

METATHINKING TOP-ECONOMY

Booklet Four

**Multi-Centralisation
Socio-Governmental Parity
and Citizenship**



*the state of the people's heart is
the condition of the heart of the state*

Eugene Halliday and Fred Freeman

The Emblem of Metathinking Top-economy

The meaning of the emblem on the front cover is briefly described at the end of this booklet. A fuller explanation is in Booklet One: *An Introduction to Metathinking Top-economy*.

Metathinking Top-economy

Metathinking is thinking which is directed to the true holistic and individual development of all humanity; *top-economy* is the economy of specific areas and places in which socially-functioning-profit is distinguished from (but may include) bank-account-profit. The aim is whole-group good. Not until *metathinking top-economy* is accepted and made operative by the majority of the electorate will all the propositions contained in these booklets on the subject prove their viability, but a suitable start forthwith can be made.

This booklet was published on behalf of Ishval in 2003 by:
The Melchisedec Press

ISBN No: 1-872240-24-0

Copyright has been waived

Institute for the Study of Hierological Values

registered charity No: 251136.

This charity, which is also known as *Ishval*, was formed in 1966 by the late Eugene Halliday with the following purpose:

the promotion and propagation of the principles of Truth in all religions, in order to achieve unity in the interpretation of sacred writings between all denominations. And mutual understanding and practice of the principles of Truth in a true spirit of ecumenism.

Metathinking Top-economy Booklet Four Multi-Metacentralisation, Socio- Governmental Parity and Citizenship

Contents

Preface	2
Multi-Metacentralisation	3
the meta-individual within community	
the monostate phase of government	
the metacentre and the post monostate phase	
the idea of multi-metacentralisation	
Socio-Governmental Parity	9
the principle of socio-governmental parity	
the problem facing every government	
self-determination and evolution are synonyms	
Affirmation of Socio-Governmental Parity	15
lessons of history	
no authority without responsibility	
Citizenship	19
citizenship and the true purpose of government	
self-discipline and self-respect	
Emblem of Metathinking Top-economy	23
Glossary	24

The State of the People's Heart

The state of the people's heart is the condition of the heart of the state.

The state of the people's heart, reflecting the feelings, desires and volitions of the totality of the nation's separate but functionally interrelated private individuals, is the most vital factor presented to government for its consideration. It preconditions the evolutionary responses immediately possible within the separate localities within the nation, and within the nation as a whole.

Preface

The booklets on metathinking top-economy, listed on the inside back cover, consist mainly of extracts from a book, *Top-economy - or whole-group good*¹, which was written as a result of meetings with my enlightened friend the late Eugene Halliday. The meetings took place during the late 1960's but, in accordance with Eugene's wishes and because unsought publicity could have interrupted his other work, no action was taken during his lifetime to publish his wider teachings on metathinking top-economy.

With a few small exceptions, everything in these booklets either was spoken by Eugene (mainly in reply to questions) and the answers written down by me, or was written by me and edited by Eugene.

Although it has been my great privilege as co-author to ask questions and to arrange the sequence and context in which the answers (or discourses) appear, the wisdom herein is from Eugene Halliday. Normally one would say "the words were his", but Eugene would never allow that statement to be made. Truth uttered, he would say, does not belong to a "person". Truth is greater than any person. At best, a person may serve as an instrument of Universal Truth.

The original aim of the meetings with Eugene was to formulate a socio-governmental justification for the development of a national charity-bank movement, which could be of service to the whole of the United Kingdom's voluntary sector. This was envisaged in a book I was then writing on why and how to form a Society of United Voluntary Organisations within Community ("SU-VOC"). This was in due course published as *The SUVOC Application*. The SUVOC idea is but one viable application of metathinking top-economy.

One of the major justifications for Eugene's teaching on metathinking top-economy was the likelihood of an eventual third world war which could have a cataclysmic effect on human consciousness.

¹ The books "*Top-economy - or whole-group good*", by Eugene Halliday and Fred Freeman, and "*The SU-VOC Application*", by Freeman (edited by Halliday) are available either to borrow or purchase from the United Trusts office. Alternatively, they may be purchased, under 'related works' at www.ishval.org.uk. For further information see inside back cover.

In the wake of such a calamity, there would be a demand for new institutions and new ways of looking at the socio-governmental order. Therefore, Eugene considered early preparation for such an eventuality would be prudent.

Even if the world is fortunate enough to escape Armageddon, the intensity of evolutionary movements will demand vast changes in social ethics. The growing and at present unchecked threat to the world environment is a typical example of this threat.

Eugene used *metawords* because, in a society which is increasingly knowledge based and participative, the determinative elements of that society require more facts and, either more precise definition and general understanding of those emotive words and phrases in common usage, which often are passively accepted in terms of the ill-defined concepts of bygone ages, or the replacement of those emotive words and phrases with new terms which will help modern man in society to create new understanding around the realities of the present, not conditioned by the myths of the past.

I am most grateful to my friend, the late David Mahlowe, who was Eugene Halliday's literary executor, for his valuable and constructive suggestions.

Multi-Metacentralisation,

the meta-individual within community

Future historians will look back on the opening years of the twenty first century as crucial and momentous for mankind. We have the means of destroying whole peoples and, at the same time, have the opportunity of creating new realms of human happiness. The clarification and determination of the new direction in which we must go is for each one of us the challenge of our time.

