



University of Tabriz

Philosophical Investigations

Fall & Winter 2015/ Vol. 9/ No. 17

The Need for the Dualist View to Combat Extremism*

Alistair J. Sinclair**

Ph.D. in Philosophy,

The Center for Dualist Studies, Glasgow, UK

Abstract

This paper argues that we will never get rid of the extremist mentality unless the dualist view prevails and is taught as part of the educational system. The dualist view takes account of both sides of an argument whereas the extremist view promotes one side unequivocally without considering the merits of the opposing view. The merits of the dualist view can be taught in schools so that everyone learns to recognise that mentality when it is evident not only in other people's behaviour but also in their own thinking about things. The dualist view is a flexible one involving trial-and-error processes as we work our way through life. That view is contrasted with the monist view that focuses on one point of view to the exclusion of all others. The extremist's view is usually monistic and is intolerable of views that contradict or dispute their dogmatic view of things. This paper therefore examines these two contrasting views. It outlines the spectrum between monist and dualist ways of thinking, and it concludes that systematic form of dualism is possible that takes the middle way between the extremes of dogmatic and sceptical thinking. Only through dualist studies will the dualist view be more thoroughly developed, as is outlined here.

Keywords: *extremism, behaviour, the middle way, dualism, philosophy.*

* Received date: 2015/12/30 Accepted date: 2016/02/09

** **E-mail:** alistairjsinclair@yahoo.co.uk

Introduction

The dualist view is about seeing both sides of an argument and the merits and demerits of both sides. The monist view concentrates on one side of the argument to the absolute detriment of the other side. Thus, extremists generally adopt a monist view and do their best to eliminate the other side as if it had no merits whatsoever. They think that their view is the absolute truth and any argument opposing it must *ipso facto* be false and ultimately evil and despicable.

It is argued in this paper that the dualist view needs to be adopted universally before the extremist mentality can be brought under control instead of being an enduring source of enmity and conflict among humanity. Unless this dualist view is taught as a part of the educational system, people will continue to go to extremes in their thinking without being critical of the thought processes that lead them to such extremes. Learning the dualist view requires at least the following:

1. A self-referential attitude that enables individuals to refer back to their views and view them critically instead of applying them absolutely as if they represent ultimate and irrevocable truths.
2. The ability to distance themselves from their views so that they are seen for what they are. Extremists typically take their views personally so that any opposition to them is taken personally.

War is nearly always the result of extremist views of some kind being pursued to their logical conclusion. Thus, the unyielding pursuit of nationalist interests was the underlying cause of the World War One, and the aggressive, militaristic policies of fascist governments caused World War Two. The warmongering mind is one of inflexible dogmatism. There is a story told of Napoleon Bonaparte that before he imprudently invaded Russia, he was presented with a pamphlet which argued very persuasively against such an invasion. He summoned the author and told him that he had read the pamphlet but nevertheless the invasion would go ahead as he had already committed himself to it. The unfortunate consequences of his inflexibility are well-known. Thus, the dualist view may involve changing one's mind in the face of inconvenient facts.

Democracy depends on the dualist view which allows opposing views to be voiced without being suppressed or forbidden. The suppression of opposing views can lead to authoritarian government and ultimately to tyranny. In Great Britain a dualist way of thinking arose out of the civil war of the 17th century CE. Instead of the forces of the King and Parliament fighting each other on the battlefield, they began to oppose each other in the House of Commons. To this day, HM Government sits across from HM Opposition with more than two swords' width between them. This kind of rivalry permeates the two party systems which are fundamentally dualist in nature. It allows the conservative and progressive sectors of society to present their opposing views to the public so that an overall consensus can be reached concerning the best course of action. When one sector seeks to impose its views in a draconian way over the whole population, the government becomes extremist and authoritarian. Thus, when the progressives used the French Revolution to enforce their views, they ended up executing the aristocracy which in their view stood in the way of progress. Similarly, right-wing fascist regimes imprison or execute dangerous radicals who threaten the established order.

The dualist view leads ultimately to a holist position in which all opinions, beliefs and points of view have their place. Wisdom consists in viewing the whole picture and not being tied down by narrow parochial interests dictated by race, religion, nationality, culture, commercial interests and so on. Humanity has already wasted countless time, effort and manpower in futile wars and disputes that amount to little or nothing in the grand scale of things. What matters in the end is the welfare and future of the whole human race and the dualist view is concerned to promote that view above all others.

2. The nature of the dualist view

The dualist view is about being interactive with our beliefs and opinions. We hold them at arm's length so that they do not possess us. It is about self-reference in which we refer back to our beliefs to criticise them. The monist view on the other hand sees everything in terms of one thing which is thought to be the ultimate, absolute solution to complex problems. An obvious example of a monist solution is the view that capitalism is the one and only solution to all economic problems as

opposed to any alternative that favours state intervention. The opposing communist view that promotes state intervention is equally a monist view that fails to take account of the capitalist one. Nowadays, there are few economies in the world that are not a mixture of these two approaches between which a balance is sought through monetary and fiscal policies.

Reality is not so simple that one 'ism' alone can encompass everything about it but monist thinkers consistently behave as if their 'ism' can do so. Monist solutions to our problems are static, monolithic and inviolable to criticism. They are applied absolutely and without alteration so that they lead inevitably to dogmatic extremism in which the opposing view is demonised. If we interact dualistically with our views we can then deal with them objectively and do not take them to heart as being the ultimate solution.

Thus, the dualist view itself is treated monistically when it is applied as if it is the one and only way of looking at things. Like any 'ism' dualism has its limitations and dualist theory aims to clarify these limitations as well as its areas of applicability. It is self-referential and is open to all kinds of interpretation. To that extent it is more like a science than a doctrine or dogma. The point is that we can choose to interact or not to interact in a dualist way and therein lies the reality of freewill. For example, we can stop doing things if we put our minds to it. Dualism is about building up the inner strength to resist and desist when we need to do so. It is about knowing when to stop and think on the one hand and when to get things done on the other hand.

When the dualist view is applied, it usually means interacting between two points of view. But the resolution between these points of view is variable. It does not necessarily mean taking the middle path between extremes, or some kind of compromise between them. The resolution may mean correcting an imbalance in which one behavioural extreme has been taken too far. For example, the world is currently weighed down with increasing debt that threatens the future stability of the world's economy. If nothing is done about this trend, a catastrophic collapse in the financial markets seems inevitable. The dualist view means recognising the extent to which such extremes of behaviour need to be corrected to ensure that future progress is balanced and

productive. Thus, applying the dualist view demands intuitive insight and foresight since there is no simple dualist formula that can be applied to all circumstances.

