wheeled conveyance, I dare say there would be much confusion at McDonalds and elsewhere. Yet, when it comes to one's beliefs and philosophical values and one's socioeconomic environment, random "shifting meanings" are commonplace without a thought of the contradiction. Indeed, adamantly defended as the "right" to define anyway one chooses." This attitude and many misconceptions about language are so readily accepted as unquestionable truth, that any challenge is likely to be dismissed without examination and consideration. Nevertheless, since language is the primary means to propagate and promote ideas and beliefs, and since distorted language usage (not conforming to reality) is used to promote destructive fallacies without end, I can think of no issue of greater importance. I shall treat it accordingly.

A word has a dual content: Denotation and Connotation. The first is constant. The latter is variable. The denotive content denotes, that is, it expresses or implies the existence of an entity or a relationship outside of the mind. Its basis is objective. The connotative content is individual valuation, individual emotional response to the entity or relationship denoted by the word. Its basis is subjective. Example: Two individuals hear the term, apple pie. To the individual liking apple pie, the term connotes pleasure. To the individual disliking apple pie, the term connotes displeasure. At another time, the personal preferences of one or both of the individuals may change, then so would the connotation. However, regardless of personal preferences, apple pie is still apple pie as determined by its objective content. Its objective identity does not change.

The simplicity of the illustration above may give the impression that the difference between denotation and connotation is so clear and precise that few, if any, would ever confuse the two. Regrettably, it happens quite often, and in most instances is not as easily detected as implied by the apple pie example. Remember, the basis of the denotation and connotation issue is making a distinction between objective identity and one's subjective personal valuation and emotional response. To put it another way, the goal is to always make a distinction between what is inside of the mind and what is outside. Apple pie is one thing. Philosophy (the beliefs and values by which one lives) is another. In philosophical issues, personal subjective valuation is often confused with objective identity. "Common usage" language is much in evidence of this disruptive and destructive practice.

To repeat for emphasis the base criteria stated above: to retain truth in definition and needed constancy in meaning, an objective referent is an absolute re-

MIND MATTERS

quirement. An objective referent is an objective thing in nature that cannot be dismissed nor altered by personal preference. It follows that if a word arrangement called a definition corresponds to a fixed and immutable objective referent, any arbitrary change in the word arrangement dismisses correspondence and identity, and therefore is false. Additional objective discovery may warrant a corresponding change in a definition, but to arbitrarily interject “modifiers” destroying correspondence with the actual is a contradiction, a thinking departure from reality into fallacy. Further, if a specific word, or word arrangement, corresponds to a specific objective referent, the same word or word arrangement, the same definition, cannot logically apply to any other referent with different characteristics. Any attempt to do so is to abandon the differentiation purpose and principle of definition. Rather than mentally abstracting via difference and discovering identity, any application of the same definition to different identities is to imply a sameness that does not exist. It is, in effect, a psychological effort to create reality by subjective words, rather than using words to differentiate objective discoveries.

I am certainly aware of satire, play on words, voice inflections that change meaning conveyed, but this is not at issue. The issue is language principles. In a science lab, or even in mundane daily events, no one would tolerate arbitrary and randomly shifting meanings of terms. Imagine the useless chaos of “shifting definitions” and “shifting referents.” It would render language useless. Yet, in the social and philosophical area “anyone can define his terms anyway he chooses” is a common refrain and claim without the slightest thought of, or regard for, a real and constant objective referent to connect the terms to reality and hold the meaning consistent. As such language usage is disconnected from reality, so are the beliefs derived from such thinking and usage. Needless to say, actions taken upon these fallacies will not produce the end result as consciously intended and predicted.

To clarify, and perhaps avoid misunderstanding of what is to follow, a brief glossary of a few central terms set forth now may be of value. Two terms at the center of it all are the terms objective and subjective. Absolute differentiation and clear understanding of these terms is imperative in understanding what is to follow. I use the term, objective, to designate that which exists independently of the mind, and is not altered or influenced by personal preferences, hopes, wishes, dreams, beliefs, or number of believers. Objective means fixed and 100% consistent by virtue of immutable natural laws, i.e., principles. I use the term, subjective, in reference to that which is derived from the mind, and therefore, dependent upon the mind; would not exist except for the mind; which is to say, exists in the mind. That which is subjective is individualistic and infinitely variable. Certainly the mind is a part of objective reality, but to separate mental invention from mental discoveries, differentiating terminology is a necessity.

MIND MATTERS

Although all language is a subjective mental invention, and therefore, abstract in origin, for purposes of differentiation, I use the phrase, abstract term, to denote a relationship and the phrase, concrete term, to denote an entity, an actual objective existent of quantity, of limitation and difference. For instance, a lamp and a table are each an objective existent. Each is an entity. The term, sitting, as in the lamp is sitting on the table, denotes a relationship and can never denote an entity. Language usage that is contrary to the criteria, objective definitive reference, is the product of subjective feelings, not objective identity. In the final analysis, all that I'm saying is the logically obvious. If a word or arrangement of words is not fixed upon and tied to something objective outside of the mind, it is attached only to the subjective mind and personal preference of each user. It is an implicit declaration of no requirement to connect language to objective reality. Such language usage is in contradiction of its declared purpose. It's "definitions" are limitless, infinitely variable in time and circumstance as determined by the feelings and desires of each individual. This unrestricted fluctuation in "meaning" makes it literally useless as a tool of communication. Worse yet, if this condition is not recognized and understood, language often serves not to communicate, but to provoke a response in accordance with each individual's "definitions." Without a common frame of reference as an anchor, verbal chaos is a certainty without intellectual means to peacefully resolve conflicting differences.

Much has been spoken and written about language influencing thinking and beliefs. Political speeches and Madison Avenue advertising techniques are just a couple of examples of the awareness of and the use of this fact. However, little is said about how language usage actually relates to the formulation and expression of beliefs. There is little notice of the fact that language usage is necessarily the reflection of the beliefs held, which may be true, or may be false. If not true, how can beliefs be expressed except by language usage that does not conform to reality, does not adhere to the criteria established above? In other words, such usage is lacking a fixed objective referent and is undefined in defiance of the absolute criteria needed for communication. Sometimes a term, or group of terms, may well have an objective referent, but the actual objective referent is denied in usage. For instance, the term, society, is a valid term denoting a relationship (proximity as opposed to isolation), but "society" is not valid when posited as an "infinite entity." And what of the term, entity? If it is used in one instance to denote an objective existent such as a car, a house, etc. and in the next used to allegedly denote a subjective idea as in "corporate entity," or "government entity," or "mental entity" of any description, does this make definitive sense? Logically, the same term indicates the same thing; at least basically. Here we have the term, entity, allegedly simultaneously denoting a finite objective thing of physical quantity and an infinite idea which is subjectively created and not physical at all; indeed exists only in the mind. All such language usage leaves a term or group

MIND MATTERS

of terms alleged to apply to a referent that does not exist: to a mental invention, a non entity. Thus do we arrive at the situation described above wherein a response is provoked, but actual communication is non existent.

The inescapable truth is that if we are to communicate, we must have a common frame of reference. I can see no other way for that needed common frame of reference to be established and maintained except by the criteria set forth above. If you are to pass judgment as true or false upon this idea and the conclusions to follow, you must first know **WHAT** the conclusions and beliefs are and **WHY** I hold them to be true. To do this, you must recognize and understand the references that underlie these conclusions. This is where identity and actual definition come in. I endeavor at all times to strictly adhere to the criteria set forth that you may define and know what I mean rather than “interpret” and often guess wrongly.

MIND MATTERS

CHAPTER II

EPISTEMOLOGY:

HOW DO YOU KNOW WHAT YOU KNOW?

There is a centuries-old ongoing debate as to whether “reason” or “faith,” or a combination thereof, is the means to acquire knowledge. It is a pointless argument since it dismisses the actual root issue. The question not addressed is whether in a principled universe there can be two means to acquire knowledge. Since principle itself, i.e., immutable natural law, is the necessity of all knowledge, the proposition of two means to acquire knowledge is in irreconcilable contradiction of the very foundation of all knowledge. Any imagined reconciliation of “reason and faith” is accomplished only by failing to define either term. Without a differentiation via objective criteria, the “meanings” of the terms are left up to the feelings of each believer precluding any resolution of the “reason vs faith” argument.

Nevertheless, let us look briefly at the logical inferences of the “reason and faith” idea. There are those who hold that “faith and reason” are complementary means of gaining knowledge. In these instances, faith is held as the primary and dominant means of acquiring “facts” from which to “reason.” Thus is “reason” set as handmaiden to faith. In other words, the base premises and foundation beliefs are a matter of faith. From this point on, “reason” just draws logical conclusions from these base beliefs and are always a reflection of said “faith beliefs.” On the other hand, there are those who claim to reject the idea of faith altogether and adamantly contend that “reason” and only “reason” is the means to know. Again, we have the same problem of differentiation and identity. It is one thing to claim that one’s thinking and beliefs are by “reason” and not faith, but it is quite another to demonstrate by presenting a clear differentiation between faith and “reason” that one may distinguish one mental process from the other. If we do not have such objective criteria to illustrate the difference claimed, how are we to know there is a difference between the two mental processes as claimed? Obviously, we do not. In any event, since the term, reason, has been corrupted by non-definitive common usage, there is no single term to express an actual differentiation

MIND MATTERS

between the two modes of thought by which one may acquire beliefs. This being the case, let us just examine the principles of knowledge without any misleading labels.

The first question is, what is knowledge? Ans: Beliefs that conform to objective reality. The ultimate test is in and upon objective reality itself. Fundamentally, if action is taken upon what one believes to be true and the end results are as expected, consistency with reality is evidenced and claimed knowledge is confirmed. The second question is, what is the nature of things and knowledge that is conducive to survival?

I think there shall be no quarrel upon the fact that truth and knowledge are dependent upon the underlying and immutable order of the universe. Were things to lose their character from one instance to the next, one could not predict and act upon prediction in the next second, let alone the next day, the next month, or next year. It is this order, the 100% dependability of objective reality that we literally cannot live without. The operative phrase is 100% dependability, i.e., objective principle. On this principle, must we not also logically assume that knowledge, that is, the acquiring of knowledge is also a matter of principle? Can there be a "counter principle?" Can there be more than one principled way to acquire knowledge? Or is it just a matter of error thought to be knowledge?

Based on the principle of principle, it follows that the means by which one knows anything is the same principled means by which any and all knowledge held is acquired. In some instances, surface appearance may appear to be the contrary, but follow the process to its ultimate base and you will find that the principle still holds. After we define knowledge, the next question is, knowledge of what? What is there to know? What can be known? What is the absolute radical of all knowledge?

In the universe and knowledge of same, there are only two base elements: Entities and relationships between entities. Everything else is derived from and tied to these root concepts. Before one can logically talk about relationships, one must first know that two or more entities exist. To know that two or more entities exist, one must first know that one entity exists. Therefore, the root question of epistemology is: How does one know AN (one) entity to exist? Certainly, we all know of sensory perception as a primary means to supply information to the brain and mind, but this is just a description of process. It doesn't tell us in itself the principle or principles upon which the process depends.

Knowledge of these principles is paramount in that sensory input, though usually correct, is not 100% reliable; nor does knowledge stop with sensory input. It follows an intricate and endless pattern of integration that must necessarily utilize the same principles. Thus does the question, how do you know AN entity to exist stands as an issue of absolute importance. The answer to the question is: By

MIND MATTERS

mentally abstracting it by its DIFFERING SET OF CHARACTERISTICS.

Difference implies limitation. Ergo, there is no such thing as a non-dimensional, i.e., infinite entity. In definitive and noncontradictory language usage, the term, entity, always means a limited, finite physical existent. It may be smaller than an electron or larger than the earth, but never infinite.

The brevity belies the significance of the idea in the short paragraph above. It relates directly and indirectly to literally every belief, every value, and every goal you consciously seek to accomplish. In recognizing principle and mentally separating it from non-principle, it clearly differentiates and clearly presents two choices in modes of thought: A -conscious adherence to the principles of identity as described above (entity identity) and B - abandonment of these principles to an imaginary infinite entity. Since no one is omniscient and infallible, strict adherence to A, the principles of epistemology, does not mean that one's conclusions will be correct 100% of the time. However, abandonment of these principles does mean that one will be wrong 100% of the time in this mode of thought. To fail to make an identity via the principles described above is to conclude upon non-identity (feelings inconsistent with reality) and act upon error.

A term that is frequently tossed about is the term, logic. If understood, logic can be an invaluable mental tool in making identifications, but is not, and does not make identifications in itself. Logic, frequently equated with scientific hypothesis and syllogisms, is an automatic mental action. Logic, i.e., the mental integrator, merely integrates given premises and logically arrives at a logical conclusion. Never does this integrator evaluate the given premises as true or false. This responsibility falls to conscious mind. Every conclusion is logical in respect of some premise. It's a natural condition. The term, logical, has little definitive meaning unless a specific premise or premises are directly or indirectly identified as reference.

Fundamentally, we are talking about what I call the "if-then" principle of mind as evidenced in formal syllogisms, or in everyday calculations and events. "If A is = to B and B is = to C, then A is = to C. " If it rains, then the ground will be wet. It is raining, then the ground is wet - and so on. Even in subconscious, the if-then principle is always present. Without conscious awareness: "If I depress the brake pedal, then the car will slow and stop." These are easily recognized, understood, and accepted, but what is not so easy to convey is that the if-then principle operates on ALL beliefs; even those held in subconscious that are unknown to conscious mind and sometimes vehemently denied by the holder. For every conclusion and belief, there is a logical if-then link back to its source. For every action, there is an underlying logically directive belief. This is the actual dominant belief even if the actor claims to hold a belief to the contrary. Subjective claims are without limit, but one can act only upon what one believes to be true. Ergo, if

MIND MATTERS

there is a conflict between verbal claim and actions, the actions tell the truth of the matter every time.

There is much lip service paid to the idea of thinking in principles. Unfortunately, this worthy admonition is rarely practiced as the confused epistemology which most embrace leaves them failing to make a distinction between principle which is objective and 100% consistent and premise which is a matter of mental invention and choice. Thousands of times each day, each conscious functioning individual uses the principles of epistemology and accomplishes a wide assortment of tasks. However, few grasp that the mental method that they successfully use to identify entities, know relationships, select means, and achieve a particular goal is a matter of principles and applies 100% of the time. Consequently, when prompted by an emotionally dominant belief, the principles are abandoned and thinking shifts to the never never land of subjective feelings. The principles and objective identity are abandoned with the thinker totally oblivious to the shift and firmly believing that his (her) conclusions are derived from the facts of an objective reality. To make the situation even more difficult to grasp, in social circumstance, the end result is often far removed in time from cause and no mental connection is made between cause and effect. Consequently, the consciously undesirable effect is attributed to an imagined cause while the actual cause is ignored and effectively denied. This means that the same error is repeated over and over again. (As in perpetual war).

Like the term, principle, and the phrase, thinking in principles, the term, objectivity, is frequently heard and recommended as a thinking discipline. Most, if not all, understand objectivity to mean determining what is true, what is as it exists independently of personal preference and feelings. In other words, identify BEFORE presuming to attribute and impose personal values to the distortion of one's view of reality. While all believe they do not allow their feelings to distort their view of reality, the unfortunate truth is that nearly all frequently deny and dismiss logical conclusions of conscious mind in deference to feelings - with the feeling that they are not allowing feelings to interfere.

An emotion-based conclusion does not necessarily refer to a situation of crisis or high emotional intensity. It refers to any conclusion that is contrary to identity and the conclusions of the conscious mind. In these instances, which are many, there is no conscious awareness of the directive emotion at all. It is known to exist by the fact that an emotion is a consequence of a belief and every belief carries a corresponding emotion even if not consciously realized. It is this condition of unknowing default acceptance that is philosophically and psychologically devastating. To understand the actuality and significance of this default acceptance, it is necessary to clearly see the mental process by which you reach conclusions that result in consciously desired ends. In this manner, you may by your

MIND MATTERS

own observation and analysis contrast productive thinking with destructive thinking.

Square one: Since the sense of sight is so fast and so efficient in supplying information to the brain, it is easy to fail to grasp the principles of identity that are in action. To get a clear and concise view, let's employ another one of the senses that is not as fast so that we can view the principles in action and in slow motion. Let us mentally enter a dark room filled with objects unknown to you. You move forward and touch an object with the tip of your finger. You observe that the surface of the object is rigid. You now have one bit of information about the object via the sense of touch. You have a perceptual (sensory perception) identity of the object. You then move your finger sideways and discover that the surface of this object is rough. Mind integrates the characteristics rigid and rough and relates the integration to the entity in question. You now have the very base conceptual identity (conceived idea) of the object. You then move around and become disoriented. Again you encounter an object that feels rigid to the touch. Is it the same object that you touched before? You move your finger and find that the surface of this object is smooth, not rough. Mind integrates rigid and smooth and creates a conceptual identity of the object.

The conceptual identities are different, so you know that it is not the same object. The entities have been mentally abstracted by their differing sets of characteristics. You may continue this exploration indefinitely. You may find objects that have nine characteristics that are the same, but one different characteristic. The difference establishes a differing set of characteristics allowing the mental abstracting and identification; which in turn provides knowledge of potential or presently existing relationships.

Now let's look at the situation from an eyesight perspective and the other side of the knowledge spectrum. You observe an entity, say a human individual. At a glance, you have enough information to mentally abstract this particular individual from all other things and all other individuals because of their differing sets of characteristics. Suppose for medical reasons, you desire or need more information about this person. You wish to increase your conceptual identity of this creature. Carry it as far as desire and ability allows. You may mentally abstract the heart, heart valves, liver, spleen, kidneys, even down to red and white corpuscles and beyond. In every step of increasing conceptual identity and knowledge of this entity, differentiation is the absolute epistemological requirement. In this instance and in all other instances, the greater the degree of mentally abstracting by difference, the wider the conceptual identity and the greater the degree of knowledge.

Imagined "conceptual identity" as in "will of the people", or "racial identity" is based on similarity, not differentiation. It is, therefore, not objective identity, but rather subjective mental invention without limit and fails to identify the

MIND MATTERS

actual objective existent, human INDIVIDUAL. Since similarity is tantamount to infinity, imagine the latitude of “discovery” if one subscribes to similarity as an element of identity.

Categorizing certainly has its place and is indispensable, but it is not objective identity. Categorizing travels in the direction away from identity. The wider the category, the less cognitive content. What differentia exists in categorical terms is dependent upon choice of what degree of difference one prefers to retain in a subjectively created category. However, as stated above, in no instance does a category constitute objective identity as it does not deal with an actual objective existent as a specific existent. There is no objective correspondent for a category. A category is infinite, and infinity is non-identity. (What is the identity in matter, the ultimate category?) Categorizing is simply a way of organizing knowledge after objective identity. Since similar characteristics indicate similar entities and similar relationships, categorizing is indispensable to survival, but objective identity it isn't.

From start to finish categorizing is arbitrary and secondary to objective identity. Since confusing subjectively created infinite category with objective finite discovery and entity existence is commonplace and poses a serious epistemological problem, it may be of much value to explore this situation in further illustrative detail.

Categorizing is the mental grouping of things, entities, or relationships on arbitrarily selected similarities. There is no objective criteria as to what to categorize or how to categorize. Its all a matter of personal preference as pertains to use value. Is it important? As stated above, indispensable. It is essential to survival. Were it not for categorizing, one would have to examine and reexamine everything at every encounter; an impossible task. Categorizing is a means of organizing and using knowledge, but it is not objective identity. The illusion to the contrary stems from two things: absence of the knowledge of actual objective identity, and the retention of differentia in any given step of categorizing. The first step is the maximum retention of differentia, and the last step is matter, which is absolute infinity and total non identity. (Individual, singular and actual identity - then individuals - man - animal - organism, etc.) To repeat for emphasis: Categorizing is a process of mentally grouping on similarity. The retained differentia is a concession to differences (identity) known prior to categorizing.

By a couple of hypothetical situations, let's illustrate the fact that there is no identity in similarity, and also determine the specific relationship between objective identity via limitation and difference and categorizing on the infinity of similarity.

Suppose that Mr. Smith has a three-year-old son who in turn has a bunch of toy bricks. These toy bricks are the same dimensions of regular house bricks,

MIND MATTERS

same reddish brown color, and same rough looking surface, but they are made of rubber. Mr. Smith frequently walks through the room where the toy bricks are. Fantasizing about becoming a world famous soccer player, he playfully kicks the toy bricks against the wall. He does this many times and no harm comes of it. Then, one day, someone who knows of Mr. Smith's diversion decides to play a cruel joke. He removes one of the toy bricks and replaces it with a real masonry one. Shortly thereafter, Mr. Smith comes strolling through the room kicking the toy bricks just like he has done dozens of times before. At the third brick, he encounters the real one and breaks his foot. The difference is that he did not know about denied identity, and therefore, denied knowledge of the relationship.

Now let's get melodramatic for further emphasis. Suppose you are standing in middle of a blacktop road near a railroad track. A train is going by and the noise from it blanks out all other sounds. You look up and see a thing that you call an automobile coming straight at you at a high rate of speed. With knowledge held, you, by mental reflex, instantaneously evaluate the situation and know that if you don't get out of the way, you will be injured or killed. You quickly jump to the side of the road just as the automobile roars by at 100 miles per hour. Your actions saved your life, but what knowledge prompted the saving action? At this point, most would conclude that they identified the automobile by category and the "categorical identity" saved their life. Is this your conclusion? If so, let's put it to a test.

Let's go back to the road, the track and the automobile. You're standing in middle of the road as before. The train noise is deafening as before. Now we add a pea soup fog so thick you can't see your hand in front of your face. There's an automobile coming right at you at a high rate of speed. You can't hear it because of the train noise and you can't see it because of the fog. Now, how much good does your knowledge of the category, automobile, do you? Freeze frame. Think about it. You still have the same knowledge of the category, automobile, as you did before. DOES IT IDENTIFY? Why not? What happened in the fog that made the difference between life and death? Ans. The sameness and infinity of the fog prevented objective identity because it prevented the mental abstracting of the automobile by limitation and difference.

Play it back in mental slow motion. See with absolute clarity that one must first mentally abstract an entity by limitation and difference BEFORE one can use any knowledge of that entity as held in the mind as category. Category is always secondary from start to finish. Objective identity precedes categorizing AND objective identity precedes use of knowledge held in category. No exceptions. 100% consistent! It's a matter of principle.

Whether it is a life threatening situation or a simple matter of picking up a concrete block from a stack, objective identity via limitations and difference is

MIND MATTERS

always the primary. One may call this primary objective identity automatic, axiomatic, and the given with no further need of thought, but to do so is to deny the base principle of knowledge. If so, this denial and consequent ignorance will be manifested as grievous errors in philosophical beliefs. A principle is a principle is a principle. It applies to all aspects of reality, from getting out of the way of a speeding car to determining fact from fiction in philosophy. To deny this principle is to deny reality. It is to psychologically displace the real with mental invention believed to be discovered. The end results are anti-individual and anti-life beliefs and actions, often quite fatal. Denial equals disaster, and due to the prevailing mode of thought, denial is a certainty UNLESS one is consciously aware of THE PRINCIPLES AS PRINCIPLES - and not to be violated under any circumstance.

MIND MATTERS

CHAPTER III

MIND: ITS YOUR BUSINESS

During and after world wars, civil wars, riots, bombings, and other acts of violence where men, women, and innocent children are maimed and killed, the question, why, is asked again and again. Since the mind is the holder of motivating beliefs and values and the ultimate director of all action, the mind is the obvious place to look for answers. Yet, the study of the mind is almost nonexistent.

Given the central importance of the mind to the life of each and every individual, doesn't it strike you as somewhat strange that study of the mind is not in the curriculum of formal education from kindergarten on, or before? Why is this most important of important subjects so blatantly ignored? Yes, there are licensed psychiatrists and psychologists that are alleged to make a study of the mind and hold knowledge of it, but what is the inference of setting authority over your mind and tacitly excluding you from knowledge of it? Could this be part of the problem rather than a solution to it? No doubt these "authorities" do hold some knowledge of the mind but what is the nature of the study and knowledge? How are you to evaluate claimed knowledge of your mind if you are kept in ignorance of it? Are you to simply accept and blindly react to something that you do not understand? Isn't this a little scary? In reference to these questions, what is the real significance of the existence of licensed psychiatrists and psychologists? Suppose that licensed psychiatrists and psychologist are actually a reflection of a widespread psychological problem. If this is the case, can the end result be anything other than propagating the very cause of the problems they are trying to remedy?

A medical doctor may set a broken bone or even perform a heart transplant. A mechanic may repair your car. A carpenter may build you a house, a plumber plumb it, and an electrician wire it. No one can be knowledgeable and proficient in all fields that are of personal interest and value. To fulfill one's wants and needs, it is frequently necessary to rely on the knowledge and expertise of another or others. However, the mind, your mind, is a different matter. To place the content of your mind as amenable to external construction, to turn it over to authority, is to abandon responsibility to self and simultaneously throw away your

MIND MATTERS

autonomy and individuality. Are you comfortable with this?

The cause of the resistance to examination of the principles of the mind and needed introspection is inherent in the fallacies that lie at the root of most philosophies and dominate thinking. It is the same resistance that disregards and denies the principles of language usage and principles of epistemology. Contrary to popular opinion, the mind is not an unfathomable mystery beyond the understanding of laymen. In fact, the concept, authority, in this field is a deterrent to the understanding of mental processes and psychological derivatives.

First, let's once again find and recognize with clarity the basis for facts, all facts. Literally everyone I know, or know of, verbally agrees that all knowledge is dependent upon the underlying order of the universe, the 100% consistent immutable natural laws. In a word, PRINCIPLES. Unfortunately, although all lay claim to this belief, nearly all belie the claim by contradicting it over and over again. The most obvious contradiction is the belief that an omni-god exists and can alter reality at will. Thus does claimed immutable natural laws become subject to the whim and caprice of an alleged omnipotent being, and the all-important 100% consistency factor goes out the window - and consistency in thinking with it. Unless you can find just cause to conclude otherwise, consciously focus upon the immutable natural laws and the 100% consistency factor. Hold to it as if your life depends on it. It does.

I know of nothing more unique than the mind. Although the mind is derived from the physical brain, it is not physical in itself, and not subject to quantitative measurement. This, however, does not place it out of range of understanding. Unique though it is, the mind is still part of the universe and must necessarily be governed by specific natural laws, i.e., principles. This means that although mind content (beliefs and values) varies from individual to individual, all minds function by the same principles of operation. Prenatal or postnatal brain damage (or drugs) may affect certain functions, but does not alter the natural principles.