The *meta-individual* is a mature person who has become conscious in himself of his creative force and of his power as a unit of social metamorphosis. He recognises the value of co-operation with other mature persons, and of the need to guide the immature towards maturity. Such an individual's metathinking is directed towards the survival and development of the greatest possible number of life-forms within the universe. Senseless destruction of life-forms is anti-metathinking. The meta-individual aims to secure and develop

individual inner authority and the capacity to respond adequately to each situation in which he may find himself. His governing concept is that man's freedom rests on the Spirit of Truth in man and that no numerical superiority of one group over another is relevant to the question of Truth.

The meta-individual is aware that pan-terrestrial meta-government can be achieved only through a suitable reconstitution of the national state.

Men and women form a community when they share a common ethos, and thus have a feeling of togetherness. Public attitudes towards a community vary between three different views:

the positive view is that a community reinforces the collective moral ethos of its members and protects important values which serve the common interest. Thus a feeling of being members of a community raises morale by upholding *the spirit of the law*.

the negative view is that a community has a tendency gradually to become corrupt and to develop restrictive practices for the benefit of a privileged elite. Thus a community requires *the letter of the law* to tell it what it may or may not do.

the balanced (or co-relation) view recognises that the positive and negative views are both valid. A truly socially healthy community willingly abides by just laws and has high morale upheld from within.

The negative tendency of the community makes the formation of a counter-balancing body a governmental necessity. Here *the state* is viewed as that triad of complexes or functions which formulates, administers and interprets *the letter of the law*; and, *the community* is viewed as that triad of functions which ratifies, services and upholds *the spirit of the law*. Together these two triads function as a six-sided governmental complex.

Effective government consists in the dynamic interrelation between the two aspects of its being, *the state* and *the community*. National health depends on the standards and effectivity of that interrelation.

the monostate phase of government

Before we discuss possible ways to achieve effective government, it is necessary for us first to agree our meaning of the term *the state*

Whatever real being should be proved to exist in its own right within the universe, humanity will certainly have to adjust to it. Using the term *real being* in its ontological sense, as a continuous or progressive form of the verb "to be", we signify by it any persistent cyclic repetitive behaviour of power so established as not profitably to be ignorable. In this sense we can talk about the "being" of the planet Earth or of the solar system or of any other cyclic behaviour of power, which endures long enough for humanity not to be able to function in total disregard of it. Unlike such real beings, *the state-aspect-of-government*, commonly termed *the state*, is simply a concept fabricated by human beings. An example of this fabrication is the act of a fascist dictator, who takes a humanly devised concept of the political state and confers so-called being-status upon the concept and then demands the subordination of other human beings to that concept, or pseudo-being.

Before the state concept of government was established there were many petty centres with no overriding co-ordination. Their relations were governed by local considerations, each centre doing what it considered to be best for itself irrespective of its effect on other centres. As societies became more complex, an effective orderly mechanism was required to regularise inter-centre relations. Thus arose the concept of the nation-state.

Originally the term "nation" would have referred to a large group of people of the same genetic origin. But as, through wars and other relations with neighbouring people, the blood of a people would no longer be pure, then the term "nation" gradually came to mean an enlarged group - predominantly of one stock - but with other elements assimilated to the point where enough coherence was gained to justify treating this group as a unit. In so far as this unit exhibited within itself sufficient stability, it became justifiable to use the term "the state" to refer to its stability-aspect.

The state has had to make all embracing rules to achieve coherence of its sub-groups; but the rules could only be large generalisations, because it did not have multitudinous data from all the sub-groups and their constituent members, nor any effective means of handling such data if it were offered. Consequently the

state evolved its highly generalised code of conduct and law, without due cognizance of the needs of minority groups and individuals within it.

Large sub-group stability does not justify the exclusive appropriation of the term *state* by the large group. Any group, regardless of its magnitude, if it can maintain stability in itself justifiably may refer to itself as “a state”. Thus even a single human individual, who is composed of a large number of cells held together within an integument, is faced with the problems arising from his own personal state-aspect of self-government. It is significant that a man is said to be “self-controlled” whose whole complex state of inner stability is highly developed.

The totality of concepts applicable to the state-aspect of a monocentrally controlled system of government constitutes *the monostate*. During what we may term the rigid monolithic phase of government, monostates have evolved as unity and stability concepts in order to control the otherwise chaotic relations of pre-state centres of government.

In principle a monostate can be of any size. It may be: a *micro-state*, being an individual or a small-scale centre of government; a *macro-state* (a *nation-state*), being a powerful large-scale centre of government constituting a nation; a *multi-state*, being a loose-international-grouping of nation-states; or a *mega-state*, being a close-international-grouping of nation-states, still in the monolithic phase, but able to function as a unity.

A monostate, in the hands of the body of men in command, tends principally to preoccupy itself with the unilateral collection and control of taxation-money and socio-governmental information. The monostate is by definition both single-minded and self-centred; this is its strength and its weakness. Its strength lies in its quality of stability, or in its capacity to impose healthy and necessary decisions upon its less well-developed members and so to preserve the general well-being of the whole state. Its weakness lies in its disregard for the human person, who cannot successfully be subordinated to monostate purposes, and in its lack of alertness.

