

FREEDOM OF SPEECH AND THE MAITREYA

Sam Fryman

The requested successful removal by one major torrent site of the recent posting of the author's "Understanding Female Sexuality and Porn" – which we know to have been downloaded at least four to five thousand times on just two torrent sites alone in the first forty eight hours after posting – has stimulated us to dwell upon and therefore comment on the issue of *freedom of speech* – because we feel there is no subject of greater importance in our current world, and indeed no greater fundamental human right apart from that to life itself.

Because of what value are any of our lives, if we are only allowed to say, think and feel what *somebody somewhere* decides is right, rather than allowing the free expression of our own individual nature?

Many throughout history – such as the Russian dissidents like Alexander Solzhenitsyn and so on – have believed that it was better to even be imprisoned and be allowed freedom of speech, than to be so called "free" in the dictatorial and totalitarian society they inhabited.

So in the current era it seems that we are being ever more threatened to "politically correct" our thoughts and feelings, and licensed by the powers that be to be only thoughtless, soulless and hypnotised working and breeding machines to be fodder to the consumer society.

Though the capitalist West has long been critical of these so called communist dictatorships like the former Soviet Union and China, and is currently condemnatory of what it sees as "religious dictatorships" such as the various Muslim countries, it appears that the major Western countries such as America and England are now becoming more and more policed in terms of what people are allowed to think and say.

As in George Orwell's classic short novel, *Animal Farm*, which was a parody of communist Russia under Stalin, the pigs who overthrew the human rule of Farmer Jones – i.e. led the "revolution" – eventually did everything that the humans they had "overthrown" for the benefit (so they claimed) of other animals had done, and worse.

Initially they had the slogan “Two legs good, four legs bad”, but the pigs eventually decided to start walking on two legs, and awarding themselves privileges that their fellow animals didn’t have, and ruled over the rest of the animals with tyranny, so that the law was later changed by them from merely:

ALL ANIMALS ARE EQUAL.

To:

ALL ANIMALS ARE EQUAL. *BUT SOME ANIMALS ARE MORE EQUAL THAN OTHERS.*

Your current author incidentally respectfully parodied Orwell’s work itself, in his recent short “satirical novel” *Feminal Farm*.

(incidentally again, those who have read the latter work, may have asked themselves the question – does the author mean *feminals* are *feminists*? To which our answer would be, not necessarily; because that would be to accuse the feminists of doing everything in the novel that the *feminals* did, which we don’t necessarily claim – but there are some *very strong resemblances*, and the author does view the *extreme feminists*, who it appears to him are trying to deny men their *human rights* as being a very dominant and powerful influence in the global society who are leading the rest of fundamentally decent women astray)

But does it not seem that the scenario of *Animal Farm* applies just as much to any modern Western capitalist nation as it did to Stalin’s Russia?

Although in theory it is *called* democracy, in practice we still have the privileged few, who write the laws for the rest, and it is becoming increasingly obvious, particularly in the UK, that there is no genuine freedom of choice, representation, and therefore *democracy*, because the few major political parties are evermore turning to near-identical “sound-byte” driven policies, which easily capture the public imagination by endlessly promising them “quick fixes” which deceive them into voting for the party who promises the easiest life, but rarely ever work.

[incidentally, for the benefit of readers around the world we would like to quickly explain our sometimes vague use of the terms *England, the UK, Britain*, and so on, as it is sometimes confusing even to “the British”

Basically, there are five countries that make up the whole “British Isles” – England, Scotland, Wales, Northern Ireland and Ireland (also know as “the Republic of Ireland” or “Eire” in Irish Gaelic, which is what is shown on the stamps).

England, Scotland, Wales and *Northern* Ireland collectively are known as “the United Kingdom” (or UK), and are under “British” (really *English*) rule, as this so called “United Kingdom” is governed by the parliament in London at *Westminster* in the famous “Houses of Parliament”, whose clock tower holds the huge bell whose chimes can be heard daily across London called *Big Ben*.

Only Ireland is independent of Westminster since 1922, after many bloody battles and attempts by the British to hold power, but Northern Ireland is still not free and independent, and there has been constant resentment of this fact by many ever since, and much murder, “terrorist bombings” and presence of British troops on the streets of Northern Ireland, and this situation remains unresolved until this day.

Consequently the Irish, Welsh and Scottish people may not fundamentally regard themselves as British, so please don’t blame those nations for “the British Empire” which used to dominate most of the world for a time, but neither should other nations blame the *modern* English people for that, because they did not commit the crimes of their forefathers, any more than the modern Germans and Japanese committed the crimes of their Nazi or imperialist ancestors, and *therefore* should not be made to suffer for them]

That is, in England, due to this short-termist “sound-byte” and therefore *visionless* politics – based mainly on the desire to get elected or re-elected – all the so-called “political parties” are seeking to *follow* what they perceive to be *the peoples’ demands* – as told them in the daily *opinion polls* – rather than to wisely *lead* the people, as any true government of a nation should.

For, we could argue – as these governments do – that by giving the people ever more sex, drugs and rock’n’roll, or as they say “bread and circuses”, they are therefore being *democratic*, giving “the people” what they want.

But the point is, the so called “people”, are being brainwashed and hypnotised by a largely uncontrolled and destructive commercial world, which seeks to give the people only false and corrupting satisfactions, or as Greg Lake of 70s rock group *King Crimson* put it (Pete Sinfield’s lyric in reality) in their famous *21st Century Schizoid Man* :

*Nothing he’s got he really needs
(Twenty-first century schizoid man)*

Let’s quote the whole song lyrics in fact to make the point clearer:

*Cat's foot, iron claw
Neurosurgeons scream for more
At paranoia's poison door
Twenty-first century schizoid man.*

*Blood, rack, barbed wire
Politician's funeral pyre
Innocents raped with napalm fire
Twenty-first century schizoid man.*

*Death seed, blind man's greed
Poet's starving children bleed
Nothing he's got, he really needs
Twenty-first century schizoid man.*

This, written around thirty-five years ago, was somewhat prophetic, and is rather like our modern TV news, is it not, with the genetic engineering, the constant war, torture and murder, and the obsessive greed of the rich and so on?

Artists like poets such as Peter Sinfield can often see what is coming before the rest of the population does.

But poets and creative people in general, whilst possessing such a great talent, also have to be careful, because if they get famous and rich, and become “part of the establishment” (which is an invitation “the establishment” frequently offers *to silence them*), so that typically one sees, they will have an endless number of women lining up to enter their beds, they can lose this purity and vision.

For example, the famous five thousand years old or more Chinese book of “wisdom” *the I Ching* points this out, which in the Richard Wilhelm translation says something like:

“many great men have been ruined, because they were dazzled by the enticements of fame, and drawn into the course of the masses.”

Likewise, we can think of Christ during his period of wandering in the desert being taken to a high place by “the devil” (i.e. *his own ego, vanity*) and offered the whole world, if only he would cast aside his allegiance to his God (i.e. *his humanity, his integrity*)

That is to say, the truly *great man* (or woman) is not necessarily *the famous* or “*worldly successful*” man or woman.

Christ, for example, was probably known only to a few thousand people during his whole life in a tiny part of the world, and likewise even figures like Van Gogh, and Johann Sebastian Bach, who were either hardly known at all *during their lifetime* in the former case, or not famous *as a composer* in the latter case of perhaps the greatest Western classical musician ever, J S Bach, whom almost all great composers of the later eras have acknowledged as an inspiration and paid tribute to.

So let us not think that because we are not written about in the newspapers or appear on television that our lives are meaningless. Life will be *great* for us or not so, according as to how we live it as individuals, whether the general public knows about us or not.

For those who are religiously or spiritually inclined of course, they may be able to take great comfort in realising that the only true witness and judge to their lives who is *in possession of all the facts* is the omnipresent universal intelligence or “God.”

We are not asking anyone however, to “believe in” such a God, though we will have more to say on this subject later, when we discuss “the Maitreya.”

But as to politics, and “democracy”, we see that in nations like England, such a concept of “rule by, and for the people” seems to be seriously under threat, and with it, *freedom of speech*, partly to do with this so called policy of “political correctness.”

The author views this so called “politically corrected speech” as the most serious and pernicious attack on free speech ever devised.

And what is both fascinating and utterly hypocritical is that the term and practice of this is said to have been invented by the so called “liberal” thinkers.

i.e. we have so called *liberals* arguing against *freedom*, in this case against *freedom of speech* – which is of course yet some more classic “doublethink”, again, as George Orwell put it so well – i.e. believing in freedom and *not believing* in freedom *both at the same time*.

And this “doublethink” we see with these kind of people – whom we may call “left wing” or “liberal” or whatever – which is not however to suppose that your author is therefore “right wing”, as those who are classed as “right wing” can in many cases equally be the enemies of true freedom.

We aren’t however going to argue the history or *taxonomy* (i.e. classification of species) in terms of exactly *who* the so called “liberals” are, but we are just going to group the followers of “political correctness” generally as the class of those who offer us what actually *looks* like freedom, but is a false freedom.

For example, though George Bush would not be described as a liberal, we would put him in that category also, due to his *false promises of freedom*.

For we cannot have a world in which freedom is truly operative when we have an *us and them* society, rather than regarding all other members of all races, philosophies and religions as human beings, as a unity of spirit.

So if we explore this philosophy of the – let us call them for sake of argument “liberals”, though this is as far as we are concerned, a vague term, and it is hard to say exactly who fits this description and who does not – we find it is full of such doublethink.

e.g. we have the concept of *PEACE EQUALS WAR*.

That is what our Western leaders are telling us: – that we can only have peace in the world by continuously dominating and attacking other nations to protect *us* from *them*.

But in reality, a very different solution might need to be employed to create *real peace* in the world.

For example, the Western governments tell us that we must live in fear of *weapons of mass destruction*, such as the deadly nuclear armaments and biological weapons that could destroy whole cities or kill their whole populations.

But the question they do not ask is – who is creating these weapons?

And the answer is – *the scientists*.

Nobody else has the know-how to make these kinds of weapons and deliver them across hundreds of miles or continents to murder thousands or millions of mostly wholly innocent people, who are no more enemies to us than are our own reflections in the mirror.

But we, as do our leaders, appreciate that the ordinary citizens of a foreign county are not the enemy, the problem, so thus they hold up to us a supposed tyrant figure, whom they paint as a monster, like Hitler, or Saddam Hussein, or whoever.

Of course, we are not in a position to know if this person really is a tyrant or not, and moreover *a threat to us*, we only know what we are told.

As is said, *truth is the first casualty of war*, and as equally has been said *history is written by the victors*, which we can see in the case of the British Empire for example.

