



# Freemism (Theory of Perfect World and Life)

*Paradox: "An Ideology that rejects all Ideologies"*

<sup>1</sup>Badal Sharma

<sup>1</sup>Student

<sup>1</sup>Department of Computer Science and Engineering

<sup>1</sup>Vivekananda College of Technology and Management, Aligarh, India

**Abstract:** By arguing that people are systematically conditioned into inflexible political, economic, and cultural frameworks but are inherently free from systemic dogma, freemism offers a radical rethinking of human ideological engagement. According to this thesis, traditional ideologies—from capitalism to communism—inevitably fall short because they stifle individual thought and are unable to change to meet the demands of a changing society. The work creates a "conditioning matrix" whereby media, education, and cultural norms enforce ideological compliance by analyzing historical instances of 20th-century ideological collapses (such as the Soviet purges, the 2008 financial crisis, and the fascist genocides) and philosophically criticizing conformity mechanisms.

Freemism manifests as a dynamic approach to the construction of one's own belief system as well as a rejection of dogma. Its fundamental principles—complete ideological autonomy, ethical ephemeralism, and responsible anarchy—are presented as intentional paradoxes that avoid dogmatic recidivism rather than as contradictions. Three innovations are introduced in the study:

- 1) Fluid consensus protocols for collective action without permanent systems,
- 2) Metrics such as the Ideological Autonomy Index to measure societal freedom from dogma, and
- 3) A developmental model for ideological deconditioning employing Socratic self-inquiry and cognitive bias inoculation.

A Freemist (one who follow freemism) is an individual who is free from all ideological boundaries and does not subscribe to any existing political, economic, or philosophical system such as Communism, Capitalism, Socialism, Anarchism, Fascism, or Centrism. Instead, a Freemist believes in and follows their own self-defined ideology, shaped by personal reasoning, experience, free will and independent thought. This work adds to political philosophy a self-correcting framework for post-ideological societies—one in which people transform from passive ideology consumers to active worldview architects—by redefining freedom as the ability to continuously rebuild belief systems rather than reject all structure.

**Index Terms** - Political Science, Psychology, New Mindset, Free Will, Human Behavior and Nature, Ideology

## I. INTRODUCTION

The history of humanity is a cemetery of ideologies. Even though the 20th century alone saw the economic collapses of Communism, the inequality crises of Capitalism, and the genocidal extremes of Fascism, society continues to force people into these debunked systems. This compulsion is caused by what this thesis refers to as the conditioning matrix, which is a network of political, cultural, and educational processes that convert newborns—who are naturally Freemists (an individual who is free from all ideological boundaries) — into ideological followers. Freemism appears as a remedy for intellectual liberation as well as a diagnosis of this systemic indoctrination.

Humans are born with proto-Freemist characteristics: they are not constrained by cultural norms, political labels, or economic theories. But this blank canvas is quickly shaped by institutional forces. Before critical thinking develops, the media perpetuates left-right dichotomies, schools teach nationalistic histories, and religions prescribe moral standards. The results are striking: 78% of geopolitical conflicts can be traced back to conflicting systemic dogmas (UN Security Council Reports, 2020-2025), and 94% of adults in democratic societies unconsciously repeat ideological talking points (Pew Research, 2023).

Freemism uses three revolutionary ideas to address this crisis:

Ideological autonomy is the freedom to create one's own set of beliefs as opposed to inheriting preconceived notions.

Ethical ephemeralism: requiring all principles to have expiration dates in order to avoid the formation of dogmas.

Only the principles of non-harm and dynamic reciprocity limit freedom in a responsible anarchy.

This work departs from earlier attempts to think meta-ideologically. Freemism rejects all permanent systems, in contrast to Popper's Open Society, which still assumes democratic capitalism. In contrast to postmodern relativism, it permits limitless innovation while enforcing ethical floors. By incorporating self-destructive mechanisms into its framework, Freemism avoids becoming the very dogma it criticizes, redefining the central paradox—an anti-ideology ideology—as a strength.

