

Posterity

The Risks of Biding the Future
to the Ideas of the Past

A Philosophical Inquiry

Salim Maloof, Ph.D.

Copyright 2017 by Salim Maloof

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise without permission of the author

No commercial use could be made of this book and no part thereof should be translated into any language. This book should not be circulated in any binding form by anyone, including an acquirer.

Suggested Citation: Maloof S., Posterity: The Risks of Biding the Future to the Ideas of the Past, 2017

This is a work of non-fiction.

Salim Maloof
Posterity:
The Risks of Biding the Future
to the Ideas of the Past

For more information on reproducing section of this book or sales of this book,
go to:

Center for Modernity Planning and Assessment
www.centermpa.com

To Roula Maloof

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Motive that propelled the author to prepare this work	
Special Note to All UN Member States	
Special Note to All Staff Members of the United Nations	
Special Note to All People of Faith	
Definitions	

PREFACE

1. Chapter 1	24
2. Chapter 2	33
3. Chapter 3	51
4. Chapter 4	64
5. Chapter 5	73
6. Chapter 6	92
7. Chapter 7	105
8. Chapter 8	117
9. Chapter 9	125
10. Chapter 10	139
11. Chapter 11	149
12. Chapter 12	161
13. Chapter 13	175
14. Chapter 14	192
Bibliography	243

Motive that propelled the author to prepare this work (this text was revised in 2022)

In 2013, a US national was working for UNOPS (a subsidiary organization of the general international intergovernmental organization named the United Nations) in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC). He expressed reservations against UNOPS approving a project in the DRC, which UNOPS negotiated directly with the prime minister.

The government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo was going to finance the general organization named the United Nations (UNOPS) to implement on its behalf a project worth \$25 million. After the government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo deposits the money into the UN bank account, the United Nations will withdraw its administrative fee, and then it will use its procurement rules to justify waiving open competition and recruit a line ministry within the DRC government to implement the project, redepositing the remaining funds back into the DRC government's bank account minus the UN fee. The DRC government does not have to justify in its own financial books how this money was spent because it was converted into a non-audit item. Afterwards, the government line ministry that received the payment becomes accountable to the United Nations. And since each UN agency runs its own legal and auditing house, it is easy to fix the paperwork to make everything legally clean. The project involved opening 2000 km of roads with bridges and culverts in 2 years in the eastern Congo (a war zone area).

When the US national reported the irregularities in this project to his supervisors, they informed him that the organization would review the situation and take appropriate action. Then his supervisors gave him two choices: wait until his contract expires to go home or accept to temporarily relocate to Sudan. He was also told by his supervisor(s) that if he succeeds in growing the Sudan office in Sudan, the organization will help him achieve his career goal of becoming a UN

Resident Coordinator. UNOPS signed the project with the government of the DRC, which was negotiated after his departure for Sudan. However, a few months later, the project was cancelled, and the United Nations returned the money back to the government.

In Sudan, the US national committed the same mistake he did in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. This mistake was prioritizing the work program of the founding fathers of the UN over his self-interests. He objected to the decision of the Department for International Development (Dfid) [now called the Foreign Commonwealth & Development Office] of the British government to finance a project in Darfur worth 10 million euros, in which Dfid (the British government) wanted to bluntly violate the UN financial rules and regulations.

To avoid the financial loss that the United Nations (UNOPS) was going to incur in terms of administrative fees after DFID (the British) made it clear that it was not going to finance this project unless the conditions it was asking for were met, the supervisors of this US national placed him on administrative leave in 2015 to investigate a claim that they said was launched against him by one of his staff.

While on administrative leave and before UNOPS told this US national what charges were leveled against him or by whom, his supervisors informed him that the organization was restructuring and that it was not going to be using his services when his contract expires. However, in the same contract termination letter, the United Nations (UNOPS) invited this US national to apply to fill the position he was temporarily filling in Sudan, which was downgraded. Next, the United Nations Office for Project Services (UNOPS) administrators (i.e., his supervisors) sent the US national a letter informing him that the organization had cancelled the investigation. The United Nations did not tell the US national what charges were leveled against him, who filed a claim, interview him, or follow any of the UN rules and regulations in cases of misconduct while he was on administrative leave.

When the US national lost all hope of persuading his supervisors to reconsider, he filed an application in the United Nations courts seeking damages for libel, rather than for his termination. At the start of the

legal proceeding, the UN judge asked the United Nations (UNOPS) to resolve this case with this US national outside the UN court. The United Nations (UNOPS) made an offer to the US national, which also included regulating outstanding issues related to his pensions and health insurance, including offering him a new two-year retainer contract.

The US national refused the offer of the United Nations (UNOPS) because it did not include assisting him to pursue his career goal of becoming a UN Resident Coordinator, as was initially agreed. The court hearing proceeded. Surprisingly, the United Nations court system, after hearing all the details of the case, dismissed the filed application in 2017. The reason for the dismissal was justified on the basis of a rule that requires any staff member who rejects any decision made by the United Nations to submit his objection within 60 days.

To put it differently, the United Nations court dismissed the application of the US national and denied him the right to any claim because he did not question within 60 days the decision of the organization named "United Nations" placing him on administrative leave and waited until his supervisors informed him that they had cancelled the investigation to put into question his rights. Said differently, the mistake this US national made was his decision to practice tolerance as the preamble of the UN Charter counsels and not use his legal right to put into question why the organization named United Nations was placing him on administrative leave; it cost him his right to any claim! That is to say, had this US national exercised his legal rights (practiced intolerance), his chances to secure them would have been higher! In other words, the United Nations requires individuals to abandon tolerance in order to have any rights and instead encourages them to be intolerant!

The victors of WW2 granted the United Nations privileges and immunities. UN staff and individuals victimized by the United Nations cannot have their cases heard in civilian courts. All cases are heard in UN courts. This US national can go nowhere to claim his right as long as the victors of WW2 do not amend the UN Charter!

In 2022, a corruption ring involving UN managers who exploited the UN as a facade for their malicious activities was exposed and

dismantled; these managers had targeted this same UN staff member who refused to prioritize his self-interests over the values outlined in the UN Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights before. UN member states chose not to request the imprisonment of those UN managers alongside the UN judges who protected them; instead, they accepted the UN's decision to end the contract of those managers while allowing them to keep all their wealth, health insurance, and UN pensions. Likewise, instead of UN member states requesting that the United Nations Secretary General reopen the case of this UN staff member to ensure he is compensated for the suffering caused by his refusal to participate in their unethical schemes, they believe that allowing this intergovernmental organization to ignore the case will help preserve their own power, wealth, and status.

Throughout history, people with considerable power have been denying the weak right, and so the way the intergovernmental organization named the United Nations, and in particular, the judges of the UN courts handled this case, is not new. What is new, however, is that this case once again confirms the elusiveness of seeking shared values by assigning a formal intergovernmental organization, like the United Nations, the role of custodian of morality and human rights while its administrators simultaneously pursue their own personal development. Throughout history, kings or kingdoms were reverted to a simpler form when they allowed false teachers to manipulate institutions or whenever those false teachers disliked the outcome.

If everything is relative, the victors of WW2 should be aligned to face the same end that the US national had to yield to at the hands of the United Nations (organization) in the course of time and things. In other words, if the decision of the US national to prioritize the philosophical ideas that the victors of WW2 laid out at the end of this global war over his self-interests led to his reversal to a simpler form by the United Nations (organization), the outcome then signifies that this organization should be reverting the United States and the victors of WW2 to face the same end in the course of time and things.

The purpose of this work is to establish if the families/dynasties that control the United States (the custodians of the idea of freedom) and the families/dynasties that won WW2 (the custodians of the

Anglosphere) could continue to transform the conditions and outcomes that matter to them while the administrators of the United Nations (the organization) have converted this global council into a market to buy and sell that is not any different than the one Jesus found was taking place when he visited a temple. Alternatively, if those aforementioned powerful families/dynasties should amend the UN Charter, thus granting any person whom the general organization named the United Nations victimized the right to have his case heard in civil courts, in this way, it would be avoided that the United Nations (organization) continue to disintegrate their power until a new authority absorbs them and starts to build on top of their civilizing mission.

Special Note to All UN Member States

This work is a treatise. It is an inquiry into the potential causes that triggered the apparent failure of UN member states to prevent conflicts and to make future wars impossible after World War II.

This work was not prepared to criticize the social order that ensued in the aftermath of WW2 or any government that came to power in the aftermath of this global war. This work is also not intended to provide any UN member states with ideas on what their leaders, thinkers, or populace should be doing or not be doing to prevent conflicts or strengthen peace. Likewise, the purpose of this work is not to share a view on how to social engineer the world to give the best results, nor was it prepared to suggest what leaders or nations should do or not do to maintain their strength and stability.

The victors of WW2 (the families/dynasties that control the international order or the money supply of the world) granted rights to the international intergovernmental organization named the United Nations (UN) to be an economic operator and to provide economic, political, social, and cultural solutions in UN member states, while UN employees are enjoying immunities and privileges.

This work was prepared for the sole purpose of understanding whether or not the international intergovernmental organization named the United Nations could revert to a simpler form, the victors of WW2, in the same way the Catholic Church managed to revert the rulers of the Roman Empire to one. The main aim is to understand whether or not the victors of WW2 would be able to continue to solidify their power while the staff of the organization named United Nations are plundering, abusing their authority, denying people rights, and most importantly, violating the fundamental principles that this organization was created to help protect.

I am, therefore, trying to form an opinion on whether or not the families/dynasties who won WW2 could continue to maintain their strength and stability while UN systems are feeding part of their decision-making process or if the strategies that the UN systems are

determining and implementing on their behalf in UN member states could result in their resizing. Specifically, I want to know if the heirs of the families/dynasties who won WW2 could consolidate their wealth, power, and status while the international intergovernmental organization named the United Nations (along with international aid organizations, NGOs, charities, and all those who believe that they should dedicate themselves to the service of their neighbor) is using their awareness to put into question how natural and legal rights should be distributed instead of doing what the founding fathers of the UN suggested, which was to let governments provide parameters for everyday behavior only. The implications of letting the intergovernmental organization named United Nations promote that it was going to end poverty and injustice in all their forms by 2030 (or at any later date in the future), and most importantly, letting this authority be in charge of such a dossier on the maintenance of the security and power of the families/dynasties that won WW2 are also studied.

As the above shows, this work was prepared for the sole benefit of the victors of WW2 (the families/dynasties who control the international order or the money supply of the world) and their heirs, and its content should not be interpreted to mean that it was prepared for the attention of any person, society, government, monarch, or nation, or for the intention of criticizing anyone.

Furthermore, one should, while reading this book, bear in mind that the intentions of the author are not to discredit, appraise, or criticize any UN member state. Nor are the intentions of the author to criticize the performance of any UN member state, regime, government, or ideology, including who governments decide should live or die or whether mankind should go back to adopting pre-1945 political dogmas or continue to strengthen democracy.

In addition, it is very important that readers keep in mind while reading this book that the reason why certain regimes or certain countries are mentioned and others are not has nothing to do with the intention of the author to criticize the referenced or analyzed countries. The world is composed of 193 UN member states. This means there are today 193 different political (and economic) systems whose architectures do not resemble each other. In principle, all the UN

member states are supposed to be strengthening democracy and the rule of law using liberal interventionism or the self-determination philosophy that was prescribed in the international rule-based postwar world order that was laid out at the end of WW2, but no nation is doing it, including the United States (the principal custodian of those two philosophies). The only reason why certain countries (regimes) are mentioned and others are not is due to the author perceiving that the way the political, economic, social, and cultural culture of those mentioned countries captures better the issues and ideas that he (the author) wants to build his arguments upon. It is very important that readers who originate from countries mentioned in this work, such as Lebanon and others, know that it is not the intention of the author to discredit your countries, the people of those two countries, the past or present leaders, or the past or present politics adopted.

The author's goal is to show, as I said above, a view that could have a bearing on the reason for the failure of the victors of WW2 (the families/dynasties that control the international order or the money supply of the world) to prevent wars between nations, including the failure to make people surrender their freedom to cooperate based on the work program that was specified in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The main aim is to provide to those powerful families/dynasties (and not the nations who won WW2 or UN member states) constructive criticism that, in the opinion of the author, they should not ignore if they do not want the fate that happened to the rulers of the Roman Empire to happen to them (i.e., their heirs).

The views expressed here are those of the author only and should not be interpreted as those of any organization that the author was affiliated with before or today.

Special Note to All Staff Members of the United Nations

An idea does not consist of physical matter. Ideas are visualizations. However, an organization is a legal entity (an artificial person) that real humans operate.

All references to the word “United Nations” in this study could mean (i) the idea that the victor(s) of WW2 came up with during World War Two to “unite” existing nations to maintain collective peace and security; and (ii) the formal general intergovernmental international organization named United Nations (UN), which the different UN member states created in the aftermath of WW2 and tasked with coordinating the work included in the UN Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

This work is a treatise. In this present work, the author is trying to understand if the United Nations (as an idea and a class action) or the United Nations (as a legal entity or an organization) is threatening the capacity of the victors of WW2 (the families/dynasties who control the international order or the money supply of the world) and is preventing them from maintaining their strength and stability as Judaism, Christianity, Islam, Hinduism, and others did on the kings of the earth, the princes, the generals, the rich, the mighty, and everyone else, or not.

While reading this book, one should bear in mind that the author recognizes that many UN staff are wholeheartedly working at the United Nations (herein, the organization) to attain the goals specified in the UN Charter and that their efforts have made lots of constructive contributions to deepening peace and security in the world. The progress the United Nations (hereinafter the organization) has made to contribute to human development is impressive. The purpose of the author is not to discredit the efforts or achievements of the UN staff and, henceforth, the results they achieved to secure the goals stipulated in the preamble of the UN Charter.

On the other hand, it is important that UN staff also know that after the victors of WW2 (the families/dynasties that control the international order or the money supply of the world) approved that the United Nations (the organization) become an economic operator, its administrators are taking advantage of the idea of good to plunder, steal, launder money, accuse people erroneously, deny people rights, and most importantly, use the UN courts to destroy people's livelihoods, just as Ferdinand II, King of Aragon, and his wife Queen Isabella I of Castile were doing in the late 15th century/early 16th century in western Europe. Those bad apples at the UN (supervisors) are not able to balance their interests against the interests of the common good because they are not working in their roles to satisfy the best interests of society only but to deepen their own. The disregard and contempt that UN supervisors and UN judges are prompting could compel people to lose faith in this institution, thus deepening fear and want and justifying why we need to go back to cooperating based on pre-1945 political doctrines.

The purpose of this work is to understand if the victors of WW2 (the families/dynasties that control the international order or the money supply of the world) could prevent their collapse after they allowed the United Nations (hereinafter, the organization) to be operated in the same way people on the outside of the UN fence do.

Special Note to All People of Faith

This work is a treatise. It is an inquiry into the continuous denial of man of the ideas that are included in the biblical scriptures (which are different than the question of whether God created the universe or not) and man's ongoing search to explore new methods to improve connectedness, when in theory all the ideas that newborns are coming up with are nothing but a different way of saying what is already mentioned in religious scriptures.

The present work is exploring the impact of man's ongoing conviction that it is possible to rely on the ideas prescribed in the religious scriptures and, at the same time, let human imagination convince human ingenuity that it could escape from the danger that the scriptures say would happen to the person who thinks that he or she is exempt from the appeal that such scriptures tax. Said differently, the work is exploring the impact of man formulating continuous work programs that prioritize the idea of good and then thinking that the idea of good could be used to solidify one's own power without the person who is relying on such an idea having to enforce them on him (her) first.

Specifically, the work is examining the impact of man's decision (i.e., human imagination) to diminish the role of religiosity as a tool for controlling behavior in the aftermath of World War II, allowing technology (machinery) to take on the majority of the responsibility. In this regard, and if we are to consider that in theory there is no difference between having a machine deny a person a right and having a real person do it (i.e., enforce the law), the author is trying to understand if the moral degradation that the world would be knowing consequent to man stopping to use human reason as a principal interlocutor to improve well-being would help the families/dynasties that control the international order or the money supply of the world (i.e., the victors of World War 2) to maintain their strength and stability, or if it would revert them to a simpler form. In other words, the author is trying to understand if the decision of the victors of World War II to undermine the values that are included in the religious

scriptures could help them get their way despite the resistance of others.

While reading this book, it is important to remember that the author's intention is not to discredit or criticize any religion or faith, to disprove any belief, to instruct readers on whether to have faith in a particular religion over another, or to question any facts presented in any religion or religious text. Likewise, I am not trying to tell you what the ideas or prophecies that are included in the biblical scripture should mean to you or in your particular faith and/or if you should believe in them or not. I selected and analyzed all the biblical references solely because I believed they contained ideas that could help me better understand whether the decision made by the victors of World War II (i.e., the families and dynasties that control the international order and the global money supply) to act against the counsel of those chosen scriptures was wise for maintaining their strength and stability.

In publications in which the Prophet Muhammad (upon him be peace and blessings) is mentioned, Muslim writers follow his name by the phrase 'upon him be peace and blessings.' Whenever I mention the name of the Prophet Muhammad (upon him be peace and blessings), I do not include this phrase in this work. Readers who adhere to Muslim faith should understand that it is assumed and that no disrespect is intended.

Definitions

The victors of WW2 (or powerful families, or most powerful families, or families/dynasties who won WW2, or families/dynasties who control the international order and the money supply of the world, or elite families/dynasties): This word shall refer to the group of men who stand to lose the most if their wealth, power, or status is taken away from them and placed in the hands of another group. This group of men exercises their power by presiding over the money supply of the world and the international order. In other words, this group of men owns and controls the system that determines the value of money, ensuring that no transactions occur on any operating platforms except for the one controlled by its members. To perceive how this group exercises its control over the world, one must regard its members as being nothing other than the people who own and administer the wire that feeds electricity into homes from the street. People would be living in darkness if they did not connect to this wire to have light. In theory, the members of this club can only be the families/dynasties that preside over the different religions; hence, no authority can outlive the authority of the group of people who rely on the idea of good (i.e., the idea of God) as a tool to solidify their power. The elites (the families/dynasties that control the international order or the money supply of the world) preserve their power through the rich countries, or the five permanent nations of the UN Security Council.

Five permanent nations of the UN Security Council: This word shall refer to the countries that provide legal functionality for the architecture that the elite families/dynasties that won WW2 want every member of the human family to respect. In other words, those five nations are the countries that legitimize the social contract (natural and legal rights) that the victors of WW2 want all people to respect. In principle, those five countries are a group of rich and poor nations that the families/dynasties that won WW2 want other societies to consider their opinions before taking action of their own. The families/dynasties that control the five permanent nations of the UN Security Council are not necessarily the families/dynasties that control the international order and the money supply of the world.

Rich nations (rich countries): This word shall refer to the countries that provide financial functionality for the architecture that the elite families/dynasties that won WW2 want every member of the human family to respect. In other words, they are the countries that own the companies through which most of the world's trading is handled as well. Until the end of WW2, those countries were based in Western Europe, and the families/dynasties that won WW2 used to make those countries their home bases. The principal job of the government in those rich nations is to induce the atmosphere that will determine which market is to fall and which one is to grow, which nation is to be engulfed in a civil war, and which country is to stay in peace. In other words, they pull the strings and levers that determine which nation has power or wealth and which one is engulfed in instability.

Nations that won WW2: This word shall refer to the western European monarchs and republics. It was the Old Powers (the western European monarchs and republics) who fought during WW1 and WW2, and they were the ones who won those two global wars. In real life, no society, kingdom, or nation that waged a war and won gave its spoils to another society or kingdom. In addition, the Western European monarchs and kingdoms started working to build wealth, power, and status at the start of the 2nd millennium and did not start to build military before WW1 or WW2 erupted. This work regards the role of the United States as the global policeman of the world, a functional role delegated to it by the families and dynasties that control the monarchs and republics in Western Europe. In other words, the United States is fronting on behalf of the families/dynasties that control the western European monarchies and republics, just as law enforcement agents front for the families/dynasties that control governments in any country.

Banks, large financial institutions, or corporations: This word shall refer to the legal organizations that the rich nations depend on to ensure that people are routing the money that created things through such service providers. Governments regulate the power of banks, large institutions, or corporations, and vice versa. All the wealth that banks, large institutions, or corporations gain comes from investment in research financed by governments.

Governments: This word shall refer to the structure (legal entity) that determines and enforces the natural and legal rights that people legitimize. Banks, large institutions, or corporations regulate the power of governments, and vice versa. All the wealth that any nation acquires gets determined by the families/dynasties that won WW2 through the rich nations. In other words, the families/dynasties that won WW2 decide which country to inject money into to increase its productivity, might, etc., and which country to build within it or next to it (i.e., in a neighboring country) competitors to weaken its government and impoverish its people. The families/dynasties make this decision based on how the balance of power is shifting within a nation and between nations as a function of progress.