In the physical world, dualist interaction is ubiquitous and it consists in one-to-one interactions in which an exchange between disparate processes produces something different. There is no logical equivalence between the one and the other because complex processes are involved, especially with regard to biological entities. Living processes are complexes of dualist interactions. They have their roots in chemical interactions such as that between sodium and chlorine producing an entirely different substance – salt.

We are dualist beings because of our biological nature. We have internal workings that interact on a one-to-one basis with our external environment to keep us in harmony with it. We breathe in air and expel carbon dioxide. We imbibe food and drink and expel liquid and matter accordingly. The metabolic processes inside us involve dualist interactions that are markedly different from the activity in inorganic matter such as liquid and metal. As social beings we constantly interact with each other and with society and its institutions. Our thoughts are influenced by such interactions, and other people's thoughts are changed as a result of our interaction with them. What is inside us changes when we interrelate with what is outside us. This contrast between the internal and the external is inherently dualist.

Being human means being in two minds about many matters. When we are all of one mind, we may be blinded to other ways of doing things and can harm ourselves, other life-forms and the planet in general because we are collectively stupid, and create bubbles, bottle-necks and other excesses which led to the world-wide financial crisis of 2008. Crowds are not always wise since they can be driven into riotous anarchy by fashionable excesses to which over-clever people drive them with their specious rhetorical arguments.

However, we are also a self-correcting species that realises its mistakes and can do something about them. Humanity's activities are not entirely unconscious or random like the swervings of bird flocks or the stampedes of animal herds. Our activities are constantly being observed, monitored and commented upon by self-appointed experts,

journalists, pundits, academics and the like. By examining the consequences of our actions, we can rectify our mistakes, and this is done by interacting dualistically with our problems. As dualists, we do not expect to get everything right all at once but may hope to do so in the long run.

Single-minded persons often commit atrocities, like Nazi officers who plead that they are only following orders when they slaughter people mindlessly. Man's inhumanity to man often results from the voice of authority being pursued single-mindedly and inhumanely. Single-mindedness is fine in moderation and within reasonable limits. We often need it to get things done. But it is taken to extremes by absolute monists (as mentioned below) who know no limits in pursuing their ends. The dualist view draws attention to our limitations in that regard because it reminds us of the need to be self-critical. We can stop ourselves and think again and be less sure of our own reasonings. The interactive aspect of dualism reinforces this critical self-reference.

We are capable of being self-conscious, self-corrective beings who examine what we are doing and thinking and correct ourselves when necessary. In interacting with ourselves, we figuratively loop back into our former thinking and correct it accordingly. This is basically what self-consciousness involves when we are aware of what we should or should not be doing or thinking. The dualist view thus refers to self-conscious activity that involves trial-and-error; a common sense procedure that also underlies the scientific method and has ensured the remarkable success of science in transforming our society largely for the better. Dualist thinking therefore moves forward recursively in a dynamic and flexible way. It embraces opposing points of view instead of being stuck unyieldingly in one extreme viewpoint. This dynamic view is not completely realist or idealist, empiricist or rationalist, logical or intuitive. It embraces all of these in an interactive manner, that is to say, it moves from one viewpoint to the other and *vice versa*, according to what needs to be done in the real world in correcting imbalances, redressing injustices, and loosening rigid points of view.

We should regard opposing positions, such as left-wing/right-wing and empiricism/rationalism, as *dualist challenges* rather than irreconcilable paradoxes. These positions constantly challenge us to

make sense of them and we live our lives confronting them and dealing with them. To take one side to the exclusion of the other side is the easy monist solution which invariably amounts to an extreme point of view. It is more intellectually and morally satisfying to accept the dualist challenge and to make the most of it to be best of one's abilities.

Perhaps the ultimate dualist challenge is to live as if one is going to live forever and also as if this is the last day of our lives. Resolving this paradox requires us to actively find the most important and lasting things to do, and the resolution demands our constant attention. If we regard it as nothing more than an irreconcilable paradox then we have no incentive to make anything of it. Thus, paradoxes should be regarded as dualist challenges to be overcome rather than dismissed because they are paradoxical. We overcome them by constantly doing things to get beyond them and to make better sense of life as a result.

As human beings we are both unique individuals distinct from society and collective units intimately involved in society. These incompatible positions must be constantly reconciled and this is best achieved when we are in a dualist frame of mind. As individuals we are not so unique that we can live entirely to ourselves. Extreme individuality makes no more sense than extreme conformity. We can learn to balance the two in a dualist manner. Our word 'idiot' comes from the ancient Greek word meaning those who live for themselves alone and do not participate in society at large. To make the most of ourselves we need to conform and to find our rightful place in society. But this conformity is taken to extremes by those who obey authority single-mindedly. They are in a monist frame of mind and may lose their humanity by being in thrall to ideas, beliefs or opinions that are regarded as real and inviolable. They become pawns in the nefarious activities of the state or of some organisation whose activities are divorced from the interests of humanity as a whole.

We all have this problem of balancing individual self-expression with the social conformity that is needed to make the most of ourselves, and this balancing involves what is here called 'dualist interaction'. We interact with opposing ideas in a genuine effort to seek the best way forward instead of being stuck in the rut of one way of thinking. There is always another way of looking at things, and this is the essence of

open-mindedness. We obey the laws of society because we have good reason to do so but we are not above breaking the law if only because we are human and not mindless automatons. If we are sufficiently moved by the injustice of certain laws, we may purposefully break them. Thus, we interact with these laws when we think about them critically and do not just obey them mindlessly.

The dualist view recognises the fragility of our humanity and is therefore the default position for human beings. Other animals may be driven by instinct and impulse but we always have the choice of doing or not doing what we feel like doing. We need to be fully aware of our potential for wicked and evil acts to avoid actually doing them. This is what self-control is all about. It is based on knowing what we can do and what we should not do. This two-minded duality makes us dynamic and uncertain animals that are always trying to do things better in the future – every day being ‘Groundhog Day’ as in the outstanding feature film of that name. We are all hoping to experience the perfect day in which everything goes according to plan, though we might never achieve it.

However, many philosophers avoid this obvious duality in favour of a monist view of ourselves and the universe. They wish to see us as purely material beings or in the contrary view as purely spiritual beings. The dualist view is too untidy and illogical as it gives us a very complex interactive account whereas their inclination is to reduce everything to one thing or idea. Their thinking is discrete and categorical, and the truth is often conceived to be static, unyielding and eternal. But in the dualist view, truth is something we are constantly striving for by interacting with our environment. It is a process of continuous advancement and enlightenment rather than a fixed goal to be arrived at.

2. The importance of the dualist view

The words ‘dualism’ and ‘duality’ are often used pejoratively to refer to contradictory and confusing behaviour: for example, the duality of behaving with sympathy at one moment and with hostility at the next moment. The dualist view itself is avoided and often dismissed without further examination. It is considered too indefinite and flawed to be seriously considered.