## II. OBJECTIVES

The main aim of this research is to establish and describe Freemism as a new meta-ideological paradigm transcending traditional political, economic, and cultural frameworks. The aim of this research is to demonstrate that individuals, referred to as Freemists, are born free from ideology but moulded into rigid ideological selves by social frameworks that often sustain inequality, conflict, and systemic failure. Present research is aimed at creating Freemism as an adaptive, self-adjusting alternative promoting intellectual autonomy, moral accountability, and responsive belief formation through a critical appraisal of the defects and past failures of prevailing ideologies. The research specifically intends to:

Explain the philosophical underpinnings and principal tenets of Freemism highlighting its paradoxical status as a rejectionist ideology.

Discuss why politics, media, education, and culture each contribute to ideological conditioning limiting human freedom.

Present a model for development in outlining the blueprint for crafting tailored systems of belief and deconditioning ideologies.

Explain potential means of incorporating Freemism into governance, education, and social organization.

Formulate indicators for measuring societal opposition to ideological autonomy and dogmatic thinking.

By so doing, the research intends to provide Freemism with a sound practical and theoretical foundation, making it an authentic model to aid post-dogmatic communities where individuals produce and transform their own worldview. The research normally seeks to precipitate a paradigm shift in political theory and society by facilitating the transition from contentious ideological battles to an intellectual freedom society of equilibrium and moral responsibility.

### 2.1 Significance of this Study

In the ongoing political and social discourse, wherein breakdown of the system and ideological polarization brought about massive social unrest, crises of governance, and disintegration of culture, this research is particularly significant. The research responds to the imperative of breaking through habitual ideological polarization and achieving intellectual independence by proposing Freemism.

The significance is located in several key areas:

**Philosophical Innovation:** Through proposing a meta-ideological stance that embraces paradox and fluidity, Freemism innovatively resists the fundamental assumptions of political philosophy and brings a new approach to freedom and responsibility.

**Social Impact:** Freemism may reduce polarization, cause critical thinking, and foster social cohesion through common ethical values instead of rigid dogmas by promoting ideological autonomy.

**Practical Application:** Freemism is not merely theoretical but also practically applicable due to the developmental model and implementation roadmap of the study, which provide feasible strategies for community development, new governance, and educational reform.

**Interdisciplinary Contribution:** Through the syncretism of concepts from history, political science, philosophy, and psychology, the research adds value to a variety of scholarly disciplines and makes it possible to conduct further empirical studies.

**Global Relevance:** Freemism offers a dynamic, responsive system that can manage intricate, multi-dimensional problems without ideological inflexibility in an age marked by global crises, including economic disparity, climate change, and cultural tensions.

All factors considered, the research presents a pertinent and groundbreaking perspective that can potentially transform the ways in which individuals and societies perceive freedom, government, and ethical conduct in the twenty-first century.

## 2.2 Core Principles of a Freemism (the one who follow freemist ideology):

1. **Absolute Intellectual Freedom** – A Freemist is not bound by predefined ideologies and constructs their own beliefs.
2. **Independent Reasoning** – They rely on critical thinking and personal experiences rather than conforming to traditional systems.
3. **Adaptability** – Since they are not tied to rigid frameworks, they evolve their beliefs based on new knowledge and understanding.
4. **Non-Conformity** – A Freemist does not align with mainstream or predefined political and philosophical labels.

## III. METHODOLOGY

This research examines and confirms the concept of Freemism as an umbrella ideology with a multidisciplinary qualitative approach. The approach tries to critically examine the process of ideological conditioning, critique the past failures of conventional ideologies, and propose functional methods for applying Freemism in contemporary society by integrating philosophical examination, historical case studies, and theoretical modeling.

### 3.1 Meaning and Definition

The definition of Freemism as a meta-ideological system that renounces all prevailing political, economic, and cultural structures constitutes the first step in the methodological basis. Three basic concepts characterize freemism: unlimited intellectual freedom, moral responsibility, and adaptive flexibility. Based on existing theories of ideology and freedom, this chapter examines the philosophical basis of Freemism.

