



Laetus in praesens

Alternative view of segmented documents via Kairos

13 September 2025 | Draft

Being a Terrorist by Implication in a Terrific Environment

Celebrating complicity in the terrifying experience of Gaza

-- / --

Introduction

Personal complicity in enabling genocide in Gaza?

Global implications of duty of care?

Bullying, hazing and their consequences for decision-making

Hazing rituals as enabling terror and complicity in engendering it

Authoritative definition of terrorism and its denial

Cultivated definitional game-playing with regard to terrorism

Recognizing one may be a terrorist -- unknowingly

Enabling terror in other life forms

Hypothetical extraterrestrials to be framed as terrorists?

Framing artificial intelligence as a terrifying threat?

Potential challenge of underlying existential terror

Irresponsible indulgence in sustaining terror

References

Introduction

How will the future describe a period in which the major strategic determinant was held to be the response to terrorism -- following the instigation of the [Global War on Terror](#) ([Timeline of the War on Terror](#), [Wikipedia](#); [Promoting a Singular Global Threat -- Terrorism: strategy of choice for world governance](#), 2002).

Curiously however many of those righteously preoccupied with this destabilizing anti-social dynamic are themselves righteously framed as terrorists by others and -- as such -- to be reasonably described as "evil" by the highest authorities ([Existence of evil as authoritatively claimed to be an overriding strategic concern](#), 2016; [Framing by others of claimants of evil as evil](#), 2016). The articulations of strategic priorities do not however include any provision for the response to "evil". There is no research or other surveys of its prevalence and how it might be counteracted, as in centuries past. The focus is reframed as a response to "terrorism" and ensuring the urgent security provisions. Arguably this is now reframed in terms of identifying and criminalizing [misinformation](#) ([Towards a Science of Misinformation and Deception](#), 2021).

As with "evil", "terrorism" has now become strangely elusive. In times past those responsible for "evil" could be sought out, precisely identified, subject to interrogation under forms of torture (now held by some to be unacceptable), and appropriately disposed of by burning at the stake and other techniques. In the case of "terrorism" there are however problems to replicating the process, despite evocation of the term "witch hunts", tweeted by Donald Trump nearly 300 times since first becoming president and leader of the free world (Alice Markham-Cantor, *What Trump Really Means When He Cries 'Witch Hunt'*, *The Nation*, 28 October 2019; Ankush Khardori, *Trump Seems to Be the Victim of a Witch Hunt. So What?* *Politico*, 20 March 2023).

As with "evil" it can easily be claimed, notably by those of religious persuasion, that anything with which they disagree is appropriately recognized as a manifestation of "evil" -- whatever the implications for the purveyor. This tendency is increasingly evident with respect to "terrorism", with any authority righteously labelling any strategy not aligned with its own as being misguided to a degree which merits its qualification as complicity with terrorism, enabling terrorism or terrorism itself.

A major difficulty is that authorities have framed iconic figures of the past as terrorists -- only to recognize their legitimacy as leaders of an independent country and to reframe them with the highest honours. This is most evident in the case of Nelson Mandela as a Nobel Laureate. In sum, historical and political leaders can be -- and sometimes have been -- labeled "terrorists" by their opponents or colonial powers during conflicts or insurgencies. Such designations are fluid and politically charged, with many figures later regarded as liberators or founders of nations rather than terrorists. Several countries have been effectively founded or significantly shaped through the activities of groups or leaders who were at times labeled as terrorists, or engaged in what would today be called terrorism -- including Israel and Ireland, if not the United States.

No effort is made to ask [which world leaders have \(not\) been labelled "evil"?](#) (2015) -- and [which countries were \(not\) engendered by "terrorists"?](#) (2015) -- or would be so labelled at this time.

As with those framed as "evil" by the Catholic Church, the "terrorist" label is employed flexibly to frame opponents whenever this is strategically convenient. As with witchcraft, the label is unquestionably justified by events characterized by tragic fatalities. Questioning the label is then framed as misguided sympathy for terrorism. Ironically this evokes speculation regarding icons of society, such as Jesus (Josiah R. Daniels, *Jesus Was a Terrorist*, *Sojourners*, 17 April 2025; Jeremy Bouma, *Did You Know Jesus Died a Terrorist's Death?* *BibleGateway*, 18 September 2017). Given the fatalities arising from natural disasters -- so-called "[Acts of God](#)" -- the question can be taken further, especially in the light of the "[fear of God](#)" long promoted and exploited by religions (*Is God a Terrorist? Definitional game-playing by the Coalition of the Willing*, 2004). Indicative of the confusion, the question has variously been raised regarding Donald Trump (Lino Matteo, *Is Donald Trump a Terrorist?*).