However, a better understanding of dualism is a tool that we can use to cope with conflict and uncertainty in our daily lives. Conflicting opinions are a necessary dynamic which can make or break an organisation. When people take sides and regard their opinions are more certain and truthful than those of the opposing side, the dualist view helps us to resolve the matter one way or the other. It may be uncertain as to which side is correct, beneficial, or whatever, but dualist thinking is about dealing with uncertainty rather than shying away from it.

Uncertainty is a necessary aspect of the human condition. Life would be boring if everything is predictable and reliable. If the outcome of a football game is certain beyond doubt, there would little point in paying to watch it. A football team that could win all its matches without fail would be promoted to a league of its own.¹ Similarly, there would be no need for leaders, politicians or managers if every situation pans out predictably and there are no doubts about how to deal with it. Computers and other machines are used when routines, processes and procedures can be worked out mechanically or algorithmically. When machines can deal with unpredictable situations as we do all the time, they will be the equal of us. (Turing's test is not rigorous enough to determine when computers are truly indistinguishable from human beings. The computer would think for itself and show that is thinking for itself without referring to anything else.²)

Whatever is discrete and measurable can be analysed by logic and mathematics. But when we think ahead and make choices between alternatives, the process is often intuitive and qualitative. Decisions made on logical grounds can be as extreme as those made by intuition. If the bankers had thought dualistically instead of logically they might have recognised the extremes to which their behaviour was tending. The bankers' and financiers' activities before the credit crunch of 2008 were doubtless backed up by a whole array of reasonable arguments. The fact is that they were too rational and failed to think outside the box. It was not so much collective insanity that led to the credit crunch as too much trust in the rationality of their actions. Only a leader imbued with a flexible, dualist outlook could have broken the mould and shown them that they were going to absurd extremes in their reasonings. Obviously such a leader never emerged at the right time.

Success in life is a black-and-white matter. Either we are successful at getting the job done or we are not – as a matter of fact. But how that success is achieved is not so clear-cut. In practical terms, we are concerned here with the means by which we may or may not achieve success through dualist thinking. A successful person is usually not just a lucky person but also one who takes account of both sides of any argument and also of the extremes to which each side may be taken by those who are prone to such extremes. In that way, they are able to take a balanced view of any situation and make realistic decisions which bear fruit.

The dualist view does not make us any less decisive in our actions. Indeed, it gives a rational basis for decisiveness. Systematic dualism (as discussed below) considers the extremes to which our thinking can go. By so doing, it clarifies situations by revealing imbalances, imperfections, injustices, bottlenecks, and distortions which can be addressed and rectified. It clearly shows the direction in which action must be taken to achieve harmony, redress imbalances, perfect imperfections, remedy injustices, and relieve bottlenecks and distortions. We can only hope to avoid taking an extreme view in politics by carefully considering the opposing view and evaluating its merits in a dualist fashion. The resulting view is more balanced when it enables us to act more justly having taken account of all factors involved in the situation.

Dualism is part of the human condition as we are alternately active and passive beings. It is in our nature to alternate between self-assertion and self-denial. We may assert ourselves boldly and then retract into our respective shells when things go wrong as a result. This alternation is at the root of the contrast between dogmatism and scepticism. We may be over-confident of our beliefs or have no confidence in them at all. The history of philosophy may be viewed dualistically as an oscillation between dogmatism and scepticism, between the confident assertion of belief and the diffident doubt of it.³ Evidently, philosophy is undergoing a sceptical phase at present. Perhaps it is now the time for some dogmatic, one-sided dualism to help us control our obsessions so that they do not control us. As correcting such imbalances is part of the dualist view, it can be used to extremes to re-establish a balance by

which things can move forward in a rational and controlled way. It is an imbalance when we have lost control of aspects of our lives. Our interests are a part of our life and not the be-all and end-all of it. The dualist view helps us to keep them in their place. We learn to externalise them by interacting with them dualistically. Conflicts can then be considered objectively to ensure that we deal with them in a balanced and systematic way. Kipling's well known 'If' poem also advocates the avoidance of extreme reactions to the 'imposters' of 'triumph and disaster' which in the cold light of day may not be as alluring or as depressing as they seem at the time.

Thus, the dualistic view is not simply about moderation in all things. It is about recognising the complications involved in a situation and, if necessary, going to opposite extremes to rectify an imbalance. For example, the prevalence of intolerance in some sectors of the community may itself be intolerable and require extreme measures to rectify it, as Karl Popper recognised in his 'Principle of Toleration' (Popper, 1945: 265).

We cannot tolerate all forms of behaviour without question as is implied by extreme multiculturalism. A limit to tolerable behaviour must be set in the interests of social harmony.

Another example is Aristotle's 'golden mean' between two extremes (Aristotle, 1987: 104). This is a static and artificial division that does not reflect the complexity of the real world. Thus, thinking of courage as a mid-point between rashness and cowardice is of no help in practical situations where something must be done or not be done, as the case may be. The courageous person does not deliberate between two extremes but acts intuitively because something must be done. Intelligent decisiveness comes from taking account all the circumstances involved in a situation. Thus, seeking a fixed balance between two extremes is naïve dualism if it does not result from a systematic view of the whole and of all the possibilities, as is argued below.

3. Avoiding the muddled middle

In Charles Dickens' novel, *Hard Times*, there is a character called Stephen Blackpool whose catchphrase is "'tis aw a muddle". He is a mill worker in the industrial north of England who cannot bring himself

either to side with his fellow employees in their dispute with the mill owners or to take the protection offered by the latter. The employees wish to change their working conditions for the better whereas the employers want to preserve the status quo and protect their company's profitability and position in the market. The employees take a progressive view and the employers a conservative one. Blackpool sees the merits of both sides and refuses to identify with one extreme or the other. Inevitably, he is despised and shunned by both sides and leaves the town. When he is falsely accused of a bank robbery, he returns to the town to clear his name but falls down a mineshaft on his way there. Eventually he is found and in his dying words says it is a muddle from first to last. If things had not been so muddled, he would not have needed to come back. If the workers had not been in a muddle among themselves, they would not have misunderstood him, and so on (Dickens, 1854: 267-8). Stephen Blackpool is one of Dickens' many exaggerated characters who nevertheless gives us an insight into the human condition. We can interpret him as a naïve dualist who is mired in the muddled middle. He sees that the truth is never as black and white as the clear thinkers make it out to be. The truth lies within the two extremes and it is easier to take sides than work out what should be done. The problem is to maintain a dualist view while avoiding uncertainty and indecision. Blackpool lacks the mental equipment to see his way forward, and therefore everything seems incorrigibly muddled to him. In short, he sits uncomfortably on the fence because he is not a systematic dualist who understands the nature of his position and is confident of its superiority over the extreme positions which it abhors.

