1. The first cognitive revolution: ethical systems

If it were that, or you are, a woman and your boyfriend is very physical and likes lifting weights, which makes him attractive to you, would he show due consideration of you if in a weightlifting session he asked you to join in? Yes, to be sexist you can lift a vacuum cleaner and so can he. Maybe he allocates weights of this extent. But if you do not wish to join in, you should be allowed not to, I think at least.

I am a thinker and do it much exercise. I think I am rather physical, and it would be a good idea for weight-lifters of this sort to adopt my routines. If they did so, they would be able to attain my lifting feats which are very substantial, if not world-beating. I have allocated a training programme appropriate for flies. They have small weights which flies find easy to lift. Unfortunately, when I allocate these tasks to ordinary people like you and me, they stagger about grunting and may even collapse.

Having been warned, you may leave. Before you go, I would like you to know that you have already accomplished my most important task. You have asserted your control. In doing so, and throughout your life, you will be living the principles I give here. Goodbye. I love you.

On the other hand, you may wish to continue. The first part is to describe ethical systems. These are adopted by people in religious uniforms who miraculously appear in your company now and then. Alternatively they may describe social systems like the National Health Service or NHS in the UK, which was designed to behave ethically in providing health care to those that need it irrespective of their wealth. This social system is embedded in a capitalist system which works using an instrument of control called money.

It is a point of view of some, occasionally voiced, that the hierarchy of the NHS has become occupied by some people who may technically be described as Nazis.

Our point of view is that systems of money control are essentially different than ethical systems based on need. We give a detailed account of this point of view. The title of this work is the most technical part, but as we mentioned before, we are designing for flies and you may find it difficult.

The reader who warms to this idea may proceed at least initially with joy. Those less inclined to comfort by these words, such as Conservative Prime Ministers, may view the succeeding text as a burden which it is necessary to read, but for which despite tiredness, it is necessary to devise defences by systems of thought.

At this stage this is not a technical document but underlying it there is a mathematical description. We replace sociology as presently understood by a theory of games. The boundary of a cognitive game object is a competitive game. A typical competitive game is football but where there is no illegal fixing of the result.

Competitive games have control structures. These control structures have control distribution mechanisms. We will describe a theoretical model of a capitalist political

system combined with the competitive game with a pure election. This means there is no fixing of results outside a strictly enforced competitive game.

Whereas underlying the control structure there is direct command and obedience, formally at least the control distribution and allocation system is described by money. In deference to modernity and indicating its control structure in ways we think is not taboo in social systems today, or otherwise they must substitute alternative language, we call these money allocation units dickbits. In the UK we call these allocation units Brendas, which are usually called pounds sterling, in acknowledging that the person at the apex of the control structure is Brenda Windsor, the Queen.

Brenda has land assets of one sixth of the world's surface. In dickbits this amounts to 17,600 trillion Brendas, where a trillion is a million million. Brenda has extensive allocations in social structures operating negative sum games, or murder. It appears these deathbit allocations exceed those already indicated in dickbits. We will deal in detail later with social systems based on dickbits. These social systems are called capitalism. We move on to cooperative games.

We regret that our analysis is in its initial stages. We do not believe its global analysis is liable to extensive modification, but we may be wrong. In local detail it needs much investigation to incorporate its understandings within systems of knowledge that social systems already possess.

We think universities have become deeply involved in control structures implementing competitive games. It appears to us that it is wise to investigate the knowledge we wish to develop so that these control structures are removed. It does not appear that negative sum social systems come in here, at least in the accumulation of knowledge. However, they do appear in its extinction, and social systems of murder are well-known in history. The complete destruction of all books in China by the Emperor Chin is a well-known example.

We already know that control systems occupy most knowledge accumulation systems today, for example Princeton in the United States and many other such global centres. These systems of knowledge accumulation have intensified their occupation of knowledge accumulation. This has become global. Simultaneously the competitive social system embedded by these universities generates systems of dogma and misrepresentation called propaganda.