The challenge of "terrorism" is notably clarified by the fact that -- despite widespread use of the label -- the United Nations has been unable to define it after many years of effort. There is no legal or scientific consensus on the [definition of terrorism](#). Various legal systems and government agencies use different definitions of terrorism, and governments have been reluctant to formulate an agreed-upon legally-binding definition. The same could be said of the definition of "evil" by religious authorities.

Despite the fatal consequences to which terrorism is held to give rise, the world is witness to what is appropriately described as definitional game-playing (*Ubiquity of "terrorism" and definitional game-playing*, 2001; *Terrorism and terminological game-playing*, 2011; *Terror as Distractant from More Deadly Global Threats: Bewitching world of definitional game-playing*, 2009). The definitional focus on "non-state actors" curiously recalls the difficulties of the United Nations -- as "We the Peoples" -- in engaging effectively with "non-governmental organizations" over past decades.

Borrowing from "[gerrymandering](#)" -- as a corruption of the democratic process involving the political manipulation of electoral boundaries to advantage a group within the constituency -- an analogous process can be recognized with respect to terrorism (*Systematic Gerrymandering of Declared Threats and Legality of Response*, 2013). The process can be seen as characterized by public relations and narrative "spin" on the part

of authorities (*Spin and Counter-spin: Governance through Terrorism*, 2002).

Missing from the many debates on the nature of terrorism is what tends to be excluded and why -- as discussed separately (*Varieties of Terrorism extended to the experience of the terrorized*, 2004). Somehow the experience of those being "terrified" is excluded from debate in preference to the focus on those perpetrating acts which authorities deem not to be in the best interests of society as they define them -- and typically those which call into question the interests they favour.

Most obviously excluded is any form of terror enabled by institutional policies negligent of any form of bullying -- whether in educational, military, hospital, workplace, or prison contexts. Curiously (and with few exceptions) bullying, to the extent it is addressed, is systematically disassociated from terrorism -- whether or not it is associated with physical violence (N. M. Floyd, *Terrorism in the Schools*, *School Safety*, Winter 1987; *From Bullying to Terrorism: violence in the workplace*, *The New Reality of Risk*, March 2016; *Bullying: An Act of Terrorism*, *Bullying is Terrorism*, 23 June 2013; Ben Wadham, *Crossing the line: why the royal commission examined initiation rituals and defence abuse*, *The Conversation*, 1 July 2016; *Royal Navy probing claims of marine 'beasting' initiations at Trident base*, *The Independent*, 19 January 2016).

Somehow terrorism is only exceptionally recognized within institutions for which governments are in some way responsible. Ironically the focus may be on the impact of those incarcerated as terrorists on other prisoners, as in the UK for example (Jonathan Hall, *Terrorism in Prisons*, UK Parliamentary Presentation, April 2022; *New drive to tackle terrorism in prisons*, Gov.UK, April 2022). Especially intriguing is the manner in which **hazing rituals** are tolerated within some institutions -- irrespective of the terror which they may be deliberately designed to engender (Robin Levinson-King, *The brutal secret of school sport initiations*, *BBC*, 10 January 2019; *'Swedish Eton' Shut Down Over Bullying Rituals*, *Sky News*, 29 August 2013; Lorna Knowles, *Shocking college hazing rituals at prestigious Australian university revealed in report*, *ABC*, 25 February 2018; Leen Dorsman, *Hazing: from beast to man or vice versa*, *Urecht University*, 30 August 2023).

Perhaps most ironic is the extensive phenomenon of "domestic abuse" by which many are systematically terrified. This is totally disassociated from "**domestic terrorism**", or (even more ironically) "homegrown terrorism", namely a form of terrorism in which victims within a country are targeted by a perpetrator with the same citizenship as the victims (although those targeted may well not have citizenship of that country). Distinguished as "**domestic violence**", this occurs in a domestic setting, such as in a marriage or cohabitation. It may be more broadly framed as including including nonphysical abuse in such settings -- then to be termed "domestic abuse". In practice it may include **spousal abuse**, **wife beating**, **marital rape**, **female genital mutilation**, and **honour killings** -- none of which are seemingly deemed to evoke terror in the victim.

