

Note: This document was constructed and widely disseminated in December of 1983, in response to the acceptance by NATO of President Reagan's offer to deploy US Pershing II missiles to Western Europe, to counter the buildup of Soviet SS-20 missiles in East Germany. Despite political pressure and mass protests in Western Europe, the first missile battery became operational in December 1983, with all 108 missiles deployed by December 1985. Eventually the missiles were removed under the terms of the INF Treaty signed in December 1987. All missiles were eventually withdrawn between October 1988 and December 1989.

THE CAUSE OF WORLD CONFUSION ©

by Donald Sagar

Questions abound in our everyday life. They are mankind's bridge between the present and the future; between the known and the unknown; and at times between the known and the unknowable. Socrates recognized the significance of using questions over two thousand years ago. Their importance to the progression of knowledge remains unchanged to this day. What has changed is the implication in the answers that today's questions provoke. When Socrates raised the question of the meaning of life, he was addressing it to individuals in his immediate environment. The answer which his questions provoked initially impacted upon only one city state, Athens. When a modern thinker raises the identical question, some of the answers necessarily contain the possibility for the elimination of all sentient life on earth. This is the epitome of all self realized tragedy; the fact that today's answers possess the inherent potential to eradicate the very thought process from which they originate.

This reality has led mankind to adopt a paradoxical mode of thinking that amounts to the answering of questions by the raising of additional questions for which immediate answers are not logically possible. This is done by hinging questions that pertain to the present on to questions that relate to their possibility future, thus producing a logical impasse that has the effect of causing the initial questions and their respective answers to appear inconsequential. Today, we see the final result of this progression toward the penultimate "trivial" question; or, that which concerns the existence and potential use of an ultimate destructive capability for which no conceivable human benefit is possible.

The actual form of the question concerns whether or not any nation can win a war, when its adversary possesses a similar technology which includes the possibility for world destruction.

The debate around this question is purposely profound, couched in a language of sound, fury and passion, because, no one really wants to know the answer. This is because it more than obvious that its existence, notwithstanding the use of such weaponry, threatens the future of mankind. And so the debate and the machinations it spawns continues, as the irresolvability of the 'penultimate trivial question' lends the only logical base to continuing with the technical advancement of our destructive capability.

Hence, it is the "impasse" inherent in the 'penultimate trivial question' that prevents an effective rebuttal to the idea of unreasonable armament. It does this by causing one to remain dependent upon the future for any specific definition of limitation that might pertain to the present. This dynamic is also what has allowed the military the luxury to develop into a fiscal monster that the world can no longer economically afford. Were there no logical 'impasse' in this equation, the impetus to continue to fortify would be lost to reason long ago.

The result of this paradigm is that practically all of the world's major financial institutions, along with the countries they serve, have been forced to acquiesce to the concept of "unreasonable extension." In simple terms this is the stuff of bankruptcy, because it involves an inability to recover sufficient moneys from outstanding debtors at an acceptable rate to guarantee normal fiscal viability. This problem exists because the bulk of all investment and loan imbalances are directly attributable to the military which successfully placates the many principals involved through the fear or war.

Thus the strategic military dilemma of nuclear confrontation is continuously being escalated in complexity by a momentum derived by the necessity to maintain an 'impasse' regarding the definition of its usage. At the same time, this equation is being destabilized by a worldwide economic crisis to which the process of 'maintaining an 'impasse' is the major contributor. How ridiculous is that? These dynamics obviously spell disaster if they cannot be reversed.

It is hard to verbalize the tragedy of humanity asking if it can survive its own "creation." The only word adequate to describe this dilemma is absurd. It therefore follows (without jest) that the greatest single achievement of our century is the reification of the absurd. Its reality is so obvious that millions of people the world over have begun to demonstrate their serious concern. Although their message is clear, their understanding of the basic problem is not. In order to understand it we must begin by taking a look at how we got to where we are today.

In 1905, Albert Einstein advanced the results of a vision. This vision introduced a new age. It subsequently became known as the Atomic Age. Central to its being understood is the theory of Relativity. In its extended form this theory suggested that matter could be transformed into energy, leaving behind the specific characteristics by which it was previously known and identified. Although his ideas initially met with substantial resistance, they gradually gained acceptance. Science would prove itself capable. Philosophy and theology showed little of the same impetus. Hence, they did little to affect what was eventually going to occur. Nearly forty years later, in the year 1945, the first atomic bomb was exploded near Alamogordo, New Mexico. The union between science and technology had been consummated while the world looked on in awe.

