

ON LIBERTY UNTHOUGHT

C Scott Jordan

Some 250 years of American history is long enough time to go without a revision of some of its foundational tenets. I like to think I am not alone in my anticipation for the long overdue US Constitution 2.0. Since the eighteenth century, a few things have changed and perhaps the highest legal document in the land of the free ought to reflect certain social iterations. Yet, an alarming number of US citizens believe all the thinking that could ever be necessary for such a monolithic entity was completed in 1787. Such mental framework starting points are, well, they aren't much of a starting point at all. In fact, this can be a very destructive hurdle as it threatens to reduce democracy, something having to do with the voices of a contemporary people engaged with one another, to the Indian intellectual, Ashis Nandy's conception of a mere custom, frail and at the mercy of the slightest breeze. And to keep it real for the realists, indeed, it would be quite the ordeal to organise a constitutional convention again. A brief stay on CSPAN will show you how much harder it is for representatives from fifty states to agree on things than when there were only thirteen. So, if you cannot be sold on the whole, how about a taste? For a starter that is sure to tickle the palate, let's try one of the more problematic good old-fashioned American principles that is making quite the scene in our postnormal times.

Liberty, the American variant in particular, has gone the way of far too many Hollywood child stars. Something once so full of promise, a sure hit for all those utopian expectations, now a window into how bad things can get, calling much into question, especially our continued negligence and outdated thinking on mental health and drugs. American exceptionalism, with no small aid from Euro-fascism's abduction of liberal sentiments, has seen to several Enlightenment ideals' rot from a tool for combating oppression into a torture implement for a new ignorant oppression that

wears the skin of freedom. Beyond bastardisation, it has become a fundamentalism existentially threatened by anything that deviates from its freedom to the utmost extreme. Its fans, fanatics, bathe in its seemingly infinite contradictions that constitute the bricks and mortar of the house built for individualism.

Give me liberty or give me death. Be free or die. Liberty once lost, is lost forever. Liberty and justice for all. Sweet land of liberty, let freedom ring! Every slogan, either simply empty or repeated beyond the point of anyone remembering any original meanings, spewed through foaming mouths reinforces the converted and lays bare the faults in an already shaky position. And then of course there is the far too often quoted comment of the United States' third President Thomas Jefferson, 'the tree of liberty must be refreshed from time to time with the blood of patriots and tyrants'. Liberty, the name given to the ninety-three-metre woman who reigns over the border between New York and New Jersey, seem incompatible to society itself. Or at least a society that is not at constant war with itself. Imagining ways to reconcile the fundamentalist defenders of liberty with the other values of a so-called Enlightened democratic spirit, community, society, or even civilisation is utterly incomputable. But that cannot be right. How could something so critical have gone so far astray?

At the sight of such reckless disregard, one is left to wonder if the whole thing ought to simply be scrapped. It is too far gone. Yet, we are somewhat trapped, because to do away with liberty would result in an ultimate betrayal of democracy, or worse, to see it as a failed enterprise. To simply widdle away at the excesses in hopes of excavating some purity has a high chance of backfiring and unintentionally justifying the long road to the dark alley we find ourselves in on the matter. This cannot be a simple study in etymology. In the literature and discourse behind postnormal times, there is a new avenue before us. One that does not attempt to see liberty as it stands today in any sort of distortion of reality, but that may help progress it so that it may live again and fulfil its purpose to the good systems of liberal democracy. Values are critical for providing us any agency in our futures and quite a few values in the contemporary milieu are worth saving. To save liberty, we must unthink it.