Global policemen of the world: This word shall refer to the United States. In this work, the United States is not regarded as a member of the club of rich nations or the powerful families/dynasties that won WW2. The United States is viewed as a satellite state that the rich countries and the powerful families/dynasties control. In the aftermath of WW2, the families/dynasties that won this global war took on the global policeman responsibility that Great Britain was playing until 1945 and delegated its functionality to the United States. The job of the United States, acting as the global policeman, is to ensure that the social model desired by the families and dynasties that won WW2 is adopted in various UN member states in the aftermath of the war. This social model was summarized in the work program stipulated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

Leading by example: The phrase “leading by example” shall refer to two relations: political and economic. The political meaning shall refer to cooperation based on the principles set forth in the UN Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The economic meaning shall not refer herein to the readiness of the industrialized nations (the Italians, the Norwegians, the Germans, the British, the Americans, the Chinese, the French, the Russians, etc.) to follow the legal procurement rules during the implementation of projects. Rather, the economic meaning of the word “leading by example” shall refer to the preparedness of the rich and industrialized nations to ensure that no newborn stays idle. This can only happen when the industrialized nations and the rich nations recognize that all that people do on earth is

create material things to improve basic social services (water, health, and food), transportation, and communication, and that there is a vast empty space on earth that, if exploited and inhabited, would make fewer people live in fear and want. This shall mean that industrialized nations give the nations whose people are idle the blueprint (technology) that can show them how to build tunnel boring machines, pile driving machines, etc., to enable them to interconnect mountains or explore the sea (build submarines, roads on the surface of the sea to interconnect the world through such a network, build tall buildings in the middle of the sea, build large boats, etc.), thus preoccupying them with building instead of being devoted to stripping them of their power.

United States: All references to the word “United States” in this book could mean (i) the United States, as a philosophical idea as penned in the US Constitution about how “all men having been created equal” by the founding fathers of this country, which they named the United States; and (ii) the territory located in North America, which is known as the United States, and whose inhabitants depend on the idea “of all men having been created equal” to get their ways despite the resistance of others. This idea that the founders of the United States penned about “all men having been created equal” is the final axiom in man’s ongoing search to enhance morality. Its power to help mankind strengthen the idea of good was incomparable from 1776 to 1945. This idea enabled the American people to develop an understanding of themselves unprecedented in the history of the world. If American culture were endangered, later generations could not prosper. Any criticism or compliment expressed shall not mean the need to have this country promote nationalistic ideas intended to deepen the hegemony of this country over the international order, but rather to maintain the understanding that the American people have gained of themselves as compared to other societies around the world. This is because it is this understanding (awareness) that led them to be in favor of the idea that the WW2 war aims be to secure that all people live free from fear and want, instead of being in favor of extending domination.

PREFACE

Nobody knows when people began to develop religious thought to prove the existence of God or to be concerned with man himself and how he should behave. People are being fruitful, multiplying, replenishing, subduing, and having dominion over all the living and nonliving things that move on earth, including being concerned with big questions about the universe, without giving any consideration to the ideology that, in the story of creation reported in the Old Testament of the Bible, it is acclaimed that God commanded humans to establish social order on its basis. This ideology is based on man refraining from knowing good or evil in order to live (Genesis 2:17).

People's defiance has led them to adopt a system of thought that divides them into the categories of oppressed and oppressors. People have also divided themselves into believers and disbelievers as well. Under each opposing relationship or stance, they formulated laws, jurisprudential theories, political stances, standards, and so forth. Most importantly, those who considered their system of thought to be rooted in the idea of belief pledged to support the oppressed against the oppressor, but without upholding God's word on earth.

In 1945, the people of the world managed to align their mindset, understanding, and awareness with the standards suggested in the UN Charter or the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR), in the hope of securing the goals, paths, and mechanisms outlined.

For various reasons, people were unable to turn the beliefs they expressed in the UN Charter or the UDHR into tangible outcomes. People persisted in their beliefs, but they struggled to convey their projects in a manner that would alter others' perspectives, foster respect, and encourage commitment to shared plans.

Accordingly, what has been uniting people's hearts since 1945 is technology and science. People believe that technology and science can organize their relations much better than through reliance on truth and righteousness.

All the tools people developed, including money spent to win each other's hearts, failed to make the weakest consider the fittest's opinion before acting, except when morality was involved. Technology and science create a leading class and a following class. Knowledge and power concentrate in the hands of the elite class. Knowledge and power can lead individuals to turn away from truth and human rights. However, while science and technology do not change reality to align with the conditions of the leading class, truth does.

The book *Posterity* attempts to show that human ingenuity doesn't know how to distinguish between good or evil, contrary to what humankind believes, and that humankind continues to make the human condition a mental struggle between good and evil. This prescription will hinder humankind from reaching the ultimate goal of seeing people voluntarily or by virtue of a system of governance manage to attain an ideal state in which all nations and people exercise tolerance, a prerequisite for the maintenance of peace and stability in the world.

The book also tries to argue that people's reunion around science and technology will fail to create the environment necessary to improve peace and security as religion did. On the contrary, the decision to leave the task of using science and technology to create an environment conducive to establishing relations based on the standards suggested in the UN Charter or the UDHR will not alter the historical dynamism that the world has experienced since antiquity; instead, it will increase division, particularly among those who pledge to uphold God's word on earth while failing to adhere to the criteria they preach and support the oppressed against the oppressor. This is because science and technology are speculative tools and not natural tools, as morality is. Science and technology do not make people loving and committed to preserving humanity, but morality does. Morality builds steadfastness and a positive spirit.

The purpose of the book is to invite the victors of WW2 or their heirs to reflect on the danger of leaving to posterity the promotion of constant ideological and ethical agendas for the preservation of their wealth, status, and power. The book argues that as people's awareness increases, the subsequent changes will dismantle the power of the families and dynasties that currently control the world, returning to a

simpler form, while new families and dynasties will emerge to take their place.

Human reproduction is a process that begins when two morphologically distinct types of specialized reproductive cells combine together to initiate human cells and the development of a new individual organism. The new organism develops to form an embryo. In human development, embryos develop into fetuses. A fetus is a prenatal human between the embryonic state and birth. Birth happens when the fetus is expelled from one of the mating partners' pouches and begins to feed and breathe on its own.

Immediately after birth, the new bare human requires nurturing and protection because it is not in an advanced state to feed itself. The new bare human is obliged to become an interdependent organism of the same species. This impediment, which prevents the new living human from being relatively mature enough to move around immediately after birth like some other species, makes them dependent on parental care for both survival and the development of awareness. Humans return from being precocial (capable of living without parental care) to becoming altricial (requiring care to survive) as they age.

The nourishment that the new bare human obtains helps the nearly helpless newborn to stay alive and aids the infant's physical body to grow. The human body's appearance doesn't stay small as per how it looked right after birth, but it stretches to a much larger size. However, the changes in body size don't remain constant when a person comes into being, and the human boundary stops growing as a person ages. The pattern of growth and development from start (birth) to end (death) could be called a life cycle. During the life cycle of any human, the deformation that the human body undergoes on the inside of the boundary is not visible. It is the outer physical deformation of

the human boundary that is visible. Humans cannot survive without continuously introducing food into their bodies. We can say that it is the food that people consume that makes a human body grow, and it is the variable that makes the human body age. No person has ever lived without food, so it is possible to determine whether the food people consume is responsible for their growth, cessation of growth, and aging. Humans do not know whether the food they depend on for survival and the subsequent decrease in human body growth were designed to work together. The aforesaid means that this structured and functional intelligent design that humans adhere to, its systematic order, could have been either programmed by a being or arrived at, depending on food to grow or function as such, by chance. However, if the human body needs something to grow and fulfill its cycle, and if food gives life, then only if the food prevents the aging process could it make sense to perceive that humans couldn't be the making of a being and are the result of a chaotic process that ended up producing humans by chance. This is because the human body is formless and void before birth. One's own "nothingness" can never come into "being" and mysteriously depend on something existent unless one is not born, and when a person comes into being, either characterization is one and the same.

This opinion cannot be true when one considers the facts. Humans are made up of both a physical body and the different organs that work together to allow the human body to be maintained. What people don't yet understand is the functional purpose for which the human body was created, how the human soul or spirit is programmed into the physical body, and where it goes when a person ages and passes away.

Therefore, the soul is not a process that originated by chance, especially considering that modern scientists have a more profound understanding of how new human beings are produced. The intelligent design must have programmed the soul to come to life in everything that makes the human body grow and made it manifest in the food or non-food items with which humans cohabit. In the case of human reproduction, for example, intelligent design programmed the soul to move in the reproductive cells, which gamete together to initiate the development of a new individual organism, which is a form of food.

In this respect, the intelligent design that humans yield to its order made the food that people consume provide life and take life by virtue of their decision to remain invisible. Humans can't be made immortal from natural materials, as they cause growth and aging. People are uncertain whether antimatter could be the solution to halting the aging process and achieving human immortality. Another method involves keeping the human cells healthy to expand longevity or starting to make human cloning become more accessible to allow people to harvest organs.

It may remain unknown and possibly unknowable how the physical world and the human body came together, but there are specific truths about their interactions. People are a mass that moves as one and can't be in two places at once. Until humans reach a point where we can explain our place in the universe or figure out how to stop depending on the natural world for sustenance, we will continue to face challenges. We could say that humans are a conserved quantity of mass that maintains its functional role by using its pre-programmed aptitude to continually process if the material the human body interacts with belongs to an animate or inanimate form of life. Humans need to continually carry out this process to develop systems and capabilities that allow them to correct the distortions that skew their analyses of benefits and costs to extend sustenance. People use their pre-programmed human ingenuity to correct the distortions that skew one's own analyses of benefits and costs. People need to engage their senses each time they choose to make use of their programmed human ingenuity. Human ingenuity works continuously to develop systems and capabilities that help the human body (its client) maintain its sustenance. Human ingenuity uses the human body's ability to speak and use complex tools to create and engineer shapes from both living and non-living objects, helping to maintain the body's sustenance. This is because human ingenuity is invisible all the time. The human body is the one that actually performs the work and interacts with objects outside of its physical boundary, especially when human ingenuity is unable to do so.

Moreover, humans' functional systems are programmed like all the rest of the living creatures with ingenuity to distinguish between safety and danger. Humans use their unique programmed ingenuity to reason,

speak, and use complex tools, enabling them to navigate interactions in nature that distinguish between safety and danger and to make decisions that result in unnatural changes in the world for either good or evil purposes.

People consider that the human body and human ingenuity are inseparable or, let us say, work together to unnaturally change matter; thus, a person is presumed to believe that all the changes humans make in the natural world are objective. Humans want reality to refer to something objective both when a person "comes into being" and when a person "passes out of being."

It is important to mention that people have the power to bypass the reality that their own pre-programmed senses transmit to human ingenuity, including going around the awareness that other people influence the objectivity of reality. People can ignore others' reasoning that shapes their view of reality, to feel powerful, and to see it as finished, especially when they are responsible for their death. However, the most common method people use to pressure each other into bypassing the detection of reality through their senses and human ingenuity is to use the sounds they make to justify the belief that reality is objective. In particular, people use the sound they make to compel others to perceive in their minds that because reality is structured, humans were created to provide unique benefits. Therefore, the ingenuity that people possess enables everyone to engineer, create, or craft shapes in reality and in imagination. The imagination of people can classify, rank, change, grant, and withdraw anything anywhere and everywhere, including seeing through any complex job they cannot understand or bring to fruition in person in reality to compensate for their powerlessness and to see it finished and operational in their head. In addition, all people can imaginatively detect or classify objects in their minds, which can extend beyond the physical realm. This ability lets people switch in their minds between making an animate object inanimate and vice versa or imagining they are the universe's creators. People take advantage of the aptitude of the mind to imagine making others believe that despite how change is always limiting, restricting, and adapting continuously to a new purpose in the nature of all existence, the purpose of human life is independent of this permanent changing cycle and is objective. Thus, expecting that whenever they

work, the imagination of people agrees on the likelihood of a specific realm through the sounds they make. This power allows individuals to influence others to agree and act based on the perceptions they create.

Each contiguous organ in the human body exhibits unique faculties within the overall human boundary. The ability of humans to reason, make sounds (or speak), and use complex tools to maintain sustenance drives people to be continually pursuing how to increase our ability to observe, adapt, and uncover new knowledge. When the human body is not resting, people's senses are dynamic and in motion, doing work or manipulating actions. When the human body interacts with objects, its abilities to reason and use complex tools serve as instruments that unnaturally displace or transform those objects, making them different in specific ways. People deform objects and adapt them to new purposes, but if they dislike the transformation, they label it as "social destruction" (or "evil"). The changes that people are pleased with, they call the opposite of social improvement (or good). Those two nomenclatures apply to the changes that objects are continuously undergoing on their own as well. Once again, in the absence of a coherent account of how the universe originated, pinning down the purpose of humans and the rest of all the living and non-living things that exist in the universe gives us a better perspective on whether the purpose of human life is something objective or not. The only program that humans can dedicate themselves to pursuing is to continue reproducing until further investigations conclude whether humans are a spinoff of a supernatural force that has privileged them with the ability to use complex tools or if this power was acquired by chance. Let us also add that the same uncertainty exists about where reality is heading or if the changes that we are continually observing lead anywhere.

As far as people who believe that a supernatural force or deity created the universe, they hold that the purpose of human existence is deliberate. The perception that was in vigor up until Greek philosophers campaigned during Greek antiquity to change people's perceptions of absolute truth. Historians and scholars report that the people who inhabited the earth during Greek antiquity had divided the human condition so it became a mental struggle between good and evil. Those people believed that every pattern in nature and every

action processed by their senses was part of a work plan created by different gods and goddesses.

However, either all the gods that people have venerated prefer to remain invisible or unseen always, or their absence is due to other constraints by the gods, who prefer instead to commission angels, prophets, offspring, specific people, messengers, and so on. In antiquity, the Greek philosophers campaigned to stop venerating different gods and goddesses for every phenomenon or element in reality, advocating instead for the grouping of all deities under a single monotheistic God. Certain humans managed to make the switch and adapt, so the claim they were making was that gods and goddesses had given them a mandate to stop interfering in the acquisition, management, and distribution of power and resources. However, the aspect of human behavior that remained unchanged when people began to believe in God—whether during the transition from venerating multiple gods to believing in one God—was the ongoing choice between good and evil, which requires individuals to actively choose to sustain goodness.

Let us put aside the claim royal made after the date when people preferred adopting a monotheistic form of a god as opposed to a pantheistic type, about their right to rule being directly drawn from the will of God and how the transfer of power to the new living human they bear is a sacrilegious act. Therefore, the actions of monarchs have not been subject to the will of people. Strangely, as of that date, people began to let awareness be a continuous choice between good and evil, making the purpose of the human condition to sustain goodness. Currently, both those who believe that the universe was programmed by God and those who think that humans are the result of evolution are unable to promote political or religious doctrines that would help people develop motivations capable of sustaining good or, in other words, distinguishing between good and evil and understanding the differences between them.

The widespread unwillingness among people to distinguish between good and evil and the difference between them continues to have a negative impact on the inalienable right of every member of the human family to live free from fear and want. So far, the different messengers

that God commissioned proposed to people that if they agree to manipulate their actions according to specific patterns, God is ready to offer to those who adhere to his commands eligibility to eternal life, which is something that doesn't appeal to people. Until now, people have wagered on eternal life instead of maintaining a close affinity with the guidance God prescribed as a reward for respecting His commands.

In effect, nonbelievers could also benefit from the invitation God is extending to win eternal life if they manage to adhere to the manmade laws derived from human reason, which relate to specific ethics, attitudes, or beliefs. This is because from the start of time until now, the laws that people develop, including the ones that God rushed to offer, pertain to how to stop the actions of any individual bound by his personal power and conscience.

Let us exclude the claim that certain individuals who identify as belonging to a specific race or caste, and who have been synchronizing their actions in nature from one generation to the next, are destined to fulfill God's prophecy. Similarly, the laws that these individuals manage to defend are often not in the best interests of the broader population. Thus, everyone else is forced to give up freedoms to follow rules that may not be in their best interests, as that group of people, in the name of God, demands. This situation is because those who see their role as the vigilante of God's interests and want everyone else to synchronize their actions accordingly are not the majority among the world's population.

Until now, only a handful of people have claimed that they are on a mission from God. Jesus Christ and some prophets claim that God spoke to them through messengers, not directly. Therefore, everyone else cannot claim that he or she is on a mission from God to reproduce or to promulgate ethical, political, or governance dogma on behalf of God.

Moreover, throughout the entire history of the world, people have never managed to overcome their willpower weaknesses, despite the efforts made to encourage everyone to choose to do good. Throughout human history, people have preferred to see themselves as more than

just programmed beings on earth, perhaps fulfilling a unique role. Instead, people desire to either draw closer to the everlasting path of unity with the creator or to create a new reality. There is nothing wrong with people pushing their programmed human ingenuity to address fundamental questions about our place in the universe. Perhaps this aptitude, which separates us from other creatures, was intentionally programmed into the human body for this purpose. The problem is that whenever an individual or a group of people develops wealth or practical and technical matters, they become more mindful of how to spread and widen power to either seek immortality or reaffirm faith in human rights and in conditions of stability and well-being. Unfortunately, no human being has been able to simultaneously spread and expand their power while adhering to the laws set by God or those created by people. The security of one person is the forgone security of the other. For this reason, from antiquity until now, people have been leaving to posterity the question of how humans could reach to emphasize the importance of the mind over the relative unimportance of the human body. Until now, people are not able to manage to improve each other's social security to allow peace and security, so not everyone finds himself living in fear and wanting despite all the good intentions that those people who follow their teachings have to do good in the world with actions.

Then, from when humans started to keep records until now. New people and technological changes have replaced the old, yet there has been no detectable change in human nature. Only new people continuously alter matter to create shapes from natural objects that enrich their lives. In addition, until now, all that people do is reproduce, and the other task is to transfer the material things they accumulate to designated new humans. Throughout history, people have disagreed on how to manage and distribute physical objects outside their sensory systems and the ones they shape. Many people believe human ingenuity is immaterial, so the scientific method could be used to test hypotheses to ensure this aptitude prevails over the weakness of the will, correcting the distortions that hinder its ability to distinguish between good and evil

Therefore, if it is true, it is the human body that interacts with physical objects and not human ingenuity. Likewise, if the question concerns

the relationship between natural and legal rights that people have developed, its primary aim is to formulate doctrines or establish ethical legitimacy for the optimal acquisition, management, and distribution of natural resources and material possessions.

Ultimately, human ingenuity has struggled to accept that all individuals possess natural desires, and this aptitude may need to willingly make concessions to do what is right. Otherwise, as people's disenchantment grows, they may begin to disregard the laws that all members of the human family rely on to maintain peace and stability in the world. This situation means that either human ingenuity fails to distinguish between good and evil, or the doctrine people picked—which makes the human condition a mental struggle between good and evil—is the wrong prescription for maintaining peace and stability in the world.

The intent of this book is to attempt to show that human ingenuity doesn't know how to distinguish between good or evil, contrary to what humankind believes, and that humankind continues to make the human condition a mental struggle between good and evil. This prescription will not help humankind to reach the ultimate goal of seeing people voluntarily or by virtue of a system of governance manage to attain an ideal state in which all nations and people exercise tolerance, a prerequisite for the maintenance of peace and stability in the world.

Reproduction regulates how much evil the world can sustain. At the same time, all of the means that people use to sustain their survival needs and to satiate their earthly desires exist because of reproduction.

Reproduction is therefore the trigger that sparks new human ingenuity; without it, many of the scientific advancements and industrial progress that we learned to be accustomed to seeing wouldn't exist. Yet, there is no need to dwell on the confusion; the accelerated injection of new humans adds to the confusion and increases the number of disenchanted people in the world, as the prevailing insecurity is a consequence of this phenomenon. However, people depend on reproduction for reasons that are more important than the confusion that an accelerated injection of a large number of new humans invites along. Reproduction is the prompt that people use to crank out the prospective inventors who are continually needed to find the origin of all things and to engineer all the tools and machinery that we use, including how to reach people so they can start to correct the distortions that skew one's analysis of the benefits and costs of sustaining good things. From antiquity and until now, the people who believe that a supernatural force or a God programmed the human body on earth and the ones who believe that humans evolved from here on earth and are related to apes on the tree of life are doing nothing but reproducing and hoping for a miracle that would make people start to act judiciously. From one generation to the next, both believers in a creator and non-believers hope future humans will change reality to make certain events possible. This approach would ensure that every member of the human family receives their inalienable right to goodness. People are also working on figuring out how to prolong longevity and stop the aging process.

Humanity's pursuit of extending longevity or exploring the natural world becomes futile in an insecure environment. Ultimately, we can conclude that people are anticipating two events that could lead to the cessation of wrongdoing, despite their genuine understanding of what is right. One is if God would intervene to stop people from continuing to do wrong or humans continue to reproduce until people manage, through the right human ingenuity, to figure out a way to stop people from letting their actions make others feel that it is depriving others from fulfilling the full development of their personalities.