Bullying, as experienced by many, helps to clarify a distinctive characteristic attributed uniquely to "terrorism". Despite its prevalence in bullying, terrorism is particularly characterized by physical violence -- whether against a person or property. No physical violence, no terror, no terrorism? This may however be extended to the planning of such acts, or possibly even to a degree of complicity in enabling them or advocating them. From this perspective, many forms of bullying and harassment -- notably of verbal form (as threats, insults, and the like) -- are excluded from any sense of terrorism, however terrified the victim may be deliberately made to be (even to the point of suicide)..

The problematic framing invites further critical extension to include **structural violence**, as formulated by **Johan Galtung**. This recognizes -- controversially from many conventional perspectives -- that a social structure or social institution may harm people insidiously by preventing them from meeting their basic needs or rights. As with bullying and domestic violence, the relation between structural violence and terrorism is only exceptionally explored (Khan Zeb, et al, *Structural Violence and Terrorism in the Federally Administered Tribal Areas of Pakistan*, *Civil Wars*, 21, 2019, 1; Richard A. Couto, *The Politics of Terrorism: Power, Legitimacy, and Violence*, *Integral Review*, 6, 2010, 1).

Again it is bullying, especially in hazing rituals in key institutions, which clarifies the flaws in the argument. Also termed "**beasting**" (with its connotations of **anal rape**), its ubiquity frames the unasked question as to

"who has been beasted by whom", and how does this affect the decision-making of those involved in their subsequent institutional lives -- including their direction of the institutions in which hazing rituals are tolerated. Questionably "beasting" may be euphemistically reframed as "beating" in any reporting of the matter. Are the practices characteristic of [Abu Ghraib](#) to be recognized as both a consequence and an exemplification of beasting -- in my name?

Potentially relevant is how invasion of space (whether territorial or personal) is characteristic of structural violence and bullying -- particularly when it evokes a violent response, then only to be potentially framed and deprecated as terrorism. The purportedly non-violent nature of the prelude to such violence can be explored in terms of "encroachment" ([Varieties of Encroachment](#), 2004). Any violence engendered can then be righteously claimed to have been "unprovoked" ([Provocation of "Unprovoked Aggression" by Encroachment](#), 2023). Encroachment is vigorously claimed to be innocent by the practitioner, despite the experience of many subject to harassment.

It is the insidious nature of encroachment, potentially evoking physical violence, which highlights both the cultivated naivety of asserting the "unprovoked" nature of the aggression as well as its purportedly incomprehensible nature ([Challenging incomprehensibility of "terrorist violence"](#), 2010). It may well be a trigger for "incomprehensible" school shootings. On a larger scale this pattern is evident in the delayed Russian response to NATO-enabled encroachment by Ukraine -- a perspective excluded from any reporting by Western media of the Russian invasion.

Especially curious has been the conflation of "radicalisation" with "terrorism" -- deriving in part from perceptions of the Islamic world view as being in "radical" contrast to the Christian world view, thereby questionably framed as "unchallenging". The perception is however also evident in the challenging appreciation of political and ideological "radicals" having no association with Islam. The conflation is all the more curious in that "radical" thinking is a primary characteristic of innovation as variously lauded and rewarded ([Arguments questioning the current framing of radicalisation and terrorism](#), 2016).

Despite it being a recognized characteristic of creativity and innovation, little effort is seemingly made to clarify the nature of "radical" thinking in whatever domain it may be evident -- and the threat it is deemed to constitute. In a world which is increasingly "terrifying" for many -- if not most -- it is remarkable to note the value associated with "terrific", and even a "terrific idea", or the possibility of a "terrific life" promised by various contexts. Who can resist what is perceived as "terrifically attractive"? In reimagining reality a physicist is free to have the most radical ideas -- potentially held to be "terrifically interesting" by colleagues. In many spiritual traditions, a radical experience inspired by deity may offer a sense of "awe", which -- although "terrific" -- may shade into a sense of the "awfulness" and terror of deity, framed by religious as an appropriate "fear of God" ([Terror of the sublime](#), 2005).

