

My Somerset Life

A diary by Brian Snellgrove

- My Somerset Life
- Diary Entries
- Writing a diary
- About, and User's Guide
- Creative Listening service
- Privacy Policy
- Contact
- Thoughts
 - Blood clots
 - Enlight and Godlight
 - Interacting with others + the disadvantage of being nice.
 - Is Jesus only our local hero?
 - Loneliness or enjoying your own company?
 - Mobile phones – neutrinos and everything
 - People of different nationalities – the myth of separation
 - Personal energy and life readings
 - Quantum Entanglement
 - Sanity and Insanity – where do we go when we die?
 - The Second Coming of Jesus – where is he?
 - The twisting of space and other matters
 - What is sin?
 - What is the brain?
 - What vibrations can improve our lives?
 - Will the truth survive?

Are you a controversial character?


controversy

*“disputation, debate, prolonged agitation of contrary opinions,” late 14c., from Old French controversie “quarrel, disagreement” or directly from Latin controversia “a turning against; contention, quarrel, dispute,” from controversus “turned in an opposite direction, disputed, turned against,” from contra “against” (see contra (prep., adv.)) + versus “turned toward or against,” past participle of vertere “to turn” (from PIE root *wer- (2) “to turn, bend”).*

Controversial

1580s, “debatable, disputed,” from Late Latin controversialis “pertaining to controversy,” from Latin controversia (see controversy). From 1650s as “of or pertaining to controversy.”

From time to time I like to dig into words just to examine my own understanding of it and the current usage that I see expressed by my fellow human beings. This did not occur to me until I started watching the video listed below about the origins of Zionism, and also the current demand by Israel to make it an imprisonable offense in all countries to criticize any of activities of Israel in their current slaughter of Gazians.



I'm going to make a huge generalisation. Most people do not want to engage in controversy. The idea of thesis, antithesis, and synthesis is a foreign land. This is called The Hegelian dialectic. This in classical philosophy is a form of reasoning based upon dialogue of arguments and counter arguments, advocating propositions and counterpositions.

The first idea, the thesis, is a formal statement illustrating a point; it is followed by the second idea, the antithesis, that contradicts or negates the first; and lastly, the third idea, the synthesis, resolves the conflict between the thesis and antithesis. It is often used to explain the dialectical method of German philosopher Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel, but Hegel never used the terms himself; instead his triad was concrete, abstract, absolute. The thesis, antithesis, synthesis triad actually originated with Johann Fichte.

It can be used in any situation and any matter come a large and small. "my child is the apple of my eye and can do no wrong" to which the second person replies "I have seen your child misbehave on many occasions". The conclusion would be

that on balance of the evidence the behavior of the child is context referenced and changes according to the circumstances.

Are there any modern trends that facilitate or make more difficult the process of discussion. First of all, there must be the will. If our life is taken up by a succession of trivia and accompanying short-term attention span it is less likely to find a situation where two or more parties sit down, free of distraction, and develop an argument from beginning to end. In a survivalist situation people's need to be right will be greater than the need to identify objective truth. This is one of the dystopian features of competition. Purist arguments are cast aside in favor of slogan's, recruited items from the mainstream media, prejudices, and a lazy procession of non-sequiturs.

The opposite of free will what should we say applied will is apathy and indifference . I noticed that many people have given up the will to live and are just going through the motions and are apathetic about most things. If they have even given up on their assertion to human rights then that indicates that they have never stood up for anything and choose to take the path of least resistance . This alas has been the job of the governments ' Nudge Unit' to influence people without their being aware of it.

In another category we have what I can only describe as argumentative and angry people . These are those when you press the button they will argue about anything and everything and engage their limbic and reptile brain at the expense of the neocortex. I ignore these people in the same way that I would not try to argue with a drunkard because they have no will to dialogue or engage on a rational level . I would not try and fight with a dog over a bone . I would need to see that the circumstances of the situation were not harmful or threatening

We also what I would call the self opinionated . They are

always right on everything , make no apology for their views, and if you don't ascent to their way of thinking you do not exist the Buddha said that *'in a controversy the instant we feel anger we have already ceased striving for the truth, and have begun striving for ourselves'*

In what circumstances are people most likely to seek the truth. It can be in a court case where great injustice has been done and in order to obtain recompense and fair adjudication, the perpetrators must be challenged.

However in normal life, everything is largely a matter of opinion. As an example 'I like Russell Brand' Another person doesn't like him. Another person cannot stand him. At the end of this attempted dialogue no one is any the wiser because they don't know the basis for the emotional reaction for or against.

Being afraid of what people might think.

