

THE METAPHYSICS OF FRACTAL POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY*

By Tecola W. Hagos

PART ONE:**FRACTAL SOCIETY: ETHICS AS THE BASIS OF POLITICS****I. Introduction**

From the outset, let me make it absolutely clear that the new Fractal Political Philosophy I am introducing into our discussion is not a diversionary tactic. My writing of this Article is not an underhanded and confusing intellectual endeavor aimed to divert the attention of heroic Ethiopians struggling against the brutal regime of Meles Zenawi and his *Mehale Sefari* supporters. I hold Meles Zenawi and his *Mehale Sefari* supporters with utter contempt. It is a well-established fact that they are completely responsible for the types of indignities, political oppression, and economic deprivation the overwhelming majority of Ethiopians have been suffering. They are equally responsible for the loss of our human rights and dignity. I believe Meles Zenawi and his *Mehale Sefari* supporters have committed treason against the Sovereign State of Ethiopia and Ethiopians, and are criminally responsible for compromising the Sovereignty and territorial integrity of Ethiopia. Thus, it is only because of my search for a solution to our cyclical suffering in the hands of contemptible and brutal leaders that I came up with new political philosophy that might help us break away from this loop of suffering and underdevelopment.

The state of the opposition is not encouraging either. What ever is now billed as the opposition looks more and more an effort to change personalities rather than finding solutions to the political and economic debacle we are faced with. With famine and the AIDS epidemics added to the political oppression and economic deprivation, Ethiopians are being decimated and on the brink of extermination. This devastating situation is the main reason that made me rethinks accepted formats of struggle and the pursuit of democratic political changes. Maybe the solution is to look at our individuality with fresh eyes. Maybe the solution is not in changing the big picture, but in changing the more intimate picture of individual relationships thereby softening the ground for macro-changes of political structure and economic system.

II. The Need for a New Critical Look at “Democratization”

Much has been written about the development and evolution of modern political philosophy that is often identified as culminating in liberal democracy of the Western World. The rest of the world is urged and at times even forced to adopt political structures aiming at the same objective of liberal democracy of the Western World. Needless to say such effort very often has resulted in utter failure, violence, turmoil, and deep disappointment. There are several reasons why liberal democracy has failed so miserably in most of the world’s nations. The modern world seems to have followed predictable processes of “democratization” that has left communities all over the world worse off than the states they started out with.

Even the so called “Second World” nations, for example, former Eastern Block countries, with far more shared history with Western liberal democratic nations, are still struggling trying to shade off the culture of totalitarianism and to replace that culture with the culture of liberal democracy.

Developing nations are another group of nations where liberal democracy has failed despite incessant effort by Western sponsors and local political movements. Is liberal democracy an impossible goal for nations other than Western states? Maybe this is not the right question to ask. Maybe the enquiry ought to focus on the basic tenet of democracy rather than on processes.

One important method that has been tried for years, at least for the last one hundred years, both to bring about social changes and to crystallize existing social structures, is the writing of constitutions. Constitutions have been written for aspiring socialist states as well as for aspiring Western styled democracies. It is amazing how “similar” written constitutions are, whether in their aspirations or essential provisions, both in totalitarian or democratic nations all over the world. However, when it comes to actual results, there are only very few nations that can be identified as democratic. It is a fact, for example, in non-Western nations, formal instruments of political structures, constitutions and secondary laws, have had very little success in bringing about democracy. More often than not, most non-Western constitutional governments have failed from delivering the goals and objectives of the aspirations of their respective citizens. The sad fact is that constitutional rights are as easily discarded or obliterated as much as constitutional demarcations are erased, and the fences erected to maintain the separation and balance of power among the many different organs of governments are as easily breached.