For example, again, suppose that Germany and Japan had won the second world war. We can well imagine that America and the West would have very different history books and teaching of history in schools to children than occurs now, and quite possibly many of us would even be speaking a different language.

So clearly, we must consider that the Western history we have got, must be to at least some extent incorrect and biased, because no nation likes to admit the details of its dishonourable past, just as the present author went through a British basic history schooling which had little or nothing to say about the centuries old persecution of the Irish by the British, which has still not yet ceased in its totality.

(as we have said, the term *Britain* does not include *Eire, the Republic of Ireland*, whereas *the British Isles* does, so that means, generally speaking when the author or others talk of *the British*, that generally excludes *the Irish*).

And of course, the more recent is a war or conflict, or *if the group who won the war and wrote the history books is still roughly the same group in power*, the less likely is it going to be that the true facts will have been reported to us, *if ever* they will be.

So this implies that our leaders do not generally speaking tell us the real truth about what is going on “behind the scenes” when they declare war, but manufacture other reasons to make us support wars.

In their defence they would argue that the public can have no conception of, and would be terrified of the real facts, so that it is justified to tell them a plausible cover story.

For example, let us suppose there was as in the entertaining Arnold Schwarzenegger movie, *True Lies*, a so called “terrorist” who managed to acquire a nuclear bomb, and threatened to destroy a Western city with it.

Would it be in such a *real life* scenario, in the interests of the people of a nation to tell them that they are under such a terrifying threat, about which they can do nothing, and would only cause widespread panic and chaos?

It would surely be more in the public interest if they dealt with it quietly, and had some “SAS” or “James Bond” type heroes sort it out – or more likely get us all blown sky high – and say nothing.

Which suggests to us also, that we may be very much unaware of any genuine events on that scale – that is, *the authorities aren't likely going to tell us – until they have happened*, just as the world awoke totally unprepared one morning or afternoon to the attacks on America's financial “Twin Towers” which killed thousands of relatively innocent people, not only all Americans incidentally, but of various nations who just happened to be working there at the time.

So to some extent, even a genuinely caring government might act in such a manner as to protect its citizens from information that might do them more harm than good, if made *public*, for example, demonstrated by Orson Welles' famous hoax broadcast of *The War of the Worlds*, which

had many Americans believing a Martian invasion was underway, and caused widespread panic.

But the trouble is when they don't tell us *their motives*.

Our leaders can easily – as they did – tell us there is some classified “intelligence information” which can't be shown the public “for reasons of national security”, so then, as we can't possibly know the facts, as we all live in this tiny bubble of limited information in the small space around us, we have little choice but to trust them.

So what can we do, when they lead us maybe into being killed as soldiers in a war, or blown up by “terrorist” bombs?

For example, let us look briefly at the term “terrorist” itself. As is now well known, one man's terrorist is another man's *freedom fighter*.

But we may say – ah, the terrorist blows up *innocent people*, but our “noble army” (you know, the one that has done the torturing and abuse of Iraqis, for example) only fights other soldiers, and does not attack the innocents.

But wait a minute – the Americans dropped bombs on Iraq for example, and thousands of innocents were maimed or killed.

They can *honestly* say that they only *intended* to hit military targets, but they themselves *knew* that despite their hi-tech weaponry and “precision bombing”, some of the missiles and bombs would miss the target, and that some of their intelligence would be wrong, and in both cases this would result in “collateral damage” – i.e. hundreds or thousands of innocents being maimed and killed, like the famous little boy who lost his arms and legs and all his family were killed, not one of them being an armed forces member of any kind.

So we are not by any means seeking to *justify* terrorist acts, but in fact, we could even argue that it is the neglect of the good and wise in the West that is ultimately responsible for the terrorist bomb attacks on the West, for failing to hold their governments to account for these acts of provocation, though we do know a good number are trying.

i.e. we are not remotely in the business of trying to support Arab “terrorists”, but we are saying, this is simply *cause and effect*.

Obviously, like the Irish IRA, these “terrorists” see themselves as “freedom fighters” who are caught up in an unequal *David and Goliath* contest, and in real life, they are well aware, Goliath nearly always wins.

So they decide, there’s no way we can beat Goliath, so we will start terrorising his people, until they tell Goliath to leave us alone.

That is in its simplest form is obviously what the so called “terrorism” is all about, yet *this obvious truth* is rarely placed before the public.

Some argue for example, that there is a battle between Russia, China and America (and its part-time partner England), for control over the Iraqi oil, and that is *the real cause* of the conflict, and that is *the real truth of the war*.

Well, if that is so – why did our leaders not tell us? Because without enough oil, our *current* Western economy is going to grind to a halt, and millions of increasingly fat and unhealthy Westerners might even *starve*, or be forced back into a World War II type rationing system, which for modern Westerners would now be unthinkable.

We *can* understand such an argument, the author believes that if this was the case, then the Western governments should have told their people about this problem, and *the Iraqi people too*, and then some kind of deal could have been struck to ensure that the West got its oil at a fair price without any problems. Surely *military action* would not then have been necessary?

So we cannot believe that the motivation for the attack on Iraq was that simple.

Or it could have been because of Korea, Russia (and the other CIS countries) and China, in that there may perhaps be a *genuine threat* to the West from those countries, and so America had to ensure that they controlled the Muslim oil.

The author is not saying there *is* such a threat to the West from those countries, or there is not. The purpose here is *not* to give an expert analysis of modern international affairs, because *he does not see that he is in any position to gather the TRUE FACTS to do so*, and equally would find it hard to be convinced that any of his readers are, unless they are deep inside the American or British government or secret services, *and properly informed*, which he finds very unlikely, *though not impossible*.

We imagine we all know what is going on in the world, but really that is mostly wishful thinking, because each of us lives in *an extremely small bubble of personal experience*, and most of the other information we get is either from books – whose contents we are again generally *in no position whatsoever to verify* – or from the media, and likewise we only know what we are being told.

If we tune our satellite dishes or radios or Internet accounts into another channel or web page, we can quite likely find *two completely opposite accounts of the same event*, obviously both of which cannot be true.

But the reporting of events is not generally black or white, just as we do not always – for one reason another – tell the exact facts of everything we have personally done or experienced to somebody else.

Which again, may sometimes be justified, or may not be.

For example, if we have a friend whose marital or life partner we have seen in the company of someone else, we may – not knowing if this is what we suspect it might be – *justifiably* decide to omit facts, or say we were some place else doing something else.

Which of course, is known as *the white lie*.

So our governments members who have still got at least some noticeable degree of conscience, can often salve it in such a way, telling us what they see as *white lies*, in order to as they see it, take best care of our needs.

But we are suggesting that the time for that policy *is largely over*, because we can see that this policy of suppression of the truth is leading us all progressively to personal and collective disaster.

In the West, the problem with government is increasingly shown to be *party politics*.

Does that surprise the reader?

Why didn't we say "government corruption", "scandal" and so on?

Because we are saying, of course those matters are a problem, but *where are they coming from?*

And they are coming from the idea that one group should form into a *separate* party of people within society, and protect the interests of *only* their followers and members, who then oppose other groups who try to do the same, so that by definition *party politics* is creating conflict, is creating *us and them*.

So for quite some time in England, the two main parties have been *the Labour Party*, who supposedly were taking care of the common man, the poor people, the masses; and *the Conservatives*, who were supposedly just looking after the wealthy, the rich.

And as there have always been huge numbers more of rich than poor people – as ultimately riches are about *getting someone else to do all the work for you*, so no more than a few can *ever* be rich – we might ask ourselves, *how on earth did in 1979 a Conservative government like Margaret Thatcher's ever get into power* in a so called free and “democratic country” like England, where every man and woman had one vote?

For only *three years* before her, there was in power a British Labour prime minister, Harold Wilson, who imposed “super-tax” on the rich and higher earners, of *95% of every pound they made*, which policy on the one hand at least partly caused an exodus of British scientists and other talented “successes” to America (called “the brain drain”) and on the other hand inspired the Beatles classic song *Taxman*:

there's one for you, nineteen for me (95%), cos I'm the taxman...

So we appreciate that the Beatles were rather upset that they were not *so quickly* allowed thereby to join the super-rich (though *Sir Paul McCartney* for example is now allegedly a billionaire), and that the song was a witty and catchy number, but if they meant that taxes *in general* were a bad thing, we would have to disagree with them.

That is to say, if taxes are assessed fairly (which of course, generally *they are not*) and used for *the common good*, obviously they are a good thing, but to create such a system of taxation, even by a benevolent government would likely be *currently* impossible to do, because – from the richest to the poorest almost *everybody* is agreed about *one thing* – they are *all paying too much*.

But then everyone wants the public services – hospitals, schools and police and so on to be utterly marvellous and well-funded – *but they aren't willing to pay for it until they need those services themselves.*

So some politician has got to be *brave and honest enough* to tell the public that if they want good public services they will have to pay for them, which inevitably must mean *higher taxes.*

So we were asking how Mrs Thatcher got into power, and though by a somewhat circular route, we now have our answer.

The truth is, that Mrs Thatcher promised the people *riches* (including *tax cuts*). In particular, and as somewhat a role model, she promised *women* riches, she had the saying after some years in power of her era of “Thatcherism”, which for many became synonymous with *greed*, “you have never had it so good.”

But unfortunately, in this statement she was overlooking the fact, that as she had been busy dismantling British industry, there were millions of mostly *men* who had been put out of work, and were thereby forced into poverty, depression, mental illness and in some cases *suicide* as depicted for example in a universally known British drama of the time, by playwright Alan Bleasdale, called *The Boys from the Blackstuff.*

Instead, Mrs Thatcher created a generation of what were known as “yuppies” – young professionals – who seemed to care only about “getting to the top”, having bucket loads of money, driving Porsches and Ferraris, and having an awful lot of sex with as many partners as they could get their greedy and dirty hands on.

Does the author sound resentful?

He certainly is.

But not because he cares for riches, nor even bedding lots of women – but because this heartless materiality obsessed British society Mrs Thatcher created, destroyed men in general, and most of what was good in British society in the space of little over ten years.

Our modern England is very much still experiencing the fallout of this *fundamental shift in values.*

Politics became no longer about issues of human concern, such as abortion or human rights and so on, all the talk became totally focused on *money, the economy*, and that's how things still are today, just adding *war and terrorism* to the equation, for good measure.

And of course, as Mrs Thatcher's policies in conjunction with her "best buddy", the then American president, Ronald Regan, became a role model for the rest of Europe, this general policy of greed and generally speaking of women become more and more the breadwinners at the expense of their husbands and children, set in almost everywhere.