The phenomenon called the mind is so unique that upon cursory examination, it appears as a mass and mess of contradictions that defy untangling. The mind has the capacity to mentally discover and to mentally invent. Alas, it also has the capacity to fail to make a distinction between the two; that is, fail to make a distinction between what is inside of the mind and what is outside. This happens more often and in much greater degree than you might imagine. Worse yet, it appears quite correct to most because the mode of thought involved is unquestionably accepted by nearly all. In conjunction with this is a natural principle of the mind that all but disappears in the process: Volition. Each individual is by nature a volitional entity imbued by natural principle with the freedom of choice. Yet, the mind is highly susceptible to being programmed and controlled by dominant beliefs that proscribe the parameters of thought. This means that choices are

MIND MATTERS

made only within the parameters allowed by the dominant beliefs. Knowledge of reality outside of these parameters is emotionally regarded as nonexistent. Much to my sorrow, most go through life not as an independent thinking individual, but as a reactive entity motivated in thought, feelings, and actions by the directives of the dominant beliefs. If this is true, is there an escape from this mind prison? Yes. It's knowledge of the mind. This is the means of controlling your own mind and thinking independently.

As a primary illustration of subconscious response emanating from held beliefs, let's look again at one of the statements above. I, in effect, stated that the failure to make a distinction between what is inside of the mind and what is outside is a common occurrence and generally accepted as the "norm" beyond questioning. What was your mental response to this statement? In all probability, it was casually passed over with no conscious thought or analysis, or of its significance if true. Why? To speak of someone failing to make a distinction between what is inside of the mind and what is outside usually evokes the thought of a person severely mentally deranged and perhaps committed to a mental institution. This reflex emotional picture does not in your mind equate with the "norm" in which I placed the conclusion. Ergo, the statement is emotionally and instantly rejected as false without any examination and effort to ascertain why I made the statement, or what evidence I can offer as proof of it. The idea that the "norm" in thinking accepted by millions is "abnormal" is too far removed from the accepted "norm" to be seriously considered. Nevertheless, the statement is quite true and there is an abundance of evidence to support this conclusion. (The observation above about positing society and a corporation as "entities" are a couple of examples of confusing mental inventions and ideas with objective discoveries.)

Since every thought and action presupposes the existence and operation of mind principles, an infinite amount of data is always available for study. As in all scientific study, the everpresent core objective is to accurately relate cause and effect. Fundamentally, I'm talking about tracing effect back to action and action back to motivating beliefs and psychological causes. This is accomplished by identifying the mind principles and causal nature of the principles that determine the final outcome of given premises and beliefs. By using the same mind principles, we can also ascertain how and why specific premises and beliefs are created and accepted. Granted, sometimes the twists and turns of mind functions create a mental circumstance with some beliefs deeply buried and not so easy to detect. However, in general, and in reference to the commonly held beliefs that are the central subject of inquiry, we do not have this problem. They are practically on the surface and highly visible.

I mentioned near the beginning of this book the problem of resistance to any idea that opposes the status quo of what "everybody knows." The psychological resistance of which I speak is not of a conscious variety. It is not like deciding

MIND MATTERS

between higher or lower taxes, drug laws or no drug laws, abortion or no abortion. The resistance of which I speak is not consciously known at all. There is no mental viewing of alternatives with a conscious and consciously emotional response to options. If there were, there would be no problem. It is precisely the absence of awareness of an alternative that constitutes the problem. The resistance to awareness of an alternative is quiet, subtle, and nearly absolute. Given this declaration, you may justifiably ask: How then does one know that such a psychological barrier exist? And how does one deal with it if known?

First, let's establish that such a psychological barrier does exist; that emotions, known or unknown, derived from dominant beliefs, denounce and reject what your conscious mind tells you is logical and true. Start with an overview of the general situation of perpetual war and other violent conflicts discussed earlier. Is it your conclusion that this is a natural condition and nothing can be done about it? If so, how does volition fit into this conclusion? Are you saying that volition does not exist and individuals do not have a choice about the matter? If determinism is your answer, this takes us down a different road of necessary discussion as to how you reached such a conclusion in the face of choice to do so. On the other hand, if you believe the situation, i.e., the eternal war problem, can be resolved, why is it that millions over hundreds of centuries have failed to find and implement the solution? What I'm getting at is that either perpetual war is a natural and naturally unchanging condition, or that the means to resolve the problem lies undiscovered because of psychological resistance to the knowledge required. If this is the case, would you call this a substantial psychological barrier protecting the violent status quo and sacred ideas? If yes, is such resistance consciously known to the holders and believers that perpetuate the condition by their thoughts and actions? Are they aware of an alternative to war, but refuse to choose it? If so, why?

An individual's beliefs and values are a sum total of all of his (her) life's experiences, and evaluation of these experiences. The evaluations are not always of a conscious design. Many beliefs are held by subconscious association from direct experience or subconscious mental integration of expressed or implied premises. Beliefs subconsciously accepted and held by logical inference are no less directive beliefs than those accepted by direct declaration and conscious deliberation; indeed, are even more so. What poses the problem is that subconsciously held beliefs are frequently not defined and not known to the holder. They exist only as directive emotions often in direct conflict with conscious observations and conclusions. By mention and illustration of the resistances, I am trying to call your attention to an element that may preclude grasp of observations and conclusions that I present. In the final analysis, it comes down to trusting your conscious mind rather than succumbing to emotional dictates that are contrary to what conscious mind tells you is true. The rationale behind this is that all emotions

MIND MATTERS

are a reflection of beliefs held whether acquired consciously or subconsciously. Since a belief may be either true or false, to rely on emotions to make that determination is to dismiss conscious mind and the principles of epistemology. While emotions are the motivator, the movers and shakers of all thought and actions, emotions are not reliable tools of cognition.

Every scientific researcher worthy of the name focuses upon discovery and use of principles, the 100% consistent natural laws that determine action, reaction, cause, and effect. The study of the mind is no different. Grasp of mind principles is the key to understanding. It will not suffice for me to just point them out and you to casually accept if so inclined. This won't work. It is for you to see the principle in operation and to know by your own mind and experience that they are indeed principles upon which you can rely at all times. I can furnish information but, in the final analysis, this is the ultimate do-it-yourself project. It can't be done any other way.

By nature, every individual is a volitional, valuing, goal-seeking entity. Although a goal sought is not always designated as such, goal seeking is an ongoing mental operation of every conscious individual. A goal is simply a desire for a change in a set of circumstances. A goal may be as involved and complex as building and flying a space craft, or as simple as raising a finger. The latter could very well be a consciously desired goal by someone recovering from paralysis of a hand. Goal seeking is mental or physical action. Also, while not always consciously recognized and declared, every action is preceded by a theory. For instance, if you arise and walk to the refrigerator to get a drink of water, this action takes place only after theorizing (subconsciously in this case) that you have the ability to achieve the end desired. By bringing this theorizing to the surface and viewing it in conscious light, we may view the mind principles in action.

The hypothetical or syllogistic form is often used in testing a theory. Although many elements are usually involved, fundamentally it consists of two premises and a conclusion. The first premise sets a propositional condition. The second either confirms or denies the proposed condition. A logical conclusion is drawn in correspondence with either the confirmation or the denial.

I gave an illustration earlier, but importance warrants a repeat for emphasis. Example: Premise 1. If it is raining, the ground is wet. Premise 2. It is raining. Conclusion. Then the ground is wet. Or - Premise 1. If Individual A wishes to live, he must take nourishment. Premise 2. Individual A wishes to live. Conclusion. Then Individual A must take nourishment. If A is equal to B and B is equal to C, then A is equal to C, and so on. The validity of this mental process is dependent upon a specific principle of the mind and the 100% consistency of the principle.

Focus most strongly upon this "if-then" factor for it is an absolute and working mind principle, i.e., the "logic circuit" involved in all your calculations via

MIND MATTERS

conscious mind and in both aspects of subconscious. Literally every belief you hold, consciously or subconsciously is by this means. However, and this is a most critical however, and again I repeat for emphasis, the mental integrator does not evaluate premises given as true or false. This is the function of the conscious mind and choice. The mental integrator is a natural mental reflex that simply and always produces a logical conclusion from antecedent premises. Since the mental integrator consistently produces a logical conclusion from given premises, it is the ultimate error detector. If a logically inferred conclusion is self contradictory or is in contradiction of some other belief or beliefs held, then beliefs held or at least one of the antecedent premises must be false. Several or all may be false.

Let's test further. Premise 1. If Individual A is flapping his arms, he is flying. Premise 2. Individual A is flapping his arms. Conclusion. He is flying. If you hold the conclusion that Individual A cannot fly by flapping his arms, then you must logically conclude that either this conclusion is false or else the premise that logically led to the contrary conclusion is false. Observe another mind principle evidenced in this mental action: You cannot simultaneously hold something to be true and untrue. You may from time to time change your beliefs, but your mind cannot hold a contradiction within itself. (The net result would be zero.) Whenever something is regarded as true, that which opposes it is necessarily regarded as false, i.e., mentally displaced and regarded as nonexistent.

The mind principle of differential reference and mental displacement of the contrary is evidenced in the physical realm as well. A wanderer lost in the desert and dying of thirst "sees" a pool of water. If he "sees" a pool of water, then he cannot see the actual sand that the pool of water displaces. Again, another mind principles emerges: With sufficient provocation by fear and desire, a mind can create alleviating compensation and project that creation upon objective reality and believe that the subjective mental creation is objective discovery. Some have "seen" Jesus or the Virgin Mary. A grieving mother "sees" her dead son. There is much evidence of these happenings, but little understanding of delusional cause.

A much stated belief in Christianity is that an omnipotent god gives man free will. Let's examine this via hypothetical form and see how the belief stands up in the "logic circuit" and how the belief is sustained.

Premise 1. If an omnipotent god exists, then man has free will. Premise 2. An omnipotent god exists. Conclusion. Then man has free will. The problem is, of course, arbitrary declaration absent definition and connection to reality. If we define and then set the proposition in hypothetical form, we arrive at a far different conclusion. Premise 1. If an omnipotent god exists, then the omnipotent god controls all. Premise 2. An omnipotent god exists. Conclusion. Then the omnipotent controls all. Premise 1. If an omnipotent god exists and controls all, then man has

MIND MATTERS

no control, no free will. Premise 2. An omnipotent god exists and controls all. Conclusion. Then man has no control, no free will.

The seeming escape from definition and the unwanted logical conclusion is simply by ignoring the definition and unwanted logical conclusion. However, the matter does not end here. The mind cannot hold the self-contradiction. It must either accept the omni-god idea and reject individual volition, or reject the omni-god idea and accept individual volition. While the conscious mind may delude itself, subconsciously, this choice is made. Premise 1. If an omnipotent god exists, then individual volition does not. Premise 2. An omnipotent god exists. Conclusion. Individual and individual volition does not, is an illusion. This subconsciously held conclusion, derived from denial of the principles of knowledge and denial of finite individual as the real, is the dominant belief that is manifest in many forms throughout the prevailing philosophical and socioeconomic environment. It will be discussed in much detail later. For now, let's clarify the existence of determinant mind principles.

Three critical and descriptive terms of mind are self (ego, if you prefer), conscious, and subconscious, the latter two already discussed in some measure. There are two aspects of the subconscious. One is highly visible and easy to discern and accept as a principled operation of the mind. The other is no less principle, but obscured and not so easily recognized since it harbors dominant fallacies that psychologically act in their own defense to hide from the conscious mind.

To visualize the primary subconscious, let's hypothetically put it into practice. Suppose you are driving down the road at 60 miles per hour and a car suddenly exits from a side street and stops directly in front of you. What do you do? Quickly apply the brake? Why? When you learned to drive a car, you consciously learned the function of the brake. This knowledge combined with other knowledge and the desire to avoid injury or death all instantly combined to create a mind-physical reflex in correspondence with antecedent knowledge and values held. This is primary subconscious at work. It is necessary for survival. Time does not allow for relearning or reevaluation of prior beliefs where circumstance calls for immediate decisions and actions. Even in non-emergency situations, daily you perform hundreds, if not thousands, of tasks without conscious review of all relative knowledge and directive values.

If we put the car situation in the simplistic form of mind functions, we find the mental integrator in action. The mental integrator is a principle of the mind that integrates given premises and infers a logical conclusion consistent with the premises given. In the car instance, let's begin with the value of your life and the knowledge that a severe impact on the body can cause injury or death. In effect, the integrator takes this path: If I wish to live, then I must avoid severe impact of my body. Knowledge of brake function creates: If I wish the car to stop, then I must

MIND MATTERS

apply the brake.

The important thing here to see and grasp with confidence is that subconscious directives are very real, not mysterious, and always are a reflection of beliefs held either consciously or subconsciously. If the beliefs integrated are true, they will result in the proper response to produce the desired end result. If the beliefs integrated are false, the end results will not be as consciously preferred and expected.

While everyone uses this principle in many calculation actions, as they must do to survive, when the integrator infers a logical conclusion in conflict with dominant beliefs, the conclusion is oft denied, which is also denial of the integrator as a 100% consistent principle of the mind. To do this is to abandon the greatest safeguard against error that the mind can provide.

In the automobile example, the subconsciously held beliefs are a matter of antecedent and known conscious conclusions. This is not always the case. Many beliefs are created and held by subconscious mental integration without conscious deliberation. The situation of subconsciously creating and holding beliefs is a matter of mind principle and is everpresent from the cradle to the grave. Subconsciously created and subconsciously held beliefs by a human individual is by a mental method very similar to that of animals of the four-legged variety.

If you observe the actions of an animal such as a dog or a horse, you will see that the minds of these animals work very much like that of a human except for the fact that a human being can think in the abstract. By calculating in the abstract, I mean mental operation by which one can know the consequence of an action without taking it, i.e., the mental ability to deal with ideas and abstract representations. For instance, a dog may struggle with a board trying to carry it through a doorway, but can't know if the board will go through the doorway without trying it, by direct experience. Whereas, a human individual may tell just by looking, or certainly can by measurement with a tape measure without moving the board. The knowledge held by a four-legged critter such as a dog comes by three basic elements: Instinct, parental guidance, and experience. The knowledge registers as emotional impressions, but the "if-then" factor is still visible as determined by observing actions and counteractions. If a dog encounters some other animal, say a badger, and comes out on the very painful end of the conflict, this experience will register in the mind and integrate with instinctive values for future reference. Without a conscious determination, the experience results in: If I wish to avoid pain, then I must avoid the badger. This is belief by causal, or what is seen as causal, association. This same mental element can be found in a human individual in many instances. A humorous one is the superstition of "lucky hat," etc. If the person was wearing a particular hat at the winning of a ball game, it sometimes superstitiously becomes emotionally regarded as the cause, that is, there is an

MIND MATTERS

effort to duplicate the previous conditions of which the “lucky hat” was a part. That a person consciously knows better does not automatically eliminate the emotional “associated cause.” A car dealer advertises a car with the decoration of a beautiful woman. Many products are promoted by celebrity movie or sports stars. These are but versions of “identity via association.” These cons are highly visible, yet enjoy much success in the marketplace. Other than perhaps being induced to buy a product by influences other than its quality, no great harm is done. Other instances are often a great deal more serious. Beliefs by association without conscious deliberation are very real and often constitute very real problems in humans and other animals.

Other similarities of mind functions are highly visible. A dog can be named and learn his name. A dog can mentally abstract existents on the sensory level, categorize and learn commands without conscious effort and without awareness of self as a mortal entity. Whatever the circumstances involving knowledge by the mind, the “if-then” factor is in operation. Where the similarities end, identity begins. An animal’s view of the world is restricted by the elements named above. The human ability to calculate in the abstract, to conceive ideas, to communicate via language, to believe without restrictions presents a far different mental and psychological situation.

Most are aware that a child’s environment has much potential for influencing a person’s beliefs and values for life. What is not so widely understood is the hows and whys of this situation. Recall that the mind works by differential reference. What one knows to be true acts as a defense against accepting fallacy that opposes known truth. What of the mind of a child that holds little knowledge and little defense against whatever fallacy may be heard or taught? When this is combined with the physical and psychological dependence of a child, the door is wide open for dominant beliefs and influences to be realized in every type of behavior imaginable.

It is not just a matter of conscious teachings, but the logical inference and subliminal directives that literally direct all the thinking and actions of the individual for their entire life. A child does not need to be told directly that he is “evil;” nor does he (she) require that “evil” be defined. It is simply emotionally attached to things and thoughts. If a thing done or not done is labeled as “evil,” the child by association and conscious or subconscious mental integration evaluates self by his relationship to the designated “evil.” A child does not need to be told directly that persons or a particular race or nationality are “inferior.” He may hold such a belief and opinion from the subconscious integration of a passing remark or gesture. If by the conversation of his parents, a child concludes that intelligence is much valued, intelligence (though undefined like “evil”) becomes a measure of self. If said parents give the impression that tying a shoelace is a mark of intelligence, and if the child is unable to tie a shoelace, it creates a negative impression

MIND MATTERS

of self. There is literally no limit to such incidents in a child's, or an adult's, life. In fact, undefined, emotionally held beliefs directing opinion, values, and value judgments often play a very large part in the view of self and interpersonal relationships on every level.

Subliminal directives and indirect instruction are all the more influential precisely because they are subliminal. There is no conscious awareness of exactly what is being taught, therefore no conscious evaluation and no conscious resistance. Tie a subliminal directive to the self value of a believer and it has more force than a thousand skilled orators arguing against it. A believer will pursue the directive even unto death none the wiser as to what or who is directing the motivating thoughts and consequent actions.

Think for a moment about the world you were born into and in which you now live; an earth mentally chopped up into "nations," "states," "governments," and "collective entities" of nationalities, race, whatever. Have you ever really questioned this? Have you analyzed it and found it all to be based on truth? Have you accepted all the beliefs that underlie this philosophical structure because your conscious mind found them to be true - or because "that's the way things are" and there can be nothing else? Have you considered these underlying directive beliefs and evaluated them in the context of your self value and personal goals? What's going on in your mind and other minds? How does thinking and mode of thought relate to your happiness or absence of it? What one believes to exist, to be true, is their concept of reality and their place in it. These determinations are made by thought. Mode of thought is a critical element in these determinations and decisions. It is of paramount importance to an individual to correctly identify them in order to act upon the real and achieve desired ends. What is involved in the necessary process? Is your thinking consistent with the principles of knowledge?

Let's begin the inquiry by observing a popular but fallacious notion dealing with the mind function of identifying an entity. I dare say that at least 99% of the population would say that they identify by both similarities and differences. Eyesight is a swift and proficient sense and the mind is so proficient at speed integration that it appears that differences and similarities are known simultaneously. This leads to the conclusion that identity is by both difference and similarity. Emotions fit this belief and there is a psychological resistance to accepting that which runs counter to the emotions. As demonstrated earlier in the epistemology chapter, these emotions do not conform to reality. Objective identity is by difference and difference only. If I can demonstrate this fact conclusively, would you accept it as principle and truth even though you still feel that its not true?

Bear in mind that when I speak of emotions influencing thinking and decisions, I am talking not just about the highly visible and obvious such as a murderer's mother believing that he is innocent. The influencing of which I speak is of a quiet and consciously unknown nature. It is actually incorporated in the dominant mode

MIND MATTERS

of thought itself, which makes it more difficult to recognize. One knows that it is emotional influence and emotionally held conclusion by observing the conflict with conclusions that your conscious mind tells you are true. The following will suffice as a primary illustration.

If you speak of the similarity of two entities, aren't you saying that you are aware of the two entities? Is it possible to know of the similarity before knowing that each of the entities exist? Forget the speed and efficiency of eyesight for a moment and focus upon principle as indicated by your own logical conclusions. Isn't it objective fact and principle that to note the similarities of two entities, one must first know that two entities exist? If identification of each entity is a prerequisite to awareness of similarities, obviously similarity plays no part in objective identity. Does this make sense to you? What this is all about is to discipline thinking by principles and make correct objective identities in all areas of life. At first, emotions resist and it takes a conscious effort to keep thinking in line with the principles of identity. When the truth of identity becomes well set in the mind by thought and experience, then it become a matter of mental reflex with emotions corresponding. Many things that you once considered unquestionable truth, you will now see as obvious fallacy.

To further illustrate this most important point of identity by difference, imagine three large, identical cardboard cartons, each containing a kitchen appliance. The cartons are labeled A, B, and C. The appliances within are a food mixer, an electric cooking range, and a refrigerator. The task is to locate the refrigerator as a description of each appliance is given. Item A is metallic. Item B is metallic. Item C is metallic. Where is the is refrigerator? Item A is white. Item B is white. Item C is white. In which carton is the refrigerator? Item A operates on electricity. Item B operates on electricity. Item C operates on electricity. Where is the refrigerator? Item A has no compressor. Item B has no compressor. Item C has a compressor. Which item is the refrigerator?

I trust the point is made that an infinite list of similarities may be offered, but will not aid one iota in mentally abstracting and identifying an entity. Only when a compressor is added to the description of Item C, creating a different set of characteristics, is mentally abstracting and identifying possible. Identity by difference and only by difference is principle. This elementary, irrefutable, and all-important fact is psychologically dismissed by the idea of similarity as a fundamental of identity. The consequence of this is emotionally regarding a subjectively created, similarity-based category as an actual objective existent, i.e., mentally treating it as a real and causal entity. The category element is combined with other abstract mental inventions resulting in a philosophy of illusory "infinite entities" and "universal values." This philosophy, epistemology, and mode of thought is nearly universally accepted without question. Language usage attests to this regrettable fact. Constitutions, laws, books, speeches, and all elements of the media are satu-

MIND MATTERS

rated with non-identity and contradiction. By most, it is all blandly and blindly accepted without so much as a raised eyebrow. What “everybody knows” is not to be questioned. After all, didn’t consensus of opinion make the earth flat?

The test above and any other valid test you can devise shows beyond a shadow of a doubt that objective identity is by difference and difference only. It also demonstrates a very important element of the mind: Emotions are the product of beliefs and conscious confrontation with facts that oppose those beliefs will not instantly dismiss the emotions although the conscious mind concludes that they are false. Which do you trust, your conscious mind or your feelings? The why of and the significance of this principle of identity by objective difference is a matter of life and death, for it is a matter of separating fact from fallacy. One acts upon what one believes to be true. If correct entity identity is not made by the principle of difference, then neither is the actual relationship(s) known and understood.

Awareness of subconscious and subliminal influence is hardly a new discovery. Advertisers and politicians have been playing to this fact for a very long time, but only in a most superficial manner. What is most ironic about this is that the advertisers and politicians are apparently completely oblivious to the subconsciously held beliefs and subliminal influences that direct their own thinking even as they consciously attempt to direct the thinking and choices of others. They are completely unaware that their parameters of thought are confined by the subconscious directives of dominant beliefs.

Let’s look at another example of the quiet and subconscious resistance to the status quo and sacred ideas. A few paragraphs above I stated: “... the above recognition of principle and non-principle clearly differentiates and clearly presents two choices in modes of thought: A - conscious adherence to the principles of identity as described above and B - abandonment of these principles to an imaginary infinite entity. Since no one is omniscient and infallible, strict adherence to A, the principles of epistemology, does not mean that one’s conclusions will be correct 100% of the time. However, abandonment of these principles does mean that one will be wrong 100% of the time in this mode of thought.”

Before any testing, let’s look at the claim and evaluate it as a hypothesis. If there are two modes of thought and one mode is certain to produce error, would it be of value to you to know this mode that you may avoid it, and thereby avoid certain error? How much value? Even if the odds are a trillion to one against the claim being true, would its value if true warrant investigation and testing?

Obviously, if true, the value of such knowledge is incalculable. Yet, if I presented this idea to a thousand persons, it is doubtful if even one would grasp the significance of the claim and expend the time and effort to test it. Actually, the idea is very easy to test and confirm as true. First, observe that literally every

MIND MATTERS

thing you accomplish every day depends upon mentally abstracting a limited entity by difference. You distinguish your hat from your coat, your auto from another auto, your house from another house, your self from other individuals, by limitation and difference. From the simplest task to the most scientifically complex, literally every identity and accomplishment is irrevocably linked to the principles of epistemology and the fact that identity, that is, knowledge of any aspect of reality, is a matter of differentiation. To be sure, there are many beliefs held of gods, ghosts, disembodied spirits, and phantasmagoria of every “non-description,” but no validation is ever forthcoming, nor will there ever be. This also applies to the endless list of “infinite entities” and revered abstracts called people, nation, society, majority, minority, public, ad infinitum. I submit that no one ever has or ever will find an exception to the principles of identity via limitation and difference. So, why the total disregard and de facto denial of such important knowledge? What underlies this absolute resistance, this quiet and subconscious instant rejection without consideration?’

The answer is highly visible, indeed, covers the earth. The principles of epistemology denounce as fallacy any and all, expressed or implied, “infinite entity” beliefs and ALL beliefs derived therefrom. At least 99.9% of the world population not only subscribe to some infinite entity belief, their entire view of the world, especially view of self and self value are totally psychologically dependent upon the infinite entities belief. This has been so throughout all known time. The beliefs and consequent circumstances are so constant and so nearly universal, that these beliefs and conditions register in the mind (conscious and subconscious) as absolute. There is no alternative to an absolute and the mind cannot envision a “counter absolute,” even if the beliefs held as absolute are false. Ergo, the principles of epistemology that oppose these totally dominant beliefs cannot exist in the mind of a believer. In such minds, there is no alternative, and, therefore, nothing to consider and investigate. Of course, such believers have no idea of the why of their default rejection of principles; for they have little or no understanding of their mind. The dominant beliefs themselves preclude the examination of the mind - unless one strongly wills it otherwise and makes the effort. Can any single endeavor be more important in an individual’s life?

Another major element in influencing thinking is authority. In this concept, fact and fiction become so entangled in so many ways for so long, that they tend to blur together with all “authority” emotionally considered to be fact. As a matter of necessity, we all begin our lives under parental authority. Then comes school and the authority teacher from which we learn. We encounter proficient authorities in many fields further embedding the idea of authority as synonymous with truth. Encompassing all of this is the everpresent authority of “government” and all of the derivative “authorities.” Is it any wonder that subordination of the conscious mind to authority is so easily and so casually accepted? Most spend their entire

MIND MATTERS

lives, not deciding what to believe, but WHO to believe; indeed, often making a god or goddess of their favorite guru. In this state of mind, they are easily offended if one disagrees with the opinion of their discovered “superior being.” They are emotionally unable to discern the difference between a criticism of a particular belief and a personal attack upon their deity. Thus do they set their beliefs as immune to criticism. They succumb to the revered and “unquestionable.” “Authority” is their epistemology, not their own conscious mind.

Colleges and universities crank out experts and authorities at a rapid pace. They are accredited knowledge commensurate with degrees awarded. Sometimes rightly so and we would do well to heed their conclusions and advice in many instances. Other “degreed authorities” raise some very large questions. Although not perfect by any stretch, by and large, knowledge claimed by medical doctors, biologists, engineers, etc., is validated by application producing the intended results. Can we truthfully say the same about claimed knowledge of those holding degrees in theology, sociology, political science, philosophy, and other such subjects? Also, let us not forget the expert economists who play word games with illusory gross national product, ignore subjective value as market principle, and fail to define money and its role in the marketplace. To be rather blunt, other than in the technical areas, the professors and instructors in colleges and universities are unknowingly engaged in trying to standardize error.

No matter. They are all called authorities and few there be who think to challenge the idea of putting theology and the like on an academic parallel with the sciences. Nor does anyone seem to notice that degrees earned in medicine, engineering, and other tech based studies are earned only by adhering to the principles of epistemology, whereas degrees in theology, philosophy, economics (and others) are “earned” only by denying the principles of epistemology. Of course, in these institutions of authority, the principles are not recognized as they would rudely disturb the cherished status quo of authority by decree and deception.