It is this persistent fact of failure that triggered my interest to look far more closely at this baffling phenomenon of failure, and specially to search for some underlying primordial base that might be overlooked or might be missing as to the reason why so many “constitutions” all over the Third and Second World nations failed to bring about democratic governments and societies. I even asked the “forbidden” question whether this phenomenal failure might have to do with genetic dispositions. One thing is absolutely clear now: constitutions are not remedies for social injustice. Thus, we can discount the importance of so called “democratization” processes and “written constitutions” in our search for social justice and humane social relationships in our communities. Our search must be focused on finding foundational social bedrock of ethical principles. It seems to me that constitutions are not vehicles for the establishment of liberal democratic tradition, rather they are manifest evidences of results than originating factors playing active roles in the achievements of liberal democracy. In fact, constitution based rights and allocations of power are secondary structures dependant on far more fundamental elements. Those elements are ethical principles.

It is not without reason that ancient forms of leadership embodied in a single person both spiritual and secular power. The spiritual aspect in the dual role-played out by ancient leaders provided not only the legitimacy but also the sourcing of fundamental ethical principles that allowed leaders to command authority and affect governance. In short, ethics has been the backbone of secular power. However, since the time of Machiavelli ethics has been delaminated from politics or government. Any number of people maybe apprehensive to introduce ethics as the basis for liberal democracy. Rightly, people may worry about that using ethics as the center of governmental objective would lead to the possibility of walking down some form of slippery-slope to religious fanaticism. Some may think of introducing ethics in a constitution as a backdoor for religion to enter into the political life of a nation.

On the other hand Islamic countries have taken the opposite route in regards ethics and politics by

amalgamating religion and governance as part of one single matrix. The result is a disaster. Despite the fact that some of the greatest centers of advanced science and technology and know-how were to be found in Caliphate and Sultanate of the Islamic world during the time Europe was in its dark ages; however, Islamic countries declined into the margins of history. Bernard Lewis has studied this phenomenon at great depth, and he is as puzzled of the situation as most are. Nevertheless, the fact remains that the Moslem nations as a whole, even though some of them are blessed with great wealth of oil and gas, are under oppressive governments, stifling religious practices and culture, and suffer the indignity of poverty.

It is imperative for people to understand that ethics is not dependant on any particular religion. However, many of the ethical principles that I will be suggesting later may have different religious basis and background. In other words, we need not worry about religious fanaticism and conflicts. Ethical precepts transcend narrow religious differences and directly engage the humanity of each member of society irrespective of particular religious affiliation.

The West has not truly discarded or separated ethics from its political system. What it did was subsume ethics in the many institutions of its society that are in fact the very building blocks of democracy even though on the surface it looks like ethics has been delaminated from politics. For the uninitiated eye, political process in the West may seem to have been cleared of religion and ethics. It is both a misrepresentation and a misleading effort when Western “experts” preach to us that democratization is achievable by drafting a constitution, making few cursory changes here and there in the economic policy of a country, effecting some cosmetic changes in the structure of a government, and above all disassociating religion (ethics) from public and civic matters.

The truth of the matter is that Western democracy is like an iceberg where most of its essential and supporting elements are not visible above water, and the tiny fraction that appears to be the case, in fact, represents only the formal aspect of the democratic process without exposing the vastly more important foundation that is out of sight. This lack of full appreciation of the depth of the huge support structure of liberal democracy, which seems to be under our radar, is the main problem in our misunderstanding of liberal democracy.

The “democratization” programs that we have witnessed being implemented in the last two decades were aimed at creating very specialized governments and economic structures or systems. Such democratization programs failed because the approach was all-wrong, and did not take into account the fact that communities all over the world are uniquely constituted. Even though I acknowledge the existence of a common nature of all human beings that overrides surface differences, we must recognize also the fact that historical incidents peculiar to a society must be understood in a limited context. The apparent differences between communities come from the way human beings constructed social structures in order to meet survival needs or vice-versa. The needs remain the same in all of human societies. However, approaches and methodologies differ due to differences in pre-existing social structures and the environment. Thus, our focus is mainly an effort to identify how those social constructions are similar or different from each other, and how such similar or different structures were effective in achieving the intended goals of spiritual and material development of mankind. Thus, the emphasis is not on the exceptional but on the commonplace, the

humble, the ordinary, or the elementary.