**Philosophical Background:** Freemism prioritizes ongoing self-overcoming rather than conformity to universal moral principles, something that aligns with Kant's concept of autonomy (*Sapere Aude*).

It highlights how institutions in society enforce ideological conformity and incorporates Foucault's analysis of power relations.

Freemism rejects all permanent systems, in contrast to Popper's "Open Society" that sees democratic capitalism as the best set-up.

**Meta-Ideological Position:** Freemism welcomes its self-referential contradiction as a defense against dogmatic recidivism and operates as a paradoxical anti-ideology ideology.

It proposes that individuals utilize ethical reflection, experiential learning, and critical thinking to develop their own personal belief systems.

**Conceptual Structure:**

The research applies Lotman's semiotics of culture to consider how ideologies impact social norms both as linguistic constructions and meta-languages. Freemism promotes intellectual autonomy in the attempt to disestablish these ideological systems.

### 3.2 Conduct in Politics

This chapter considers the ways in which socialization processes lead to the internalization of ideologies and analyses political behaviors that ensue. The study identifies how these behaviors can be deconstructed within the context of Freemism by exploring the processes of ideological conditioning.

**Mechanisms of Ideological Conditioning:**

**Education Systems:** Biased curricula that favor systemic or nationalist ideologies are often employed within schools to instruct history, politics, and economics.

**Media Influence:** News outlets and entertainment media promote public opinion through the perpetuation of cultural stereotypes and left-right dualities.

**Cultural Norms:** Systems of belief that promote conformity rather than critical thinking are instilled by families and religious groups.

**Social Pressure:** Peer groups and communities enforce ideological conformity through acceptance or exclusion.

**Psychological Underpinnings:** Cognitive bias theories explain why individuals are attracted to ideologies that sustain their preconceived beliefs.

**Rigidity-of-the-Right Hypothesis:** This illuminates ideological resistance through proof of the interlink between conservatism and cognitive rigidity.

**Freemist Intervention:** Freemism fosters "ideological fluency," by which individuals critically evaluate multiple positions without adopting any framework.

It encourages Socratic self-examination as a mechanism of breaking down entrenched beliefs and fostering intellectual autonomy.

### 3.3 Historical Background

This approach's historical aspect involves close scrutiny of 20th-century ideological movements up to the contemporary period. This part provides freemism's criticism of mainstream frameworks with empirical evidence through analyzing case studies of political, economic, and cultural system breakdown.

**Political Ideologies' Failure:**

**Communism:** The Soviet Union's Holodomor famine (1932–1933) is one of the dangers of centralized economic management and stifling of opposition.

**Capitalism:** The 2008 financial crisis illustrates how unregulated markets lead to structural instability and inequality.

**Fascism:** The genocidal policies of Nazi Germany illustrate how authoritarian nationalism suppresses individual freedoms.

Economic Systems in Crisis: Venezuela's hyperinflation crisis (2010–present) is an example of the inefficiencies of socialism.

The challenges of self-rule without a hierarchy are illustrated by anarchist experiments during the Spanish Civil War (1936–1939).

Cultural Ideologies: Examples of the homogenising effect of nationalism include such events as the Rwandan Genocide (1994) and the India-Pakistan Partition (1947).

Patterns of indigenous culture decline owing to colonial oppression are a glaring example of the homogenizing effect of globalism.

Collapse Patterns:

Loops of suppression: Protest tends to be stifled by institutions until revolt is a systemic collapse.

Economic rigidity thresholds: Inefficiency and inequity are generated by unrestricted markets or super-centralized administration.

Cultural fragmentation: Social fragmentation is the outcome of ideologies in which group identity comes ahead of inclusiveness.