We cannot know what peace and security were like on earth when the world's human population was lower than it is now in modern times. Since the invention of mediums to record thoughts and speech, half of what has been documented reflects people's failures to agree on how the earth's resources should be acquired, managed, and distributed. People could consider implementing birth control measures to reduce the demand for the resources they create or engineer, using their human ingenuity to slow down the race to ensure that their standards of living align with their personal expectations. Evidently, the concerns that people express over an apocalyptic event or climatic, natural, man-made, or medical/epidemic outbreak striking the world are real and present. The past outbreaks that humans have known showed that such a disorder can put humanity ahead of a real survivability test and that no member of the human family is immune. However, the real test of such a drawback is its potential to wipe out a vast amount of human ingenuity and delay people from figuring out how to sustain goods more effectively. Unmistakably, other dangers besides those we just cited also endanger human ingenuity, weaken the endurance of the human body, and could trigger a human race extinction scenario if not controlled. Wars, conflicts, disputes, hostilities, rivalries, feuds, crusades, and so forth can create the same outcome.

The opposition over power, property, material things, ideas, interests, and feelings that people exhibit each time they fail to be in agreement or accord results in people expressing their incompatibility in the form of discord, strife, conflict, contention, dissension, variance, and so forth. Usually, people exhibit their discord by quarreling or disputing,

which, when it remains irreconcilable, can result in the use of force. Each time people clash owing to a difference in nature, opinion, or interest, the opposing forces can settle their differences either antagonistically or diplomatically. When diplomacy fails, tolerance fails. When tolerance fails, the mission of human ingenuity becomes to sustain disregard and contempt.

In wars, battles, and fights, the point of contention often arises from the struggle for superiority or the conflict over differing interests among opposing individuals or groups. However, the variance that people exhibit, which many take for granted, has a significant drawback: it threatens human ingenuity, the primary casualty that suffers when individuals resort to force to address opposing views. The recurrent conflicts that people continually have could be considered by many to be part of human nature and, therefore, a necessity for arriving at any form of reconciliation. People who see wars and conflicts as a conventional aspect of human nature ignore the damage their actions cause by wiping out human ingenuity, a prerequisite for further evolution or development of mankind. It is human ingenuity that unveils what the objective nature of things is, including addressing fundamental questions about our place in the universe and not the human body. Putting human ingenuity at risk means denying and delaying the human race's ability to discover ways to prolong life, stop the aging process, and expose our technological civilization to the same threats.

The consequence of being an unsupervised and unmanaged species creates a context in which humans must continuously develop new practices to ultimately establish a wider and permanent system of general security for the world. There are two credos on whose basis people could formulate a wider and permanent system of general security for the world. One is a credo that was evoked in the Bible, whereby it is suggested that God proposed it. This credo from God warns people against distinguishing between good and evil to avoid unnatural death (refer to Genesis 2:17 in the Bible). The other credo is the one people practice, which is the opposite of the one in the Bible.

Under God's credo, a person should not seek improvement in reality so that all people remain equal and avoid destabilizing others' security, given that human nature makes one person's security the other's

insecurity. They think they are on a mission from God to improve the world by developing each person's personality or shaping the personalities of those who disagree with their views on how the world should be organized. God's motive for suggesting that humans refrain from knowing good or evil may have stemmed from his awareness that not all people possess equal abilities. God's preoccupation may have also stemmed from his awareness that when people begin to distinguish between good and evil, this ability could grant certain individuals an elevated status, which those with increased knowledge might then use to deny others the opportunities they believe they were created to provide.

Therefore, given people's historical decision to interact without structuring their relationship with one another and with the natural world on the basis of the conditions God laid out. People throughout history may struggle to understand that perhaps the purpose of human life is not to devote one's entire life to the civilizing mission. For how long must people continue to structure their interaction with one another and with the natural world on the basis of fixing natural and legal rights before humans conclude that perhaps man was programmed to function differently than humans' desired structure of the human condition, such as that based on a guiding philosophy? When will the knowledgeable and capable realize that the less powerful will reject the authority of those in established positions, since all humans have desires? When will those in power stop betting on what is needed for full personality development, since no one can overcome their will's weakness? The readiness of the people who have power and status to agree to let, after WWII, the people whose abilities are less advanced be entitled to the full development of their personalities on the basis of respect for the principle of equal rights and not on the basis of natural or legal abilities is a major milestone in the history of the world. However, can those in power and with status persuade individuals with lesser knowledge and abilities to agree that when the less fortunate are granted improved standards of living, the world will be just and secure, particularly when people view the human condition as a struggle between good and evil? Does making people pledge to respect and observe, after WWII, ideas and policies that function on making every member of the human family integrate into the absolute autonomy of markets and financial speculation

establish political morality or plunge mankind into a harsher degree of insecurity?

From antiquity until now, equality under the law bestowed privileges on the upper castes more than the lower castes, especially after the invention of coinage and monetary economy to facilitate wealth. People who grew up in substantial privilege or had a head start in education, health care, and finance, and who were born in the right environment, have trapped those with less developed power and practical skills in fixed social orders that are very difficult to escape. Throughout history, many people have relied on their power and practical skills to unify ideologies and expand their economic influence. Those people with such ambitions managed, through the spread of religious conversion, trade, colonization, invasions, and war, to extend their bureaucratic control, but the sphere of their influence always died and was displaced by people who possessed better scientific material production or natural ability.

Over the course of human history, the decision to leave the task of creating a polity that would unite people in peacefully establishing the right social order—specifically, to regulate the limits of individual personality development—has failed to achieve the desired improvements. Until now, despite all the progress that was made, people remain divided on correcting historical injustices and providing a level playing field to the traditionally disadvantaged.

If the intention of reproduction is to plug in new people, then those new ingenuities contribute to furthering understanding on topics that are important for the preservation of humanity and to answering the call of God. The crises, conflicts, fights, wars, and so forth that have been accompanying human history since time immemorial are major obstacles to attaining the goals on whose basis different people interpret the purpose of human life. Humanity's ongoing insecurity from one generation to the next may stem from its desire to live in opposition to the credo specified by God in the Bible. But again, if the intention of using the relation is on its basis, humans derived how to structure their interaction with one another and with the natural world, and that is to test whether people could manage to condition human ingenuity to split voluntarily between natural and legal rights so that

those who do not want to keep their greed or civilizing mission in check continue to plunge humanity into a pool of insecurity. How long will humanity experiment with new social or political philosophies before admitting that future human ingenuity cannot align humanity's relationship with the natural world and with one another based on how certain people want everyone to structure interactions with objects, and that is based on natural and legal rights? The natural right in this context refers to the entitlement to a legal right.

People could continue to allow the history of the world to be shaped by political entities that develop through either amicable or hostile means, only to later witness the decline and fall of mergers as new ones emerge. The question therefore revolves around whether people have practiced all possible social or political orders. Thus, people reason that if they continue to crank out new human initiatives to test, the likelihood of reaching and motivating behaviors that would be willing to seek political and ethical truths will increase.

Numerous issues and circumstances can lead to feelings of deprivation and unhappiness, which may result in disputes and even wars. However, we must set aside the idea that any rules, beliefs, or teachings from political decisions, governments, religious beliefs or practices, public activities, individuals, and so forth influence a person to act irrationally. Instead, focus only on two truth values: people and physical objects, both of which are continually changing and often unaware of whether the changes they perceive are real or illusory. In the case of human beings, only when a person's body is resting, not in motion, is it temporarily idle and not altering matter with the senses. When a human being is awake, the human body cannot remain idle. When a human being passes away, the living entity we refer to as a person stops altering matter unnaturally, and from that moment onward, natural processes take over and begin to change the human body according to the way this mass is programmed to function after death. If humans are programmed on earth, the future of the human soul is determined by a person's conduct. Then, it should be clear to everyone that those who use this lifeline to help others distinguish between good and evil have likely already determined their fate. This belief is because both God and Jesus Christ, who claimed to be his son, preached against people orienting their lives toward this civilizing

mission that we all spend our lives developing interests in and pursuing.

Now, people can either accept that reality was programmed by a god or, if they don't, see it as an evolutionary process. So far, we have tested organizing ourselves under social systems that either excluded religious communities from public employment or included them. Regardless of whether we chose God or evolution as the origin of reality, we have failed to triumph over the weakness of our will. We created kingdoms, empires, and states, and some of us even lived in stateless conditions; however, no matter which social, political, or economic system or guiding philosophy we chose and tested, we have failed to overcome the weakness of our will. In addition, even when people maintained relationships with each other through subjugation and domination to keep the political, economic, social, or educational preparedness of the exploited people low, did such a practice manage to improve peace and stability in the world? Lastly, it is important to note that only after people became united and agreed to work together under a global council did the new method currently being tested show any potential for making a difference. In fact, it appears as if peace and security were much more under control when people were living under subjugation, domination, and exploitation than when they started living without. Likewise, despite significant scientific advancements and industrial progress, the transformation aimed at improving people's standard of living did not seem to resonate with everyone, leading some to perceive the incentive to be more tolerant toward peace and security as unappealing. Instead, when we compare the challenges that people faced to meet their survival needs, many of which persist today, with the methods used by those living in the developed world, we observe a stark difference. People in the developed world often misunderstand how lucky they are to be born in the right place compared to those in the least developed countries. To the contrary, it appears as if the more knowledge and scientific advancement and industrial progress people register and accumulate, the more peace and security seem to diminish. The fragility, violent conflicts, crime, corruption, insecurity, evil behavior, contradiction, divergence, lack of awe-inspiring agreement, misuse of power over others, and the many other irrational acts of nature we just cited are all examples that seem to depict people's tendencies from one generation

to the next, which we are all condemned to live with and support. For example, instead of starting from antiquity, people should focus on genuinely curbing greed and corruption, as well as regulating the products they create to address their inability to overcome their willpower weaknesses. This way, we could ensure equal knowledge among people, preventing any group from feeling disadvantaged. Instead, people want to keep the things they produce liberal and expect others to regulate their will, preferring to institute that the human condition is a mental struggle between good and evil and any newborn human needs to start his life surrendering to this doctrine.

People could continue to focus on inventing new weapons of warfare that can threaten human existence on earth irrespective of age, sex, race, or religion in the same way the people who lived before us did, culminating in the Second World War that was fought not too long ago. Many innocent people had to pay the ultimate price during the past back-to-back wars until people managed to admit on their own that disregard and contempt for human rights were what caused the barbarous acts they lived through, which ended up even outraging the human conscience due to all the extreme destruction, aggression, and mortality that was observed.

The initiatives that people started employing as of when the First World War ended in 1918 to contain human rights violations and to encourage all members of the human family to work together to reach a point where everyone can live in an independent and secure world free from any fear and want have proven elusive until now. After one century has elapsed since World War One, the priority of the new generation seems less focused on cooperating to promote universal respect for and observance of human rights and fundamental freedom than on teaching these values to their newborns, as each generation was promised. In fact, it appears that people want to establish a common standard for all individuals and nations to aspire to, enabling everyone to achieve a life free from fear and want without having to forgo investments in military buildup and defense.

The weapons of mass destruction that some nations boast about and regularly use to threaten other nations, despite everyone having pledged to resolve any breaches of peace through peaceful means,

demonstrate that people are not truly united or committed to maintaining international peace and security, as all members of the human family expressed their resolve to do in the aftermath of World War II. In the ultimate analysis, the value of any hope is the sincerity of its spirit.

Pushing the boundaries of our scientific and technical limits to extend longevity will allow us to spend more time with our loved ones and finish the projects that old age cuts short. However, when people's longevity is prolonged, the extension of life will also increase the duration during which their actions are influenced by their power and conscience. The rise and fall of any polity will also modify the cycle of expansion and contraction. The latest scientific discoveries made recently in the medical and health care fields have helped a lot to prolong the average life span of humans. Scientists and researchers anticipate that the average life span will reach unprecedented levels in the 21st century.

As people begin to live longer, the civilizing mission and the responsibility that some believe they have to fulfill a divine purpose of ensuring social justice will also extend over a longer period. This means people's insistence on what they believe in will start to last longer. The longer people's lifespans are, the more social space and material resources they will be freezing. Could the conjectures and dogmas that humans decided to interact with one another on their basis lead people toward starting to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to peace or those perceptions when weaved into the explosive progress in science and technology that the dawn of the information age ushered in, widen the economic inequality that exists in the world, and create more perils than what has been known?

People's gestures incomprehensibly train human ingenuity to endure moral verities, but so far, the specific views, beliefs, attitudes, or values of those whom the world is privileged to host have not demonstrated that practicing any of these suggested perceptions would make the world more peaceful and prolong everyone's lifespan. In fact, those who opposed the views, beliefs, attitudes, or values of those who used their power to impose their dogmas and resorted to aggression or

violence to stop the impositions of others from squeezing their own perceptions or beliefs were the principal victims and losers.

But in this work, we are not specifically concerned with why people fail to create peaceful, just solutions to situations that might breach the peace. Rather, why did the people and nations who won the Second World War separate their war aims from nationalistic ambitions and prioritize moral objectives? In other words, they let all the colonized people and countries free and take responsibility for the development of their personalities. The people and countries who were freed and decolonized refuse to voluntarily surrender, integrate, and agree to develop friendly relations based on the views, beliefs, attitudes, or values of those who freed them and gave them the right to self-determination. By this statement, I mean to refer to the common program of purposes and principles outlined in the covenants of the Charter of the United Nations.

Therefore, what is of more concern to us during this ongoing reorganization of the world, which started in 1945, is not the abnormal conduct of certain people who are until now refusing to adapt and replace their current values, traditions, and emotions with thoughts and actions that are more rational. Rather, why did a good number of people tolerate all the oppression imposed on them while living under colonialism and involuntary domination? As of 1945, the nations and peoples who won the Second World War permitted the removal of economic barriers between nations and, most importantly, agreed to entitle every member of the human family to the free and full development of their personalities. The people and nations who were subjugated, dominated, and exploited—who should, in principle, be the most responsive to such an offer—continue to seek to unite their strength to maintain international peace and security. If we take the country of Lebanon, for example, this nation is only 10,455 km² and is inhabited by close to 5.8 million people as of 2015. We have no way of knowing how many political parties existed in Lebanon in 1945 when this country was granted independence. Currently, over a hundred Lebanese political parties are interpreting how citizens should coexist peacefully, competing with international efforts to promote economic and social progress, leading to a common program of goals and principles.

Thus, people cannot divide their freedom based on natural and legal rights, which would allow them to trust each other and deepen their sense of fraternity and fellowship, as all Lebanese are united in this regard. Likewise, many people prefer not to recognize that all reproduction triggers serve only as an end in themselves, as these actions merely awaken human bodies to eventually confront death. For this reason, it would be in everyone's interest, across all societal levels, to establish conditions that ensure justice and respect for the obligations arising from systems designed to promote the economic and social advancement of all peoples, until scientists and researchers discover a way for all members of the human family to live free from fear and want. Even if this situation means that the ambitions of some people may be minimized from how much a person expects to achieve through the free and full development of their personality. People hoard and brag about what they'll leave their kids, even though they know that the creativity they deny the right to be free and live without fear or want may be the key to extending longevity for all.

People may have many shortcomings in coming up with specific actions that would mark the advent of a world where humans can start to live free from fear and want. In this work, we plan to investigate how the laws and values that people depend on to establish political morality could be one obstacle. Specifically, we plan to investigate how the perception of the human condition as a mental struggle between good and evil, along with the belief that the purpose of human life is to sustain good, could be impacting the visions that humans continue to create for achieving a just and secure peace in the world, either negatively or positively. We want to examine how the laws that people claim were commanded by God, which humans use to establish political morality, may be trapping individuals into trying to force the human body to follow rules that human ingenuity was not designed to accommodate. Hence, not all the people believe that the universe was programmed by a deity. This human powerlessness to conform and to adapt to programs also applies to people's attempts to make the human body adhere to rational rules, which, even though it makes lots of sense from a logical perspective, could be antagonistic to the way the human body and human ingenuity were programmed to function.

This illusion that herein I am alluding to is the laws and values that humans depend on, which is one shortcoming in people's inability to subscribe to a program of purposes and principles, thus sparing any new living human from experiencing the scourge of wars or living throughout his entire life in fear and want and not in a just and secure world. This illusion was based on the belief that the people and countries who won the Second World War had moral aims, rather than nationalistic ambitions.

In other words, if the people and nations who won the Second World War in 1945 had not made adjustments in the interests of colonial people to ensure world peace in the future, peace and security in the world could have been different. By this statement I mean the people and nations who had won the Second World War started acting rationally. Since then, some Lebanese have not followed the common program of purposes and principles set by the nations that freed them. The Lebanese people diverged from the expected path and used this milestone as a justification for their right to self-determination, leading to the establishment of more than 100 political parties in their small country, which covers an area of 10,544 km². Then, in 1975, this situation escalated into a civil war that engulfed the entire country. This situation would be due either to the people and nations who won the Second World War taking an irrational act to free the Lebanese people or to the Lebanese people being, by nature, inhuman.

However, if, as we are saying, in 1945 the people and nations who freed the Lebanese people so they have the right to self-determination and they don't continue to have to live under alien subjugation, domination, and exploitation constitute a "good" act, then Hence, the Lebanese people, after they were freed, refused to subscribe to the common program of purposes and principles that the countries and people who won the Second World War invited them to take part in, which we said constituted a "rational" act, and instead, 30 years later, or in 1975, drove the country into a civil war, which constituted an "irrational" act. As of 1945, the Lebanese people began to use violent means to create the conditions necessary for achieving peace.

Hence, the lifespan of any human being could be 60-80 years. If a person was 60 years old when the civil war broke out in Lebanon in

1975, that means he would have been 30 years old in 1945. This means that the same person had lived half of his life under colonialism and the other half free from it. I have no way of knowing if, when a person reaches 30, he is realistically considered mature and equipped to measure and quantify in a meaningful way. Likewise, a person, when he reaches 30, becomes equally mentally equipped to tackle complex and demanding subject matter, including having the grasp of logic and reason required to work.

In the case of Lebanon, for example, the people practiced tolerance and lived together before 1945, when they were subjugated, dominated, and exploited and were engaging in what constitutes a “rational” act. After 1945, the same people who had been tolerant became intolerant and refused to get along, which constitutes an “irrational” act. The only change for the Lebanese people born in 1915 and 1945 is the type of common program of purposes and principles they were asked to follow.

The Lebanese people’s method for sustaining survival needs and satisfying earthly desires after 1945 remained the same as when they lived under colonization, compared to when they became decolonized. The requirements for food and material goods to sustain survival and satisfy earthly desires remained the same for the Lebanese people before and after 1945. The items that people rely on to meet their survival needs and satisfy their earthly desires remained commodities that were inaccessible to everyone, just as they were before and after 1945, including during the period when the country gained independence. In other words, how people acquired, managed, and distributed the things they used to sustain their survival needs and satiate their earthly desires didn’t change. What changed is that, starting after 1945, more technological and medical discoveries, knowledge, and food that could enrich people's lives and sustain the human body became accessible, whereas they had not been easily or readily available before that time.

I have no way of knowing if going ahead and making the war aims that the people and nations who won the Second World War moral instead of keeping them nationalistic ambitions so the Lebanese people would, as of 1945, have access to better health care and nutrition to protect the

human body is a rational act. However, I believe that any improvement aimed at preserving the human body also enhances human security, allowing humankind to harness its ingenuity to discover ways to promote longevity. As I said before, I think the decision of the people and nations who won the Second World War to make the war aims moral instead of keeping their nationalistic ambitions is "rational."

However, neither when the Lebanese people were colonized nor when they were decolonized did they agree to be united to promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom; the people of this country made their interactions with one another and with objects produce the required leverage so fraternity, peace, and security foster. Under either governance system imposed, the Lebanese people were not ready to make a switch, so they could condition their exchange with each other so it starts to exhibit attitudes known to prosper when people are in a period of peace. After the Lebanese people obtained their independence in 1945 and began to access previously unavailable resources, they started to behave more irrationally.

On the contrary, when we compare the period of Lebanese colonization to the time after 1945, when they began working together under a central governance system to regulate and expand access to freedom, it appears that people's feelings of being rivaled, deprived, and violated have increased rather than decreased. Since no person can claim that what he accomplishes or amasses in material things during his life is not something he brings along with him at birth, this attitude of feeling deprived and unhappy is abnormal. From 1945 until 2017, the Lebanese people continued to do nothing but act "irrationally," and the people who freed them acted "rationally," because, as we said, if they didn't make the WWII war aims moral, the people of this country would be drowned with social and economic problems and epidemics. If the Lebanese people born in this country since 1915 have not all become inhumane, then one of the factors preventing them from resolving their disputes peacefully may be related to the laws and values in place. Therefore, we can't know if the Lebanese people in this country since 1915 are inhumane, especially since I was born here. Likewise, we have no way of knowing if the people and countries who had won the Second World War in 1945 had acted rationally by making adjustments in the interests of the Lebanese people. This

conclusion is because if the people and countries who had won WW2 had kept the Lebanese people continuing to live under alien subjugation, domination, and exploitation, there is a probability that the people of this nation would have stayed acting "rationally." Therefore, if being human means a person born into such a body realistically cannot determine if his action tackles "goodness," and we cannot know if the people and countries that won the Second World War in 1945 acted rationally by making adjustments in the interests of the Lebanese people, even though their decision to decolonize Lebanon seems rational, then we are unable to judge the actions of the past. Since the Lebanese people began to create situations necessary for peace through violent means as of 1945, while others pursued the same goal through peaceful methods, we must consider the implications of their actions.