In that light, the conventional framing of "terror" as an existential threat is dangerously simplistic through its focus on physical violence -- evoking a "war against terror". How does existential threat relate to the existential implications of any terrifying appeal with the potential of reframing fundamentally any sense of identity -- one effectively "not fit for purpose" in a world of polycrisis ([Radical identification of the root cause of terrorism](#), 2015)? How indeed to engage with the many dimensions of an incomprehensible reality, as may be variously speculated ([Thinking within a terrifying reality](#), 2005; [Radical Disaffection Engendered by Elitist Groupthink?](#) 2016; [Coming Out as a Radical -- or Coming In?](#) 2015)? Why are the radical possibilities "terrifically interesting" -- if only to myself?

In this context it is appropriate to ask which authorities are now worthy of respect -- given the propensity to vigorous denial of any complicity in engendering terror. Government? Bureaucracy? Science? Religion? Military Intelligence services? Technology? Judiciary? Finance? Business? Humanities? Clearly the nations gathered in the G7 or the G20 do not consider themselves to be engendering or enabling terror -- however much their empty declarations to the contrary may be called into question as opportunistic virtue signalling. As a "terrific country" in the eyes of many, this is especially the case of the USA. In its existential battle against "terrorism", this is most obviously true of Israel -- in total denial of the terror engendered by the

structural violence it has long deployed in relation to Palestine.

Most ironically from a future perspective, it could be argued that the only configuration now "worthy of respect" (as authentic bearer of human values) is the fleet of ships endeavouring to breakthrough the Israeli blockade to deliver resources to Gaza (*The Global Sumud Flotilla to Gaza*, *Aljazeera*, 31 August 2025). As a symbolic gesture -- a surreal act of imagination -- it is curiously prefigured in popular imagination by the "rag-tag" fleet of civilian spaceships that assembled around *Battlestar Galactica* following the *Cylon* holocaust. Reminiscent of the *Twelve Tribes of Israel*, the fleet carried human survivors of the *Twelve Colonies of Man* on an iconic quest in search of the lost planet -- Earth. The "Cylons" of today are readily recognized in that frame.

This exploration continues previous experiments in making extensive use of AI to clarify the themes evoked. For comparative purposes, responses are presented by different AIs (*ChatGPT*, *DeepSeek* and *Perplexity*) to the same questions. The responses have been framed as optionally visible grayed areas -- with that form of presentation itself treated as an experiment, in anticipation of the future implication of AI into research documents and debate. The AI responses are hidden unless specifically requested by the reader (a facility not operational in PDF variants of the page, in contrast with the *original*). Clearly the questions can be asked of other AIs -- and framed otherwise -- whether at the present time or in the future, when more sophisticated large language models become available.

Show/Hide All AI Responses

Personal complicity in enabling genocide in Gaza?

Question: Given the terror currently experienced in Gaza, if the Israelis are not "terrorists" is there some sense in which I am

Show/Hide AI response

Global implications of duty of care?

Question: Various legislations (including that of Israel), have legal provision for "duty of care", possibly framed in response to "withholding assistance to persons in danger" and acting only as a "bystander". Could you clarify which countries have no such provision and the extent to which it is enshrined in international law. With respect to Gaza, which major countries could be considered "bystanders" -- possibly whilst indirectly actively enabling the trauma.

Show/Hide AI response

Bullying, hazing and their consequences for decision-making

Whilst "bullying" can be understood as narrowly focused on individuals -- typically within institutions -- there is a strong case for recognizing its practice by collectives, by organized crime, by corporations, or by any imperial power pursuing a hegemonic agenda. It has become an alternative to the classic "art of war" (*From the Art of War to the Art of Being Bullied? From Playground Bullies to Imperial Powers -- and Beyond*, 2025).

Question: Within countries people may be exposed to harm, and threats of harm. Whilst this may take the form of physical harm, of particular relevance is the extent of *bullying* within families, groups and institutions (educational, military, hospices, prisons, and the like), and what may only be evident as *structural violence*. Whilst victims may indeed be terrified to an unimaginable degree, the perpetrators are not recognized as "terrorists", and those enabling and abetting that terror are seemingly seldom considered complicit or -- beyond token claims to the contrary -- effectively bound by any provisions of "duty of care".