In support of all the “authorities by decree” is the unofficial but much revered authority, “consensus of opinion.” In a philosophical environment based on “higher powers” and subordination of the individual mind to the alleged higher power, mass opinion wields massive influence on the minds of most individuals. If nearly all hold certain sacred ideas, it follows that much influence rejects out of hand anything that opposes. To grasp the measure of the psychological resistance to the principles of epistemology, let’s look at a partial list of what these principles oppose and declare to be fallacy.

“God’s” will, life proper to man, the will of the people, the values of society, national interest, for the good of the community, public welfare, majority rule, natural rights, human rights, state’s rights, federal rights, minority rights, public welfare, constitutional rights, objective morality, gross national product, family

MIND MATTERS

values, America's children, on and on and on. - Psychological saturation. These revered illusions have been around for centuries and all the violence and bloodshed derived from them has induced few to reexamine their premises. There is no doubt that the psychological dependency on these beliefs is near total and it is most unlikely that any argument will persuade many to take a new look. How ironic it is that millions feel that they cannot live without these beliefs, when in fact, the very things that they fear and consciously seek to prevent are the inevitable consequence of these revered fallacies.

Although these beliefs come under a wide variety of labels and claims, psychologically and epistemologically, they are all the same. The common denominators are hard to miss. First, in abandoning the principles of epistemology, the actual identity, human individual, is emotionally dismissed in deference to an expressed or implied "infinite entity." The epistemological and psychological effect is that real human individual is declared nonexistent. Certainly, everyone is absolutely certain that they recognize human individual as real, but their thoughts, conclusions, and actions contradict the claim. The "infinite entity," under whatever label and claim, is explicitly or implicitly posited as a superior being to which the deposed and denied individual is subordinated. Real individual goals are now denied as each individual is effectively declared to be the means to a "universal goal." (Which, of course, is actually the goal of each believer hiding from self while seeking to collectivize all under his (her) personal beliefs and preferences.)

Since all ideas of "infinite entities," expressed or implied, are psychologically and epistemologically the same in that they deny identity and subordinate real individual to an expressed or implied omni-superior-being, for sake of utility, I refer to one or all as the god concept. "God's will," will of the people, and all other such ideas that express or imply an omni-entity of volition and creator of value. The alleged values are consciously or unconsciously believed to exist independently of any human individual creating them. In other words, these alleged values are said to be discovered and objective as opposed to being individually created and subjective. The concept, objective value, is diametrically opposed to the reality that values are subjectively created and attributed by each individual. No exceptions. There are no objective values or "natural standards" of any type anywhere. How could there be in the reality of human individual and unqualified natural volition?

If you believe that "the ways things are" is derived from unquestionable truth, then you accept the conditions as determined by nature and there is nothing you or anyone can do about it. On the other hand, if you suspect something may be wrong at the core and make the effort to think independently AND trust your own conscious mind, then a critical look at "the way things are" and why they are may culminate in a far different perspective than the one you now hold.

MIND MATTERS

CHAPTER IV

DICHOTOMY: MIND AGAINST ITSELF

The preceding chapters on the principles of epistemology and the principles of the mind show how the principles of the mind act upon conclusions and beliefs. Conclusions and beliefs established by denial of the principles of epistemology create serious problems. This denial of the principles of knowledge and subsequent mental construction of the god concept (illusory “infinite entity”) sets a condition of a mind divided against itself. Since this is a constant condition as long as a believer holds the god concept, the mind division and mental conflict will be evidenced in literally every area and aspect of a believer’s life. Since nearly all subscribe to the mind-dividing beliefs, these beliefs underlie the self-contradictory official socioeconomic system as well as being evidenced in self conflicts in the most personal of personal individual situations.

That which is discovered outside of the mind is without contradiction. While error is possible and knowledge not always as extensive as one might desire, that which exists independently of the mind is part of a continuous universe and is without conflict. It follows that beliefs conforming to reality are without conflict. On the other hand, a god concept representing an imagined discovery of an “infinite entity” in objective reality is a different matter. Although the elements of a god concept are the product of a subjective mind and exist only in the mind, since they are believed to be objective discovery, the elements constitute psychological directives of the same intensity as actual discoveries.

A god concept, by definition, is not a concept of individual self, that is, not recognized self. It is necessarily apart from, different from, and therefore contrary to a concept of individual self as seen by a believer. Psychologically, it establishes two sets of conditions in a single mind. In effect, it creates a “dual reality,” i.e., two opposing “realities.” Whether expressed or implied, declared or denied, the god concept always represents a “universal infinite entity.” The “infinite entity” is attributed the human characteristics of volition, valuation, and cause along with omni-superior-being status. The “self values” and the “god concept values” can never meld lest self become the god to the defeat of the psychologi-

MIND MATTERS

cal purpose of the creating.

By choice, a “dual reality,” i.e., contrary premises, are regarded as real (although the believer is not consciously aware of what’s going on). At this point, the principles of the mind take over and there is no choice about the outcome of these beliefs. One “reality” or the other will determine the parameters of thought and subsequently determine action. The effects will follow a sequentially logical pattern no less by natural law than gravity. The outcome is no less predictable than is prediction upon any principle.

The primary and highly visible logical inference is the relationship, superior-inferior beings. This is followed by subordination. Thus the first logical directive is to accept and abide by the “god concept values.” Since these “god concept values” are inherently opposed to “self values” and reconciliation impossible, the mind tries to go two directions at the same time and is in constant conflict. It is caught between “I must” and “I can’t,” as well as being manifested in two opposing types of behavior.

In the reality of individual identity, there are no standards by which to judge, value, and evaluate self except as self determines. While one may be discouraged by limited capacity to achieve ends desired, acceptance of the finite and limited is accepting reality and imposes no standard of judgment. It is when mind leaves the finite and presumes to grasp infinity that the trouble begins. Let’s look at excerpts from one personal experience that is basically representative of all experiences in the same context. To be sure, individual is reality and individual variations are to be expected, but the common effect from common cause is highly visible and logically undeniable.

The representative example is a candid disclosure of the emotional turmoil of an ex-Catholic nun as a child, then as an adult. “As a child, I was convinced I was going to hell. In the Catholic Church we heard so much about mortal sin I became convinced that I was a bad girl because I couldn’t honestly say, I love God.”

Note the primary evaluation of self as “bad girl” because she couldn’t “love God.” Why not? And why was this failure so emotionally devastating to the child? Mind cannot grasp infinity and the child’s mind could make no connection to an alleged infinite being. In all probability, she was looking for a feeling toward “God” like the feeling that she had toward her parents. However, there was no identity to grasp, and the failure to grasp was not attributed to the non-identity factor. She attributed the failure to “evil self.” What the child’s mind did connect to was the values and judgment of her finite parents. To the child, the parents were the superior and omniscient beings; their conclusions and beliefs were necessarily correct -and if the child could not believe as well, certainly the fault must be the fault of the child. This was the emotional conclusions of the child. This negative self-

MIND MATTERS

judgment combined with the implicit threat of rejection by her parents as well as a threat of an eternal hell no doubt was a severe mental torment.

“I started to feel pulled in two directions. My church said, Don’t question anything; my school said, question everything.” The torment took its toll: “I cried for days,” she said.

Not a very pretty picture, is it? The cardinal sin of inquiry and the fear and guilt associated with it is a nearly impenetrable barrier to knowledge that reveals such beliefs as a fallacy. Fear dominates and consequent ignorance prevails. Mental torment is the consequence. Confusion, inability to resolve the dilemma, and feelings of guilt from the lack of faith added to the feeling of self-doubt and lack of self-worth. Truth is consistent. There is no mind division in beliefs that are consistent and conform to reality. A mind divided against itself as described in this example is clear evidence of fallacy. Yet, this mind was so dominated by the god concept fallacy that there was no thought of this fact, not as a child, nor later.

However, there was a brief effort to escape and in defiance of faith, conscious mind concluded: “From the beginning, it was men and women who created God, to meet their needs, to conform to their time, and to reflect their socio-economic circumstances.” In other words, she consciously concluded that “God” is a mental invention. Unfortunately, she didn’t trust her conscious mind and still held to the god concept lest she alienate friends and family, and perhaps offend the god that she consciously concluded doesn’t exist. Throughout all her struggles, one base tenet of Christianity held total influence and dominance, an influence of self-condemnation: “We know we are these cruel and murderous beings.” She dismissed individual and individual volition, and dominated by the innate evil of man idea and “God” as the redeemer, she remained imprisoned in a confused and backward mind-world: “All religions have been designed to help us touch the God in each other.”

After all the mental torment and effort to escape this psychological domination, conscious mind was denied and she still held to the idea of a universal and objective value which she called god and revered as “the good.” Self, is of course, the completely “evil.” No doubt, she saw wars and other violent conflicts as “evidence” of “man’s evil nature” to be redeemed by “touch of the God in each other.” The thought never occurred to her that the god concept and subsequent concept of rule is the cause of the violence and “evil” that she witnessed, not the remedy.

From the “highly inspired” to the “uninspired,” mind manipulation is the stock and trade of religion. (Albeit, not necessarily consciously). Guilt is a pivotal emotion. Duly note that the child in the illustration felt a very real and painful guilt, not because of some harm she had done to someone, but simply because she couldn’t feel what she thought she “ought” to feel. Religion provides both cause and “cure” of guilt. To teach a child that “man” is evil by nature is to teach

MIND MATTERS

the child that he (she) is an “evil being.” A feeling of guilt goes with the belief. The teacher then provides a way to absolve the guilt. The ritual may vary from sect to sect, but absolution always entails subordination, confession, and prayer for “forgiveness of sin.”

In Catholicism, formal confession to a priest is the preferred ritual. In Protestantism, to be “born again” is the ultimate triumph of “good over evil.” The Catholic ritual, although fundamentally the same as the Protestant idea, is lacking in the emotional intensity of the “born again” phenomenon. So, let’s look at this “miracle” and see what’s really going on.

First, the feeling of guilt is implanted by beliefs that have no connection to objective reality, that is, beliefs whose basis is entirely subjective emotions. The feeling of guilt is not a desirable state of mind and the “guilty” individual values means to alleviate the feeling. The believer follows the instructions to be humble, confess, and pray for forgiveness, and lo and behold, the feeling of guilt disappears. All is forgiven and the “sinner” is joyfully “born again.”

The feeling tells only of its own existence. It tells nothing of cause, source, or relationship to reality. This knowledge is found by conscious effort and analysis of the mind. When identity is employed, it is discovered that “divine miracle” has secular roots. If a mind can be manipulated and conditioned to feel guilt by one fallacy, is it any great mystery that the same mind can be reconditioned to dismiss the feeling of guilt by another fallacy?

Unfortunately, most who experience the “miracle” of being “born again” know nothing of the mind and reach a different conclusion. All they know is the feeling of exhilaration as the burden of guilt is lifted. Being well conditioned to accept feelings as fact, they consider the experience as proof of “God” and “God’s power to redeem the soul from man’s innate evil.” Little do they know that instead of “divine intervention” from a far distant heaven, the entire scenario takes place just a few inches above their shoulders. There are many who consciously reject the ideas of formal religion and cannot see themselves in the position described above. However, nearly all accept the same epistemology, the same psychology, and share the same mental state. Although the god in formal religion is denounced as fallacy, within the epistemology and psychology they often subscribe to the surrogate gods, “society,” “public,” etc., and are no less affected by the “standards” set for them. Who does not judge self as a “success” or “failure” by reference to these “standards?” Very few, I’m sorry to say.

As indicated in the foregoing, the god concept splits the mind into “is” and “ought.” The dichotomy is further manifested in two personalities evidencing two sets of values. Of course, the two sets of values are antagonistic to each other and when put into practice sets a physical condition of self against self. Sometimes this is realized in direct self-mutilation or varied acts of direct personal self-destruction. However, the most common method of implementing the self-destructive

MIND MATTERS

dichotomy is via an official socioeconomic system.

Relatively few individuals would take gun in hand, go to a neighbor's house, and by threat of injury or death, compel the neighbor to turn over part or all of his (her) material wealth, force a specific code of dress, determine the food and drink the neighbor is allowed to ingest and imbibe, and in general set guidelines for the neighbor's behavior in all areas of living. Most would consider such acts as outrageous, immoral, and a violation of rights. They would vehemently condemn such behavior as totally unacceptable and insist on laws and punishment to discourage it. They would label the action "unfair," "unjust," and "socially disruptive." They would clearly see that this action would be met with resentment and hostility culminating in violent conflict. They cannot envision themselves acting in this reprehensible manner.

In this circumstance, the focus is upon self and the neighbor as individuals. There is a conscious recognition that the relationship is a relationship of two finite human beings. Cause and effect are immediate and highly visible. There is a conscious recognition of self as cause and conscious sense of personal responsibility tending to preclude the intrusive anti-individual and anti-peace behavior.

Now enters the god concept and the whole epistemology, psychology, and philosophy is reversed. It divides a single individual mind into two diametrically opposed poles: The "self pole" and the "god concept pole" ("ought"). The god concept is set as the dominant pole. The intrusive behavior regarded by the self pole as "unjust," "immoral," and "unacceptable" is now via the god concept pole regarded not only as "fair and just," but as a "moral imperative." In this reversal process, self is disowned, psychologically declared not to exist. The conscious connection between cause and effect is no more. There is no conscious recognition of the relationship as being a relationship between self and another finite human being.

The relationship is now emotionally regarded as a relationship of the god concept and subservient subjects. The god concept is now declared to be cause and beneficiary. Conformity to "God's will," "values of society," "national interest" is the directive for and justification of all action. Behavior shunned with disdain and horror by the "human self" is now embraced by the "god self" and carried out via an interconnected political system and centralized coercive force. The actors see only the preferred self-image of the "human self" and make no mental connection to self as cause of the effect via the system. Cause and effect are emotionally attributed to the disowned god-self thereby dismissing the sense of personal responsibility needed for peaceful coexistence. Although a simple and logical trace reveals the truth, believers refuse to see that voluntary support of the coercive system, including voting in a political election, is an act of violence no less than direct physical assault or armed robbery, which is suicidal in base character.

MIND MATTERS

CHAPTER V

WORD GAMES

Since the dominant beliefs that underlie the official socioeconomic system are in denial of the principles of epistemology, denial of the principles of language is a requirement to psychologically sustain the revered fallacies. This is the purpose and function of word games. Word games are language usage that does not conform to reality. Since the language usage does not conform to reality, what is being said or written is a lie or fallacy. A lie is usually thought of as deliberate deception whereas a fallacy is often believed by the promoters to be true. In either event, the purpose (conscious or subconscious) is to deceive others or self.

As opening observation, on any given day how many times do you hear or read the term, ought, or, the term, should? What do they mean? Do they connect to objective reality? If so, how? If an individual is to achieve a specific goal, the individual **MUST** apply appropriate means. Obviously, ought is not a scientific term. So, where does the term come from - and where does it come in? Look to the admonition, "ought to obey God's will" to reveal source and meaning of the term, ought. It is simply an expression of personal preference imagined to be a universal value. The idea that anyone can actually disobey nature is, of course, a contradiction. The ought itself indicates the subjective reference for the term. That which is objective is. There is no "ought" involved. "Ought" has no objective support other than subjective personal valuation.

The most damaging word games are those necessary to promote the illusion, confusion, intrusion, contradictions, and self-delusion in the prevailing philosophy of rule. Few seek to look at the philosophy exposed by removing all the non-definitive rhetoric and connecting it to the real. Without these word games, the truth is laid bare and the philosophy loses much of its appeal; indeed, I submit that without these word games, the philosophy of rule would disappear altogether.

Since definition and denotation connect to reality by entity identity, playing word games requires the dismissal of definition, denotation, and entity identity in favor of interpretation, connotation, and non-identity. There are millions upon

MIND MATTERS

millions who constantly play these word games as a matter of philosophical course. For the most part, believers actually believe what they are saying. The problem is that they don't know what they are saying. They are simply floating along with emotions and imagining these emotions to be objective reality. They are completely oblivious to the deception (self and others) and most are bent on staying that way lest the truth disturb preferred self image. As an excellent representative example, lets look at an item from a junior college text book that is alleged to explain the American political system. It asks the question: "WHAT IS GOVERNMENT?"

The text offers this as answer: "The words 'government,' 'politics,' 'power,' and 'democracy' ought to be clearly defined. The difficulty is that political scientists, philosophers, and kings have never been able to agree entirely on the meanings of these terms." "Ought?" Notice that the "definition and meaning" of the term, government, is dependent upon subjective agreement. Duly note the inference and significance of the inference: In this thinking, definition is not connected to anything objective and fixed, nor do the believers see any need to do so. "Definition" is totally dependent upon subjective preference and declaration. This means that the "definition" of a term can vary infinitely between individuals and within the individual choice of each. Thus the "meaning" of a term can change a thousand times in the space of a few minutes. How is this idea of definition going to work in practice? Keep in mind, this is the usual thinking and attitude that saturates the social and philosophical environment and is evidenced in word games without end.

The text continues: "The ancient Greek philosopher Plato and his pupil Aristotle speculated on their meaning, and the process has continued up to the present day. Bearing in mind that no universal or perfect definition exists, we can still discuss the words and arrive at a general concept of what they mean."

No definition exists? General concept? In continuing confusion, vagueness, and evasion, the text book states: "Even in a primitive society, some form of government exists. A tribal chief emerges with authority over others and makes decisions, perhaps in consultation with the elders of the tribe. The tribal leader is governing." "Emerges" - How "emerges?" Did the tribal chief just suddenly rise up out of the sea or ground with unexplained "authority" to govern? What precisely does it mean to govern? In the next paragraph, the author gets very close to the truth, but dances around it with non-definition and more word games: "Government, then, even in a modern industrial state, can be defined on a simple level as the individuals, institutions, and process that makes rules for society and possesses the power to enforce them."

Thus government is "defined" as individuals (real entities), institutions (abstract mental inventions) and process (mental and physical action) making rules

MIND MATTERS

for “society” (abstract) and possessing the power to enforce the rules (offensive physical action). Real individuals are mentally and verbally lumped with abstracts as cause and beneficiary of enforced rules. Getting very close to the truth, but in continuing evasion via an “infinite entity,” the text states: “In short, government makes the rules to decide who gets what of valued things in a society.”

Observe the common practice of positing “government” as a causal entity, an “infinite entity.” Since government and society are abstracts, not causal or beneficiary entities, this leaves an individual or individuals to fill in as fact where fiction was before. To rewrite in step with reality: “In short, some individual or individuals make rules to decide who get what of valued things; i.e., to decide whose will will prevail.” Relate this to the “power to enforce” and you’re closing in on the meaning of the term, government. Where did “they” get the “power to enforce?” From the “will of the people,” of course - another abstract. However, the text inadvertently exposes the truth of the matter: “A century ago, Boss Tweed, the leader of Tammany Hall, the Democratic party machine in New York City, reportedly expressed a simple, cynical philosophy: ‘The way to have power is to take it’.”

Cynical or not, this is the truth of the matter. It is actually the “law of the jungle” with intellect used only to “justify” the predatory action. In support of this truth, it is also worthy of note that this textbook says that “Power is the possession of control over others.” In other words, it is ownership of others. Thus even after the truth is laid bare, it is ignored and the status quo and supporting word games go on and on.

For all the sidestepping, dance arounds, word games, and confused rhetoric, the term government is easily defined; not by subjective agreement, but by reference to objective reality and the actual entities involved. First, we know that there is no such thing as an infinite entity and that the term, government, necessarily denotes a relationship. The actual entities involved are human individuals. The base options of relationships between individuals are non-initiation of force and non-coercion, or initiation of force and coercion. It makes no difference how many different subjective labels are put upon the situation, the objective fact remains that at the root of it all, these are the only two options. The former is in recognition of the individual as a self-owned entity. The latter is based on the idea of an individual being the property of an “infinite entity;” which is the “justification” for rule by the individuals who hide behind the abstracts and exercise their will to dominate and control all others.

The subjective and arbitrary labels arbitrarily associated with government such as democracy, socialism, communism, etc. are purely for the purpose of self-delusion. Although form of implementation may vary and some versions start closer to ultimate self-destruction than other versions, the common and identifying objective content of each and every one is initiation of force and coercion. Millions

MIND MATTERS

may volunteer for such an antisocial system and play self-deluding word games for the sake of preferred self-image, but all the pretense in the world and “definitions by agreement” will not erase the truth about government, nor prevent the certain violent consequences of initiation of force and coercion.

Fallacies propagated and promoted by word games are easily detected by a constant mental reference to the principles of epistemology and corresponding principles of language usage. After a while, it becomes mental reflex. Unfortunately, most are so psychologically caught up in the fallacies and the word games scene that they have no idea that such references exist. Nevertheless, whenever you hear or see an “infinite entity” posited as a volitional, valuing, causal being, you can safely bet your last peso that a con is going on. In fact, since word games are part and parcel of the prevailing backwards epistemology and confused philosophy of “abstract entities,” the con is always going on. Behind every mythical “volitional and valuing abstract” is a real individual bent on imposing his (her) will.

When a politician proposes to “get the country moving again,” what does it mean? Nothing really, but it does have appeal to “patriotism and national pride” and emotionally connects the politician with those he is trying to convince. When a campaigning politician says that he will “create jobs,” how is this promise to be translated into action? What do you suppose would happen if one required the politician to explain just exactly how he proposes to create the jobs? Suppose that in his explanation, he is not allowed to posit abstracts as beings. What then would be his answer? How is a job created? There are two ways: Free market or non-market.

Free market method: In addition to providing for his immediate needs, an individual works and produces something of value to another individual. The other individual does the same. A voluntary trade is made. Each, in effect, creates a job for the other on the basis of production and free market supply and demand. Isn't it amazing how rarely that one hears of voluntary trade and mutual exchange for mutual benefit?

Non-market, i.e., political method: A politician does not produce commodity goods or services, and has no production of his (her) own to trade. He (she) “creates jobs” by confiscation and allocation of what others produce. This may be done by distribution of tax dollars, subsidies, grants, regulatory legislation, etc. In all cases, it is the use of initiation of force or coercion favoring some at the expense of others. (If you stole a million dollars and spent it, wouldn't you be increasing demand and “creating jobs” in the area of your spending no less than the area chosen by a politician? Why is it illegal for you to do that which is the paid profession of a politician?)

This truth about market intervention is obscured by the word games placing abstracts as cause and beneficiary. The reality of the individual as cause and

MIND MATTERS

beneficiary is buried under all the abstract rhetoric that is common to the prevailing epistemology and philosophy. As horrible as economic intervention is, word games have an even more directive and sinister effect in other areas. Mind manipulation by word games is the mainstay of the prevailing socioeconomic system. I am not talking about consciously deliberate superficial and transient effects. I am referring to subconscious mind programming that is a near universal practice embraced and endorsed by nearly all. While the conscious teaching of subservience is bad enough, it is the logically derived subliminal directives that lock in the concepts and carry them to their maximum destructive potential.

By reference to mind principles, let's analyze a highly visible and popular belief as representative illustration: The Pledge of Allegiance.

"I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and the Republic for which it stands, one nation, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

What exactly is taught by this pledge? Philosophically and psychologically, what does it mean for a person to pledge allegiance to a flag; not just any flag, but the symbolic representation of the United States? Why allegiance to this flag and this country? Why not Canada, England, Mexico, or all the others? Why swear allegiance at all? What's the purpose? There is no point to the pledge to a specific flag except to segregate. There is no point in segregating unless the U.S. is considered superior to the others. There is no preference in equal valuations. The lesson subliminally taught is that Americans are superior and more valuable than other "national beings." This conclusion is supported by the ever popular "proud to be an American." Completion of the statement is saying that one would be ashamed to be another nationality.

What core psychological relationship does the pledge express and imply? The denial of self and subservience to the "United States of America" is an open and clear declaration. Via logical inference, the pledger is positioned as property of the "United States." The essence of ownership is control. Ergo, control of the pledger by the "United States" is inherent in the pledge of allegiance. The oft heard phrase, "America's children" and similar utterances are not just a meaningless figure of speech. It states the condition of being regarded as property that nearly all accept with "pride".

Within the pledge and in direct self-contradiction are the "noble sentiments," "liberty and justice for all." Thus is liberty and justice verbally and emotionally equated with servitude. In this thinking, the concept freedom is tied to the concept rule and subliminally culminates in the conclusion that freedom means the "freedom to rule".

What does the pledge mean in terms of translating these dominant beliefs into physical action? Notice that the pledge reveals two mutually exclusive psychological factors within two mutually inclusive tangential psychological factors.

MIND MATTERS

The pledge of subservience denies and excludes the individual as the real. In its stead is an "alternative," "group identity;" in this instance, "national identity."

Inclusive of "national identity," via denial of the individual, is loss of the sense of individual responsibility. Also inclusive of "national identity" is the concept, "superior being." Since this is the sustaining premise of each and every "group identity," the inherent "superior being" dominance psychology assures perpetual antagonism among all "group identities."

With real individuals left out of the thinking, "group identities" such as American, German, Russian, black, white, men, women, etc., presumes to "identify" on similarity providing unlimited latitude for judgmental purposes. Keep in mind as well that the decision as to enemy or friend is not made by the pledger, but by the "United States" to which the pledger is subservient. Since the United States is an abstract and not an entity, superior or otherwise, what happens to the pledged allegiance? Who receives it? How is it translated into action? What action?

The questions are answered by the underlying psychology and subliminal directives. Independent thinking and sense of individual responsibility are gone. The pledger lives only to serve. Serve whom? Roosevelt as he orders the round up and incarceration of "America's enemies" decided by physical features similar to the "Japanese enemy?" Hitler as he set his sights on conquering the world by the "supremacy of the Aryan nation?" Stalin and company in the endless bloody purges to save the purity of Communism? Or some present day "powerful leader" who seeks self value in domination? Or perhaps just follow the "leader" in blind obedience in a methodical destruction of the socioeconomic system? In the final analysis, the whole thing comes down to unquestioning obedience, not to the "infinite entity," United states, but to a finite power-hungry human individual with the will to rule. While few if any individuals would openly and knowingly turn their life over to another individual without qualification, in the pledge and psychology of the pledge, this is precisely what they do. This is the ultimate destination of those who succumb to word games.

MIND MATTERS

CHAPTER VI THE GOD CONCEPT

As previously indicated, a god concept is simply the expressed or implied positing of an “infinite entity” as a “superior being” to which the individual is subordinated. Whether it is called “God,” “Society,” “Majority,” “Minority,” “Public,” “Nation,” “Country,” whatever, it is epistemologically, philosophically, and psychologically irrelevant. Except for the purpose of self-delusion, it’s all the same. Since a god concept is illusion and the individual real, it creates a situation of mind dichotomy as also explained earlier. Since the god concept is the dominant belief, via principles of mind the premise is manifested in every logical derivative. The central and corollary derivative of the god concept is the concept, objective value. The objective value concept expresses or implies that there are universal values that constitute natural standards. This idea of natural standards is not confined to alleged standards of “moral values”, but sets the psychological condition that all values are objective and constitute natural standards. It is these imagined standards that nearly all accept as objective and use as reference to judge self and others. The dichotomizing illusion plays havoc in many antisocial ways. Some are highly visible. Others are not, but play a key role in nearly every part of every believer’s life. Let’s briefly examine this by looking at a condensed sampling in the field of formal education.