To clarify, this is not to be confused with unlearning or erasure, though a degree of both can become necessary in pursuit of the unthought. The idea

is brought into postnormal times literature by Ziauddin Sardar and John A. Sweeney as they establish the three tomorrows framework for exploring deeper futures. They used the Algerian philosopher, Mohammed Arkoun's coining of the unthought during his investigation of the limits of our worldviews, particularly the notion of Sharia in Islam, on our ability to conceive of external notions. Arkoun's account leaves readers with a need to flesh out this idea to which Sardar and Sweeney happily oblige. They note that the unthought 'is not unthinkable', as though it defies some internal logic or consistency. It is just beyond our ability to conceptualise for a myriad of reasons – the assumptions we take for granted, the paradigms we think and work with, the truisms of our society. All that makes us who we are plays a role in this. Our language, our culture, our education, our senses, our experiences, and so much more define how we engage with the world and shape our thinking processes. Take, for instance, two people. The first is born on land, beholden to the Earthly forces of gravity and the bipedal's desire for mobility. This person is beholden to simple Cartesian coordinates for his or her navigation of the world (north, south, east, and west and all her combinations therein). Suppose a second person is born and lives their whole life in the ocean. Suddenly, the world cannot be said to be flat or planar and a new system of directional navigation taking a three-dimensional approach adds to simple Cartesian planes. The navigation used by the second, aquatic person is unthought to our first, terrestrial person. Indoctrinated with certain worldviews our grasp of reality is left with certain gaps not minded. When we meet people from other walks of life, a beautiful phenomenon takes place and worldviews are broken down like a muscle exerted in lifting a heavy weight, that will, with rest and care, repair larger and stronger. This is why Sardar and Sweeney offer in their introduction to the unthought in postnormal times the need for greater polylogues with others who differ from ourselves, to breakdown the limits of our worldviews or manufactured normalcy. It should also be noted that the unthought comes in a progression (that need not be necessarily linear!) of tomorrows (categories of the future). The first tomorrow being the extended present, that future which is mostly set, determined by our past and present events. The second tomorrow, the familiar future, is the often-mistaken idea of the future given in science fiction films – seeking out strange new worlds, but not necessarily going somewhere entirely outside

the realm of our comfort. The unthought constitutes the third tomorrow, this is the end of the line for comfort, where our present mental frameworks do not allow us to go.

So, to get to the unthought of liberty, we are going to have to travel to places outside of our comfort zone and if we are lucky, we just might learn something along the way. To begin this exercise, I find myself travelling to a most uncomfortable piece of my own history. My very own childhood's end. My experience with liberty is rather tremulous.

Liberty is a town. This is not a profound metaphor, but the name of a (actually, several) town(s) in the United States. The one I am speaking of is in the state of Missouri and is more appropriately described as a suburb of Kansas City, a city whose imperially expansive desires would make Russia blush (and Putin would be wise to take a page from this city that has gobbled up significant land claims in two US states and without a military – though US police forces and national militaries differ little these days). For 200 years, this small town in the northland (KC metro areas north of the Missouri River) has taken as its namesake that most sacred of American concepts. And best of all, the name is disgustingly ironic.

Liberty has two historic claims to fame. First, in the 1830s, tensions (or persecutions) occurred between Mormon and non-Mormon settlers in Missouri after the Mormon prophet, Joseph Smith Jr., was revealed a revival of the Christian gospel noting that Jesus would have his second coming soon in the town of Independence (today a similar KC suburb to Liberty, but with more methamphetamine). The conflict was known as the Mormon Wars which ended with Smith and a few other Mormon leaders being imprisoned at the Liberty Jail, one resembling a jail out of a John Ford film. One of the early town heroes, Alexander Doniphan, the man ordered to lead Missouri soldiers to arrest Smith, would defend Smith in a trial. Doniphan, a disgruntled soldier in his own right, looking to get away from the horrors of conflict after a particularly traumatic stint in the Mexican-American War, would win his case. Smith would be spared the hangman's rope but was ordered to leave Missouri should he wish to keep his life more long-term. Liberty for some, see terms and conditions below. Second, an American Civil War later, the day before St. Valentine's Day, 1866, Jesse James, his lesser-known brother Frank, and a gang of outlaws conducted their first bank robbery at the bank in Liberty, riding off with

\$60,000. This became the new vocation of the James brothers and their gang after they gave up the less lucrative practice of bushwhacking (irregular military forces that supported Confederate operations in the border states during the Civil War). Bushwhackers continue to this day alongside their Union counter parts, the Jayhawkers, in a highly anticipated annual collegiate basketball game that allows the war to continue ad infinitum and remind everyone of how little progress has been made on racial relations.