Thus around us today in most of the West, we have largely a *nothing* society, of *nothing* people, who just mindlessly worship the celebrities placed before them everyday, and spend endless hours making their little nests into extravagant little palaces, and buying thousands of dresses and pairs of shoes that they don't really need, like the two ugly sisters out of Cinderella multiplied by millions – while around a quarter of the world barely survives or starves – but are as far away from being real people – caring, sensitive, humane, tolerant, and loving *in the Christian sense* – as are plastic flowers from real ones.

But we do not *blame* the masses for this.

On the contrary, the author has the greatest sympathy for the mass of people, whom he sees in fact to be the greatest victims of this shift in policy, as they are merely the fodder of the consumer society, who are themselves now suffering under all kinds of addictions, like shopping, gambling, too much sex, and are victims of violence, mental illness, bullying, obesity and other health problem which are all the outcome of a world and society *gone wrong*.

It is *the leaders of society* who must surely carry the blame, because ultimately they are telling everyone else – directly or indirectly – what to do.

For example, our current British politicians are not telling us *directly* to gamble, but they are authorising lots of casinos in every British city which *they must know* will lure in and addict countless people who never gambled significantly before, just as the now legalised – and in the author's view degrading to both men and women – "lap dance" clubs do.

So we said *party politics* was largely to blame. Why?

Because all members of political parties are motivated by the leaders in the party to “follow the party line” – i.e. to suppress their own *free choice* of voting on the various policies and laws presented to them. In British party politics, all parties have persons who are known as “whips” to ensure that their members vote in parliament as their leaders wish, and therefore *are not tempted to follow their own conscience and beliefs*.

The reason it is so easy to “whip” members of parliament into cooperation, is because, as Britain is run along *party political lines*, if whichever party is currently in power, i.e. *the government*, loses enough votes in parliament on some policy or law they are trying to push through, they could lose power altogether, either by causing the calling of a new election, or by losing the next election, which in England is no longer than five years hence, as that is the maximum time any current government is allowed to run.

Thus, although the UK or Britain is divided into roughly six hundred or so relatively small geographical areas, called *constituencies*, which each have their own MP or “member of parliament”, because *the public* tends to vote for a *party*, rather than *an individual*, this means that the job of each MP (member of parliament) is only safe, if *their party* is safe.

Therefore each *locally elected* representative, i.e. member of parliament or MP, is scared to death to “rock the boat”, because *they may lose their job*.

Thus, the vast majority of so called “members of parliament” are *not* allowed to vote according to their own conscience and principles, and thus the public is deceived that there is any democracy at all, which we have now *logically proven* to not exist, as in practice all the big decisions are therefore dictated by a small elite who intimidate and “whip” the rest into cooperation, and thus we are back to George Orwell’s *Animal Farm*, in which the privileged pigs *appointed themselves* to rule over the other *not so equal after all* animals.

Of course, these leaders might argue – “ah, but I was elected by the members – they chose *me* to represent them.”

But this does not overrule the fact that there is no political system in place that would *permit* the individual members to have a free vote on every issue, as should surely be.

We don't wish to bore readers around the world with too much details of British politics, which incidentally tends to bore the author himself in many cases, but we wish to show that Britain, which has surely become a model via the British empire and so on for numerous world countries, has in its own oft-imitated system this *fundamental flaw*, which clearly rules out immediately any possibility of the real *democracy* it claims.

That is, suppose instead *party politics* were abolished, which incidentally in Britain *is* currently under attack, due to many rich British citizens allegedly having given the current British "New Labour" party illegal financial incentives in order to indirectly "purchase honours" such as *peerages*, so that they can instead of being known as Joe or Jane Bloggs become entitled to call themselves, Lord or Lady Bloggs, or Sir Henry Bloggs, or even Dame or Baroness Bloggs, and thereby imagine they are a million times better than the rest of us.

So imagine instead we merely had *independent* members of parliament only, elected as usual by the local people but *purely on their own merits*, *purely on their own personal principles and beliefs*.

There could of course still be a national leader, and a cabinet of ministers, who *proposed* most of the policies, who would also be elected *on merit* by this totally free *non-party political* vote.

And then equally, each law or policy that was introduced would be voted upon by each member of parliament *entirely on their own free judgement and principles*.

So surely, this system would be a much fairer and more representative version of "democracy", which we clearly see cannot possibly happen as things are at present, when more or less every so called "democracy" in the world is divided into an "us and them" war of rivals, constantly attacking the other side, and blaming the other side for everything that goes wrong, just as daily, *ad nauseam*, do the British Labour and Conservative parties in England, just as in America we have the Republicans and the Democrats playing the same tedious and hypocritical "blame game."

So it is surely time to end *party politics* – is it time to base the government of nations on *principles*, on matters that directly affect peoples' lives, not on a never ending greed-based war of *us and them*.

[incidentally, with simple logic and arithmetic it is easy to show that in a country which runs this “democratic party political” system, suppose there are 3 main political parties, e.g. in England, *the Conservative, Labour and Liberal parties*, it is easy to work out that any of these 3 parties could win and be elected as a *majority government*, and therefore run a more or less unopposable dictatorship, on only marginally over 1/6th of the public vote, for example by winning half the local elections (*constituencies*) *plus one* across the country, if each election was composed of a theoretical electorate of 1000 voters who voted in the following way 334: 333: 333.

Thus in this so called “democratic voting system”, at the extremity, less than 17% of a nation can effectively rule over the rest, and this is even *before* we consider the party political “whipping” system, that forces “dissident” party member to vote with the small elite.

In England, the current Tony Blair “New Labour” government has been voted for by less than 23% of the electorate, but in parliament holds a majority of over 66 seats, and won 92 more seats in England than its closest rival, the Conservative party, though *astonishingly* the latter party had 50,000 more people in England vote for it, which shows this system up for the travesty it is. That is, let all world citizens be aware, that the current British government had in theory at least as much as 77% of the British public *against it* at the time of the election (who either voted for someone else, or did not care to vote at all). Surely, every reader must by now therefore realise how fundamentally *unrepresentative and therefore undemocratic* is the party political system.]

For now, more often than not, (and due to the above bracketed explanation we can see *statistically* why) we see that the government is in fact *the enemy* of the mass of the people, which seeks to divide and conquer them, by for example, enticing them all with greed, and making other promises to all kinds of minority groups, saying they will be all things to all people, but in practice we find *the wishes never come true, the promises all turn out to be lies*.

Because logically, it is clearly *impossible* to fulfil all the promises to all the different groups whose demands and desires are all conflicting, such as for example in England, the animal rights activists who have demanded that fox hunting be banned, and on the other hand, the fox hunters – many of whom are “landed gentry” and aristocracy – who wished to see their centuries old rights and liberties protected.

So what did the British government do?

It banned fox hunting to satisfy the campaigners, but seems not to be properly *enforcing* the ban, in order not to upset the upper classes and aristocrats who still want to hunt.

The author is lost for words to comment on this inconsistent madness, which he will therefore leave to the reader's own judgement.

For as this example clearly illustrates, there cannot *logically* in fact be any peace in society unless the vast majority of its members are motivated by a common philosophy.

And of course, there lies the problem, and the *raison d'etre* of *party politics*.

Some of us are capitalists who believe in either *meritocracy* or *plutocracy*, depending how you define those terms, some of us are "socialists", who think (at least *in theory*) "equal rights for all without exception" is the only basis for just government, and others are religious fundamentalists, who think that everything should be governed on the basis only of their own particularly "holy book", whether it be a Muslim, Christian or Jewish one.

So this endless philosophical wrangling has all got to stop.

That does not mean necessarily that any nation should give up their "holy book", but it does mean for example that religious groups must find *a common consensus* in their beliefs, which can be agreed upon by all, and used as a basis for cooperation and removing strife.

For as things stand, if there really are indeed "secret rulers of the world", they are surely all laughing themselves silly drinking champagne and eating caviar, while they watch the rest of the world squabbling over "ideologies", and attacking and murdering one another.

But the Dow Jones Wall Street stock market index doesn't appear to suffer a great deal, however much we all race hate and religious hate one another.

As British rock group *10cc* put it in their classic hit, *Wall Street Shuffle*:

Dow Jones ain't got no time for the bums.

But at root, clearly all the “isms” and “ideologies” in the world have to cease, and be replaced by only one concern, as put for example in Christ’s dictum:

treat thy neighbour as thyself

If we don’t start seeing one another not as Muslim, Jews, Christian, or capitalists and socialists, and even atheists (i.e. “unbelievers”, “infidels”) we are all going to be finished.

The kundalini expert, Gopi Krishna, whom the author has mentioned in his recent work *Kundalini – A Personal Experience*, claimed a prophetic vision which suggested to him that the world was on a more or less irreversible course towards a nuclear war – not a *global one* incidentally, he said, but enough to teach mankind “a single lesson”, to shock us all out of our selfish egotism and hate of our neighbours, and to see that it is now no longer merely a *moral choice* to care for our neighbour, but is in fact *the only realistic survival policy in the nuclear age*.

So as to this question of weapons of mass destruction, we pointed out that our present Western governments were currently seeking to use them as an excuse to whip up paranoia in the public, about possibilities we are not well informed enough to properly assess.

But let us suppose instead that a world allegiance of scientists was to form, without whom the politicians could never make and even maintain these weapons, who simply *refused* to be used by government to do their evil work for them.

Many scientists who worked on the development of the nuclear bomb had such qualms, as one can see for example depicted somewhat realistically in the Paul Newman movie *Fat Man and Little Boy*, and if the conscience of scientists in general were to awaken to what the purpose of their weapons really is, they would cease to give their talents to government, and then these horrors would become impossible.

(of course, at present there are large numbers of such weapons in the hands of the military of various nations, but once dismantled and destroyed, they would then become irreplaceable).

But for now the Western scientists are driven by the feeling that the world is an *us* and *them* battle, and we need bigger and scarier weapons than

“our enemies”, who would not of course be enemies at all, if we learned to make peace with other nations, instead of war.

Some may say this is a naïve view, that dictators and empire builders will always arise in various places, and thus we will always have to keep an army and fearsome weaponry poised to act as a deterrent.

But in that case, the great powerful nations should see to it that they support leaders who are of a peaceful nature, who will bring freedom, peace and prosperity to their countries, rather than supporting a sequence of elitist dictators, as the West appears to have done for decades in these less powerful and developed nations, for example in South America, Asia, some parts of the middle East and Africa.

For what do we have in these countries that have had for example communist regimes removed, such as Russian?

We have widespread gangsterism, chaos and festering civil wars, and so far, this kind of chaos is pretty much what the West has led Iraq to.