Show/Hide AI response

Question: Is there any trace of studies of the effect of beating in hazing rituals on the decision-making of the participants in their later roles

Show/Hide AI response

Hazing rituals as enabling terror and complicity in engendering it

Question: In the light of that response could it be concluded that hazing rituals enhance the capacity to enable and tolerate the exposure of others to terror. How is negligence of the incidence of hazing and anal rape in prisons reconciled with any claim for the role of prisons in rehabilitation and reformation, namely aiming to help offenders reintegrate into society as law-abiding citizens.

Show/Hide AI response

Question: In the light of that response, should it be asked whether key leaders at this time are profoundly constrained by their hazing experience in responding appropriately to any form of terrorism. Whilst the question has been raised with respect to the brutal experience of King Charles III (Calum Ross, [Scale of child abuse at King Charles' former school Gordonstoun laid bare after Scottish inquiry](#), *The Scotsman*, 19 June 2024), should it be raised with respect to Benjamin Netanyahu (a student at MIT long before it was obliged to formulate a hazing policy) or with respect to Donald Trump in the light of his student years in a military academy and various universities in the USA during the period when hazing incidents were an emerging concern

Show/Hide AI response

Question: Who then are to be understood as sustaining the experience of terror whilst avoiding any framing as terrorists? Are there no terrorists ensuring that experience for thousands

Show/Hide AI response

Authoritative definition of terrorism and its denial

Question: Given that response, are there examples of state actors being defined as terrorist in contrast to the non-terrorist framing of Israel. Who is empowered to give authority to such definitional framing?

Show/Hide AI response

Question: To what extent are those framing others as "terrorists" susceptible to the proverbial expression "[the pot calling the kettle black](#)", namely a situation in which the accuser is guilty of the same fault -- an instance of [psychological projection](#) or [hypocrisy](#). Complicity in terrorism is thereby deflected by labelling others of wrongdoing

Show/Hide AI response

Cultivated definitional game-playing with regard to terrorism

The variety of approaches to defining terrorism -- with the recent addition of criminal organizations -- is clarified by Brian Phillips ([The end of US-led global counter-terrorism? Changing trends in terrorist designation](#), *International Centre for Counter-Terrorism*, 10 September 2025):

One of the most widespread and enduring legacies of post-9/11 counter-terrorism is terrorist designation – the labelling of certain entities as terrorist organisations... Dozens of countries, along with international institutions like the United Nations and the European Union, now maintain [terrorist lists](#).... The terrorist lists are highly diverse. This is due to different definitions of terrorism, legal restrictions, and distinct goals regarding terrorist listing (e.g., foreign policy vs. domestic policy). For

example, the [US FTO list](#), with 81 organisations, includes only non-US groups, and about half are Islamist organisations.... Declaring criminal groups to be terrorists is a fundamental change because for decades, experts have used [separate frameworks](#) – theories, laws, etc. – for criminals and terrorists.

Question: It is somewhat extraordinary to recognize the extent to which it is variously assumed that nation states can do no wrong and are effectively themselves the definition of righteousness -- however they may be ("inappropriately") perceived and labelled by others. The framing of "non-state actors" as the primary instigators of any terrorism recalls the struggle of the United Nations -- as "We the Peoples" -- to engage in decades past as minimally as possible with "non-governmental organizations", perceived as a potential threat by key member states, even as "anti-governmental organizations" (*Conceptual Distortions from Negative Descriptors*, 1974). As late as 2004, a UN [Panel of Eminent Persons on United Nations-Civil Society Relations](#) produced a report criticized for definitional game-playing and conceptual gerrymandering in relation to "NGO" (*Future of United Nations - Civil Society Relations*, 2004) -- subsequent to its opportunistic conclusion of a "[Global Compact](#)" with "non-state actors" long held to be highly problematic (*The Global Compact with Multinational Corporations as the UN's 'Final Solution'*, 2001). Could you comment on the manner in which "NGOs" have since morphed into the social media currently challenging forms of governance questionably "fit for purpose" -- whilst the resources of many multinational corporations now vastly exceed those of many member states with whose agendas they are now complicit.

Show/Hide AI response

Question: There is an implication that all are free to avoid considering themselves to be a terrorist -- an implication effectively upheld as being a fundamental human right. There is some implication of cultivated definitional game-playing.