The systematic dualist recognises that there are only two clear responses to a confusing situation in which people take sides against each other. One can join one side or the other or one can work towards a resolution, reconciliation or synthesis which will take the situation forward and make progress possible. Taking the first alternative, the systematic dualist would join one side or the other and work hard to moderate the views of that side and achieve a reconciliation of some kind. Taking the second alternative, he or she would be confident enough to persuade both sides that conflict and confrontation cannot achieve their ends. In Blackpool's case, the first alternative is more

likely to be successful than the second one, given the passions of both sides in such 19th century conditions. However, Blackpool clearly lacked the leadership qualities required to take the dynamic and purposeful action that the situation demanded. It is arguable that successful leadership depends on the use of systematic dualism to a greater or lesser extent.

Dualism is often associated with shiftiness, prevarication, hypocrisy and even immorality. But systematic dualists by virtue of being systematic in their thinking are also being consistent, reliable and moral in their behaviour. They are no longer being systematic when their behaviour lacks integrity. If they acquire the depth in philosophy that systematic dualism demands then they are more in touch with themselves and are less inclined to misbehave. Their conduct can be consistent with the highest standards of honour and respectability though being human means that they may fall from grace as readily as anyone. The moral lapses of the eminent persons in sport and entertainment (for example, the professional golfer, Tiger Woods) come to mind in that regard. Sooner or later, insincere, immature or malign personalities reveal their inadequacies as they are deficient in the self-criticism that the dualist view demands. They no longer see themselves as others see them and are therefore incapable of behaving themselves.

4. The relationship between dualism and monism

At one extreme, the monist view is uncompromisingly focused on one viewpoint whereas in the dualist view there are no fixed either/or, black/white alternatives as far as our beliefs and opinions are concerned. Opposing alternatives are always up for consideration. The moderate or systematic dualist never excludes entirely any opposing view, and this includes even the monist view. Extreme monism in this context is a single-minded and exclusive devotion to ideas, ways of thinking, ideas, hobbies, lifestyles, and so on. Monism is not an absolute alternative to dualism as it has its place in human affairs just as dualism has, and indeed it forms part of the dualist view. There is therefore a spectrum of monist and dualist views such that there is no clear dividing line between them. We can all be monists and dualists to some degree

or other. But we must never lose touch with our inner dualist and become absolute or extreme monists.

Absolute monists who give no credence to opposing views can be a menace to society, especially when they know no bounds to their fanaticism and enthusiasm. Terrorists, extremists and hot-headed fanatics are typically absolutist in their thinking. Less extreme monists are simply bores when they systematically interpret everything in relation to one thing. These include those whom the essayist William Hazlitt graphically describes as ‘people with one idea.’ (Hazlitt, 1824: 59-69). Having one idea means that every conversation is brought round to it as if it were *sine qua non* of their existence.

However, we are all moderate monists in our everyday pre-occupations with hobbies, football teams, shopping or whatever grabs and interests us most in life. Moderate monists are amateur enthusiasts who may be fanatical about their interests but only within limits. Their interests are always balanced by other interests and responsibilities such as earning a living, pursuing a career, raising a family, political activity and so on. We can therefore distinguish absolute, extreme and moderate monists along a spectrum that includes the dualist view at its moderate end. The full spectrum between monism and dualism may be represented as follows:

Absolute Monists - Extreme Monists - Moderate
Monists/Systematic Dualists - Naïve Dualists - Absolute Dualists

The spectrum ranges from absolute clarity to absolute obscurity, as absolute monists have absolutely no doubt about their beliefs as much as absolute dualists doubt absolutely everything as a matter of policy. Absolute dualists have no views of their own and are true sceptics. They apply their scepticism single-mindedly so that paradoxically they are absolutely monistic in that regard. The same kind of paradox arises when dogmatic left wingers become fascists in enforcing their views, or when extremely conservative people are notoriously lax and permissive in their moral behaviour. In other words, absolutists end up chasing their tails and confirming that which they deny. These distinctions are summarised as follows:

- ***Absolute Monists*** despise moderation and give no credence to opposing views. They know no bounds to their fanaticism and enthusiasm and are often a menace to society. Terrorists, extremists and hot-headed fanatics are typically absolutist in their thinking. In absolute dualism, the world is divided absolutely into black and white, good and evil, matter and spirit, mind and body and so on. The thinking of absolute monists is dominated by categorical thinking in which the world is divided into rigid categories. You are either for them or against them.

- ***Extreme Monists*** systematically interpret everything in relation to one thing without using violence to enforce their views. Having one idea means that every conversation is brought round to it as if it were *sine qua non* of their existence. To be obsessed about one's hobbies, about losing weight or about any number of such fixations is to be an extreme monist. Thus, those suffering from obsessive compulsive disorder (OCD) are invariably extreme monists.

- ***Moderate Monists*** are what we all are in our everyday pre-occupations with hobbies, football teams, shopping or whatever grabs and interests us most in life. As moderate monists we are amateur enthusiasts who are fanatical about our interests but only within limits. We are not obsessive about them to a fault, as such interests are always balanced by other interests and responsibilities such as earning a living, pursuing a career, raising a family, political activity and so on. But moderate monists are also systematic dualists by the very fact of being moderate in their monist indulgences.

- ***Systematic Dualists*** recognise when faced with opposing sides that there are only two clear responses to a confusing situation in which people take sides against each other. One can join one side or the other or one can work towards a resolution, reconciliation or synthesis which will take the situation forward and make progress possible. Taking the first alternative, the systematic dualist would join one side or the other and work hard to moderate the views of that side and achieve a reconciliation of some kind. Taking the second alternative, he or she would be confident enough to persuade both sides that conflict and confrontation cannot achieve their ends. Thus, systematic dualists work hard to reconcile extremes and may even resort to extremes in their

dualism if the end justifies the means, that is to say, the end of achieving moderation and good sense.

- *Naïve Dualists* are without any systematic approach by which to cope with their dualist views. They have the muddle-headed, fence-sitting kind of dualism in which one is unable to make up one's mind. They are like Buridan's ass that had equal piles of hay on either side of it. As it was unable to make up its mind which pile to eat, it starved to death. Such dualists clearly lack the internal *nous* and the leadership qualities required to take the dynamic and purposeful action that the situation demands.

- *Absolute Dualists* are sceptical of all beliefs whatsoever. They tend to divide the world absolutely into good and evil, matter and spirit, mind and body and so on. They lack a stable belief system by which to relate one side to the other. The Manicheans were absolute dualists as was Descartes with his mind/body dualism which lacked a coherent interaction between these extremes. These views are also absolute in that they interpret the world from one sceptical point of view. Like all absolutists you are either for them or against them from their point of view.

