



Send Us Your Article

Our Country is the World, our Countrymen are all Mankind.

TheLiberator.us

Date: 6/3/2023 Edition 5. Main Editors: Cory Edmund Endrulat, William H. Douglas

What's "Wrong" With Most People?

By Imani P. Ulate

What is wrong with most people is that they do not want to be, do not like to be, and oftentimes cannot accept when they are wrong about something. Most people love to be right, but in many situations being right takes being wrong over and over again. Many people personalize and mischaracterize being wrong into an attack on their intelligence. This is because ***"the truth by its very nature wages war on lies and deception."*** - Mark Passio

This ego identification with the falsehood causes an inability to accept being wrong about it. This is at the root of peoples dogmatic religious belief in that which does not exist and never has, and that which is not happening and never has. In addition this causes people to not accept or "believe" that which does or has existed, or not to accept or believe that which has happened or is happening.

"There are two ways to be fooled: one is to believe what isn't true, the other is to refuse to believe what is true." - Soren Kierkegaard

That dogmatic religious belief is tied to perceptions, assumptions, worldviews and axioms-(a statement or proposition which is regarded as being established, accepted, or self-evidently true.) that inevitably lead to behaviors that lead to completely unnecessary suffering in the world for ourselves and others. Anyone who professes to care about truth vs lies, candor vs deception, should absolutely adore being wrong as it yields more ways to be right. Being wrong is a huge step toward affirming through negating.

Being wrong is not simply the opposite of being right, it is the polar opposite of being right. Being wrong is the lowest degree of being right and being right is the highest degree of being wrong. If intelligence is simply pattern recognition then being intelligent of how intelligence works has a great deal to do with accepting that **you will be wrong from time to time** and more importantly you will be wrong about extremely important things from time to time. In this way we can see how nurturing our ability to accept being wrong is the key to finding our way. This method of inquiry is called "apophatic inquiry" or affirmation through negation. Discovering what something is or was by familiarizing ourselves with all that it is not or was not is a very useful way to discover truth. Being wrong is part of the natural process of the scientific method. Many hypotheses are ultimately proven false. Refusing to accept information and truth simply because you were tricked into believing something or thought about it incorrectly will never make the truth of the matter void or invalid.

The great honor of humanity is for every capable human being to be able to use the scientific method to discover truth and its many variables and various practical applications. The dishonor of humanity is to willfully remain *ignorant* to the truth when it is adequately

presented. Being wrong is not a defamation of character. Refusing to correct oneself is the foundation of unintelligence, the ultimate wrong and the most profound personal and social shame. Accepting that you are wrong should be a very liberating experience. It should humble you, it should shock you. It should be similar to seeing something in the distance and moving closer to see it, being convinced that it's one thing, and then *realizing* that it's something totally different. There should not be the sensation of inferiority or stupidity. It is only stupid to insist on being wrong.

What does one gain from willfully denying truth as what it is? How does the wrong benefit those who experience cognitive dissonance when faced with the certain realization that they are wrong? What allegiances, obligations, or afflictions does one have with the content of that which is empirically false? As an example, hypothetically if a flat earth believer went into space and saw that the earth was a spherical cap; parallel to that the same scenario reversed with a person who believes the earth is "round" ultimately seeing it is "flat". Would either of these people on average be able to readily accept the magnitude of how vastly wrong they have been and have propagated to others oftentimes in heated debates and arguments. Why do people have an emotional attachment to their perceptions of what they perceive to be correct or incorrect?

The anti-idea that all opinions are equal to the truth is by its very nature logically fallacious. What makes someone intelligent is their ability to recognize complex patterns in relation to the incoming data they receive. What makes someone wise is their ability to use that very same pattern recognition software to do a diagnostic of their own pattern recognition software. In short the enlightened are masters of checking themselves.

"If you tell a lie big enough and keep repeating it, people will eventually come to believe it. The lie can be maintained only for such a time as the State can shield the people from the political, economic and/or military consequences of the lie" - The Big Lie allegedly attributed to Adolf Hitler. If this has any truth or validity to it (which it does) it is because most people despise being wrong. Since those same people are not likely to do any investigation (especially pre-internet), when the components of the truth are presented they will disregard the relevance of these components and variables. Ultimately those with unchecked egos will resist and resent being wrong. This is because they have invested a great deal of energy, contemplation, emotion, decision making, and more into their own identity based on absolutely nothing. If they admit without accepting that too many components and aspects of their lives are utterly contradictory and empirically false, then they will have to experience an involuntary ego death which for many is just as dreadful as them actually physically dying.