A subject is selected, study material is taught, and a test is given. The student making the highest grade is directly or indirectly pronounced as highly intelligent and a superior being. All students may aspire to this position, but only one can make it. The inferior being position is not a desirable one and those so explicitly or implicitly designated feel denigrated and resent what they see as cause: The “superior being.” This is not a comfortable and constructive position for anyone as alienation sets an antisocial condition. It’s a no-win situation.

Some repress or suppress the feeling of lowered status and resentment and manage to move on without extensive damage to ego and values. Others closer to the bottom of the “objective value” scale feel helpless and hopeless because they know they have no chance of even coming close to the academic achievement of

MIND MATTERS

the “superior being.” Neither child nor adult will pursue what is considered to be unattainable. In an ego salvaging psychological twist they denounce the system and cease to care about academic matters. Failure and defiance is the value they now pursue. The end result is not pleasant. It is a loss of unrealized potential. Worse yet, more often than not, many of the “inferior beings” turn to the “power value” and seek self redemption in dominating others - as they have been so thoroughly taught. Combine this value with the “value of money” and you have a large part of the answer as to the cause of bank robberies and other “street crimes.” In no way do the conclusions above suggest the individuals in focus are not responsible for their actions. I am merely pointing out the underlying psychology and motivating influences that are inherent in the god concept and the idea of objective value.

The problem illustrated is neither new nor hidden. Teachers, psychologists, counselors and many others are acutely aware of it but, for them, it presents an unresolvable dilemma. They cannot by declaration or command raise the academic ability of the lesser achievers and solve the problem. So, what are they to do to escape the unwanted psychological effects? Lower the academic standards and cater to the lowest common denominator? They are in a quandary. Every proposal they consider has obvious drawbacks. In the end, they accept the “natural paradox” without a clue that the problem is derived from the contradictions in their thinking and philosophy.

This is but one of the many such circumstances of trying to resolve a problem without identifying it. It is the all-to-familiar situation of trying to resolve a problem within a context wherein the context is the problem. What is the context that poses the problem? You guessed it. The ever popular and much revered myth, objective value. Take any number of individuals in any endeavor, academic or otherwise, and interest and ability will vary from individual to individual in every instance. This is the natural and immutable condition of individuality. Is it inherently antagonistic and antisocial? Or is the actual problem caused by distorted additions and impositions of “natural standards” that deny the natural condition?

It is virtually certain that some individuals will be better in math, science, biology, mechanics, sports, whatever, than others. Some are clearly superior to others in these fields. The question is, how does this get transposed to “superior being” and the problem of relative devaluation of other individuals? Yes, once again, it’s the objective value illusion that is the problem and the core of the problem.

Definitively, the terms superior and inferior refer to the objective evaluation of means in respect to a subjectively chosen goal. However, in the god concept, the “goal” is not subjectively chosen but objectively discovered. Focus upon the phrase, subjectively chosen goal, i.e., subjective value, for this is the denied reality of the situation. It makes no difference if 100% of the population chooses

MIND MATTERS

values dependent upon the knowledge of science, etc., the values are still subjectively chosen, not objectively discovered. The knowledge of persons in these specific fields is certainly superior to non-knowledge in respect to relative goals, but how does this constitute “superior being?” Answer. By the illusion that these goals and values are somehow inherent in nature and are an objective standard of measurement.

Value is not intrinsic and inherent in anything. Nothing has value until value is attributed to it by an individual. Value to whom for what purpose? This the reality of the situation. In light of this fact, how does one propose to rate the abilities of other individuals except in respect to his (her) own personal preference? Ergo, the alleged objective standard of value by which persons are rated as superior or inferior does not exist. The school problem and a whole lot of others are easily traced right back to the objective value myth.

Constructive individual interests and abilities are not antagonistic; indeed, are beneficial complements. Can you envision a world wherein all individuals have exactly the same interests and the same abilities. Even if such a world were possible, would you want it? Would you go to a doctor that knows no more of the body and medicine than you do? Would you get on an airplane whose pilot knows no more about flying than you do? What of the valuation of the person or persons who regularly collect your garbage? Do you not find this service of value? In respect to this particular value, is not the person or persons who collect your garbage much the superior of a politician who produces nothing? Although garbage collectors are usually not high on the list of “superior beings,” they provide a service that many value in the same manner that they value services in other fields. Values are many and priority rating is merely a subjective exercise, not an objective discovery. It is this natural and individualistic difference that the concept, objective value, denies and believers ignore in their “natural standards of measurement.”

In objective value thinking, it is implied that without the “place of honor” goal, school children and others will have no incentive to learn and achieve. This is like saying that a person alone on a desert island will cease to function and will die because there is no competition, no one to defeat, and no one to pat him (her) on the head for his (her) victory. Nonsense. From infancy on, one truth that is well ingrained in every mind is that learning and knowledge is an absolute requirement for survival and achievement of one’s goals. The “superior being place of honor” may encourage effort by some (distorted incentive), but, as pointed out above, it also alienates and discourages effort by others.

Failure to measure up to the “objective standards” produces envy, jealousy, and doubts about one’s abilities and diminishes the feeling of self worth. This combination of negative influences often results in just giving up with potential unre-

MIND MATTERS

alized. This psychological condition is by no means confined to the area of formal education. It is inherent in the prevailing epistemology and psychology and is a factor in every area of every believer's life. This is what underlies the idea of the success of one equating the failure of another. This leads to applauding the failure of others even when such failure of others may well be detrimental to one's own personal self-interest.

The problem is not individual differences in interests and abilities. The problem is failure to recognize this as a natural complementary circumstance. This failure results in an antagonistic attitude born of the objective value fallacy and the corollary fallacy, superior and inferior beings. From antagonism in elementary school up to and including global warfare, the god-concept-objective-value-superior-inferior-being fallacy is everpresent as perpetual destroyer.

Freedom, peace, and harmony is a valid equation. All claim to want peace, yet nearly all employ means that are certain to cause the exact opposite. Believers equate "freedom" with democracy, the "will of the people." They speak of "national interest" and the "values of society." They think in abstracts, talk in abstracts, and act in the name of abstracts. Real individual is not to be found in their thinking and consequent philosophy. They deal not with reality in their thinking and when reality deals with them in their actions, they are at a loss to understand why peace eludes them. Centuries of perpetual war is a natural judgment upon their beliefs, yet they refuse to reexamine. Lessons hard earned are hardly learned and they remain virtual prisoner and victims of their own imagination and mental inventions. As Pogo so aptly put it for them: "We have met the enemy and they is us."

The earth is mentally chopped up into abstract segments called nations or countries. Nation and "national identity" has been a constant part of the scene for so long that it appears to most as a natural condition not subject to change. This is, of course, a manifestation of the god concept and carries with it all the elements that the god concept expresses and implies. The concept, nation, can be created and sustained only by treating it as a being of superior status. Anything less will not suffice. An expressed or implied allegiance to any specific nation is an implicit declaration of preference over all others. It is, in effect, a declaration of war. The preference itself indicates that it is held as a higher value. Higher value implies better and superior. Better and superior places it as "proper means" to achieve the "universal purpose," though such "universal purpose" may remain undefined. Thus is every "nation" inherently antagonistic to every other "nation" in that "superior objective values" and will to rule imposing these "superior values" is the "duty" of each "nation." "Summit conferences" and "peace treaties" are a waste of time and paper. The subliminal directives of the god concept takes heed of neither.

MIND MATTERS

Although believers often talk about “nations” going to war and fighting for freedom, no war between “nations” has ever been fought for this purpose. The purpose has always been and still is to decide which “nation” shall rule. Within the confines of “national identity,” individual and individual sense of responsibility is obliterated. Exemplified and amplified by and in the military structure, there remains only bipedal robot-like causal units programmed to do the bidding of the god, nation. They await only for the right emotional buttons to be pushed before springing into action to abolish the “ultimate evil” that opposes the “ultimate good” personified in the revered “national identity.”

Men, women, children, and babies of other nations are regarded as enemies by virtue of the “evil national identity.” They are ruthlessly slaughtered without mercy and without a twinge of conscience, for conscience is the property of the god, nation, and pride is found in the humility of subservient obedience that shrinks from no act of barbarous cruelty for the “good of the country.” This may be a most unflattering conclusion, but it is confirmed a million times over by all of history and contemporary beliefs and current action throughout the world.

The same backwards epistemology, same philosophy, and same psychology that creates “nations” and determines “international relationships” is equally evident in “intranational relationships.” “Enemies” are decided and regarded in the same manner and with the same attitude. Instead of wars between “nations,” it is hostility between factions, between “group identities” such as regions, districts, states, counties, cities, religious sects, race, gender, and other illusions of “divine abstracts” and “categorical identities.”

MIND MATTERS

CHAPTER VII

THE SACRED IDEA

The idea of some things and some beliefs being sacred is a part of nearly every belief system; even most of those wherein the believer is quite certain that he holds no such beliefs. The sacred is by definition that which is believed in, accepted and revered, but never questioned. Absence of inquiry assures ignorance of that which is held sacred. Indeed, it is a requirement.

The ultimate significance of this situation is that the mind of a believer is committed to the sacred idea as absolute and unquestionable. This means that any idea that directly or indirectly opposes the sacred belief or beliefs, whatever it or they may be, will be rejected, usually adamantly so. To make matters worse, the sacred idea is quite often held in the subconscious and, although unknown and oft denied by the holder, invariably directs the thinking and beliefs of the holder. The sacred idea becomes, in effect, the “master circuit” controlling all thought and all beliefs and directing all actions. The “master circuit” determines the parameters of thought by shunting as nonexistent and not possible any idea that threatens it.

To sharpen focus upon this phenomenon, imagine a number crunching computer program in which all nines are converted to sixes, all sixes converted to nines, and all threes are ignored. This is the “master circuit”. As long as the numbers fed in contain no nines, sixes, or threes, the conclusion is correct and there is no problem. However, suppose the users of this program are not aware of the master circuit and take as valid all conclusions even those with the 9-6-3 data corrupted? If we assume that this mathematical data is designed to be an accurate abstract representation of some aspect of reality, what happens in an attempted application of conclusions corrupted by the 9-6-3 master circuit factor? Obviously, they will not conform to reality and the end results of the application will not be as consciously intended and expected.

Let’s look at a philosophical parallel involving the “master circuit”: untouchable sacred idea. Several years ago, a book was written comparing the circuit operations of a computer with the functions of the mind. Among the things the

MIND MATTERS

author examined for purpose of illustration was some of the tenets of Christianity. He observed that a central belief of the denomination is the original sin concept. He further observed the doctrine of necessity to suffer in redemption. He noted that if someone is suffering, they are not happy. However, he also noted that since the suffering is for atonement and for the purpose of gaining a desired end, the sufferer must necessarily value the suffering, and therefore, be happy in this suffering. Thus he arrived at the conclusion (and these are his exact words), "They are happy to be unhappy."

He declared the conclusion "absurd" and promptly abandoned the issue. There is nothing wrong with the thinking that led up to this conclusion from the given premises. The problem is in the premises. The self-contradictory conclusion, "happy to be unhappy" is clear warning that one or more antecedent premises are in error, i.e., in contradiction and therefore false. The self-contradictory conclusion, "happy to be unhappy," is logically derived from the self-contradictory premise, volitional self and volitional, omnipotent, and omniscient "God." The dictate of subordination combined with the original sin idea and needed redemption by suffering in atonement necessarily created a dual value system within the mind of the believing individual. Self opposing self is the end result, but a mind locked into the sacred idea is completely oblivious to the warning contradiction. To the author of the book, "God" is absolute, and it is literally "unthinkable" that this belief in which he places so much psychological dependence could be false. The "master circuit" did its job. The sacred idea remained intact in his mind. Via this mind-dividing sacred idea, believers have a love-hate attitude towards war. Their beliefs call for being "happy to be unhappy;" which is to say, they enjoy misery and need misery to enjoy. War fills the bill. To put it quite simply, war goes on because it is much valued by many.

As illustrated, the "master circuit" sacred idea aborts continuity of thought in a continuous and principled universe. The logical conclusions from identity are accepted only when they do not conflict with the sacred idea. Since all sacred ideas are based on false premises and do not conform to reality, logical thought beginning with and depending on these false premises will invariably come in conflict with facts of reality. Since the mind is dominated by the sacred idea, it is the facts that refute it that will be dismissed. In these circumstances, which are many, premises are randomly picked up and dropped in step with the dictates of the "master circuit." Without continuity of thought, there is no mental connection between cause and effect. If the cause is unknown, it is virtually certain that the alleged cause will be attributed to some non-cause in correspondence with the dominant sacred idea. Ergo, error in perpetuity.

Since sacred ideas are not questioned by believers, it is not surprising to find that while they are not questioned, they are not discussed either. If a belief is true, what harm can come from questioning it? Indeed, may not an even better

MIND MATTERS

understanding of it be gained by inquiry? Does setting a belief as immune from questioning indicate a fear that the belief may be false? Yes, it does, but the situation also tells of the psychological condition that necessarily accompanies the fear of questioning, the yielding of the conscious mind to the mystical unknown. It's all part of the subservience package. That which is understood by the conscious mind holds no mystery, and exerts no influence to believe beyond one's own conscious mental capacity. To "go beyond" conscious mental capacity, to accept that which is contrary to the conscious mind conclusions, is in the realm of faith. Confidence in one's conscious mind is the exact opposite of faith. Confidence in one's conscious mind is confidence in the principles of epistemology. Faith is the denial of these principles. To put it another way, confidence in the conscious mind is believing because of the facts. Faith is believing in spite of the facts.

In every known historical period, formal religion has played a large part in the beliefs and lives of most individuals. It still does. Although denomination names, rituals, and ceremonies have often changed over time and vary from group to group, the fundamental that links all together has been and is the same throughout all times and in all places, the belief in an imaginary superior being. The mind thus cut loose from limiting and stabilizing reality is subject to holding any and every belief no matter how self-contradictory and absurd. Indeed, the more absurdity believed, the more dedication shown to the imagined superior beings and the greater the "virtuous faith" by which a religionist is measured by himself and others. We could casually dismiss the whole thing as animistic fears and the attempt to bridge the gap between limited ability and infinite desire, but that would do nothing to aid in understanding exactly what religion is and the implication of such beliefs.

The discovery of many secular causes once thought to be mystical and unknowable does little or nothing to diminish the appeal of formal religion. No amount of scientific evidence will ever dispel a single religious notion for science and religion are of two different mental realms that are inherently opposed. The former is of finite objective identity and the latter of infinity and non-identity. Since science has no part in the making of religious beliefs, it has no logical connection to it and is without avenue to undo. When some opposing scientific facts become well known and are seen as irrefutable even by the most devout believers, beliefs are simply modified to fit the time and circumstances with no loss of faith and fervor. The only place that science may fit into the picture is scientific study of the mind to ascertain the cause of this penchant for mental inventions thought to be discoveries and worshipped as superior beings. We may gain some insight into the matter by observing psychological cause and effect as related to the pursuit of happiness, i.e., pursuit of a desirable state of mind.

It is easy to imagine those most ancient and inept Homo Sapiens barely conscious of self and goaded by fears both real and imagined. How simple it must

MIND MATTERS

have been to imagine causal gods and seek their favor and protection. Certainly believing would go a long way in reducing the stress. Although much advanced in knowledge, including knowledge of many causes, modern believers are motivated by the same emotions. We all seek a desirable state of mind. It's a matter of nature and not an issue. The issue is the means one employs. Most pursue religion in an effort to achieve this goal. They look not to self, but to "divine intervention". What is the end product of the quest by this means? To answer this question, we must examine the matter in terms of mind principles as pertains to cause and effect.

The first and always most obvious psychological relationship between a believer and his god is the superior being - inferior being status. The ramifications of this are extensive. The situation is one of complete mental reversal of reality. The believer creates a god, but sees self as the created, and therefore, subordinate. It is the psychological negation of self and individual per se. The subliminal directive is death. This is a central critical factor that we see evidenced again and again in the thinking and acting of believers as they oscillate between choosing life or death. They are forever engaged in a precarious balancing act to remain alive to promote the death oriented beliefs.

Recall the earlier description of the mental integrator, the "logic circuit" of the mind. If you have tested the idea presented, I believe that you have found it true that every conclusion and belief is a logical derivative of antecedent conclusions and beliefs whether those conclusions and beliefs are true or false. It follows that a god concept processed by this principle of mind will always produce a corresponding logical conclusion and belief. This means that if we have a mental reversal of the created and creator situation, all derivatives of this premise will likewise be reversed. Certainly, we can immediately see the mental reversal in the de facto denial of real individual as the real in deference to an illusory god. But what is not so immediately evident is that this represents a complete reversal of the principles of epistemology and criteria of thinking. This manifest effect is constant throughout and plays havoc with mental and emotional operations.

There is a most serious corollary problem: "The Lock." Looking once again to the principles of the mind, recall that the mind works by differential reference and cannot hold a contradiction within itself. What one believes to be true and real is held as absolute. Though one may speak of it and seemingly imagine counter belief, the mind cannot accept a "counter absolute." That which opposes belief is consciously or subconsciously regarded as nonexistent. Add to this the principle that one must by nature necessarily think and act upon what one conceives to be real and we have a very large problem born of the god concept.

If the "superior being" is believed to be real, to be absolute, then literally every belief, value, and emotion attached to this belief are the dominating ele-

MIND MATTERS

ments in the thinking and life of the believer. What we have in this idea of a causal superior being is philosophical absolutism. Note the reversal once again. In reality, individual is the real and philosophy (values by which one lives) is individualistic and infinitely variable. The superior being idea locks in a specific philosophy (the believer's own) as a universal. In other words, in reality there are fixed and immutable natural laws. Human individual is a part of that reality. Volition is a natural characteristic of the human individual and infinite choices means there are no philosophical absolutes. In the mental reversal via the god concept, the causal superior being, as cause, negates the idea of fixed natural laws while setting the contrary and erroneous idea of fixed philosophical absolutes.

"The Lock" part comes in due to the believer's mentally tying self in subordination to the "superior being." "Superior beings" are to be obeyed, not questioned. If a believer psychologically ties himself to a "superior being", then said believer's whole value system and sense of being is dependent on this belief. Aside from the direct conscious fear of displeasing the "superior being," a believer committed to the "superior being" as absolute cannot envision an existence without the divinity. Ergo, to challenge a believer's belief is to the believer a challenge to his very life. Fear, resentment, hostility, and instant rejection is a foregone conclusion. Any alleged questioning by the believer of their beliefs is merely a self-deluding pretense as such "questioning" is psychologically confined by the parameters of the belief itself. (Yes, one can get beyond this, but unfortunately, its rarely done.)

If a believer's beliefs were confined to himself, it would create no problem for others. However, this is not the nature of the god concept. It is inherently imposing. Bear in mind that a believer knows little or nothing of the mind and its capacity to invent and self-delude; to fail to make a distinction between mental invention and mental discovery. A believer is absolutely certain that the "superior being" he worships and obeys is real, is an objective existent. He has no idea that the "messages from God" are only his own confused beliefs and equally confused emotions. If a believer believes that the "superior being" is objective and real, then he must act in accordance with what he believes are the values and dictates of the "superior being." This is a matter of the natural law of the mind principle.

It is the "objective value" element that creates havoc. No matter what the obscuring rhetoric and word games of denial, every idea of objective value always culminates in the concept of rule. It is not sufficient that a lone believer believe and keep his values to himself. The very idea of a superior being and objective value means that said values are universal and applicable to all. Certainly, the "god," the "superior being," would be displeased if all did not follow "his" direction. It is just as certain that if a believer wishes to please his "god," it is his "moral duty" to see to it that all obey. A believer cannot be happy, cannot achieve

MIND MATTERS

that desirable state of mind, if his “god” is displeased. To please his “god” and thereby achieve his own desired state of mind, he is psychologically obligated to see to it that all conform to his “god’s will” by whatever means is required. (Envision the billions of persons in the world committed to the god concept and all that it entails and perpetual war and other atrocities are not so hard to understand.) Keep in mind that the god concept refers not just to the imagined god in formal religion, but to “nation,” “society,” “public,” whatever, that explicitly or implicitly posits a mental invention (an “infinite entity”) as a superior being to which the real and finite individual is subordinated. In literally every instance, these mental inventions and mind sets of imagined superior beings are used to psychologically justify oppression.

MIND MATTERS

CHAPTER VIII

GODS AND GOVERNMENTS: THE TWIN PERILS

Lest my commentary on this issue lead someone to jump to the wrong conclusion, let me set the record straight from the outset. I am not in any way, shape, or form instigating, advocating, or even suggesting the “violent overthrow of government.” Namely because it can’t be done. Government is an idea and an idea can’t be undone with a gun. If peace, harmony, and prosperity is the end desired, the idea, government, is a very bad idea. The purpose here is to displace the fallacy-based idea, government, with the reality-based idea of individualism and freedom. Where the mind goes, the body will follow.

There is such a widely held belief in the absolute necessity of government that it seems that the only issue to be considered is what kind of government; meaning what form of implementation. It is as if government is an objective discovery rather than a subjective mental invention. The idea of government is no less enmeshed in absolutism than the idea of an omni god in formal religion. Indeed, that is how most emotionally regard it. This fact is daily evidenced in the language and attitude of millions as they call on “government” to fulfill their wants and needs. In this mental atmosphere, to raise and discuss the question of government vs non government is nearly impossible. Since the concept, government, is held in most minds as an absolute, they can hold no differentiating reference. If they can envision no alternative, they are without choice. They are mentally locked in and completely unable to grasp an idea that opposes what they hold as absolute. They may play with words and imagine that they grasp nongovernment, but they simply yield to the absolutism and delude themselves.

The term anarchism is the word generally believed to denote a non-governmental social existence. However, Webster’s alleged common usage definition is non-differentiating and non-defining. It says that “Anarchy is a political theory holding all forms of governmental authority to be unnecessary and undesirable, and advocating a society based on voluntary cooperation and free association of individuals and groups.” Then, in confused contradiction, Webster’s defines “political” as “... and of or pertaining to government.” Thus, the term, an-

MIND MATTERS

archy, is implicitly “defined” as a theory of government holding all governmental authority as unnecessary, etc. This is not the worst of it.

Notice that the conscious declaration is voluntary cooperation. Voluntary cooperation is free individuals making free choices. There is not even a suggestion of initiation of force or coercion. So, how does one equate voluntary cooperation, the denotation of the term, anarchy, with violent conflict and chaos? By the denotation declared by conscious mind, one doesn't. It is connotation, the subconscious and emotional valuation of the term, that leaps to the conclusion, violent conflict. Why? In spite of the fact that the term, government, denotes the relationship, initiation of force and coercion, for several psychological purposes, including the purpose of preferred self image, the actual definition of the term government is denied. In spite of the fact that government is, by definition, by logical theory, and verified by all of history, accompanied by violent conflict and chaos, nearly all still believe (feel) that government is the means of peace and order. Given the dominant belief (feeling) that government is the means to peace and order, although false, any verbal designation of nongovernment is emotionally regarded as the opposite, that is, emotionally evaluated as conflict and disorder regardless of the actual definition and all relevant facts. In other words, while they speak words about voluntary cooperation and freedom, emotionally it is regarded as impossible. With rule held as an absolute, they cannot envision the alternative, individualism and freedom.

This thinking doesn't provide many options, does it? If government is the initiation of force and coercion, producing violent conflict and chaos, and the term anarchy connotes to nearly all the initiation of force and violent conflict, where is the word that denotes voluntary cooperation and connotes its corollary, peace? Isn't it amazing that no such word exists in the language? Why is this word and a lot of companion words needed to express individualism and freedom missing from the language of “common usage”? The only logical explanation is that most not only believe that no such thing exists, but also believe individualism and freedom cannot exist; in fact, cannot even believe that an idea of freedom can exist. This psychological lock out is derived from the god concept and the logically derived concept of rule as absolute in nature itself. How does one communicate ideas of individualism and freedom when nearly all are mentally directed by dominant beliefs that declare that rule is the absolute and freedom cannot exist?

Thinking from the identity, human individual as a volitional entity that pursues subjective values, is there any doubt that initiation of force or coercion will create a condition of hostility? Is there any doubt that government is the initiation of force and coercion? Is there any doubt that every historical record and contemporary fact bear out the logical conclusion that government is certain to cause hostility, violent conflict, and chaos? The conscious mind says no. Logical theory and centuries of practice support the conclusion without equivocation and with

MIND MATTERS

100% consistency. Yet, in spite of this simple theory and centuries of facts validating it a trillion times over, at least 99.9% of the world population still believe that government is the means to peace and order. This is the power of the sacred idea. This is resistance to the max. This is a condition of perpetual conflict and chaos that will not change unless and until the directive thinking changes. This is the choice that each individual faces.

By denying the principles of epistemology and the principles of language, they manage to hold on to their sacred god concept and perpetuate it and its destructive directives by distorted language usage. Classic example: A phrase one often hears is democracy and freedom. However, those uttering the phrase never stop to explain how two imposing their will upon the third constitutes freedom for the victim. Nevertheless, democracy is thought by many to be a “government of freedom and protector of individual rights.” In addressing this popular illusion, perhaps it would be of some benefit to backtrack a bit and take a look at the psychological evolution that led up to the idea of “democracy and freedom.”

In the days of the “divine right of a king” where a lone monarch’s word was law and his every wish a command, no one spoke of freedom and individual rights. No one doubted that the concept, rule, was in practice. To the believers, this was the natural order of things and there could be nothing else. However, the everpresent and ever-busy oppressive might of the “state” is proof enough that psychological subjugation was never quite complete. Although the concept, divinity, was never questioned, the monarch’s connection to it more and more came under suspicion. Somewhere along the line, “earthly divinities” fell from grace and there began talk about freedom and rights that belonged to all. The old way was declared “immoral” and the new idea was heralded as the universal good. While the conscious mind desired and claimed the “morality” of freedom, the subconscious and emotions remained stuck in the old concept, rule. Subconscious was (and is) running the show. After the godhead, king, was banished, another was needed to accommodate the concept, rule, but invisible so as not to disturb self image by contradicting the claimed “morality” of freedom.

The mental groundwork was already laid for the transition. They had long been accustomed to believing mental creations to be objective discovery. In a new system called democracy, government, nation, society, the people, and other abstracts became the new godheads. Each individual became “the chosen” and instead of one monarch, the number of rulers were equal to the number of believers. Thus by way of the maximum number of rulers, each got to exercise their will to power and called it “freedom.” Again, the individual was left out of their thinking and social equation.

