

Relations with the first iteration

This second iteration has an antecedent in the first iteration documented above. The second iteration is also not for release. Naturally, it will be followed by the third iteration. Originally, the third iteration was to be released for limited discussion, so that the substantive fourth iteration could be released for full nationwide discussion on a totally documented platform with intensive deep discussion. It was assumed the fourth iteration would be completed, and its assembly would bootstrap, so that it would be an implementation of itself.

Before we proceed further in the style of the original intention, we need to note that some altered features of the third iteration have become apparent, and these impact on the plans we outline in the accounts which follow. Firstly, the name of the BC will change. This will defend it against cognitive attack, and make it apparent that we are not a control structure, since we are not a part of a competitive game, although we have well-defined interfaces with it. The name will be the Snail Ecological Area, or SEA. It will have a cooperative social substructure which may be identified with the BC in the documents which follow. The protocols of the operation of the substructure will be openly defined and operated according to ethical plans as defined in subsequent documents. Later developments indicate that it might be wise that parts of the SEA be numb. The SEA is more general than the BC and wishes to understand game structures of all types. Whereas this might be alarming to those that wish to maintain ethicality in all aspects, we assure the reader that the objective is a higher-order ethicality. Whereas we have heard this before in control structures, and this can be part of misinformation transmission, the existence of this higher-order ethicality is objective and can be proved. The question then is how a non hyperevolutionary social system such as the SEA can situate itself in coherence with this idea. We think at this time the discussion must be numb, and should be a part of social interaction within the SEA and not in its binary externality. We are open to communication on this matter. The document continues as it was originally arranged.

In this situation we expect the substantive fourth iteration will be a document we think not only of national importance to the development of the UK and BC, should we decide to proceed, but also of international importance. It will be a document indicating a purpose to a new development in history. There will be a host of problems for the BC, its interaction with the EU, its intended reassembly as we expect within the EU, which has enormous consequences for the EU itself, and moreover for the discussion and development of civilizational problems which beset humanity. These problems are not only the acceptance that a new form of social organisation exists on the planet with sufficient resources to develop technologies and innovate which is way beyond anything that has existed before, and the social interior planning that must go with such a system to maintain interior coherence and stability. The acceptance means that it must be the wish of this social system to allocate an area and a space to itself in which it can perform the tasks that it wishes to do. At the same time an ethical requirement of a system designed to promote ethics must be non-threatening and supportive of social structures outside itself which wish to maintain their own social structures without outside interference. This itself is an ethical idea. This will be supported with intensity. The boundary between social systems which decide to innovate by these means or others will be wide. It will introduce great difficulties in adjustment and negotiation between their boundaries on the disruption, both social and technological, which will result.

These disruptions must be discussed in a kind and accommodating way. For our part we believe these negotiations and developments will be planned. The BC if it is the only such social system, but others independent of our control may try similar endeavours, have a duty to maintain social structures which do not conform to their idea and their own plans. It is therefore incumbent on the BC to introduce advice to exterior social systems which do not accept its values, free to be rejected, and other means of assistance, free to be rejected, so that these social systems may continue to develop and flourish according to the principles which are given them, partly no doubt from design, but also through history.

This continues to be the case when these social systems exhibit behaviour which is violent and strongly irrational. It must be admitted that this may introduce difficulties in interaction with these societies and the BC. We feel that the response of the BC to such behaviour must always exercise extreme ethics. This means it must be totally nonviolent in all circumstances, even when the result is death or catastrophe to ourselves.

Beyond the fourth iteration we believe the BC will be to a certain extent already in the water aiming towards the implementation of an innovative society based on reason. It admits authority to the truth as the principle factor, then the ethics of the social system which it creates and sustains around it as a second factor, and third, except where the first and second factors override, the minimisation of the control of ourselves and the subservience of ourselves to others and the reasoned and collective accommodation to their will.

The BC, arising from an individual response to the expected chaos in the UK following a hard Brexit, will have multiple tasks to perform. Even if we are to clear up this mess, we must admit we are progressing from a mess of one type to a mess of another with different characteristics. Provided we are aware of this, and that we can never progress to Utopia in this system, in terms of the direct tasks needed to accomplish an introduction of a totally ethical system, I believe this will succeed. Threats to the structure of the BC are dealt with in document 10 of this iteration.