Unless, of course, the people who started to live in this country from 1915 until now are inhumane. And if God or a supernatural force didn't interfere, the Lebanese people would have started to become irrational in 1915. The only source of the Lebanese people's irrational behavior since 1945 was the opportunity to adopt the irrational laws and values of the countries that won the Second World War.

Before 1945, the laws and values practiced by people and countries led to irrational actions. After the Second World War, those people and countries started to act rationally. The Lebanese people are experiencing the opposite circumstances.

The laws and values that the winners of the Second World War followed were based on their own conscience, whether derived from religion or manmade. Likewise, the same can be said for the laws and values that the Lebanese people are also subscribing to.

Therefore, God has chosen to remain invisible, which means that it will never be known whether the laws and values that people attribute to deities, and on which they base their laws, truly reflect how God intended humans to interact with one another or if those laws were developed through human reasoning.

Then, as we mentioned, the decision made by the people and nations who won the Second World War to prioritize moral war aims over nationalistic ambitions was a rational one. Either human reason fails to distinguish between good and evil, or God has confused the people; the nations that won the Second World War chose to make the war aims moral instead of pursuing nationalistic ambitions. The former, not the Lebanese, proposed freedom to the people and nations that won the Second World War.

Therefore, since there is a good chance that human reason doesn't know how to distinguish between good and evil, it is important to adhere to the laws and values that this programmed aptitude generates and to ensure that humankind, either voluntarily or by virtue of a system of governance that prevents violence or warfare, reaches and maintains international order. This situation arises because human reason might be inadequately programmed to align with humanity's desired structuring and regulation of rules, norms, and interactions. This could also explain why the people from antiquity until now have never managed to live by the laws and values they developed.

Humankind may be trapped in the desire for every citizen to accept the challenge of human reason, providing benefits to our society so every member of the human family can live in an ideal state of freedom, peace, and happiness. Now, after observing the inability of human reason to voluntarily or willingly adhere to the laws and values it generates, we can see the consequences. We are all witnessing how human reason relies on exploring solutions through the machinery it creates, which forces humankind to overcome the weakness of the will instead of triumphing over it voluntarily.

In other words, people in antiquity were trapped by the laws and values that many criticize today as unjust and regressive. Those laws and values were established to ensure that the traditionally privileged maintained their advantages while preventing disadvantaged individuals from submitting to authority, whether that authority was a third-tier rule (God) or an impractical rule intended to justify the discipline of those who violated it.

Therefore, since we have two control systems that require sustenance, each in its own way, we must create the necessary conditions to promote social progress without making one person's security dependent on the loss of another's. One of those control systems is humans, and the other is the natural world. In the case of the natural world, the way this mass body is programmed to function, its sustenance seems to come from within. Until now, the natural system has appeared to be a fixed system, operating independently in relation to the two great lights and the positioning of the planets relative to one another. Regarding the control of human sustenance, human ingenuity appears to have a greater influence on managing the human body than it does on the natural world. However, in the case of humans, reproduction is the mechanism that produces new humans for a specific period of time. Reproduction is a mechanism that human ingenuity has power over. What human ingenuity doesn't want to have power over is the actions that people manipulate in the natural world until a person ages and dies, so the latter can then take over and control and regulate how it changes the carcass as per the way this control system is programmed to change such a body or mass. This control system means that to ensure the continuity of human life and progress, people have two options to consider if they wish to allow each new human the opportunity to develop their personality: One method could involve controlling and regulating reproduction, while the other method could focus on revamping the relationship between natural and legal rights, which serves as the basis for establishing doctrines or political legitimacy. In this context, humans need to improve their interactions with both the natural world and each other.

Controlling population growth can ease the pressure caused by people's inability to establish ethical or political truths, but it has the drawback of halting human progress, as it is human ingenuity that pushes the scientific and technical limits, not the human body. If the world hadn't experienced the population growth explosion that emerged after WWII, most likely the technological progress we see today wouldn't have occurred.

In this work, we examine how people's laws and values may hinder recognizing the mind's importance over the body's or senses' relative unimportance. People's decision to program what each newborn can do

during his lifetime gives certain newborns a chance to live a richer life, but this programming, of course, doesn't come free and requires mankind to continue paying a hefty price in return. This price is the delay caused by social systems that hinder people from discovering how to slow the aging process and extend longevity. Among the newborns who were not allowed to detect their existence and who faced the ongoing aggression and menace that people live with, there could be the human ingenuity we all seek to give the experience of being alive a better meaning for everyone. I expect that conducting this work will offer fresh perspectives on whether it is worthwhile to revamp the relationship between natural and legal rights, which serve as the basis for establishing doctrines and political legitimacy, or to maintain the current system. Let us continue to explore how everyone supports the ongoing commitment to dynamic human security, which has existed since time immemorial.

After World War Two, parents expected their children to follow the common programs and principles set up for them to avoid another similar event. Those parents expected that their children, and later their grandchildren, would reject the values, traditions, and emotions that existed before the war, and that over time, they would gradually reach a point where everyone worked together to achieve a just and secure peace.

Many demographic cohorts have since emerged, following the young men and women who grew up immediately after World War Two. The demographic group born at the turn of the century will soon have their chance to ensure that all the common programs and principles agreed upon at the end of the Second World War are upheld.

We have no way of knowing what specific challenges the young men and women growing up immediately after World War II, along with the other demographic cohorts that were barred afterwards, have resolved from among the many challenges that faced humanity in 1945, so the young adults who were born at the start of the millennium would tackle the rest. However, what we do know is that the commitments made by the parents of those young men and women who grew up immediately following World War II have influenced the readiness of their children, grandchildren, great-grandchildren, and so forth, to work together with others to promote peaceful solutions for situations that could lead to a breach of the peace, although this progress is not occurring as quickly as one might expect.

The young men and women who grew up immediately after the Second World War, as well as those born after 2 September 1945,

continue to uphold the traditional values that have been the foundation of humanity since time immemorial. This perspective is based on maintaining a cultural context in which civil war, transnational organized crime, interstate war, terrorism, threats of the use of weapons of mass destruction, increased divorce rates, high levels of unemployment, and other atrocities are widespread. The young men and women who grew up immediately after World War Two and were born in the 1940s are now between 70 and 80 years old as of 2017. Those individuals who are now nearing the end of their lives certainly hold varying opinions on how their efforts contributed to redefining traditional values that originated from the aspirations of their fathers, who believed these values would improve peace and security over time.

It is very difficult to quantify universal attributes that we could all be reaping the benefits of in terms of abundant levels of food, apparel, retirement programs, etc., 70 or 80 years from our collective efforts, which the young men and women growing up immediately following World War Two spearheaded, so we could say that the world is on its way to being more peaceful. This cohort was expected to be the first to reject the older values rooted in their parents' and grandparents' beliefs and practices, leading us to conclude that their efforts created an effective measure for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace. Instead, it is very difficult not to note close cultural similarities between the people who lived before the two back-to-back world wars and those who started living after. What precisely changed after WWII is increased consumerism and, depending on the social and economic conditions of the household in which a new living human is brought up, increased access to material things woven around the usage of communications, media, and digital technologies that make it appear as if this new cohort tends to desire nothing other than to be entitled and self-centered. In most parts of the world, the effect of making people desire nothing less than the free and full development of one's personality is the common principles and programs that our fathers arranged for us and fought two back-to-back world wars for so we could all be entitled to. This upbringing, which seems to reflect a liberal approach to politics and economics, has enabled the current generation to secure the common programs and principles that our fathers established at the end of the Second World War, allowing them

to replace older values with new ideas and actions that appear more rational. However, the main challenge facing the men and women who are currently responsible for safeguarding future generations is finding peaceful ways to address situations that could potentially lead to a breach of the peace. In other words, respect the programs and principles that our fathers suggested we keep in mind, and strive to ensure we are spared from experiencing the same disregard that has resulted in barbarous acts that have outraged their conscience, leading them to aspire to create a world in which everyone could work in it together on the basis of ensuring political morality.

If everything on Earth is relative, then it has always been so. In other words, before 1945, people relied on burning wood to prepare food, and now it is possible to prepare the same food using a microwave oven. The same can be said about how people communicate with one another. While the methods people used to prepare food or to communicate changed before and after WWII, how people survive remained the same. The demographic group born at the turn of the century now guards the resources people agreed to observe after the Second World War, as they did not experience a world war. The genocide, civil wars, intra-state wars, terrorism, transnational organized crime, etc. that are raging in many parts of the world—their threats refer to the same result that is produced in wars. In Syria's civil war, those who don't want to fight can emigrate to a safe neighboring country until the conflict ends.

Nine weeks after Nazi Germany was defeated during World War II and agreed to unconditional surrender, the Allies organized in Potsdam, Germany, a conference to decide on how to administer the postwar order in this country. During the same conference, the allies, on 26 July 1945, appealed to the Japanese to surrender in a document that became known as the Potsdam Declaration.

In this declaration, the Allies give an ultimatum to the Japanese to surrender to spare future military operations and warn that if Japan doesn't surrender, it will face "prompt and utter destruction." The United States dropped the first atomic bomb on the Japanese city of Hiroshima on 06 August 1945, less than two weeks later. The Japanese ignored the allies' request to surrender after the first atomic bomb

exploded over Japan. The United States dropped the second atomic bomb three days later on 09 August 1945. The next day, on 10 August 1945, the Japanese surrendered, leaving them with the task of burying an estimated 129,000 to 246,000 people who died as a result of the two atomic bomb explosions.

The powers decided to establish a postwar order to administer their relations, preventing a repeat of the barbarous acts the Americans subjected the Japanese people to. The powers' concerns about more countries possessing nuclear power are certainly legitimate; they desired that no future generation relive the dread of another world war to counter the dread of another barbarous act equivalent to the devastating acts their parents or grandparents endured, which outraged their conscience.

However, the only fundamental change that can be identified since the end of the Second World War in 1945 is that the entire human family has begun to practice promoting respect for the inherent dignity and inalienable rights of everyone to live free from fear and want. Currently, the demographic cohort is actively pursuing the common programs and principles agreed upon for maintaining peace and security in the world. Their efforts, similar to those of the young men and women who grew up immediately after World War Two, who constantly kept in mind the need to promote and practice these values, did not result in a substantive change in global security. Despite all the scientific advances and technological breakthroughs that now exist as compared to what the case was like at the end of the Second World War, there should be an incentive to motivate happiness. The mere choice of humans to desire a just and secure world is to motivate nothing apart from access to greater happiness. Strangely, the more people explore and the more scientific and technical limits scientists and researchers provide, the more benefits their discoveries bring to our societies. Many people are ready to come together to agree that access to knowledge and material things has increased in the hands of people compared to what it was like at the end of the Second World War. The more people's tolerance for peace and security diminishes, the more willing they are to commit human rights violations instead of abstaining from such actions to promote greater happiness. The young men and women guarding the political agenda agreed upon at the end

of the Second World War do not seem threatened by the inherent disregard and contempt for peace and security that our fathers and forefathers faced.

The young men and women who are supposedly now implementing the milestones that were agreed upon to save, in this case, their children and grandchildren from the scourge of war seem untroubled by their lack of resolve to promote respect for the common programs and principles that were agreed upon at the end of the Second World War. The goal is to work together to unite our strengths in promoting universal respect for and observance of human rights, as well as to reaffirm our faith in the worth of the human person and fundamental freedoms. After nearly eighty years of practicing friendly relations, the different efforts initiated to buttress these relations show that the young adults born at the turn of the century are now taking up the task of ensuring that people keep greed and corruption under control. Based on their upbringing and its principles, which are marked by a liberal approach to politics and economics, there is no support for the idea that the world will become a better place anytime soon. Despite all the efforts made, the promotion of friendly relations seems to be resulting in more segregation than integration or social cohesion. Most importantly, the coming together of people to work to promote social progress and better standards in larger freedom has achieved nothing apart from serving as an incubator for more human rights violations, greater, if not identical, to the ones that were lived before and during the Second World War. The aspiration to live in greater freedom appears to have died with the parting of our fathers and grandfathers, leaving us with only two options to pick from: either save the common programs and principles that our fathers suggested to spare our children and grandchildren from living the scourge of another world war or prepare to embrace the consequences.

This isn't the first time people have proposed programs and principles to strengthen moral aims and then failed to fulfill them. This practice has been ongoing since humans began farming the land for sustenance. Historians and scholars claim that before people took to farming, only in a few favored locations were people able to establish permanent settlements or communities. The absence of technology that could provide a year-round source of both marine and terrestrial plants, as

well as animal husbandry, forced people to remain constantly mobile and to stop at regular locations to meet their food needs. The lack of access to technology prohibited the accumulation of material things and wealth. There is so much that a person can carry when he is continually on the move. In fact, the lack of technology didn't only prohibit the accumulation of wealth. The collective efforts required to hunt and forage made people work together at all times. Most importantly, it freed people from having to develop or take part in programs and principles aimed at improving social conditions since they weren't dealing with income inequality or too much income equality. Their equality likely persisted until those who lived in prehistory realized that the human ingenuity they were programmed with possessed the ability to create programs and derive principles. So far, as of the date humans took to farming the land for sustenance until our contemporary times, people continue to come up with new programs to force fit their perception to the principles that they are trying to make human ingenuity adhere to its values, and no work plan seems to work out.

When people realized they were revered for their human ingenuity, which they could use to shape things or patterns, and that they were the only living creatures programmed with tools that aided in exploiting the environment in search of food, they felt a sense of purpose. This sense of superiority led hunter-gatherers to use their human ingenuity to develop interests in activities that were not part of their original programming. If everything is relative. The most fundamental change that we, the people who transitioned to farming for sustenance, have made—unlike the hunter-gatherers—is the search for ultimate truth, in addition to our ongoing exploration for the food necessary for our survival.

The idea of making the absolute truth the only permanent concept when everything else is continually changing has its pros and its cons. It freed people from having to be continually on the move in search of food. It allowed people to begin to live in permanent settlements or communities. Evidently, this shift that man made to stop having to be continually moving from one place to the next in search of food, and thus by virtue of being continually moving through space with time, creates change without restricting any loss of identity. In this way, we

can maintain a balance with the understanding that everything outside of our senses is constantly changing, including the internal functioning of our human bodies. This pause to make the body stop moving through space with time in search of food and, along with it, to make the food humans consume become farmed (meaning it is grown in a fixed spot in space and humans don't have to look for it) allowed us to address fundamental questions about our place in the universe.

This shift to doing things unlike how hunter-gatherers were living has provided many benefits for our society for centuries. However, the concept of causing the human body to age from a fixed point in space has its disadvantages. When food becomes a stationary entity that grows over time, humans cease to roam in search of it. Man has to be idle to allow time for the plant or crop to grow.

However, since human ingenuity relies on both space and time, these two factors determine the specific achievements a person can attain. The timing and the circumstances of one's entry into life significantly influence whether a person spends their life merely seeking sustenance or is able to pursue the search for ultimate truth. Hence, each person is programmed to process the information transmitted by the senses to the brain differently, and as we mentioned earlier, the limitations of human ingenuity depend on the level of civilization attained by those who are already alive at the time of a person's entry into the world. Those born in the right place or who have to work less to meet their survival needs are fortunate enough to pursue activities unrelated to sustaining those needs. Hence, the rise of healers, judges, priests, lawmakers, and war leaders complements people's mode of life, in which the level of progress that human ingenuity finds upon its entry into becoming among the living plays a critical role.

Evidently, the gap in knowledge between people cannot but lead to the rise of an upper class due to human ingenuity being a property that, as we said, the natural environment and the time and point of entry regulate what this programmed feature in the human body can accomplish and what it can't. Humans made the right choice when they decided to organize society in a way that excludes the human body from being considered a food substance that people eat. In this way, when a person lives and eventually dies, the natural system

changes its physiology, rather than this process being carried out by other animals or living creatures to sustain life and growth. Where I think things went wrong. This decision brings humanity closer to unity with the creator on the eternal path.

This human choice to search for the ultimate truth gives people identity and kinship. Its usefulness lies in how it helps people to extend longevity. Science can now explain how the human body is made and how it works. The interest that people exhibit in understanding how the universe was created to change the starting point interests us all. However, what we are interested in in this work, as we have said already, is understanding how the belief in some kind of creator of the world and the condition of how people interact with other objects to an afterlife for those who believe in such tales could weaken the human condition rather than strengthen it.

Making the absolute truth to be the only permanent concept in a realm in which everything in it is changing, including humans, and letting each posterity dedicate its purpose to how to decrypt has certainly made people live continually in a time of change. This “revolution” involves every new human being participating in a collective effort that contributes to the ongoing search for the ultimate truth, which is pursued through a series of small steps taken in response to practical problems. Similarly, the transition from a hunter-gatherer lifestyle to modernization led to increased health issues and slightly shorter lifespans compared to primitive living.

What if the people living in ancient times had a constant need to roam in search of food because only a small portion of the plants in their environment were suitable for human consumption? This preoccupation limited people's need for organization, adherence to rules, and submission to the authority of a ruler. The lack of technology to farm, hunt, and gather created a situation where there was no specific person who would exercise authority as posited in modern times other than the elders due to their power to transfer know-how as well as knowledge. However, the increase in birth rates meant that people did need to roam in large land areas in search of food; hence, only a few locations could have been favored to establish permanent villages in ancient times. As people became more

sophisticated, they found themselves bound only by their personal power and conscience when attempting to coerce others they did not know into obedience. One of the most effective ways that a person could use to coerce people he doesn't know to obey him is to relate humanity to the supernatural or an order of existence. In other words, this shift occurred when people began the systematic husbandry of plants and animals and allowed human communities to expand into larger units. As people became more sophisticated, the new capabilities and habits they acquired created an increasing need to establish permanent villages. Hence, the need for people to be organized and to guard important areas for the purpose of extracting or accruing value was born. The need to coerce people to make all actors involved surrender their freedom to individuals whom they didn't know became more and more necessary. Most importantly, the need to discover an effective mean to coerce others to acquire or control their resources became indispensable. There is no more effective way to make others surrender their resources to individuals whom they don't know than to relate that concept to an order.

The brilliance of relating humanity to the supernatural or a higher order of existence lies in its ability to coerce unknown individuals into obedience; its power resides in making others surrender their resources to people they do not know and in countering threats to the value of what they extract or accumulate. Most importantly, the ingenuity of relating humanity to the supernatural or a higher order of existence eliminates the need for any set of norms and institutions to control the social freedom of others. Human ingenuity can coerce individuals whom one does not know to obey by relying solely on speech. Moreover, it is an idea that could be made into a doctrine with norms and institutions. The actors who promote such an idea could employ strategic, operational, and tactical capabilities to control others by manipulating their awareness of how to coerce unknown individuals into obedience.

Empirical knowledge provides the sophistication that any society requires. Empirical knowledge is what creates progress. People use progressivism to advance from uncivilized conditions to a more civilized society. The advancement of any idea is driven by the identified concepts, methods, and systems that are continually

developed to create a cultural framework. Hence comes the need to organize a cultural structure that would use concepts, methods, and systems effectively and provide education and training to allow continued application. This sociocultural system, which evolved around the idea that absolute truth is the only permanent concept connecting humanity to the supernatural or a higher order of existence, enables people to coerce others they do not know into obedience and has expanded since the time of antiquity. In modern times, people can choose to either accept the idea of absolute truth as a permanent concept through faith in religious beliefs or to surrender to a set of political systems, norms, and institutions that control their social freedoms, which may or may not be voluntary. Alternatively, people can surrender to a set of political systems, norms, and institutions that may or may not voluntarily control their social freedoms. This mechanism is dubbed government.

We said earlier that people are organisms that depend on each other and the natural world. They all need sustenance, but they disagree on reproduction's purpose and life's meaning. Specifically, this issue pertains to the purpose that individuals serve while they are alive. Everyone has a different perception, and each member of the human family prefers his active participation in the realm to connote something that could be his making or to derive his contemplation from existing philosophical and religious perspectives.

Many sociocultural areas exist where people are willing to unite to build communities or expand ideas and beliefs, thereby creating learned behaviors for addressing threats or opportunities that affect human security. The sociocultural areas where people are willing to unite and build communities involve actions that connect humanity to ideas and beliefs in faith, as well as other learned behaviors that shape how individuals interact with material things. People are continually developing collective interests related to how all members of the human family interact with material things, and they do that using religious and philosophical contemplations. However, the relationship that describes how matter and humans interact is a phenomenon in which each property maintains its conserved physical system throughout the life or duration of the interaction. In other words, humans only take from nature; they don't give anything. The only time

people contribute is when they die. Humans leave their physical bodies to the natural world when they pass away. Humans feel powerless to provide and are limited to taking, which drives them to use their ingenuity to focus solely on sustaining their bodies. Humans obtain their sustenance from food and material things. Freezing social space and accumulating material possessions and wealth lead people to unite in developing ideas and beliefs that foster learned behaviors, ensuring that the physical and mental abilities of others do not threaten their survivability.