Oh how common this is and what a terrible price we pay for our fear and expressing our own views. People almost apologize for their views saying, 'well that's just my opinion' and in so doing they degrade their own importance and apologize for thinking. There are ways of saying things let us say out of your heart, that are less likely to cause offense. The problem is that not saying something, stuffing it up, could do you more harm than speaking out. This is especially true when you see someone behaving in an inappropriate manner. After they suffer the consequences of their own mistakes it's too late to say when they ask you why you didn't say anything 'well, I didn't want to upset you' what sort of friend are you?

In order for me to describe my feelings I need to know that the other parties are interested in what I have to say. This is why conversation at social gatherings tends to be superficial because the focus of another person is not

concentrated in any particular direction. I am not going to bear my soul to someone if their eyes are flitting around the meeting room in the hope of some distraction or entertainment.

Another reason for lack of dialogue is the fear of what the cost might be of a result not in your favor. We can take for example the recent medical interventions that were forced upon so many people. If I started dialogue within asking why they took the interventions they are likely to be resistant maybe for reasons of fear and the dialogue will not take place. Unfortunately, it is possible that the proponent of the question or argument will be marginalized by the listener. So the dialogue cannot even start.

Another reason is that if you're going to talk with someone about something important there needs to be a common level of respect. Of course you can talk to a complete stranger in the street but the commitment to actually do something about it is lessened if you know that you're not going to meet them again.

So for any dialogue to start we need the will to discover, an environment that is supportive and not disruptive or disturbing, and enough respect of each other to listen to what the other one has to say.

The semblance of the right conditions though as I will argue not the reality is in social media. People can raise a subject, battle away, and as often as not end up with the same state of mind as they were in the beginning. Was this topic controversial? Clearly it was. Was each side interested in the arguments that the other? In most cases, no. This is because we have become invested in our position with which we now identify ourselves and do not wish to change from it.

Reflecting on controversies, some controversies come, and some controversies go but the important thing is sticking to your principles and persevering through those controversies. There is something of greater duration that needs to be respected

and that is the absolute truth in other words set up paradigms that do not change with the wind or with local opinion. It could be for example be supremacy of love as a guiding force all that unity or attempts for unity are greater than divisiveness or that attempting to discuss something rationally is better than reaching a conclusion by means of violence.

The person with a strong historical knowledge set is in a better position to argue a case, as they can give examples of when for example rebellions happened as a result of the continual abuse of power of governments. They can give examples of the self-destruction of civilization through abuse of natural resources and so any argument can be seen in a much greater context that can give meaning and significance to even small points .

Our cousins in America tend to reach for their lawyer when they cannot agree something with their neighbor, who might not have a better mindset is to look at why they have difficulty with them in the first place and sit down together and try to work out a solution. Both parties can grow, and get to know each other more.

Is there a good way of starting a dialogue?

I do this with people I do not know. I ask them questions. I can say, have you heard the latest research about this that or the other? If they say no, I can then say ' I read this fascinating article in a journal' which said such and such. The other party can then decide whether to engage or not. This could be a useful way of moving forward because we could start off by establishing what we believe in common prior to establishing what we disagree on. In other words we do not start with a fight, and assumption, but with a question.

What sort of people are those that we are likely to be able to

have a productive discussion with? From the experience of many decades I can say that a well-educated person with nothing to prove and who is secure on their own ground and who is curious is probably the person to find, if you can find such a person. One of the hidden benefits of attending a rambling group is that you have the opportunity to twin with a kindred spirit without any pressure, chat for as long or as short as you like, and see what come on ground you have.

The question of political correctness, or de-platforming someone, is a feature of the woke of a wise known as the continued activity of the Frankfurt group in the 1920s or in a world, communism. They have no interest in promoting unity and in spite of what they say their intention is not diversity but divisiveness. You could say very crudely, divide and conquer. So-called winning an argument does not depend on the strength of your argument let alone any facts but the application of brute force towards the other party including ad hominum. If they are known to be on the other side of the fence the person believes that even talking with them is pointless and they should not even be given the chance to express their view. This is in my opinion the hallmark of an intellectual retard. Funny. You go to a university to improve your mind and leave with a retarded mind. Such is political correctness.

We speak of PC gone mad. News – it is already mad at its inception.

—VIDEO LIBRARY—

Dustin Nemos and Daniel Kristos unveil the DEMONIC origins of Zionism. Hosted by Mike Adams 50:40

My Somerset Life by Brian Snellgrove

With over 1 million words and 7,130 images.

You can search for any place or topic including Bath, Frome, Wells, Bristol, Glastonbury, Cheddar, or you can search topics such as Christian, meditation, philosophy. You will also find extensive writings on Swansea, Cardiff, Weston Super Mare, London, Avebury.

- Christianity
 - health
 - Personal development
 - Philosophy
 - psychology
-
- How to use
 - Contact
 - Writing a diary
 - Privacy Policy
 - Creative Listening service

All content © 2024 Brian Snellgrove