I cannot perceive something more fundamental than ethical precepts. Ethics is the foundation of law, of social and individual relationships et cetera. What is amazing is that such foundational ethical principles are on one hand simple behavioral patterns with easily understandable principles and on the other hand expressions of deep spirituality. The recasting and interpretation or recognition of ethical principles in the fabric of higher social structures is where the new metaphysics of fractal political philosophy comes into play.

There is an obvious contradiction if fractal political philosophy is perceived as categorical and clear-cut. I believe that as long as we are not dogmatic and inclined to using “either/or” type reasoning, there is much to be achieved by shifting our focus on to the foundational structures of ethics and individual relationships and away from our traditional line of attack of those who are in political and economic leadership or power. There should be no doubt that our leaders are monsters. For the time being let us focus on treating each other decently, let us restrain ourselves from abusing our children—let us start to see them as our most precious gift to our nation and thus treat them with love and respect with no form of corporeal punishment. Let us treat the female members of our society with respect and compassion and save them from our age-old horrendous abuse. Here is where fractal political philosophy comes into the picture.

III. Fractal Society/Philosophy

Fractal political philosophy is a metaphysical explanation that tells us that the smallest part of society has as much complexity and as much importance as the large[r] social structures, thus one need not waste time trying to change such large structures through massive effort when such desirable change can be achieved by exerting a fraction of such effort by focusing on and changing small structures. This concept coheres beautifully with the principle of “complex adaptive system” that tells us tiny imperceptible changes in simple and primary structures over time result in the creation or changing the paradigm or restructuring of large systems. If we base our effort to promote and instill, especially in the young, ethical principles, at the very foundation of social structures, it will be far easier to bring about democratic government structures into the political life of a community. This means, although well intentioned, we have been doing the wrong thing in our effort to democratize our community by focusing on large social and political structures such as constitution drafting, elections, economic development programs et cetera. Instead, we should have focused on refining and enforcing our ethical principles, on our social relations, our treatment of our children and the female members of our society.

With increased cultural and economic globalization, human society has acquired a striking resemblance to a fractal model. [1] Thus, it is appropriate to identify all of the different communities in the world as explainable as intimately interconnected in a single fractal system. The types of differences in culture, economic and industrial development used by classical economists and sociologists to identify and categorize systems and structures no longer holds true in as far as such categories are disjointed or isolated from every other. The fractal nature of society is very obvious. Even between extreme situations the basic human values and norms are repeated in all human communities, creating a tapestry of surprisingly similar patterns of behavior and institutions.

And when we add to this fractal conception of human societies the hidden system of chaos [2] or randomness, human nature and institutions in all of their manifestations in distinct groups become much more understandable and much less threatening, even pitiful. The limitations of earlier concepts of social development such as structuralism on one end and the idea of intuitionism or 'Divine' interferences in human affairs (fatalism) on the other, can be pulled closer into this understanding of society as a fractal system, which approach is profoundly more enlightened and understandable. The human family truly can be perceived of as a 'family' organic in all its dimensions. Thus, obvious contradictory and opposed views may in fact be seen as part of a larger fractal structure and not as opposites.

IV. The Process of Maximalism (the circle within a circle, within a circle...)

Thought contaminates individualized reality, in the sense that thought contains not only observation but also judgment, i.e., realignment, comparison et cetera. The difficulty of articulating the issue of what is being observed from the interpretation of such observation or the question of an underlying reality that can only be partially transmitted by way of a medium or a vehicle has been the core point of discussion by philosophers from Plato to philosophers of our own time. Plato's attempt to distinguish between "form" and "matter" is similar in essence with Kant's effort to make a distinction between "phenomenon" and "thing-in-itself." The suspicion of the existence of a reality that may not be what seems to be observed by our senses or recorded by our instruments (extension of our senses) is a very serious and legitimate point of inquiry. [3] We are not talking here about judgment, but about a much more fundamental stage in the process of judgment - observation or recording with least intellectualization or interfacing.