Lack of alertness is evidenced by the monostate's incapacity adequately to assimilate and handle the locality-relevant data, which is essential both for informed and balanced policy deliberation and for intelligent and realistic policy creation. This incapacity brings a

tendency to rigidity and to an insensitive, inadequate system of government.

Recognition of the deficiencies of monostates leads leaders of monostates to distrust each other. Paradoxically, this distrust of other monostates has been the rational justification in the past for the reluctance of leaders of monostates themselves to initiate the devolution of power necessary for healthy socio-governmental change. Thus, until such time as there has been evidenced sufficient intelligently directed resistance to stimulate the state into progressive change, leaders of monocentral governments have rightly been able to claim that the appropriate tempi of developmental change had not arrived, and that it still would be prudent and expedient to withhold effective power from local and international centres of government, even though potentially, for the responsible provision of certain useful services, those centres could be more suitable self-governing centres of control.

A state-in-transition between the monostate and post-monostate phases may be viewed as a *trans-state*. Until the state wakes to the realities of its position, the trans-state could be spelt "trance-state".

the metacentre and the post-monostate phase

As we have observed, the *pre-monostate-phase* consisted of petty-groups unrelated in functions of political significance. Under the monostate phase, unity was imposed on the petty-groups to hold their functions in productive relationship.

The term *metacentre* is used to describe any centre of group activity which has passed through the phases of simple pre-state group isolation, and of monostate compelled group integration, into the phase of intelligent post-monostate-centre group activity, and in which there is consciousness of the necessity for the interrelation of multicentres for their own whole-good.

In the *post-monostate phase* of metathinking, there is awareness that the monostate has no authority, other than that vested in it by its constituent members, and that it is right for authority to be conferred on all metacentres wherever this is justified by locality-relevance.

The governing intelligences of all metacentres have now to reconceive their functions. They must see themselves, not as needing the concept of the state to bring them into proper co-ordinated relationship, but as centres prepared consciously to participate in reciprocal interfunctioning in order to halt the progression of the state

to a position of monolithic authority.

This new post-monostate awareness is what we term *metaconsciousness*, which will generate in time a new metathinking process, by which we can prevent either the dictatorship of the pseudo-entity state or a regression to the pre-state squabbling of innumerable petty centres.

Metaconsciousness recognises that, whenever a number of individuals co-operate to form a group and subordinate themselves to certain rules of interrelation, or a number of groups co-ordinate themselves to form a super-group, never at any time shall the group or the super-group be allowed to assume entity status and power to determine action inimical to their constituent or participant member-individuals.

the idea of multi-metacentralisation

Inherent within metathinking top-economy is the idea of *multi-metacentralisation*. Multi-metacentralisation implies a coming to consciousness of the necessity for individual and small-group responsibilities *within* the large-group.

This concept of multi-metacentralisation is different from those of decentralisation and devolution, in so far as they imply loss of control from a monocentre, or the arbitrary granting of authority by a single body which itself relinquishes that authority. Monocentralisation is in its extreme form a unity imposed from above by force. Multi-metacentralisation on the other hand has the unity grown from mutual understanding of the necessity for *co-ordinative* rather than imposed unity.

Some people may consider a national government to be incapable of multi-metacentralisation on the grounds that no government ever willingly surrenders power. Today no democratic government believes that its power is based on the unilateral principle of monocentral control, for it is aware of the wisdom of giving rein to the healthy desires of its people, and of providing only the necessary controls to maintain stability of purpose and the safety of the realm.

In almost every country, the present situation points to a judicious and carefully phased policy of pragmatic multi-metacentralisation as the obvious policy direction to be taken by an intelligent government. Other considerations apart, it is the logic of the nuclear age, because a nuclear attack on a metropolis serving as the sole centre of government would completely destroy national co-ordination possibilities.

A world monostate would be utterly unwieldy because the realities of monostate government involve oligarchal control. No matter how intelligent its individual members may be, each in their own particularised fields, an oligarchy does not possess the power, collective intelligence and sensitivity to be able to process efficiently for world welfare the continuously accelerating flood of computerised and often confusing data, apart from the subjective factors of individual human evolution.

Multi-metacentralisation removes the authority from the level of the unwieldy monostate and places it in the hands of intelligent men and women comprehending the needs of their own real situation. Multi-metacentralisation, not mono-centralisation, is the future of world government.

Every government tends naturally to aim at absolute authority within its own domain in so far as this does not refute its own purposes. The fact that its domain or zone of influence is interrupted by influences from beyond its own boundaries means that its authority cannot be infinitely absolute. Hence the fact that international relations largely determine the nature of the solution of home problems.

What is true of a nation, within the whole complex of nations on earth, is true of local territories within a nation. Just as a national government must deny the power and authority of a world government to solve its own inner domestic problems peculiar to itself, and must assert itself as a true and valid entity essential to the corporate health of humanity's world-organism, so a local government within a nation likewise must refuse the authority of any would-be monistic government in finding solutions to purely local problems.