But as we said, we don't want to discuss *the detail* of international affairs here, because as we have also said, the real *facts* of what is happening and why are not necessarily easy to come by, and thus we can get bogged down in arguments about irrelevant detail, which will just obscure the big picture.

That is, if we get into the realms of “conspiracy theories”, but *we don't have the facts*, we can just waste endless amounts of time and energy in speculations that ultimately lead nowhere, like trying to find out who killed President Kennedy or Marilyn Monroe (was it really accident or suicide or murder?) or Princess Diana (accident or murder?) and so on.

It can be interesting to speculate on these matters, but we may have to accept the truth is lost in the mists of time, even regarding the more recent tragedies such as the British Dr David Kelly, a government weapons inspector and adviser, who is *officially* supposed to have committed suicide, but appeared to be a “whistleblower” who perhaps *knew too much*, and looked like he might very well have revealed something very damaging to the government had he lived much longer.

Various crusading or merely acclaim-hungry journalists will keep digging at these matters of course, but if we ourselves don't know anything, don't have any *facts* based on our own experience to add, we are left only with

the more or less impossible task of trying to distinguish one set of allegations from another.

The point being that the modern way of dealing with international and even national and local affairs by “the authorities” is generally speaking *the cover up*.

When Western civilisation (and let’s recall what Mahatma Gandhi said when asked what he thought of Western civilisation – *it would be a very good idea...*) is based on elitism, that is, a powerful minority who live like emperors dominating the rest, inevitably the currency of the conduct of political relations must be *cover ups, lies*.

It is thus no coincidence that we see so many *lawyers* (strange how close this word is to *liars* is it not?) who are trained to be able to argue a case, for example, if their client wants *black proven white*, then it is *their job* to do so.

They will say (for example) “we can appreciate that the jury may have long believed that white was not black. But there has been major doubts cast upon this by modern research, and we intend to produce *expert witnesses* to show that these doubts are justified. For example, many people have been found to be unable to distinguish white from grey and black from grey, so clearly black and white cannot be so different can they? And then we have to consider *the blind*, who are unable to distinguish black from white completely, and regard them as the same. Are we to deny the opinions of the blind? Are we to deny the blind equal rights as citizens? And therefore, if they hold the opinion that black and white are no different whatsoever, surely this must be influential. So we find the more we dig into this subject, it seems impossible to definitely claim that black and white are different. For after all, consider the night. No one has yet at night time been able to distinguish black and white, so at the very least, we can say that black and white are absolutely equal, absolutely equivalent, so that therefore we can say black and white are equivalent at least fifty-percent of the time, and thus the argument that black is not white can only seem to be dubious at the most. And do not forget there are many racists who seek to prove black and white different in order to persecute other races. As we know racism is evil, this seems yet another convincing claim against the argument that black and white are so different, when clearly as racism is wrong, and we are all humans, black and white must indeed be very much the same...etc...”

And the author has just thought up these arguments *instantly*, purely off the cuff, so just imagine what a highly trained and experienced lawyer can do with issues that are far less clear cut and *far easier* to argue, given weeks or months to prepare a case.

And of course, if our author or such a truth-twisting lawyer was able to bring some “scientific experts” to bear on this subject, he could likely find some one or several experts cranky enough to convince a jury that their reality view was wrong, and that they should accept *black is white*, and bow down to “science”, just as people in general do out of fear and ignorance.

So we see how words and ideas can be used to make people doubt even *obvious facts*, so thus, when generally speaking in politics and law the public has *no access* to the facts, it is easy to see how people can be constantly deceived as to what is really going on behind the scenes of all the “cover stories” we are constantly told.

(for example, in the case of the scientists who are made to invent and produce the weapons of mass destruction for the governments, no doubt those with moral qualms will be told something like: “of course nobody *wants* these weapons. But our enemies threaten *their* scientists with torture or that harm will come to their wives and children if they don’t cooperate, so we have just got no choice but to *ask you* to make these weapons too, but we ask only therefore that you do this *for your country, your own family even*, which proves *we* are the civilised ones, unlike our enemies, who brutally threaten their scientists to *force* them to cooperate.”

But the trouble is, such scientists do not see, that the so called “enemy” will likely be telling *their scientists* exactly the same story about *us*.)

And that is why we see many *lawyers* in government these days, because they are very good at arguing – with a straight face we must point out, that sometimes defies belief, and surely verges on the *psychopathic* – these “black is white” arguments with which to confound us, and keep us in the dark as to their real motives and intentions.

So let us rather deal with *the facts* we all know. That is the only *logical* way to deal with reality.

Let us observe the fact that the West has thousands of filthy rich people who have one hundred foot yachts in the Mediterranean and stables full

of Rolls Royces and Ferraris, whilst in the Third World, millions die of hunger and disease every year, without proper food, medicines or clean water.

Let us look at *the fact* that even in most South American countries, we see a similar rich elite, but then also thousands of children who live on the streets rooting through the garbage left by the wealthy ones, just to survive.

And yet British parliament spends hundreds of hours discussing fox hunting, the plans for England to get the next Olympic games, and other such *comparative* trivialities.

And this is one reason why we must protect *absolutely* the right to *freedom of speech*.

Because the authorities do not want to talk about these matters, and if the ordinary people (i.e. those who are not celebrities or elite) are not allowed to talk of these matters without fear, the world suffering will get worse in a thousand different ways.

But there is a major problem with *problems*.

The problem is, that because not enough humans have *vision*, i.e. can see where the trends are going, like the poet friend we mentioned earlier, Pete Sinfield and his *21st Century Schizoid Man*, few of us are interested in or concerned about problems *until we have them ourselves*.

For instance, those who have never been burgled are not much interested in having something done about burglars. Those who have never had or feared cancer are not much interested in supporting cancer research. Those who have never been in a war zone, are not too concerned about war – as long as it stays far away from them. And of course, those who have never been hungry or poor, and don't know what it's like, are unconcerned about the fate of the hungry or poor.

So we are at this point, going to divert briefly, from our main theme of *freedom of speech* and discuss *the Maitreya*.

There is a website on the Internet the author found one day somehow run by an organisation which calls itself *Share International*.

The object of this organisation is so it says to encourage the principle of *sharing* as the means of solving *all* international crises.

That is, for example, (these are your current author's words, not *Share International's*) our governments are – so they say – concerned with protecting us from terrorism.

Well, our answer to that would be – let us give the terrorist plenty of food, a satisfactory home to live in, a wife and family to care for, freedom to practice whatever religious views he sees fit, and complete protection from having other nations interfering in his life and that of his nation. What cause then will he have to motivate him to make bombs and blow others up, or hijack planes and fly them into office buildings?

None whatsoever, clearly.

So terrorists have not been made by the Muslim religion or any other. Terrorists have been *made, created, invented* by the Western powers themselves, who have dealt unwisely in international affairs at the expense of their own peoples.

And why have they done that?

Because they do not much care about their own peoples. They are quite happy to sacrifice as many of them as it takes in wars for example, just as we have seen all elitist rulers of nations do throughout the ages, such as the Roman Emperors.

And we, the people, stand by and let it happen, just as the “Roman citizens” did, while we watch and eat the “bread and circuses” that our leaders conjure up to keep our minds off politics and international affairs.

For example, in England now, there is a new sport known as “cage fighting” and this sport has the approval of the authorities, and violates no laws. That is, two men without boxing gloves, almost naked, just as the corrupt but glamorous (we are sure they too had lots of fashionable dresses and pairs of shoes) ladies in the *Spartacus* movie requested, fight one another inside a cage, and there appear to be few rules. They aren't officially allowed to kill one another, but surely it won't be too long before that happens, just as it has happened many times in boxing matches over the years.

So tell us please ask ourselves how far away this is from the gladiatorial fights in the days of the Roman Empire, when gladiators were made to fight to the death in the arena, with only the incentive that if they killed enough other men, they might be made “freemen” and heroes?

Obviously not very far away from what we now imagine to be “those dark and barbarous days.”

And of course the motivation is exactly the same. That is, though officially no slaves exist in the West, the truth is that most of these people – the boxers and street fighters – are enslaved by *poverty*, and they see their only route out of the gutter is by battering lumps out of one another in a kind of “circus ring” or now even an actual *cage*.

As we have said, when government is only *pragmatic*, only interested in *the economy, money*, and not in *what is right, in principles*, then all these things happen.

They don’t say as surely civilised caring people would – “hang on, these men might get hurt, have their brains “cabbaged”, so let’s discourage this, even *ban* it if necessary, and help these men find lives and jobs with self-respect which don’t require them to beat each other’s brains in.”

But no. Our governments – many of them, now full of *women*, as in England – do not say that.

And so the barbarism goes on, which if we consider it, shows that those in government – even if *women*, whom most men *start* out in life, as did your author, imagining are all sweetness and light and the embodiment of love and kindness – are themselves barbarous, because they clearly don’t care.

We have men beating each others’ brains in for money, many or most of whom will likely end up with some degree of brain, ear or sight damage, or even Parkinson’s disease like the once mighty and eloquent but now feeble and dumbstruck *Muhammad Ali*.

But no, the government don’t care about that – *bread and circuses you see* – but rather they spend hundreds of hours of precious parliamentary time debating fox hunting.

The author incidentally is not *pro* fox hunting, but what he is, is *pro freedom*, and he thinks that *human rights* must always come before the rights of other animals, though that of course does not mean he approves of cruelty to animals either.

The question is: which should we be *more* concerned about – a few thousand upper class toffs and so on who chase a fox around the fields, because they can't think of anything better to do, or it's a tradition where they live, when a fox is after all *a wild animal* which will kill any number of "innocent chickens" to feed itself, and has even been known to attack babies left unattended?

Or rather should we be *more concerned* about the millions of *humans* who suffer and starve and *die* daily, in the Third World?

And should we not be more concerned about the fate of men (and my god, now even some *women*) who are driven to batter one another's brains out and maybe die or kill in the process for an audience of the public who bay for blood, in order to escape the gutter, and maybe get famous?

As always, the verdict is *yours*.

But *logically*, if we have a society based on sharing, as this Share International organisation promotes, then we won't have poor and starving people who are forced to do crazy things like boxing and this new barbaric craze "cage fighting" to earn money.

That is to say – would these men who box and do the cage fighting *still* wish to do this if there was no money in it?

If they want to do it anyway, fine, it's their choice to put their own life and limb at risk, just as incidentally we should point out do many cavers, climbers, "round the world" type yacht people and "explorers."

But if the motive is mainly *money*, which all logic would suggest it is, then surely society needs to ask itself how it can consider itself *civilised* if it gives such (mostly) men no other way to gain their "respect" or "freedom" or human dignity other than to be *a modern gladiator*.

