

Masters & Slaves

The 45th Page

Just a few weeks ago, I had an instant urge to write a real “down to earth” introductory book on physics. Maybe it was because I was tutoring a student in science, and I was more than usually frustrated by her textbook. This new book I started, was the result of more than thirty years of experience, so it seemed that I would only have to organize the already floating thoughts in my head. Strangely, I decided to break the book down into individual thoughts with simple headings and let the sequence of problems organize itself. The whole thing went so well that just yesterday we got to the 45th page. I said “we”, because my son, Daniel, was typing it for me who became quite a whiz with the equations and graphics I needed. He already typed hundreds of pages for an earlier math text book and a short introductory physics book titled “Things That Matter”. And then, yesterday evening we had a fairly long conversation. He became tired, went to bed but I kept on thinking and realized that the same simplicity, I achieved in my physics book, is now ready in my head for the field of social lies. My frustration with the education system has been always part of a wider disgust with society in general. This new simplicity probably was spawned by watching Gary Zukav on Oprah four days ago. I watched the show on purpose because I hadn’t seen him on Oprah for a long time, and somehow I had a faint hope that maybe he realized how absurd his association with the show, especially with the rise of Dr. Phil, as a new “star” of Oprah. But I was wrong. Zukav wrote a new book, which he introduced on the show, called “The Seat of the Soul”. He continued on his “new age journey”. Somehow this new level of phoniness made me realize how the audience is hypnotized and can’t realize that the emperor is naked. Actually, I can pin point even more closely the reactions of a woman in the audience as the initiator of my thoughts. She was a teacher, who was obsessively studying for her degree. Zukav tried to make the distinction between obsession and passion, by claiming that if you stop the obsession, then you will feel the pain. He said that you have to face this feeling inside your body and not react by obeying the obsession. The woman first asked quite honestly, what she could do to face the truth. Then Zukav asked her to close her eyes and imagine that she can’t do her study at home and how would that make her feel. The pain in the stomach and throat are the perfect signs of progress said Zukav, and was happy to initiate the woman on her healthy journey. Oprah, as usual, tried to “translate” Zukav’s ideas to the audience. Here she said, that the main thing is to put a gap between the obsession and the reaction and thus, realize the obsession for what it is. For a second, the whole thing made sense and I almost felt sympathy for Zukav’s and Oprah’s intentions. Okay, maybe it was two seconds, in fact too long to be embarrassed by it now. There is one more important sentence of Zukav that still rings in my ear, where he admits that he himself has to separate daily, the obsession from passion, and that he always finds out that the things he writes from passion are the best ones. So where is the obvious contradiction? We didn’t see it and the audience especially, because in the media we are always faced with hollow descriptions of stereotypical situations. The teacher getting her masters degree is a bubble without content. Everybody who wants to get a masters degree, just to get ahead, is obsessed! The real motivation or the “passion” of learning for a teacher should be to learn how to teach. But schools as rule, don’t care about motivating through problems, rather offer the “final solutions”. In fact, the truth is even worse, they offer the papers by which one can get ahead in life. So it all boils down to the universally bad intentions. Getting more money, getting more power. This is the source of the woman’s and most “achiever’s” obsession. This general pattern is exactly what Zukav and Oprah don’t want to get into. The emperor is nude, but the simplest facts are the deepest taboos. Anyway, the show served a good cause. It made

me to be even more honest about my frustration. And so, I decided I stop my physics book for now and start something else, which I hope will help you even more.