These two historical moments give us an insight to the contradictions that have always been embodied within the concept of liberty. The Doniphan and Smith examples hint at almost this requisite need for liberty to remain precious. Perhaps we might forget its importance if it isn't taken away every now and then. Certain Christian theologies are far too accepting of that logical premise. More obviously with the first case, 'liberty for whom' is asked and while the US Constitution guarantees this for 'any person', the reality of this protection and the definition of who exactly is a 'person' remains disappointingly murky. Later in the same constitution, certain people are described as fractions of 'a person' which made matters all the more complicated, luckily that little compromise would eventually be repealed. In the case of Jesse James, the antagonistic relationship between security and liberty is highlighted. This dichotomy, taken as impossibly irreconcilable by most, has been a particular one of interest underlying a destructive contradiction in the US Constitution that has nearly seen the document tear itself to shreds following numerous legislative debates (and those of executive orders) following the 11 September 2001 attacks. This troublesome little idea has far more internal dilemmas that have also not been given their just dues in the intellectual arena.

But history doesn't provide the only contradictions for our little town in Missouri. Today, a cornucopia of Christian denominations make their relatively peaceful home in Liberty. A significant population of Mormons have settled into the land that once gave only options of death or death to their prophet less than a century ago. Abstinence as the best form of sexual education, optional attendance of science classes on evolution, and Jesus being an alright dude keep Catholics, Protestants, and everyone in between cheering together at Friday night football games. For the little things, agreeing to disagree is fine too. Liberty also houses the esteemed liberal

arts college, William Jewell College, which contrasts nicely with the nearby Ford assembly plant that keeps the blue-collar life force alive (when not swiftly laying employees off) that has built most of the pro-Trump electorate throughout the country. Republican, Democrat, well those are just ingredients we are happy to blend together as filling for that great American pie. Just remember to vote the same elite families into local posts, that guns don't kill people (how anthropomorphic!), and to smile at the occasional minority you see going about their daily life, they are proof that racism only exists in history. You can take a stroll around the historic Square where we forget that public lynchings were a regular weekend event here and that there seemed to be two of everything, one for the whites and one for the, well, non-whites, until sometime in the 1980s a few farmers' sons had the wild idea to gentrify and whitewash over all those minor indiscretions. Support your local small businesses, unless their owners are paedophiles, then we just make them disappear and everyone gets enough ice cream to keep us from actually having to deal with any traumas. Fourth of July weekend, Fall Festival, and the local high schools' homecomings are sure to be significant events. And if you're feeling extra ornery, you can play a little game by asking the salt-of-the-earth citizens of Liberty what the definition of the word liberty is. You are sure to get an interesting outpouring of responses and almost all of them will be insufficient.

Although I doubt most of the citizens surveyed in this hypothetical study have considered the true meaning of the word, I am confident answers will be provided in abundance. And I would hypothesise a majority of the responses put forward will be a refrain of patriotic platitudes and bile painted with a disturbing shade of xenophobia and nostalgia for a fragile patriarchy. How correct or incorrect the response is not important. Indeed, the answer requires a far more philosophical exploration than one might intuit for a seven-letter word. And then there is the issue of trying to define the word by distinguishing freedom and liberty. Often the two words are used interchangeably, and I am not entirely sure this is incorrect, at least in all cases. I cannot give you a clear differentiation myself as I suspect they may come from the same essence. But based on its use in English, I would offer that freedom is the broader term for 'uninhibited' while liberty is the legal ability or authority to exercise said freedoms. In that case, rights and liberties are essentially synonymous. This discussion

could go on and should as it is important for us, communicating beings, to seek better understanding of what we are saying, but my point here is not to say I am right and others are wrong (if I am to refer to the postnormal literature, we are all a degree of both).