Show/Hide AI response

Question: Despite widespread accusation of genocide, any systemic comparison between Gaza and the Warsaw Ghetto is now effectively prohibited (with legislative support) as antisemitic. The same may come to be said about any such equivalence between the Hamas attack of [7 October 2023](#) and the [bombing of the King David Hotel](#) (1946) by [Irgun](#), a Zionist paramilitary organization under the leadership of [Menachem Begin](#) Donald Neff, *Hamas: A Pale Image of the Jewish Irgun And Lehi Gangs*, *Washington Report on Middle East Affairs*, 3 September 2009; B. Michael, *Hamas and the Irgun? How Dare I Compare the Two...* *Haaretz*, 2 May 2016; Lawrence Mhandara, *Comparing Hamas and Irgun in the Struggles for Independence*, *Palestine, Taiwan, and Western Sahara*, January 2023). Both Hamas and Irgun were defined as terrorist organizations at the time of their attacks. Both were defined as acts of terror (Mordechai Golani, *Israel Historian on King David Hotel Bombing: 'It Was an Act of Terror'*, *History News*, 23 July 2016). Begin later became prime minister of Israel and was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize. Given the extensive criticism of the "terrorism" of Hamas, now justifying all support for its total eradication by Israel at any cost, how might it be usefully compared with the actions of Irgun prior to creation of Israel.

Show/Hide AI response

Recognizing one may be a terrorist -- unknowingly

Question: In the light of that argument, anyone could be defined as a terrorist from some alternative perspective. From whose perspective might I currently be held to be a terrorist -- legitimately so -- even when I am unaware of that framing

Show/Hide AI response

Question: That response offers the ironic perspective that everyone is effectively a terrorist from some perspective. This recalls the discovery of Moliere's *Le Bourgeois gentilhomme*, suitably adapted: *For more*

than forty years I have been a terrorist while knowing nothing of it, and I am the most obliged person in the world to you for telling me so.

Show/Hide AI response

Enabling terror in other life forms

Question: The tragedy of the irony is that my capacity to engender terror extends all too clearly to both the slaughter of many animals for my consumption and the use of many animals in medical experimentation -- both arguably to sustain my health. Will the future frame my complicity as indeed inducing terror within a terrorist civilization. As with the rights framed righteously by "just war theory", my rights to exploit the suffering of other lifeforms would appear to merit a "just terrorism theory"

Show/Hide AI response

Hypothetical extraterrestrials to be framed as terrorists?

The possibility of contact with "extraterrestrials" continues to invite speculation on their treatment of humans in the light of the human treatment of "terrestrial extras" (*Writing Guidelines for Future Occupation of Earth by Extraterrestrials*, 2010; *Anticipation of Judicial Inquisition of Humans by Extraterrestrials*, 2020). This frames the dilemmas of terrorism and the response: "Do as you have been done by", "Be done by as you did", and "Do as you would be done by". More challenging is any speculation regarding the nature of their current presence, namely the embedding of "extraterrestrials" in epistemic dynamics (*SETI: Sensing Epiterrestrial Intelligence*, 2013).

Question: Given the hypothetical possibility of the much-envisaged contact with extraterrestrials, will humans be obliged to have recourse to the definition of them as a source of threat and terror through lack of appreciation of any more subtle framework they may employ. Will the human default be to define ETs as terrorists -- as frequently envisaged by science fiction.

Show/Hide AI response

Framing artificial intelligence as a terrifying threat?

There is extensive commentary on the ultimate threat constituted by artificial intelligence to humans and to humanity. Given the dubious normative role played by so-called Just War Theory, there is a case for extending that rationalization to AI -- especially in contrast to the "Just Suffering Theory" as the prevailing response to terror might be understood (*Just War Theory as an inspiration for Just AI Theory?* 2023).

Question: Could you comment on how that response might apply to the future human response to AIs -- given that they could well come to be framed as "extraterrestrial", especially with the emergence of AGI, and even a "Just AI Theory". Given the focus of their training data sets, might it even apply to the AI response to humans

Show/Hide AI response

Potential challenge of underlying existential terror

Question: Could you comment on the possibility that the default human response to the "other as terrorist" derives from unconscious recognition of existential terror -- a fundamental existential threat to the prevailing simplistic framing of human identity -- which the future (and ETs) may understand as an instance of misplaced concreteness

Show/Hide AI response

Question: The framing and experience of terror would seem to derive directly from the unreconciled insights of competing religions -- and especially from the Abrahamic religions so intimately associated with

engendering "terror" and "fear of God". Ironically this could be seen as a consequence of contrasting articulations of the terrifying nature of transcendent reality and how that can be mitigated. Each insight is then terrifying for the other, whilst holding the other to be a fundamental source of "error".