One of the more popular illusions to come along with democracy after the “divine right of the king” was denounced is the idea of separation of church and

MIND MATTERS

state. "Church and State" are fundamentally the same philosophy, and the same psychology derived from the same backward epistemology of "infinite entities." The changing of form and a few arbitrary labels does nothing to disturb the common content of anti-individualism and anti-freedom. The identifying characteristic of religion is the subordination of the individual to an alleged infinite entity superior being. As stated above, it is definitively immaterial whether the alleged infinite entity superior being is called "God," "State," "Society," whatever. The individual is no less subordinated. This fact may be obscured by arbitrary self-deluding labels and denying rhetoric, but when it comes down to actual definition and reality, State, i.e., government, is no less religion than Protestantism or Catholicism. Subjective arbitrary labels are objectively meaningless. The end result is determined by objective content and objective reality. The end result of subordinating the individual is exactly the same in gods and governments. So, argument about separation of church and state is no more than an exercise in the all-to-familiar emotional conflict of the undefined.

Throughout all of known history, literally every governmental system under any and every label has met the same fate: Failure. None produced and sustained the peace and prosperity promised. Indeed, the end result has been and is the exact opposite. Each and every one has either been taken over by an outside superior force or collapsed within due to declining economic conditions or increasing internal dissention and eventually violent revolution. Current systems, if not already in disarray, are in the same pattern of decline. Still, the ever-faithful pursue. They believe that this time things will be different. They will "control government." They will "limit government," and when these fail, they will "reduce government."

There are those who look upon the burgeoning bureaucracy and ever-increasing "welfare state" and pine for the good old days when the U.S. governmental system was in its infancy; when the rules and regulations were fewer in number and less offensive with more left to individual decision. They propose to wend their way back to that cherished bygone era by the same road that brought them here: Government and politics. I see no indication that they have studied the problem and understand how and why "minimal state" became maximum nightmare of rule. They mention neither a different psychology nor different means. They appear to assume that will and intent alone will bring fruition to their quest to "reduce government."

Just exactly what is it that they propose to control, limit, or reduce? What is government? This is the question that they perpetually refuse to definitively answer. Is government a thing of quantity that one may bind in chains to control it? Is it a growing physical something that one may enclose in a container to limit its growth? Is it a fat or some substance that one may render or compress to make it smaller? No, it is none of these things. Government is simply, unequivocally, and

MIND MATTERS

always initiation of force or coercion and nothing else. To be sure, official government is organized, politicized, centralized, canonized, and revered initiation of force, but it is no less initiation of force and coercion than any unofficial singular act of the same offensive content. So, let us be clear from the outset. When someone seeks to control, limit, or reduce government, what they are clearly saying is that they wish to direct the centralized coercive force to compel all others to conform to their personal values, to act for their personal benefit, i.e., to claim ownership of all other individuals.

Although each governmentalist volunteers for the system of coercion and tacitly agrees to the outcome, each is still resentful and hostile when they are on the receiving end of the compulsion. Will each not attempt to escape the imposition even as they respond in like kind unto exhausting their personal values they wish to impose? Can anything come of this except escalating incidents of oppression and violent conflict? By what rationale do they expect anything other than what they voluntarily create? It is truly incredible that those who label the idea of nongovernment as a utopian pipe dream presume to perform the miracle of creating peace by means of war.

To speak of a governmental system is to speak of a specific segment of earth wherein the inhabitants are controlled by a certain person or persons. The segment, always established by physical force, is usually called a country or nation. The primary philosophy is physical dominance. The will to power is an insatiable appetite and those controlling each segment are forever fearful for their "security." Every alliance of two or more segments is seen as a threat. Counter alliances and weapons buildup are necessary precautions that instills fear and insecurity in others. This fuse is always burning, sometimes slowly, sometimes swiftly, but always the psychological condition of escalation is present and operating.

When King George's subjects known as the Colonies estimated that they had sufficient manpower and firepower, they concluded that George's rules and regulations were no longer tolerable. After dispatching "George and Company," they had a most excellent opportunity to set up a community of individualism and freedom. Unfortunately, this did not happen. Minds locked into the concept of rule talked much about individualism and freedom, but were incapable of envisioning and living it. After lopping off the branches of British grown tyranny, they proceeded to build upon the same root. They brought forth a governmental system of representative democracy with a Constitution, division of powers, and all sorts of checks and balances to "limit" their governmental system, to "control" it. A couple of hundred years later, we know just how successful this attempt was. What is not widely known is that the monstrous growth was inevitable, inherent in the system itself.

In conjunction with the "need" to control "evil man," the underlying ratio-

MIND MATTERS

nale of the original U.S. government (and all others) is that each individual left to his own non-invasive personal preferences and devices is incapable of doing what is right for himself and others, and most importantly, would most certainly be derelict in doing what is “good for the country.” By some mystery, yet to be explained, they concluded that if certain individuals were selected to manage the affairs of all, these selected individuals, by virtue of being selected suddenly took on superior intellectual and “moral powers” not found in the individuals prior to the election. No documents explain this magical transformation and one is left to wonder if the divine spell cast fell a bit short. That the “national interest” and the interest of the elected just happened to coincide did not go unnoticed, but the believers never lost faith in the system.

It is this total and totally blind faith that is at the center of the matter. Few see government as it is, simply as initiation of force and coercion. Rather, they regard and speak of government as an omni god endowed with no fewer divine attributes than the god of formal religion. In formal religion, “God” is the omnipotent force, i.e., omni force and omni being are the same. The transposition of this psychology to the omni force called government is an easy one. This is the sacred idea that dominates the mind of every governmentalist.

Amusing, though tragic, is the idea that the governmental system of the United States could do anything else but expand. The revered “founding fathers” did not set up a few protective rules and regulations and then go home. They set up a system where lawmaking was the occupation of hundreds, then thousands. In pursuit of this occupation, what else could happen except the continual increase in the number of laws and lawyers. Sure, now and then a law or two was repealed. This only temporarily shifted the favoritism from some to others. It did not deter them from their divinely appointed task to more and more bring all under the advisement and control of the “enlightened.”

From the outset, the intent was made clear. Nothing was hidden. Official documents stipulated without equivocation that the “government” would regulate trade and commerce, coin and mint money, provide for the “common defense,” etc., etc., etc. There is not a single line in the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, or any governmental document that says that an individual will be left alone as long as he does not impose upon another or others. By commission and omission, all official decrees make clear that human individual is regarded as property of the god called “State.” Do you think that the phrase, “America’s children” and other such announcements are meaningless? An abstract, an “infinite entity” as a possessive noun? If this does not designate a god and ownership by the god, what does it mean?

So, is it any surprise that the manipulation and control of “State property” is an ongoing and forever escalating process? How did or does anyone conclude

MIND MATTERS

otherwise? Oh yes, the Constitution and “constitutional rights.” To be quite blunt, the Constitution is a mish mosh of self-contradictory gibberish that says whatever anyone feels it says. Questions of “constitutional rights” are not settled by the conscious mind and intellect, but by emotions, and eventually by the gun. Since “constitutional rights” are a matter of feelings, by what does anyone propose to control and “delimit?”

In spite of all this, I am sure that there are many who still believe that the massive bureaucracy and the millions of strangling regulations may be brought under control and reduced. Don't I wish - but afraid not. As long as the psychology of rule prevails the same actions will follow and that which brought us here will take us further down the same destructive path. To grasp this unpleasant fact, it is necessary to hold focus upon two related and determining facts. As previously stated, government is psychologically regarded as an infallible god, the omni protector and provider. Illusory as the whole idea is, it is much believed and therein lies deadly dependence.

As you may have noticed, this dependence is a downward spiral as less dependence on self results in more dependence on “government,” which naturally fails, but does not shake the feeling of dependence and the persistent cry, “Government do something for me.” Was any politician ever elected who did not yield to this cry and make this promise? Second, all these illusory concepts oppose the real human individual. This means that every governmental action, economic or otherwise, will meet with resistance requiring further control. The god, government, is regarded as infallible. So, every adverse effect is not attributed to coercive intervention, but to other causes. This means that further coercive intervention will be sent as cure only to compound the problem in perpetuity unto collapse.

Every law proposed has its proponents and opponents. Hence the need for the initiation of force and coercion. Currently, every governmentalist has a list of laws they wish to see made and a list of laws they wish to see repealed. The latter is construed as “reducing government.” Always keep in mind that the operational premise of a governmental system is the initiation of force and coercion. Ergo, every instance of law making or law repeal is merely a shift of advantage via “the force.”

Can one perhaps argue against a particular proposed offensive legislation and maybe defeat it by argument? Certainly, but on what grounds do you argue it? There is no argument on the grounds of individualism because in the governmental system, the individual doesn't exist. Each is regarded only as a means to an alleged universal purpose. Must you not endorse the idea of collective interest in your arguments and thereby support the very concept that gives rise to all oppression? Although you may stop or retard one oppressive proposal, how do you

MIND MATTERS

deal with the underlying directive of external ownership and the inevitable ongoing increase in regulations that is inherent in the idea of gods and governments? If a governmentalist seeks to impose one value upon others, is there any reason to believe that the same governmentalist doesn't desire to impose all of his or her values? Given the number of governmentalist engaged in the insanity of "reciprocal slavery," can you see an end to the impositions?

The ultimate question is why anyone would want a governmental system. Obviously, it has much value to believers, so what is the basis of the valuation? What can an individual do or gain via the governmental system that he can't without it? Without initiation of force and coercion, one can act in any way that does not impose upon another individual. One can produce and deal with the production by voluntary exchange, or give it away if one so chooses. If these are the options without a governmental system and are not valued whereas the options in the governmental system are, we must logically conclude that value lies not in controlling one's own life and one's own production, but controlling the lives of others. It is controlling the lives of others that requires coercive force and this is its sole value. If we take away the illusory god concept and the accompanying language distortion and insist on identity and language conforming to reality, a believer's purpose and intent is exposed for all to see. Although there are millions that make demands in the name of god, country, community, or other abstracts, I dare say that precious few, if any, would stand up and demand that all cater to their personal preferences. Take away the word games and the hiding place is gone. The individual stands alone, recognized and responsible. It's a whole new ball game.

MIND MATTERS

CHAPTER IX

OWNERSHIP AND RIGHTS

The essence of ownership is control. Labels implying otherwise are incidental. So the base question is, How is ownership established? In the jungle, a question of ownership is settled by the existence of superior physical force. At a given time and given place, an animal owns all of the territory that he has the physical capacity to control, including all other animals with less physical ability. In a pack situation, the pack leader is the ultimate owner.

To sharpen focus upon the issue, let us now leave the jungle stage and imagine one individual human being emerging from the sea and finding himself alone upon an island. Of course, the question of ownership does not arise. The totality of personal preference is in one mind and one mind directs the actions of one body. Then there emerges from the sea a second individual, volitional, i.e., with personal preferences.

In the jungle, the question of ownership is answered by physical force. There is no volition, no choice. Volition adds a dimension: Options. The two individuals can engage in physical combat until one or both are dead. One can establish physical superiority and the other can obey, or he can avoid physical contact if circumstances afford opportunity. That is, if the island is large enough and suited to evasion. If not, we're back to the first two options. Or one individual can choose to obey the other without being intimidated by force. Or they can, by peacefully resolving conflicting personal preferences, exist socially without either initiating force.

Suppose the evasion situation exists. The physically superior individual may claim to own all of the island, but the existence of the other individual opposing his personal preferences belies his words. As in the jungle, he owns only that which he can control, and he cannot control all of the island, or the other individual. So the other individual owns part of the island. At a given time, which part depends upon the actions of the physically superior, but at all times, some part. This situation constitutes shifting ownership. Neither individual owns all of the island for neither can exercise control over it all. When the physically superior

MIND MATTERS

individual attempts to control a different area, he automatically relinquishes objective claim of the area vacated. It may be said that the two individuals own the island collectively. It may be said, but saying does not erase the relationship between ownership and control, and the fact that collective ownership means no ownership. If two individuals are said to have equal ownership of a given property, disagreement as to action regarding the property results in zero. There is no action, i.e., no control. There is no natural law that says that a particular individual must own a particular property for a specific time. There are many arrangements that may be made to accommodate many situations. However, in the final analysis, ownership and control are synonymous and a single mind is the ultimate director at any given time.

The jungle type existence described above can continue or the physically stronger, being volitional, may decide that the actions he is taking are not in his own best interest. He concludes that he can never really control, i.e., own all of the island and that his time and energy would be of more value if used in gathering food and building shelter. So he stakes out a claim, either physically or mentally, encompassing a territory of dimensions corresponding to his ability to control. Naturally, the other individual then owns the remainder of the island. Such is the birth of the concept, private property, as it is, one step removed from the law of the jungle.

At this point, the private property idea is strictly a one-sided affair as decided by the physically superior. This individual successfully directs his actions and accomplishes much. He builds a shelter and gathers and stores a substantial amount of food. Then one day he thinks of something he would like to have, but this thing is beyond his territory. He has no fear of the other individual, so he sets out to get it. Returning some time later, he finds that his store of food is gone. The other individual has come while he was away and carried it off.

He valued his store of food more highly than the thing he had gone after, so he lost in the exchange. Yet, he valued both and preferred to have both. The question is, how? Answer? By making an agreement with the other individual which would be conducive to this end. Property lines are defined and rules of conduct are agreed upon to accomplish this goal. Such is the birth of the concept, individual rights. Individual rights - one step removed. Each owns and each controls his own property. They trade and each prospers from this social action. Then one day, there emerges from the sea a third individual. Again the same fundamental options are available, plus a few more. Since it is established that each of the first two individuals agree that value is derived from a social existence based on the concept of individual rights and private property, it might be assumed that these two individuals would combine their physical force, if necessary, to preserve this relationship. Thus they could exclude or include the third individual in respect of mutual personal preferences.

MIND MATTERS

It might be assumed, but volition can negate arbitrary assumption. The third individual could combine his physical strength with either of the first two and take over the property or life of the other. They could accept “majority rule,” which is regression to jungle existence. This circles back to the “no ownership” situation with the actual controller and owner hidden behind the abstract, majority. After the “majority rule” decision, the survivors, or “victors,” might again talk about individual rights but the words serve only to self-delude.

You might ask, Where did these two individuals each get a right to this property in the first place? Since no one can produce an original deed to Earth, it is often argued that the Earth belongs to all. The question not addressed is that since “all” is an abstract, how is “collective ownership” going to work in practice. It doesn’t because it’s an illusion. Nevertheless, many subscribe to the illusion and presume to build a social structure upon it. This is where many theories of “natural rights” are usually offered in eternal arguments about what those “natural rights” are. They ignore the individual and ask the wrong questions. The defining question is, How are rights established? They are established by individual choice; a choice to cooperate rather than conquer. I’m quite sure that the idea of rights being left up to individual choice rather than being “natural rights” is a terrifying thought to the “inalienable rights” believers, but that’s the way it is; an ongoing and everpresent responsibility to choose a course of action compatible with the end consciously desired. This fact doesn’t present a problem, but denying it does.

Rights are but means to an end and can be validated or invalidated only in this context. In the preceding illustration, we have assumed the desired end to be social cooperation and peaceful trade. As rights are means to an end, a right refers to action. Since rights refer to actions, the term rights has definitive meaning only in reference to an entity with the capacity to act, i.e., an individual human being. Declarations such as “society’s rights vs individual rights,” “rights retained by the people,” “state’s rights,” “minority rights,” and all the other claimed “abstract rights” are god concept illusions that actually deny the concept, rights. They are posited for the purpose of self delusion and to “justify” might and rule. In an official governmental system where “rights” are a matter of feeling and force, is it any wonder that instead of the concept rights being a means to peacefully resolve conflicting differences, “rights” are the source of conflict. (Yes, reality mentally reversed again.)

MIND MATTERS

CHAPTER X

THE ILLUSION OF UNIVERSAL GOOD AND UNIVERSAL EVIL THE MYTH OF MORALITY

Has there ever been two terms that have occupied more thoughts, discussions, writings, and speeches than the concepts of good and evil? Certainly, there is an ongoing debate of the issue in every area of our socioeconomic environment. This phenomenon is hardly new. Historical records that go back for centuries show the same general concerns about good and evil. Since these concepts are obviously important to all, wouldn't it be of much value to actually define these terms so that one would know where one stands in respect to the many ideas about good and evil? Let's briefly go back in history and observe Socrates as he sought the answer to the same question that all face today. The term virtue is often used as interchangeable with the term good. Virtue is the term that Socrates uses.

According to Plato, Menon asked Socrates, "What is virtue?" Socrates answered that he didn't know, and furthermore, did not know anyone who did know. So, in turn, Socrates asked Menon, "What do you think virtue is?" Menon named thrift, honesty, kindness, and a few other things. Socrates admonished him not to give him virtue in bits and pieces like change, but the whole. To paraphrase only slightly, Socrates asked, "How do you know that each of these things is a virtue unless you know what virtue is in itself?"

Socrates recognized the logical necessity of validating the claim of a virtue by reference to the whole, to virtue itself. What he was looking for was a definition of the term virtue, its identity. Socrates and Menon began arguments in search of the meaning of the term virtue. The arguments went on and on without success. Finally, Socrates admitted failure and concluded that whatever virtue is, it must come to us by "divine dispensation".

About 20 centuries later, G.E. Moore took up the chase in a book entitled *Principia Ethica*. He sought to understand the term good, which is virtually interchangeable with the term virtue, within the idea of "moral good." Moore quickly concluded that good is indefinable. Indefinable is the same as unknowable. So Moore, in effect, said that he doesn't know what good is. He then offered thou-

MIND MATTERS

sands of words to prove the point. In the end, he concluded that “good” is some quality in things that remains constant. In other words, he wound up at the same dead end as Socrates. What’s the problem? Answer: Reality cut off by the god concept.

They assumed that good is something inherent in nature itself; that it is totally objective, and therefore, constant. What it is, they didn’t know, but felt it was something “out there.” The variable left out of the equation is the actual referent, human individual. Upon this reference, the term good can be easily defined. Seven words of definition will dismiss trillions of words of undefined rhetoric on the subject: Good is the means suited to the purpose. It’s as simple as that.

Entities are neither good nor bad. They exist independently of any value judgment. The terms good and bad refer to actions (or reactions). If a large bucket of water is dumped on a small wood fire, is the act good, or is it bad? Same entities. Same action. Same end results. What determines the answer to the question of good or bad? If you want the fire to go out because it is threatening to burn your house down, the act is good. On the other hand, if you want and need the fire to cook food, the act is bad. In the final analysis of down to earth meaning, the determination of good or bad is by the objective evaluation of means in respect to a subjectively chosen end. You can easily verify this definitive truth by your own observation and experiences. Do you not call good that which is suited to your purpose? Do you not call bad that which is not? Isn’t this true of everyone? So, what’s the problem? Why so much disagreement on “good and evil?” Obviously, there is a disagreement on means because there is a disagreement about ends desired. What disagreement, and why?

The story and illustration via the Socrates - Menon dialogue of 20 centuries ago may seem far removed from present time and have no bearing on currently held philosophies and the issue of good and evil. To the contrary, it is as relevant today as it was 20 centuries ago, for there has been no change and the same question remains at the center of each individual’s philosophical existence. Socrates and Moore (and most others) could not find the answer and definition because they had no objective referent, and therefore, no definitive end by which to determine good or bad. They imagined an omni god and a universal purpose, but the imagined universal purpose has no objective identity. Their reference existed only as a feeling and this was their only means of considering something as good or bad. This condition still exists to a near universal degree. What is the significance of this fact in relation to your life and the values you hold and pursue?

First, notice the god concept that literally dominated Socrates’s thinking. Although Socrates’s analytical abilities were much in evidence, the parameters of inquiry were limited by the god concept that he held. A conclusion is a reflection of the premises integrated, and no matter how logical and accurate the conclu-

MIND MATTERS

sion in respect to these premises, validation of the premises integrated is a prerequisite of accurate conclusions. Socrates arrived at the conclusion that any claim of a virtue could be validated only by the reference, virtue itself. This conclusion is quite logical and quite true. Socrates clearly realized this and put forth much effort to find the definition of virtue as a basis for judgment of a claim of a virtue. He failed to do so. He knew that he failed, but never understood why.

As explained earlier, the god concept psychologically negates the human individual. That which has been psychologically negated does not exist in the mind, and therefore, cannot be referenced. This leaves the good - bad issue in the realm of the god concept. Since the alleged god exists only as a feeling without finite characteristics and objective identity, "god's purpose," i.e., the "objective universal goal" is likewise without definitive identity. Although one may not always be consciously aware of it, the mind principle always makes a connection between ends and means with emotional evaluation as part of the process. Socrates was not consciously thinking of a specific "divine purpose," but definitely felt that it did exist. Although vague, the feeling dominated and controlled his thinking. Naturally, in his mind, his god was totally equated with total "good." Thus he arrived at the inconclusive conclusion that virtue (whatever it is) comes via "divine dispensation."

There is little or no disagreement on the fact that the terms good and bad refer to the evaluation of means in respect to a specific end. However, many disagreements and conflicts arise in a situation where nearly all hold some god concept and the belief in a universal goal. In this circumstance, instead of means being evaluated in respect to an individually subjectively chosen goal, the emotional evaluation of good or evil is in respect to an imagined universal (objectively existing) goal. This means that the individual is not seen as an individual with personal goals, but rather is regarded as a means to the alleged universal goal. Needless to say, with billions of believers each trying to force everyone else into the role of the means to the "universal goal," violent chaos is a virtual certainty.

The terms morality and immorality are often connected with the good-evil issue in an interchangeable manner. Notice that what a believer calls moral, he also calls good, the "moral good." The concept of morality comes from the infinite entity, universal goal realm of beliefs, which leaves the terms moral and immoral meaning the same thing. It just depends on who you're talking to. "Moral" is a circumstance wherein the actions of an individual are means suited to the "universal goal." Since there are as many "universal goals" as there are believers, what is "moral" to one believer is "immoral" to another because the individual's actions do not suit his "universal goal." In other words, morality is a myth.

Surely, every believer finds such an idea frighteningly appalling. With be-

MIND MATTERS

liefs and emotions determined by the god concept and the “evil nature of man,” the idea of an individual making decisions on a personal basis is a terrifying prospect. “Everybody knows” that if an individual (“evil man”) has no “moral guidance” apart from his “natural evil self,” then he is certain to do all sorts of horrible things. This is, of course, exactly backwards. The psychology of the god concept is a prerequisite to “justifying” and carrying out oppressive and destructive atrocities. Does not the Crusades, the Inquisitions, and all of history confirm this? Can you name a genocide or other atrocity that was not carried out in the name of the “moral good?” To be sure, there is constant disagreement as to what is or is not the “moral good,” but in all cases, do not all such arguments rest on the idea of universal values rather than individual personal preferences?

An individual who sees himself as a fallible self-responsible being whose values are personal, not objective mandates, can not reach the psychological state necessary to impose by force those values upon another individual. Acts of aggression and oppression always require the sanction of a “superior being.” There is not a known single fact that refutes this argument, yet nearly all still hold to the idea of the “need” for the “universal values” and regard these illusions as the bases for the “good,” i.e., morality. Motivated and driven by these confused values, they presume to force all into the “moral mold” and thereby create the very “immoral horrors” that they consciously seek to prevent.

They do not recognize the individual as the real, so are incapable of grasping a society based upon the reality of this identity. If an individual prefers to live in peace and harmony and knows that initiation of force and coercion are means contrary to his purpose, would he not refrain from taking such offensive action? If he knows that the benefits that he enjoys come not only from his own mind, but from the mind of others as well, would he not refrain from trying to have all minds conform to his and lose these benefits? What guidelines of behavior are needed for peace and productivity except the god-free mind of the human individual? (Since the actual individual is psychologically negated by the god concept, there is no single word in the language to represent the individual attitude and actions described above.) Given the mental reversal of reality by the god concept, it is hardly surprising to find that while the concept of morality is held out as the means of peace and harmony, in logical theory and centuries of practice, it is precisely the idea of objective value and objective morality that “justifies” cruelty and oppression and underlies wars and atrocities that makes one shudder just to describe.

MIND MATTERS

CHAPTER XI

ECONOMICS, GOODS AND SERVICES

An individual's material condition is a matter of economics. Food, shelter, and usually clothing, are things of grave importance to any and all who wish to survive. There are, of course, other wants beyond bare necessities for survival. These too are a matter of economics and involve the same actions or interactions as those required in achieving base survival needs. If an individual lived alone on a desert island where all economic action is totally self-directed and totally self-controlled, understanding one's economic situation is an open and straightforward proposition and easy to understand. Even in a primitive rural setting of several individuals where barter is the means of exchange of goods and services, most transactions are direct, immediate, and visibly linked. In this kind of economic system, it is not at all difficult to see what's going on and to know of supply and demand and how transactions affect one's material condition.

In an economic system involving many millions of individuals and where daily billions of exchanges are mostly indirect by money, the ins and outs of this system and how they affect your economic condition is not so easily grasped. It is literally impossible to directly trace the influence of even one transaction in such a system. Without some principled references firmly held in mind by which to evaluate the underlying and directive beliefs, premises, and theories that create this system, one may witness effects, oft times adverse, and really have no idea of the cause. Indeed, ill effects are frequently attributed to just about everything except the actual cause.

In the barter system mentioned above, if the exchanges are voluntary, the principle of the market, subjective value, is highly visible. That is, it is a circumstance wherein each individual attributes personal value to a given item of goods or service. The differences in individual valuations between the potential buyer and potential seller are the market activators. This is the free market. Regulation introduces the contrary. This is the end of the free market. It is not that subjective value disappears. Regulation is a circumstance in which the subjective valuations of one or some are imposed by force upon another or others. Of course, this is

MIND MATTERS

done with the actuality kept hidden and in the name of abstract cause and abstract beneficiary.

Boom and bust economic cycles are a matter of record. Some bust periods, better known as depressions, have been long, wide, and deep with widespread misery that is always part of the scene. Repetition undeniably reveals that either the cause is unknown or is improperly treated. Some would have us believe that it is just a matter of “normal business cycles.” I find it inconceivable that supply and demand on a nationwide scale suddenly are incompatible because of simultaneous miscalculations of suppliers and consumers; or because there is a simultaneous devaluing of materials and labor. Granted, there are no natural guarantees and at any given time a business may fail because of poor judgment, nature caused misfortune, or because new technology and innovation has made a product or service obsolete, but on a nationwide scale affecting nearly every business? Hardly likely. This is a little too much to attribute to coincidence.

It is a principle of nature and a foundation premise of all scientific research that from common cause comes common effect, and vice versa. Bear in mind as we seek that common cause, we are not talking about economic deprivation due to natural calamity. Rather, we are talking about a circumstance in which resources are abundant and labor plentiful, yet fail to combine to fulfill needs and desires. This in itself is a strong indicator that something is wrong at the core of the system. What? Answer. Regulation - the enemy of freedom of choice and voluntary exchange, the enemy of the essence of the market itself. Regulations are always imposed in the name of protection and for the “benefit of all,” but the claim is belied by definition and practical application. Regulation (not protection) is basically one individual imposing his will upon another individual via the governmental system. As one after another seek to escape the imposition, or to gain in like manner, competition in the marketplace and voluntary exchange is abandoned to compete for legislative favor and coercive advantage. In so doing, the market is declared inadequate and unwanted. The future is foretold.