One graphic example that may shade light to the problem at issue (phenomenon vs. thing-in-itself) is the phenomenon we call color. We know that a particular color is reflected light frequency while the other different frequencies are absorbed by the thing that light was shined on. In both Platonic and Kantian way of thinking color would have a very tenuous connection with the "thing-in-itself" or matter. However, such perception might have unduly discounted the fact that such event of reflection and absorption might indeed be an essential aspect of the "thing-in-itself" or matter under the particular circumstance. This does not in any way change the fact of observation or recording as an important aspect of our reality, since such observation or recording in similar circumstances can be repeated universally and the out come will be the same. Without light the classical world observation would not be possible. However, such view is unduly limiting; there is gravity in addition to light to observe within the modern world.

Our worldviews are essentially *photic*, for a lack of a better word. Our reality is intimately dependent on light and sight, thus our tendency to concretize. Both time and space make sense only with our attunement or sensibility to light. And to be more correct, light in a specific range of frequencies. The fact of our relationship to light does not exclude the development of other forms of sensibilities, however, it is safe to assume that our brain is essentially wired with light as its medium of conceptualization. We are creatures essentially dependent on the matrix of space and time, and we carry all the entailing limitations (fragments) which are aspects of our internalized sense of time and space. Outside of human sight, time will not make much sense.

At the preliminary stage, my effort will focus in establishing the individual as the most important player in this new fractal political philosophy. Thus, any deliberate attempt at an elitist purity of ideas or concepts is very much doubtful to succeed; it is like trying to catch a shadow. However, intuitively created ideas or concepts maybe the closest to being free of contamination. Here, I am attempting to restate succinctly what I have elaborately stated throughout. "Intuition" as stated earlier is a form of reasoning the logic or premises of which are subsumed and are not accessible through deliberative process. I was warned a long time ago when I was a young often-cantankerous child that little knowledge was dangerous. After two scores of years of life with books and some form of an academic career, I realized that no knowledge no matter how small is as dangerous compared to blind ignorance. Even if one makes mistakes because of inadequate knowledge, that mistake is exceedingly more desirable than being an inert being.

We, every single one of us, from urbanites to dwellers of the deepest and most remote rain forest, at the present time, represent the longest, the most painful, but also most successful struggle for survival. In each one of us is a tread of life, which is unbroken, and stretching back all the way into eons of incredibly remote past. We should feel great about our success, and shout above our voices congratulating each other. This is also a good time to start thinking of a new "beginning" and a more rewarding life than the one that we have successfully come through.

When we started out we were a frightened, weak, ignorant lot; there was not much going for us. Along the way, we acquired creative insight. And in order to help us survive through the uncertainty and the mindless violence around us, we created our gods in our own image and in the image of the violence that surrounded us. We tried to control the unpredictability of the violent world around us and the uncertainty of our circumstances through our intellectual ideas. We anchored the violent physical world by recreating it in our minds and endowing it with distinct personality in the form of superhuman beings so that we may be able to control and bring the physical violence of nature under our command.

We truly have traveled quite far from where we started out not only in terms of temporal-space but also in our knowledge of the world around and within each one of us. We have evolved and developed strategies which are at times quite charming even though some of them had been destructive. We are not frightened cave dwellers who mistake shadows for the reality of our existence. We have pulled ourselves out of the pit of ignorance on to next stage of hopeful life of enlightenment. Our bright future is inevitable, and it is only a question of time and not of unfulfillment. I used to be afraid that such an exquisite and complex bundle of life would disappear. I am not afraid any more. I believe we have acquired the necessary built-in mechanism of restraint as part of our ethical nature a result from our millions of years of struggle for our survival.

Compared to our God or Gods, we are exceedingly more interesting and infinitely more deserving of recognition and respect. The world we have created within us and around us is a testimonial to our bright future. It is high time we consider ourselves as gods and behave in a lot more responsible manner. We are the precious pearl found between the two shells of Earth and Space or, if you want, between matter (energy) and field. We sometimes belittle the significance of our consciousness, our

faculty of reason and passion.

