

Rescue

If you are:

1. Happy or
2. Don't care or
3. Found the solution

then stop reading.

Every individual after reaching suddenly a higher level of intellectual or emotional state is faced with the choice whether to relate this to others or not. Most of the times this choice becomes obvious because some tools of expression are already an initial part of the higher state. The musician uses an instrument, the painter a canvas, the poet his language. Since these tools are given by society, it seems natural to turn to society to express ourselves. In science or philosophy the urge to communicate the insight is even stronger because the whole meaning of an insight is based on the previously communicated results of others. We might think that in ancient times there was an original direct influence of feelings and thoughts, and this slowly developed into the present more estranged social expressions. This is not so! The technical advances of communication are not important! In the Greek Academy the speakers were just as alienated as the artists, philosophers and scientists of the present institutions. The first wall drawings of a talented caveman already became tools for the others to manipulate. On the other hand, the imperfections in communicating feelings and thoughts are not causing the deceits. If a message resonates, it is always perfect even if it is not the same as the intended or original. And indeed the evolution of human insights is undeniable. We could attack this evolution and say that in fact it is a devolution and the socially transformed messages became false. But again, there is no false impulse. Whatever makes us feel or think is "good". So what can social lie and deceit mean then? It means that we are told things that never even had original intentions, feelings and thoughts behind them. These lies and deceits slowly appeared to cause satisfaction or "resonance" but these reactions are already working against our original and true needs of communication. This is complicated but the choice is simple: Should we accept all the lies and deceits in order to get some truth with it? Admitting this, the defenders of social values could say: Can you provide a better system? And indeed no one could. The utopian ideas were either so subjectively particular like Plato's Republics that nobody took them seriously, or so distantly noble like the goals of Marxism that they didn't define any roads to them. The most obvious fault of all utopian ideals however is a much simpler common lie. They pretend a homogeneous solution for all to overthrow a situation that is totally convenient already for some. Earlier the simple quantitative argument of revolutions could "resolve" this, namely to get rid of a few to make happy the rest. But today the majority is definitely convenient and not for a change. So the only goal could be to "free" the majority from its own ignorance. This of course is the same as saying that: I'm going to make you happy even if I have to kill you. Even if our immediate goal is not to design a better social system just to spread the consciousness of how bad the present system really is, the obsession with homogeneity is still a danger. We are reluctant to split humans into the "see-ers" and the blind slaves. Luckily this whole false selection evaporates if we embrace a wider view in which lies and deceits are not about messages and meanings but also about actions and roles. A first naïve defiance

of the homogeneity paradox was Timothy Leary's "solution". The more well known half said: "Turn on, tune in, drop out". This failed not because not everybody "sees" by "dropping" but because society "evolved" to hide its evil from the level of seeing caused by dropping.

It's not the acid that changed, it's the milieu! But there was the second less well known recognition by Leary, namely that in history society changed not by revolutions but by groups leaving society. The early Christian communities were such, and clearly the hippie communes were meant to be corresponding. These were not killed by society but by themselves. In fact we might oversimplify the situation by saying that the early Christian communities were kept alive by the persecution. But history never repeats exactly and just look where the purity of those communities lead. To the most deceitful organized religion in the world. Leary cannot be blamed for the failure of his "ways". In fact he should be blamed for not going further and instead becoming a clown, a part of the media. The full scope of judgment should not only based by the things one does but also by the things one fails to do. As an example we should remember where Leary came from. Reading his early speech for the psycho analytical society it seems obvious that awakening from those early lies is not enough. He should have been more scientific and continue to destroy the lies. Strangely, Hubbard who always wanted to appear as officially "scientific", declared a war against psychiatry. A brave thing, that Leary should have done too. If nothing else, this could have been a common ground for them to combine their intellect and efforts instead of sliding into to the two poles of lies. All this of course is the past, the hippies became an empty stereotypical media tool and Scientology became the newest dead religion. Digging out the history of social criticism might be very interesting for some but actually leads to the very lies that we must defeat. Real social criticism must step to a new level! We have to give up the phony objectivity and replace it with detailed factuality. As I said, one must be measured by not only what he says but by what he should say, what he does, what he represents and so on. This might seem as an easy way to crucify everybody but we have to realize that society uses all the tricks to deceive and lie so we can't be fair when revealing the corporates. We have to be clear about the facts but not considerate about our judgments and reasoning. Society can hide the liars because we are afraid to jump to conclusions. The end result is simple! Everybody who becomes part of a lying system is a complete liar. It's scary to draw these conclusions because no safety idols remain. We prefer to judge someone and be happy to like someone else who also judges the same as we. But both the judged and the liked remain hollow this way. All cops are bad because if a cop is good he must see how bad the others are and would step out of the whole system. No teacher can be good if he accepts the bad ones around, so again all teachers are bad. Using the words "good" and "bad" in these intentionally naïve manner, is completely meaningful. We can even differentiate in levels and indeed a higher level of bad applies to the media. Oprah Winfrey is not bad, she is evil. Is the usage of phony spirituality more evil than advocating a religion? We might analyze this by the motivations but we shouldn't! Instead, we should look at the effect! Half of America adores her as a champion of spirituality though she is the perfect anti-spirit. Favorite books, favorite people, favorite looks, nobody is criticized. But the whole media is a lie so is she an island of truth in it? No. She is the strongest web of deceits. Is she a liar because she spends more on her dogs than a family's income? Is she a liar because she is rich? Yes! But evil has other forms!