In modernity propaganda has changed its name and is called the media. Cognitively the change in terminology represents a social control mechanism. Propaganda is associated with refusal in acceptance of its transmissions. The media is associated with deference in acceptance of its transmissions. It is arbitrary which we use, and we will use either.

It is a major thesis of this work that ethical games, part of the mechanism of cooperative games, are important. We occupy a position of cognitive harmony and embedding in social structures connected with their reestablishment where they have been destroyed and their reformation on a systematic basis that is totally consistent. This means they do not possess Stalinist control structures in their operation. They are ethical systems

based on planning. This planning is extensive and collective. It is based on many instances and is long range. The plans are themselves designed by methods of planning and this system is iterative. If the system is cooperative our strong indication is that it is ethical. It directly sustains the social structure surrounding it.

It is important for this method of knowledge accumulation that a university system based on principles of a cooperative and planned extension of knowledge is established, or reestablished, outside the control of the present university system.

A global cooperative knowledge enhancement system, at present heavily dependent on social systems with control mechanisms, will substantially improve the knowledge base and lead to rapid innovation. This global system already exists – the internet. Adding these planning structures will expand it, alongside and not in contention with internet communication. Innovation and its binary opposite sustainability, for instance social sustainability, can be combined by planning to maintain or increase social harmony under rapid innovation. This is entirely desirable but difficult. Ethical planning is well-suited to implementing this idea.

Innovation compatible with social stability confronts at present some social systems where control is rapidly degenerating into predictable chaos, including murder. The capitalist social control system is incapable of dealing with climate catastrophe, which is both imminent and of great significance.

The rapid implementation of social systems developing ethical innovation is urgently needed on this issue alone. Planned and global interconnection on these issues faces governmental control and propaganda. Disinformation is accepted with deference.

Cooperative social structures are well-capable of acting ethically. It is unnecessary to direct them but may be necessary to devise an environment where these issues can be discussed further. This is our primary objective here. This metadescription is useful to devise accurate plans to be acted on with many objectives. We think, but cannot prove, this accurately represents these social systems in a maximally coherent way.

Continuing the discussion, we ask how this game theory relates to the physics, or truth, of the universe that surrounds it. Theory should be consistent. Our theory is coherent, which is a good indication. To find it we used intuition. Insight is the binary opposite of delusion. Intuition, which contains both possibilities, is a binary opposite to reason. Both reason and intuition must have a wider embedding with a boundary between them in it. Insight may be investigated for correctness using reason. Reason uses consistent systems with well-stated axioms or rules and consistent systems of deduction, or logical transformation. Insight is testable at least in observable consequences. If an intuition is delusional, an objective of an ethical system should definitely be to reject it. Ethical systems which do not accommodate the truth, particularly when it is evident that this is physically important, are inconsistent with reality. Then the social system can act in ways inconsistent with its underlying ethicality. Internal contradiction may result in application of social murder and control. So ethical systems must always accommodate to the truth, however unpleasant this may be to the collective social system. If they do not it will become collectively evident that they have become unethical. Then it is likely

the social system will collapse. To avoid this needs no more than ethical planning itself. Accommodation to the truth is not incompatible with ethical social systems. To the contrary, it is a direct and absolute requirement.

We summarise positive sum, or cooperative, games. They accumulate knowledge to develop explicit plans dependent on this. They allocate need in their systems. Just as capitalist systems allocate control in dickbits, a distributed ethical social system implements need allocation in needbits. We have not described this in detail, but move on.

We discuss negative sum games based on murder. It is interesting to ask what sort of structure this represents. It seems the binary opposite of an ethical system. We say it is an unethical system. Some may be disturbed that we are describing in detail how these systems work. Should we not exclude them from our cognitive horizon?

I suggest it would be unethical for ethical systems to ignore them. The reason is that ethical systems are based on a socially acquired stage of knowledge, and this is based on truth. We remark that some social systems deny truth exists at all. We discuss this in section 2, *Metaconfusion, tripe immersion and a tripological analysis of propaganda and thought control in the* BBC.