All people have vested interests in developing collective actions that connect humanity to ideas and beliefs, whether in faith or in strategies to prevent wealth from concentrating in the hands of specific individuals. Hence, expanding the capability development of any group of people addresses such contemplations. The acquired capability helps a community become organized to identify concepts, methods, and systems to cater to.

We believe a large number of people could be motivated to unite in building communities and expanding, including taking action based on ideas and beliefs, accumulating material possessions and wealth, or a combination of both. People could have vested interests in developing collective actions along the activities we referred to because the capability development of any group of people is expanded through such actions. The acquired capability could help a community become organized to identify concepts, methods, and systems, including creating the necessary structure to develop doctrines and guard important territorial areas required to address sustenance.

Again, because only a small proportion of the plants in any given environment could be exploited, plus there is the wait time that people have to spend for different fruit or plants to grow and ripen. The need to protect important areas and stored food surpluses between growing seasons is a detail that imposes itself spontaneously. It is clear that people expanded their activities to include roles such as healers, judges, and lawmakers. The only path to getting the masses to cooperate and be organized is to base the legitimacy of any form of authority on creating a demarcation between moral and material authority. Hence, each concept imposes itself inherently as an activity

in its own right. This phenomenon is due to people having developed disproportionate capabilities both by nature and through education, training, and practice. Therefore, it is highly likely that people whose human ingenuity has provided them with superior wisdom and judgment are better able to improve their understanding of various subjects through their accumulated knowledge and technology, thereby exercising authority effectively. Ultimately, people are compelled to broaden their influence, governance, concepts, and convictions to enhance the commonwealth for all or most members of a community and to promote the welfare of the common good through the accumulation of knowledge and technology. Knowledge and technology alone do not suffice; one must actively utilize these capabilities to expand power, administration, ideas, and beliefs.

The historical phenomenon of colonization, invasions, and religious conversions is one that stretches around the entire history of humanity. Almost immediately after people started keeping records, every community deemed that the common good of its commonwealth was vested in seeking to take control of land believed to be uninhabited or done deliberately to expand the civilization and culture of the conquering community into the newly seized territory.

The appropriation of land for the benefit of a community is said to have spread for various reasons and in multiple ways. One reason for the spread of colonization may have been that settlers began to farm land they believed was uninhabited and free or to address the welfare needs of their community members by gaining access to important areas for extracting or accruing value. Ultimately, it was the neglect of inherent culture that drove individuals or groups to conquer in order to expand their power, administration, ideas, and beliefs. In this work, we are interested in investigating how the aspiration to universality, which arises from people's desire to view the human condition as a mental struggle between good and evil, could serve as a major obstacle to their ability to faithfully uphold the declarations they make. We plan to show that the constructive thoughts, words, and deeds people derive could be creating the perils that have been confronting mankind everywhere and anywhere since the dawn of time. We have reasons to believe that by virtue of this right that people assign to themselves, they ensure that others have the right to self-determination. This

conviction could be what is delaying the educational preparedness required to ultimately achieve universal peace. It is highly unlikely that a creator programmed humans with two distinct moral aptitudes. The technological achievements that people develop to improve the ability of all members of the human family to distinguish between good and evil may actually be a delusion created to justify conquest and force.

Before the entire human family decided to establish conditions in which all men and women of nations, both large and small, could promote social progress and better standards of life—due to the extreme aggression, destruction, and mortality experienced after two consecutive world wars—there was hardly any interval in the entire history of humanity during which people were not in direct competition with one another, either individually or as part of a community, to extend their power in the economic, social, and political domains. When this competition did not involve military conquest to subjugate the local people who claimed ownership of the land desired by settlers or colonizers, the same objectives were achieved through the imposition of diplomatic pressures or the control of water supplies and other essential resources for sustenance.

It is clear, however, that many settlers or colonizers occupied land previously home to long-established peoples and that often such actions were met with resistance and violence. The scramble to expand power, administration, ideas, and beliefs, including cultural habits, either makes it very difficult for native people to continue their work or pushes them to squat if they prefer to avoid integration. Occasionally, the colonizers subjected the local or native people to subjugation, domination, and exploitation.

Morphological analysis is a method that was developed by Fritz Zwicky (1898-1974) to study multi-dimensional, non-quantifiable complex problems where causal modelling and simulation do not function well or at all. Zicky was a Swiss astronomer and applied morphological analysis to astronomical studies and the development of jet and rocket propulsion systems.

When exploring possible solutions to complex problems, such as launching spacecraft and artificial satellites into space, it is important to address how such a spacecraft will behave in space to explore possible solutions in non-quantified models and scenarios. A conventional approach involves breaking the system down into its components, isolating the critical parts that contribute to the output, and solving the simplified system to create the desired models or scenarios.

Zwicky suggested exploring all the possible solutions to multi-dimensional, non-quantified complex problems by confronting and studying them differently. Zwicky proposed not to drop any trivial components from the system itself when solving any complex problem but to work backwards from the output towards the system's internals. According to Zwicky, the disadvantage of dropping trivial components could lead to a breakdown when the contributions of those components become significant. This approach is because, in real-world scenarios, not all the components of a system behave rationally. There are many components in a system whose parts may seem minor before the analysis, but their behavior is governed by the states of, and their relations with, other components.

The work of Zwicky made it possible to apply this method to study relationships between forms and their specific structural features in many diverse fields. One of the fields that benefited the most from Zwicky's work in morphology and has been drawing upon it since then is lawmaking to posit policies.

In political science, policy formulation involves exploring a variation of options for addressing a problem in the public sector. Making policies is a multi-dimensional, non-quantified complex problem because it involves formulating solutions to alternative courses of action available. If we delve deeper, policymakers ultimately choose a course of action based on systems analysis. When analyzing a policy system, the vertical and horizontal dimensions of the policy must be accounted for to determine how the policy will achieve its goals. When it comes to structuring complex policy and planning issues, developing scenarios and strategies and analyzing organizational and stakeholder

structure are essential to ensure that the policy ultimately decided upon will achieve the set of given goals.

It is clear Zwicky's work in astronomy and in jet propulsion and rocket propulsion systems requires developing problem-solving techniques that study how well the components work and interact to accomplish their purpose. This work does not question humanity's interest in exploration or the purpose behind pushing scientific and technical boundaries.

Humans have used various technologies to explore and challenge the limits of knowledge. Based on archaeological and written records, the history of the world dates to thousands of years. There have been many life-changing scientific discoveries that marked a change in human history, or more fundamentally, in quantifying the human place in the universe. This belief persisted until Polish astronomer Nicholas Copernicus published his theory that the sun is a motionless body at the center of the solar system, with the planets revolving around it. His work helped expand human knowledge of deep space and contributed to the desire or curiosity to explore even more. This desire to explore has helped humans to expand technology, create new industries, and help to foster connections between people. Indeed, the technological forecasting that scientists and researchers are promising makes one wish he weren't already a citizen of the world due to all the ongoing research to prolong the lifespan of humans to extend longevity. However, despite these advancements, a close examination of how the universe functions and the discoveries made by humans reveals that there is a need to identify ways to expand longevity. Everything humans discover, the natural system either produces or offers preventive options for; life would be the same without human discoveries, despite differing opinions.

It is difficult to argue that one human discovery is more important than another, as each discovery holds its own significance and often serves as a prerequisite for subsequent discoveries. Science is the study of the natural world and includes the study of nature and the truths of reality. People are all the time trying to classify the most important discoveries of human civilization. Perhaps among the various discoveries that

human ingenuity created—like fire or the refashioning of stones—none stands out.

It is clear, however, that if it weren't for humans learning the art of creating fire, this discovery wouldn't have given humans access to warmth and light. Electricity, which was discovered by man, allows humans to continue communal life after nightfall and helps them maintain body warmth, extending their geographical habitat to colder latitudes. In summary, humanity's pursuit of understanding the truth about reality has benefited society; as a result, people can now enjoy light at night without the need to stay up late to share stories. However, our analysis of the scientific journey that each member of the human family embarks on after birth focuses on assessing whether this curiosity to employ human ingenuity for scientific discoveries fosters peaceful connections between humans and how this journey aids the human spirit in understanding the truths about reality and humankind's place in existence.

The ideas and beliefs that people, in the whole history of humanity, followed to push the boundaries of human ingenuity, to drive to explore the unknown, and to refashion patterns present in reality, which could be used to improve people's standard of living, including how to condition people to exercise constructive thoughts, words, and deeds to aggregate feasible allocation of resources in terms of social welfare, have allowed people to establish conditions better than the ones our ancestors experienced. Certainly, the progressive philosophy that people have adopted will continue to enable future generations to develop new systems and capabilities that will expand technology and industries, allowing them to discover true answers to the questions humans have always asked. However, despite the significant changes in human lifestyle brought about by the rise of civilization, our scientific and technical limits have been pushed to unimaginable realms. A fundamental question is going to remain on people's minds no matter how some life-changing discoveries end up pushing the boundaries of their scientific and technical limits to fashion objects that people perceive as a path to address fundamental questions about the place of humankind in the universe. Two fundamental social mores have divided the history of humanity. One more governs the accumulation of knowledge and technology, and the other refers to

how to establish a unified social organization that would be willing to architect moral norms that could be widely observed. Throughout human history, people have consistently failed to establish a unified set of proper behaviors or mores. To cope with or address, either explicitly or tacitly, people's inability to manipulate their behavior that human conditions stop them from becoming bound by their personal power and conscience. From this shared starting point, the history of human behavior has become intertwined in organizing the behavioral and cognitive traits of humans to develop unifying characteristics within various social structures. Most people throughout history have seen the human condition as the mental struggle between good and evil. All people want the purpose of humankind to be to sustain goodness. This transformation requires people to consistently exercise constructive thoughts, words, and deeds to influence behavior and liberate human conditions from the constraints of personal power and conscience, which is a challenge for most. People have managed to divide reality into right and wrong, establishing behaviors that apply to various areas of human activity or custom when faced with a moral choice. On the other hand, people have successfully used scientific methods to test hypotheses regarding the reasons and mechanisms behind specific natural events or the functioning of scientific ideas, translating those findings into theories or technologies that we see around us. Despite the vast number of philosophical investigations, readings, and discussions, people find it difficult to apply their understanding of what makes things right or wrong to specific instances. Among all those who have so far lived, only a small number have demonstrated an ability to compare and contrast assumptions, arguments, or modes of thought. Similarly, only a few people have demonstrated the ability to apply abstract ideas, such as beliefs, practices, or traditions from philosophical, religious, and ethical theories, to shape behaviors that can distinguish between what is right and what is wrong.

People consider that morality comes from rationality, character, culture, religion, rights, feelings, pain and pleasure, interests, relationships, and so on. People assert that explaining why and how to ensure every human exhibits actions deemed right by future generations is impossible. This approach is to sustain good by exercising constructive thoughts, words, and deeds, as we said. In the ultimate analysis, until now, everyone has their own answer to explain

why people have not managed to establish social mores that are widely observed despite the technological innovations and cognitive or cultural foundations that have been registered. People struggle to make moral choices, possibly because morality wasn't programmed into humans; rather, concepts of right and wrong are inventions people created later, based on various possibilities.

Earlier we said that researchers and scientists are actively working on activating genes that destroy unhealthy cells to prolong the lifespan of humans. There are many people who believe that moral beliefs come simply from God because they were programmed into the human body. There are many people who accept the importance of God's commands in establishing morality as well. If researchers and scientists manage to find a method to extend the life of humans through improved selection of the best cells within the human body, this life-changing discovery will mean that certain stories many people accepted about a creator of the universe intervening to establish morality may be partly untrue. If people started to live longer, humans would stop being mortal, making their days limited to one hundred and twenty years, as certain religions believe God commanded.

The purpose of pushing the boundaries of our scientific and technical limits is to expand technology, create new industries, and foster a peaceful connection between people. However, when people start to live longer, such longevity would also bring along know-how that would include how to tackle a cycle of known diseases so that they can stay healthy. The rise of civilization occurred when people swapped the hunter-gatherer lifestyle in favor of refashioning objects. It was thanks to the large number of refashioned objects or shapes that people refined that humans managed to transition from a hunter-gatherer lifestyle to a settled way of life in permanent settlements. It was the exchange of goods, ideas, and inventions that principally led to making people have better lives and live longer. When people began to live longer than the previously believed limit of one hundred and twenty years, as stated in certain religions, it was thought that God commanded this change. This life-changing development should bring peace and stability along. This is because the trading of goods, ideas, and inventions would become less of a source of power, as has been the case until now, leading to the rise of dominance. It is to address the

question of the relationship between natural and legal rights and why people resort to ethics. When people live longer, it will be their power, not God's, that made this breakthrough possible.

The Bible reports that people lived much longer than a hundred and twenty years before wickedness increased on earth. We cannot determine whether the people of that time lived as long as the Bible claims, either because they extended their lifespan through scientific and technical advancements or for entirely different reasons. What we know is that Noah, whom God found righteous and spared along with his family, became a father when he was 500 years old. Whether God saw how the wickedness of the human race had become on the earth and decided to wipe the human race from the face of the earth due to the people of that age pushing the boundaries of their scientific and technical limits or not, the Bible claims that God ordered a flood to address the widespread wickedness problem on earth.

For modern humans, it is their personal power that is encouraging them to push the boundaries of their scientific and technical limits to prolong the lifespan. This phenomenon is occurring due to the scientific and technological breakthroughs that people have achieved. We have no way of knowing if, when people start to live longer or when scientists and researchers start to alter human genes to control human behaviors, people's moral attitudes will change. People now understand how to manipulate human behavior through automation. It needs more testing to see if people can manipulate their behavior to make their sense of moral rightness or wrongness function like the scientific method. However, if scientists are unable to alter human genes to control behaviors, people's moral attitudes will remain divided between right and wrong, reflecting their desires for reality. The scientific breakthrough that people are making would be able to control human behavior due to how much automation can regulate human morality.

When science reaches a point to regulate human morality, people's concern over the human condition being a mental struggle between good and evil will cease relative to what the prevailing scientific breakthrough would be, allowing specific objects people can refashion, shape, or alter. In effect, once an individual's freedom to choose

between right and wrong is stripped away, it undermines their natural rights and will. The individual responsibility for one's deeds would no longer be a dictate of God but rather of what another human being perceives as morally right or wrong. Therefore, when people's actions start to be regulated, does such regulation bring a person closer to the everlasting goal of being sustainably good, as intended by the creator through participation in life, or does it simply mean that humanity is fulfilling the perceptions of the individual who manages these regulations?

People made lots of progress to sideline God and religion so they don't interfere with the way people interact with each other. In other words, attribute the right and wrong actions that people take to the programmed human ingenuity of a creator. In this work, I plan to investigate whether there is guidance from God that may be influencing people to recognize their existence, even though this guidance might be incompatible with the intended functioning of the human body. What people freed themselves from when they began their movement to separate the imposition of religion in favor of their decision to detect absolute truth to address fundamental questions about our place in the universe were the matters of religious beliefs and not the matters of how to interact with objects. The laws that God imposed regarding how to interact with objects are still desired by people, who wish to continue believing in and using them.

Humans have now reached a point where they control people's behavior, suggesting that more progress could still be made to ensure that one's deeds are always intended to support positive outcomes. There may be certain guidance from God that causes the human body to function differently than originally intended, as it restricts specific negative actions that might be necessary for sustaining life. In other words, as long as people remain divided in their understanding of right and wrong, this perception will prevent them from exercising constructive thoughts, words, and deeds. This perception turns humanity's interest in exploring the unknown, or the intangible desire for continuous improvement, into a permanent task. As people strive to unite with the creator on their eternal journey, their desire for continuous improvement will only grow.

Therefore, since people are now working on making life-changing discoveries, such progress could lead to the belief that humankind's destiny is not pre-planned but rather created by individuals before we were born, as some people believe. However, it is now up to individuals to determine what their destiny will look like. The crises and conflicts people create may stem from their thoughts and imagination. This situation signifies that perhaps both evil and good originated on earth, with the intention of conditioning human behavior and imagination to help specific individuals contend with their circumstances. I will demonstrate that if people continue to transform the essential body of knowledge needed for their survival into a commodity, similar to how they have commodified water and food, humanity may enter an era of domination that is far worse than anything experienced thus far.

Historians posit that as humans began the systematic husbandry of plants and animals, this ability to think with increasing logic caused humans to transition from maintaining a dispersed gatherer-hunter lifestyle in sparsely productive areas to engaging in the expansion of permanent, denser population settlements, which in time grew until becoming organized into a polity, also called "states." Until people, irrespective of factors such as class disparity, poverty, incidence of disease, variation in infrastructure and environmental quality, climate, and safety, manage to address the fundamental place of mankind in the universe, they cannot devote their time to anything other than fashioning objects to sustain themselves. This signifies all the technology, industries, science, research, and so forth that people developed when they decided to be engaged in intensive agriculture, mining, manufacturing, and trade. Its purpose pours into one focus. This is how to sustain the human body. The human body obtains its sustenance from food. People know how to produce a food surplus, but they have no power to maintain it as edible for a very long time.

Trade is a concept that involves the sale and purchase of a good, service, or information. The transaction can range from the exchange of stones to setting multinational policies and protocols between countries. Considering that all the resources that are required to produce the food people need for their sustenance necessitate the disposal of unique environments, and such conditions are not homogeneously dispersed everywhere on earth. The same applies to the elements or raw materials that people use to produce the material goods, technological devices, and tools that enhance everyone's quality of life. People can use two methods to access others' resources and turn them into commodities for their use. One option is through force,

and the other one is through peaceful means. Similarly, there are many methods to pursue when people seek to obtain the resources of others peacefully. The most common one is through trade.

In this broad sense, no person can extend his control over any resource, whether it is a good, idea, or invention, without first extending this power over other human beings. The race to monopolize power led to the formation of hierarchical social classes whereby power becomes concentrated in the hands of an elite ruling class. However, goods, ideas, and inventions are traits of human quality, and such characteristics regenerate with the coming of every new living human. The invention of a monetary system enables the trade of countless goods, ideas, and inventions that people continuously develop, as well as the development of capabilities by one group of people in comparison to another in the fields of science and technology. These two phenomena have existed throughout human history, creating reasons for the shifting of power from one group to another based on the degree of military or political power that each group wields. For example, the conflicts between the settlers and the native people who lived in the land and claimed ownership were about how the exploited resources were acquired, managed, and distributed. Since the dawn of humanity and throughout history, successful civilizations that managed to achieve notable military, ideological, and economic power spread and colonized territory and people who were less prepared. Some invaded or colonized people accept assimilation and integrate. But some people refuse the technical, material, and social dominance that the modernized behaviors or spread culture carries along in terms of changes in traditions, values, or ways of living and fight them.

Cartographers claim that the total land area of the earth is slightly over 148,900,000 km². Historians claim that the Achaemenid Empire (c. 550–330 BC), founded by Cyrus the Great, spanned 5.5 million km² of territory and that it was the largest empire by the standards of that time. The Achaemenid Empire, because it's larger than any previous empire in history by the standards of that time, had to be the antagonist empire to surpass, emulate, or challenge its lead. The empires that followed the Achaemenid Empire, culminating in the British Empire, which reached 35.5 million km² at its height in 1920, all experienced

their moments of glory. However, what those two empires and all the others that emerged in between had in common was that they were all marked by specific ideas and customs influenced by unique cultural, social, technical, and religious factors. However, despite how much the ruling class of those different empires that the world had known tried to utilize their understanding of the socio-political conditions governing the territories they were extending power over to maintain their control. At some point, the extension of the empire's political sovereignty lost its popular prestige and entered a cycle of decline or collapse, ultimately leading to the empire's end. Each empire that spanned from the Achaemenid Empire to the British Empire was supplanted by a more potent new empire that was formed around a new compelling ideology and ethics.

Social anthropologists provide various explanations for the motives behind the eventual weakening or collapse of the authority and cohesiveness of different empires, which led to their decline. However, a close analysis of the different empires shows that it was the ideology, not ethics, that was always supplanted.

Since the dawn of time, people have transitioned from one system of ideas and ideals to another, and to this day, none of the various ideologies that individuals have explored through their philosophical tendencies have succeeded in establishing a normative system of thought that motivates a set of ethical behaviors.

In 1945, the countries and people who had won the Second World War believed that individuals should not be forced into aggression and destruction to establish a hierarchical system of power or to conform to a set of ideals and principles deemed important by a particular group or society. The correct way to implicitly create new hope for morality is for the entire human family to come together and establish a new global council that ensures the observance of stability and well-being conditions necessary to achieve universal peace through the use of such machinery.