So the general solution of the Share International organisation is to use this *one single concept of sharing*, as the basis for solving all global crises, which if we think about it is precisely the same as Christ's saying:

Treat thy neighbour as thy self

(you know, share half your cloak like “the Good Samaritan” did and so on).

And this is perhaps no coincidence, as this site claims that there is a being known as “the Maitreya” alive in the world today who is more or less “the second coming” of Christ, or a reincarnation of Buddha, or however you like to put it.

So your author is going to neither confirm nor deny that, but merely seeks to make you aware of it, firstly, because for all he knows *it is true*, and secondly, because whether that is true or not, the general intention of the site seems good.

However, he also wishes to point out that by one means or another, he has become aware of let us call it a “theory” that there is a whole hierarchy of spiritual beings involved in the life of our planet over thousand of years or more, such as Moses, Lord Krishna, Buddha and so on, who may continue to exist in modern times in a kind of “spiritual body” – that is, of a kind of finer matter which is more like energy than the dense physical matter we touch and see which is part of our normal experience.

But before the reader mocks such an idea, let us consider for example that modern physics is telling us that what we imagine to be “solid matter” is really ultimately some kind of force field, and that atoms themselves which we assume to be so solid, are almost entirely composed of *nothing whatsoever*, with just a few “particles” floating around inside them somehow.

The world is full of “miracles” which we take for granted, but would have astounded and even terrified those living just a few hundred or thousand years ago, such as huge metal objects that can fly though the air at hundreds or thousands of miles an hour (i.e. aeroplanes) or boxes that one can look into that show what is happening thousands of miles away (televisions) or lumps of metal and plastic with which we can even *talk* to people thousands of miles away that do not even have wires connecting them (mobile telephones).

But we imagine we know everything, that science knows everything that is possible.

For instance, in the future, will *science* invent such devices as the “teleporter” or “transporter” from *Star Trek* to move humans or other objects around throughout space, rendering conventional travel by cars, trains, airplanes and so on obsolete?

(it would certainly save on *petrol* if they could)

The author does not know if this will ever be possible – does the reader?

So as always, the author is not looking for *belief*, but he is just giving information, ideas, which you can consider and then decide upon for yourself.

And as the author is also fundamentally *logical* and *scientific* in his thinking, he thinks also that a few pieces of *evidence* should be put forward based on his own first hand experience.

Though he is not going to go into great detail, he has had several incidents in his life, that have given him *the strong impression* that he was being “taken care of” at times by some kind of “higher power.”

Many “New Agers” immediately reach for the term “angels”, and start spouting at length about their own amazing (and therefore *unbelievable*) detailed knowledge of these “beings”, but we don’t want to foist any kind of fairy tales we can’t justify on the reader.

The author is simply saying, there were a few very difficult times in his life when he felt some kind of presence actually *physically intervening* in certain situations he was in, one in particular when he was falling off a wall, and seemed to “float down” a few feet, rather than land with a heavy bump as one might have expected.

It’s a somewhat vague memory now, but such incidents however rare which seem to “defy the known laws of science” tend to leave a lasting impression.

On at least two other occasions, he thinks he *may* have actually *met* beings of some kind, who appeared ordinary and human, but seemed to know things about him which didn’t seem possible ordinarily, and merely appeared to be strangers who chose to talk to him, whom he didn’t seek out, and has never ever seen again since.

What persuaded him in particular that these beings were not just ordinary humans, was that these two incidents occurred in almost exactly the same physical location, some miles away from where he lives, but a few years apart.

On another occasion, he was half asleep after having watched two television programs which sought to unveil the real truth about Princess Diana's death.

The problem which he was contemplating, seemed to be that the driver, Henri Paul, who crashed the Mercedes car the princess was travelling in, was supposed according to medical reports to be drunk, but was not known to be irresponsible in this respect, and video evidence suggested he had been unable to have the amount to drink which the blood samples (possibly false samples) had suggested as the explanation of the accident.

So whilst your author was in a kind of "waking sleep" state, contemplating this paradox, all of a sudden it was as if a voice "intruded" into his head, and said the single word, very powerfully – *DRUGGED*.

(i.e. the implication was that Henri Paul had been drugged, and that was what caused the accident in which Princess Diana was killed)

This shocked your author into the "normally awake" state, and he assures you, he is not in the habit of hearing any "voices in the head" apart from his own thoughts, just as everybody generally does.

So the author does not wish to claim or prove to the reader any of this is hard fact, or even that the explanation of Princess Diana's death is any better than any of the other theories on offer.

But collectively, over many years, he has seen enough "signs" and "eye-witness accounts" to make him think that the theory of this "hidden hierarchy of masters" i.e. advanced beings, who don't necessarily have dense physical bodies, but are some sort of "transfigured" beings, as in the alleged "transfiguration of Christ", is a reality.

Of course Yogananda's *Autobiography of a Yogi*, which incidentally is free to read on the Internet at various sites, makes many claims of such "miracles" far beyond anything your author claims, and whether it is all true or not – again, *you* be the judge – it is certainly a very entertaining read.

So in the final analysis, what the author here wishes to explain is that he sees himself as a junior assistant to such *genuine* higher beings, such as those commonly believed to have existed – Christ, Buddha and so on – and moreover the modern “gurus”, about whom no doubt whatsoever can be alleged *as to their existence and words*, there being pictures, video material, and books *written by them personally* – unlike the Bible and Koran, which at best were dictated – and numerous real life encounters and so on, such as Krishnamurti, Gopi Krishna, and to some extent the Maharishi and Hazrat Inayat Khan.

But as always, he is not saying to anyone *believe*, and in particular he is not saying *blindly believe*.

It is just that the author feels he has had enough *personal experiences* to base his life on such ideas, and sees a logic in them, which seems to be lacking in the “rational scientific” explanation of life, as he has argued in his recent work *What is Intelligence?*

(incidentally all of Sam Fryman’s works are completely free, and are available on <http://www.geocities.com/thmlplx/> though the bandwidth is limited and so you may have to come back after a few hours or even days when the demand that tends to follow any new posting has cooled down, in order to download the files there).

So that is, unlike any kind of religious zealot, your author is not claiming *certainty* for his views on this matter in any absolute sense.

So does such a “maybe” approach seem to be a crazy basis upon which to conduct one’s existence?

Well, the *fact* is, that such a *maybe* approach to how we deal with so called “reality” is *all we have got*.

There is no “certainty” or absolute “security” for any of us in any way.

For example, though the author tends to think that most likely at certain difficult or dangerous moments in his life he feels he has been *protected*, at other moments he feels he definitely *has not been*.

(for after all, was Mahatma Gandhi protected from his assassin?)

So he certainly does not *rely* on such assistance from “higher powers in Nature”, and will not waste his time trying to argue the case which no

doubt scientists and most psychologists would put against him, that this is “all in his mind.”

But then on the other hand, we see, let us ask the psychologist or scientist if in fact there is *anything* which is *not* “all in our minds”?

Because, we register all that we see and feel and think, only through our mind, our brain, don't we?

And what exactly is our “mind”?

Is it the brain?

Or can mind exist independently of brain?

We don't know, do we?

And even if we said, every thought only existed in the brain, and nowhere else, well, what is the brain? It's made of atoms, right? But what are atoms? They are made of protons, electrons and neutrons, right? So what in turn *are* these (no longer) fundamental particles, and what again are the even smaller, more recently “discovered” particles or energy fields made of, and so on and so on?

And as we have pointed out using the *New Scientist* magazine article in our recent book, *What is Intelligence?*, the scientists themselves admit they *do not know* the answers to such fundamental questions.

So therefore, they have like the author, ultimately only their own *opinions* on these “metaphysical” subjects, and no hard scientific proof either way.

So there is then only one real difference between people on these “spiritual topics.” And that is – has the individual concerned who is offering an opinion had any such experiences themselves?

And therefore, what happens is that those who *have* had one or several *very strange* experiences, tend to “believe” in some other dimension beyond what the scientists are *currently* aware of, and those who haven't *don't believe*.

For example again, to the best of his knowledge the author has never seen a “flying saucer” or *genuine UFO*.

i.e. is it a bird, is it a plane, it is *Superman*, is it even a *UFO* ?

No, usually it's a bird or a plane, or a meteorological balloon or whatever.

But then your author has never visited the famous *Area 51* in America and therefore he doesn't know what is to be found there, and doesn't know whether to believe the reports of those who say they have.

But that doesn't mean he *disbelieves* in alien spacecraft visiting earth. He just has to be *scientific* and say like Mr Spock – *insufficient data, Captain*, or in other words “I don't know.”

But on this Share International *Maitreya* site, there is quite a lot of information about UFOs, including how they say the increasingly elaborate crop circles were formed and so on, which mostly the authorities have *unsatisfactorily* (as far as your author is concerned) explained as *hoaxes*.

His “sixth sense” tells him that these crop circles, quite apart from their sudden appearance and huge size, appear *otherworldly*.

He cannot see the *motivation* of any hoaxers to have produced them *all*.

But then, we had the Mel Gibson movie *Signs*, and incidentally the *Dark Skies* US TV series suggesting to us that aliens would be *hostile*, which since even *The War of the Worlds* and the 1960s TV drama *The Invaders* has been the constant theme in science fiction.

The only major movie the author can think of that suggests different was the excellent *The Day the Earth Stood Still* which from the author's point of view, is probably nearer the mark to what any real aliens would likely be up to – i.e. to warn us that our world and science is out of control and advise us to fix matters quickly for our own good and safety.

After all, why should any aliens who are able to roam the galaxy or cosmos at will be interested in “conquering” a likely comparatively underdeveloped planet like ours?

They would likely be less interested in such a thing, than we would be motivated to conquer an ant hill or a bee hive.

However, the Share International site, says that not only are some aliens (from within our own solar system) here, but that they are not only *not*

hostile, they are utterly benevolent, and in fact are even working feverishly to prevent the more negative things we are doing to our planet.

Well, your author certainly *hopes* this to be the case.

But certainly, what he does find amazing is that, as far as he is aware, there has been *not one single nuclear attack* on a human population in the now more than sixty years since Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

As an ex-British army acquaintance once said to him in the greatest earnest and bewilderment (decades ago, long before *Iraq*):

“ You can’t have all these (nuclear) weapons lying around, and *NOT USE THEM!*”

This gentleman, who was not generally speaking aggressive, though was a physically tough and powerful human being, seemed almost offended that the nuclear weapons had not been used as yet, it seemed to defy his innate sense of reason.

And whilst we hope that not all in the military share his point of view, we also find it difficult – the world being what it is for so long now, full of dictators, greed and treachery – to believe that not even one intentional use of nuclear weapons has ever occurred since the end of the second World War, unless there are somehow some kind of “benevolent aliens” or else some “higher forces” in Nature that science is not yet aware of that are preventing this *total destruction* of the human species.