Slavery Of The Mind, Yoga

The word slavery refers to forced workers and it's unbelievable for how long this meaning survived as actual practice. The black slavery of America has much more to tell about the founders of the U.S., than it was ever revealed. Not because it was kept secret, but simply because the self consciousness of the U.S. can't cope with it. The U.S. could be called the new roman empire and indeed, the Romans couldn't cope with the meaning of slavery either. And yet, before Rome, the Greeks who were their ancestors and the eastern civilizations who were much more in contact with the Greeks as we know, both came to the amazing realization that the masters are slaves themselves. Today, we always tend to portray the ancient Greek philosophers as deep thinkers about the mysteries of the universe. They were just as much refined practitioners of life. Already the Pythagoreans formed a forbidden sect with secret rules. Ancient masonics who despised the average crowd. Then Socrates appeared, the Jesus of philosophy. Why did the rulers of Athens made him drink the poison cup? Which by the way, he could have escaped easily if he wanted to, just as Jesus the crucifixion. His crime was to corrupt the young, the potential future rulers. And indeed, some of the young were turned away from the daily politics. To give up power is the greatest threat to a system that operates by the hunger for power! In the east, long before Socrates, the idea of giving up power was elevated to the highest value as Yoga. Power is the slavery of the mind, the masters are actually slaves of themselves. The western world achieved a form too, where in its own terms, Yoga became acceptable as an ideal, but only long after Socrates in the catholic rule of Europe. Monks became "part of the system", just as yogis in the east. So we shouldn't be surprised that today yuppies are "doing" Yoga. The lies have their full history.

The Evolution Of Slavery, Classes

The full truth only survives through the history of these new lies! Those who didn't believe in this crap about slavery of the mind, only in the down to earth enslaving of others, soon became the tools of refining the big truth itself. In Feudalism, the slaves were replaced by peasants, who worked for themselves after paying to the landlords. This transition was not due to Christian morality, rather to practical interest. Slaves were simply less effective than "free" peasants. This evolution continued from landlords to capitalists and the branding iron was in the hand of Marx. It's owning the means of production that makes all the difference! This is what separates the masters from the slaves or in the new language, the "classes". This was not just a philosophy but much more a political movement, so there couldn't be ifs and buts about these classes. They had to be black and white, or as they called it, antagonistic. Marx, who is regarded as a dangerous materialist against religion, was actually the biggest idealist. Not just because he believed metaphysically that the ultimate hidden force of history is the class struggle, but also in the more everyday sense that he believed in a solution to this struggle in Communism. Both of his idealism were false! The first, the class determination of history, is false because there are no classes. But the application to history can be seen to be false directly too! And indeed, coincidences and personal influences on history can't be more obviously experienced than in the twentieth century. In fact, the collapse of communist regimes was the best example. History is a mystery! Even the physical history of the universe and the history of life on earth before humans. The root mistake, the non existence of classes also became self evident in the twentieth century. The naïve ambiguities about owning the means of production were not threatening the concept itself. Questions, why a plumber with an apprentice or a factory owner who shares all the profit with the workers, should be

a capitalist, were easy to fend off. In fact, it was undeniable that the rich got richer, the wealth became more and more concentrated. This seemingly proves the existence of classes, but not really. If only the super rich is the capitalist, then the large amount of small business people should be workers, which is absurd. So the scissor effect of wealth concentration is only among the capitalists themselves, and then we should have three classes, which is absurd again. But there is an other process, which we forgot about, that makes these contemplations meaningless anyway. With the advance of share markets, all means of production are collectively owned. So at the same time as the concentration of wealth progressed, the distribution of particular ownerships did too. So today, if a pensioner owns shares, he should be a capitalist too. Strangest is that recently, the die hard communists concentrate their attack on the new dangers of the so called “globalization”, and fail to realize that globalization already took over and won the world while they were sleeping. It killed the classes, but of course brought out something new instead, that these leftists fail to recognize. They are afraid to label the pensioner, who owns a few shares as capitalist, and can’t see him for what he is, a slave of the system and of his own greed.

