

right to hate^[1] You have the right to dislike, despise, criticise, hate and if needed express that with adequate and sensible rhetoric^[2] just like love, kindness and affability, the human is an emotional being incorporating aforementioned sensory spectra and everything in between. I have the right to hate the enemy of my people, my daughters rapist, despise the collective stupidity of man. However, hate is *not* the same as intimidation, threat or directly taking measures. Then it plainly is that -threat, coercion or violence-

Hate is often used as a derogatory stigmatising term towards some people and their right to have a 'hateful' opinion. However in our era of paradoxes and logical fallacies^[2] hate very often is used unnoticed by 'some who *hate* others and their opinion', but they themselves very much unaware of their own hatred, as they perceive it as their 'morally justified value', with a major exception, they want to silence the others with unwritten laws, political correctness but in the end -legislation^[2]. That sums it up as hate with both intimidation and action, law-threat, imprisonment/coercion/action. 'We' have the correct moral value! ('värdegrund' in Swedish). 'You' hate!^[1] A bigot and contradictory use of terminology with following judgemental coercive measures.

Despite terminology, nomenclature, semantics -we do have the right to hate (arbitrarily add synonyms, with much lighter connotation; critique, dissent, aversion, opposition etc.) but if you subsequently follow up with ultimata and acts to silence the other, you've made the final cardinal error, critical to shed light on.

You can bomb a group of people in the 'name of hate'. Most people would 'naturally' see that as an unfounded violent act consequently from its motives^[3]. A fallacy, a none argument, a war crime. But it can also be done in the name of 'democracy^[4] and freedom' and the action is indeed equally unfounded, but not recognised as such due to false ethics: -'Because, We come in peace (by the barrel of a gun)'. It should be seen as equally morally unjustified. Newspeak and the era of fallacies sadly justifies the latter more and more.

terror is terror Lexical version; 'the use of violence and intimidation in the pursuit of political aims'

FBI phraseology: 'Terrorism is the unlawful use of force and violence against persons or property to intimidate or coerce a government, the civilian population, or any segment thereof, in furtherance of political or social objectives.'

So FBI is trying to enlighten us we can discern lawful terrorism from unlawful, but upon reading above simple lexical definition we clearly see that terrorism can only be the pure act or an explicit intimidation or threat to act -period. It can never politically, scientifically, by nature given nor by any Godhead claimed or proven that any being or group have the right to act. Wouldn't Justitia be blind before the terror, screams and the blood, who ever the perpetrator? When it is being justified to bomb 'for peace' or 'for democracy', it is not even the underlying motives^[3], but the false excuses, which makes it possibly even more disgusting.

Ronald Reagan said, paraphrase:

"One man's terrorist is another man's freedom fighter."

Peter Ustinov said, paraphrase:

"Terrorism is military for poor, military is terrorism for rich"

We really ought to expect a true paradox/catch-22 where laws falls into their own pit, and de facto goes too far in their absurd final reach aiming directly towards themselves. A precedent legal case where regulation, sections and paragraphs *in themselves* becomes intimidation, hatred toward 'some opinions', hate speech, but all to apparent with following threats, coercion and at its pinnacle, seizure, violence, police and martial force.

closing argument:

Freedom is when anyone can describe what freedom is, and accordingly conduct oneself, without infringement, harm or coercion to others and their definition of the term.

novelty There are naturally expressions and acts both in the name of love and hate that can be humble, forgiving and creative leaps. If the haters are being allowed to hate and be hated, and a mature dialogue can be conducted, a disarming agreement can be more easily achieved. Let's recognise it as self awareness, insight and wisdom in contrast to puerile hypocrisy -thus showing everything but signs of submission or weakness.

David Bohm said:

"If one approaches another man with a fixed 'theory' about him as an 'enemy' against whom one must defend oneself, he [the enemy] will respond similarly, and thus one's 'theory' will apparently be confirmed by experience." p.8 Wholeness and the Implicate Order

The 'theory' can be reversed, replace 'enemy' with friend

Footnotes:

[1] Denna text på svenska, [rätten att hata](#) på inormous.net

Pejorative epithet -Ad hominem: Example of how precarious it can be using the word 'hate' as a fallacy. When people carry difficult emotions like anger, mourning, dismay and yes -hate-, how do professionals work with clients with pain and trauma? Never with shackles or by silencing them, never with ridiculing stigma but it must be ventilated in numerous ways, humbly and respectfully.

[2] Rhetoric: Not to be mistaken by winning political debate with cunning sophisms and talking points but rather honest dialogue where **taboo must remain our only taboo** and arguments are valued by its conciseness, logic and evidence. Look further: logic fallacies, legalese, [Strawman - nature of the cage](#), connotation-denotation, Trivium method (seven Liberal Arts and Sciences) [triviumeducation.com](#)

[3] Motive: Something far to often forgotten or hidden in debate and in legal systems, curriculum, science etc. Look further: Kaliber: "[Beställningsjobb och köpt tystnad - är den fria forskningen hotad?](#)", causality/cause-effect, follow the money, climate change (subject matter as big as the Universe), any other topic you can think of

[4] Democracy: If to survive it must part from indifferent, anonymous and lofty representation and political polarisation, and instead as close as possible to the actual subject matters where above adequate argumentation must bear the weight. The 'politicisation' of local or global issues and societal development is in fact a form of **logical fallacy**, left unnoticed dividing and misleading us. Look further: direct democratic methods, local solutions in global synergy, rather than global solutions in local synergy.