The number of present regulations defy counting. Types and methods of implementation are infinite. They travel the interlock with multiple direct and indirect adverse effects; often emerging at great distances and in such form that the cause is not recognized. Recognized or not, regulation has been chosen in negation of the market and this is the disastrous practice now in dominating practice.

Notwithstanding all the obscuring rhetoric and word games, regulation is simply the introduction of offensive physical force into the market in denial of the personal preferences of the many traders and consumers. In denying personal preference, i.e., subjective value, it is always “justified” by the conceptual illusion, objective value: “for the good of the country,” etc. As all the ill effects are observed, the cause is absurdly attributed to the free market - which does not

MIND MATTERS

exist because of the intervention. Nor is there a mixed economy as you may have heard claimed. Literally, the availability and cost of every good or service in the system is affected in some manner by regulation. Bear in mind that I'm not talking about the prohibition of theft and fraud. The issue is regulation: One or more persons deciding for other individuals and backing up the decision by offensive force or the threat of it.

Most go along with the idea of regulation because they have been taught and unquestionably believe that it is necessary for "protection" and for a "fair and sound economy." There are so many myths entangled with the "justifications" for intervention, a hundred books would not scratch the surface in covering separate and actual instances of intervention and adverse effects. Let's just examine a few basics as a foundation for understanding the whole.

First, take a look at the context in which regulations are created and implemented. The geographical area called the United States is divided up into 50 states and subdivided again into smaller and smaller political districts. On the national (or state) level, every Senator and every Representative is sworn to act for the benefit of the persons in his or her area. In this atmosphere, where there is much verbal condemnation of "special interest," "special interest" is actually the operational premise of every piece of legislation. Worse yet, most if not all of these legislators actually believe they are doing "good" and benefiting their constituents. Of course, they don't think of non-constituents and the fact that the singular purpose of regulation is to benefit some at the expense of others. They never seem to grasp that the consequence of their actions eventually comes full circle.

Taxation is certainly one highly visible form of regulation. The potential for disruption is literally unlimited. Yet, most are concerned only when a tax directly affects their economics. For instance, if a tax is placed upon whiskey and beer, those that do not purchase whiskey and beer are not concerned; indeed, may think that such drink is the "devil's brew" and wish to see the users pay dearly and perhaps be discouraged from drinking at all. Does a tax on liquor affect you even if you neither sell nor drink the beverages? If the tax is high enough on liquor, the price becomes prohibitive and legal liquor sales end. This has an economic effect on every person involved in the liquor business, even down to the persons selling fertilizer for the growing of the necessary grain. If regulation instead of economics ends the legal liquor trade, but demand remains, rest assured supply will come even if it is not legal. There now is a cost of apprehending and punishing the offenders.

Assuming that the tax is absorbed by the customer, the money paid in liquor tax cannot simultaneously be spent for something else. If that something else is an item that you purchase, the decline in purchases tends to raise the price of the item as production costs are allocated to a fewer number of the items. Even if

MIND MATTERS

the item directly affected is not one that you ordinarily purchase, within the interlock, sooner or later, the effect will be felt on whatever you purchase. The liquor tax simply shifts the allocation of some buying power while consuming other buying power in nonproductive legislation and enforcement.

Each individual has limited buying power and must make choices as to how that buying power is allocated. The only way for an individual to increase buying power is by increasing production and trading ability in a free market. There are ways to steal buying power, but stealing is not increase and is anti-free market. An official decree will neither increase buying power nor decrease the cost of production. The correlation of cost of production and price charged as related to buying power of given consumers is completely overlooked by the regulators. Apparently, they believe that natural law, in this case the natural law of economics, will yield to their beliefs and wishes.

Let's look at a simple and theoretical example of classic market intervention. Since the free market is against the law, we are left to envision it in theory to illustrate the adverse effects of initiation of force and coercion. Assume that in a free market situation, milk is generally priced at one dollar per gallon. Some can afford it and some can't. To purchase milk, either those that can't afford it must increase their buying power, or the producers must find a profitable way to lower the price. No matter what their desires might be, they cannot produce milk at a loss for an indefinite length of time. Profit must be maintained for continued production or research and development for better and more economical means of production. There are certain laws of economics dealing with production and sales that cannot be abridged without serious consequences. Indeed, any attempt to oppose these laws will inevitably cause end results exactly opposite of the declared intent.

The kindly disposed Senator Do Good is not aware of this and sets out to help his poor constituents by having the price of milk set at fifty cents per gallon. Getting his bill made into law requires some vote trading. Tariffs and taxes appear in regard to steel, gasoline, wheat, corn, clothing, etc. Also, at fifty cents per gallon, small producers are driven out of business and the large ones can't afford to expand at the non-market, officially set price. So, just as prices decline and demand goes up, production goes down and there is not enough milk to go around. Of course, Senator Do Good can fix this. He gets another bill passed to subsidize milk to get the production up. Follow these actions throughout the economic interlock and you will see that the price of milk forced down by law not only favored the larger producers as it forced smaller competitors out of business, it also set off a price increase chain reaction through the whole economic system. This is in addition to the cost of creating the regulation and enforcing it. Taxes, tariffs, and

MIND MATTERS

regulations altering the market raises the price of corn, potatoes, beef, pork, chicken, and literally every item of produce. When the dust settles, Senator Do Good's poor constituents have less buying power for food than they did before he "helped" them. Naturally, they ask for more help.

Enemies of the free market rest their case upon the belief that unfettered competition would lead to business conglomerates driving out all competition leaving the consumer at the mercy of the giants of industry. In other words, they fear a "free market monopoly." First and foremost, mono means one. The one in this instance is the implementors of the governmental intervention that denies the free market and manifests the very monopolistic situation that the intervention is alleged to prohibit. The milk example is a simple but adequate representation of this fact. In open competition, a business may well grow very large - because of customer satisfaction. Indeed, being large often provides a circumstance for maximum benefit of production material by reducing the cost per item of that which is produced. As for "monopoly," what size is "monopoly;" and how does one gain a monopoly when buying power is limited and is attributed on a priority basis? Whatever the item, its price cannot defy the law of economics that spending cannot exceed buying power. Thus a monopoly must necessarily control all buying power in literally every area of purchase and consumption. This omni power is allocated only to the god called government. Herein lies the much feared monopoly, but in confusion is embraced as the protector against monopoly.

The threat and existence of monopoly and monopolistic enterprises is very real as illustrated above, but it is not of the free market. It is via governmental favoritism. Land grants to open and run railroads, subsidies, bail outs of businesses, the issuance of licenses, franchises coercively granted to selected utility companies, et al, is monopoly in action. You pay the cost of non-competition whether it is a law prohibiting the import of steel, or a medical regulation that dictates who your doctor can be, or what medicine he can prescribe. In these and millions of other instances, the truth emerges that regulation is not protection. It is depriving you of using your own thinking and making your own choices.

The idea of regulation is directly derived from the god concept that psychologically negates the individual and individual choice. The underlying rationale is that you are incapable of selecting your doctor, grocer, carpenter, mechanic, etc. The rationale presumes that on your own you cannot judge for yourself, nor find a knowledgeable individual to trust in making decisions regarding the various economic areas of your life. If you are so incapable and so incapacitated as implied, by what thinking can you or do you judge the character and capabilities of the governmental regulator that is selected for you? The answer is, you don't. You must necessarily accept it on faith in the omnipotent and omniscient god called government. Economic regulation is just part and parcel of the whole scene in which real individual is declared ignorant, stupid, dishonest, and

MIND MATTERS

totally dependent upon an omni superior being. Since most buy into the con and go along with the directives, the situation winds up creating the very dependence that is initially assumed. It's just one more instance of the self-fulfilling prophecies of religious ideology.

There are those who favor regulation, but conclude that regulation has gone too far, that some "deregulation" is now in order. They delude themselves. It can't be done. A physical structure put up piece by piece can be taken down piece by piece. Not so of an idea. An idea has no parts that can be separated to create a "lesser idea" of the same idea. It either is manifest or it isn't, and if it is, the consequence of the idea is a constant factor and not subject to arbitrary alteration as pertains to effect. The idea, regulation, is implementation of initiation of force and coercion for the purpose of favoritism. Whenever and however employed, this idea in action always favors some at the expense of others.

A "deregulation" is simply another regulation of favoritism, but with the reverse twist always found in the god concept. Actually, a "deregulation" is a means to centralize wealth. As brief illustration, imagine ten truck drivers regulated by licenses, taxes, load limits, etc. Now imagine one truck driver deregulated. The removal of restriction gives the one trucker a distinct financial advantage. Follow the actions and reactions and you will find that money is funneled throughout the economic interlock to the deregulated trucker. You can quickly envision the same thing by mentally setting one victim of taxation and the take spread among many; then the one is not taxed while all others are. In the economic interlock, this constitutes a reversal that tends to concentrate the wealth via "deregulation". In other words, "deregulation" is just another one of the many myths found in the gods and governments philosophy.

MIND MATTERS

CHAPTER XII

INFLATION: THE INVISIBLE THIEF

Like an insidious incubus, it enters through every crevice and invades every sanctuary. Once inside, it consumes the sustenance of its victims with such stealth that the impoverished know only of their state and not of its cause. This demon cannot be caged. No defense can limit its destruction. Survival demands that it be totally destroyed. It goes by the name inflation. Of all the intervention ways to destroy markets and an economic system, none hold a candle to inflation for pure means of absolute destruction.

What is inflation? In a word, counterfeiting, a fiat increase of the money supply. Cause: An individual or group legally or illegally printing paper currency or issuing bogus coins. Or the Federal Reserve manipulating the money supply by other onerous means. Effect: Devaluation of existing dollars, i.e., redistribution of wealth, consumption of inventory and capital goods without replacement, prohibition of long term planning, general apprehension, confusion, chaos, and market destruction.

All true. Yet, by myth and misconception, inflation is believed by most to be a necessary part of the market and receives support and praise for its "saving quality" from nearly every quarter. Disagreement centers on "too little" or "too much." This is the totality of their excuse for failure. The usual argument "justifying" inflation is that if the money supply does not keep pace with the output of goods, the goods will not be sold and the "economy" will become depressed, businesses will fail, unemployment will increase, etc. After a given increase in the money supply by "monetizing debt," (magically turning a liability into an asset by arbitrary declaration), "fractional banking" (banks lending money they don't have), etc., the amount of money in circulation at any given time is controlled by the Fed buying or selling "debt securities" (the biggest compounding rollover scheme ever devised). The money manipulation is called "stimulating the economy" or "fine tuning."

For obvious and sound reasons, counterfeiting is lawfully forbidden to John Q. Citizen. However, counterfeiting is an official duty of the Federal Reserve Sys-

MIND MATTERS

tem. Herein lies the rub. If a large bucket of water is dumped on a small wood fire, the fire will be extinguished. Regardless of who dumps the bucket of water or how many times it is done, the end result is always the same. I know of no one who has ever challenged this truth. The same cause equals the same effect is principle, the sine qua non of all truth and all knowledge. Yet, monetarists claim that the act of counterfeiting has two different effects which are dependent upon who commits the act.

This is most disturbing. For we either have a flexible and therefore unknowable objective reality, or persons who believe that it is flexible and still knowable. They believe that they can counterfeit and by governmental decree completely reverse the effects of counterfeiting as would be the effect if the act were committed by John Q. Citizen. Knowing that objective reality is not subject to alteration by subjective wishes and beliefs is of little encouragement. Minds that hold such absurdity as unquestionable truth necessarily derive the beliefs from sacred and revered illusions; a psychological defense of such magnitude that one is not likely to penetrate it. Nevertheless, considering what is at stake, I will try.

In an effort to dispel the illusions that the minds of believers turn inflation the destroyer into inflation the universal benefactor, let us closely and thoroughly examine and analyze market and money. First, at root level, then progressively up to and through the current level where inflation is an everpresent thief.

In a pure barter system of market, there is no money and therefore no possibility of inflation. Undistorted by monetary manipulations, the principles illustrated will serve as references by which to recognize and evaluate elements of the current economic system influenced by an arbitrary and variable money supply.

In any market, supply, demand, personal preferences, and personal valuations are everpresent variables. In a free market (actually, there is no other kind) one voluntarily gives up something he values less for something he values more. It follows that market, i.e., voluntary exchanges, exists and functions only by differences in valuations of the buyer and seller as regards the value attributed to a particular good or service.

The identity of the human individual, observation, and practice establishes that value is subjective, not objective; attributed, not discovered; non-quantitative, therefore, non-measurable. Every voluntary exchange indicates a difference in valuations and never sets a value on the item exchanged. These are the essence and principle of market. Any concept or theory of economics in conflict with these principles are in conflict with reality. Any attempted applications of such concepts or theories will invariably produce end results exactly opposite of consciously declared intent.

In a barter system, a trader may exchange two bananas for one coconut,

MIND MATTERS

three apples for two oranges, a canoe for a hut, and so on. In general, the ratio of supply and demand influences valuations, but at no time is there a fixed value of anything. Most importantly, in a barter system, there is no central determinant that coercively ties all business together. A change in the supply and demand of bananas or coconuts does not necessarily drastically affect the value of apples and oranges. If the banana business fails, the proprietor may find salvation in a flourishing apple enterprise. But, if they are all tied together in some fashion that the failure of one venture tends to bring down all the rest with it, the banana proprietor has no place to go and the extended forecast for all is gloom and doom.

As implied, in a barter system, any theft must be direct and the thief and victim easily identified. Consumption by theft without replacement production, while not approved by most, is visible and can be factored into the economic equation. One does not count a coconut not held nor imagine an apple to exist that has already been eaten. Also, a debt and repayment in kind, or unlike kind per agreement, while always subject to market variables is not subject to external and arbitrary declaration of increase or decrease in value. This means that if an individual borrows, repayment requires an increase in production or decrease in standard of living. There is no fiat forgiveness of debt.

A primary and exceedingly important fact discerned from a barter system is that money is not a fundamental of market. Money is only a marketing convenience. The logical implication is that the concept, money, defined, understood, and applied in accordance with its identity shows money to be neutral to market. This is not to say that the concept, money, cannot be corrupted and used to destroy the market. Indeed, there is overwhelming evidence of this. Exposing this corruption and the illusions that support it is the task at hand.

What is money? Most, if not all, agree that it is a medium of exchange. Beyond this is the argument that what is or is not money is determined by common usage; and since the term, common usage, is somewhat vague, what is or is not money is likewise uncertain. This confuses bookkeeping with the items being counted. Money is an abstract concept of standardized units and therefore of linear ratios. In other words, money is an abstract concept applicable to indirect exchanges for the purpose of registering individual differences in valuations. In all probability, some physical material has always been used in implementing the idea of money, but the origin of money is the mind, and is inextricably entwined with the reality, subjective value; which necessarily precludes any logical attachment to or dependence upon objective quantity. Gold, silver, copper, paper, etc. are merely means of accounting; a way of physically unitizing for the purpose of record keeping. In fact, given adequate memories and honesty, money units can be held in the mind only and transferred from mind to mind as dollars are now transferred from hand to hand.

MIND MATTERS

The significance of this fact is that money, being totally abstract, is by origin and character, non causal, i.e., neutral in respect to the market. The unlimited fiat expansion of the money supply is proof in itself of the abstract nature of money. Yet, monetarists would have us believe that they can, by nothing more than an increase in the money supply, cause a creating of goods and thereby improve the “overall economy.” I agree that the intervention has an effect, but it is not the effect they claim nor from the cause they imagine.

Where, when, and how the concept of money came into being is not important. Let’s assume a market system with a fixed money supply held in varying amounts by the market participants. In this market are the usual supply, demand, and personal valuation factors that participants must take into account in dealing with each other. But, they don’t have to worry about all the adversities of a variable money supply subject to the whims of persons who obviously know nothing about the market.

There are some ups and downs, successes and failures, but by and by, most are doing just fine. Wealth is accumulated and provides time and materials for research and development of new items of value or increased efficiency in production in various fields. Here, an increase in efficiency and production tends to bring prices down and there is a beneficial ripple throughout the market system.

A fixed money supply effects and holds a “balance” between money, supply, and demand. The market reflects the choices of the traders. With a fixed money supply and use of the complete supply, if the price of some things go up, others must come down or not sell. It’s a matter of elementary arithmetic and ratio. Limited buying power and consequent priorities informs the traders of their preferences and valuations. An item in demand tells the maker and seller that they made the right decisions. An item not selling well, or not at all, sends the opposite message. One venture fails as others succeed. The alternative is centralized economics (non-market) where all fail.

In this fixed money supply system, the money units travel throughout the system in step with valuations and exchanges of the participants. Each increases or decreases his holding of money units in correspondence with production, personal preferences, and market choices. The value of each unit is determined solely by the variable market factors. The proportional value does not change because counterfeiting and increase is nonexistent. Except by direct theft, there is no means of redistribution of wealth via a fixed money supply. All factors converge upon the truth that money is neutral with respect to the market.

Since understanding the role of money in the market is of utmost importance, it behooves us to clarify the relationship between money and market with such definitiveness that there remains no doubt. By reference to this relationship, one may better see the distortions and illusions of the monetarists.

MIND MATTERS

In the days of open slavery, a slave, by threat of punishment or death, was obliged to work and produce. The slave owner then took and consumed whatever he wished of the slave's production. There was no place for money in this relationship and none was used. Goods changed hands, but not by voluntary (market) exchange; rather by coercive force was the producer compelled to give up his production to be consumed by someone else. The point is, and no point is more important in philosophy or economics, where coercion is, the market isn't. In definition and practice, coercion and market are mutually exclusive. Whether it is a slave owner taking from his slave, a burglar in the night, an armed bandit in daylight, or the Fed creating and circulating counterfeit currency, the act is theft, not market. The only difference between the acts is visibility. "Legal tender" is a constitutional declaration of intent to defraud. Inflation is the ultimate fulfillment.

The base of buying power is exchangeable goods. The total supply is always limited and is distributed in varying amounts among the market participants. Likewise, the total money supply, "corresponding" to the total supply of exchangeable goods is distributed among the market participants. Although the use and movement of the money supply is determined by the infinitely variable choices and valuations of the traders, the unit ratios of money, representing buying power, is fixed by the totality of the money supply. Any increase in the total supply of money necessarily decreases the buying power of each unit. I know of no one who denies that buying power is transferred from the old money to the new in proportion to increase. So, I see no need to elaborate. The critical issue is the alleged justification for increasing the money supply and redistributing the wealth.

As stated earlier, buying power is limited in total and per individual. Limited buying power cannot support unlimited enterprises. Priorities are a foregone conclusion. If a good or service is not selling, it is because the participants in the market choose not to allocate buying power to this item. Unfortunately, monetarists reach a different conclusion. They conclude that the item is not selling because there is not enough money in existence. So, to "stimulate the economy," in defiance of the market decision, they increase the money supply.

Naturally, the new money provides a means of consuming without the requirement of exchange and replacement. Follow this premise to its final conclusion and we see everything consumed and everyone perishing. The direction is clear. How far we go down this road is dependent upon the whims of the legal monetarists. Not a pleasant thought.

We know that the decision to increase the money supply is motivated by something. What? They give as reasons, "to stimulate the economy," "to fine tune the economy," "to improve the overall economy," to raise "the gross national product" and "increase the national wealth." Perhaps in focusing upon their motivation and seeing the fallacy therein, we may come to understand the perpetual

MIND MATTERS

failure of monetary policy. You have heard of the person who could not see the trees for the forest. Could it be that the monetarists cannot see the real market participants for the abstract economy? Are they lost in a world of abstracts; a “mind world” disconnected from the real; a “mind world” exactly opposite the real one? Would this explain their belief in reversing the effects of counterfeiting? Would this explain the belief that consuming (via counterfeiting) precedes and causes increase in goods? Would this explain the belief that diminishing the parts by counterfeiting somehow increases and improves the whole? I believe it does.

Accounting and abstract calculations mentally applied to the real is of much value to an individual in understanding the elements of household or business finance. By numbers, income vs outgo, savings vs debt, assets vs liabilities, can be known and factored into one’s personal values and goals. This method of financial accounting has value only because it is part of the total. The figures mean nothing without reference to other money and goods held by others throughout the market system. Economy is an abstract term denoting the existence of an ongoing economic system comprised of real individual participants. These are the objective elements of the market. To presume to “stimulate the economy,” “improve” or treat the “economy” in any way in disregard to each of the real individuals and the effect thereupon is to pursue illusion unto disaster.

Let’s look at this a moment in terms of the much revered Gross National Product, which is alleged to be the total output of the “nation” in goods and services in a given time period. This “Gross National Product” is measured in dollars and is expressed and implied to represent value. It is used as an indicator of economic conditions in determining what action to take in regard to the “economy.” What is the quality of this reference serving as justification for market intervention via money supply? Is it based on fact, or fallacy? You decide.

If you voluntarily trade a banana for an apple, doesn’t this indicate that you value the apple more than the banana whereas the person with whom you make the trade obviously values the banana more than the apple? Now, instead of a banana, you voluntarily trade a dollar for an apple. By action, you show that you value the apple more than the dollar. By action, the other trader shows that he values the dollar more than the apple. The exchange takes place only because of a difference in your valuation and the valuation of the other trader. At no time is it expressed or logically implied that the dollar represents a fixed value. Indeed, as just demonstrated, it represents a subjective difference in valuation of two individuals in regard to a particular good. So, pray tell, from where or what do the monetarists get the “Gross National Product?” To arrive at a “Gross National Product,” they presume to add variable subjective differences and arrive at a fixed objective total of value for all. Pure myth.

To be sure, one may count the number of dollars changing hands, but what

MIND MATTERS

knowledge does this yield except a total of dollars in motion? Naturally, the more counterfeiting, the more dollars in motion and the greater the “Gross National Product.” What exactly does this total reveal? Answer. Useless history. It tells that Y number of individuals spent X number of dollars during time period Z. It doesn’t set a value. It doesn’t measure wealth. And it certainly doesn’t reveal what the counterfeiting and money manipulation is actually doing to ruin the economic system. The GNP is simply an abstract total arbitrarily allocated to an abstract economy. It is completely cut off from the real and has “meaning” only in a “mind world” of illusions. Monetarists presume to grasp the whole without knowledge of the parts. They claim characteristics in the whole not found in any of the parts. They devise plans to improve the whole by destroying the parts, i.e., they cut down the individual trees to save the collective forest.

A market system is made up of interdependent traders. Though each is free to make independent valuations and exchanges, the interlocking nature of the system means that every action therein has a corresponding ripple effect throughout the entire network. Some actions are positive. Some negative. Some ripples minor and unnoticeable. Some major and devastating. To see the origin and cause of a ripple, it is necessary to find the initial source and determine its character.

In practice, the Fed usually interjects money (counterfeit) into the system by indirect means; by banks, savings and loans, and the like. However, instead of going through all the thieving machinations of the banking system, for sake of simplicity, let’s assume a direct link to the Fed. The participants in an economic system often number in the millions and the daily transactions in the trillions, but again, for sake of simplicity, let’s assume a few participants in direct focus with all included by inference. The effects of inflation travel throughout the system by many routes and are often obscured by time, distance, and assorted beliefs and claims. By reducing all the system elements without losing integrity, the “invisible thief” (aka monetarists) can be identified and convicted.

Begin with a market system and fixed money supply. You manufacture and sell roller skates. Mr. Smith manufactures and sells widgets. Others are engaged in a variety of businesses and forms of employment. Some business are thriving. Some doing ok. Some barely hanging on. Some sinking fast. Your roller skate business is thriving. You spend part of your money and part you save. Mr. Smith, on the other hand, is not doing well at all. He is selling some widgets, but not nearly enough to make a go of it. The market decision is that Mr. Smith is in the wrong business. Limited financial resources demand priority valuations. For most, widgets are not on the list. Mr. Smith has no choice except to admit error, absorb the loss, and close up shop. Tragic perhaps, but not fatal.

Mr. Smith may salvage enough to try again in something else. He may also entice investors into another venture. Or he and his employees may find work in

MIND MATTERS

one of the thriving and expanding businesses. But, before any of these alternatives can be chosen, the monetarists observe the plight of Mr. Smith and the impending layoff of his employees and conclude that the only reason Mr. Smith's widgets aren't selling is because there is not enough money in existence to "keep pace with the output of goods." From this premise, the "solution" is simple: create enough money to "match" the selling price of the widgets.

Cometh now the Fed and prints money believed to be sufficient to keep pace with the production of the widgets. What the market rejected, the Fed now embraces. What the consumers refused to buy directly, they now are compelled to buy indirectly - without even receiving the goods. The Fed distributes the new money to selected consumers with instructions to buy widgets. They do as instructed and lo and behold, what market rejected is now a thriving business. Salute to the wisdom of the Fed! Second look: They count the money in motion as dollars are exchanged for widgets. They are pleased to improve the "overall economy" and total the value created. That each exchange depends on difference in valuation and does not set a value, they do not notice. That the buying power used was stolen, they do not think about. That each purchase is consumption without replacement is ignored as a matter of policy. That this act diminishes total goods is beyond their comprehension. They see only dollars in motion and applaud the economic activity without a clue as to the massive destruction of their act.

In the preceding example, the widgets were, in the market consumer sense, consumed and the Fed has nothing permanent to show for their efforts. They look to other effects as "proof" of money's "power to create" and improve the "overall economy."

To wit: The Fed prints \$50,000 and gives, loans, whatever, to Individual A. Individual A takes the money, buys materials, adds his labor, and builds a house with an estimated market value of \$100,000. Along come the monetarists and exclaim, "Look, where there was nothing before is a house worth \$100,000. We put in only \$50,000. The purchase of materials and the construction raised the GNP and the national wealth has increased by \$50,000."

Until I see a "nation" standing in a welfare line, I'm obliged to regard their thinking as highly suspect, to say the least. The fact is, the buying power for the materials was stolen from the market participants the same as in the widget example. That Individual A made a house of the materials in no way erases the confiscation or alleviates all the adverse effects described earlier. While the monetarists spout silly phrases about an abstract nation, in the real world Individual A does increase his wealth - at the expense of the victims.

A market tends to adjust to any given money supply. Given sufficient time (though the price of folly must be paid) any increase in the money supply will be

MIND MATTERS

discounted and it will be business as usual. Unfortunately, with the prevailing monetarists' mentality, this is not allowed to happen. At the bottom of the "natural cycle" naturally caused by the monetarists, firmly convinced that they are right and spurred on by the righteousness of their action, they seek to resolve the problem by expanding the cause.

As the buying power of each monetary unit is directly proportional to the total units in existence, any increase in the total supply diminishes the buying power of each unit. Therefore, to transfer the same amount of buying power, the new money must increase proportionally and always exceed the previous increase. A transfer of 10% of buying power requires a multiplying factor of 1.1111 applied to an ever increasing base. A 10% increase in the money supply leaves unit buying power as 0.90990. Follow this through 10 increases of 10% and the buying power remaining is 0.38555 of the original.