Consumption And Communism

So what if there are no classes as a category? Once the production is centralized, it brings about a stability anyway. Everybody works for the state and the state can provide for everybody. So what brought down Communism? First of all, there was no Communism yet, only Socialism. In Socialism, the wealth is distributed according to the work, while in Communism, according to the needs. I remember when I first asked my father, how will it be in Communism, if everybody can get what they want. He explained that by that time, people will be smart enough to only want what they need. While he really believed in this, and didn’t care about money, others in power were buying up prime lands and real estate. In the west, a common belief is that it was the failure of production that caused the collapse of Socialist countries. This is totally false. Being a few years behind the west, doesn’t cause collapse. It was the people, namely their obsession with consumption, that rotted the system. My father’s colleagues in the interior ministry, who abused their power to own more and later became the new capitalists, were the extreme top end, the greedy liars. The average poor was merely greedy, and wanted only to consume, just like in the west. It doesn’t make any difference whether you can choose from twenty brands of cars or three. The advantages of cheap housing and services, free health and education, were taken for granted. So the communist personality that wouldn’t regard consumption, as its life goal didn’t rise from Socialism. And why would! Then of course, the few years advantage that the west always maintained became a continuous envy of the people living in Socialism. They believed that Capitalism is better. They gave up on a dream that wasn’t theirs in the first place.

Price And Value

So if the two ideas, the existence of classes in Capitalism and the emergence of new consciousness in a classless, Socialist society are both false, then what is true about Marxism? Just as these two lies became more and more obvious before the last decade of the twentieth century, a much more fundamental concept about Capitalism itself became overwhelming. The globalization of the share market, not only gave the final refutation of the class concept, but stretched to the extreme, the question whether the price is the value or not. If somebody is a buyer or a seller, then obviously the possible prices will mean the value. But for Marx, the “value” was a starting point of an other investigation. Today, it’s immaterial how realistic was his introduction of the real value based on the invested works and other factors. The main thing is that the whole separation was raised. It is the prices dictated by the global share market

system that does the exploitation today. It's not the classes that exploit each other, it's not the countries that exploit each other. This is more devilish, because you can't point the finger. The victims are still people and countries. Countries that can't compete with prices, so they have to change their values. They obey, they sell out. Thus, the share market becomes their internal separator too. Not of classes, just of victims and criminals.

Closure And Opening

The moral ground of the global share market system is its voluntary non forced appearance. Indeed, if a country doesn't like the prices, they can create their own. When Stalin ruled before the second world war, the Soviet economy was closed and became completely unaffected by the big economic crisis of the west. For a while, the ruble was worth more than the dollar. The war and the march into eastern Europe changed everything. In the end, these eastern European countries brought down the Soviet Union itself. The lagging behind the west in production could only be apparent to the people through the opening of information. The allowing of western culture to infiltrate was first thought to be a good anesthetic for the domestic bleakness. So, with a little exaggeration, we could almost say that Hollywood brought down the Communist regimes. But the correct meaning of this is not the infiltration of the western culture to the public, rather to the creators of their internal culture. So the mimicking of the western values was much more important than the appearance of them. A best example of this same contradiction is in China today. The system has no clue how far it could go without sacrificing everything and doesn't want to face that it already lost the plot. Of course, for a poor African country today, the closure is impossible, simply by economic reasons alone. So their dependence on the global share market is indeed, just a new form of colonialism.

Big Lie And Little Lies

The Communist ideology in the Socialist countries was one big lie. After a while, everybody knew that it was a lie, and the question was only, how to admit it. The western culture infiltrated its little lies and at the beginning they were regarded as truth. People having their own businesses and thus making money on somebody else, advertisements of flashy products, were sweet relief from the single big lie of Communism. The speed by which the new system of lies replaced the old in the last decade of the twentieth century, is unbelievable. The theoretical question whether the people in those Communist countries including even Russia, would go back to the early state is meaningless, because you can never go back to one lie. So, there is an irony here, because the Communist ideology always referred to the dialectical nature of Marx's materialism. But at the end, the real dialectical nature of multiple lies buried the single dogmatic lie. Those who attacked Communism and praised Capitalism in the west, didn't see this depth and were dogmatic themselves. Popper's "Open Society and Its Enemies" was required reading in '67 at my philosophy class, in Budapest. And yet, in the next year, the Prague spring was crushed by tanks. I didn't see at that time, that this would have no effect at all. Most sadly, I didn't see the system of little lies. Of course, how could I, if Popper didn't see it either in the west.