There will be many iterations beyond the fourth. We have not mapped out in detail any of them. We believe an innovative society must plan in amazing detail which is amazingly long term. Then we must constantly revise all aspects in a plan, the general features of which we have just mentioned.

The objective of planning is not just to produce paper, though it will, it is to match the development of plans with the situation as it exists on the ground. So as well as an extensive system of planning to determine the social structures around us, including desisting from planning from time to time to relax, we must determine whether the information we receive is correct. Perhaps it needs to be thoroughly exact. For an ethical system, we additionally have to deal with the situation that all information is ethically received. The ethics of its use is ethically enforced with true information which is ethically received, etc.

We believe if we can do this we can extend the enjoyment of ourselves and the community around us, if that is what we want, or otherwise to pursue our own interests of our own free will. An ethical system must not always bind people around itself, but try to maximise the free will of others. Be aware that unforeseen events happen. We seem to be designing a system to avoid pain. If unforeseen events happen we can be in chaos. This can happen to the whole social system. It does not seem to me that we can design away death. A system of change, or

innovation, introduces change to the system itself in the endeavour to succeed in its objectives. This effort, I think, must always result in some degeneration of structure. Locally, this is death, however long life, or a part of it, is artificially prolonged.

The great challenge for the BC is the tackling of issues of climate catastrophe which have too long been ignored, and impel the planet and living things on it to immense difficulties and even death. Our determination in this regard must be implacable. There are two types of miracle, possible miracles and impossible miracles. We cannot perform impossible miracles. A purpose of innovative systems must be to devise ethical procedures in which I hope the possible miracles to an effective solution to issues of climate catastrophe can be attempted.

The reader may be aware that the author has thrown his hat in the ring on this issue too. The replacement of carbon based fuel must be terminated with the greatest rapidity. This is utterly urgent and is not happening now, rather the reverse. Despite the fact that carbon burning can be replaced by renewable energy, his great interest in innovative mathematics due to intense research and a corresponding interest in physics to which the intention has always been to apply it, has resulted in a realisation, which history if it goes so far will refute, modify or accept, that immense energies are available to mankind, and it should not be too difficult to introduce them.

With this idea, and the irrational, centralised, ignorant system of violence of our societies today, you may see that he has introduced already immense dangers which it is your explicit responsibility to avoid.

The objective is to rapidly extend these physical ideas which have yet to be developed entirely theoretically, and employ them in engineering, if that is possible, in an innovative system which will produce energies available to all mankind without burning fossil fuels. An accompanying idea, even though we allow other structures outside the BC independent of its control, is that requests could be made so that social planning could be available to those that want it, so that this technological change can develop in these societies without too much disruption.

I would like to say a final thing. A culture of non-compliance is essential to a normal, effective social system. Thinking about this, I need to say something more. This is the most important idea on behaviour in the book. I forgot to say it. When we have a structure of authority, the deep idea is that someone accepts this idea without thinking about it. I think a lot of people do this, but I cannot prove it. I have never been able to do this. If I am given an idea, I need to think about it. Maybe this is not so. In my youth I was very interested in memorising facts, and lists of things which purported to be facts, the latter because they were necessary in passing examinations, and I later became very uninterested in this idea. But when I looked at ideas that might explain facts I became very interested. Sometimes I came to conclusions that were in direct conflict with what I was taught, and I thought sometimes that I had made a correct analysis at my young age without any experience, and everyone else was saying I was wrong. I think the basic idea here is I always believed there was something called the truth, and I didn't matter how many people told me otherwise, I had worked it out, and they weren't able to explain properly their thinking. Basically they had accepted what they were taught, and I had thought about it. I think, for any society, this is all that is needed. At an early age to get the idea that we can work it out. It is then painful and stressful when everyone else disagrees with us. If we have a culture where we can non-conform, that is all we need. If you want to be like me in a new context (heaven forbid) that is all you need to know. Everything else follows from that. Stick to your guns. If you think everyone else is wrong don't fall back in mute silence and

agree with them. Your ideas may even be right. Don't be put off when people try to prevent you from speaking. After long experience you learn they are important idiots. You are right.