Just because there is a rejection of old beliefs and rebellion against old social institutions, it does not mean that there will be an automatic degeneration back into brutish existence. Our nature will not allow us to collapse back into our remote past. The distance we have traveled away from our humble primordial beginning itself is an impenetrable barrier with no risk of anyone of us falling through. Can a man enter back his mother's womb? Take heart by the fact that we are moral beings even though we may have started out with nothing of the sort. We have overcome much and had in the process completely transformed our relationship with nature and with each other.

I do not think that a world without a god or gods is a frightening place. It might probably feel a little lonely at times, but a far more liberated place uninhabited neither by a hysterical and lascivious god or gods nor with the terror of burning in hell after death. Man liberated from the anxiety of living inside such a cosmos will be able to give unbridled effort to his creative impulses. It might even be a far more conducive environment for the creative process. The world we know with a god or gods extends the fear and anxiety felt by our ancestors who devised the belief in super beings in the first place. Mankind without a feeling of sin may evolve a different kind of mind conducive for further ethical development. At any rate, the idea of a god or gods involved in human affairs has been to me an uncomfortable thought and a concept too self-serving to be worth taking seriously. Invariably, I ended up with questions and making up absurd answers dealing with such assumptions or beliefs.

However, no one should criticize a person for trying to be close to his God or Gods. It is mankind's search for the perfect and the ideal. What is so bad about any one trying to be close to the ideal? What we must seek is knowledge and wisdom, which process is not incompatible with an ideal (God or Gods) we may hold within us, but a tool that will help us move away from dogmatism and vicious self-importance. If there is a blurring between our thought and the assumption of a fundamental reality which does not depend on our thought for its state of being, such uncertainty is the price we pay for having a free will and analytical brain. Schopenhauer in his conception of the "world as will and representation" has laid bare the problems of cognition and intuition. And far more to the point of the reality of our individual capacity and in the words of Jung we are dealing here with "the splendor within"—the human yearning for the realization of the perfect and the eternal within the confines of the fragile and finite individual self.

Knowledge ultimately is a positive attribute, even maybe a morally good one. All the warning coming from leaders about the danger of a breakdown of civil society et cetera if there is no formal structure of government and religious institutions may be an overstatement, and a simple expression of fear and anxiety and a lot of times self serving. Ignorance and uncritical acceptance of dogmas is a hindrance to mutual respect and acceptance of differences between people. People are taken advantage of by leaders through manipulation of their fears and ignorance. Ironically, the fact of human vulnerability also confirms that human beings by nature are not inclined to harming each other.

Considering mankind as a whole, the time of our rapid transformation into an informed and industrialized people took place in the last one thousand years. Even by a conservative estimate, we

were around for at least two hundred thousand years in our present form. And up to that point for millions of years we were engaged in fine-tuning our inner working mechanism. The time we spent fine-tuning our own system seems to be almost 99% of our existence. I do not mean to imply that we were consciously engaged in creating and developing ourselves like the 'hands' drawing of M.C. Escher creating themselves (drawing each other).

We are not little children any more who need fairy tales and myths in order to keep us straight and act responsibly, and contribute our share to the development of society. We can be trusted with the truth and can deal with it intelligently. The types of crimes associated with development and urbanization are manifestations of our inadequate government structures and due to the exploitative profit motive ingrained in our economic systems, and not a reflection of our individual inability to lead a civilized life. If we start with a different premise the type of crimes we have would decline greatly. More often we criminalize activities that are nothing more than the overt manifestations of a failed social system which at times is submerged in rituals, taboos and symbols. It is a fact most crimes are committed for economic reasons or for reasons indirectly connected with economic matters.

It is quite ridiculous for anyone to shut out people on the ground of citizenship or kin relations. The oneness of mankind is not just a theological escapade but rather a biological and historical fact. The threat to peace and mutual support and mutual development comes from those groups of people who see them as specially entitled to privileged place in their theology or mythology. There are very many human groups who believe their right supersedes those of other individuals or groups. As a survival strategy it is understandable to protect the interest of a manageable group size, however, to think of the group as 'the ultimate' goal would lead to an error and unsolvable conflict with the possibility of inbreeding and stagnation.