Show/Hide AI response

Question: That response acknowledges the transcendental nature of the experiential challenge of religions to individuals and groups -- as well as to religiously inspired nations. However, as with the religions, it ignores the complexities of the multidimensional nature of reality freely explored through contrasting insights of physics. How is it that the experiential implications of those radical insights for human identity are appreciated neither as a threat nor as a source of collective inspiration complementary to those of religion.

Show/Hide AI response

Question: That reference to the complementarity between the "experiential" of religion and the "abstraction" of science frames a sense in which both define an insulating bubble through which a questionable comfort zone is protected from the direct experience of terror -- strangely reminiscent of the [ideological filter bubble](#) now sustained through interaction with the world's knowledge resources. A shared document questions how that bubble might be appropriately "pricked" to ensure more meaningful experience of cognitive complementarity (*Pricking the Bubble of Global Complacent Complicity*, 2017).

Show/Hide AI response

Question: Could you comment on the curious irony that although fundamental physics gives significant credibility to "complementarity", the masters of such abstractions offer no insights in the light of their own experience of sexuality -- whereas religious (and their practitioners) have long been scandalously conflicted by a sexual dimension deemed of fundamental theological significance. Is it the dynamics of the sexual experience which embodies the terrifying bridging reality which both avoid in their own way -- denying its relevance (*From sexual attraction to existential preoccupations of discipline practitioners*, 2024; *Us and Them: Relating to Challenging Other*, 2009) .

Show/Hide AI response

Irresponsible indulgence in sustaining terror

Question: How would those experiencing existential terror -- and those ensuring it -- reject this exchange as a highly irresponsible indulgence -- indicative of my own complicity in sustaining terror, rather than alleviating that suffering

Show/Hide AI response

Question: In the light of the trauma currently experienced by thousands in Gaza (variously framed in terms of genocide) could you suggest an appropriate title for this exchange -- given that others (including myself) cultivate righteous justification in denying responsibility or complicity in sustaining that trauma

Show/Hide AI response

References

Pieter G.R. de Villiers. Fear as dread of a God who kills and abuses? *HTS Theological Studies*, 2013 [[text](#)]

Kristy N. Kamarck, et al. Hazing in the Armed Forces. Congressional Research Service, 2018 [[text](#)]

Kirsten M. Keller, et al. Hazing in the U.S. Armed Forces: Recommendations for Hazing Prevention Policy and Practice Research. Rand Research Reports, 2015 [[text](#)]

Kowalski, R.M., Foster, M., Scarborough, M. et al. Hazing, Bullying, and Moral Disengagement.

International Journal of Bullying Prevention, 3, 2021. [[abstract](#)]

McCreary, Gentry R The impact of moral judgment and moral disengagement on hazing attitudes and bystander behavior in college males 2012 University of Alabama Libraries [[abstract](#)]

Vishwani Sahai-Siddiqui. The Long-Term Psychological Effects of Hazing and How We Can Prevent Them. *Behavioral Health News*, 12 September 2024 [[text](#)]

Jane Stapleton, et al. Lessons Learned from Bystander Intervention Prevention in Ending Sexual and Relationship violence and Stalking: Translations for Hazing Prevention. University of Maine, 2014 [[text](#)]

Nassim Nicholas Taleb:

- The Black Swan: The Impact of the Highly Improbable. Random House, 2007 [[summary](#)]
- Antifragile: Things That Gain from Disorder. Random House. 2012 [[summary](#)]
- Skin in the Game: Hidden Asymmetries in Daily Life. Random House. 2018. [[summary](#)]

Susan Wallace, et al. Bullying in Healthcare: A Disruptive Force Linked to Compromised Patient Safety. *Pennsylvania Patient Safety Advisory*, 14, 2017, 2 [[text](#)]

John Yates. The Fear of God or the fear of man Our choice. *Cross Connect*, 19 September 2005 [[text](#)]



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License](#) .

For further updates on this site, [subscribe here](#)