The point is that languages change, and they should be allowed to change. I partially stand against certain language institutes who seek the preservation of their 'pure' language. The French Académie Française is one of the most famous for this pursuit. But anyone who has even glanced at the history of language knows there is nothing pure about any of the languages as they exist today. I suppose one could reduce one's national language back to a series of grunts and moans, but what does that accomplish? Now, having said that, yes there are a great number of languages in the world that are under threat and while I believe in the flexibility of language, I also recognise and appreciate the identity grounded in the languages we speak. So, yes, I believe in preserving languages as cultural and identity stalwarts, but if a language cannot adapt and learn and change, then I cannot feel sorry for its ossification and death. And how are we to call ourselves a globalised world seeking something resembling plurality and peace without borrowing and exchanging words, building a language together. And I admit that's rather radical. The old way is you learn my language or two languages punch it out until one is more dominant. I recognise the irony that the English language is no stranger to this old way. But I would argue, every language needs new words for a better understanding of changing circumstances.

While language ought to and can be quick to change (as soon as a thing is invented, a word is usually instantaneously needed to identify it), sentiments are not so quick to change. Certain constitutionalists will ask 'what would the founding fathers think?' This question is usually asked by someone who thinks the Constitution is a document set in stone. I am the other kind of constitutionalist that thinks both language and laws need to have the flexibility and elasticity to change along with everything else. Recall the Nandy comment I began this piece with. In fact, the other constitutionalist asks this question because they do not wish to think. Ironic because I believe the founding fathers would be rather upset that Americans have opted for not thinking in the contemporary period. So, if this question is put to me with a sly smile of self-confidence, I may scratch

my chin and say 'well, well, what would the founding fathers think of nuclear proliferation? They wouldn't!' The founding fathers, mostly white male Protestants living at the end of the eighteenth century could not have conceived of such a weapon. Hell, even the guys who had built the first nuclear bomb, watching it, from a comfortable distance, detonate in the Jornada del Muerto desert in 1945's New Mexico, could hardly conceive what they were dealing with, what it would mean, how things would forever change. It was the unthought, but I like to think the founding fathers were not afraid of the unthought. I mean, damned fools they were, thinking that Americans would continue thinking into the future!

The thing that always gets me about these sorts of debates is that certain people fail to see the founding fathers' own admittance to their limitations. It is easy for us to turn our national heroes into their deified superhuman caricatures, but they clearly built a system that was meant to last, not keep everyone in line. Their failure to resolve the slavery issue and prevent the slow simmer towards civil war, less than a century later, are prime examples of this reality. Numerous arguments and commentaries around the framing of the US Constitution point to the fact that there is no perfect system and the high likelihood that in a generation the whole process would need to be done again. Several of those present at the constitutional convention had only a decade earlier signed their name to the most treasonous Declaration of Independence in resistance to perceived tyranny. Why would they break from one tyrant to construct a new one? But here we see where the founding fathers made a massive underestimation and set us on the course towards today.

The rise of communism and the Cold War has clouded the American mind to the point of forgetting that the US itself is a revolutionary endeavour. And there is one law to revolutions whether they are launched by young intellectuals in Moscow or Shanghai or Philadelphia or Paris, the revolution continues until it burns itself out or evolves into something new. Look to the Communist Revolution in China. The Communist Manifesto, read without context, provides a wonderfully terrible template that requires only the inputs of a few data points. For communist forces, they became the proletariat, leading the noble cause against the bourgeoisie, who began as the Nationalist government under Chiang Kai-shek. After the communists, under Mao Zedong, had taken control of mainland China, the

leaders of the party were wise to note that it would not be long before the uneducated farmers that filled their masses could see the party leaders themselves as the next bourgeoisie putting down a new proletariat. So, they needed to keep the revolution going or deliver on bringing prosperity to the world's most populous country. Seeing the infeasibility of the latter, they opted for manufacturing a new bourgeoisie – the smart people, those dastardly intellectuals. And suddenly a revolution against Nationalist oppression became the Cultural Revolution. And so, this cycle would continue for every generation up until today. The higher-ranking members of the party may or may not have been aware of how well Mao or other leaders' policies were working, but as long as the revolution was kept alive, the order was maintained. The problem today is that now China has its first leader born after Mao's rise to power and where an unspoken understanding of Mao's failures were corrected quietly as the propaganda was kept on repeat, a new generation aware only of Mao's greatness wonders why so much divergence has taken place from Mao's vision. But will Xi Jinping be able to determine the next disposable bourgeoisie and keep the revolution going for another generation?