Socio-Governmental Parity

the principle of socio-governmental parity

A logical evoluate of multi-metacentralisation is that principle of government, termed socio-governmental parity, which states:

from each according to appropriate need-relevant response-ability; to each according to adequate need-relevant utilisation-capacity.

The meaning of the word *response-ability* should be distinguished from the word *responsibility*. In fact, they are opposites. *Responsibility* means "liable to be called to account for one's actions" (and punished where these merit punishment). *Response-ability* refers to an adequately self-accounting being, able to make a proper response in *every* situation. By definition, response-ability is self-determined, because one cannot confer upon a being from outside and without its co-operation, a capacity not proper to it.

Need-relevant refers to the whole relevant situation and includes what is *need-determined* and what is *need-relative*. *Need-determination* is that which is necessary in a particular situation to ensure the viability of any part or whole organism. Thus a *need-determined* act is one the end or goal of which is wholly conditioned by its initiating need. *Need-relative* is that which is related to the need-determined, but is not in itself an *essential* need property in that particular situation. For example, a man may have a need-determination to wear shoes, but the process which produces those shoes is to that man need-relative. Only to the shoe manufacturer's own feet is the process of shoe manufacture need-determined. Similarly, a government's need for taxation-money may be viewed as need-determined, whereas its need for the information necessary to obtain that money may be viewed as need-relative.

A further example of a need-determined idea is the need of one human social group for a certain amount of additional food. A need-relative idea here might be the realisation that other neighbouring groups also need additional food, and that action by one group to seize the food of another group could lead to armed conflict and to a consequent overall reduction in food supplies. Another need-relative idea could then be realisation of the need for co-operative food production by pooling the efforts of all groups concerned. A need-relevant idea has intelligent regard to all relevant factors.

The principle of socio-governmental parity is different from the constitutional *principle of parity* governing the allocation of public finances between the national government of the United Kingdom and officially self-administered countries, such as for certain purposes Scotland or Northern Ireland. The constitutional principle of parity is defined by political economists as "*from each according to ability; to each according to need*". This principle is also found in Marxist philosophy, whose adherents have always defined the ability-need

expression as basic to human social relationships.

The state tends to interpret the concept of parity-of-ability-and-need entirely in material terms. But the fact that the human being is not merely a material entity indicates that ability and need cannot be evaluated solely in terms of material wealth. They may be evaluated also in terms of those volitional, emotional, intellectual and spiritual forces, which are the true source of whatever material wealth the human race may have amassed.

The fascist doctrine that the state is a real entity in itself having absolute authority over its members is manifestly false, because if all the individual members were to disband there would be no state. No other form of government would claim the capacity to judge all the subtle and personal differences in ability and need of its individual citizens. If it does not believe itself capable of exercising these super-human powers, then government must, logically, recognise the principle of socio-governmental parity.

For a mature and democratically orientated nation, this must be a leading evolutionary principle. It transcends the more confused governmental systems existing before the electorate came of age. An analogy can be made between the pre-electorate-maturation age and the pre-electric age, when all forms of communication and development moved at a much slower pace.

Socio-governmental parity implies that gradually, as individual citizens assimilate and adopt the basic principle, the whole electorate can participate in government, through conscious assumption of response-ability.

Thus, socio-governmental parity means that a society precipitates the government it deserves. Ultimately, the development of socio-governmental parity can lead to a situation where society is so response-able and mature that it becomes the government.

Although this response-ability principle has not generally been published, always in the past it has been the implied principle ruling over every human social group, and basically it has governed the evolutionary development of the human race.

Socio-governmental parity affirms that members of government are also members of society, and that members of society are also responsible for the election of, and themselves can become members of, government; both government and society therefore need to evidence response-ability to each other's rightful needs to receive

service and assistance according to the principle of adequate utilisation.

Government is not a superior body controlling a separate inferior body. Government is not effectively separable from the governed, but is a necessary expression of the self-regulating human social group called the nation.

the problem facing every government

At the present time knowledge is being spread more rapidly than at any previous time in world history. Short therefore of a possible temporary set-back - caused, say, by a devastating World War III - it is reasonable to assume that evolution also will proceed more rapidly than at any previous time in world history.

The realistic choice facing any government is not whether it will allow this evolution to occur, but simply whether it is willing to free itself from inefficient and/or erroneous ideas in order the more intelligently and effectively to co-operate with the developmental tempi of the evolution which inevitably will occur.

The problem facing every government is how best to respond to the rapid evolutionary changes which are taking place. A progressive policy requires the evolution of more political maturity within society. A regressive policy, which seeks to keep its citizens in perpetual childhood by doing for them what they could better do for themselves, will not suffice.

Suitably implemented, the effect of socio-governmental parity will be two-fold:

one: to provide the interested leading members of mature governments with the means whereby they may govern better, and thus more effectively improve the health of their communities and states.

two: to provide the individual members of human society with the means whereby many more may consciously accept responsibility for the condition of their own society, and thus for the quality of their government.