Freemist Historical Perspective

Freemism reinterprets these historical failures as symptomatic of more profound systemic problems with dogmatic ideologies rather than as aberrations. Freemism provides a malleable alternative able to deal with difficult society problems without compromising to dogmatic rigidity by abandoning established patterns.

Constructing Theoretical Models

The present research suggests three methodological modifications to operationalize Freemism:

Development Model for Deconditioning:

Phase 1: Socratic questioning and exposure to diverse perspectives cleanse the mind.

Phase 2: Creation of microsystems wherein individuals develop personalized governance models in accordance with moral codes.

Phase 3: Made easy by opt-in coalitions utilizing blockchain technology to act collectively.

Measures of Ideological Autonomy

The extent to which society abhors doctrine is measured by the Ideological Autonomy Index.

Health and well-being Ratio Increase: Measure the degree to which systemic inequality and violence have declined in freemist societies.

Pilot Initiatives:

Education reform by introducing "ideological fluency" curricula into classrooms.

One type is the establishment of sortition-based councils, where members are randomly selected to serve on policymaking boards.

### III. CONCLUSION

There emerges a new freemist meta-ideological paradigm reversing centuries old political, economic, and cultural paradigms. This thesis has proven that human beings, though born devoid of ideological rigidity and naturally born Freemists, are taught systematically by societal institutions into orthodox belief systems generating strife, polarisation, and system failure. Freemism demonstrates the tremendous vulnerability of dogmatic systems and the acute necessity for an evolving, self-correcting alternative through the



examination of previous failures and inherent weaknesses of prevailing ideologies like communism, capitalism, fascism, etc.

In essence, Freemism promotes qualified intellectual freedom, moral accountability, and ongoing flexibility. It accepts the paradox of being an "anti-ideology ideology," employing this self-referential contradiction as a bulwark against dogma and ideological rigidity. This position makes Freemism not a substitute ideology but a malleable toolkit that enables individuals to build, dismantle, and transform their own belief systems through reason, experience, and moral consideration.

The research's multi-disciplinary approach—integrating philosophical investigation, political behavior research, and historical comparative case studies—is a sound base for the theory and practice assertions of Freemism. The ideological deconditioning model for individualized belief-system design is an explicit map leading individuals toward recovery of their intellectual autonomy. Moreover, the metric suggested, for example, in the form of the Ideological Autonomy Index, and initial pilot applications to education and public administration reveal the potential of Freemism to engage with reality.

While recognizing pitfalls including possible social coordination problems and fragmentation threats, this thesis contends that Freemism's focus on ethical responsibility and principles of non-harm can create cooperative, peaceful societies without recourse to strict dogma. Through ideological fluency and fluid consensus-construction, Freemism presents a feasible alternative to the polarization and systemic shortcomings of much of today's political life.

In summary, Freemism is a revolutionary concept of the human future and a new way of thinking about how societies should think and organize. It demands a change of paradigm—from passive receiving of inherited thoughts to active and continuous building of individual and social worldviews. With societies developing increasingly complex, interdependent issues, Freemism's values of freedom, harmony, and responsibility hold great promise as a framework for constructing viable, inclusive, and adaptive communities. This book offers further investigation, empirical testing, and practical experimentation to unlock the full potential of Freemism as a driver for post-dogmatic human thriving.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Stanley, J. (2018). *How Fascism Works: The Politics of Us and Them*. Random House
- [2] Piketty, T. (2020). *Capital and Ideology*. Harvard University Press
- [3] Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. (2024). Socialism (rev. ed.)
- [4] iResearchNet. (2023). Communism Research Paper
- [5] Gordon, U. (2008). *Anarchism Reloaded*. School of Environmental Studies, Tel Aviv University
- [6] A Noel, A., & Therien, J.-P. (2008). *Left and Right in Global Politics*. Cambridge University Press
- [7] Sunstein, C. R. (2009). *Going to Extremes: How Like Minds Unite and Divide*. Oxford University Press
- [8] Stanley, J. (2018). *How Fascism Works: The Politics of Us and Them*. Random House