Although I may not agree with the pessimistic view of Schopenhauer concerning human life, I do agree with his emphasis on the human "will" replacing all other sources or calls for action. More so now than ever before, since our God or Gods have atrophied and have become weak because our faith is intellectualized and our resolve compromised. Thus, we have to depend on our will alone. In the past, because of the fact of too many variables in play, and because of our own inadequacy and ignorance, we failed to guide willfully our development. We depended much too much on the "blind watchmaker" (to use an apt description of life by the great scientist Richard Dawkins)[4] to charter our destiny. This time, however, through our "will" we should be able to guide ourselves into a realm of higher existence of ethical and commitments and respect to others.

It is good that we are mortal. Human life cleans itself, from the overburden of the human-garbage we become in the process of our struggle in living out our individual lives, at least every one hundred years. Imagine the situation if man had a much longer life, what a disastrous system it would have been. Death is a renewal process where the old is recycled and transformed into a sparkling and fresh new life, and more importantly new hope. How can that be a frightful process? We should do our very best by cleaning up the place, recording and insuring the availability our very best scientific findings, and our very best creation for the coming new life so that it will be able to build and enjoy more of what we have achieved and aspire for. In this struggle we meet each other only in a single

time continuum. Thus, we should cherish the moment to acquaint each other with our efforts and help and cooperate with each other. Against the backdrop of eternity, the span of our individual life is quite limited. However, as one aspect of life we are as eternal as time. Should we not make the best of what we have and aspire to all our potentialities? If such is the case, should not we be more courageous to face our tormentors and oppressors?

We hear too often how different and “superior” the Western mind is. The claim that the Western mind is the only analytical mind is a self-congratulatory remark. Analysis is an attribute of all human beings. There is also a non-structured way of thinking which maybe as significant as analysis, where non-Western people exceed. Every single one of “Us” on Planet Earth is a manifestation of the triumph of life over entropy and living proof of our successful struggle and process of actualization. We have done quite well to the extent we need to survive. Life is not wasteful even if a lot of times most of its effort might seem pointless to our individual human perception. The current difference in cultural and creative outputs between developed and underdeveloped nations is simply a response to different environmental demand.

The way to fulfill our individual aspiration and our collective human purpose is to recognize and guarantee human rights universally not in its reduced form as an aspect of particular culture or as a reward for performance or as a privilege but as an inherent and fundamental attribute of being a person - a human being. A poignant observation by a great scholar of constitutional law succinctly illustrated the paradox between fundamental rights and guaranteed rights. Corwin, writing about the Constitution of the United States, stated that "the course of our constitutional development has been to reduce fundamental rights to rights guaranteed by the sovereign from the natural rights that they once were." [5] The concentration on ethics brings forth the correct state of mind of universalism without having to forgo our identity and our search for justice for a particular group of people.

We judge without knowing, and we try to know without critical judgment - thus, our problems. There are parallel cultural and institutional developments in human groups or in different “racial” groups or nations that have effectively met the survival demands of their members. If there was no such success, we will not be talking about different groups. The consideration of looking at one “being” superior to another is a misreading of the fundamental process of our becoming. In the 1970s Benoit B. Mandelbrot developed (The Fractal Geometry of Nature, Freeman, New York, 1983) a new field in geometry capable of generating complex structures exceedingly more intimate to nature than those achieved through Euclidian method. The basic concept of an enduring pattern repeated endlessly (stretching to the infinitesimal and as far to the gigantic into infinity) is adopted in my concept of “fractal society.” Each human group has a system that responds in a kind of a social and evolutionary Parieto *optimum* [6]—whereby meeting precisely an acceptable degree of survival demands of its members. It does not reflect the abilities of individual members to excel, but a common minimum satisfaction for all with available resources. At any rate, the human genetic pool is made of diverse human groups and so dramatically commingled that it will be stupid for anyone to talk about a pure racial group. In a properly balanced environment, where the demand of individual survival is satisfied with ample resources, we all would have been amoeba-like. Even if we acknowledge mutation as random variation from the norm, without challenge there is no possibility of firming up that mutation as a new feature of that life form. No environmental

challenge, no variation in life forms.