For example, again, the Maharishi declared (perhaps in the early 1980s?) that due to what he called “world coherence in consciousness” global nuclear war was no longer possible – and indeed with the falling of the Berlin wall, and the disintegration of communist Russia, the fear has certainly receded – but he said rather *terrorism* was the issue that would come to greater significance to the people in general, which he has certainly proved to be right about, hasn’t he?

Further, in his “Science of Being and Art of Living” written around 1963, he explained how when first religion fell from being the dominant influence on the masses (which was happening very quickly in the 1960s, as children refused to accept the religious beliefs of their parents due largely to their school “science education”), it would be replaced by politics, and then politics (i.e. *people issues, human values*) in turn would be replaced by *economics*, which as we have explained is *exactly* what

happened in the British Margaret Thatcher era, commencing 1979, *long after* the Maharishi wrote this book.

In the latter half of 2005 he also said that Blair and Bush would not last much longer in power now, and we are seeing strong signs of that in the case of Tony Blair as the author writes.

The Maharishi – who amazingly seems totally *compos mentis* and in fine health at around the age of ninety – also amazed his own numerous followers (said to be around four million worldwide) last year by *banning* the teaching of his famous “transcendental meditation” in England – an action which would seem to also confound those who believed he was only seeking money – on the grounds that he now felt England was “a scorpion nation”, and that he did not wish to add more power of intelligence to a nation that was so destructive.

The author himself largely can confirm this view, that not only is Britain damaging to other nations such as Iraq, but that the current British government is in his view even hostile to its own people, and is therefore encouraging Britain to be like a scorpion, *stinging itself to death*.

So does this mean that the author is a great “fan” of the Maharishi and believes everything he says?

Not necessarily, but the Maharishi certainly seems to have some wise and interesting things to say, and the author practised his meditation technique for around twelve years before his *kundalini* awakened, at which point he had to stop doing it, so as ever, your author *listens with an open yet discriminating mind* as he does to *everything he hears and sees*.

Interestingly, the Maharishi also pointed out somewhere in his commentary on *The Bhagavad Gita*, that some people *might* be forced to stop the TM technique *for one reason or another*, but did not elaborate, which again, as he has said, happened to your author himself.

As we have said in our *How to Meditate*, we are not either recommending or discouraging anyone from using the TM technique, but we have explained in detail another “method”, which is in fact, arguably not a method at all, along the lines suggested by J Krishnamurti, a highly respected 20th Century “philosopher” and arguably “guru”, whose numerous followers and admirers were as diverse as writer, Aldous Huxley, and martial arts genius, Bruce Lee.

Your author however found that the transcendental meditation *movement* seemed to be a rather authoritarian, hierarchical structure, organised somewhat like a huge modern global corporation – though a *benevolent* one as far as one can see – and this restriction on his freedom, he found unsatisfactory and ultimately unacceptable, *though he continued to practise the technique* for many years after parting company with the movement itself.

For example, one top ranking American general has discussed the difference between “the soldier” and “the warrior”, portraying the warrior as a kind of rogue “free agent”, and the soldier as the comparative ideal.

However, your author does not agree. He sees *the warrior* as someone who is motivated by his own ideals, and if he feels he is ordered to do some unjust action *he will not obey*, whereas the *soldier* must it appears give *total obedience to orders* whether those orders are wise and humane or not, and wholly regardless of his own conscience and opinion.

For example, Bruce Lee himself, surely, we would term a *warrior*, rather than a soldier.

So we feel there is in this general’s agenda, a desire to *suppress the individual*.

But again, that surely need only be done, if soldiers are being forever forced into what they do not see as *just causes*, which appears to be too often the case in military actions now, and therefore, we see generals expressing this *unquestioning and mindless obedience* as the ideal.

Likewise, the author therefore did not wish to be part of the Maharishi’s army of *spiritual soldiers*, but sees himself as a *warrior of the spirit*, and wishes to help – in so far as he can – to assist others to be likewise, rather than mindless “soldiers” and slaves of the current globalist regime.

Not of course, that a general or captain in an army can or even *should* explain everything to his men in advance of action if a real battle has to be fought (for example, to prevent enemy *spies* learning the military plans).

But if the general and captain are *believed in* by their men, due to their high ideals and humanity, then that will surely produce the most heroic and loyal kind of soldier or warrior, however we wish to put it.

You know – like *King Arthur* and his *Knights of the Round Table*, *Arjuna* from the famous *Bhagavad-Gita*, or inspiring known historical examples such as Henry V, Joan of Arc or El Cid.

(and if this is how the Maharishi’s “soldiers” feel about *him*, then we don’t criticise, as that may be what is best for them, to find such a “spiritual army” into which they can fit and feel they belong)

The *historical accuracy* of these heroic leaders from the past however, is not the issue, and indeed likely lost in the mists of time (remember, we don’t even know who was behind the death of JFK only forty something years ago or Princess Diana even), but it is *the ideal* that is the point.

For leaving *military action* aside, if we focus on the “spiritual warriors” like Buddha and Christ, we see that *billions* have followed them throughout the ages, because they believed in their leadership, they were admired for *their humanity and ideals*.

So we felt it was our duty to pass on this *information* about the Maitreya, in the spirit of open minded enquiry, and also for the interesting and possibly true information to be found on the web site (www.shareintl.org) but now we have “done our duty” we shall proceed.

(incidentally, for those who love “conspiracy theories” the Share International web site alleges that the presence of these friendly aliens, who have they claim created all the *genuine* crop circles and so on, is being denied, even to the degree that some governments are deliberately sending hoaxers out to create some bogus crop circles to persuade the public to write them all off as nonsense, which of course many people, especially *scientists* are doing; and therefore, if the truth is as Share International says, does that not suggest the *motive* of governments is to deny their presence *because they oppose the current governments* rather than because they are evil invaders and conquerors as movies such as “Independence Day” would have us believe?)

But no doubt some readers will find some or all of the above, crazy, ridiculous or unbelievable, just as one or two readers have already expressed such a view about the author’s presentation of what we shall call *the kundalini explanation* of human evolution, as expressed in the author’s *Kundalini – A Personal Experience* and more broadly in *Kundalini – Preventing the Apocalypse*.

To sum it all up in once sentence, basically the author is saying – as indeed does the Maharishi – that ultimately, only a further development in human consciousness is going to solve our problems, and that beings like Christ, Buddha, Krishnamurti and Gopi Krishna are the forerunners of what the future man and woman will be like in the coming centuries and millennia.

So thus, now we are in this awfully painful interim period, this “adolescence”, from which we have got to struggle and evolve beyond and thus escape.

And we are saying in this current “thesis”, that surely the major part of this process of *growing up*, is *learning to live with the truth*.

And our focus here is about being able to accept *psychological truths*, and this not only implies, but *demands* that we must have in society *freedom of speech*, whereas we see our governments seeking increasingly to control and take away this right, particularly under the excuses of so called “political correctness.”

For example, in our recent discussion and commentary on the Guardian newspaper *Men and Porn* article, we expressed as best we can, based on our own long experience, and that of as many other reliable sources as we could find, the true nature of women’s sexuality, and how this has been manipulated by the media and many women themselves in order to maintain an “unholy” power over men, which is ultimately not in anybody’s best interests, in particular that of *women themselves*.

Our main tack, was that by modern Western society’s general practice of objectifying women as sexual beings, this has made men in general unhealthily interested in sex, in many cases addicted to multiple relationships and pornography, which is both damaging to men and women and children, due to the likelihood of such sexual addictions destroying the family, and leaving the children fatherless and consequently at least partially unprotected and uncared for.

Our message was that men and boys should see girls and women principally as *people*, as *human beings*, not merely as sex objects and lumps of flesh to worship and molest, so that women would be loved and respected by men, instead of being sexually humiliated, raped, and enticed or forced into pornography or prostitution as happens now.

So one would have thought that no sane person could have objected to an article which carried such an intention.

But no.

This article was removed from one well known torrent site – we are not going to name names – due to at least one complainant.

But this complainant used the grounds of “this is a family site, where children go. The poster (and presumably author) has *no respect*.”

And we replied as a comment roughly: “the intention is to educate males of all ages on the true nature of women, so that they may see women as persons to be respected and loved, not objectified as sex objects and pieces of meat, as much of the media, including pop videos is presenting females as *even to young children*. And furthermore, no responsible adult would let a young child loose *unsupervised* on the Internet, where it is easy to find even the most dark pornography.”

And gladly, even prior to the author’s own comment defending his work (which incidentally he seldom does, but rather lets the work speak for itself, knowing not everyone is going to agree) one discriminating reader commented “this is not only *not* offensive to or unsuitable for children, this is *exactly* what children should be reading.” (i.e. if they are old enough for “school sex education”, let us give them *the real truth*).

So the critic was silent after this, at least *to us*, but nevertheless after downloading well over three thousand times on this single site in just two days, the torrent posting was again removed by this same web site’s administrators or owners without any explanation.

So there are several points here.

Firstly, clearly this torrent site does not very much care to support *freedom of speech*, as clearly neither in truth, does the critic who likely caused the posting to be taken down.

For those who have not much thought about it, as far as the author can see, the torrent sites in general are merely *businesses*.

It costs a lot of money to have the bandwidth to have hundreds of thousands or even millions of web page views per day or week, as some of the bigger of these sites are clearly getting.

So naturally, they are full of adverts, so that they can earn their money by the well known pay-per-click *affiliate programs*.

So we are not in a position to know how well any particular site is doing, but they are getting huge number of hits on their sites, by the means of listing *free access* to all the latest software, movies, CDs and so on, so it is not implausible that the owners of a few very successful torrent sites might even be driving around in Ferraris or Rolls Royces, though no doubt they would not like to admit or tell us about that.

They use the legal technicality, “we *host* no copyright material” – because you see, they do not host the *files* downloaded; rather, the peers (i.e. *us*) host the files on our own PCs, they host only the torrent listings, which link us to a tracker that enables peer-to-peer sharing.

But clearly this is just a legal technicality, as they are at least *active and collaborative* in the distribution of copyrighted materials, which though they may not profit directly from as in *sales*, they profit *indirectly* from via the affiliate programs.

So this surely suggests to us two things.

Firstly, the torrent site owners are mainly only interested in very high demand material such as the latest famous movies and CDs, and in some cases popular e-book materials which will also be high demand such as “How to” computer and electronics guides, and best selling books like Harry Potter etc.

Thus, in some cases, the torrent site owners will obviously just consider the sort of material before you – unless it is of personal interest to them – as an irrelevance or a nuisance, and not likely to bring in much affiliate cash.