Most lies, deceptions, falsehoods, incorrect axioms, propagandized principles etc. for that matter (because they affect us all) are the direct consequences of certain individuals, institutions, groups, organizations, societies, and so-called leaders with deliberate actions to use their knowledge to gain a differential advantage over one another and over their perceived subordinates. These are the agencies and faculties of Supremacy. For this reason, willingly and willfully accepting and perpetuating false information causes harm to others and makes it an issue of Morality. We are free to believe what we want even if it is not empirically true precisely because that belief does not harm someone or violate their property. **Once that belief manifests into actions that violate the rights of man, the belief is rendered invalid, illegitimate and void.** Being wrong because you really mean it does not trump the calm, callous, casual truth of Reality and Morality. (*Evolvingseeds.com*)

Don't Care About Politics? I Don't Blame You!

By Cory Edmund Endrulat

Just because an individual may not care about politics does not mean they do not care. How we can blame them? Day by day, it only seems to divide people, leading to worldwide scenarios nobody likes or arguments which never conclude. Could we blame them, if all they want to do is live their life, have fun, be healthy, be happy? Well, these are the same things that I desire, and more times than not, it's also often what those in politics *claim* they desire. Yet, they feel, for the greater good, it is necessary to engage in politics in order to fulfill those desires. They thus may see politics as a *necessary evil* at times, where a sacrifice must be made by the common person going into a corrupt system to make everything better for everyone. But does it really work like that? Should those who don't like or don't care about politics just let these individuals take control of their lives, for such a presumed greater good?

The truth is, what I talk about and when I talk about this, it has nothing to do with politics. In fact, politics is just a game of sides and whose opinion gets to be imposed on another. **What I actually talk about has everything to do with morality and truth itself.** For could we blame an individual wanting to just live their life, if they were born in the world having no natural obligation to obey a government or engage in politics? And if an individual were constantly intruded upon by government, even just the littlest amount of money taken from him without his consent, is he not justified in trying to get away from politics every way he can? Let us see more why this is about morality.

If any tax is justified, would you personally take your neighbors money without their consent? If you wouldn't personally do it, what makes it right to say that other people can do it for you instead? Theft is theft, whether going by one name or another, it is taking property that does not belong to you. Yet, while we may claim we don't care about politics, the mass peoples of the world are being blindly stolen from, routinely and for nearly a third or more of their income, and for things they may not even support, as well as for the paychecks of those in government. And if you dare challenge such a system, you may be deemed a criminal, or at least perceived as unorderedly and immoral. Yet, legality isn't morality. **We each live in our own reality, our own lives, and if we want to live our own lives in peace, it's in knowing that,** to never get in anybody's business. The more you meddle with other people's lives, the more problematic everything becomes, as you may even justify the fact you are doing so and convince others that it is necessary, and then the argument becomes about how much one should meddle with other people's lives. But again, it's other people's lives. What gave us the right to mess with other people's lives in the first place?

This brings us to the belief system that so few people in the world know about: statism. This is why although I would never speak of politics, I have a moral obligation to share something that might be considered political by some, but because it isn't being shared anywhere else, and yet because it, **statism is the heart of politics, challenging it, is actually the total opposite of politics.** To understand this, we can apply this to ending chattel slavery of the past, it's a moral issue, though it could be political. Those who made it political were asking for changes in law, changes in government, justifying the system that ever maintained slavery, or steals people's wealth. Those who kept the moral cause, were educating their fellow man, justifying no theft or slavery. Those in politics had no power here because writing something down on a piece of paper and calling that law would not change hearts and minds, and reducing slavery by passing a law would still legitimize slavery. Whereas, those who promoted morality had no division, except with those in politics who

insisted that their rituals would be necessary; the moral abolitionists connected with the average individual and taught them something that everybody nowadays sees as natural to society, that is living without the need of slavery. While one could argue that some people may not care about either or that both actions were essential, one group of people were meddling with other people's lives, those in politics and the other group was not, the moral abolitionists. Meaning, if you did not care about the moral cause, you really did not have to care; but morality if true, you will come to learn. And sure enough, people did as the ideas were irresistible, like any good product in a free market. Politics on the other hand demands your compliance and involvement one way or another, otherwise it cannot persist and no politician would get their paycheck. Politics needs to enter your life, so no wonder why it can get annoying, or why people talk long about "how" it should enter your life. Yet, **nobody ever asks the question of if it ever needs to enter your life in the first place**, or if compassion rather than violence would be a better pursuit for education, i.e morality rather than legality.