From one generation to the next, people find themselves continually obliged to orient their actions in accordance with the level of progress achieved, which includes mitigating the causes and effects of income

inequality and seeking the greatest good for the greatest number. However, in the whole history of humanity, there is no interval that shows that when fellowships, mutual sympathy, or social cohesion among groups increases, greater trust, tolerance, or correctness inversely emerges. Evidence has never supported the conjecture that social cohesion, fellowship, and democracy improve when wealth equality increases. On the contrary, all the evidence indicates that when humans pursue the greatest good for the greatest number, it leads to increased poverty, diminished community life, unrest and conflict, eroded self-esteem, and greater social dislocation. The proof lies in the history of empires that have risen and fallen throughout human civilization. In fact, the economic liberalization policies that have surged worldwide since the turn of this century indicate that social and cultural cohesion erodes more deeply when people prioritize maximizing utility over the purpose of increasing connectedness and correctness.

For most of human history, higher material living standards didn't lead to an increase in connectedness and correctness between people to help foster a peaceful world. The question that some people might ask regarding the decision made by the countries and individuals who won the Second World War is whether improving the well-being of all human beings and ensuring that everyone perceives themselves as living in equal societies would lead to increased trust among people, thereby reducing tendencies for violence, crime, and hate. Alternatively, in more equal societies, social and cultural cohesion can fracture, leading to increased income inequality and, consequently, higher levels of violence.

For example, in the past, the methodology used to provide learning opportunities for children involved having them play with physical toys. This early childhood development learning method has now changed and was replaced by a newer approach that integrates technology instead. What has changed from the past to the present is that the toys and materials used for children's learning and motor skill development no longer focus on engaging the senses through interaction with physical objects to explore shapes, colors, textures, sounds, and other aspects of the world. Now, parents only need to provide their children with a computer or a high-tech electronic

gadget, which interacts with their senses virtually to deliver the necessary learning experiences. The benefit of making all the new living humans right at birth stimulate their senses and develop learning aptitude from interacting with goods, ideas, and inventions virtually does indeed standardize the source from which new living humans, rich and poor, develop awareness. This methodology for making learning accessible to any social strata has never been tested before, because until people decided to unite their strength so that all new living humans would have access to equal natural and legal rights, they enslaved each other by restricting access to education and controlling the transmission and distribution of goods, ideas, and inventions.

We cannot determine whether restricting access to the scientific knowledge that people use to enforce conformity in behavior and to address social and economic inequality—thereby creating the illusion that wealth is not concentrated among certain individuals or entities—will lead to the development of moral habits necessary for maintaining justice and the rule of law. Since the date people resolved to combine efforts to accomplish the aforementioned aims, people continue to seek to be socially positioned in reference to indicators such as education, occupation, and income. Moreover, the variance in ability, both natural and manmade (ideology and ethics), including environmental quality issues, is what introduced the inequality that led to World War II. How, whenever people's capabilities develop and such phenomena lead the owners of this capital to become, by proxy, more capable, thus introducing inequality, can a person reapportion his knowledge so it doesn't eventually become a threat in a world that functions on neoliberal policies?

The intention of the countries and people who had won the Second World War was to unionize and, through various possible redistributions of social mechanisms such as social welfare, keep inequality at low levels to create new hope for morality. This is indeed an attempt that was not tested before on such a large worldwide scale. This methodology involves disseminating information about comfort, leisure, recreation, material goods, necessities, healthcare, and education so that all people, regardless of factors such as class disparity, poverty, disease incidence, variations in infrastructure and environmental quality, climate, and safety, can achieve parity from a

virtual perspective. Then, rely on computerization, automation, and technology to prevent actions that could impair people's morality, regardless of factors such as class disparity, poverty, disease incidence, variations in infrastructure and environmental quality, climate, and safety. It is possible to attain it. This capability is because computerization, automation, and technology can monitor in real time today the actions of people. The question we want to investigate is when people establish fixed notions of equity, income equality, and equality of opportunity, which are criteria that promote better standards of living. If the employment of international machinery to satisfy people's needs and wants establishes conditions of peace and security, and if the economic and social advancement of all peoples ushers in more inequality and poverty due to how, when people are allowed to exercise knowledge, ability, and skills, their need for better access to food, drink, clothing, supplies, care items, housing, transport, and so forth increases. In other words, now that people have changed the preconditions that every new human used to start his life depending on at birth only and that were based solely on the ascribed and achieved status of the limitation of his family to include, in modern times, access to information, thus making people stop from only working on building their social identity but rather focus only on the role they believe they are more likely to identify themselves with and they expect their coming into the living to ascribe to achieve. What we want to investigate is whether, when people remove social identity in favor of market-based ideas and principles, the general perception that people gain when they are led to believe that all human beings are born equal in dignity and rights and therefore could all reach better standards of life through active participation in life and the exercise of constructive thoughts, words, and deeds changes. If this conditioning leads to brotherhood or if education, which once suppressed, becomes accessible (even if the scientific know-how that people use to control others is locked away), the world will become unstable.

The countries and people who won the Second World War believed that achieving a uniform level of educational preparedness among all people was essential for establishing conditions that would maintain justice and the rule of law. It appears that those countries and people were looking beyond the military victory and the conventional war

aims that are normally recognized following the successful conclusion of a war. Their concern about the possibility of living in fear of another war against countries and people who were unprepared to practice tolerance or coexist peacefully as good neighbors was a significant factor in their decision-making.

The decision made by the allied countries and peoples who won the Second World War, along with their resolve to work together during both wartime and peacetime to prevent the recurrence of aggression or war, represents an aspiration that challenges the established social and cultural norms and values associated with humanity throughout history.

Two motives may have driven those allied countries and peoples to engage in ensuring the equality of nations. One reason could be to relieve their people from the menace of aggression, which could be finally bestowed between humans, and henceforth conditions under which justice and respect for the obligations arising from treaties and other sources of international law can be maintained. The other option is if those allied countries and peoples recognized that even when other members of the human family start to have the right to self-determination, their political, economic, or educational preparedness could never be a threat. It is well known that as a country develops, the people acquire more capital, which leads to an improved standard of living and the owners of that capital having more wealth and income.

It is logical to encourage people to believe in their right to self-determination and to unite all members of the human family to work together in both war and peace, allowing each entity to exercise sovereignty over its national territory and determine its own political status. But the question we are keen to explore in this work is whether subscribing people to common programs and principles that promote cooperation in economic and social security ensures the equality of nations. This is because the people who perceive this idea want to sustain more good in the world or increase the satisfaction or benefit they derive from ensuring that the utility of their goods or services yields more personal sentient well-being. Herein, either it is their consciousness that makes them perceive that their wealth is introducing inequality and that it would be better if they took part in

various redistribution mechanisms to ensure the greatest good for the greatest number, or their fear about the human condition, absent from any political order, leads them to surrender some of their wealth in exchange for protection against surviving in an environment in which individuals' actions become bound only by their personal power and conscience. And so, what we want in this work to know more about is whether, when the wealth, income, and consumption of nations equate, for humankind, such a situation would mean that man triumphed over seeing the human condition as the mental struggle between good and evil and that the causes of people's powerlessness to triumph over the weakness of their will, thus paving the way to shape a better life for all countries and peoples, man would swap its causes by exercising constructive thoughts, words, and deeds, consequently.

The decisions of the people of the allied countries who won the Second World War to struggle to find common ground so that all members of the human family finally reach the practice of tolerance to spare mankind from reliving the continuous, relinquishable menace of aggression during anyone's life make sense. After man invented the profession of soldiering, some nations in modern times reached the point to develop and use new weapons capable of resulting in massive destruction and mortality, as was the case during the Second World War, which even created vast exclusion zones due to what such weapons can impact on social space or the environment. The need to forge political and economic compromises is evident in a world where people have divided themselves into two distinct subcultures: one civilian and the other militarized. This division is necessary to prevent a relapse into conflict, spare future generations from the scourge of war, and address the economic and social consequences that can arise from a disregard for peace and security. The allied governments and the peoples who won the Second World War are ready to promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom, even as the world's inhabitants have split their social attitudes into two masses. One civilian mass is organized to execute operational tasks, similar to those in commercial enterprises. And another, to execute military ideology or policy directives by forming skilled killers or professionals in the use of weapons or warfare to support the state's defense. This social attitude is undoubtedly a creative solution, given that the initial disregard for peace and security threatened human existence and

brought the entire human family to its knees, as evidenced by historians and personal accounts of the Second World War. Most importantly, in a world whose inhabitants leave to posterity the promotion of political agendas, the protection of economic interests, and how to deal with the physicality of managing both a subordinated and an unsubordinated organized citizen tasked with executing routines and projects. At the same time, the inhabitants divided themselves into two groups, with each group dedicating itself to either garrison duties or tasks outside the barracks, which included conducting administrative work, engaging in training and educational activities, maintaining technology, and creating outlets for releasing human energy through either positive or negative perceptions. Capability development is about enabling people to perform functions and roles. While capability development is arguably one of the most complex activities known to humanity, it is complicated by the fact that humans have tied their destiny to understanding the purpose of the human condition and the nature of existence. Then, it is reasonable to think that the acquired capabilities that people develop would be used to counter perceived or identified threats to preserve doctrines in which people are divided over their essence.

Therefore, if people believe that their purpose is to guard doctrines, including how to research, design, and develop concepts and methods to defend godly or national man-made policies to impress either the gods or to seek immortality. Once again, given that people are willing to accept that their capability development be focused to derive strategic, operational, and tactical progress to serve themselves and to defend—not necessarily the gods, because no human can claim that the gods sent him to put him in charge of overseeing the interpretation of the different gods' ideologies or policies. Rather, the will of other people is just like them, due to how those individuals are capable of instituting that they derive their right from the will of God and, in some cases, are even capable of conditioning people's attitudes to believe that their actions even constitute a sacrilegious act, as in the case of the divine right that certain kings claim.

If we consider the divine right claimed by kings, including those who assert that they have been sent to Earth to safeguard the will of the gods or a god, whether through action or message, we can see its

implications. We can say that the strategic, operational, and tactical doctrines or ideologies that people acquire, develop, and use to manipulate actions are primarily inspired by their own will. This situation implies that the inhabitants of a world have made it their occupation since ancient times to apply scientific discoveries or technological breakthroughs to improve capability development to search for the ultimate truth and the best interests of social welfare. The aim is to use the advances made by human societies as a basis for deriving the right to rule. Constant technological development guides the interpretation of ideology in a world that relies on technological advances to accelerate citizens' social attitudes. The organization of people aims to engage them in a constant race for technological development, ensuring that the material outcomes of scientific, literary, or artistic production can be applied in both civilian and military contexts to advance political or religious doctrines. This cultural rationalization essentially defines the nature of modernization or progression, serving as the foundation for human operation and focusing on allowing individuals to pursue activities they enjoy and value for the complete development of their personalities. It is evident that the ongoing process of capability development, which continues into the present and will remain constant, allows us to interpret how ideologies best serve people or shape social attitudes. If people continue to make a significant part of their constant technological development process, it becomes a constant general capability development race to push the boundaries of scientific, literary, and artistic production limits, including an arms race. It is evident that the more doctrines or systems people come up with, the more military actions are sometimes argued as justified to influence power shifts. In a world whose inhabitants preserve ideology and ethics through protocols that are based on portraying power and feats, and in which, in the face of the constant changing technology, governments and geography make it so that some nations boast about their weapons of mass destruction arsenal to defend, through such capability, their interests. Possessing capabilities in a macroeconomic or military sense that outpace the development capability or preparedness of other people or nations is insufficient if this capability cannot be deployed or employed in political leadership or combat operations to induce power shifts, especially when we all know that the security of one person is the forgone security of the other. If people believe that to preserve

ideology and ethics, such a premise is derived from the will of people and the maintenance of particular and public interests through the exercise of state, regional, or global-scale economic and military domination to wield unrivaled power and influence, then will people reach a day to shape the polarity of the social attitude to tilt and regulate the relationship and ambitions declared in treaties and periods of peace to contribute to the institutionalization of a disenchanted cultural attitude, or will the increased preparedness of the capability development of people aggravate the problem? In addition, will people reach the point of institutionalizing common social attitudes if the masses remain divided between those who consider that they are not subject to earthly authority and others who believe that their will is derived from God? This belief implies that only God can judge the ideology or ethics of those who believe that it is sacrilegious acts that manipulate their actions.

Peculiarly, despite all the ideological and organizational enablers and guiding principles that people invented to create a culture that would nurture a commitment to truths and values. It is indeed mind-boggling to note that just a short time ago, countries and peoples proclaimed that the aspirations of the entire human family would be directed towards avoiding aggression, tyranny, and oppression in order to prevent the recurrence of wars and to ensure equality and universal peace. The new generation of humans, who now bear the responsibility of fully realizing this pledge, makes it seem as though we are living in an increasingly unstable world. The reorganization of the world that is ongoing, so the postwar purpose that all the countries and peoples pledged themselves to work together to reach, so all members of the human family can start to live free from any fear and want, takes place in an absurd and irregular manner. People are ambivalent about striving to reach the conditions that our fathers recently took on our behalf, pledging to teach and educate us to promote their observance so every country can live without the dread of yet another war. This common standard of achievement, which we claim we are still determined to accomplish, creates the perception that we are setting each other up or allowing future generations to recreate the disregard for our fathers' pledge to avoid the extreme aggression and destruction their own barbarous acts caused, to the extent that it outraged their conscience. The instability that people perceive or hear about, which is

facilitated by improved access to knowledge, creates a widespread belief that a significant and harmful event is imminent. Even if the vast majority of the people cannot identify what that negative event will be, the mixed disenchantment or enchantment that people express toward modernity or economic inequality is constantly giving rise to a broad range of ideologies and social movements. Proponents and antagonists of modernization or social justice create the impression that humanity must constantly adapt to resources that are no different from those available before the agreement among all governments and people to unite in order to ensure that everyone can enjoy economic and social security. Consequently, modernization closely links wars and violence as a means of addressing social inequality and shifting power. The aggressive tactics that people are using to promote respect for the various common programs and principles that emerged as postwar aspirations—principles to which everyone pledged adherence after the Second World War—create the impression that there has been a net loss in peace and security compared to the period before the war. The UN Security Council, which is authorized by the member nations that ratify the UN Charter to take action on their behalf for the maintenance of peace and security, has adopted more than 2400 resolutions or recommendations that have been infringed upon by its members.

It is generally regarded that when people choose to promote the development of friendly relations to strengthen social cohesion and fellowship, this undertaking involves the use of improved economic and social security cooperation mechanisms. People's perception is that human choices are motivated by the desire for happiness and that when labor and living standards are improved, such enlightenment could correct the distortions that skew people's inability to develop personal ethics. Therefore, this phenomenon of perceiving that when everyone is included, such capability development reduces the tendency for people to resort to aggression to achieve their goals, which they believe others have denied them, is indeed a great paradox that, despite people's efforts, remains unsolved.

The constant economic and social security systems that people create in their pursuit of political and ethical truths, along with their ongoing departure from the ideals they pledge to uphold, suggest that the political and ethical beliefs they invoke may be central to their

inability to master the corrections needed for the distortions that skew their analyses of benefits and costs.

For example, according to the Hebrew Bible, Moses was a former Egyptian prince who later in life became a religious leader and a lawgiver. The Torah is the central reference of the religious Judaic traditions and includes the foundational narrative of Jewish peoplehood, their trials and tribulations, and their covenant with their God. The authorship of the Torah is traditionally attributed to Moses. Historians provide various accounts of when Moses lived, and some calculate his lifespan to be from 1393 to 1273 BCE. The Torah reports that God chose Moses to bring the Israelites, a minority who were living in Egypt, into a promised land so those returnees could establish a homeland. As part of this plan that God had for both Moses and the Israelites, the Torah claims that Moses carried out the exodus that God commanded him to do to lead the Israelites out of Egypt, and then God gave Moses a covenant that involves following a way of life embodied in a set of moral and religious obligations and civil laws. One of the covenants reported in the Torah states that God revealed to Moses, while he was carrying out the exodus exercise of the Israelite people out of Egypt, what are called the Ten Commandments, or Moses' Laws. Those laws are a set of biblical principles relating to ethics and worship.

The Ten Commandments provide a way of life for their followers, and because they allow for varying interpretations, individuals from different religions and non-religious groups use these laws as a blueprint to establish moral, religious, and civil obligations. In the case of religious people, those laws are considered a product of divine inspiration and a record of the relationship between God and humans. For those people who are non-religious and who follow different traditions, those commandments serve to establish civil laws across changing circumstances such as murder, adultery, theft, bearing false witness, truthfulness, and so forth.

In effect, the Ten Commandments form the basis of a standard of behavior central to people who observe religious devotion, piety, and worship toward a deity. Similarly, this standard applies to people who do not affiliate with a cultural system of behaviors and practices that

include elements of divinity, faith, or supernatural beings. This phenomenon occurs because the commandments are considered self-evident, particularly the prohibitions against murder and theft. Moreover, consider how the Ten Commandments provide norms that have transcended ethics and societal organization, possessing the power to shape cultural systems since their inception, as they relate humanity to an order of existence and guide the creation of laws and treaties by non-believers through their influence on our relationships with one another, thus ensuring their validity to this day. Despite the commandments containing standards of right and wrong, they refer to fundamental “positive commandments” and “negative commandments” that require abstaining from certain acts.

Ultimately, since the inception of these laws, people have primarily concentrated on interpreting the Decalogues in various ways, which serve as a summary of essential principles for piety and moral living. People specify punishments for violating these laws, but so far, humanity has not been able to establish a moral order that everyone can agree to follow. Despite all the political and social machinery that people invented and experimented with throughout the whole history of humanity, humans from religious and non-religious schools of thought continue to fail to live according to this “way of behaving” or, let us say, this “way of walking,” which governs how people can establish relationships with God and humans. In a word, it seems as if people cannot perfectly obey laws. Be that as it may, instead of people focusing after birth on translating the obligation that the Ten Commandments reflect their role as a summary of fundamental principles in providing meaning and purpose to evoke a deeper rational connection with other fellow human beings, convey foundational truths, promote ethical experience, foster communal identity, and guide individual and communal relationship practices. In other words, just as in the military, the first requirement is to condition soldiers' attitudes so they can understand the meanings of "loyalty," "duty," "respect," "selfless service," "honor," "integrity," and "personal courage," which is essential for creating a cohesive force capable of acting on policy as needed. The aim is to create a cohesive force and a military organization whose constituents become conditioned from then on to translate and to live such values every day in everything they do—whether they are on the job or off.

Much of what we know of the old world starts with humans having begun the systematic husbandry of plants and animals. Since then, the advances made by human societies have been irretrievably linked to conquests, thus creating different needs for military forces. Perhaps people deem they must remain subservient to militarism to promote national interests or political agendas to maintain continued independence. The recorded military history shows that the education or skills that those who take soldiering as a profession manage to translate policy into concrete missions and tasks, generally called "orders," are crucial. The military creates effective soldiers who prioritize the nation's and their subordinates' welfare over their own. Selfless service encompasses more than just adhering to the Decalogue. The military organization, even though most people refuse to abide by these principles outside the military context, functions as a discrete subculture within a larger civil society and seems to condition the attitude of personnel in what is arguably one of the most complex activities known to humanity, and that is ethics. As an applied field, militarist ideology, guided by concepts embodied in military culture, doctrine, or system, seems to instill ethical quality or conduct in which an individual becomes capable of doing what's right, legally and morally. An individual becomes capable of bearing true faith and allegiance to national defense policy attitudes, which most people refuse to abide by as their principles outside the military as a doctrine or system.

Arguably, when we draw a historical parallel to civilian social attitudes outside of militarist ideology or organizations, we can learn valuable lessons from the many individuals who do not view soldiering as a means of making a living or fulfilling their obligations to selfless service, which involves consistently making value choices that align with moral principles.

The subculture and lifestyle of non-military people can be defined by a large group of people doing daily tasks as part of their routines and projects. However, instead of focusing on training and education activities that maintain the same values, individuals who choose the profession of soldiering learn to ensure a constant or steady flow of social attitudes that embody selfless service, integrity, respect, and

similar principles. The people who do not pick the soldiering profession spend their entire lives splitting the human experience of reality into the sacred and the profane and see the human role as a means to spot improvements that could be deeply meaningful to society. Instead of merging their ideologies to live as part of a larger civil society, people often pursue individual agendas and protect their economic interests, dedicating themselves to questioning issues such as whether God gave the Decalogue to Moses, the exact date the Ten Commandments were written, who wrote them, their interpretive differences, and whether the laws should be displayed on public property. In civilian life, people engage in projects and routines designed to prevent the development of a social attitude that enforces specific ideologies or ethics, similar to how militarist ideology compels the translation of policy into concrete missions and tasks. The proof of this phenomenon is people's ongoing inability to unite to maintain peace and security, as history has shown up to the present day. Perhaps people are unable to trust each other to maintain peace and security because mankind continues to use, until today, an antonymic ideology that precedes the ten laws that the Bible claims God gave to Moses, which the same Bible proclaims about God having said in his heart, "Every inclination of the human heart is evil from childhood" (Genesis 8:21).