But we are not saying they are *all* without conscience, they may for example, say “they support freedom of information.”

Well, fine, we are not going to judge them then. They are providing a useful service for those who are unable to afford the materials available on the torrent sites, due to the extortionate prices of software, CDs, DVDs and indeed *books* in the shops.

But because they are making a living out of material created almost exclusively by other people, in many cases at *enormous expense* to the producers, like a big budget Hollywood movie, whereas the actual *downloaders* of the files, are generally speaking only using them *for personal use*, surely they cannot consider themselves in any position to start moralising and judging on what others post.

So we would say at minimum *they make a living out of the torrent site users*.

So let them *give something back*.

And that something is, *let us use these sites to express free speech*.

How can it much hurt them?

The books and articles of this kind are only a small number, and only clicked upon by a relatively small number of people, many of whom incidentally are also likely to click upon their affiliate links, whether deliberately or often even accidentally.

And in particular, the author would appeal to all owners of these sites, to support his works, as they are all designed to help bring about one purpose alone – the true freedom, happiness and peace of mankind at least – which can only come about from a clear understanding of ourselves and what is going on in society on the psychological and social levels – hence the content of the books.

The author believes that if the understanding and ideas explained in his works – which as he has many times pointed out, are by far from being *his own original thoughts*, rather he sees himself as a “messenger” or “middleman” on behalf of the truly wise and great – were taken up by society in general, that would lead to a world based on justice, fair sharing and fair treatment of one’s neighbour, and thus if such a society gradually appears, the torrent site owners themselves – probably almost entirely male – will not then need to fear for their livelihoods, and play a game of constantly having to dodge and outmanoeuvre the authorities, which we can see that at least some of them are engaged in, if not all.

So in the hope that they will take such an attitude, that is *support freedom of speech*, we would just like to point out one or two things.

This likely single critic who caused the removal of the *Understanding Female Sexuality and Porn* article, was likely motivated not by the desire to protect children, whom as we have said, are either protected or not so by *their parents* from the Internet in general, whatever we do or do not post on any torrent site, most of which as we all know contain lots of porn downloads in any case – but rather by the desire *to suppress the truth*.

For unfortunately, in our exposition of female sexuality, and the manipulation of women's sexual image in the media, we were obliged to point out that a huge proportion of women, not just a minority, are using men's inborn sexual weakness against them to dominate and manipulate them as if they were some kind of pet animals to be kept, instead of human beings, entitled to be given dignity and respect.

These kind of corrupted and manipulative women and their male victims and allies don't see things that way of course, in many cases, because they believe that it is the normal course of events for men to be lifelong slaves and effectively psychologically speaking little children to women, instead of free thinking, self-controlled and self-contained, emotionally mature and independent adult human beings.

And even worse, many women – mostly due to neglect or abuse in their own childhood, as probably all the feminist types have experienced – have a hate and war against *all men*, in other words a stance of “gendercide”, which is motivating them to taking undue precedence in the media, and now increasingly politics and the law, from which places they are using all the means of misinformation and repression they can think of to wage their war on men and their human rights.

We are not going to bother to detail the huge list of crimes against men, including continual false arrest on assault charges which have been initiated or caused by women, denied access to their children, discriminated against or sexually harassed in the workplace, *wrongfully* imprisoned for or accused of all sorts of crimes such as murder, rape and so on, and equally, the many cases of women who have been excused from mutilating (e.g. the *Bobbie* case) or even *murdering* their husbands on all kinds of flimsy bases which would never be accepted if men were to try to claim such grounds.

So naturally, the exposition of this ugly truth about *a large number of women* is going to upset a lot of people, just as is the sudden realisation by many men that they have most or all their lives been manipulated and played with by the women in their lives like a puppet on a string.

So we see, people do not want to face their own stupidity, or their own ugliness, they only want to see something wonderful when they look in the mirror, just like the wicked witch in the Snow White fairy story.

We are thus seeing daily more and more of this increasing phenomenon of *denial* of reality, and therefore when we post *the truth* (as we see it, mostly logically proven by real behaviour, by *facts*) lots of people who might come across this material accidentally, believing they are just going to have a nice read, as if they were reading the latest Harry Potter or something, are going to get a terrible shock and can't handle it.

And as we have said, they will then resort to *denial*, they will deny the *real reason* why they want this material taken down. They will say "it is to protect children. You have no respect" as this critic did.

They are right about one thing – the author certainly has no respect for *bad people* who hurt others, but want to tell us they are *good*.

For example, this very day was an absolutely damning exposition of the mentality of these "fake good" and self-righteous people like our critic, in the form of a British news item.

A lovely little two year old girl was dropped off by her middle class parents at a nursery (this happened three years ago, but the case was reported on TV today due to the legal verdict coming in) and just one hour later was found dead floating in a pond.

Somehow the child had escaped from the nursery grounds through an unlocked gate, and ended up in this pond.

So the nursery today was found guilty of "negligence", a verdict about which the parents were very pleased, and felt "justice had finally been done."

The judge (i.e. coroner) closed the case by saying to the parents : "I doubt if there is anybody who does not have the deepest sympathy for you."

Well, I am afraid he was wrong about that, because I, and hopefully *you* too, have no sympathy for these *parents* whatsoever.

Rather, what I do have is the deepest sympathy for *the child, the little girl*.

For what a crazy, heartless and deluded world it is we live in that any parent, in particular a mother, should leave her *two year old child* to the care of strangers, who cannot possibly care about it as she *should*, and indeed *proved they did not* by their negligence, such that this defenceless little girl, barely able to walk, was left wandering in the wilds and fell into a pond and drowned.

And the story gets better (we mean *worse*) in that a labourer saw this toddler wandering on the road, but was afraid to do anything *lest he be accused of abducting the child*, no doubt again, because of this total paranoia about the relatively small number of paedophiles that has been used to smear all men, and make them afraid to care for or even go near or work with little children, in utter terror that they will be branded child molesters and have their lives destroyed.

And thus, these *feminists* – of which our critic is likely one, or else a “disciple” or “stooge” of their philosophy – who have launched this war on men, must carry the blame for *the death of this little girl*, both by encouraging a society that says it is “OK” for this little girl’s mother to go off to work and leave her in a nursery, and also, to create a distrust of and persecution of men, such that an innocent, averagely good hearted man like the labourer in this case, felt too terrified of being accused of abduction to have intervened and saved this girl’s life.

So our *Understanding Female Sexuality and Porn*, was not in any way disrespecting *good women* or in any way harmful to children, whom any rational person can see would not even have got beyond the first few pages of a work such as the author’s, which they would have considered utterly boring, lacking pictures and having too long sentences and so on.

(in fact, the author usually *restrains himself* considerably in his writings, and before publishing cuts out many things he would have like to have left in so as not to “lay too much” on people at once: e.g. he would have liked to have pointed out that this fashion and practice that modern women have of shaving their pubic hair – due to the ridiculously small modern underwear and bikinis, no doubt, we accept *amongst other things* – is not only displeasing to many men who like their women to look like women, and not little girls, but by giving adult women a pre-pubescent look, might likely *we imagine* be very pleasing to the genuine paedophile types, who will likely be “turned off” by an unshaven adult woman’s hairiness – a fact we think should cause modern women to think twice before they take this option themselves, and also they may even consider

if *fashion* has for some bizarre reason, even *manipulated* women into doing this, for some dark reasons nobody it appears in the public media has yet considered).

So as this article was no danger to children, we suspect what was really in the minds of our one or more critics was the following:

You have no respect for women, you do not worship women as you should.

Ah well, *if only* they would be so honest to say so!

We would at least *respect* that honesty, but no.

But of course, that is not at all the author's sentiment. He is the greatest admirer of women – he enjoys their company greatly, and has found in most cases that they also enjoy his – but he only *respects* women, just as he does men also, when they are acting *in their positive aspect*.

And this positive aspect is partly their *modest* admission that *worship* should be only given to “gods”, if such indeed exist, but not to *any* ordinary human women *or* men.

It is utterly degrading to our fellow man and woman that we should ask any of them to *worship* us.

We are just human, we are part good, part bad, part clever, part stupid.

It is not a *mature, evolved* mode of being and thinking to relate to another person in that way.

That doesn't of course mean we cannot feel great *love* for and *devotion* to another person, whether male or female.

For example, in India, many “gurus” – incidentally *either* male or female ones – have been “worshipped” or “revered”, but generally only due to their utterly saintly characters, which none of the rest of us clearly possess.

So the author is just saying to this critic person *grow up please*, learn to see others *and oneself* as they and you really are, stop trying to pretend you are wonderful, *when you are not*.

So we see the problem is *vanity*. These people cannot face their own image in the mirror, and if someone momentarily *makes them see it*, they then blame someone else (in this case your author), or say the mirror is untrue, or even want that mirror *broken*, or at the very least *taken down*...

So what can *we* do about this?

About this desire of those who are really enemies of free speech, who are doing their level best to see that nobody else finds out *the real truth* of what is happening in society at large, and in particular in the psychological and sexual dynamic between women and men?

Well, we are perhaps being too optimistic to believe that many or any torrent sites owners will be bothering to read this.

So SF, your author, would just like to suggest how he feels those who *do* support these ideas should behave in the face of these unjustified attacks upon freedom of information and expression, *in regard of his own works at the least*.

Obviously, SF is not telling people *what to do*, he is not going to try to either prevent or comment negatively upon any of his works being posted elsewhere, as indeed he *never* comments negatively upon anybody else's torrent postings. He isn't the police or a judge – he offers ideas, information, advice even, trying always to offer *reason, logic, facts* rather than mere *opinion*, but it's totally up to the individual what he or she then chooses to do.

For example, he is well aware that there is even someone trying to sell some of his e-books on E-bay – though apparently not successfully – which he only finds amusing, as he has no plans to ever make any money out of them himself, as he has already explained.

So firstly, we would suggest that readers do not trouble to post any of SF's works on any *torrent site* (unless they are the site owners themselves) or do spam mailings or whatever with them, as he would not do so himself.

(but he is not against people commenting positively on any of the postings (but avoid *arguing*, which apparently upsets some of the torrent site owners), as this may attract other people to them who might not have otherwise considered taking a look, and also may deter the torrent site

administrators and owners from taking them down so quickly, if they see they are appreciated).

We have to acknowledge however that the torrent web sites, whatever we may think of them, are owned by their owners, and we are therefore only *guests*.

Thus, we feel that one posting of any new book or article on a torrent site is enough, and if the site owners decide to take it down for whatever reason, that is *their right and their business*.

We may repost some of the books from time to time – perhaps six months or a year apart, or may not do so. There is no specific plan.