There are four distinct levels of interpretation of socio-governmental parity:

the first level: at the level of physical material bodies, socio-governmental parity is concerned with the responsibility of everyone to ensure that everyone is fed, clothed and housed. And, as the people are responsible for providing the means whereby the government shall subsist, so the people should control the government at the physical level.

the second level: at the level of life-force desire, socio-governmental parity means proper provision of leisure-time activities. It is the responsibility of everyone to ensure that their leisure-time activities are such that they do not in fact contradict and nullify each other's. Pleasure contradicted is no longer pleasure. And, as the people must be given adequate means of expression, so there must be provision of adequate places of entertainment.

the third level: at the level of higher intellect and spiritual principles, socio-governmental parity means free worship, i.e. the right of every person to free interpretation of the concept of spirit. This implies intelligent respect for divergent points of religious view, and mutual toleration of these divergences.

the fourth level: at the level of co-ordination of the preceding three levels, socio-governmental parity means wholeness; the conscious awareness that the three functions of physical subsistence and development, entertainment, and free worship shall be seen to be three aspects of the One Whole Being.

self-determination and evolution are synonyms

Intelligent governments cannot ignore the effects of increasingly high standards of communication, of education, and of more widely propagated scientific methods of investigation.

All over the world men are learning to think for themselves, and are demanding more say in the control of their own affairs. This trend will continue, as people become more consciously aware of their deep inner need for self-determination. Men are not sheep, to be shorn by the shepherd. The metaphor of shepherd and sheep is now being replaced with the deeper truth that all human beings have at their centre a free, self-determining will. That will is, in every being,

the will to evolve to ever higher levels of awareness. It is the job of the government-appointed educator to promote this awareness. Self-determination and evolution are synonyms.

Socio-governmental parity, with its implied freedom, is an ideal, in the same way that a society which does not need laws to govern it is an ideal.

With due regard to the general laws of inertia and consideration of the tremendous mass of energy involved in evolution, culminating in man's present condition, we cannot envisage the immediate putting into application of any new truth, even where it is seen clearly to be truth. In consequence of this we cannot anticipate an immediate victory of the concept of socio-governmental parity over the forces of historic procedure.

The time involved before full socio-governmental parity becomes as natural as the air we breathe may well extend itself another few thousand years, but such a time scale, large in the eye of a single living individual, is insignificant in the whole march of human evolution. We cannot abandon our vision of the mountain range we see on the far horizon simply because we are at the moment forced to wade through a marshland of ill-defined misorientations.

The unattainability of an ideal posited at infinity is no justification of a refusal to move towards attainable finite ends. Minds who call high aims unrealistic utopias, and then use this concept of unrealisability to inhibit possible attainment, must be brought to realise that their refusal of the utopia on the grounds of its unattainability is merely a disguised will to conserve a status quo.

By definition no man is wedded irrevocably to the conservation of the status quo, for within himself every man naturally feels the quickening pulse of his divine discontent. Change is inevitable, but we may believe the direction of this change is at least partially determinable by human beings.

At the present time it is feasible for many practical steps immediately to be taken towards the realisation of socio-governmental parity. Some of these we will consider.

Affirmation of Socio-Governmental Parity

lessons of history

A basic function of every national and other government is the recognition of the different tempi of development of social organisms. All specific social developments have their own natural rates of development, and if a proper balance is lacking there is a serious possibility of one section or function developing far ahead of the others, thus throwing out of phase with each other the different social functions, to the serious detriment of national and international health. Here the principle function of government is to adjust the various developmental tempi within the body politic.

The world is on the move, and no static socio-governmental concepts can provide an adequate solution to the myriad conflicting and interrelated problems with which modern governments are increasingly presented. It is necessary for those determining a government's policy to agree a suitable phasing tempo of developmental change in each field, so as to maintain a desirably healthy degree of socio-governmental stability.

Provided that suitable agreement on the true purpose of government existed in broad principle amongst the leading members of the human social group concerned, it would be neither desirable nor practical to seek general agreement on detailed particulars of organisation and methods, before first ratifying socio-governmental parity as a principle.

The healthy will to power of individual men or groups of men is not simply the will to accumulate power, but also the will to develop and organise that power, in order properly to use and distribute that power. "Properly" here requires that such distribution be in accordance with socio-governmental parity. For in the future only with pragmatic affirmation of this principle of adequate utilisation shall any group of men, acting in the name of government, reasonably claim the right to exercise power over other men.

If, like misers, the would-be powerful leaders of a monocentrally controlled government unintelligently hoard the decisive powers and resources at their command and fail to put them to good use, in time those leaders are weakened, at least morally, by their own lack of healthy function.

The words *miser* and *miserable* are closely related, for the miser, through his non-functioning wealth, is made miserable through perception of his own non-use of his wealth and the dread of it being stolen. The existence of a miser dams the flow of goods and money. Such a being could therefore be said to be in a state of damnation - at least as far as the community is concerned. This gives rise to the idea of *distribution by compulsion*.

When a given person has accumulated goods or properties, such that he has unbalanced the socio-economic health of the community in which he lives, then it is just that his accumulated properties, etc., should be redistributed among the community. The sense of injury and loss which arises from such damnation or redistribution of a man's accumulated properties applies only to the man who is compelled to redistribute them, not to the community that receives them.

History records that the greed of individuals and oligarchies has led them to seize possessions and powers in the name of equitable distribution and to accumulate them instead into the hands of minority groups, which then, through being unable to give them adequate utilisation, have devolved into a corrupted state of damnation.