Surely the great United States of America could not allow itself to play into such a cyclical historical trap. There was but one tyrant whose name made good American boys spit at the sound or thought of: George III. And maybe also his Parliament. Okay, at the very most, the entire Kingdom of Great Britain, colonies and territories sold separately, batteries not included. But surely every American child from 1776 until 2022 knows that America was only faced with one tyrannical threat, whose butt it thoroughly kicked and forever after remained the land of the free. We at least made it to the second president before we started calling him a tyrant. And pretty much every president since, perhaps with the exception of James Polk, earned that moniker from someone in the US or her territories. While the template is not as linguistically impressive as those of the communists, to revolt against a tyrant has become a generational tradition in the US, also continuing up to the contemporary period. Tyrants were first foreign oppressors denying liberty to cheap tea, then those in the North denying the liberty of owning other human beings, then those monopolies denying the liberty to compete with them, then foreign tyrants denying the liberty of others abroad, and then those who denied our curiously domineering

form of liberating others – the terrorists. Finally, only 250 years later we finally figure out who the real tyrants are. For we have found the tyrants and they are us. Thank you very much Twitter.

And now for the ultimate irony. The US was manufactured as an anti-tyranny. How could this be possible, you may ask. Well, I answer your question with another. Who is the sovereign in the United States? I cannot be mad at those who believe it to be the President or Congress. That is the conventional sentiment of sovereignty that all these years later remains hard to break from. But the sovereign of the United States, those who give legitimacy to its government, are, in fact, the governed. It is the first line of the preamble, ‘We the people...’ And I have to hand it to Thomas Jefferson and John Locke, it is a rather unthought idea for a Western nation to have as its sovereign, instead of one ordained representative of God (a monarch), the vested interest of all of God’s representatives, the people. But to be fair, language again changes quicker than sentiments and it took a very long time to settle who those ‘people’ were exactly and even today, questions of citizenship remain a fiery political talking point. While a tyrant in the conventional sense should be impossible with regards to upholding the constitution, our revolutionary need to overthrow the tyrants reveals that the American people are tyrants to themselves. Yet another beautiful contradiction. Suddenly, my hearing ‘we are legion’ every time the phrase ‘my fellow Americans’ is uttered by a politician makes a whole lot of sense. And social media does a fine job of reinforcing this point.

But before we can pass into the unthought of liberty and, in a nice two for one deal, tyranny, there is a major impediment that has risen in the last few decades that currently undermines my desire for progress and stands as a much larger existential threat. In order for fundamentalist devotion to the concept of liberty to survive and even thrive, it needs a home – a safe place. In the course of America’s cyclical history of tyrannical revolutions, it makes sense that anarchy is brought into the conversation. What better to oppose all tyranny, especially that pesky tyranny of the majority, than good old-fashioned anarchism. The problem is that true anarchists stand as a fundamental contradiction to a society and, by convention, the nation-state world order. So, these chaps tended to not be easy to talk to, taking violent and destructive approaches to their freedom of expression. Once

an ideology is formed, it can never really die. Anarchism, except in that utopian and passive hue it took among hippies in the 1960s, does not bode well for its followers. In order to keep the glorious anti-tyrannical revolution burning, a few of them made the ultimate compromise to put away their firearms and explosives (those will be needed after the inevitable apocalypse) and agree to the barest minimum of a state structure only allowed to protect the liberty of its citizens. These folks became the founders of the Libertarian Party. Those extremist defenders of liberty now had a home and a name. Soon it would have political legitimacy.