What no one in 1945 could have anticipated was the success that science and technology would have in their pursuit of the atom. In 1952, the first Hydrogen bomb was exploded at Eniwetok. It represented yet another step in a process that was surely leading to the potential for world destruction. It is questionable if anyone really knows the date that mankind achieved this potential. And, in reality, it no longer seems to be of any real importance. Some scientists still speak in terms of "world destructive" nuclear capability, but it's obvious that they don't understand the importance of relevance. Human reason cannot differentiate between being destroyed once or being able to be destroyed 200 times over. It should be rather obvious that it's the first time about which we should be most concerned.

Those that survived the year 1945 were soon to become involved in a controversy which continues to rage today. It concerns the role of the atom in the future survival of mankind. Although the basic substance of this controversy remains unchanged, elements critical to its proposal and solution have changed radically.

It is an undeniable fact that our association with the atom marked the beginning of a new and distinctly different era. In effect, the practical application of Einstein's ideas have been responsible for setting mankind upon the wheel of destiny. Once the atomic phenomena was demonstrated, its power could never again be ignored. Time and history have proven this to be true. But the problem didn't stop there. The continued unfolding of the atomic potential carried with it a definitive alteration in the association of idea to "time" – one that manifested itself in a continuous escalation in the complexity of language. This change proved necessary so that mind could consider the results of new experimentation in relation to preexisting theory. Although each successive change to language was subtle, the combined effect has proved enormous. It now spans sixty-two years of continuous research and development coupled with an ever more complicated learning process.

Without realizing it, human potential has undergone a shift in emphasis that is being driven by the continuous alteration of its language; the very substance from which all of its ideas are formed. This 'shift in emphasis' is of crucial concern, because it (by way of language) concretizes the acceptable limitations of human idea to 'time' – in order to ensure continued human survival.

Language is a tool by which the human mind understands and represents its reality. It is comprised of words and grammatical rules that govern their use. Words are incomplete representations of dichotomy; and, their continuous proliferation stems from the consequence that each idea is an incomplete representation of the all encompassing dichotomy, or the dichotomy of self, i.e. "non-being encompassed by being." The idea of dichotomy is therefore necessary to the foundation of language, if language is going to remain relative to us.

Dichotomy is the proposal that equal opposing positions can be contained within a single idea by way of language. Rules of grammar dictate the structure by which this occurs. This is what makes language relative to consciousness. Consciousness (the awareness of self) is the ability of mind to determine the difference between itself (as a form of something) and the absence of itself (as a form of nothing). These two forms constitute the most basic dichotomy. They pervade by necessity all forms of idea. They are commonly referred to as time and space. Time and space are therefore fundamental to both consciousness (the awareness of self) and language (specific aspects of that awareness) if both are to remain relative to each other. The dichotomy 'something/absence of something' is commonly referred to as time/space. It pervades all idea, because ideas (via language) cannot come to exist "ex nihilo."

Historically, man has been able to deal with 'time' by visualizing it to be fundamental to quantification by way of language; but at the same time, he has been unable to deal with the concept of "space" because of language. All that language is able to say about the idea of 'space' is that it is. The human mind is understandably uncomfortable with an aspect of something which it must admit exists, but which it can say nothing else about. In an attempt to overcome this dilemma, mankind has proposed a substitution for the authentic dichotomy (time/space) using instead an inauthentic dichotomy (time/place). Einstein's theory unmasked in definitive terms the illusory

quality of the time/place dichotomy and suggested that science return to the fundamental dichotomy of time/space.

Then he compounded the problem by questioning whether time and space constitute a dichotomy at all. This had the effect of forcing man to choose between chaos (as the basis for its language) or God. In other words, to choose to believe in consciousness by way of language (minus the ability to consider beginning or end) or to believe in the consistency between beginning and end with the realization that consciousness cannot validate its own existence by way of language. The stage was now set for a major confrontation in idea, but it never came.

The road that led from Socrates to Einstein proposed a convincing argument for the transformation of quality into quantity – but Hegel, foreshadowing Einstein, perceived quantity as becoming a quality in itself (quantitative changes yielding quality through the process of continuous refinement). The alteration that language was to suffer at the hands of science would initially prove to favor Hegel, because Einstein would not justly argue his cause. But, this belief was destined to prevail only in the interim between Einstein's initial proposal of idea and the reality for world destruction that his ideas would promulgate. By means of Hegel scientific thinkers would find the justification for progressing their work and language would slowly but surely lose its ability to support dichotomy. Without dichotomy, idea soon began to lose the ability to control itself and it is this reality (in full bloom) that now faces the world.

Today, many self-destructive characteristics are surfacing within society. They are being triggered by a breakdown in the ability of language to convey and thereby support mind's need for dichotomy. This has occurred because of the addition of non-relative terminology and ideas (consistent with Hegel's premise) to everyday language. These words and ideas exist in a 'time' reference that is foreign to the construction and maintenance of self – because they are unipolar (non-dichotomous). This reality has caused many to adopt a form of thinking previously reserved for the scientific method. It amounts to a quantitative focus that is selectively employed to achieve specific ends.

I refer to this process as “time altered thinking.” Its language comes almost entirely from the need to explain experimentation; and, its conclusions adhere to probability curves driven by 'time' efficiency criteria derived from mathematics. The result of this process are conclusions that are overly complex and by definition never quite complete. It is a process of thought that has evolved to serve a specific need. Although it is capable of improving many aspects of mankind's existence, 'time altered thinking' seriously complicates everything human. Because of its complexity and the tentative usefulness of its conclusions, the individual is unable to confirm his/her own reality – because, reality bonded to quantification has no comprehensible limits even though the self is confirmed by way of limitation. This results in indecision and frustration which eventually surfaces as apathy and/or hostility.

Before science and technology had risen to their present degree of sophistication, mankind played out its aggressions through the selective destruction of itself; i.e. the French Revolution, World War I & II and the Russian Revolution. Today, as a result of the advent of the atom, each new conflict between nations accelerates the risk for world confrontation and nuclear holocaust. This fact is undeniable. What still goes unrecognized is the fundamental reason for why all this is occurring. That answer is bound to the continuous alteration of human language and the ideas it

sustains or can no longer sustain. It is this reality that will become the final instrument that will cause us to self destruct if its effect cannot be reversed and then controlled.

In order to consider this problem further, let's consider an example. In their most basic forms the concepts of offense and defense appear to constitute a dichotomy. This means that for every offense mind can conceivably determine a defense. Military strategists, through the use of hindsight, in their consideration of recorded history, agree that this is true. However, the continued impact of the quantitative process upon knowledge, and its associated impact upon reality, through the manipulation of matter, has now altered this simple truth concept. As knowledge has increased, the efficiency of its destructive capability has resulted in a reduction in usable 'time'. I refer to the 'time' critical to the consideration and response required to achieve an effective defense. In other words, both the consideration and the act of initiating a response requires sufficient 'time.' At present, in the context of strategic thinking, we do not have 'sufficient time' for conscious reflection.

Today, it takes approximately seventeen minutes for a nuclear armed missile to travel between the two strongest nations on earth. Submarine based missiles require just seven minutes to achieve the same result. Countries whose chief antagonists border one another, like Israel and Syria or India and Pakistan have less than 4 minutes to respond to incoming threats. Bare in mind that the identification and subsequent verification of any potential nuclear threat reduces retaliation times (for vulnerable weapon systems) to under two minutes – provided they are going to be launched and not destroyed in the incoming attack. Daily, technology seeks ways to decrease this 'time' interval. And, there is no reason to believe that it will not be successful.

Four minutes is obviously an insufficient amount of 'time' in which to initiate a defense. The appearance of the word “retaliation” into this ongoing controversy indicates this. Retaliation suggests the use of offensive weapons to achieve defensive goals. This idea differs from the idea of defense, because it does not employ an inherent act of containment in its meaning. Consistent with that, the weapon systems involved exceed the capability of mankind to survive their use. And, without human survival the concept of defense is obviously meaningless.

How then are we to understand the idea of retaliation as it relates to the idea of defense? It should be quite obvious from the destructive nature of the weapon systems involved that retaliation is not an acceptable alternative for defense. An attempt to solve this contradiction has resulted in the linking of the idea of 'retaliation' with that of “deterrence.” To deter, means to discourage through fear. This marriage of idea resulting from necessity clearly demonstrates for the first time, the basic **FLAW** inherent to our use of the quantitative thought process that supports and otherwise validates the scientific process.

To discourage by means of fear is not a consistent extension of a scientific process that uses quantitative analysis to determine the specific nature of its result. Instead, its presence in this chain of reasoning suggests something much more climatic. This inconsistency in thought proves that neither science or the method by which it achieves its result (the quantitative thought process) can ensure the continued survival of mankind – if FEAR cannot contain the human factor.

Proof of the finality of this conclusion lies in the fact that retaliation is already programmed into the computer systems of most nuclear capable countries. This program concretizes an approximation of the minimum amount of quantifiable data required to engage the retaliatory capability.