In a world whose inhabitants are fluids and not permanent. How can people expect to overcome the weakness of their will if the Bible states that the laws they have followed since the beginning of time demonstrate their inability to achieve perfect obedience? Hence, the need for religion as an alternative machinery to derive knowledge and understanding to advocate for truths and values. Therefore, religion, as in the military organization, functions as a discrete subculture within a larger civil society. Historically, neither militarist nor religious ideologies have succeeded in fostering a social attitude that encourages people to use their time on earth to practice the laws or values that are clearly necessary to avoid any form of injury in society. How long should people allow discrete subcultures within societies to dictate or govern values? To establish conditions under which people begin to act in accordance with legal and moral standards, it is necessary for individuals to come together and create foundational principles that will encourage new generations to embody and practice values such as

respect, duty, loyalty, selfless service, and integrity in all aspects of life. When done otherwise, people function as discrete subcultures, as the case is now, where people are subdivided into communities with varying degrees of knowledge, political agenda, ideology, and so forth, trying to come together not to teach and educate posterity on the promotion of values but rather on how to harmonize actions to solve international problems composed of different economic, social, and cultural characters.

This lack of resolve to combine efforts to carry out, act, and live the values of respect, duty, loyalty, selfless service, integrity, etc. in everything that one does makes it so that we have an ongoing situation on earth whereby right after a new living human reaches development, the power to distinguish between good and evil is attained. Each new living human is willing to agree that the Decalogue is self-evident and serves to establish a cognitive orientation. When practiced, those laws can lead to the formation of a tradition in which individuals are able to address the legitimacy of being organized without interference from discrete subcultures, such as religion or the military, thereby creating an ethical way of life characterized by a set of moral and religious obligations as well as civil laws. However, instead of developing the human condition since those laws were created to establish a culture ready to live according to guiding principles, as the Ten Commandments intended, humankind has failed to do so. As we said earlier, people spend their entire human experience working to enunciate a new corpus of texts, practices, theological positions, and forms of organization to comprehend the purpose of human life and all other creation. The consequence of this phenomenon has created a tradition whereby we have different people from one generation to the next doing nothing but purporting to describe the origin of some feature of the natural or social world, including establishing paradigms on how people should conduct themselves, counting in the process how their trials and tribulations are either bringing immense pleasure or suffering. This information is used by the new leaders to continue the same traditions, drawing on their human experiences to encourage people to adopt a way of life that outlines a normative set of moral and religious obligations, as well as civil laws, which Moses detailed thousands of years ago.

Ultimately, we can conclude that our ancestors have been deriving doctrines for thousands of years that all new living humans can use to begin developing the necessary cultural capability for everyone to interact with one another and with the objects that exist to influence morality and virtue in return. The likelihood of peace and security becoming a reality could have been greater long ago if people had refrained from wanting to believe that their purpose is to spot improvement rather than to practice the improvements that have already been devised to exhibit constructive thoughts, words, and deeds and just stick to living by what the Decalogue calls on people to do—point-blank. Anyone who breaches those laws is punished. Nonetheless, people seek to adopt ideologies and ethics that align with their specific internal subcultural needs. We currently face a situation where, instead of new living humans dedicating themselves to building institutions that would create a framework of ideas and beliefs to guide future generations in adhering to straightforward normative laws like those depicted in the Ten Commandments, there is only one prevailing approach. People want the purpose of human life to involve questioning what Moses identified long ago and the methods he proposed for maintaining peace and security. The aim is to reconstruct a subculture that operates within a larger culture so new living humans could, right after birth, start to exercise constructive thoughts, words, and deeds that adapt to the subscribed internal subcultural needs others want them to identify themselves with or they decide to do on their own.

In the whole history of humanity, the delegation of knowledge is thought to have weakened the power of central or local governments, causing resources to be expended in attempts to address succession. If, from the date when Moses introduced his laws until now, the Decalogue has permeated ideas, perspectives, attitudes, images, and other phenomena in the everyday lives of various cultures and societies, then its influence is significant. Since their introduction, the Decalogue has remained an enduring source of inspiration in literature. The growing complexity of human societies has prevailed over people's ability to let the Decalogue or others become subservient to the needs and goals deemed necessary to create a cohesive society capable of obeying perfectly the laws that people enunciate. Regardless of the laws that people articulate, the new generations of

living humans seem to lack both the power and the desire to refrain from actions that these laws prohibit. The human condition may be understood as a mental struggle between good and evil, influenced by the transfer of knowledge from one generation to the next, which is a result of the various improvements that people observe. Evidence of that is the Bible, for it is a reference that all historians acclaim as among the oldest textbooks in circulation and one that articulates nothing but the human condition as a mental struggle between good and evil, including consequent punishment, justice, and retribution for those who do wicked acts.

It makes lots of sense to emphasize that the purpose of humankind is to sustain good, because evil brings negative deeds. However, the only way humans can achieve good is if people are conditioned to exercise constructive thoughts, words, and deeds either rationally or by indirect means. As we mentioned earlier, it is very unlikely that individuals will change their attitudes and start behaving rationally if, after birth, they are confronted with a reality where it is up to them to choose between right and wrong, based on how society has shaped morality, virtue, and sin to fit the internal needs of its members. Let us review the impact of continually allowing subcultures to exist within societies that function based on internal needs in order to understand how such a situation affects the choices people make to sustain positive transformations.

People want human life to be a mental struggle between good and evil, whereas the purpose of humankind is to sustain goodness. Positive changes in people's social and economic standards lead to positive transformations, while negative changes shorten an individual's life. It makes a lot of sense to make the cardinal concept of life the sustenance of good. The challenge is how to make people emphasize good, because whenever a person manipulates actions, the choice to classify the action as right or wrong is something that a person decides upon. Rational ethics helps to emphasize how to increase positive deeds to deter individuals from manipulating actions that harm others. Since not all men possess the same abilities, this fact could result in some men achieving a higher status. It is fundamental to come up with a system to serve as the basis of order and regularity in society. But again, people can derive power from their natural strength and from scientific production, which they are the author of. Natural strength is not permanent throughout a person's life. It makes sense to regulate human order so that no individual derives power solely from his conscience, especially if both physical and intellectual characteristics come together to benefit one person. The idea of making all people believe in mythology and view the human condition as a mental struggle between good and evil aims to prevent individuals from being solely guided by their conscience, thereby creating necessary checks and balances against those who seek to establish political authority based solely on natural rights. The weaving of assertions about human actions being a mental struggle between good and evil enables people to manipulate actions to avoid contending with the unlimited natural freedom of one man or an assembly of men.

Humanity's interests in the celestial are universal, and the search for the ultimate truth is enduring. The word "love" is used for the expression of different sets of perceptions. Everyone has different emotions and views on existence's issues. One difficult matter in creating the requirement necessary to instill a sense of depersonalization or readiness to exhibit total subordination toward a common social cohesion, in which its members manage to put the welfare of others before their own and adhere to laws related to practical matters, as Moses's law, for example, suggests, is that people's weakness is to avoid coveting.

The caste system, for example, was a process by which exchange became facilitated through the intermediation of a social stratification that divided people into hierarchical groups. For example, India's caste system successfully regulated society until its ban. To regularize this society until it was banned. To sustain the political and social order promulgated by India's caste system, it is necessary to ensure that each group occupying a specific place in the social hierarchy remains segregated, based on the belief that the god of creation originated the idea of dividing people into rigid hierarchical groups according to their karma (work) to control their desires. Traditionally, the upper castes enjoyed many privileges, while the lower castes faced disadvantages. Another effective system of control that has persisted for thousands of years is one that all people who trace their common origin to Abraham adhere to. This system relies on trapping people into fixed social orders from which it would be impossible to escape by promising them to adhere to principles so their fulfillment could take effect in another afterlife.

When humans linked ethics to essence, mythology, gods, traditions, and so forth, this system provided a level playing field for traditionally advantaged groups by facilitating exchange through the intermediation of celestial instruments. Such individuals managed to promote the idea that the rule of God takes precedence over political legitimacy, deriving their rank and position from their natural skills in both physical and practical matters. Secular education likely spread and challenged the practice of linking ethics to humanity's interests in absolute truths, especially since God has decided to remain invisible, and laws and political order are human creations rather than a divine

dictate, unless people impose their power and ideas to make them so, i.e., free from earthly desire.

The idea of always seeking to adhere to the truth, which humans have transformed into a challenge to develop systems and capabilities, has inevitably led to the continuous creation of new methods for enhancing our senses and increasing our ability to observe, adapt, and uncover new knowledge. Pushing the boundaries of our scientific and technical limits continues to be a stepping stone for expanding wealth, income, and consumption; however, computerization, automation, and technology do not allow us to go deeper in expanding technology alone. The benefit of pushing scientific and technical limits to deeper grounds lets us monitor in real time the actions of people. This curiosity to sustain good things: computerization, automation, and technology are very effective tools to help use such instruments to address human powerlessness to ensure equity and equality. In ancient times, people relied on religion as a mediatory agent to gain the power needed to justify social stratification, which in turn influenced their understanding of how to regulate equity and equality.

Given that people currently have access to physical and technological machinery to control and regulate unethical actions, as well as sufficient human capital to support these efforts during shortages, the situation is complex. This situation implies that the perception that religious institutions try to postulate “every inclination of the human heart is evil from childhood” is a given, as religious mediators link this belief to any act of injustice. The question remains whether the perception that religious institutions try to promulgate is true or if it is merely another human creation. People are now not obliged to teach the wisdom and dogma of truths and values; hence, computerization, automation, and technology can overpower human physical and intellectual characteristics whereby individual actions stop being bound only by one’s personal power and conscience. This perception signifies that conforming to a standard of what is right and good is now something that another individual could decide upon according to his determined wish or need. To illustrate what we mean, consider a person who is taking an elevator and whose destination is to go to the 15th floor. In the new elevators that are in operation. A person cannot

change their mind and get off at another floor. The elevator operator can also decide to override the sought-out destination.

Therefore, since the previous issue faced by those promoting social change was the inability to control desired and actual outcomes, it is now unnecessary to model desired outcomes before deciding on intervention methods to achieve those outcomes. Computerization, automation, and technology can now force the outcome that the operator wishes or needs. Accordingly, people now have a process that allows them to compel any individual to engage in constructive actions or, conversely, to refrain from them. In other words, the freedom to choose right or wrong is no longer an individual responsibility derived from one's own rational perception, as was the case until humans invented automation. Now people are not required to increase rational ethics as a condition to sustain good; automation can manipulate the pathway to reach this outcome. Therefore, the method of intervention that people are relying on to overcome the weakness of will has changed. People are still far from being one with the creator, even if a deity programmed humans to identify improvements in the world and selected them to uphold goodness for clear reasons. However, modern scientific breakthroughs can inspire God to take pride in our progress as we decide how to help each other overcome their willpower weaknesses. We can now relax a good number of Moses's laws.

Ultimately, the key to ensuring the survival of mankind lies in sustaining goodness, and the desire of individuals to expand the frontiers of our scientific and technical capabilities will yield unprecedented benefits for our societies. The first four commandments in Moses's law pertain to a person's relationship with God, and the other six address our relationships with one another. There are many religions today, and each one is regarded as having a different relationship with the deity or deities of the religion to which its adherents subscribe. In this work, we are not concerned with the four laws that pertain to a person's relationship with God.

When people start to live according to the six laws that govern our relationships with one another, they will benefit from the scientific breakthroughs that people made in modern times. Computerization, automation, and technology will guide people in correcting the

distortions that skew their analyses of benefits and costs. The only significant negative transformations that people would still need to address would be related to how to manage natural disasters and how to cope with the loss of loved ones until they achieve prolonged longevity.

At this juncture, we would like to examine the contentious issue of how current technological, economic, and social trends will continue to develop and shape a preferred vision of the future.

People adapted a religious development in the whole history of humanity that conditioned the freedom of the individual to a cultural religious movement that permitted the individual to choose right or wrong based on rational ethics and not a dictate. The individual was ultimately responsible for his deeds under the leading political doctrine of the era.

We cannot determine whether this perception or mental attitude—associated with religious beliefs or practices and expected to be adhered to by all new humans—resulted from cultural influence or was a dictate programmed by piety.

The earliest religious culture involved the worship of forces of nature as providers of sustenance. Then, objects of worship were personified and became an expansive cast of divinities. From that point, the polytheistic culture evolved into a widespread monotheistic piety movement, which is followed by adherents of the Abrahamic religions today, even though Hinduism and many other religions still qualify as believing in multiple gods in contemporary times. Then, greater emphasis was placed on personal religion and the structure of gods into a monarchical hierarchy, or, let us say, a form of government whereby different adherents exercise exclusive sacred rituals consistent with select legislation, administration, and arbitration. As the previous discussion indicates, people have significantly evolved since they began believing in a deity or deities, showing a willingness to adjust and make concessions in their beliefs.

From the date when people began to have faith in the spiritual until now, the different religious beliefs and practices have tried to develop a culture that adapts to the internal collective needs of the adherents

based on the particular functions that the group considers appropriate with respect to what is purported as right or wrong. However, increasing the exercise of constructive thoughts, words, and deeds in the world and in ourselves is a personified approach, with the exception of kings who claim they hold a sacral function directly connected to God or, in the case of some, a special connection to a divine being. This statement signifies that regardless of what religious beliefs or machinery people pick, the main center of power will always be the choice that the individual makes. This is because for as long as God decides to remain invisible, the mythological hero will always be man. Man discovered fire, agriculture, speech, tradition, law, and religion and is the one who founded the different cultures that we know.

For example, the Bamboo Annals are a chronicle of ancient China with records extending to the Wei state in the Warring States period (221 BC). The Bamboo Annals were discovered in 281 AD. Some historians and scholars dispute the authenticity of the text reported in the Bamboo annals. Some scholars claim that the text begins with the Xia dynasty (2070–1600 BCE). There are other scholars who report that the text began with the reign of the Yellow Emperor (2698–2598 BC calculated). To give an idea about the relationship of the Bamboo Annals to the Bible. Moses is credited with writing the first five books of the Bible. Moses lived between 1393 and 1273 BCE. The accounts that Moses reports in those five books, including the creation, Adam, Noah, and others, occurred long before his lifetime. Those accounts were most probably handed down orally or in narratives, poems, songs, etc. Let us just mention that evidence of viable writing systems appeared in Mesopotamia and Egypt during the Bronze Age (3300–1200 BC).

According to the Bamboo Annals, Emperor Yao (2333–2234 BC), who lived during the Xia dynasty, is traditionally regarded as one of the Three Sovereigns and the Five Emperors who, in the Bamboo Annals, are depicted as the initiators of Chinese civilization or cultural heroes. A sequence of dynastic traditions traces the history of Chinese politics. When Emperor Yao became old, he became distressed because he saw that his 9 sons were all useless. Yao asked his administrators to propose a suitable successor and chose Shun (2233–2184) because he

was impressed by his achievements. Likewise, in the last years of Shun's reign, he considered his son, Shangjun, unworthy to succeed him and picked Yu the Great (2200 – 2101 BC) as his heir.

We have no way of knowing what set of political and moral doctrines those earlier people were using to develop ethics and benevolence to the extent that they used to pass over their children when they found heirs that exhibited better morality and ability. In effect, according to many scholars and historians, Sumer, which is a region in southern Mesopotamia (modern-day southern Iraq), is arguably the first urban civilization that man has known (4500-2004 CE). As in the case of the records that appeared in the ancient Chinese texts, anthropological evidence suggests that most societies before Sumer were relatively egalitarian.

However, that started to change as the growing complexities of human societies were giving rise to a leisured upper class. For example, according to ancient Chinese texts, when it was time for Yu the Great to pass the throne, he did not choose the most capable candidate based on morality and ability, as was the tradition; instead, he inaugurated dynastic rule in China by passing the throne to his son, Qi. Many versions circulate, each offering different accounts of how Qi rose to the position of heir. There are accounts that speculate that Shun wanted to name his deputy Gaotao to be his successor. Gaotao's death before Shun forced him to make a difficult decision: to choose between his son and Gaotao's son, Bo Yi.

Ultimately, Qi's succession marked the end of the Chinese historical tradition of people living based on rules centered around meritorious selfless service, ability, respect, or morality customs. For example, the Zhou dynasty (1600 to 1046 BC), which deposed the Shang dynasty in the timeline of Chinese history, declared that heaven had revoked the mandate from the Shang dynasty (1600 to 1046 BC) and given it to the Zhou in retaliation for the Shang's immoral comportment, corruption, and misrule.

The Zhou emperors' justification for their takeover of the Shang dynasty or change of mandate does not align with how ancient Chinese texts depict the people living in the Xia dynasty. In the Chinese

historical tradition, the Chinese people who were living in the earlier era managed to use their abilities to motivate each other to exercise constructive thoughts, words, and deeds to live in peace and stability. Those earlier people are depicted as possessing outstanding moral character who succeeded in managing to live in peace without letting the scramble for power split them apart despite how much their essential skills and knowledge were broadening. During this period, the tribal units and chiefdoms did not begin to coalesce with the desire to form empires, monarchies, or state-level polities.

Yu the Great, whether willingly or unwillingly, introduced a tradition that revolved around the organization of a political ideology that converted governance into lineage societies, thus setting the precedence for dynastic rule or the hereditary system. This tradition that Yu the Great set up for the Chinese people did succeed in forming a social structure and a chronicle that lasted until 1912, when the Qing dynasty, the last imperial Chinese dynasty, died out, giving rise to a new Chinese diaspora with the establishment of the Republic of China.

It's basically impossible to say for certain where early civilizations arose or how humans spread because nearly all of our knowledge comes from archaeology. Anthropologists claim based on artifacts that people concentrated in fertile river valleys. Scholars and historians claim that civilization emerged along the banks of the Tigris and Euphrates, the Nile, the Indus, and the Yangtze and Yellow Rivers, including where the earliest form of writing appeared. As complex societies were developing in the old world, historians claim that religious and philosophical ideas emerged in many different locations. It is basically impossible to know if the different religious and philosophical ideas that people developed to raise themselves above the merely physical aspects of existence and to create institutions or permanent organizations were a result of the customs and beliefs that life would be better off if societies were regularized. Alternatively, the growing pattern that emerged across all cultures of the old world to regularize societies and create social order was a result of the polity system that people were using, bestowing many privileges on upper castes while sanctioning the repression of the lower social groups. Political economy, which is a synonym for economics, deals with studying production and trade as well as with the distribution of

national income and wealth. Moral philosophy is a concept that deals with systemizing what is right or wrong. The people who lived in the old world couldn't have been doing business any different than how we are doing today. The people who lived in the old world must have had their own laws, customs, government, or unifying characteristics governing the production and exchange of the material means of subsistence. Goods and services are two terms that people developed to categorize the things they desire.

Scholars and historians claim that when people lived in the old world, most people were dedicated to farming. We have no way of knowing what technology existed in the old world; so many people would be dedicated to the performance of duties involved in offering services related to the production and distribution of goods. The services that existed in the old world had to have dealt mainly with people offering to cut other people's hair, washing clothes, mending shoes, stitching clothes, working for another in the field, teaching how to read and write, and so forth. Therefore, the limited scientific and technical knowledge meant that people could only dedicate themselves to promoting religion and philosophy.

In contemporary times, a polity decides that a confrontation is necessary to achieve tangible or intangible war aims. The entities that go to war use weapons and other military technology and equipment to attain the desired benefit following the successful conclusion of a war, invasion, or dispute. In the old world, there was little technology to rely on when a polity could have decided to carry out a raid, massacre, and so forth. This situation signifies that there were no bullets or devices to inflict bodily harm or physical damage from a distance because the rifle musket had not been invented then. People fought with massed manpower using hands, knives, spears, sticks, stones, etc. As knowledge, technology, commerce, and weapons were being transformed, the people who lived in antiquity had to have relied on using a variety of techniques to coerce certain actions, thereby compelling their constituents to foster unifying characteristics or to gain relative advantage over their opponents besides limiting themselves to weaponry or combat events.

People throughout history have used tactics to motivate the discharge of internal rage against others, fueled by creating bias and hatred through a belief in an institution, goal, or common purpose. People who wish to preserve and defend their cherished order must focus on using speed to defeat opponents when they seek aggression through warfare as an outlet. People have developed many military strategies to quickly conclude war or dispute aims. The ideal strategy that people can employ in pursuit of a common purpose is the use of tactics that put less emphasis on battles to attain the tangible and intangible benefits expected at the conclusion of a war or dispute. There are a number of strategies or techniques that people could rely on to unleash or create fear, and psychological warfare can successfully compel others to do one's will. Evoking psychological reactions in other people can coerce them into action.

One of the most effective psychological coercive techniques to force a course of action favorable to a policy without utilizing force is when people target a value system or belief system. This tactic, which relies on emotions, motives, reasoning, or behavior to gain a material or mental advantage over an adversary, transforms people's hearts and minds into a weapon. This type of persuasion eschews the use of violence in order to further policy or interests; hence, it is a substitute for military action or takeover.

Could the pattern that emerged across all cultures in antiquity have allowed religions and philosophies to endure despite the influence of governing polities or empires? This pattern rose when people were using those two means to compel others to do one's will instead of relying on amassing manpower to fight in battles and thereby save lives. The different empires and kingdoms also needed new technology to fight religion and philosophy. As we said, in the old world there was little technology, and therefore traders taught people religion and philosophy to form soldiers since other coercive methods such as the application of economic pressure were most probably limited to blocking water sources or food supply routes.

