

ESSAY: IDEOLOGY, DICHOTOMY AND TELEOLOGY

The words we have for ideas important to us will always be attributed their antonyms; any word can be given an opposition, a negative. Ideology is important to people; people judge each other on it. They see the conflict of ideas as the dichotomy dividing humans. They see their ideology as paramount, and that people divide along the lines of what they think, so want their ideas to prevail over the ideas of their opponents. Teleologically, people are convinced their ideas will ultimately prevail, and they know how history will unravel.

But closer examination shows this to be incorrect – ideologically, dichotomically and teleologically. It's not ideas that motivate people – it is power: gaining it, retaining it or regaining it; what really divides, or unites, is power. If ideas do not drive people, neither can they divide. And if mistaken on ideology and dichotomy there is little chance of them being right on teleology – destiny and purpose.

The doomsday syllogism concludes that every empire/civilization eventually faces the war it wants to avoid; everyone wants to avoid WWII; therefore that is the fate that awaits humanity. If major and minor premise are correct, then so is the conclusion. The premises have to be proven for the syllogism as a whole to be proven. But what inspires us to question the historical facts and what could well be erroneous historical 'certainties'?

While the doomsday syllogism leads to that rational conclusion, what motivates our search for an answer has to come from somewhere else – the inverse syllogism. Take the three headings: ideology, dichotomy and teleology. In the first one, people protest that ideas are of utmost importance. And logically it would follow that people divide on the basis of ideology. Further to that, humans establish a system of thinking whereby their ideas will ultimately triumph over the ideas of others – teleological certainty. But if one takes the teleology heading (and this done more through feeling than logic, as is the case with the doomsday syllogism) we can see that the future does not turn out the way we think it will, or want it to. Inversely from this, if people cannot accurately predict the future neither can they argue that ideas are what divide people, or indeed that ideas are the true motivation. In this syllogism the conclusion precedes the minor and major premises. It is this approach that can lead to the rational deduction of the doomsday syllogism. It allows the evidence and proof to be established that everyone eventually faces the war they seek to

avoid, major premise. And it allows the minor premise to be proven – and so the conclusion.

Ontologically we accept history is real, because we talk about it ('about': the preposition of prepositions). The use of historical evidence in an argument makes it *a priori*. The only problem with the evidence-based approach to history is that almost everyone actually takes the *selective* evidence-based approach when it comes to presenting the facts of an argument. This widespread approach ignores facts inconvenient to conclusions that have already been drawn.

It is empirically clear from history that all wars are fought for power and interests, although this is widely denied. If one takes any big event in history, for example the forming of an alliance or commencement of a conflict, it has to have an antecedent (the pursuit of power) and a consequent (the loss of power).

Very few see power is illusion, most convinced it is real. If we cannot see power is illusion we cannot see reality – what IS.

So, what is that feeling – desired state? While the feeling of powerlessness is real, it is not desired – naturally. Being powerless has serious implications. But the desired state cannot be achieved by the fallacy of thinking power is real. The 'feeling' of having 'power' can bring a sense of euphoria (happiness, warmth, contentment even), control, security, autonomy, direction, invulnerability, determinacy, infallibility, being invincible, unassailable, ideally unanswerable to any other person or force – the final authority. While this 'feeling' manifests itself as physical, tangible, it is not real because it is impermanent. On the other hand, the feeling (love), that desired state, is the opposite: the ineffable, the ephemeral, the spiritual. Its nearest physical description is perhaps a warmth, radiating from the chest – and probably indefinable.

Humans give substance to the feeling through anthropomorphism. We attribute supernatural characteristics to inanimate objects, animals and nature. We give human characteristics to the divine, which we culturally celebrate through ritual, custom and narrative. Yet anthropomorphism's an idea, or set of them. It too is at a remove from what it is trying to describe (as are the cultural phenomena): it is not fully describing reality, but hinting. And reality can never be seen if power is thought to be real. The feeling is nearest to the soul – individual or collective, that can exist anywhere and everywhere – but even that term is at a distance: we can but sense the reality of the eternal – desired state, permanence.