The arithmetic is deceptively kind. Aside from the inflation-caused "need" to increase the rate of inflation, as the counterfeiting undermines otherwise sound businesses, the number of "needy" increases as the number of "saving sources" decrease. Meaning that as the base shrinks, the burden is laid upon fewer and fewer at an accelerated and higher rate. Each business is tied to the other by centralized coercive force. Corrupted money is an indirect and universal means of deceptively applying the coercive force. (Coercion is the cause, not money.) As counterfeiting consumes without replacement, the resources of every victimized person and business are diminished. Planned innovations, increased production, increased employment, are aborted for lack of resources; resources consumed via counterfeiting. Instead of expansion, there is decline. Instead of hiring, there is firing. Instead of prosperity, there is depression.

Throughout the world, many engage in buying and selling money, not an objective commodity or real service, but abstract speculations about abstract units. The money manipulations by the "governments" trying to gain advantage in the "money market" will eventually come home to roost in the collapse of the international monetary system. Since real economics is officially tied to this insanity, severe adverse effect is a certainty. There are too many unknowns to set a timetable, but that this situation is heading for one big collapse you may be sure. The collapsing banks and the failures of Savings and Loan institutions brought to you courtesy of "The Fed and Government" was a mild preview of coming attractions.

The problem is, as stated in the beginning, a psychological one. Value is subjective. Inflation is counterfeiting. Elementary. The causal elements involved in the issue are simplistic and highly visible. The denial and rejection of these basic truths in deference to mental constructs, expressed or implied to be real entities, indicates a serious thinking disorder. Or to put it more palatability, an absence of awareness of the principles of knowledge and self-imposed mental

MIND MATTERS

discipline to adhere to the same.

The underlying cause of this faulty thinking is taught in indirect and unconscious fashion. The condition is almost universal. This, in conjunction with the prevailing psychology of yielding the mind to authority, in the form of a figurehead or anthropomorphic “public opinion” leaves little hope for emergence of an attitude of efficacy of self and trust in one’s own mind.

The position assigned or accepted in the psychological hierarchy of authority is of no importance. All are imprisoned by the same restraints. A “well recognized authority” dare not think outside of the proscribed parameters lest he lose his standing among his peers. The “lesser” dare not challenge lest they be considered a fool to imagine their mind to be on a par with their “betters.” Thus, by fear of knowing and silent agreement, vile absurdity is enthroned and revered as unquestionable truth. This is the guardian of “national wealth” and other such nonsense.

MIND MATTERS

CHAPTER XIII

THE MYTH OF ALTRUISM

We are all born into a social environment set against the human individual. To be more precise, the official philosophical environment is actually antisocial. We are taught by word and deed that our purpose in life is for the glory of "God," to serve our country, to help others, to deny self for the good of all. Deny self - that is the crux of the matter. The issue is not whether one chooses to help another or others for personal reasons. The issue is that individual choice is denied and the individual is regarded as nothing more than a means to ends not of his own choosing.

The command to deny self is heard in formal religion, the pledge of allegiance to flag and country, and oaths of governmental offices. Indeed, the command is everpresent and all encompassing and sets our lot in life as servitude to alleged superior beings, or "others" as a surrogate "superior being." This philosophy goes by the name altruism. It is allegedly set in opposition to self-interest which is assumed to be inherently "evil."

This antagonism is sometimes called the great philosophical divide. In popular thought and in popular language usage, the impression is given that one has the philosophical choice of altruism or self interest. No such option is available. It is literally impossible for anyone to knowingly go against what they conceive to be in their own best interest. Certainly, one may take an action and later discover that it was not in their interest, but at the time of the action, it was thought to be. Pursuing self-interest is as certain as consciousness and volition. What constitutes one's self-interest is dependent upon one's values, which in turn, are dependent upon one's beliefs. Whether one is aiding the poor and helpless or stealing from them, it's still a matter of self-interest. Each intends to gain tangible or intangible reward. Material reward, either immediate or delayed, is just part of the picture. To leave out future expectations or intangible value as means of pursuing happiness denies the reality of the situation.

The condemnation of self-interest, per se, ties directly to the innate evil syndrome and a mind divided by a god concept. Further, since everyone pursues

MIND MATTERS

self-interest, pretense otherwise has value only in hiding the specific self-interest pursued; not only hiding the specific interest from others, but from self as well. The hiding is not always of conscious construction, nor conscious intent. It is a matter of derivatives of fallacious beliefs. The whole fallacy of philosophical selflessness can be easily exposed by a few simple observations.

The fallacy is easily exposed by envisioning only two individuals. Aside from the fact that selflessness is a synonym for death, if one preaches altruism to another, is he not asking to be served rather than “selflessly giving” as he would have us believe? Who are the “others” if not the one promoting the idea of altruism? Unless and until someone can demonstrate that he can go against his nature and act without the motivation of self-interest, the issue is not self-interest vs non-self-interest. The issue is what those self-interests are and how they relate to the social condition of a believer and persons with whom the believer interacts.

The god concept self-interests of an “altruist” are multifaceted. If a believer feels subordinated, unworthy, and fearful of receiving help when needed, would not it be in the self-interest of the believer to have “evil man” subscribe to the philosophy of “altruism” or be forced to act for the benefit of “others?” This also serves the purpose of controlling “evil man” for the sake of “security.”

There is an even more sinister side of the altruism myth that may be seen in contrast with individualism. In a social environment of individualism and voluntary mutual exchange for mutual benefit, it is certainly quite possible that any individual at any given time may need some help. If someone chooses to offer such help, it may be gratefully received. However, this is a voluntary and temporary social situation and not a constant and prevailing philosophy of subservience.

On the other hand, “altruism” as a constant philosophy requires a constant pool of “the needy.” Obviously, if a believer is to promote and sustain “altruism,” it is in his self interest to see to it that the pool of “the needy” does not disappear. The multiple adverse effects of the god concept illusion fulfills this requirement. The value of “the needy” is two fold. First, as one of “the needy,” the “group needy” provides a place in the recipient line of the sanctioned policy. The second value is once again best seen in contrast with individualism. In individualism where there are no “objective values,” nor superior and inferior beings, help needed, offered, and accepted is simply a part of a harmonious social interchange with no lowering nor raising of anyone in the process. In “altruism,” as a “giver,” “the needy” provides a subordination by which to act godlike in giving and raising self-value via the god-dependent relationship. While there may be some trace of human compassion in the scenario, when offensive physical force is added, there is no doubt that the main psychological drive is the god concept values. Of course, the core god concept self-interest is to “please god” by doing “God’s will,” “national

MIND MATTERS

interest," etc.

Since nearly all hold a god concept and seek to have all abide by "divine will" or "society's values," power is the ultimate value almost universally sought and revered. On any given day, one can read of or hear the reverence for power expressed or implied again and again. This value is so nearly universally accepted and unquestioned, it is spoken of as a matter of course and implied by attitude and actions to be a "natural condition" and a "natural value." To a believer, it is incomprehensible that anyone would not want to hold dominion over others, that ruling or being ruled is equally abhorrent.

Since nearly all subscribe to the god concept, the official socioeconomic governmental system is set up on the belief in illusory altruism. It is implemented by "guilt drive" and coercion as each believer pursues self-interest in the name of nonself, i.e., the god concept. Although the actual philosophy and agenda may be hidden by unspoken consensus or agreement, its hiding place is rather shallow and easily exposed as demonstrated above. Further analysis of mind principles lays it bare.

Literally every belief and value an individual holds plays directly or indirectly to the concept, self value. To grasp the significance of this, and to grasp the depth and intensity of the natural directive, observe that it is human nature to hold onto what one values and discard that which one does not. Ergo, one's value of self is directly relative to sustaining life itself. This is not to say that all the beliefs and values one holds are life oriented. To the contrary, in a mind divided by a god concept, many are not. In fact, all god concept beliefs and values are anti-life. In formal religion with the idea of eternal life after death, one must necessarily value death as a means to achieve this goal. Outside of formal religion without the belief in death as means to an eternal life, allegiance to any other god concept is no less divisive and death oriented. Whatever the confusion and contradictions, believers still seek self value in the god concept context. It is this self negating context that is the crux of the matter. Arbitrary labels and claims are irrelevant to effect.

A believer, of course, does not know that the god concept is their own mental invention. To emphasize the point again, it makes no difference whether one calls the god concept, "God's will," "Society's values," "American interest," or whatever, its all epistemologically, philosophically, and psychologically the same. A believer believes there are two beings, and therefore, two sets of values and two sets of interests: self, subjective value and personal interest; and superior being, objective value and superior being interests. Actually, self, being psychologically subordinated, is emotionally regarded as non-existent, thus negating the concept subjective value as well. However, self and self-interest are seen as contrary to the superior being and the superior being's interests. Since the superior being and superior being's interest are held as the ultimate good, it follows

MIND MATTERS

that self-interest is held as the ultimate evil. Hence, the popular notion that self-interest, per se, is to be condemned outright without any exploration of the specifics of any person's self interests.

The god concept has many self-interest directives, the main being ownership, i.e., the control of others. To control others via direct physical force or purchased physical force is to cause subordination. It is the god concept realized in self and is regarded as the source of self value. Fame is setting apart and adulation and simply another manifestation of subordination to enhance the feeling of self value. This scenario has numerous drawbacks. First, everyone can't be a god and achieve self value in this manner. Second, even for those who achieve the god status, it doesn't work. No matter what successes they may achieve in the god concept values, the god concept itself always leaves them with a feeling of subordination and diminished self value. It's the pursuit of illusion; the pursuit of some undefined, mystical, and emotional goal that doesn't exist. The returns of such a pursuit are at best transient, shallow, and temporary, and at worst, not at all except to compound the feeling of inferiority and unworthiness because the efforts to alleviate these feelings always fail. The feeling goes with the god concept context. As long as one holds onto these beliefs and context, the feeling of self diminished and unworthy is certain to be a constant companion.

The natural self-interest questions that everyone consciously or unconsciously asks are: What do I want? Can it be achieved? If so, how? From an individual identity perspective, it is a straightforward proposition that recognizes limits, ends, and means in a noncontradictory sequence of thought. The god concept throws the whole thing into self conflict. Needed self value and self confidence is sought in the god concept that takes away these very things. Worst of all, while conscious mind may desire freedom and peace, the god concept denies the individual and freedom and sets a condition of rule as absolute. Thus in conflict and confusion, domination and suffering are valued and "peace" is pursued by means of war. Such is the nature of the god concept and the myth of altruism.

MIND MATTERS

CHAPTER XIV

THE ILLUSION OF CATEGORICAL IDENTITY (RACISM)

A category is subjective mental invention, not objective discovery. It is a mental grouping of entities or relationships on arbitrarily selected similarities. This fact is especially important in dealing with unique existent human individuals because specific volition, the root identity of each individual, defies categorizing. When dealing with a stack of concrete blocks, one block will do as well as any other for the purpose at hand. What is usually mentally lost in this type of action is the principles by which one block is selected from all the rest. It may appear to be instant and automatic knowledge, but it is not. It is the principled process of primary identity, the sine qua non of all knowledge. Given the beliefs generally held, it is not surprising to find that nearly all frequently disregard these principles and presume to begin their "reasoning" from a category.

Daily one hears or reads a constant barrage of language usage that posits a category (or other abstract) as a volitional, valuing being. Characteristics, attitudes, and beliefs are attributed to "Americans," "Germans," "Russians," or other "nationalities" as if all under the subjective arbitrary label constitute a "collective entity" of identical components. A newspaper columnist asks the question: "Are men superior to women?" The columnist receives many responses that presume to answer the question. This emotional response is so ingrained in most thinking, they ignore absence of identity and imagine they hold a valid answer to the question. Yet, if one were to ask each if all men and all women are the same, the likely answer received would be no. Also, what is the basis upon which they imagine a superior or inferior being? This popular anti-individual thinking and "common usage" language is cut loose from reality in every respect. Worse yet, every believer holds knowledge to know that it is not valid, but ignores it. There is no end to this confused thinking as it is evidenced again and again in "group identities," "infinite entities" of "nationality," gender, race, or any other similarity one randomly chooses as "identity."

This philosophy, epistemology, and mode of thought is nearly universally accepted without question. It is a derivative of the god concept that denies the

MIND MATTERS

principles of epistemology and identity. The ultimate consequence is the denial of the individual as the real and definitive reference for thinking. With the real finite individual psychologically negated, what remains to direct the mind is the illusion of “infinite entities.” These “infinite entities” are categories or other abstracts psychologically regarded as valuing, volitional beings. When I say that this mode of thought saturates our philosophical environment, I do not exaggerate. Indeed, as difficult as it may be to believe, the entire official governmental, socioeconomic system is set upon and dependent upon this backward epistemology and illusory infinite entities. Since it is the common and usually unquestioned mode of thought accepted by nearly all, it is evidenced not only in the official system, but in every part of every believer’s life. If one fails to heed the principles of identity, they not only fail to identify another individual, they also fail to know themselves. All are aware of many conflicts and problems on every level of interpersonal relationships, but few are aware of the underlying psychological and epistemological cause.

Racism is a topic frequently discussed and regarded by most as an important issue and problem in need of resolution. Some, on the other hand, such as members of a white supremacy group, see racism as a good thing. Since both of these factions are mentally dominated by the same epistemology and psychology, they inadvertently join forces to promote the natural corollary of such epistemology and psychology. In other words, those consciously trying to oppose racism continue to believe in and promote the underlying concepts of racism no less than those who consciously promote it. Racism under one label is applauded while the same thinking and same effect under a different label is condemned.

The question they fail to ask and answer is, what is racism? What is the radical of the concept? What is it when defined in the context of an objective reality and principled identity? Strangely enough, some frequently come very close to the answer, but are blinded to it by their dominant philosophy and backwards epistemology. From time to time, someone will say that each individual should be treated as an individual regardless of race. Then they follow it with the conclusion that this is the way to improve “race relations.” They see not at all the contradiction of such a statement, nor the self defeating horror of it. The point is that objectively, epistemologically, and definitively there is no such thing as “race relations,” for there is no such thing as racial identity. The concepts of racial identity and race relations are anti-individual and, therefore, are racism. So, how does one propose to end racism by promoting its root concepts that deny the real individual?

For those who subscribe to the idea of racial identity, I have a question: If yours was the only race on the earth, would you disappear into the sameness and cease to exist? This is a serious question with serious implications. If no is your answer to the question, then obviously your existence and identity is not depen-

MIND MATTERS

dent upon arbitrary racial designation. What does it (your identity) depend upon? If you look, I think you will find that your identity is a set of characteristics that only you possess. This is you, your individuality, and your identity. So, the crucial question is: Why would anyone want to trade their uniqueness of individuality and identity for the nothingness and non-identity of race or nationality?

A race is an arbitrary category based on arbitrarily selected similarities. It exists only in the mind. The real is each individual who is identified by a specific set of characteristics peculiar only to that individual and no one else. This is reality. The admonition to treat each as an individual is sound advice if one wishes to deal with reality. Although the core definition of racism is anti-individualism and not at all confined to skin color, it is this particular manifestation that is most highly visible and the focus of much attention. Given this fact and the fact that exposing the roots of racism in one area exposes the roots in all, let's examine the racism that is usually regarded as a "black vs white" issue.

Racism and slavery have been around for as long as all known history. The past era most relative to the current situation is that time period when black persons were brought from Africa (and elsewhere) and sold as slaves. Not only these specific captured and transported black persons, but generations derived therefrom were also considered chattel. They were bought and sold in the same fashion and with the same attitude as horses and mules. The surface attitude has changed in some degree in the minds of many since that time, but no one speaks of and questions the beliefs and motives that were the directives of that time of treating human individuals like livestock. Since these same beliefs are still around and still causing many problems, I believe a close look is well in order; indeed, mandatory if understanding is the goal.

Certainly, financial benefit was an incentive to own slaves. A "Lord of the Manor" ego trip no doubt also played some part in the decision and practice. This, however, does not explain the beliefs and ideology by which the slave owners "justified" claiming another individual as property. These same individuals did not claim white persons as property, so we must assume that black skin tied into their thinking in some manner. This was not always so, for there are many historical records that show that some white persons enslaved other white persons. Obviously, they had "justifiable cause" as well. Could there be a connection here? Is there a common belief, or common set of beliefs, that necessarily must accompany the "justification" of slavery?

From some of those historical records, we know that in some instances, slavery of one's own "kind", or group, was prohibited by the law of the day while all others were fair game. What beliefs and psychology does this indicate and how does it fit into the "justification" of slavery? Since slaves were made subordinate to their masters, there had to be and has to be a basis in belief for holding some as

MIND MATTERS

inferior beings; inferior beings being the necessary psychology for the instituting and carrying out of slavery. Where does a believer get the idea of superior and inferior beings? In formal religion, "God" is considered the supreme and ultimate "superior being." "God's will" and "divine values" are believed by many to be totally superior to the will and values of human beings. From this premise, anyone who believes in and adheres to these "divine values" is logically superior to those who do not. Sometimes this "higher position" is called "the chosen." Many times it is implied if not named directly.

It is of utmost importance to clearly grasp the underlying psychology and divided epistemology that results in the superior-inferior belief. By your own experience and your own conscious mind you can mentally view the mixture of fact and fiction, the psychological juxtaposition of fact upon fiction to produce the mythical superior-inferior being status.

If the end desired is to travel from Florida to New York in the least amount of time, as means, is an airplane superior to a bicycle? If the purpose, i.e., end desired, is to have and keep a healthy body, as means, is nutritious food superior to food sorely lacking in vitamins and other elements essential to good health? The point is, and it is a point you demonstrate thousands of times each day, is that the terms superior and inferior always refer to means evaluated in respect to a purpose, a goal.

In each of the examples given, it is understood that the purpose and goal in question is of an individualistic nature, a personal choice of end desired. Given the natural and logical connection between ends and means and the evaluation of means in this connection, what is the effect of positing a "universal goal?" Answer. In the beliefs and psychology of a "universal goal," "God's will," or any other alleged "objective and universal value," the mind regards a human individual not as an individual in itself, but as a means to the alleged universal goal. Whatever one's god concept beliefs may be, subordination of the individual as the means to an alleged universal goal is always the underlying directive psychology and "justification" for slavery or racism of any description.

In any event, since subordination is a logical derivative of any superior-inferior belief, we know with certainty that whenever a condition of slavery exists, there is a believed superior-inferior being condition. In very large part, the condition ties directly into formal religion. This should come as no surprise since literally every king who ever held power either directly or indirectly claimed the "right" via divine descentance or divine decree. "Lesser persons" merely adopted the premise and found "even lesser persons" they could dominate. However, formal religion is not essential for the slavery condition. All that is required are beliefs that psychologically set the superior-inferior relationship. Any belief or set of beliefs that are expressed or implied to come from something other than

MIND MATTERS

the subjective mind of an individual fills the bill no less than the same premise in formal religion where such beliefs and values are said to come from "God."

To grasp the anatomy of slavery, one must look at the belief directives that create the condition. We can easily do this by a look at some of the "justifying" arguments heard in the "old south" and still heard to this day. Intelligence is held in high regard by most, indeed, is commonly thought of as a mark of a "superior being." It makes no difference that intelligence is not a quantity and not subject to objective measurement, believers are quite certain that intelligence is an "objective value" and a competent yardstick by which to measure a person's superior-inferior status.

Believers have argued, and many still argue, that the black persons brought from Africa, and their descendants, are of lesser intelligence, ergo, inferior.

Part of this "proof" is that neither the "African" nor any other "black nations" ever developed a modern civilization with tall masonry buildings and other high tech creations. This they say is a "white accomplishment." This argument has a lot of flaws. First, I have no idea why a "high tech society" was not developed in those areas populated by black persons. It really doesn't matter, for if lack of intelligence to do so were a genetic trait, then no black person to this day would be capable of such a feat. Since there is much evidence setting aside this premise, we can dismiss lack of intelligence as a factor. Indeed, all we ever actually look at is the direction the intelligence takes, not how much of it exists as determined by what one chooses to value. In other words, whether one values or devalues high tech is a personal value judgment and certainly no objective criteria by which to imagine intelligence is measured. As for high tech creations being a "white accomplishment," if it is true that "intelligence" is genetic, then one may randomly select any white person or persons and have them invent the light bulb, put up a sky scraper, or navigate a space craft. Can any and every "white" do this? What does the answer do to the "white accomplishment" theory? The absurdity of the whole thing is easily seen by the implied declaration that every member of a particular race is "more intelligent" than any member of another race. As always, the truth of the matter comes down to real individual interest and individual accomplishment, not an illusory categorical entity.

Mr. Lincoln's decree ended the legal and official sanction of open slavery. He has received much credit for "freeing the slaves." What was Mr. Lincoln's motivation for this act? Did he and others have a sudden change in beliefs and find slavery "morally reprehensible?" I can find no evidence to support this conclusion. In fact, Mr. Lincoln promised in a political speech not to disturb the slavery situation below a specific parallel. His "change of heart" not so mysteriously coincided with a change of circumstance called war. "Freeing the slaves" was not an act of understanding or compassion. It was an act of military strategy and legis-

MIND MATTERS

tics.

The segregation that followed clearly revealed that there had been no noticeable change in beliefs and attitudes. The superior-inferior being philosophy was as evident as it had been in open slavery. Granted, there were a few individuals here and there who voluntarily sought to improve the condition by helping some black individuals. Even here, I must wonder about attitude and motivation. Was it a matter of recognizing the individual as an individual and discounting the idea of superior-inferior being? I much doubt it. Most likely, at least in most cases, such help offered was of a condescending nature; an attitude much like that which is seen in sympathizing with animals as inferior creatures in need of protection.

During the last four or five decades, lawfully sanctioned segregation has decreased greatly. Why? Is it a matter of change in beliefs and attitude, or a matter of political expediency? Is it mere coincidence that the antisegregation legislation followed close on the heels of an increase in black voters? Did this factor combined with marches and other protests, sometimes violent, have anything to do with this great “humanitarian” change? Did racism diminish, or is it status quo racism much obscured by different labels and verbal declaration?

One of the most highly visible and controversial pieces of legislation to come out of all this was and is called “affirmative action.” The legal requirement is to hire X-percent of “blacks” and other “minorities.” What “affirmative action” affirms is blatant racism. When personal preference and individual merit is taken out of the equation, this is clearly anti-individualism, i.e., racism. The “affirmative action” psychology is not only evidenced in the job market, it saturates the socio-economic environment, including schools. “Minority status” often gains preferential treatment in the form of newer and better schools, better equipment, etc. Some children are deprived of equal opportunity for no other reason than not being a “minority,” i.e., for being white. If this isn’t racism, then what label do you put upon it? A most poignant question is, How does this obvious racism help in the alleged goal to end racism?

Contrary to all the posturing and talk about ending racism, the ideology of racism is as much revered today as it was in the “old south” and thousands of years beyond.

Believer’s, whether they be black, white, purple, or whatever, are not interested in ending racism. They seek only to gain advantage by it. Each seeks to be the “superior” in the “superior-inferior” relationship. They can conceive of no alternative and strive only to gain ego and economic stature by dominating the “inferior.” They play a foolish mind game that is certain to culminate in violent conflict wherein all are certain to lose.

It is literally impossible to resolve a problem wherein the context is the problem. This is precisely the condition that presently exists. The prevailing anti-

MIND MATTERS

individual psychology and philosophy proposes to divide reality into two segments of equal content, and then by different labeling and attitude pretend a difference that doesn't exist. If one says, "I am proud to be white," denigrating all nonwhites, it is frowned upon as unacceptable racism. On the other hand, if one says, "I am proud to be an American," denigrating all non-Americans, the remark is applauded as valued patriotism. To simultaneously promote and destroy an idea is a contradiction. It can't be done. Either the promoting of racism or the destroying of it will prevail. I believe we know which prevails at this time, and pursuing the contradiction will inevitably result in escalation of the racism they imagine they seek to end.

In the anti-individual environment, "group identity" has always been and still is a value held by most. One often hears proud talk about "national" or "cultural heritage." In an epistemology, psychology, and philosophy that denies the individual, what remains for "identity" and "self value," except the "group?" Let us not forget that we are also in an atmosphere of the "superior-inferior being" ideology. The "being" is "group being" and the struggle to gain the superior status is a foregone conclusion. So is the animosity between "groups." Religious denominations, national denominations, racial denominations, gender denominations, whatever. Literally every "group identity" is inherently antagonistic to every other "group identity." Please do not jump to the conclusion that I am opposing group activity per se. Much can be and is accomplished by a few or many joining forces to put up a building, build airplanes, go bowling, or a million other things. However, do not confuse "group doing" with "group being." The former is the interaction of individuals. The latter denies that such individuals exist.

In the present time, the black-white racism pendulum has, in many instances, swung nearly full cycle. Are the laws favoring blacks due to assumed inferiority, needed help, or needed advantage, or is it a declaration of superiority that receives such favoritism by law? All-black beauty contests and other such segregated activities abound. An all-white beauty contest would surely raise much outcry and be labeled racism, but no such label is attached to "all black" activities. One hears again and again the reverence for "African heritage." For many black persons, it is identity and being itself. I hear not a word of protest about all the efforts to promote "black identity." Yet, when members of the Ku Klux Klan do the same thing in promoting "white identity," millions arise in protest. Why? What do we have here except the "proud white" - "proud American" contradiction under a different label? What I am pointing out is highly visible, yet only a few see and fewer still mention it. Most are simply at a loss as how to handle the situation. In the meantime, the division and hostility builds.

The coin of black-white racism has two sides. Both sides are bogus for they are stamped of fallacy. During a TV interview, one well-dressed, erudite black man remarked, "We have been enslaved for over 300 years." Who the "we" is, he

MIND MATTERS

didn't specify, but I think it is clear that he referred to "blacks." The inference is that there is some eternal "black entity" that defies nature and continues in the form of black itself. Thus did he see himself in this form and felt the part of the victim. It follows from the "victim status" that he felt deserving of recompense. It follows from the "black identity" that he blamed "white identity."

Another black man on the same program stated, "Whenever I hear that a crime has been committed, I pray that the perpetrator is not black." Why? What difference does it make what color the skin of the perpetrator? Obviously, this black man felt guilty because of the act of another black person. The first black man attributed guilt on the basis of skin color, while the second accepted guilt on the basis of skin color. Both responses deny the reality of the individual, individual volition, and individual responsibility. Thus this entire scenario of attributing and accepting guilt is derived from the illusion of categorical identity.

By no means is the thinking and feelings of these two black gentlemen an isolated incident. Indeed, it is a clarifying microcosm of nearly all thinking and feelings. The illusion of categorical identity is not a respecter of skin color or any other physical trait. The illusion exists in most minds as part and parcel of the encompassing and "unquestionable" belief system of nearly all. Make no mistake about it, racial bias is inherent in every god concept philosophy. It may be suppressed or repressed, but its there and influences thinking, including the making of laws and jury decisions. If race is your "identity," would you not be somewhat inclined to favor "yourself?" I trust that it is clear that not only am I talking about every race, but every nationality and all other "group identities" as well.