The historical lesson for every powerful state is that unless, whilst still near the height of its apparent greatness, a government is prepared to commit itself to a new governmental seed-concept, that state will continue to grow until its size exceeds its vitality, and - like the ancient Persian and other Empires - it becomes unmanageable and is destroyed. That is the catastrophic method of redistribution.

Within a politically mature nation, the equitable distribution principle of socio-governmental parity offers a dynamic new governmental seed-concept. Armed with this liberating principle, interested members of society can demand that certain of the sluggishly functioning powers of the state be redistributed to more suitably sized centres of government, large and small, which are better equipped to give these powers adequate use.

no authority without responsibility

The governing concepts of: "*no authority without responsibility*", and; "*no responsibility without authority*", are implied in the principle of socio-governmental parity.

Excluding those essential state-aspects of government, which potentially defend the safety of the realm or restrain improper demands of the free individual, the effect of supplying goods and services either by statute through the public sector, or independently through the private sector (including not-for-profit community organisations), must be examined.

In theory, it might be held that parity of service could be obtained and that it would not matter which system was adopted, provided that an effective spur to improved standards could be built into both systems. Free competition could be said to provide the spur to improve the quality of the private and not-for-profit community supplied services, and effective democratic sanction to provide the spur to improve the quality of the state supplied services.

In practice the fear of competition and of democratic sanction, though valid and necessary spurs to worthwhile human endeavour, would never by themselves be sufficient to obtain adequate standards of parity of service. At different levels of his being every man is motivated by good or bad, bliss or misery, carrot or stick, etc.

Adequate standards of parity of service between state and community organisations therefore are feasible only when potentially at least there is equality of opportunity, interest and reward. This presupposes freedom to use initiative, to experiment and to accept personal recognition and responsibility for whatever results may be achieved.

No reasonable citizen could deny that for the foreseeable future a system of government is necessary, and that the powers of such a government perforce must be exercised by a small minority group of persons acting on behalf of the citizens as a whole.

In principle, as fundamentally self-governing beings, our citizens together delegate power to the representatives of government, on whatever basis they as members of democratic communities consciously consider to be right.

A system of government has no entity status as such, and history redounds with examples of obsolete systems of government which were replaced. In our own country the Peasants' Revolt of the fourteenth century - with its rhetorical question: "When Adam delved and Eve span who was then the gentleman?" - provides an early example of the common man being prepared to discard the eroding concept of serfdom, and to fight for responsible recognition

by government of his natural freedom as a private person, which at that time he was beginning consciously to recognise as his birthright. The fact that this healthy body political evolution developed relatively more quickly in England than elsewhere in the world may be indicative of the British character - "Britons never shall be slaves".

The basic difference between slavery and liberty is not freedom from authority, for regardless of his position every man at times will be forced to undertake particular obligations in deference to the authority of a governing group. No, the basic difference is that a man who is not a passive slave is in principle at liberty to require that a responsible and satisfactory account be rendered to him of the authority exercised over him by every government servant. The fact that it may not yet be technically feasible for such a responsible account to be rendered does not invalidate the principle.

The terms of the socio-governmental parity contract could hardly be incorporated effectively in the static terms of any pre-written constitution. Those countries with pre-written constitutions bear evidence to this fact in the subsequent legal redefinitions and fresh interpretations required to maintain the vitality of what otherwise would become a dead code overlaid with legal precedents.

"The Rights of Man" Tom Paine wrote "are the rights of all generations of men, and cannot be monopolised by any. That which is worth following will be followed for the sake of its worth, and it is in this that its security lies, and not in any conditions with which it may be encumbered ... The best constitution that could now be devised, consistent with the condition of the present moment, may be far short of that excellence which a few years may afford"².

Political thinkers in Britain may consider we have reached a stage in the development of our sophisticated society when it is necessary for the individual citizen to know exactly what his rights are, even if it is necessary to state these rights in general terms.

It may be decided to redesign the *Bill of Rights of 1689* asserting more clearly the rights of the citizen in relation to the state, rather than those of parliament in relation to the sovereign. Such legislation however would not be a *pre-written* constitution; it would reflect merely the *present* climate of political opinion.

² Paine, Thomas, *The Rights of Man*, p. 210. 1966 edition. Everyman's Library. Dent and Sons Ltd. London.

Within a politically mature nation such legislation should be subject to constant review.

The dynamic principle of socio-governmental parity can be applied to the exercise of all governing powers of authority. Just as, when Britain entered the industrial revolution of the nineteenth century, the great reform movements successfully required the rulers to modify the system of government on a reciprocal basis of "*no taxation without representation*"; so, as Britain enters the twenty first century, the politically mature voice of the electorate will require the rulers to modify the system of government on a reciprocal basis of "*no authority without responsibility*".

As the phased development of metacentres and of socio-governmental parity inevitably must be as logical evolutes from prior systems of government, we will consider in another booklet how these earlier systems of government came into being, and the importance both of their governing concepts and of the tempi of developmental change. First, however, we will consider the metathinking value of citizenship.

Citizenship

citizenship and the true purpose of government

All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights, states the Universal Declaration of Human Rights³, but whether these conceived rights are obtained and maintained depends not only on history and circumstances but also on whether the community struggles for the acquisition, retention and extension of such rights.