David Letterman can get away with hating Oprah without admitting this because the two evils are one. Being funny is not an excuse, but lately he hasn't even been funny. Being good in something is not an excuse in general! Oliver Stone is a good director which doesn't change the fact that JFK gives nothing more than the Garrison Tapes. If we need Kevin Costner to convince us as about something that the real but strange looking guy, Jim Garrison can't, then we are already hooked to deceit. And indeed we are! Our primal urges and judgments are hardly alive under the need to be entertained. Yet once we free ourselves enough of these "values", the whole social web of lies unfolds. This is not quite true! To really acquire a solid conviction that the social value system is a parasite living on the few true individual insights, one needs deeper scientific, even mathematical knowledge. It's not the details of science that is important, quite on the contrary the realization that the deceit is here too. Outsiders from religions or new age spiritualism criticize science in a totally stupid way, questioning it's results and sometimes even claiming a conspiracy of materialism. This phony criticism made science seem even more solid in the eyes of the realist common people because firstly the technological results are unquestionable and the criticism from the loonies are far out weighed by the support from the education system. That the education system is not problematic in it's approach could be explained by the lack of time or resources but the true reasons is simply the same as everywhere else in society: Those who are in control are afraid! Teachers themselves are afraid to look stupid, to ask questions from above so they seal the flow of information, become dogmatic.

Mathematics is central! This is the only field where the language became totally exact. Yet the fundamental contradiction is this: Math is only relying on common sense, so why is it so hard for most people? Honest math teachers would say because some people don't have the patience or will to follow through the common sense in the seemingly boring fields of mathematics. This is not true. The real obstacle is the tendency of formalism. This started long before the mentioned recent formalization of logic. In fact Euclid was a formalist already! He spent a long time thinking about the parallel lines and realized that it is too hard to explain all the complicated interrelations and instead he picked some basic assumptions or axioms and tried to derive others from these. Most people imagine this axiomatic method as a straight forward way to derive the complicated stuff from simple ones. This is false! Some axioms are picked not just by their simplicity but because they yield easier all the others. Sometimes we even derive seemingly more obvious facts than the axioms that we start with. This also meant that total derivations were never really the goal and in higher math it was enough to derive the new results from already known facts. Even the acceptable steps as derivations went through big changes. Newer and newer arguments appeared, stretching the applicable common senses to their limits. One of the biggest such stretch was Newton's mechanics because he fought on two fronts at the same time. He not only realized the concept of forces determining motions but he had to use new mathematics to apply those laws to real situations. A good example for this can show how far the well known story of the apple falling to the ground must have been from the real breakthrough. Indeed, we can only realize that the earth is attracting the apple if we already accept that all bodies attract each other! The apples also attract each other but we don't see that because the frictions and random motions of the air are far bigger than the forces between them. The earth however is billions and billions times bigger than an apple and this produces the actual force that

causes the fall of the apple. This qualitative picture is interesting in itself and the direction of falling towards the center of the earth is obvious from the fact that in overall the earth is symmetrical around this direction. But Newton went further and had a definite idea how the minute force between two apples should be calculated. This automatically raised the mathematical question that if we regard the earth as a set of small apple sized masses then how will these forces combine. The ground under the apple tree pulls the apple down while further away the ground pieces pull it a part fighting against each other. As the earth rounds back the pieces all attract down again but from further distances, so weakened. The beautiful result that the totality of the earth attracts the same way as if it were in the single point in the center of the earth, took more than a year for Newton to prove. Today it is an easy exercise in integration. I mentioned all this so that we can see how the obsession with derivation is a natural tendency. By the way Newton was reluctant to publish his results anyway because he feared criticism.

The word “formalism” could be used for the whole general tendency of “proving” instead of “explaining”. A true criticism of formalism can only come from within. Artists who are proud of being bad in math are simple wankers. You cannot see the bigger picture of formalism that involves all bureaucracy, abuse of power, bad teaching and emotional dependence on media if you don’t see the central mathematical formalism. On the other hand mathematical or scientific knowledge can go completely without the realization of the tragedy that formalism is causing in the world. This must mean however a sick, selfish, insensitive person. Society is the perfect place for such people, they can even be famous. The Princeton duo Einstein and Gödel are the perfect example. They were paid to raise the value of the university, not to improve the education! They played their unchallenging roles perfectly. Earlier, Einstein who faced the world with the most ground breaking theory was afraid what his parents might think, so he forced his pregnant fiancé to give away his first born daughter to a hidden family of peasants in Eastern Europe. Gödel who cut through the maze of all axiom systems by proving his two basic theorems, was convinced that the world tried to poison him. These two had nice walks in the park sighing about the crazy world. What a pathetic duo. Posters with the fatherly Einstein with a violin or with cheeky, poking tongue might satisfy the needs of slave minds but the truth was very different.

To be continued!

Hello. As I promised I continue this site to be the place where people who hate society at least half as much as I do, can get help and find each other. I have to mention that the first part, up to this point, was written on the 30-th of April in an hour because I was a lazy dog and delayed it. But I had to get online on the 1-st of May 2001. Why, you may ask and I will explain it once, later. Since I live in Sydney, a parallel site will be also opened today for people who want personal contacts.

As the name of the site says we’ll get into utopian ideas, both the history of such and the reality of new ones. This will come much later and first I want to deal with the far reaching consequences of the social deceit in which we grow up. I want to stress it right now that the views expressed here will be extreme, appealing only for a very few. For example I will show that all formalism, including most of the arts are doing harm to the human mind. If somebody is still clinging to some social values, it will be very hard to give those up. The reward, the total inner freedom and detachment from all material

entanglements, especially from the fixations of passion, well worth this. So until then look up the other site: