

POSTULATES OF THE THEMATIC

I have often felt that one of the key factors that entrench the alienation of people in this age is the way in which the intelligentsia sets up the study of humanness. What I mean by this is that the disciplines that are concerned with understanding the human being present themselves essentially in two classes, namely the psychological and the sociological. It is as if one's inner reality and the world of transaction out there are seen to be distinct and mutually exclusive areas of concern.

This bifurcation is unrealistic because it amounts to attempting to split a coin down the middle and still have something useful afterwards. It is not only unrealistic but it is fundamentally disabling. Your inner health is intimately connected with you acting on the basis of what is transactionally correct. This transactionally correct action is the basic building block of just and sane society. And of course the converse is also true. If you act in a malevolent way this transaction not only damages society but it also entrenches your inner malaise and existential disquiet.

The outer and inner are inseparable. What follows is the application of this insight to the world that we are in.

1. It is axiomatically true that at birth the totality of an infant's potential lies before it. It is therefore here to get in the fullest, most unconditional sense of the word. It is equally true that at the moment of death one loses it all unconditionally. We arrive getting it all and we leave giving it all, and the process of maturation which transmutes our lives implies a movement from one extreme of unconditional getting to the other of unconditional giving.
2. The difference between giving it all and having it all taken away lies in the intent of the one who is doing the giving. The process of the maturation in the direction of unconditional giving is therefore a process of the maturation of the will or of intention.
3. Maturity, inner wellbeing and wholesomeness are about being able to face death without regret or fear. The only useful clinical contribution to the self must therefore be about cultivating the ability and the preparedness to die at any given moment.
4. Any biographic account of the self is disabling because it focuses the attention on the past, what the self has accumulated. An enabling account of the self must therefore take account of the self as the self looks forward, in other words, faces death. Fundamentally this truncates the need for catharsis in the cultivation of inner health.
5. One's understanding of the movement from cradle to grave can either be based on an advancing or a receding view of time. A receding view of time takes birth as its reference point and views life as a process of accumulation. This means that as one gets further and further away from birth one has more and more. An advancing view of time takes death as its reference point. This means that as one ages there is less and less of you. Every moment is a moment of expending potential, of handing over something. This is a view of time advancing because it is a view that is concerned with the inexorable approach of death.

6. To aspire to either wealth, knowledge or significance is to have a receding view of time, since both of these assume that there is more and more as one gets older. To aspire to the maturation of intent is to have an advancing view of time. It is concerned with having less and less over time and being able to face the final test of disappearing with nothing at all with equanimity.
7. Intention defines interest and therefore attention. A person therefore demonstrates their maturity by what they pay attention to in the world.
8. If you pay attention to what you want to get from the other, the other's ability to withhold what you want makes you manipulable. They are strong and you are weak. When you pay attention to what you should be giving to the other, the other no longer has power over the self. The empowerment of the self coincides with the shift of attention of the self from taking to giving, from expectation to contribution.
9. The degree to which a person's motive is conditioned by their expectation is the degree to which they are defined by the outcome of events. The more unconditional a person is with regard to what they are contributing the more they will define the outcome of events.
10. To construct one's intention on expectation is to become the slave and the victim of the other. Freedom is therefore concerned with basing one's intention and attention on your contribution.
11. The totality of the other rarely delivers a set of circumstances that coincide totally with what will satisfy the self at that time. For a person to focus their attention on what they want from the other therefore cultivates discontent.
12. One's own behaviour, in other words, what one is doing to or giving to the other, is always within one's own control. To concern your self with the nature of your contribution is therefore to cultivate a habit of fulfilment.
13. A person who is here to get will focus their attention on maximizing accumulation and minimizing loss. The predominant register of their internal dialogue will be greed and fear. A person who is here to give will be concerned with cultivating the capacity to hand over both things associated with the self and the self itself. The predominant register of their internal dialogue will therefore be concerned with generosity and courage.
14. The mature self transacting in the world will give things easily and will not be risk averse.
15. The demeanour of the immature self is fundamentally hostile and malevolent with regard to the totality of the other. The other is seen to be there to serve the self. The other is seen to be that which has to be changed, dismembered and demeaned to satisfy the requirements of the self. It is therefore accurate to identify the intention of the immature self as malevolent intention.

16. The world encapsulating the malevolent self will be in a process of extinction. It will be in chaos, decay and disorder in the process of satisfying the futile attempt of this self to establish permanence.
17. Every attempt of the malevolent self to establish order in view of securing the self will further entrench the process of decay and extinction. The extinction of the totality of the other is exponential.
18. People who are here to give are able to suspend their own comfort, convenience and interest in order to serve the other. The self accepts constraint in serving the other. The self is therefore expended in the care of the other. The self is submitted to extinction and the other is cultivated. The world encapsulating this self will present itself as orderly, wholesome and well tended. Both the intention and the effect of this self will be benevolent.
19. There can be no benevolent intention without the affirmation of a greater and absolute continuity that subsumes the self and the other. The loss of conditionality implied by acting with benevolent intention is therefore simultaneously the process whereby the self is sublimated into this higher order continuity. The extinction of the self in the process of serving the other establishes a higher order subject that subsumes both self and other. This higher order subject is not in the world. The world is in it.
20. The more malevolent a person is the more they will experience the other and the good auspices of the other to be discontinuous with the self. The malevolent self is fundamentally in a win/lose competition with the totality of the other.
21. The totality of the other presents itself as vast, majestic and unassailable next to the apparent smallness and insignificance of the self. The attempt of the malevolent self to bend the world to its will is therefore fundamentally futile. When the gnat irritates the giant long enough it gets swatted into oblivion.
22. We either give in to the process of submitting the self with good grace or we are crushed into submission by the totality of the other. Either way the self is destined for extinction.
23. Because a process separates birth from death it indicates that growth or the transmutation of intent happens incrementally. Each incremental step of change has the same basic structure. The self presents the other with behaviour based on malevolent or conditional motive. In the fullness of time the other confronts this behaviour and the self is presented with failure. This failure necessitates a review of motive by the self.
24. The nature of the resistance which the self experiences from the other is appropriate to the level of maturity of the self. In its most infantile state the self is here to get unconditionally. The other resists this brazen lack of consideration and the self realises that it has to appease the other in order to get what it wants. It therefore gives in order to get.
25. Giving in order to get is about manipulating the other in order to achieve an end that the self would construe as beneficial to the self. The other disables

every transaction based on this intent. Every time a transaction of this nature is disabled the self attempts a more sophisticated strategy in order to gain control over the other. The increase in sophistication of these strategies amounts to an increased preparedness of the self to delay gratification.

26. Growth is therefore about a sublimation of intent.
27. In the process of growth the child is introduced to the social order when it discovers that it is discontinuous from the other. This discovery is simultaneously the first apprehension of the capacity of the other to withhold the good auspices of the self and the birth of the intent to bend the other to suit the design of the self. The core of this intent is about the managing of predictable outcomes beneficial to the self.
28. As the self matures there is a growing insight that vanquishing the other destroys the source of the contentment of the self. There is an understanding that the self cannot achieve peace with the social other in the absence of a negotiated settlement with the social other.
29. The production of surpluses is an economic metaphor for a successful social order. A surplus suggests that the members of that society have produced more than they have taken out. Collectively they have given more than they have taken.
30. The degree to which members of a society are negotiating on behalf of their own interests is the degree to which the society has cancer and is doomed to failure. This is because the intent of the individuals is to succeed at the haggle, in other words, to get as much as they can for giving as little as possible.
31. A social order may be described a pattern of transactions between people. If the intent of the average transaction in a society is malevolent then the society will be fractured, at war with itself and in a state of decay. The degree to which the individual engages each transaction in view of what is correct and benevolent is the degree to which the society is robust and in harmony.
32. The pursuit of transactional correctness is simultaneously the path of unfoldment of the individual and the establishment of a legitimate social order. The individual's highest self-interest therefore lies in acting consistently with the best interest of the other.
33. A society based on the pursuit of self-interest will cultivate hostility between the generations, the sexes and between the leadership and the following.
34. A person in pursuit of his or her self-interest is fundamentally untrustworthy.
35. The degree to which there is an element of unconditional service in the intent of the self is the degree to which the self makes peace with the social order. The attempt to be of service to the other amounts to the intent to manage outcomes beneficial to the other. While this intent is benevolent the behaviour that flows from it is still conditional. It is benevolent getting to give.

36. Preparedness for death implies the capacity to give unconditionally. This implies a fundamental disavowal of any pretence of usefulness or capacity to manage outcomes. Giving to give implies a disregard for outcome, or what is going to be achieved. At this point the maturation of the self requires a fundamental alienation from the social order since death is an alienation from the social order.
37. The final fulfilment of the destiny of the individual is therefore beyond the social good. In this sense the successful life is superordinate to the social good. The individual is superordinate to society. The social order is fundamentally there to enable the individual, not the other way round.
38. Societies that are concerned with the enablement of the individual are fundamentally benevolent. Societies that subordinate the enablement of the individual to the social project are fundamentally malevolent.
39. In Semitic mythology this distinction is explored in the account of Moses and Pharaoh. The Pharonic model subjugates the people to the work of the social project. This project amounts to the construction of the pyramidal mausoleum of the leader. The aim of this mausoleum is to ensure the immortality and eternal aggrandizement of the leader. The people are enslaved to this project principally because of their own need for the security of life in Egypt. In the Mosaic model the social project is fundamentally bizarre. It amounts to an aimless wandering through the desert for forty years. However, this wandering is about enabling a generation of free people. The social project is therefore the means to the end of enabling the people, not the other way round. Moses, the leader, never gets to the Promised Land. He is expended in the process of freeing the people from slavery.
40. A Pharonic society therefore subordinates the growth of the individual to the social project and the social project is about the immortality and aggrandizement of those in control. A mosaic or prophetic society applies the social project to the end of enabling free and mature people and the leadership of this society expend themselves to this end.
41. Correct leadership therefore entails understanding that the role of the leader is to serve or care for the following. However, this care is fundamentally about the growth of the individual, in other words, cultivating the individual's freedom, maturity and power. It is therefore about cultivating the individual's capacity for unconditional benevolent action. Legitimate leadership is about the care and growth of the follower. Likewise, a legitimate social order is about the care and growth of the individual.
42. Legitimate governance is concerned with enabling the best in the citizen. This means that at the end of a legitimate political establishment the average citizen will be functioning at a higher level on the continuum of intent than was the case when that establishment came to power. Conversely, illegitimate governance will finish with the citizen functioning at a lower level along the continuum of the maturation of intent than was the case when it started.

43. Illegitimate governments leave the people more greedy, selfish and needy than what they found them. Conversely, legitimate governments will leave the people more courageous, honourable and generous than what they found them.
44. A malevolent social order has a vested interest in the disablement of the individual. It will seek to cultivate neediness, insecurity and conditional behaviour in the individual. It is precisely this behaviour which lays the foundation for its demise.
45. The liberal defense of human rights confuses the right of the individual to be enabled with self-interest. It therefore forms part of the ideological justification of a fundamentally malevolent social order.
46. Making the social project subordinate to the individual does not imply endorsing rampant individualism and self-interest. The generation that fled Egypt found the wandering through the desert fundamentally onerous. Their own freedom meant giving up the collusion of mediocrity that gave them security. In this sense freedom from tyranny is simultaneously freedom from Pharonic oppression and a disavowal of the expectation of security.
47. An enabling social order requires the individual to pursue goals that are greater than self-interest. They are goals that are fundamentally generous in character. Every incremental step of growth implies an incremental shift of intention in the direction of benevolence. This is only possible if the social other holds the individual accountable for the malevolence of his intention.
48. A social order that does not hold the individual accountable for the malevolence of their intention is fundamentally disabling. Such a society can only cultivate weak, grasping, cowardly and selfish individuals. Such people will be ill equipped to face the most fundamental existential problem, namely the proximity of death.
49. It is unjust to hold a person accountable if they do not have the means or are not able to make the contribution required of them. A person does not have the ability to contribute if they do not know why or how to make the contribution required of them.
50. For a person to know why they should do something means for them to understand the benevolent intent of the particular task or activity. It is not possible for a person to act unconditionally in the pursuit of a task that is fundamentally about taking.
51. It is not just to treat the person who behaves deliberately malevolently and the person who does so through carelessness in the same way. A person who behaves malevolently through carelessness should be censured. A person who behaves with deliberate malevolence should be punished. There is a difference between culpable homicide and murder.
52. The register of correction in the liberal language of justice suggests that inability, carelessness and malevolence are somehow the same thing. This assumption is both false and disastrous. It is unjust to punish a person who is unaware that he is transgressing. It is appropriate to censure a person who

transgresses through carelessness. However, it is appropriate to punish a person who transgresses deliberately. Not to view the person who is malevolent as worthy of punishment is to sanction malevolence in the society.