It is as true to say that man finds happiness in his struggles as it is to say that man struggles to find happiness. It follows therefore that those leading citizens responsible for government cannot intelligently seek to run a country as if they were managing an animal farm⁴. An attempt to do good to people, with "good" being interpreted by the government as providing the people with a pre-conceived form of happiness or contentment, and at the same time progressively depriving individuals of personal responsibility for the management of their own lives, is simply not enough. The fall of the

³ The First Article of *The 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights*, by the United Nations.

⁴ *Animal Farm* by George Orwell, published 1945.

communist states in Europe was evidence of this.

The human race does not consist of potentially contented animals, but of potentially creative and divinely discontented men, who know that human relationships are subject to a strange dynamic instability, which affects the whole body politic. If men become bored, society becomes restive, thus constituting a dangerous threat to social peace and to the continued existence of established order.

Mass unconscious evolution in the past has resulted in many of our countrymen remaining nescient or uncertain about the true purpose and value of citizenship. It has not generally been conceived that the purpose of citizenship is the development, within a social context, of the *whole person*. This metathinking purpose if pursued leads to the development of a mature society of individuals, and to the progressive realisation that the assumption of personal responsibility is more essential to freedom than the claiming of assumed or ill-defined "rights"; for such falsely conceived rights, exercised without regard to their effect on other people, are more in keeping with a primitive than with a civilized society.

The true purpose of government is to develop the individual citizen, not to train him as one trains a dog, but to awaken conscious intelligent awareness in the individual of his real potential for evolution as a fundamentally self-governing being contributing unique individual values to his fellow men. This is the ultimate benefit of citizenship.

The social, economic and personal health of the individual citizen is as important as the well-being of the nation, and the two are dependent upon each other. The *whole person* must be allowed to develop without the imposition of unhealthy restrictions on his personal freedom; otherwise the nation cannot long survive.

The true value of government is the provision of the structured functional situation necessary for the individual to affirm the purpose and value of his citizenship.

Although each individual represents a small centre of self-government, no healthily functioning man in principle could deny that equally all other individuals constitute other lawful small centres of government. And no society possibly could remain in being if it consisted merely of a multiplicity of unrelated individual centres of self-government.

It is a dialectical necessity for national health that, between the

individual members of the national human social group, there should be many differing interpretations about the purpose and value of their own citizenship, as well as many conflicting self-conceived loyalties about the apparently right or wrong, or healthy or unhealthy, functions of particular systems of socio-governmental relations.

This dialectical necessity is universally to be desired, for it is the necessary foundation of functional interrelationships between all human beings.

self-discipline and self-respect

No wise government would deliberately ignore reasonable demands for increased personal freedom within its developing society, provided it was fully satisfied that the natural evolutionary process was capable of control. By judicious government this increased freedom could be directed towards a more mature society capable of exercising an increased degree of self-discipline.

The self-discipline and self-respect sought by the members of a more mature society can grow most fruitfully in a social group where a clearly defined measure of personal freedom is circumscribed by a necessary measure of responsibility as embodied in law.

A continuous process of subtle change is needed in the relationships between the private individual and the government, for nations, like children, need to develop, and cannot spring fully armed like Athene from the head of Zeus.

An analogy can be seen between the people comprising a nation and a maturing child. As the child matures compulsory unilateral restraints are not enough. Although still arbitrary, the decisions at least must appear to be intelligent and made with proper awareness of the facts; if not, the child will lose respect for its parents and possibly rebel and/or leave home. The increasing homelessness, vandalism and delinquency in our present society may be regarded as symptomatic here.

When we consider the human organism, we observe that if the malfunctioning of any particular organ tends to produce a malfunctioning of any other organ the second organ automatically reacts back, and by means of chemical and neurological means registers its complaint. In the same way the individual cells within any individual organ, if distressed by malfunctioning of other cells within that organ, or within the total organism, may express their

dissatisfaction with the conditions imposed upon them.

From the viewpoint of conscious national socio-governmental relations, any given locality-relevant human social group may be viewed as a whole organism within the national body politic, and any sub-division of that body be viewed as a specific organ within it. The same laws apply here as in the single biological organism. Thus any local government finding its healthy function impaired by action initiated in monocentrally controlled national government, has a duty to the locality-relevant members of the human social group and to humanity as a whole, to register effective protest against that action. Similarly, if any member of a group be brought into malfunction by any decision of the group leaders, or of any other members of the group, that member has a spiritual, ethical and biological duty to bring this fact to the notice of the persons responsible and to require reassessment of the total situation.

Within the government, each of the specific complexes has a duty to assess the activities of the other complexes, in relation to the effect of their actions upon the whole human social group.

In the same way, as we have considered earlier, every man is in essence responsible for what emerges from him, and thus has a duty to make himself cognizant of the effects of governmental decision and action upon himself and upon every other member of society.

It is the duty of every metathinking person, as a member of the body politic, consciously to recognise his own part responsibility for decisions and actions taken by his elected representatives.