I am not the first to rage against America's *de facto* two-party system – a frank and clear insult to the outgoing wish/harbinger of the first US President George Washington. But when the closest thing we have to a competitive third option is the Libertarian Party, I pump the breaks and begin soul searching. The Libertarian Party is intelligent, clever, and most dangerous. It is entirely too easy to wave the Libertarian banner if only to voice a complete and utter exhaustion with the Republican and Democratic parties (which spare no expense in keeping that feeling on American sleeves). They claim to be the party that breaks the mould and convention of US politics when, in actuality, they are the most disgustingly out of date version of it, unable to move in time. Aside from the belief that society can prosper without taxes (without an alternative paradigm proposed), or that humans left to their own individualism will come around to a profound collectivism, their entire party platform makes me feel like 1984's Winston being asked by O'Brien how many fingers he is holding up. Interesting and potentially most dangerous, is that Libertarianism prides itself on existing outside of a standard moral framework. On one hand such freedom allows multiple ethical systems to fit into the party, but on the other that means the ideology could simply thrive without any ethics whatsoever. And such an arrogant, confident denial of reality is a demonstration of power. We saw it take main stage under the presidency of Donald J. Trump. But it has been particularly attractive to young, white, educated, ironically close-minded, male Americans for far too long. All rooted in a fundamental definition of liberty that numerous free speech kerfuffles from Salmon Rushdie's *Satanic Verses* to contemporary French politics demonstrates is past its sell-by date.

It is critical that not just Americans, but all Western thinkers, especially those not of the West but informed by Western disciplinary norms and

conventional global (Western) educational systems, consider the unthought of our outdated principles. There, of course, will be many ways to do this and new ways are always encouraged. But to break beyond an understanding of the convention and breach the unthought, it will be of value to explore a variety of polylogues concerning liberty and how it is seen in other worldviews and mental normalcies. Since Western notions of democracy have been hailed seemingly by all and sundry, where one might think democracy would come into conflict with Eastern ideologies, such as the often-proclaimed Asian Values or in terms of Islamic republics, the reality is that these other value systems' understanding of Western 'democratic' values can vary and actually bring in some interesting insight. Specifically, I feel Islam's approach to liberty has a lot to offer the Libertarian dilemma.

When one really puts liberty under high resolution of both the Western and Islamic worldviews an interesting detail arises. Both concepts of liberty assume a degree of responsibility. Libertarianism is often criticised for its reckless desire for freedom, its freedom from everything, including responsibility for what one does. Largely this is a major problem that has arisen, particularly in the freedom of speech debates – and is abused by both the left and right. Yet, the Western Enlightenment thinkers whose treatises Libertarians throw at their opponents, mention this sense of responsibility, but somehow this was lost in the radicalisation of the ideology. The responsibility one bears for their liberty resonates stronger in the Muslim tradition because of a key difference between Western and Islamic approaches to liberty. For Islam, liberty is internal. One of the most established mentions of liberty is the liberty God gives to humans to take care of their own affairs and to build a stronger connection to their community, the Earth, and God. The freedom and liberty in Islam derive from respect and dignity, so the fundamental rights to free movement, right to safety, right to freedom of thought, education, and religion, and even right to privacy gain primacy. In Western discourse of liberty, the notion is much more external: it comes out of one's individualistic value over the dignity respected in others. The struggles even become different. For Islam, liberty is a self-struggle, I must overcome myself to bask in the freedom God has endowed. For the Western tradition, liberty is a dog-eat-dog man-to-man conflict. I must fight for my liberty and defeat the tyrants

who would seek to take it. The perceived secularisation of Europe only cranked this up. God, as seen by others was a sort of tyrant I must overcome. While liberty allows Muslims to be free to seek their God, it allows the Western thinker to take up his independence from God (in some interesting theologies this is what God wants). Yet, as I shift from Camera One to Camera Two on these two lenses of viewing liberty, there is an interesting commonality that tethers the two, which I think reveals a key to seeking the unthought of liberty.