Establishment

I had to go to America to realize the system of lies that is inherent in the "free" world too. Only much later did I realize that this common system of lies has nothing to do with economy and was already present in the Socialist countries too. In the Christmas of '69, when I arrived at the Kennedy airport, most of the hippy movement was over,

and for a year, I had no sympathy for its remnants either. I regarded myself a pure mathematician and believed that any truth must be scientific. My disillusion with “freedom” came gradually, but the final turnaround was drastic. At that time, the “turn on, tune in, drop out” completely described what happened to me and I myself regarded this slogan as the essence of Timothy Leary’s philosophy. Only decades later when Leary became a clown, did I realize that he discovered the most serious and darkest feature of human existence. Just as Marx’s deep and most fundamental distinction between value and price was overshadowed by his two mistakes, the classes and the Communist personality, Leary’s main realization was also hiding behind his slogans. This realization was the concept of the monolith “establishment”. This was the first consciousness of the system of lies that governs society. It was totally unscientific, it didn’t go further, and ask how the individual mind is affected by society, it only described the meaning through its intentions. In other words, the fact that he referred to the establishment as a single structure that tries to suppress the individual’s natural state, was in itself the big step. In an other sense, his big philosophical value was not how he analyzed what establishment is, rather how he avoided wrong solutions. To fully appreciate this, of course, first of all we have to know who he was before himself turned on, tuned in and dropped out. One of the most eminent psychiatrists of the U.S., a top academic at Harvard. The fact that he dropped not only out of the system, but dropped all the bullshits of psychology, is the most important. He dropped everything, but he stopped dropping names. He didn’t turn to already made “solutions”. The biggest temptation could have been Communism, but instead he preached communes. We might even think that he returned social criticism to the point where it should’ve continued without Communism, namely to Anarchism. But we have to be scientific and credit him with what he achieved. Achieved levels of consciousness don’t just disappear, because of the historical ups and downs. The young generation of today, seemingly has nothing to do with the sixties and the hippies. These are almost reduced to stereotypical caricatures by the establishment itself. Yet, any new ideologies must contain the truth of those.

The Creative Capitalism Myth

To fully understand the evil of the establishment, is identical with the highest level of yoga in our age. So the system of lies is far deeper than we can even imagine. One example of this is that its protectors are much wider than its defenders. Most of the artists and leftists would strongly deny that they are protecting the establishment, in fact they continually criticize it. Yet in fact, they are protecting it more strongly than the right wing defenders. The admitted intentions here have nothing to do with the already socially motivated subconscious contradictions and with the final actions. In fact, the self conscious defenders of the free democratic Capitalist society can help us to see the truth much more than the screwed up liberals. As I mentioned, the west was always developing faster than the Socialist countries. The defenders claim that free enterprise is the only system from which new inventions and improved production can grow. In fact, they specify the competition as the driving force behind all progress. If somebody has an idea that can make money, it doesn’t necessarily mean a new or better product. Even if it’s not a crime, it can be a gimmick or something that simply appeals to the consumer. The defenders claim that these unproductive, money making tricks are minimal compared to the real improvements. They say, look around and see how fast all technologies are growing due to the freely competing enterprises. Some leftists reply to this that the race for consumption is not really a race for happiness. Unfortunately, this reply never goes into the details where consumption would stop and happiness would start. Thus, it silently accepts the perfection of the profit driven enterprise system itself. Most importantly though, the consumers vote with their consumption. If they fall into consumption instead of the search for happiness, then

nobody should rely on the majority to prove his minority points. But the defenders claim not only that they represent the majority, but also that no minority is suppressed, in fact the special ones can play even bigger roles in the fair competitions. They even believe that the established system of fair competitions is the actual selection of values. Here values mean not only values of products or objects, but values of human thoughts. So clearly, we are dealing with a generalization of the ignorance that Marx discovered. While the global economy forces the world into the false belief that the value is the price. The free democratic societies force the world into the false belief that the value of thought is success.