Most white persons remain silent about the "all black" racism described above for two reasons: 1. They really don't understand the situation, but fear being labeled a racist if they object to the pursuit of "black identity." 2. Since they also subscribe to the illusion of categorical identity, they feel "white guilt" no less than the black gentlemen felt "black guilt" for the actions of another. To be sure, a white person may consciously conclude that the black man who claimed to be enslaved was not, nor is one responsible for what some distant relative or a member of the race may have done hundreds of years ago. No matter. Accepting the illusion of categorical identity is accepting the "group identity" feelings that go with it - even if conscious mind says it is untrue. (I strongly suspect that many white persons involved in "black causes" are motivated by the feeling of "white guilt," but rather than admit it and try to understand, they go out of their way to "prove" that they are not racist.)

Want to end racism? The answer is elementary and highly visible. It is individual identity and individualism. Not only is this the end of racism, it takes care of just about every other social problem as well.

MIND MATTERS

CHAPTER XV

LAW AND DISORDER

“We are a nation of laws, not men” is an often heard phrase. What does it mean? If the laws are not created by men (or women), then, apparently, they are discovered. What is their source? In Christian mythology, Moses is handed “The Law” by the omni god. Is this the alleged source of the laws “not of men?”

We are all admonished to “obey the law.” Never mind that “American law” exists only by not obeying “British law.” Nor is there any mention of the fact that more murders have been committed inside the law than outside. Nevertheless, we are told and told again to “obey the law.” Suppose it can’t be done? Then what?

First, if you are to obey “The Law,” you must first understand it. Second, if you are to obey a law, this law cannot be contradicted by another law lest you break “The Law” in obeying a law. Do you know of and understand every law on the books? If not, how do you know at any time that you are not breaking the law, or know that contradictions do not make it impossible to obey “The Law?”

Reverence for “The Law” is just another element of the sacred idea regarded by believers as immune to questioning. Setting aside all the implied mystical causes, “The Law” is simply the personal preference of an individual, or individuals, given “official status” and imposed by the dominant physical force in a particular geographical area, or all geographical areas as in “international law.” “The Law” is synonymous with governmental system, which in turn is synonymous with initiation of force and coercion. All the while, its declared purpose is protection of “rights” and the maintenance of peace and order. Thus the underlying rationale of “The Law” is the implementation of initiation of force and coercion to prevent initiation of force and coercion. Since government exists only by the denial of the individual, the actual effect of the self-contradictory base premise is negation of individual rights with the consequence of “Law and Disorder.”

Most think of “The Law” as opposing and discouraging fraud, theft, and murder and regard it as a protector of individual rights. If they think of the thousands of regulatory laws at all, it is usually with an attitude that these laws are protection as well. They fail to see the actual contradictory base premises and derivative

MIND MATTERS

contradictions that reveal that “The Law” is not what they imagine it to be. Laws are the plaything of the “gods.” Do not imagine the “gods” that create the laws will be bound by them. That which is forbidden to you is the directive and sacred duty of the “gods.” If you believe there are laws against theft and murder, look again. These laws are merely to keep some “state property” from destroying other “state property.” If in doubt, try to withdraw from the system. Just declare your life as your own. If you refuse to pay taxes or refuse to abide by numerous other laws prohibiting you from exercising your non-imposing choice, you will quickly discover that the imagined omni protector is in reality finite individuals ready and willing to use whatever force is necessary to bring you back into the fold; whatever force necessary meaning punishment or death.

The thousands upon thousands of regulatory laws administered by the personnel of thousands of bureaucratic departments not only creates a huge burden of administrative and enforcement costs, the sole purpose of these laws and departments is to favor the personal preference of some over others. In the name of protection, these regulations oppose the subjective value principle of market and promise to destroy it. Favoritism and nothing else is the singular purpose and function of “The Law,” economic, regulatory, or otherwise. The illusion that the “government guardians” are honest and competent whereas those they regulate are not is the only belief that supports economic regulation. It’s all part of the god concept which ascribes to “gods and governments” “virtuous qualities” not found in any of the individual parts.

As always, to grasp an aspect of reality, an entity, or a relationship, it must be differentiated and viewed in contrast. What is in contrast to “The Law?” Non-law, of course. Since this is regarded by nearly all as not possible and not an alternative, there is no single word in “common usage language” to denote and connote the circumstance of which I speak. Since this idea is opposed to “The Law” and the practice of such is prohibited by “The Law,” we shall have to content ourselves with a hypothetical view; a hypothetical situation with all the ingredients of reality that are denied in and by the official governmental system of “The Law.”

Remember this is a hypothetical situation with specific given premises. The central premise is individual volition. Please do not speculate as to what “people might do” and fail to follow the principles. What “people might do” is equating potential with actual and denying the element of individual choice. This implicit blanket indictment of volition via the innate evil syndrome is precisely what is to be viewed in contrast, not incorporated in a social existence of individualism, freedom, and non-law.

Suppose there are only two individuals on the earth. Can each choose not to impose his personal preference upon the other by initiation of force and coercion? In other words, choose to live by the social premise of self-ownership? Is

MIND MATTERS

this possible? Can each make the choice of the philosophy of self-ownership? Let's up the number to 20, to 200, to 2000, or to any number of persons. Are the same options still available to each? Whatever the number, let's now suppose that all reject the god concept and everything it expresses and implies. This means that each recognizes himself and each of the other individuals as the real. This identity, the individual, is the basis for thinking and is always held in focus in social existence no matter what form of organization or independent action each may choose.

The operational social premise is self-ownership. The only prohibition is one individual (or some) imposing their will and personal preferences upon another or others. What word do I use here? The term, law, by denotation and connotation is offensive force and doesn't fit this circumstance. Anyway, in this no name circumstance, the singular question to be answered is whether a given act does or does not impose upon another individual or individuals. This is the only social issue of possible conflict and the only social issue to resolve. It's that simple. Keep in mind that individualism is a whole different set of values than the values of anti-individual beliefs. While this does not guarantee Utopia, the reference, real finite individual, and the base premise of self-ownership provides an easily seen reference by which to peacefully resolve any conflict of opinion that might arise. Also, do not forget that we're talking about an attitude dedicated to the reality of individualism and held as the highest value by each individual. To sustain and maintain this priority value, each will bend a long way if necessary to keep the peace and harmony. Money and power at all costs is not part of this philosophy. In the philosophy of individualism and freedom, one does not engage in theft, fraud, or pollute the air and water for wealth and power. An individualist does not refrain from such acts because of some external mandate but because he knows that such actions will certainly destroy his highest priority value, a life of voluntary cooperation and peace.

Now look at the god concept society in contrast. Each of the individuals denies himself even as he seeks the holy grail of money and power and proposes to dictate the values and behavior of all other persons. In no way am I opposing the non-coercive accumulation of wealth; nor do I presume to decide how much is too much. I refer to money and power as a revered value in the control of individuals. I refer to the money and power syndrome as a widely accepted symbol and mark of "superiority." Make no mistake about it. Money and wealth are major factors in creating "The Law." The superior-inferior-being anti-individual values that are the logical derivative of the god concept are the operational directives, i.e., "The Law." This is the current system that winds up with thousands of bureaucratic departments, thousands of volumes of "The Law," legions of administrators, lawyers, and judges all lost in a nightmare of contradiction and chaos. What's worse, they imagine that it makes sense. How did things get into such a mess?

MIND MATTERS

Can the cause be anything other than the thinking that brought it about and sustains it? Since the U.S. Constitution is the “law of the land,” let’s look at the thinking behind it starting with the “revolution” and Declaration of Independence.

After prolonged confrontation and conflict in the year 1776, certain individuals took it upon themselves to denounce and overthrow “British rule” administered by King George and Company. They drew up a long list of grievances and justifications and proceeded to declare the “United States” an “independent nation.” With this document, it was made clear that they considered it a duty of the citizens to overthrow a tyrannical government (as if there is any other kind). However, I duly note that even as they named this a duty, they made it unlawful to advocate the overthrow of their ideas. In any event, our primary interest here is the thinking that served to establish the operational basis for the “new independent nation.” They wrote: “We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these, are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That, to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed; ...”

If “these truths” are “self-evident,” “rights inalienable,” and all consent to be governed, then behavior is already determined. What then is the purpose of the compulsory force called government??? Apparently, there is considerable disagreement over the “self-evident truths” and “inalienable rights.” Why? What’s the problem in this thinking that is reflected in “The Law?” It doesn’t take any stretch at all to conclude that “The Law” is “God’s will” and “rights” are privileges bestowed by the “Creator.” Where is the real finite individual in this scenario? How are these “self-evident truths” and “divinely created inalienable rights” premises going to work in practice? To get an idea, randomly select any two believers and have each draw up a list of “inalienable rights” that “God intended.” Now figure out how these conflicting “rights” of just two are to be implemented. Multiply this by the millions of believers and you begin to understand why and how thousands of laws about “lawful rights” are the source of conflict, not the solution.

Legislators, judges, lawyers, and all other purveyors and defenders of “The Law” are so caught up in and so mentally dominated by the god concept, they are completely oblivious to the fact that they have left real individuals out of their deliberations. Having left real individuals out of their thinking, there is no objective anchor, no common frame of reference by which to make and administer “The Law.” “The Law” is without identity, and therefore, without definition. It shows. The word, interpretation, appears often in reference to court decisions, as it must for “The Law” is without objective reference and is undefined. “Interpretation” is a euphemism for personal preference and emotional dictates. Robed judges, well dressed lawyers, and others go through the ritual of administering law and “dis-

MIND MATTERS

pensing justice” fully convinced of the rightness of their thinking and the sanctity of their professions. They propose to uphold the “right to do” and “the right to be done unto” with no notice of the contradiction.

The “right to be done unto” (“freedom to rule”) naturally carries the “right to compel.” Outside the official governmental system, economic gain by initiation of force or the threat of it is called robbery. Within the system, it is called “justice.” There is no law against larceny, only against independent larceny. In any event, since most regard government as an omni god and inexhaustible manna, they fail to see that a system wherein 250 million people propose to make a living by stealing from each other doesn’t have much of an economic future.

Nevertheless, the grab game goes on and on. Each and every believer, if not looking for a direct handout, wants “government” to allocate funds to his or her personal interest and project. Naturally, the sales pitch is made in the name of “public welfare” or similar “infinite entity” beneficiary. I observe that this pitch is more successful if made by a lobbyist for the “money people.” This is especially so if combined with the spiel of saving jobs by saving economic failures. Lockeed, Penn Central, and Chrysler are three of many that come to mind.

The “right to compel” is not restricted to economics. Compulsion is abundantly used in a perpetual effort to make all conform to the “objective natural standards of morality.” Ergo, the base purpose of “The Law” is to stamp out the “crime of individualism.” The umpteen thousands of laws forbidding non-invasive, i.e., non-imposing choice leaves no logical doubt of this intent.

Overflowing jails and prisons are evidence of the “good work” of the vice squads, i.e., “the morality police.” Many of those imprisoned are there for violating laws concerning “controlled substances.” In typical backward governmental fashion, cause is attributed to an inanimate object. The terminology employed is to deny that what is controlled is the individual. As usual, they propose to resolve a psychological problem with physical force. Many years and billions of dollars later, the absurdity of the approach is clearly evident, but they push on.

If someone for nonmedical purposes takes a mind altering drug, it is rather obvious that they prefer the altered state of mind. If this is a problem, isn’t the logical approach an effort to find out what the unaltered mental state is and why the altered state is preferred? One often hears the “reason” for drug usage is that he takes drugs to escape reality. The truth is, in the confused god concept mind world of mind-dividing “objective values,” “superior-inferior beings,” and general chaos, few ever get a look at reality. Drugs may well be a means to escape the mental torment of non-reality. What is virtually certain is that laws and physical force will never solve the problem.

Presently, there is much concern about the large number of violent crimes, and the increase in many areas. What are they doing except acting as they have

MIND MATTERS

been taught? Are they not emulating their teacher and acting upon the same values? Is it any wonder that efforts to stamp out these independent acts of violence fail? The fact that "The Law" exists side by side with the condition of violent crimes is evidence enough that "The Law" does not work to prevent this circumstance. It is worthy of note that "The Law" not only exists physically side by side with the violent crimes, it, as indicated above, also exists philosophically side by side. It is a situation of power vs power and nothing else. The dominant power is "The Law," but the elusive power is non-law, i.e., nonofficial law. The issue is not the use of offensive force per se, but the regulation of the use of offensive force. It is an effort to prevent the use of offensive force not sanctioned by "The Law." As deterrent, "The Law" offers the proposition of punishment for violating "The Law." However, effectiveness depends on several factors, not the least of which is swift and certain punishment. Given the confusion of "The Law," this "deterrent" is neither swift nor certain; nor does it take into account the psychology of the violator who will often pursue the value of power and dominance regardless of the risk.

Since "The Law" presumes to impose upon others (although most agree to the system), it is certain to encounter opposition at every turn whether in economic regulation or dealing with "street crime". Given the compounding nature of regulation and the necessary increase in means of enforcement, eventually the system will break down from the pure mass of the situation. The contradictions, confusion, and emotional "interpretations" of "The Law" assures an ever expanding increase in the use of offensive physical force and an ever expanding increase in the absurdity of it.

With "lawful rights" referenced only to feelings, chaos is a foregone conclusion. One individual may go to jail for using or dealing in a "controlled substance" while a mass murder is turned loose because the arresting officer neglected to "read him his rights." A serial killer is found "innocent by reason of insanity" and draws Social Security Disability Payments paid for in part by the friend and family of the victims. A conviction for theft of millions is overturned because of "unreasonable search and seizure of evidence." Law suits are often a legal extortion game surpassing the lottery as a chance to get rich quick. A prison inmate sues on the grounds that denial of cable TV is "cruel and unusual punishment." These things are part of the daily news scene and I need not list more here.

What is abundantly clear to everyone is that "equality under the law" may be a noble sentiment, but in practice is nonexistent. Derived from the god concept thinking and couched in non-definitive language usage, emotional interpretation of "The Law" is the "standard" of application. Add to this the absurd cost of legal action and "The Law" is out of economic reach of all except the rich and the indigent that receive "free counsel." To be rather blunt, "The Law" is a self-contradictory unfunny joke.

MIND MATTERS

CHAPTER XVI

NOBODY'S FAULT

By mind principles, if it is believed consciously or subconsciously that an omni god exists, then it must also be believed that the omni-god is controlling the universe. Within this belief is the belief that the omni god must logically and necessarily be responsible for everything. One need not subscribe to formal religion to hold this belief. It is evidenced in every instance of an expressed or implied "infinite entity" and corollary "objective values." "Free will under God" is a conscious declaration to absolve "God" of guilt for the "creating of evil man" and all derived therefrom. Subconsciously, the logical inference that "God" is responsible is the directive belief.

The god concept psychologically negates real individuals. The psychological negation of the real individual has a corresponding negation of individual responsibility. Since the god concept to which responsibility is assigned is illusory, this leaves no one as responsible. This "divine miracle" culminates in the conclusion of effect without cause. Although I know of no one who would consciously make such a claim, this belief is manifest from top to bottom in the prevailing philosophy. The blatant contradiction is simply obscured by word games and ignored.

In the geographical area called the United States, the official governmental system is sometimes called a constitutional republic, democracy, representative form of democracy, or majority rule. Since it takes the form of election and selection, the concept of majority rule is central to the process. What is majority rule? One thing that majority isn't is an entity. Majority is an idea. The term majority means one more than half the total of a given number. In this case, a given number of human individuals. Since majority is not an entity nor a causal thing in itself, we know right away that majority rule is an illusion. What is the truth of the matter?

First, observe that the concept of majority rule as an operational premise in effect states that the agreeing opinion and common desire of two shall prevail over the third. Thus is the dissenting third regarded as property of the two. This idea is a little unsavory to some, so it is obscured and qualified by the phrase

MIND MATTERS

“constitutional republic” (or some other phrase) of “guardian laws” to temper the unpleasant truth. The question of how this constitutional republic came to be is ignored. Its “majority rule” base is disregarded by word games of convenient omission.

In any event, when the majority rule idea is put into practice in the official governmental system, it creates a circle of floating abstracts as “causal infinite entities” and real individuals and individual responsibility is not to be found anywhere in the entire scenario. A legislator is elected by “majority” heralded as “the will of the people.” He makes laws for the “public welfare.” They are implemented by “public servants” for the “good of society” and in the “national interest.” Notwithstanding argument to the contrary, the implementation of these laws is by initiation of force and coercion. However, duly note that although all the laws are made by “abstracts” for “abstracts,” the initiation of force and coercion is directed not at abstracts, but real individuals. Wherein lies the responsibility for creating and implementing these coercive laws? If there is effect, there must be cause. What is it? Or who is it?

Let’s look at a hypothetical illustration in pursuit of the answer. Suppose that an individual sees the governmental system as ultimately destructive and wants nothing to do with it. This individual wants nothing via the system and doesn’t want to support any of the destructive activities carried out under the auspices of the god called government. Suppose this individual refuses to pay taxes. This individual does not steal nor impose his will upon anyone else. He simply wants nothing to do with the destructive governmental system. What happens if this individual won’t voluntarily submit the tax monies that it is claimed that he owes?

First, let’s examine the concept that he “owes” tax monies and try to find out how he came to “owe.” If this individual didn’t enter into voluntary agreement to support the ideas and implementation of the system called government, on what basis is it claimed that this individual “owes?” A corollary question is: “owes whom?” The answer usually given is that he “owes” the “government” and we’re right back to the popular illusion of valuing “abstract infinite entities.” Let’s take a different tact and see if we can find out how this money came to be “owed” and who is to be the recipient.

Suppose this individual approaches every finite human individual in the United States and ask each individual, “Do I owe you money?” Suppose that in every instance he receives the answer, “No.” From what then comes the argument that he “owes” money? Here we have literally 100% of the individuals saying as individuals that he does not owe, yet via the magical governmental system and “divine abstracts,” the 100% no’s become a yes upon threat of life and limb. Suppose this individual refuses to accept the declaration that he “owes,” physically resists, and is killed in a hail of gunfire. Wherein lies responsibility? The one that

MIND MATTERS

pulled the trigger is “just doing his job according to law and for God and Country.” Those that made the law made it because it is the “will of the people.” The lawmaker exists by “majority rule.” Literally no participant in the sequential action accepts responsibility. All is in the name of the non-entity’s nonexistent abstracts. No individual responsibility. Thus do we have the miracle of effect without cause.

One often hears that a particular politician won the election by a majority of 10 votes, 100 votes, and so on. This bit of language distortion and illusion helps to sustain the illusion of no individual responsibility. Majority is one more than half a given total. One. That is the truth of elected by “majority.” If a politician is elected by only one vote over half, which vote elected him, you might ask. Wrong question. Each vote, each one elected him. This may not fit emotions, but it is quite true. Any argument that proposes to excuse any one as cause simultaneously excuses each one as cause. Thus do we arrive once again at the miracle of effect without cause - as predicted via the god concept at the outset. To take the issue of cause and responsibility a step further, whether one votes for a given politician or not, support of the system itself definitively places each and every voter and supporter as responsible for every act committed via the system. This truth may not be emotionally palatable, but by identity, it is logically inescapable. (Voters are fond of saying that if you don’t vote, you have no “right” to complain. Exactly backward, of course.)

The god concept system is a system of rule predicated upon a hierarchy of command. Although the hierarchy of command is evident throughout, it is epitomized in the military organizations that openly places it up front as the revered operational premise. To disobey a direct order of a superior officer is a serious crime subject to severe punishment. It may be argued that a military organization can operate in no other way, that individual decisions would result in chaos and destroy military effectiveness. Aside from the fact that one may find himself in the order-taking position without volunteering for it, notice that the “merit” of this argument depends on admitted denial of self and denial of self-responsibility. This should come as no surprise since this is the root premise of the god concept and rule which gives rise to the “necessity” of the military force and “justification” of conscription or confiscation of property for “the cause.”

All the way down the line, the individual is left out of the scene except as an expendable unit to be sacrificed for the “good of god and country.” In this god concept thinking and system, the words “individual responsibility” are randomly and arbitrarily applied for the convenience of the moment in assigning of guilt to some while absolving other no less causal parties. A trial of “war criminals” or similar proceedings is a scapegoat maneuver designed to create an illusion of different philosophies where no fundamental difference exists.

MIND MATTERS

The psychological negation of the individual, individual volition, and individual responsibility is repeatedly evidenced in an infinite variety of applications. In economics, corporations and bankruptcy laws are clearly a means of denying and lawfully evading individual responsibility. On the “crime scene,” a thief may be “excused” because of his background and for being a “product of society.” While not denying environmental influence, this premise leads backward to affix responsibility to the “original sin” in a “mind world of infinity.” If responsibility lies not with each individual, it lies nowhere. “Nobody’s fault” is the absurd and destructive legacy of the god concept.

Violent behavior is also frequently attributed to a “chemical imbalance” in the brain. Yet, no one attempts to explain how one can act against one’s beliefs, or how chemicals create beliefs independently of individual volition. Then comes the “genetic propensity” for the “disease” of alcoholism or other “drug dependencies.” In this prevailing “no fault” philosophy, there is literally no belief or action that is not excusable on the grounds of non-volitional cause. Currently in vogue is the catch-all exoneration, “addiction.”

The term addiction has been around for a long time, but in recent years has become the catch all buzz word alleged to justify, not explain, a wide assortment of behavior. Whether it is the consuming of food, alcohol, cocaine, or other substances, or active pursuit of other interests, including sexual interest, there are those quick to attach the label addiction. They then talk about treating the problem of addiction without defining and saying exactly what it is they propose to cure.

“Genetically disposed” is an expression also currently in vogue and alleged to be the underlying cause of certain “addictions” to particular substances and even to cause “abnormal behavior.” Everything is conveniently packaged under some label of genetic determinism, or “neuro values.” Treatment, of course, necessarily requires genetic alteration or chemical additives as behavior modifiers.

What is truly incredible in this scenario is the selectivity in these conclusions. What is the most highly visible genetically caused characteristic of literally every human individual??? Answer. Volitional mind, of course. Yet, this natural genetically caused capacity to calculate and make choices is left out of their equations. To mention it would call for some explanation of how one reconciles the idea of predeterminism (or “chemical thought”) with individual volition. Since the contradiction can’t be logically reconciled, it is simply ignored.

I certainly am not saying that genetic makeup plays no part in an individual’s life. What I am saying is that one element of genetic composition does not and cannot negate another element of genetic composition, even if that derivative of genetic composition is a nonphysical phenomenon called mind. To express or imply the negation of volition via a “neuro tech” diagnosis and prognosis is a de

MIND MATTERS

facto denial of mind itself. To presume to study and understand the mind by a method which denies its existence is a contradiction of the first magnitude that portends adverse and most serious consequences.

I dare say that we are all creatures of habit in large measure. Do we not all repeatedly engage in eating, drinking, bathing, sleeping, and routinely pursuing our individual interests on a regular basis? If body and mind become accustomed to certain pleasant experiences, it follows that cessation of these experiences will be accompanied by discomfort. There is nothing mystical about this. It's a natural part of the human condition. Isn't this really the crux of the fiction of addiction?

To be sure, mind and body may undergo some rather drastic changes if certain substances are consumed. The changes may well register as pleasant and cessation of intake of the causal substance will result in discomfort. How is this fundamentally any different from the eating, drinking, bathing situation described above? Isn't everything "addictive?" Many persons smoke or imbibe alcoholic beverages on a daily basis, sometimes for decades. Then one day, for whatever reason, a person decides to quit - and does. Obviously in these cases, "addiction" was servant to volition and was summarily dismissed. Are we now to believe that some are addicted and some not although all evidence the same natural capacity to calculate and choose? Perhaps, the real problem is "addiction" to illusion.

MIND MATTERS

CHAPTER XVII

THE FEAR OF FREEDOM

I stated near the beginning of the book that the conclusions and beliefs to be presented are the essence of simplicity and highly visible - and so they are. Literally every scrap of demonstrated knowledge is via the principles of epistemology. The principles of language usage is a matter of elementary logic in reference to purpose and requirements to achieve the purpose. Categorical identity is an illusion easily exposed. Do you know anyone who would argue that persons of the same hair color, skin color, gender, or any other similarity are merely duplicate units without individual identity? The concept of “infinite entities” upon which the official socioeconomic system is dependent is a fallacy that is also easily exposed. Yet nearly all subscribe to these anti-reality beliefs and cling to them with total dedication. Indeed, we must conclude that such dedication to contradiction must necessarily be derived from a powerful and controlling emotion. What is it? What is excluded by the beliefs? Answer. Individualism and freedom. Herein lies the answer. Fear of freedom is the dominant emotion.

If one listens to the claims, one is led to the conclusion that freedom is the most cherished value of all individuals. However, if one listens to the words that are alleged to express this “freedom” and looks to the actions as well, one is led to a far different conclusion. Rather than freedom being the highest value sought by most, it is their deepest and most abiding fear. So much so that they can’t even envision it.

Where and when the fear of freedom began is lost in historical antiquity. There is no known record of any group of individuals living in a social circumstance of freedom. Perhaps it all began with the origin of the thinking individual whose desires and fears far outweighed capacities to satisfactorily handle them. The individual invented a god to compensate for inadequacies. Ironically, the psychological “savior” was self-defeating in that it decreased the necessary reliance on self and set a condition of rule; a condition of inevitable intrapersonal and interpersonal conflicts certain to exacerbate the very fears and problems that initially prompted the mental invention. Whatever the time and reason for the aban-

MIND MATTERS

donment of self to a “ruling mental invention,” the psychology was passed from generation to generation. In this day, it is clearly evidenced in formal religion and in every present antisocial governmental structure. We are all born into this anti-freedom environment. In this circumstance, it is a matter of individual choice whether to blindly and passively accept the anti-freedom philosophy and anti-self psychology or to consider the “unthinkable.” It is highly unlikely that there will be any mass movement into the realm of freedom. Most will go on pretending as they have been programmed to do. The pretense is a substantial barrier, for there is no greater deterrent to freedom than an illusion of it.

The programmed and accepted mode of thought itself tends to discourage inquiry and understanding. If one attempts to grasp the whole and find instant and total solution for all the violent behavior throughout the world, one is overwhelmed by the vastness of it. When the mind seeks sense of order, it is thrown into disorder by trying to envision an instant and universal solution. Solution lies in self. Self-recognition and self-determination via the conscious mind and reality. Although one may not “save the world,” neither does one have to accept the self-condemning and debilitating beliefs that are the accepted “norm.” As stressed throughout this book, the real is self and self is the focus of reality. Universal plan and individualism are diametrically opposed and can neither be merged in the mind nor practiced outside of the mind. Looking for and demanding a universal plan before advocating freedom is a contradiction. The goal to be achieved is the psychology of freedom. The rewards of a free mind will follow.

As shown above, the truth is highly visible and extremely simple. Indeed, the whole thing can be stated in one sentence. It all comes down to entity identity via limitation and difference and recognition of the individual as the real. That’s it. When this elementary criteria is ignored and the mind presumes to conclude upon “infinite entities,” the mind is divided against itself and everything is mentally turned from front to back and violent chaos ensues.

It is unpleasant to be encompassed by the psychological and physical manifestations of this insanity, but it is a thousand times worse to be mentally a part of it; to have one’s own mind divided against itself and unknowingly manipulated by emotional dictates of the god concept and illusory objective standards of judgment of self and others. It doesn’t have to be. Its your choice. Its your life. Who’s living it?