And that's where I come in. Again, not to be political, but rather to remind you of who you are, a human being bound by no title, no position and no government; you have the free will choice to voluntarily participate in anything that you want in this life and nobody has the right to tell you what to do with your own life. If we apply this to all peoples, this is a moral teaching, which means you should not transgress on others freedom and ownership as well, you treat others the way you'd like to be treated and you learn how to treat yourself; you aren't just being told, your humanity is used, not robotic or childlike. **So what do I ask of you? Nothing.** Like the ancient Taoist wisdom of the true "master" being one not of force or how one may only abide to the way of the world, the tao, by acting without force.

Politics asks for much, coming to be more and more as people use it to their advantage, every law backed by violence, justifying the individual getting violated for the collective. Meanwhile, a world could work with a free market of ideas and solutions, as it mostly already does, but without government interference, businesses able to thrive and compete with each other for the best ideas to be found. Therefore, **the only thing I could ask is for you not to care about politics, as you may already do, and to simply stand on it firmly** to realize it has no place in society unless it is about voluntary community affairs, in which case, it's just society doing what it does best, like everything in nature, self-organizing.

Don't care about politics, care about truth; and this means, not just not caring about politics but rejecting politics completely. Without its rejection, it will continue to be more and more of an injection into our lives, where democide becomes continually the top cause of unnatural death. Death, if not concepts like love or morality, hopefully something you'd care about. And people do, because that's how society functions. Therefore, simply continue to learn, continue to teach as you may by mere living example, and you will help everybody. Real leaders emerge from people willingly emulating their actions. I'm not asking you to do anything new, simply recognize nature's authority rather than man as you would if you didn't go through the schooling system, simply see that politics is viewed to have an exception to the morality you yourself and most people have. Have fun, live life, but don't legitimize or give any credence to that which would hinder such for others, be it both, a criminal or government. **Thank you for not causing more of the problem, but thank you more, if you can never allow the problem.** If the latter seems difficult actionably, we'll get there together in time, with sharing our care for mere humanity.

The Necessity Of Noncompliance

By William H. Douglas

“But if anyone slaps you on the right cheek, turn to him the other also.” (Matthew 5:39)

“Doesn't matter what the press says. Doesn't matter what the politicians or the mobs say. Doesn't matter if the whole country decides that something wrong is something right. This nation was founded on one principle above all else: the requirement that we stand up for what we believe, no matter the odds or the consequences. When the mob and the press and the whole world tell you to move, your job is to plant yourself like a tree beside the river of truth, and tell the whole world – ‘No, you move.’” - Captain America (Amazing Spider-Man #537 by J. Michael Straczynski)

The purpose of violence is terrorism. It really is that simple. There is no fundamental difference between a growling dog and a person brandishing a club or a gun other than the latter walks erectly and has opposable thumbs. The purpose of each action is the same- to terrorize the one being threatened with violence to do what the one threatening violence demands be done. In short- “Do what I say or suffer!” **The State is therefore a terrorist organization because it is based on violence, and it uses violence or the threat of violence to compel obedience from the public.** To reiterate, the government uses terror, the fear of it and its power, to maintain control of society. That is, the government uses terrorism to control the public. Thus, the State is a terrorist organization.