Selling Out In Public

But there is a huge difference between the economic and the information market. In the economic market, the compromises bring about the common price, while in the information market, there are no compromises, there are no common platforms. Yes, there is no transfer of thoughts! People are buying thoughts according to their needs. There is no political dialogue, there is no changing of opinions. The “share market of information” is truly just sharing the market. This infinite tolerance of contradicting thoughts, hides the admission that the public thoughts themselves are worthless. How can this be? This is the most fundamental dialectic of lies! The public thoughts are worthless because they’re worth money! We slipped into a coma, a hypnotic spell of believing that there is nothing wrong with being paid for our “truth”. In a sense, this could be celebrated as a new level of proving that Marx was right about the purely economical explanation of society. But this is false! There is no economics behind the public lies and their rewards. The selling out of “public thoughts” is merely a “selling out” in the individual brains who are willing to step into the arena. What’s more, this selling out obeys the same laws as the selling out of the common crowd in consumption. On the other hand, the public lies have their own rules of political correctness, phony tolerance, patronizing simplicity, and so on. This requires specially twisted brains to play along. Most importantly, the public lies have their own contradictions which are much easier to catch than the individual lies that lead to them. In fact, these contradictions are the foundation of our instant judgments against some public figures. Unfortunately, even this simple logic is too complicated to become conscious, so our judgments seem to come without reason and thus, we fall back to an even deeper social dependence. I will give an example of how such logic is missed. I asked dozens of people who hate Oprah Winfrey if they could give an exact explanation why she is phony. They all failed! There is only one single line of reasoning that brings out the truth. Her making a billion dollars a year can make us angry, but that’s not a logic. Her new age spiritualism and using the soul as a loaf of bread, a wildcard borrowed from religion can make us angry too, but that’s not particular to her. Many others do it the same way. Kissing the ass of celebrities and bringing them into the public arena as idols, is again a general feature of talk shows. The real contradiction is the following: She became the singular most successful talk show host. Either this is so due to her personal incredible talent or her incredible luck. She investigates everything except this duality. If she is incredibly talented, she should share this talent and teach other young ladies to become as good as she. That’s really giving. In fact, all giving is teaching. Giving away vacuum cleaners to the audience on random days is definitely not giving. If she has been merely lucky, then she should even more share her job with other better ones. So the point is that everything she does is a replacement of facing her real contradiction, who is she herself. Her lifestyle, her dogs, her slaves are all flowing out of this contradiction. All her public roles are merely an avoidance to face this. From an other point of view, her lies are merely a product that can be sold. After all the media makes even more money on her than she herself. But again this is not an economic choice, rather a philosophical one, even though the sellability or success might suggest otherwise.

There is always one fundamental line of lie behind a public liar. The reason of this is that in a public liar, the individual lies that allow the choice of public appearance must be synchronized with the sellability of social lies. I'll give you an other example as Gary Zukav, one of Oprah's favorite "soul professional". In his case, the crucial point is the conquering of anger. He simply gave up the distinction between anger against people or anger against society. Not being angry with society, is merely a pose to allow the phony tolerance of all stupidities that contradict with what he really claims. This actually serves the goal that he can promote himself and make a comfortable living. But again we can make it much sharper by simply asking how can he use Oprah for his message when Dr. Phil was also launched by her. Not commenting on Dr. Phil is accepting the ultimate lie, even in his own terms. Of course, the terms can always be refined to obey the real need, which is the public appearance.

A quite opposite dynamics of synchronization is working for David Letterman. His cynicism makes a natural target out of Oprah. The personal attacks on Dr. Phil almost can give us the false impression that Letterman is admitting the crucial point of marketing stupidity. But he carefully didn't step over a certain line. Dr. Phil using his sons as apprentices in his down to earth enlightenings is an obvious giveaway for where he is really standing. And yet, this was not picked up on by Letterman. Maybe it's so sad and obvious, that even Letterman couldn't make fun of it.