In everyday life, we can be both moderate monists and systematic dualists. When we want to get things done, we are generally single-minded about it and have no doubts about it. When we are faced with problematic situations then the dualist within us comes to the fore. We need to take account of opposing views and perhaps carefully consider both sides of the argument. We have to be open-minded when we want to reach a clear view of things. But when it is clear that things have gone to extremes and a serious imbalance has occurred then the moderate monist will find plenty of reasons to do what needs to be done.

We also incorporate both dualist and monist ways of thinking without being aware of it. The latter means being moderate in our prejudices and pre-occupations, and the former means recognising the alternatives that are always possible. We must judge when to be carefully doubtful and when to be cautiously certain. Great and successful leaders are usually adept in combining moderate monism with systematic dualism. They are generally dualist in their thinking

and are invariably flexible and creative in their behaviour while also being certain and sure-footed in their decision-making. An outstanding example of this is Oliver Cromwell whose conversation could be baffling and hard to understand but whose actions and battle strategy were decisive and effective.⁴ This duality is often called ‘common sense’ but dualist theory goes much further than Thomas Reid and the Scottish Common Sense School in elucidating what it is.⁵

We can all identify with Robert Graves’ poem, “In Broken Images”.⁶ We are “slow, thinking in broken images”, while others are “quick, thinking in clear images.” We reach a new understanding of our confusion while others experience a new confusion of their understanding. The systematic dualist view is that clarity resides with facts, things and events while confusion and uncertainty may justly reign in our views, opinions, beliefs, convictions which are peculiar to ourselves. Formal linear logic is needed for the former but a dualist, dynamic logic is required for the latter. We may be certain, reasonable and logical about facts that we all share but we often have to suspend judgment about our own opinions. A different logic is required in which the middle view is not excluded. Thus, dualist logic is not the same as formal logic. Changes of mind may lead us to contradict ourselves. We must be more inclusive in our thinking. Being open-minded and forward thinking means that we hold our opinions at arm’s length and with some doubt and uncertainty. In contrast, the absolute monist errs in attributing absolute truth and clarity to his or her beliefs and in attempting to eliminate doubt in matters in which doubt is more often a virtue than a hindrance. It is nearly always the case that “much might be said on both sides”.⁷

Nevertheless, decisiveness is not incompatible with dualist thinking. In daily life, it is often necessary to be decisive and sure-footed. Systematic dualists must necessarily hone their judgments to ensure that decisive action is taken when required. They will thrive on opposing arguments and on the pleasure of reconciling them to achieve worthy ends which are otherwise defeated by the acrimony aroused by such oppositions. They will seek unity and unanimity in relation to the aims of society. Effective leadership can always inspire and motivate people so that they fight for common causes rather than against each

other. But it is successful only when it eschews the extremes and shows clearly the benefits of the middle way. When left wingers and right wingers make enemies of each other then the middle way is lost and society can lose its sense of direction.

5. The fundamental nature of dualist interaction

When the dualist view is systematically developed in dualist studies, the importance of the dualist interaction emerges. The dualist interaction is a one-to-one relationship between two things which is fundamental to the universe from the quantum area of existence up to gravitational relationships between galaxies, stars and planets. It is entirely material, entirely a part of the physical world, and is always amenable to causal explanation. The development of this notion in dualist studies gets rid, once and for all, of occult, supernatural entities in the brain and the universe in general. However the availability of causal explanation is limited by the extent of our scientific knowledge. At the moment, it is clear that our knowledge is insufficiently advanced to account for all dualist interactions in the universe. But, from a philosophical point of view, dualist interaction can be used, figuratively speaking, as an Occam's razor to sever the Gordian Knot of tangled philosophical problems such as the following:

The Mind/Body Problem. Dualism has been too closely associated with Cartesian dualism which posits the existence of a mental/physical divide that is too rigid and narrow to explain the complexities of brain activity. Descartes famously distinguished rigidly between mind/body and mental/physical by making them distinct substances or things instead of continuous processes that are implied by dualist interaction (Descartes, 1986: 54). When we apply dualist interaction universally it becomes clear that notions such as immaterial, spirit, soul, and vital energy (*élan vitale*) are superfluous entities that ultimately cannot be defined. The continuous nature of dualist interaction means occult entities are not required to explain, for instance, self-consciousness. Our self-consciousness may be thought of metaphorically as a turning of brain activity to make self-awareness possible. Exactly what interactions are required in physical terms depends on further understanding of brain activity. Subjectivity

therefore refers to the misfit between what is going on within our physical bodies and the environment in which they exist. We need to be constantly alert and attentive to overcoming that misfit. The problem of how the mind influences the body vanishes when we explain all our experiences in terms of dualist interactions. The word 'mind' becomes an empty notion. If it is uninformative to say that the brain moves the body, it is even more uninformative to say that the mind moves body. When we move our limbs, all kinds of dualist interactions are involved which are not yet fully understood. The processes involved are wholly physical and material and no spiritual or immaterial explanations are required. The unified activity of these dualist interactions is all that is required, and these might ultimately be explained in terms of neural networks and the like. The role of dualist studies is to show how this unified activity is sufficient to explain our ability to move our limbs at will, and that the unified activity is entirely material and not spiritual or occult in any way.

The absolutism/ relativism problem. The only absolute that we require is the continuous existence of dualist interaction that links us to external reality. The 'now' or 'nunc stans' of present existence is a unified absolute that is only sustained by continuous dualist interaction between ourselves and our external environment. We can be absolutely sure of our relationship to external reality because of the work that we are constantly doing, both consciously and unconsciously, to stay in touch with it. Everything is relative to what we are doing. The same applies to the relativity of our beliefs and opinions. We have to work at keeping them down-to-earth. We also need to work constantly at relating our views to those of other people and ultimately to society as a whole. Dualist studies deals with this problem through contextualisation, that is to say, by putting things into context and by seeing things from different perspectives. In that way, we begin to see things as a whole instead of confining everything to one or more perspectives as if nothing else important existed in the world.

The sceptical/Dogmatic problem. We can never be absolutely certain about anything. But at the same time, there is no need to be sceptical about everything. The problem of dealing with doubt and uncertainty still remains since the dualist view seems to put us perpetually on the fence. We are apparently prevented from making our

minds up altogether. However, by developing the dualist view we can fine tune our reasoning without lapsing into abject scepticism or rigid dogmatism. For example, the logical law of the excluded middle is confined to its proper place instead of being applied to all of our beliefs and opinions as well as to discrete objects in external reality. In other words, the ‘either/or’ distinction applies rightly to the existence of things and events in the real world. They either exist or they do not exist and there is no doubt about it. We may be totally certain that tables and chairs exist in the next room if this is factually the case. In such practical matters there is little doubt in the matter. But if we allow our beliefs and opinions about political and religious matters to be held with absolute certainty then we may be led down the path of extremism. We may feel honour bound to impose our views on other people willy nilly. The dualist view helps us to moderate such views and to take due account of the merits and demerits of opposing views. Thus, an understanding of the relationship between dualism and monism helps us here.