This threshold obviously varies from country to country depending upon computer system capability. The less sophisticated the system the greater the need for a lower threshold. The lower the threshold the greater the possibility for error. Paradoxically, the more sophisticated the system the greater its potential for malfunction. This mindless intervention has become necessary because mind realizes that it can NO LONGER FUNCTION IN THE REDUCED 'TIME' INTERVAL ALLOTTED TO IT FOR DECISION MAKING WITH REGARD TO NUCLEAR WAR.

It is ironic that the final decisions regarding world survival rest with the machines of our contrivance by default. And they do, because they alone possess the ability to implement retaliation in the ever shrinking parameters of 'time' to which they so heavily contribute. So where does that leave us? Not in a very good place, to be sure. Today...

AN ACT THAT REQUIRES ONLY A FOOL TO BEGIN, CAN SET INTO MOTION THE MOST COMPLEX TECHNOLOGY ON EARTH TO COMPLETE. Once begun it cannot be reversed, because the 'time' necessary to achieve reversal no longer exists in the cycle. Mind simply cannot function quickly enough to intervene.

This scenario is the climax to a destiny upon which mankind was placed over sixty years ago. It is a reality that looms ever closer day by day in a world beset with increasing confusion and unrest. Having borrowed the quantitative thought process used by science, almost every aspect of modern life is experiencing a "word lag." It occurs as mind attempts to understand the implications of its interface with increasing complexity. The result is destabilizing to all the basic indicators that previously ensured national and world stability. This begins with the family unit and stretches all the way to the economic and political interactions between super powers.

There is no immediate solution to this problem because contaminated language, along with the ideas and realities it sustains, is heavily entrenched into all aspects of life on every continent. Through its use, it is providing mankind with a knowledge that is relative to a 'time' that is other than his own. The main focus of this knowledge is not with the present, but rather with the future. By this simple change of emphasis, the special gift of individuality is successfully confused. In its place, each human person becomes just another cog in the great wheel intent upon forging a better (more efficient) tomorrow – irrespective of its cost in today's. This process is billed as a worthwhile sacrifice for the children. And, although this was once thought to be true, the increasing probability of world destruction casts a very real shadow on this optimism. The fact is that we can no longer guarantee the sanctity of either tomorrow or the children who would innocently play in it.

It should therefore be obvious that human logic can no longer support the continued extension of its reality into the future until the destructive capability it now possesses is defused. Mankind has NEVER been confronted with a greater threat.

The only hope here is a moratorium on new weapons coupled with the systematic reduction of existing ones. Obviously, I'm not the first to suggest it. The problem is with implementation. I believe that unless the rulers of all the major powers can be made to understand that a self-destructive alteration has occurred to the language by which each presently defines their objectives, world disarmament is impossible. And, that alteration has occurred because of a fundamental mismatch in temporality between us and our thought process due to its ability to quantify thought ad-infinitum. This is the only idea that is consistent to all principles, individually

and collectively, throughout all aspects of their definable 'time.' Hence, it is capable of being universally embraced.

The failure of the quantitative (linear) thought process to ensure the continued survival of itself, even by way of our most efficient use of it, amounts to a problem that is inherently undeniable. In addition, this flaw is the root cause of what now amounts to an overwhelming number of critical issues (see www.edenorg.com/edp-08.htm) that must be addressed, before they propell mankind into the very conflict that fear of self-destruction was supposed to prevent.

Hence, the delegation of this contaminated language to the role of sole denominator for the purpose of problem solving, either internal to national boundaries or across international ones, is potentially suicidal. The reason is because language is no longer able to convincingly convey intentionality to oneself and therefore another. It can't do so, because it is too corrupted by the acceleration of the quantitative aspect of our thinking to do so. In other words, today's language can no longer define by way of human limitation a constant rate of change that is universally applicable to the constant state of change which the self necessarily imposes upon itself during the consideration of itself.

Because of the common ancestry of all languages, all have proved equally vulnerable to this quantitative contamination. As a result, every human person is inadvertently effected. This common deception constitutes a foundation for making inquiry that can serve as a basis for a first step toward something better. This approach is concretized in the Eden project, a global initiative that already has the support of principals from 28 international organizations from around the world. Its structure can be considered on the Internet at www.edenorg.com. It's object is to bring all cultures together for the purpose of trying to determine an alternate understanding that will forestall the eventuality that currently contaminated language is poised to impose upon mankind.

I know of no other way to turn this mess around, short of the admitted intervention of God into the affairs of man. If mankind is to reassume control over its own destiny, some form of multilateral action along the lines suggested must be initiated immediately. If it is not to be, then destiny will direct mankind into Armageddon and the heavens will find cause to resound, because of the inadequacy of thought to recognize and operate within the boundaries of 'time' capable of insuring its survival.