Some will disagree with this arguing that their goal when using violence is to protect their home, property, or family. Likewise, they argue that the government’s goal is to protect the community, whether that be the local community or a national one. But to confess this is to concede the point. The government is a terrorist organization that can only “solve” the problems of society by the use of blunt force violence or the fear of it that their power inspires. **Is that truly any different than the dog’s motivations when it barks and bites?** Is it not also “protecting” its territory and its pups when it snaps and snarls at those it dislikes? Humans are never more animalistic than when using violence to secure their goals. As Gandhi said:

“I am not a visionary. I claim to be a practical idealist. The religion of nonviolence is not meant merely for the Rishis and saints. It is meant for the common people as well. Nonviolence is the law of our species as violence is the law of the brute. The spirit lies dormant in the brute and he knows no law but that of physical might. The dignity of man requires obedience to a higher law to the strength of the spirit.”

“I have therefore ventured to place before India the ancient law of self sacrifice. For Satyagraha and its off-shoots, non-co-operation and civil resistance, are nothing but new names for the law of suffering. The Rishis, who discovered the law of nonviolence in the midst of violence, were greater geniuses than Newton. They were themselves greater warriors than Wellington. Having themselves known the use of arms, they realized their uselessness and taught a weary world that its salvation lay not through violence but through nonviolence.”

“Nonviolence in its dynamic condition means conscious suffering. It does not mean meek submission to the will of the evil-doer, but it means the putting of one’s whole soul against the will of the tyrant. Working under this law of being, it is possible for a single individual to defy the whole might of an unjust empire to save his honor, his religion, his soul and lay the foundation for the empire’s fall or its regeneration.”

Gandhi starts off by dispelling the idea that nonviolence is utopian in nature. Of course, it isn't. **It is in fact eminently practical as the only means by which to bring true and lasting change to a society by transforming the hearts of the people within it.** Easy? No. Effective? Absolutely. And, of course, compared to violence, far more successful. Then he goes on to make the distinction discussed in *The Liberator 2 Edition 4* article, *The Importance of Nonviolence*. When we engage in animalistic behavior -violence- we degrade our humanity to the level of brute animals. We dehumanize ourselves. But we are not animals. As humans we are so much more than animals and are therefore capable of so much more than acting as animals in order to "solve" our problems.

We are capable of nonviolence, the only species capable of doing so in fact. **Violence is the opposite of civilization and humanity, nonviolence the essence of civilization and humanity.** Any deranged, rabid, mongrel mutt can bite its attackers back. Only humans can choose to be nonviolent in the face of violence. Only humans can reach the hearts and minds of others through suffering and love. Only humans can convert their enemies into their friends. We are fulfilling our possibilities as humans when we embrace and engage in nonviolence. And the power of that nonviolence to defeat even the greatest of enemies without incurring the terrible mutual slaughter of war, ironically makes those dedicated to nonviolence greater "warriors" than any of the greatest generals in history who could only accomplish what they did by incurring immeasurable destruction.

Then Gandhi makes a triumphant point about the power of nonviolence. **Nonviolence leads to noncompliance.** Violence ultimately is about submission and only ends when either one side submits to the other or both are destroyed. Having submitted to the ways of the world, they go the way of all the world. It is the lifeblood of statism ("state-ism") and all government oppression. Using the tools of oppression only makes you another oppressor, not a liberator. But nonviolence empowers its practitioners in a way that makes the State impossible. Because **the nonviolent resister cannot be terrorized by violence into engaging in the brutal game that justifies violence, the practitioner of nonviolence cannot be controlled by those in power.**

Instead of submitting either to the will of the oppressor or the terror of the oppressor's violence, by refusing to either obey or be terrified into obedience, nonviolence empowers the resister to refuse to obey those in power. This noncompliance delivers the resister from the system of the State's control and makes him or her more powerful than all the weapons of the State, combined. Though they may beat, cage, or kill you, they can never obtain your submission because you will not comply. Therefore, they have no power over you and you are free.

This is the power of turning the other cheek. In suffering, you absorb the violence of the State without submitting to its orders, laws, and/or commands. Instead, you refuse to comply and turn to it your other cheek. It too may be smote, but that is all the State can do. Having been smitten and still not terrified into submission, you are now free. **You have defied the State's only tool, terror, and it can no longer control you. All by you simply refusing to comply with its rituals of violence that justify terror and signal submission.** You are defiant, you do not back down. Nor do you play their game. Your spirit conquers the tyrant's will and in doing so, conquers the tyrant. And the law becomes impossible to enforce because you will not obey. Nonviolence and noncompliance by society therefore makes oppressive laws and oppressive government impossible.