6. The social usefulness of the dualist view

Some Aims of Dualist Studies

- To train the mind to cope with extreme thought tendencies and to avoid complete scepticism on the one hand and complete dogmatism on the other hand;
- To show that dualist thinking is not necessarily vague or indecisive and is in fact necessary for correct and productive thinking;
- To show how new ideas can change society for the better;
- To instil philosophy with renewed vigour;
- To understand better what it is to be human, especially in contrast with what is considered to be inhuman, in thought and behaviour.

The Application of Dualist Studies

Dualist studies involve applying the dualist view to practical areas such as management, crime and punishment, education, future studies, and extreme ways of thinking. An outline follows the dualist approach to each of these areas:

A dualist approach to management: The dualist view is essential to successful management. It consists in understanding the extremes of opinion and attitude to which both employers and employees are prone

and which pervade every workplace. The dualist view can help managers deal with situations that demand intuitive insight more than incisive logic. The distinction between naïve and systematic dualism is useful here in which the former refers to confused and muddled thinking whereas the latter involves organised and purposeful thinking to deal systematically with confusing and conflicting situations. Such distinctions help us to understand conflicts between rival groups within the workplace and with leadership dilemmas such balancing friendliness with aloofness. The successful manager learns intuitively how to maintain a balance between being friendly with employees and keeping his distance from them and is thus behaving in a dualist manner in that respect.⁸

A dualist approach to crime and punishment: At present, crime is punished very unevenly and often ineffectively. Punishments are meted out in an unsystematic way that leads to the extremes of under and over punishment. Those who might be punished with leniency are often given custodial sentences that ruin their lives, while others who deserve very harsh punishment to put them on the right track are often treated too leniently. When dangerous people finish their term of ‘punishment’ they are let out into the community and may endanger the public. The conservative view is that criminals should be punished with longer jail sentences. The liberal view is that people should be rehabilitated and not merely punished by jail sentences. The dualist view is that the person should be punished, not the crime. In other words, law-breakers should be punished not by fixed, predetermined sentences but according to what is required to ‘cure’ them of their social deviance and hopefully make honest citizens of them. A *social treatment system* is therefore required to change our criminal justice system and to ensure that those who need lenient treatment are given it and those who need harsh treatment are also given it.⁹

A dualist approach to education: In one respect, we need education to be thumped into us if we are to imbibe successfully such basic skills as reading, writing and arithmetic. But in another respect we need to absorb knowledge and understanding in our own way and in our own time. When these two contrasting approaches are insightfully combined, they interact to produce the best kind of education. The first

approach may be called ‘Mode 1’ and the second ‘Mode 2’. Mode 1 emphasises the skills, knowledge and abilities that should be inculcated through education, whereas Mode 2 emphasises the cultivation of individuality and creativity. In the dualist view, both these approaches are combined in an imaginative way.¹⁰ Another way of putting it is that we must both ‘fill the vessel’ and ‘kindle the fire’ in our dualist educational approach. Plutarch is often quoted as saying that a child’s mind is not a vessel to be filled but a fire to be kindled.¹¹ But children’s minds need also to be filled with facts, poems, stories, languages and all the skills needed to understand society and take their place in it. Their memories need to be developed just as much as their interests and passions kindled and promoted. Thus, a dualist approach to education involves as much disciplined learning as free learning.

A dualist approach to future studies: Though we live in the present we constantly look back to the past and forward to the future. Studying the past helps us to predict the future, and looking to the future helps us to anticipate things being better than they are at present. But we can be too pre-occupied with the past at the expense of the future and vice versa. These are monist views that look exclusively in either one direction or the other. It means that we dwell too much in the past or look too confidently to the future. The *retrospective* view looks to the past and *prospective* view to the future. The dualist view helps us to place equal value on both these views. We move in a dynamic way from one to the other without being stuck in the past or leaving everything to the future.¹²

A dualist approach to eliminating extremes of thought: Systematic dualism is essential for creativity as it depends on our maintaining a balance between thinking too much or too little. It is arguable that those ‘geniuses’ who perform extraordinary feats of creativity are only able to do so because they are systematic dualists who avoid self-defeating extremes in their thinking. They develop their mental powers in a purposeful fashion without taking themselves too seriously on the one hand or belittling themselves too much on the other hand. Often we are in doubt whether to think too much of ourselves or too little. Here are the extreme consequences of the opposing tendencies involved:

Thinking too much of oneself

May lead to

Hot-headed extremism

Involving

Brazen overconfidence

And *in extremis* to

Thinking too little of oneself

May lead to

Empty-headed indifference

Involving

Insipid lack of confidence

And *in extremis* to

Homocidal sociopathy suicidal self-abnegation

It appears that too many young people are prone to these extremes these days, leading to an outbreak of massacres and suicides, as reported in the mass media. Suicide bombers seem to incorporate both these strands in their thinking. Their unbalanced thinking twists these strands into a deadly double helix, the antithesis of DNA which gives life instead of taking it. They think too much of themselves and too little at the same time. They arrogantly think that their deaths can make a difference while by making out that their lives are worthless enough to be terminated instantly. They achieve nothing lasting by their senseless actions. A rational dualist interaction between these extremes is required to avoid being possessed by them beyond sense and reality. Thus, a greater understanding of our essential duality is the next big step forward for humanity.

7. In praise of the middle way

Our capacity for extremism. Perhaps our most admirable and our most dangerous trait is our capacity for excess. The seemingly limitless extremes to which we push ourselves bring out the best and worst in us. Our obsessions can lead us, for example, to climb the highest mountains, write huge novels, built bridges and buildings, and gain immense advances in scientific knowledge, while crippling ourselves with addictions, killing each other in the millions, and destroying the planet in our pursuit of the ‘good life’. From a moral standpoint, it is usually obvious which of these are beneficial and which are harmful. But it depends on our state of mind whether we adopt the first and avoid the second. In so far as we have personal insight and self-discipline we

can avoid harmful states of mind when we recognise them as such. We can choose not to do harm or to have negative thoughts in so far as we have control over our emotions. For example, we can stop being angry with someone when we realise that our anger is unfounded or unreasonable. People about to commit murder or suicide can be persuaded by others to desist. Potentially we can all change our minds if we choose to do so. Therefore, we have enough freewill to consciously avoid going to these extremes if we really want to. A clear method is needed to deal with these extremes, and the following distinctions hopefully help us to recognise extreme and harmful states of mind both within ourselves and in others, so that we can avoid them.

