



Freedom Club Ethical Anticode

Last Revised: September 14, 2024

Introduction

Even if I don't change this version of the anticode, you can consider it a work in progress, because I do not claim to be finished with it.

This anticode is an anti-code — it aims to decodify strictly arranged ideas rather than codify them.

0.1

Do whatever you want with this anticode — modify it, distribute it, show it to your neighbor — but be aware of cause and effect.

0.2

This anticode is not a moral obligation — in contrary to your typical ethical code. You can still consider yourself or be considered a Freedom Club member if you somehow deviate from it. It's neither prescriptive nor descriptive. It is propositionary.

0.3

You are encouraged to publish your own renditions, editions and iterations if this anticode.

0.4

Feel free to agree with some points and disagree with others. Actually, it'd be very admirable if you also discuss it anywhere.

0.5

This introduction is an adapted form of the first section of the Meta-Anarchist Ethical Anticode.

There is no one form of, and likely no set of related forms of politics that are best for the world. all forms need some assumptions because there is no one sole absolute truth. to be free, we need to expand the amount of forms of politics that are up for consideration fast enough that there is a good chance a suitable one for your situation will be considered. In this sense even a politics that involves imposing over others may be good to study, as long as it won't involve shutting ourselves from other politics, as long as we know to stop it from imposing. Recognizing imposition is important, however since dividing things into strict camps of impositionary and non-impositionary is itself impositionary, recognizing imposition

isn't about telling others what is and isn't impositinary, but rather sharing as many details as propositionarily possible about what could make something impositinary and what could make it propositionary. That's why we can openly discuss freedom club having freedom oppression and so on. We are signifying the possibility of imposition but not shutting down a concept. That's one reason why this club itself can be more of a story than a group, because that likely enables even less restriction in many aspects including this.

By being a story of freedom we can explore all kinds of ideology and their effects live, it is the live action roleplay for all politics, so true freedom lies within it because it can be anything itself, and allow anyone to be anything. We can't force people to participate, only encourage them, with consent and without coercion, if we hope not to force anything on anyone, to let everyone be free, then things strictly outside what's considered necessity should be favored. However it is subjective what counts, we better lean towards not doing harm, people can decide for themselves, and we trust that because that's what makes up the tenet for freedom, if everyone affected can agree however, and consideration is made for those that can't voice their concern then we can go through with experiments that may be questionable, and be sure to be dynamic, stop your participation if it becomes problematic. There is a certain balance between not doing harm and finding good results, the proposal of the club is that because it is not defined in organization, it cannot harm without some level of participation, some ability to be changed, and therefore the hierarchies it imposes can be challenged meaningfully by those affected. This assumption may not be right, but the idea being malleable allows the tenets to be changed.

being free can extend to ethics itself. By the fact that the club is about freedom, it is meant to also free ethics. Freedom club being freedom could represent that there is no imposition of ethics over others or its members. Whatever ethical considerations on members have are as valid to be used as any other member or entity outside of freedom club. And what counts as freedom club's ethics is not defined, since it can include all ethical beliefs of its members or its sub-entities, or those that may be adjacent. What's considered right is not imposing over those ethical considerations or those outside the group, however the avocation of ethics by any members is not counted as imposing, but rather can count as proposing and the judgement of that proposition is free to be thought of by others as however they consider, and make whatever groups about it, however they should also not be impositinary, propositionality should be sought in all aspects even to itself, all things are propositional in a system like this, when nothing is solid, everything will be swimming. To make freedom club an idea rather than a defined group with a goal helps in this respect. Some organization may be needed, in fact it may even be sought to prove points of the members that agree, and as long as they don't become overly propositional, as the members and themselves decide, they can be okay. In fact the greatest problem is those that are affected, but can't voice their opinions, those with a voice can make the over-impositionality clear if it exists, and those that are not affected at all ideally should add on in case they are themselves being impositinary, however since there are voiceless people in the world, there needs to be careful consideration of them, and therefore the voices of the non-affected do need to be considered when it concerns making sure the silent can be heard. Essentially, the consideration of those that can't stop a potential imposition or explicit but purposeful imposition, needs to be cared for extremely, non-affected can be unbiased sources, and all opinions need to be heard, within and outside to make sure the silent are heard. As long as these considerations are made the group can continue, though it should head for the goal of propositionality, however at times to achieve true propositionality, some impositinality needs to be done, because propositionality is just broken down impositinality, perhaps by making an imposition you can make it break down larger ones, however that imposition needs to have A. consideration for the voiceless, which are those that matter to impositinality, without their existence there wouldn't be an impositinality just an advocacy and consensus decision, a proposition that is successful, B. not be larger/more impositinary than what it aims to break down. voicelessness also includes disability, it is broad to all types, and should be considered broadly. The

1 The word freedom is free from meaning

1.1

Freedom is clearly not a word we would strictly define, it might be ironic if we did. Freedom is in general

- 2 Freedom club is free from existing, from purpose
 - 3 Freedom club is free from boredom, from definition
 - 4 Freedom club is free from philosophy, from ethics
 - 5 Freedom club is free from club, from structure
 - 6 Freedom club is free from intolerance, from tolerance
 - 7 Freedom club is free from morals, from religion
 - 8 Freedom club is free from freedom, from expectations
- 8.1