53. If technocratic society requires the brazen pursuit of self-interest to function, it also suggests that it will harbour a relatively large number of criminally disposed citizens. In fact, a degree of criminality in the population makes a functional contribution to the overall maintenance of the status quo. It cultivates the climate of insecurity which legitimises the security apparatus of the state.
54. The assumption that imprisonment rehabilitates the criminal is both false and arrogant. Prisons foster and cultivate a culture of criminality, they do not remedy it. To imprison the criminal means to punish the victim of the crime twice. Firstly by having been the target of the crime and secondly by being taxed to keep the criminal in prison. To hold the criminal appropriately accountable for his malevolence means to execute those guilty of violent crimes. Further, it follows that flogging and amputation for less serious crimes would be more just than imprisonment.
55. A company is a virtual village. The requirements for the legitimacy of the social order are therefore equally applicable to the company. A company that has the enrichment of the shareholder as its primary goal is basically concerned with the aggrandizement of those in control. It is therefore malevolent and disabling.
56. The view that sees organisational structure and system as superordinate to the individual is fundamentally Pharonic. The bureaucratic concern with control both assumes and entrenches the untrustworthiness of the employee at work and the citizen in society. Far from empowering the individual the technocratic order diminishes him at every turn.
57. The liberal understanding of human rights fundamentally undermines the individual's accountability and therefore entrenches his disablement. This establishes the conditions where people are permitted to pursue and remain equal to the worst in themselves. This destroys the individual and the social order at the same time.
58. In one bulletin a BBC newscast laments the flogging by Islamic law of a woman in Nigeria for promiscuous behaviour and the staggering AIDS statistics of Africa. Amazing.
59. The perpetuation of the current order requires the licentiousness of the individual. It therefore follows that the suppression of fundamentally destructive phenomena such as promiscuity, pornography, gambling and prostitution will be construed to be contrary to basic human rights.
60. A disabled parent will not be trusted to spank her child. A disabled teacher will not be permitted to exercise corporal punishment on the pupil. A disabled employer will not be permitted to dismiss an employee. A disabled citizen will not be allowed to defend himself when attacked by a criminal. All of this suggests that the individual is not allowed to hold someone else accountable

for their actions. The individual is not accountable nor can they call someone else to account without the intercession of a superordinate control function. The system rules. It is superordinate to the individual.

61. The more a society is concerned with control the more it cultivates criminality. The more sophisticated the control mechanisms are the more ingenious the rogues become.
62. Every time one introduces a control one shifts accountability for the thing that is being controlled from the person who is doing it to the person who is controlling it. In South Africa, for example, the concern with crime is more about the ineffectiveness of the police than the accountability of the criminal.
63. Just as it is illegitimate to ascribe significance to the social order over the individual, it is inadmissible to see the economy as superordinate to the transaction. A successful economic order is not one that is well managed by economic technocrats, but one in which each transaction is value adding.
64. The language of economics ascribes a scientific validity to a principally speculative exercise. Economic jargon replaces the concern with what accounts for a just transaction with a concern with what kind of system works. It is about what is pragmatic rather than what is right. It trades correctness for expediency.
65. A legitimate transaction will reflect the intention of the seller to give good measure and the intention of the buyer to reward service appropriately. The concern for both of these parties is therefore what is fair and just for the other, rather than getting as much as possible for giving as little as possible.
66. Any transaction in which someone gets something for nothing is fundamentally usurious and unjust.
67. The degree to which the individual transactions in the market are unjust is the degree to which the market will require superordinate control.
68. When the average adult makes doing the right thing their central concern there is little need for overall management of the system. There is a spontaneous order that arises in every sphere of life, from the market to the school. Such a society basically works. When the average adult makes getting as much as possible for as little as possible their central concern the social order requires to be managed. Without continuous superordinate control such a society collapses.
69. The modern economy is a hybrid of two tyrannies, an uncontrolled market and illegitimate transaction. This has enabled piracy on a scale unknown in human history.