A Schematic Depiction of the Middle Way

	The Will to Power (Nietzsche)	The Will to Understanding (Systematic Dualism)	The Will to Belief (William James)
	□	□	□□
Features:	Carnivorous (Wolves)	Human	Herbivorous (Sheep)
Motivations:	Seeking immediate fame, power or notoriety	Seeking long-term personal development	Seeking security within 'herd/flock'
Traits:	□	□	□□
Relational	Dominant	Independent	Dependent
Prescriptive	Commanding	Questioning	Unquestioning
Doxastic	Dogmatic	Critical of belief	Blind belief/faith
Reactive	Authoritarian	Authoritative	Credulous
Predictive	Deterministic	Latitudinarian	Fatalistic
Attitudinal	Absolute certainty	Relative certainty	Total conviction
Judgmental	Contempt	Respect	Uncritical
Behavioural	Demeaning	Self-critical	Subservient
Effects:	□	□	□
Social	Esoteric	Inclusive	Exclusive
Heuristic	Indoctrination	Teaching	Preaching
Emotive	Hypnotic induction	Rational passions	Mob mania
Dispositional	Them/us discrimination	Tolerance of differences	Indiscriminate love/hatred
Goals:	□	□	□
Epistemic	Messianic knowledge	Hypothetical knowledge	Common knowledge
Personal	Adulation	Truth	Conformity
	□	□	□
Outcomes:	Self-deception	Insight	Delusion

Introducing the middle way. The above three outlooks or ways of thinking characterise human nature from the dualist point of view. We have, on the one hand, the overly strong ‘will to power’¹⁴ and, on the other hand, the overly weak ‘will to believe’,¹⁵ between which the relatively moderate ‘will to understanding’ hovers uneasily. The former two ways represent relatively unreflective and uncivilised aspects of human nature which need to be supplemented by the middle way. Their unreflective and uncivilised aspects emerge when they are isolated from the middle way and are taken to extremes. All forms of political, religious and behavioural extremism result from such a loss of the middle way, as is argued below. This extremist potential persists within us all and we need constantly to guard ourselves against its reassertion and predominance. In so far as there is progress in civilisation, it consists in the middle way being progressively introduced until it forms part of everyone’s mindset and ultimately of the political and social fabric. Civilised behaviour requires the middle way to insinuate its way between these intimate extremes which feed on each other. This process has recurred several times in history when humanist attitudes have come to the fore. Equally, the simplicity and attraction of extreme views has all too often resulted in the loss of the middle way. Until the twentieth century, the appearance of the middle way has been cyclical and impermanent. It remains to be seen whether the twenty-first century will see its permanent institution if it ever becomes an integral part of the educational system.

The Consequences of repudiating the middle way. It may be argued that excess is tolerable while it is related to the middle way wherein we remain human rather than inhuman. We can be a little wicked as long as we repent of that wickedness and resolve to do better. For we need to bear in mind the harm which excessive behaviour does to ourselves and others. We need the restraints of the middle way to function as sociable and rational beings. Repudiating the middle way entirely means losing one’s moral sense or social conscience. Psychopaths and sociopaths feel no shame or remorse because they have lost all restraints over their behaviour and have nothing within them to draw them back from doing their worst. In the same bracket, we may include terrorists, extremists, fanatics, zealots, criminals, rapists, gangsters, gurus, charlatans, and sectarian bigots of all kinds, who commonly scorn the

middle way between the will to power and the will to believe. They seek the nearest way to satisfy their ambitions, desires, compulsions and obsessions. In preying on the populace like wolves on sheep, they dehumanise themselves and demean their victims. They dominate people to achieve their self-serving ends. They are so sure of themselves that they become dogmatic and authoritarian in their behaviour towards others. In the case of religious and political bigots, they exert power over others by means of messianic knowledge which is usually a belief system specific to themselves or the organisation within which they operate. The belief system is often so esoteric and divorced from common life that they adopt a them/us discrimination policy. You are either in or out, for or against, and there is no middle way.

No excuses for repudiating the middle way. Clarifying the middle way helps us to put such people in their place and treat them with the contempt and disapproval they deserve. Neither their genetic inheritance nor their social backgrounds are sufficient to excuse their opprobrious ways of thinking over which they potentially have as much self-control as the rest of us. Their freely adopted attitudes and frames of mind are primarily to blame for their deplorable behaviour. We need not respect or tolerate behaviour and attitudes which cannot be justified by reason or reference to the middle way.

Without the middle way we lose our humanity. In the absence of any middle way, power-mongering and intimidation prevails, and the human race is composed of nothing but knaves and fools, or exploiters and victims. Knaves think too much of themselves and fools too little of themselves. Knaves quarrel among themselves and use fools to fight each other. This can happen in tribal and criminal set-ups that still recur even in developed nations. Such absolute divisions make relations between people problematic, and they erode trust, perpetuate enmity, make co-operation impossible, and prevent us from fulfilling our potential as human beings. Killing each other becomes a routine matter when we have no respect for others as human beings and regard them as dispensable vermin. It is Hobbes's 'state of nature' in which there is "a time of War, where every man is Enemy to every man".¹⁶ The highest human aspirations are thrown away in favour of the lowest and meanest ones, dictated by narrow, personal, group, sectarian, nationalist or

religious matters. Such are the conditions which prevailed under authoritarian regimes such as Nazi Germany, Stalinist Russia, and Pol Pot's Cambodia.

Power and subservience go together. Just as sadism goes along with masochism and *vice versa*, so power-mongering goes along with submission and subservience to a stronger will or character. Power-mongers will always have victims over whom they exert power and influence while their mind-slaves retain an uncritical will to believe in spite of all reason or common sense to the contrary. When people form a mobilised mob or a cowed crowd, they are susceptible to the wilfulness of dominant characters. It is easy to appeal to people's emotions when they form a cohesive tribe that spurns the freethinking individual. Only when people are allowed to think things out as individuals, is it possible for reason and good sense to prevail over crowd-pulling emotion. Thus, the dualist view repudiates the polarisation of these positions in favour of the middle way towards which all positive and progressive movements must tend if humanity is to come together and ensure its collective future.

5- Conclusion

The ultimate truth for human beings lies not in settling for one viewpoint but in incorporating all viewpoints by interacting constantly with them to make as much of them as humanly possible. This is clearly the opposite of religious or ideological viewpoints that see only one way forward. It accords with an ongoing dualist view that is constantly interacting with the world and its contents. This whole-hearted position provides us with the open-minded outlook to work out for ourselves what we are to do with our lives. We manoeuvre our way through life on a trial-and-error basis and do not expect everything to be straightforward or made easy for us. In other words, our safety, security and internal well-being lies in constant interaction, in striving to better ourselves, and in taking account of everything in a spirit of open-minded curiosity and vitality. Being open to all things promotes optimism whereas confining ourselves to one point of view or mindset depresses and stunts us as human beings. Dualism can be all things to all men but only by bringing all views into its omniscient fold. This is no easy task but we can all learn to work at it if we have the will to do

so. Thus, the task of dualist theory is to supply the reasons and rationale for doing so, and this is a beginning not an end.