But what we definitely do *not* want to do, is create any kind of “fanaticism” or “revolutionary zeal” around SF’s works, because that will put all those who support these ideas into the category of fanatics or “zealots” like the “religious fundamentalists” and thus bring themselves, *and* the works and ideas into discredit.

The author himself went through such zealous phases in his youth, of making what he felt to have been great discoveries, which other people seemed wholly unaware of, and having this desire to “tell the world.”

But he discovered that in most cases, *the world isn’t ready*, and that we may often get the exact opposite of the response we hope for and seek if we put forward our ideas in any kind of zealous or aggressive way.

So rather, the approach SF has taken is merely to find a notice board – in this case, the torrent sites – and put up a sign saying in one way or another: *Helpful And Enlightening Information Here*.

Then people *voluntarily* may *choose* to look or not look as they please.

There can be no element of *force* in this process, because we are talking about a desire that people either currently have or *do not* to explore their mental world, and if they don’t have it, we will not only antagonise them, we will likely turn them off from looking at our ideas with an open mind ever again.

We can’t teach children (prodigies excepted) calculus at two or three.

Generally, we have to wait till they are ten or eleven or fifteen even, when they have had enough experience and preparation to be ready for it, and even then, many will *never* see the point of it, and will either resist or be unable to learn it.

The point we have to appreciate is that the degree to which *any* of us are truly “free thinkers” is far less than we imagine. And currently, due to the mass hypnosis coming from the media, which only the very discerning or experienced can much resist, is making the truth seem like lies, and the lies seem like truth.

Thus we show to them some *white*, and they say angrily “No, *black, black, black!*” (which is what they have been hypnotised to *see*).

Thus, we must be *gentle*. We must let them simmer down, and take another look *when they choose and please* and then they may one day say “ah, that does look rather white, or at least grey.”

But we cannot *force* that day.

For example, some people would no doubt say “how dare you talk about women this way! You are a *misogynist*. You have no respect!”

But they do not see that in his everyday life, the author is *kind* to women and children, and does not abuse them. He has made great efforts in his life to help them, he has *the greatest respect for all humans* which obviously around fifty percent of whom are girls or women.

But what he will not tolerate is *injustice*.

He will not tolerate men being falsely accused, or men being murdered whilst women blame it on pre-menstrual tension and walk free, or men having their sex organs savagely cut from their bodies, when the civilised thing to have done was to either forgive or *seek a divorce*.

He will not tolerate the ignorance and therefore *inhumanity* which causes modern Western women to spend countless millions of dollars and pounds on vast numbers of dresses and pairs of shoes that they don't need, whilst millions of *men, women and children* starve to death in the Third World, nor of course does he accept or respect the extravagance of some *men* who equally spend huge amounts on luxuries, such as fabulously expensive cars, yachts and so on.

That doesn't necessarily mean of course that it is right to point a finger at every rich man or woman, because we don't necessarily know what they are doing with their money, their power and wealth.

There are such people as "philanthropists" in the world, who may give great amounts to charity, perhaps Paul McCartney for instance – we don't know – so it isn't safe to criticise individuals *without the full facts*, which as we know by now, can be very hard or even impossible to find out.

But it is clear to everyone that huge injustices are stalking the world like monsters, and thus we must all apply our minds and energies to the cause of doing *whatever we can*, without as we said being *overzealous* or offensive, to enlighten an ever wider public to the truth.

For example, if anyone wishes to put up a web page carrying the files of SF's books for free download, such as the free Geocities one he has earlier mentioned with SF's own works on it, and register it (*for free*) with a few search engines, they are welcome to do so.

Suppose *one person* did that. That might bring in a few hits a day eventually. But if *one thousand people* did that, that might bring in a few *thousand* hits a day, which therefore in one year, could be *a million readers* aware of these works and ideas.

If anyone wants to do that, they should look at least in a basic manner at how search engines function, and how to set key words and so on to pick up as many search engine users as possible.

But this is not an "order" or even a "request" – it is merely a suggestion, which has been prompted by the obvious desire of at least a small number of the readers of SF's works to see wider readership of this material, and therefore spreading of ideas which they clearly themselves identify with and support, and indeed a small number of people so far worldwide have already taken this step of hosting some of the works on their own web pages and sites.

But above all, we wish to point out that the main thing is that the *individual* reader makes this material his or her own and uses it to *improve his or her own life*.

The "enlightenment" of just one or several persons, is far better than a thousand or even million people reading the material, and gaining little from it.

An enlightened person (to whatever degree that occurs, there are obviously all degrees of “enlightenment” somewhat like the “belts” awarded in karate or judo, though SF is *never* going to award any such “gold stars” and “medals” either to himself or anyone else) is important to society only to the degree they make a genuine difference to it, in terms of *a good influence*.

If each of us is a *genuinely* good citizen – which isn’t easy – meaning therefore *a good example* in the little world that surrounds us individually, that does far more good than having a million people read a book and then cast aside and forget it for the rest of their lives, like probably happened for example with Robert M Pirsig’s once famous *Zen and the Art of Motorcycle Maintenance*, which the current author regards as one of the most over-hyped books of all time, from which he cannot recall getting hardly one single piece of enlightening material, and wishes he had never wasted his time reading it.

But for those who do appreciate SF’s works, do not fear that others do not understand this material, and therefore do not understand your thoughts.

If you have close friends or perhaps even in some educational situation, you can – if you feel it wise – argue these ideas, explain to them as you see it what *the real truth is*. For example, if a friend is having a problem with their relationship with their wife or girlfriend (or even husband or boyfriend, since *good* though perhaps a little confused women should understand this material too for their own benefit) then you can surely send them one of the books on an email saying it might help.

Equally, if there are those from various world nations who appreciate these works, who are fortunate enough to be able to read English fluently, would wish to translate any of the works for the benefit of their own native peoples, full permission is given to do this, with just the proviso that they don’t alter a single word, except for obvious typographical or grammatical errors.

But the only *real thing* that matters, the only real power we can have, is to set right *our own lives*.

If the harmony is *truly* in us, others will see that, and *be positively influenced*.

That doesn't necessarily mean they won't fight us, but we have to then see ourselves somewhat as a therapist, but without feeling "superior" about it.

That is, they may take out their frustrations on us with negative treatment of us, and though we should prevent that when we can, it is not always possible to do so, and then we have to *respond in the correct way*.

It is no use if we say wise words, but in practice we have no emotional control, and start ranting and raving at them, feeling self-righteous at our superior knowledge and understanding, because such a loss of control makes us no better than them.

So therefore, the author wrote his *How To Meditate* which was designed to enable the reader to start taking more control over their own minds and emotions, in a way that is not generally explored by any school of psychology known to the author, though he considers Eric Berne MD's *Games People Play* a good starting point for such an approach to the process of "self-awareness" and "reality therapy" described in the *How to Meditate* book.

But our broader point, that hopefully all readers can accept is that the suppression of free speech is the chief instrumentality of the dictatorship or totalitarian state, and whether it is a communist or a capitalist dictatorship is irrelevant, the point is *some guy or woman somewhere is deciding what you or I have got THE RIGHT to say or think*, however many clever "lawyerly" arguments they may have to defend taking away from us what we consider an indispensable and incontrovertible human right.

For example, to see the error in their thinking, let us take another news item discussed today in the media.

In a British school, a teenage Muslim girl was sent home because her dress was deemed to be against the school rules.

One politician argued that school uniforms were necessary to stop pressure being put on other children, for example, arguing that a uniform "protected" children from showing up their poor background, in comparison to the children from wealthier families, who would otherwise just use such permission as an excuse to flaunt their family's wealth.

So this seems to be "pro-equality" and fair does it not?

But on the other hand, one could argue that the *real effect* of such uniforms – which incidentally have always been a burden on the genuinely poor parents, since they would then have to buy *two sets of clothing* for their children each time they grew, one for leisure and *another one* for school, and the cost of the latter of which was often also unduly high because they were only available from an exclusive supplier – has been merely to *mask* the differences in the backgrounds of the children in terms of wealth or poverty.

For the truth is that it soon comes out in a school what the backgrounds of the various children are in innumerable ways – for example, what their parents do as jobs, whether they live in a “desirable area”, or if some are picked up in luxury cars, while others have to take the bus, and boasts between children of what fabulous homes, cars or new luxury items their parents have just acquired, or some extravagant holiday to an exotic location they are going on.

So it appears that *the real truth* is that school uniforms are *a burden* on the poor, as well as frequently being ugly, depersonalizing children, and functioning as yet another means to impose a mindless conformity upon them.

Surely, it is *what we are* in terms of character and personality that is important, and *this* will reveal itself, despite the clothes, whether cheap or expensive ones.

So here again we see those who *superficially* seem to be helping, and “pro the individual”, using this policy of *masking* truths.

Whereas if we let school children dress as they or their parents pleased, we would *see* the inequality in society for what it is, and thus *be more likely* to confront it.

Likewise, suppose we allow *totally free speech*.

Suppose instead of putting “the thought police” on everybody, we said *say whatever you like*.

Then we would *see* what the problems really are.

But a world that suppresses these *realities*, these *facts*, and therefore its own innocent observations and thoughts, that can't look itself in the mirror, is obviously a world that is *in denial*, like the ostrich with its head buried in the sand, and clearly that is no way to live, that is no way to solve our human and societal problems.

And further, what these “politically correct” “suppressers of truth in the public interest” overlook is that just because we have *the right* to speak freely, that does not necessarily mean *we will use it*.

That is, if we have *the right* to say what we please, we then have *the choice* to behave responsibly, and use *of our own freewill*, our good sense and discretion to speak in a way that is in the best interests of all, and not unduly offend anyone unnecessarily.

But when as now governments *refuses to trust its own people* but instead seeks to put a “gagging” order on us, robs us of this *ultimate human right apart from life itself*, we must resist it with the greatest possible force.

So your author will now cease, as he does not wish to put his readers to sleep or steal too much of their precious time.

Will he write again?

He doesn't know: as he said, there is no plan.

If he feels he has something enlightening and important to say, he may do so, but he has concerns of his own, in his own life, which he must take care of also, and perhaps has been somewhat neglecting in this sudden outpouring of writing and thought.

But he wishes to finally say – Sam Fryman himself is not important. It is *you* the reader who is important, and all the author therefore wishes, is that you may benefit from these thoughts and ideas.

So with the thought that this may or may not be his last “opus” for some time, or perhaps even permanently, he wishes to leave all his readers with the very best wishes for their futures, and indeed the future of all on this little planet we all share, which we will hopefully sooner or later learn to share much more fairly and rewardingly, for the benefit of all concerned.