No individual can relieve himself of the responsibility for the effects of his actions on other individuals. We cannot truthfully accept the non-responsibility which each individual member of a firing squad is supposed to feel for the death of the man who received his bullet. The bomb dropper's responsibility for the damage he causes has its correlative with the responsibility of the pilot or navigator who made his bomb dropping possible for him. The same correlative responsibility stretches backwards to the men who designed and produced the bomb and the plane that made his action possible, and to the electorate whose support allowed the government to make effective all contributory factors. The Nuremburg trials⁵ underlined the necessity for each individual to accept full

⁵ In 1946, the trials of the German war leaders, charged with war crimes, were held at Nuremburg..

responsibility for his own actions, and refused to accept a plea by some of the prisoners in that trial that they had been acting under orders from higher authority.

From each individual there is not and cannot be a higher authority than the inner principle of his own conscience.

Emblem of Metathinking Top-economy

(A fuller explanation is in Booklet One: An Introduction)

the emblem: illustrated on the front cover, is a radiant heart in a white hexagon with a triple border of gold mounted on a blue shield;

the heart (blood red): the individual citizen, whose good stands as the *raison d'être* for the existence of the state and the community, is represented by a heart.

the hexagon (white): the hexagon represents the six-sided governmental complex inherent within the very nature of the body politic⁶. The hexagon is white to symbolise purity of intention and the equilibrated state of mind generally desirable in those responsible for government.

the triple border (gold): the three-fold human aspects of feeling, thinking and willing are represented by the triple border of the hexagon.

the shield (celestial blue): the surrounding blue on the shield represents the presence of environing forces, temporal and spiritual, beyond the natural limits of any temporal government's authority. A deep celestial blue is used in recognition of our conscious and intuitive awareness that some of those forces are of spiritual origin.

the radiance (gold): the radiance of the heart is a universally recognised symbol of expressed love and charity, for it symbolises the response from the inner feeling centre of man's essential vitality, the vehicle of which is the blood, that most mysterious delicately balanced fluid which responds in its metabolism to every impulse of our thoughts, feelings, desires and volitions.

⁶ *The state triad of functions formulates, administers and interprets the letter of the law; the community triad ratifies, services and upholds the spirit of the law, together they function as a six-sided governmental complex. Ref Booklet Two: The Human Needs of the Community and Charity.*

Glossary - Booklet One contains a larger glossary

metacentre: the logical centre of self-government for any mature human social group to develop, and in which there is consciousness of the necessity for the interrelation of multicentres for their whole-good.

meta-individual: a mature metathinking person who views the monostate system of government as out-moded and anachronistic, and who aims to develop individual inner authority and response-ability.

metasociety: that society which becomes metaconscious of the necessity, not merely of creating the pre-conditions of its own well-being and survival, but also of not destroying the pre-conditions of the survival and further development of future generations.

metastate: the self-stabilising large group which is thoroughly conscious that locality-relevant problems of sub-groups within it most effectively can be solved by the intelligences resident within those sub-groups.

multi-metacentralisation: implies *co-ordinative unity*, i.e., a coming to consciousness of the necessity for individual and small group responsibilities *within* the large group.

need-relevant: refers to the whole relevant situation and includes what is *need-determined* and what is *need-relative*. A *need-determined* act is one the end or goal of which is wholly conditioned by its initiating need. *Need-relative* is that which is related to the need-determined, but is not in itself an *essential* need property.

post-monostate phase: awareness that the monostate has no authority, other than that vested in it by its constituent members.

response-ability: refers to an adequately self-accounting being, able to make a proper response in *every* situation. By definition response-ability is self-determined, because one cannot confer upon a being from outside and without its co-operation, a capacity not proper to it.

socio-governmental parity: the principle of socio-governmental parity is: "from each according to appropriate need-relevant response-ability to each according to adequate need-relevant utilisation-capacity".

top-economy: is the economy of specific areas and places in which socially-functioning-profit is distinguished from (but may include) bank-account-profit. The aim is whole-group good. It is the joy and heightened morale which stems from the solution to a problem which has been achieved through co-operative group activity.

Booklets on Metathinking Top-economy

- Booklet One: An Introduction to Metathinking Top-economy
- Booklet Two: The Human Needs of the Community and Charity
- Booklet Three: The SU-VOC Idea
(Society of United Voluntary Organisation within Community)
- Booklet Four: Multi-metacentralisation, Socio-Governmental Parity
and Citizenship
- Booklet Five: Evolution of Intelligent Government, Governing Concepts
and Tempi of Developmental Change
- Booklet Six: Two-Way Multi-Metacentral Government and Britain's
Metathinking Leading Role
- Booklet Seven: Information within Metacentres and Personal Values

Further information about the works and related works of Eugene Halliday (including the booklets) is available from the Ishval website, <www.ishval.org.uk>.

The Authors

Fred Freeman, a Liverpool businessman, deeply concerned with the social problems in the Liverpool City Area, consulted his enlightened friend Eugene Halliday. This work is an outcome of their meetings.

Throughout his life, Eugene Halliday artist and philosopher worked without cease. The body of his work, written, spoken, drawn, painted and sculpted, is imprinted not merely on paper and clay, but in the hearts of all those he helped in the spirit of Logos-love. He defined Love as "The willingness to develop the potential of Being wherever it appears". His life was utterly devoted to it. He died in 1987, in his 76th year. To those who knew him, Eugene Halliday was and is one of the most significant spirits of our time.



The Melchisedec Press