Notes

1. Perhaps such an outstanding team might become an exhibition team that tours the world, like the basketball team, the Harlem Globetrotters, its members becoming celebrities in their own right. However, competitive sport usually involves an element of uncertainty and unpredictability to attract spectators and partisans.

2. A. M. Turing, "Computing Machinery and Intelligence," *Mind*, 1950, Vol. LIX, No. 236. This famous paper is excerpted in Hofstadter and Dennett's book, *Mind's I*, Penguin Books, 1982, pp.53-68. However, the question of whether a machine is thinking or not may be resolved by observing how it is behaving to itself. Thus, self reference is more important than its reaction to people in the way suggested by Turing. Its inner life, consciousness and self-identity can give it feelings and thoughts of its own. We will react emotionally to their displays of emotion and will either empathise or not as the case may be. What we are actually feeling may be uncertain even to ourselves, and computers would need to behave likewise if they are to be likened to us.

3. This dualist view of the history of philosophy is outlined in my book, *What is Philosophy?* (Edinburgh: Dunedin Academic Press, 2008).

4. Cf. Sir Walter Scott's extraordinary portrayal of Oliver Cromwell in his novel, *Woodstock* (1826). It seems convincingly true to life.

5. Thomas Reid's view of common sense consisted of a psychological examination of the five senses laid down by Aristotle plus a list of common sense principles that served only to stultify metaphysical discussion. See, for example, *Essays on the Intellectual Powers of Man*, Essay VI, Chs IV-VI in *The Works of Thomas Reid*, ed. Sir W. Hamilton, (Edinburgh: James Thin, 1895), pp. 434-461.

6. Robert Graves' poem 'In Broken Images' is freely available online

7. Joseph Addison (1672-1719), in his *Roger de Coverley* essays in *The Spectator*, no.122, July 20, 1711, (London: J.M. Dent, 1909), p.149. See also no. 117, July 14, 1711 (p.128):

"There are some Opinions in which a Man should stand Neuter, without engaging his Assent to one side or the other. Such a hovering Faith as this,

which refuses to settle upon any Determination, is absolutely necessary to a Mind that is careful to avoid Errors and Prepossessions.”

8. This is the subject of my paper entitled “The Role of Dualist Thinking in Management” which was presented to the Seventh International Philosophy of Management Conference at St. Anne’s College, Oxford on Friday 23rd July 2010.

9. The ‘social treatment system’ is elaborated in my e-book entitled *Punish the Person, not the Crime! Proposing a Social Treatment System to Punish Lawbreakers*, (Amazon Kindle, 2013).

10. Cf. *The New Production of Knowledge*, Michael Gibbons, C. Limoges, H. Nowotny, S. Schwartzman, P. Scott, and M. Trow. (London: Sage, 1994).

11. The quotation is in fact a paraphrase from a passage in *Plutarch’s Moralia*, Vol. One, III ‘On Listening to Lectures’, (*Περὶ τοῦ ἀκούειν - De recta ratione audiendi*), 48 C2–D4, trans. by Frank Cole Babbitt, (Loeb edition, London: William Heinemann Ltd., 1927). pp. 257-259. A fuller paraphrase might be as follows: ‘The mind is not to be filled like a vessel (ὡς ἄρτιον) but requires kindling like wood to provide new illuminations and insights through speech and text.’

12. There is more on these distinctions in my article, Posterity—An Eighteenth Century Answer to God and Religion, *The Humanist*, Vol. 71 (2), March/April 2011, pp. 39-40. It is also reprinted in my book, *American Papers on Humanism and Religion*, (Almostic Publications, 2014).

13. As to be found in his *Also Sprach Zarathustra* and other works. For example, *thus Spoke Zarathustra* (London: Penguin Books, 1967), ‘Of Self-Overcoming’ (*Von der Selbst-Überwindung*), p. 136: “That is your entire will, you wisest men, it is a will to power.” (*Das ist euer ganzer Wille, ihr Weisesten, als ein Wille zur Macht.*)

14. Cf. William James (1897), *The Will to Believe*, (New York: Dover Publications, 1956), pp. 1-31.

15. Thomas Hobbes, *The Leviathan*, Part I, Ch. 13, (1631 – London: Penguin Books, 1985), p. 186.

References

- Addison, J. (1711), “*The Spectator*”, nos. 122, 117, (London: J. M. Dent, 1909)
- Aristotle, (1987), *Nicomachean Ethics*, London: Penguin Books.
- Descartes, R. (1641), *Meditations on First Philosophy*, trans. J. Cottingham, (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1986)
- Dickens, C. (1854), *Hard Times*, (New York: New American Library, 1961)
- Gibbon, E. (1776), *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, (London: Allen Lane, 1994)
- Gibbons, M., et al, (1994), *The New Production of Knowledge*, (London: Sage)
- Graves, R. *In Broken Images*, A poem widely available online.
- Hazlitt, W. (1824) ‘On People With One Idea’, *Table Talk*, (London: J. M. Dent, 1908), Essay VII.
- Hobbes, T. (1631), *The Leviathan*, (London: Penguin Books, 1985)
- Hofstadter D. and Dennett D. (1982), *Mind’s I*, (London: Penguin Books)
- James, W. (1897), *The Will to Believe*, (New York: Dover Publications, 1956)
- Nietzsche, F., (1883-5), *Also Sprach Zarathustra*, (*Thus Spoke Zarathustra* – London: Penguin Books, 1967)
- Plutarch, *Moralia*, Vol. One, III ‘On Listening to Lectures’, (Loeb ed., London: William Heinemann Ltd., 1927)
- Popper, K. (1945), *The Open Society and its Enemies*, (London: RKP, 1969)
- Reid, T. (1785), *Essays on the Intellectual Powers of Man*, in *The Works of Thomas Reid*, ed. Sir W. Hamilton, (Edinburgh: James Thin, 1895)
- Scott, Sir W. (1826), *Woodstock, or The Cavalier*, (Edinburgh: T.Nelson, 1926)

- Shannon C. E. and Weaver W. (1949), *The Mathematical Theory of Communication*, (Urbana: The University of Illinois Press, 1964)
- Sinclair, A. J. (2008), *What is Philosophy?* (Edinburgh: Dunedin Academic Press)
- Sinclair, A. J. (2010), “The Role of Dualist Thinking in Management” Seventh International Philosophy of Management Conference, at St. Anne’s College, Oxford, 2013), *Punish the Person, not the Crime! Proposing a Social Treatment System to Punish Lawbreakers*, (Amazon Kindle, 2013)
- Sinclair, A. J. (2014), Posterity—An Eighteenth Century Answer to God and Religion, reprinted in *American Papers on Humanism and Religion*, (Almostic Publications, 2014)
- Turing, A. M. (1950), “Computing Machinery and Intelligence,” *Mind*.