Why do people want to go outside of a group to propagate? It is a survival strategy - expanding the genes pool; thereby insuring survival by meeting the demands of unforeseen circumstances. It has been recorded that some Monkeys had been observed to sneak out and mate with strangers occupying the lowest ring of the totem pole. Experts saw this as a most puzzling phenomenon. However, when you think about it - it does make sense. After all the best possible combination is also in all probability the least restricted i.e., the most chaotic one. This fact is such expanded random sampling is most useful in statistical work to reach a most representative property or characteristics of a group.

Does this mean that it is necessary that we must engage in adversarial confrontations to insure the development of our country? Not at all. There is enough challenge in nature that we need not concentrate our effort against each other. Our native curiosity will keep us going for some time - for a long time. It seems to me after reaching a certain stage of development, rational thought need not be fretted out of each one of us. I believe at a certain stage knowledge will be her own propellant, in other words our search for knowledge will be self perpetuating ever pushing us into more complexity. Complexity will insure to us that the issue of political power and economic development will not be a bone of contention, but [will be dealt with as] a matter of course.

Conclusion

The ultimate evidence of our limitation as human beings (discreet entities) is the fact of our mortality. I do not believe that we will be able to appreciate significantly the specialness of our individual lives if we do not consider our mortality at all times. The briefness of our individual lives paused in the face of eternity should make us appreciate and respect all life not just human lives. If we do not feel the Earth under our feet trembling, or the fact that we are precariously hanging on a thin crust of silicon and carbon that protect us from the furnace below, or the fact of our timeless journey to no where being thrown from a slingshot of unfathomable force with such jarring speed, then may be we should try harder to appreciate the least significant lives around us in order to see later the full splendor of our souls.

I believe that the Universe is permeated with life, that life is not unique, but widespread; nevertheless, not cheap. The very fabric of the Universe seems to be understandable and explainable through reason. And more importantly, life shapes the Universe at some level making it inner directed as opposed to just being a "field" or inert. These considerations along with my own personal spiritual inner glow has given me the right to state that there are no illegal human beings, that all human beings are a marvelous universe unto themselves individually or otherwise and must be respected and, if possible, adored. With that in mind, it will be absurd to think that one human being is worth less or more than any other human being. And this is not a question of semantics or sentimentality but a reality that goes beyond culture or history. This is the base understanding for my suggestion that our struggle should be conducted based on ethical grounds.

Tecola W. Hagos

February 2004

PART TWO: THE CASE OF ETHIOPIA.

In Part Two I shall discuss how and where the fractal system of the foundational ethical precepts could be identified and how the constructive ones are to be integrated in the culture and social structure of Ethiopians.

Endnotes:

*This article is an extraction from a book manuscript just completed under the same title.

1. In the 1970s Benoit B. Mandelbrot developed (The Fractal Geometry of Nature, Freeman, New York, 1983) a new field in geometry capable of generating complex structures exceedingly more intimate to nature than those achieved through Euclidian method. The basic concept of an enduring pattern repeated endlessly (stretching to the infinitesimal and as far to the gigantic into infinity) is adopted in my concept of 'fractal society.'
2. For basic explanation of the theory of chaos, see James Gleick, Chaos, New York: Viking Penguin, 1987.
3. See Immanuel Kant, Critique of Pure Reason, trans. N. Kemp Smith, New York: St Martin's Press, 1965.
4. Richard Dawkins, The Blind Watchmaker, New York: W.W. Norton and Co., 1986.
5. Edward S. Crowin, The Constitution and What it Means Today, 1978 (14th) edition, rev. Harold W. Chase and Craig R. Ducat, Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 1992, 440.
6. *Parieto optimum* is an economic term which is described as: "When the economy's resources and output are allocated in such a way that no reallocation can make anyone better off without making at least one other person worse off then a *Parieto optimum* is said to exist." The MIT Dictionary of Modern Economics, ed. David W. Pearce, Fourth edition, Cambridge MA: The MIT Press, 1994, 324.