Both the Islamic and Western approaches to liberty are liberty *from*. Liberty from my animalistic or sinful nature or liberty from oppression or tyranny. Whether internal or external, they have a fundamental mechanic that is the same. Which if problematic, creates issues for both approaches and at least to seeing liberty as a higher principle. To liberate for both worldviews is to break. Fundamentally this is violent, which should at least feel problematic. But it then gives any preternatural tendency towards liberation an instinctual need to break things. And so, if one of your highest principles calls on you to break – liberate – and when that act does not go to plan, we can do nothing but despair. And in postnormal times where complexity and chaos accompany all these contradictions I've spoken of, the act of liberating/breaking only produces more problems. It fundamentally betrays the complexity of the system and becomes a Sisyphian trap. So are we doomed?

I believe not. For while the Islamic and Western view give us some interesting insight into how to break from our conventional concepts, they are not unthoughts of each other. And indeed, while many more polylogues on liberty specifically can be done adding in notes on Chinese, Hindu, African, and many other perspectives to the discussion, a strict diagramming and comparative analysis could fail to get us to the unthought. So, I put forward a far simpler approach to bringing liberty into a better, perhaps more preferred future. First, we must heed the responsibility at the heart of liberty. If you follow my definition of liberty as this authority or ability to practice one's freedom, the responsibility inherent is that you do not disrespect the liberty of others – taking from the respect towards dignity of others from Islam, but something even the Libertarian may be amicable towards. 'Don't Tread on Me' comes to mind. And instead of this strangely capitalistic idea of Liberty as a commodity, we can stop seeing

liberty as something that can be lost, further adding to its inherent inalienability within at least human beings (we can deal with posthumanism at a later day). Finally, the simple move comes here: Instead of liberty *from*, we look at liberty *with*. Liberty *with* then represents a societal approach to freedom that transcends the violent contradictions of liberty earned or gained in conventional democratic histories. Liberty *with* is cooperative and open, multicultural as a path towards plurality. It is coexistence and acceptance of each other guaranteed by respect and the need for humans to live amongst each other in societies and open civilisations. Liberty *with* allows us to learn from one another and progress. It provides for freedom of speech towards mutual understanding that discourages the weaponisation of hate speech for belittling, alienating, and othering. The unthought comes in taking liberty from this adversarial conflict and transforming it into a collaborative creation. We do not have to be alone. No longer do we need to take to liberating crusades on social media cancelling others or PC policing. Instead, we can learn and experiment again without the fear of manufactured oppression and homo tyrannus.

Freedom, rights, and our identities are going to be major intellectual battlegrounds in the very near future. Far too much domination in the realm of thought has come from others; and worse, the non-thinking thought of others – the regurgitation of old and less than useful ideas. And with the rise of artificial intelligence and algorithmic ‘thinking’ or decision making, everything looks to get a whole lot worse. Contrary to popular belief, knowledge and wisdom are not necessary roads that intersect, or exist in the same block, neighbourhood, borough, even city limits. But breaking beyond our comfort zones and seeking out truly new approaches and navigations, such as is found in exploring the unthought, we can find new ways of getting over the next horizons without losing ourselves in the process.

Citations

Much of the understanding of the American conception of liberty comes from a youth filled with listening carefully to the lyrics of patriotic (propaganda) American songs and being bushwhacked by the overabundance of star-spangled banners that fly on any given day within the borders of the United States of America. For a more intellectual understanding of the roots of liberty that has become all the rage in the US and across the West, see John Stuart Mill's *On Liberty*, (Penguin, London, 1985) and John Locke's *Second Treatise on Government*, (Hackett, London, 2005); The Islamic discourse on liberty is rich and storied, but for a nice contemporary survey of the conception and its application in law and governance, see Mohammad Hashim Kamali's *Freedom, Equality and Justice in Islam*, (Islamic Texts Society, Kuala Lumpur, 2002);

To learn more about the origins of the 'unthought' see Mohammed Arkoun, *The Unthought in Contemporary Islamic Thought*, (Saqi Books, London, 2002); For the application of the unthought to postnormal times see Ziauddin Sardar and John A. Sweeney's 'The Three Tomorrows of Postnormal Times,' *Futures* 75 (January 2016): 1–13. doi:10.1016/j.futures.2015.10.004.

For more insight on the unthought and unthought futures, readers are encouraged to explore further the writings and contributions made by members of the CPPFS that can be found at the website: postnormaltim.es.