The organization of behavior patterns to address the issue of one person's security being dependent on another's could result from socio-cultural circumstances, such as complex social organization, greater

population density, and competition over resources. Animal tendencies could also give rise to these behavioral patterns. In this situation, this “love of wisdom” motivated humanity to pursue and express this philosophy by framing the human condition as a struggle between good and evil, which in turn pushed the boundaries of science, technology, and political morality, making these two instruments essential for life.

Humans can continue to make the purpose of human life entail a search for absolute truth and to keep the human history of every age motivated by cultures that become divided into two forces. One force sees its role as encouraging values and ethics to reach the best way to live or to be just. This is because this force, which feels deprived of realizing the full development of its personality, wishes that the other force promote active participation in life through the exercise of constructive deeds. The other force is working on denying the group that feels deprived of the full development of their personality by employing the continuous technology that people develop because they perceive that their mission is to strip them of the material things they have accumulated.

History involves examining past human affairs and natural events to identify the patterns of cause and effect that shape them. The usefulness of tapping into the chronicle of past events is that it provides a perspective on the problems of the present, including getting us to guess the changes that we can expect in the future.

If we examine the records and narrative descriptions of how people in the past constructed their relationships, we are bound to find that the events and developments that occurred during this particular block of time are likely to repeat themselves. For example, if we study the past from the Bronze Age to the present, we can observe significant patterns. From when the first dynasty in Chinese history began with the Xia dynasty (2070–1600 BC) until the Republic of China emerged in 1912, the Chinese political system was nothing but a cycle of expansion, fracture, and reunification. All other dynasties, monarchs, empires, and cultures have experienced a similar cycle as this Chinese chronicle. All the people of those different eras up until 1912, irrespective of race, color, language, religion, birth, or other status,

saw cycles of prosperity and declines. Therefore, for much of world history up until 1912, the opportunities for social advancement created a general perception of cultural refinement, which included the belief that investing in modernization while addressing issues related to family, morale, and the roles of a good ruler was essential. This movement, whose origin stands as how to ensure the full development of the human personality, could be managed by mythologizing nature, history, and customs to institute a behavioral model that divides the human condition into a vertical and horizontal struggle between good and evil for the purpose of the love of life.

If we have learned from the past, then we ought to be consequent to all the many cultures, personalities, and famous philosophers whose contributions through their writings about human nature and other ponderings of the world span many millennia up until 1912 and have failed to create the changes that people deemed necessary. The emergence of religions and philosophies aimed at explaining nature, history, and customs, along with the development of technologically advanced urban cultures, did not lead to the creation of behavioral models that could promote peaceful connections among people. Of course, we can continue to hope that people will establish conditions that allow them to achieve practical tolerance and live together in peace as good neighbors so that all members of the human family do not have to live in fear and want.

Therefore, as of 1912, the complex social organization that emerged along with greater population density and competition over resources, including all the scientific and industrial revolutions that accompanied this change, didn't derive the organization of behaviors to correlate people's powerlessness with the division of reality into two separate realms, emphasizing the importance of the mind over the relative unimportance of the human body. Some scholars and historians argue that human behavioral tendencies derive from animal tendencies, which could explain why humans struggle to overcome their will's weakness. The paradox of supporting such rationalism is that empirical research shows humans exhibit competitive territorial and sexual tendencies similar to those found in many primates. The irony is that the power and purpose humans show in their relationships are incompatible with those of animals. Up until humans become

immortal, all things would remain temporal. We cannot know the human purpose of preserving material things without humans inhabiting the world. It is fascinating to find that, as soon as a new living human is born, the people he will encounter represent the only real and eternal aspect of addressing the fundamental questions about our place in the universe, with political morality at the center of humanity's ongoing exploration to understand absolute truth and ensure that every member of the human family is entitled to the free and full development of his personality.

The third millennium is a period of time that began on January 1, 2001, and will end on December 31, 3000. "Intellectual freedom" is coined to refer to the freedom to hold, receive, and disseminate ideas without restriction. Humans began the process of making intellectual freedom an integral component of the human aspiration long before the start of the first millennium, according to scholars and historians. Intellectual freedom encompasses human ambition to build democratic societies, where adherents explore, consider, and express ideas and information freely. I cannot identify a specific starting point in human history to illustrate how the concept of intellectual freedom has become the only truly enduring aspect of this idea. In the next chapters, I will depict two case studies. I don't think it is necessary to go back far in time to illustrate the consequences of valuing an individual's right to formulate thoughts and opinions throughout history. I was born in Lebanon, and then my family immigrated to the United States around the time when the Lebanese civil war started in 1975. Those two countries in which I have lived are both pursuing making every citizen realize the free and full development of his human personality. I will explore the political morality that governs the Lebanese people based on this principle. Then, I will explore how the concept of intellectual freedom may explain the rise and fall of empires by drawing an analogy to the history of the United States. I will do this work in the next chapter. The objective of this exercise is to determine whether the concept of the human condition as a mental struggle between good and evil, when combined with the legitimacy of various prophecies regarding the preservation of human security, may conflict with one another.

Exploration is the act of searching into or through something to gather information or resources. The new people who keep on becoming among the living diagnose what could be preventing humans from casting a foundation in ethics since antiquity and producing rules that no one ends up being capable of applying. People have developed religious and philosophical transformative ideas to establish a naturalistic or supernatural approach to understanding man, spanning the entire length of human history. As of the date when humans began making the “idea” the only real and eternal thing, the experience that a new living human could identify his entire system to tend towards could be to consider Western or Eastern tendencies/doctrine or both. The challenge has existed since humans declared the “idea” to be the only real and eternal truth, regardless of which school of thought a person chooses to associate with. The choice is between viewing life as a journey towards eternal realities that transcend our current existence or as a service that ultimately leads to nothing. Humans have created the concept of conquest to ensure the realisation of full personality development, which determines the life journey a person can choose. It is one thing for man to feel compelled to ensure the realisation of the full development of his personality, particularly since human life is temporary. The challenge is man’s decision to use creativity as a driver to ensure the sought gain. The test is not just about helping people develop their personalities but also about letting them choose their purpose. The human search to prolong life necessitates that the complex social systems—social, legal, political, religious, and economic—manifest in their current forms. As such, to reach the lasting changes that everyone is expecting from the intervention and programme that people are subscribing to, we define this moment as the point when mankind reaches the goal of prolonging

human life. There could be two scenarios to characterise human conditions, then. Either humans would have managed to overhaul the human condition to stop it from continuing to be a struggle between good and evil, or this condition would remain as it has been the case, like since antiquity.

A key question is how we can be convinced that overhauling the current social, legal, political, religious, and economic organisational systems, while prioritising technology and data, will lead to significant positive changes in people's lives.

We have all heard the term "everything is relative." Humans have been deconstructing social, legal, political, religious, and economic organisational systems since antiquity. Ever since that date, people began relying on human ingenuity to build relationships with the natural world and with each other. The cooperation method that people employ interlinks all so everyone can start to make use of the resources that others are not using to convert them into tools that everyone can benefit from, including allowing people to promote views, beliefs, attitudes, values, goods, services, information, etc. However, the net gain expected from this collective effort, which began millions of years ago, shows that the benefits of materialism now outweigh the drawbacks due to the reliance on machinery that improves the standard of living. A person can only improve their standard of living by agreeing with another person, using them, or using force. Because crises and conflicts change human life, we can say that all the progress people make results in no net gain, as people succumb to natural and manmade causes. People settle their disputes using the tools and objects they create because human physical abilities vary throughout a person's life. It is true that without the tools that people engineer, which humans use to do both progress and destruction, the technological progress and improved standard of living that people rely on would not have allowed life to be as enriching as it is now, especially since God has decided to remain invisible and communicate through scribes. At the same time, people living without supervision do not contribute positively, as this situation leads many to feel compelled by their own power and conscience to define the purpose of human life. Indeed, the conclusion that people have been transitioning from one generation to the next, collaborating

to abandon force so that each member of the human family can cease living in fear of need and want, is a positive step forward, as we have previously stated, since humans have historically chosen to focus on sustaining good as the only real and eternal value.

This is a long-term goal that humans have been pursuing to sustain good, which every posterity regards as the central reason for the purpose of human life. Its series of programmes, which makes the preservation of God, the natural world, and man's accomplishments at the centre of this drive, has helped humans through the different philosophical and religious dogmas that people are continually injecting or reformulating to make everyone perceive that the reform to create relief is underway.

For example, in the 20th century, the countries with great military and economic powers tested with expanding moral and progressive domestic ideas into becoming foreign open agreement policy that incorporates free trade, democracy, and self-determination. Convinced that the continued existence of colonialism impedes the social development of dependent peoples. Those nations who enjoy great power took steps to end colonialism and made all people have the right to self-determination.

Humans can manifest social, legal, political, religious, and economic organisation from within two social models. Either on the basis of how people started living after the Second World War, whereby all the nations that were under colonialism were given the right to exercise their sovereignty over the integrity of their national territory, or based on the way it was done before the Second World War was fought, when many countries and people lived under colonialism, empires, monarchs, etc.

Under either model, citizens can choose to secularise (or separate) religion from the government institutions or allow the government function based on having the religious communities be represented in public employment. The world has had extensive experience with colonialism, but it was only after the Second World War that people began to test and develop their ability to exercise sovereignty over their national territories.

The colonising countries and their people believed that all individuals had an inalienable right to complete freedom. In other words, the colonised countries and people lacked a voice in reaching this conclusion. The decolonised countries and people could either let their government institutions function on the basis of secularising religious values and traditions to let the behavioural motivators that, on their basis, people interact with each other with become allied to operate on neutral lines after they were freed or use man-made common principles.

For example, at the end of WW1, Lebanon was placed under the protection of French power. Before WW1, Lebanon was under the protection of the Ottoman Empire.

In 1905, the French passed a law that established state secularisation. Historians and scholars claim that the French Revolution (1789–1799) could be one of the most important events in human history. The French Revolution's causes are debated, but one is the resentment of the clergy and aristocracy's privileges. The revolution overthrew the monarchy and established a republic. This country, from 1789 until 1905, when the law was passed to separate the church from the state, experienced violent periods of political turmoil to ensure that its government institutions and their representatives should remain separate from religious institutions, their beliefs, and their dignitaries. The French people wanted the government, businesses, corporations, and so forth to be allied and organised around a social system that aligns itself with non-religious lines in favour of letting citizens base their traditions and values on human rationalisation principles.

Lebanon is a country that emerged under the French mandate following the First World War. On 23 May 1926, this country came into existence for the first time as a separate political entity. The French High Commissioner, who was under his alien subjugation, promulgated that the Lebanese constitution be established as a form of government based on the requirement to have the religious communities be represented in public employment. In other words, the French set up a political system that, in the year 1905, passed a law to free themselves from abiding by it due to all the violent periods of

political turmoil they experienced when their own government institutions and their representatives were enjoying privileges due to religious institutions' influences.

The Lebanese constitution, which is still in force today, is a form of government that has been operating as of 1926 on the basis of the total opposite lines that the French set up for themselves as a social system to operate on their principles or within their own territorial boundaries as of 1905.

If we consider the French decision to decolonise Lebanon after 26 years of mandate, which occurred on 22 November 1943, we can better understand its implications. Next, we take into account how this separation enabled the people of Lebanon to become a member of the United Nations on 24 October 1945. Since Lebanon became a member of the United Nations, its people have not united to establish a parliamentary form of government that would eliminate religious interference in public governance; businesses, corporations, and others have been fighting and disputing with each other since. The people of Lebanon have kept the Lebanese constitution intact until now and will only revamp it if a great power forces them to do so or if the bloodshed and insecurity they have experienced compel them to change. The people of Lebanon have been fighting and disputing with each other since 1975 over political morality because each religious community sides with each political or governmental faction. In fact, in 2008, following a military operation between the people of the different religious communities that form part of the sovereignty of this country. The political parties agreed that no major decisions by the Lebanese government can be made without the consent of all major religious communities, no matter how large the majority supporting the government may be. If the different religious communities had not reached this agreement in 2008, known as the "Taef and Doha agreements", the various religious groups living in Lebanon might still be engaged in conflict today.

If we consider that we have had, since 1975, when the civil war in Lebanon broke out between the different religious communities, and until now, in 2016, a semi-state government operating and running the country. In other words, the best way to describe how the Lebanese

people are living in modern times is to compare their situation to that of the French people before the French Revolution or, better, the people in Greece when they were living in Greek antiquity. The Greeks during the Hellenistic period (323 BC–31 BC) also had a revolution and decided to neutralise the importance of religious values and traditions in favour of burgeoning government institutions, whereby the representatives remained separate from religious institutions, their beliefs, and their dignitaries.

Therefore, the best way to describe the political reality of the people of Lebanon is to compare it to a documentary on the History Channel that explores how the Greeks, the French, and others lived before the 20th century. Even if the Lebanese people choose to enact a law separating religion from the state, it remains uncertain whether such a law will result in enduring change. How could we be assured that this move to establish a republic would stop this country from experiencing violent periods of political turmoil? If it weren't for the United States' efforts to assist in rebuilding Europe after the Second World War, the French would likely still be living in the same conditions as the Iraqis, who chose to exchange their subjugation by their people for the promise of modernisation.

Even if the people of Lebanon pass a law establishing state secularisation to regularise society, the modern technologies and cutting-edge systems they could count on might not have the impact they expect. Following the unionisation of the world, which emerged at the end of the Second World War, modern technologies and cutting-edge systems are now controlled solely by those who operate the machinery that regulates people's actions and their freedom to choose between good and evil. All others would have to choose between living as obedient citizens ready to surrender to the automation system's authority—fulfilling the role of individual rights protector—or living incarcerated. The automation will create a divide in reality, allowing each individual to choose whether to live among free people or in a restricted environment. This change signifies replacing the religious communities that the Lebanese government currently favours and overhauling the social, legal, political, religious, and economic organisational systems in the country to prioritise technology and data. This change will change the people in power, but it will not change

political morality; the most important aspect of creating a social contract is improving relationships between people. The proof is the social, legal, political, religious, and economic organisation of the French people as of 1905. Despite all the modernisation that the French people invested in to improve social cohesion, many scholars are willing to argue that the peace and security of France are worsening.

Ultimately, this reform signifies the 1918 decision made by the people of France, along with other nations, to transform moral and progressive domestic ideas into a foreign open agreement policy that encompasses free trade, democracy, and self-determination. This reform may still be undergoing significant changes, but one thing is certain. This reform, which started almost a century ago, has not transformed the world into a more peaceful place or made a significant difference in people's lives; instead, it has satirised an era of serious social problems that are masked by a thin layer of gold. Instead of violence being coerced in the form of widespread wars involving mass-scale military operations or conflicts between nations, as occurred during WW1 and WW2, the current situation reflects a different kind of violence. The new type of violence that is increasingly evident seems to be a conflict characterised by extreme poverty and inequality, where both the rich and the poor are fighting over the concentration of wealth in the hands of individuals and entities. In other words, we are living in the same insecurity that was known in Mesopotamia and during Chinese antiquity three thousand years ago, except it is new people who are playing out or living in this present instability.

We can't know if human nature has changed since Yu the Great, the last century, or the end of WW2, when people first aspired to peace. It is evident that violence can never go down to zero, and the interconnection of the world makes the dissemination of unfavourable news much easier, leading people to think that we are living in a violent time. However, social crises and conflicts exist in two forms: violent and non-violent. Let us classify the manner these crises and conflicts manifest into two types: sparked and incubated. The incubated violent crises and conflicts undergo a transformation process; first, through a gestation period, and then they take shape and

explode. After World War II, the violent crises and conflicts experienced by nations and their people belong largely to the category of unilateral violence and not the multilateral or multidimensional conflict, which is typically international in nature. With the advancement of technology, people are now able to neutralise unilateral violent acts. The question that arises is how we can be assured that the ongoing reorganisation aimed at eliminating problems caused by industrialisation, immigration, urbanisation, and government corruption is not setting people up to experience a new world explosion. The peace and security situation would continue to remain in a state of incubation or gestation until the struggle against the menace of poverty and inequality explodes. In particular, what if the common programmes and principles that people believe will reduce the causes of violence and aggression, thereby creating a better life for all countries and peoples, actually serve as impediments? From one generation to the next, people have been switching between periods of peace and war. After each embattlement, people resolve to never be compelled to have recourse to aggression, but this tenacity lasts only up until all the parties implicated in the dispute start to implement the treaties or conventions that were agreed upon.

Despite the widespread scientific advancements and industrial boom since the end of the Second World War, there has been a corresponding trend of poverty and unemployment that mirrors the technological progress, but in a reversed order. The question that may be on the minds of many people is what could be the root causes of this resolve and weakness trend that people exhibit towards maintaining peace and stability and which jumps from periods of conviction to periods of disregard.

The unequal distribution of wealth and power has destroyed every previous civilisation that existed. We want to focus on a different inquest in this work: how human progress begets havoc in the world, a view I wrote about in my other works.

In this work, I am interested in understanding how the ongoing transformation of people's interactions, with the central aim of sustaining goodness, will unfold. Even when people successfully integrate technology and data into their relationships, challenges still

arise. This new form of collaboration, which allows people to exchange or conduct business with one another, does not prepare humans to face more severe challenges because, as we mentioned, the security of one person often comes at the expense of another's security. Since people pursue an economic system that creates winners and losers, this approach leads to a gap in knowledge that will continually concentrate wealth and power in the hands of specific individuals. If people desire only what is truly real and eternal, they must acknowledge that every inclination of the human heart is evil from childhood. Even if the social, legal, religious, and economic organisations that people choose could bring about the expected changes, the reality is that individuals have categorised each action as either good or evil. This mental conditioning creates a struggle to the extent that anytime a person doesn't manage to realise the full development of his personality, he feels a sense of failure. The culprit is the doctrine that people set up. If the human heart is inherently evil from childhood, then no social, legal, religious, or economic organisation can overcome the weakness of the will or encourage people to defer their bodily desires without using force. And so, if we replace force from being as it was across the different range of cultures and civilisations, being enforced by real men, including military technology and equipment, and replace that force by using automation to control and regulate human action. How can we be sure that the disregard for human rights, which leads to conflicts and wars to impose a doctrinal switch, won't be what future generations resort to for the full development of their personalities if we keep saying that every human inclination is evil from childhood? If the human heart is truly evil from childhood, then all the efforts made by social, legal, religious, and economic organisations are futile. Alternatively, the human heart may be less evil from childhood than people claim to justify social and economic inequality. In this latter case, the time could very well be opportune to overhaul the religious doctrines or beliefs to align them with the widespread scientific advancement and industrial boom. In other words, the economic system that people collaborate on is the only reasonable system to organise around, because one person's security is inherently linked to another's. We know this economic system creates subjugation or segregation, regardless of people's desires or the practice of colonialism. The alternative is for people to return to a Stone Age lifestyle, devoid of

any technology that could create equality. The need for human ingenuity in utilising resources to produce apparatuses and tools is constant and will create a gap between people, regardless of whether they desire this outcome. This situation signifies that people must either practise moral and progressive domestic ideas, which include open agreement policies such as free trade, democracy, and self-determination, or revert to dictatorship. As long as people believe that the human heart is inherently evil, their actions will be driven by this belief, making it impossible for true reformers to succeed, even if they have the best intentions.

For example, during WWI, the Germans were sinking passenger ships that were crossing the Atlantic. On 8 January 1918, Woodrow Wilson presented war aims to end World War I in a speech to the United States Congress. In this message, Wilson declared that the United States' objective was "to vindicate the principles of peace and justice in the life of the world." Perhaps the Americans were transporting weapons on those ships, which may explain why the Germans felt compelled to sink the passenger vessels. Even if we assume that the United States intended to establish hegemony over the world when Woodrow Wilson made this powerful statement, it is important to consider the implications. The social, legal, religious, and economic organisation challenges that the United States is facing one century later due to all the competition could have brought its end as a superpower if it weren't for all the military strength that this country manoeuvred to gain political authority.

Therefore, if the people of Lebanon wish to emulate the great powers of France, the United States, or Russia, they must first address their internal issues. The French are working on emulating the United States or Russia in terms of competence, military strengths, or status. The United States could be assuring its citizens that its economic capacity, political stability, and competence are moving for the better. However, we know very well that this situation is because the United States has not abandoned its programme in developing nuclear and missile technology, and the only source from which the people of the United States could be drawing such a view is their belief that there are bad actors and they are the good actors. Therefore, if the people of Lebanon, France, the United States, and all the others don't want to be

committed to the abandonment of military technology and equipment, it is because the human experience is divided into bad actors and good actors. If not for human nature, the world might have been more stable long ago. What if people need to seriously consider removing the belief that humans are inherently wicked from childhood in order to stop viewing the human condition as a division between good and bad? In lieu of this belief, advocate everything about the universe having perhaps been programmed by a deity, minus all the laws that are attributed to God having passed laws on how people should interact with each other, starting with the Ten Commandments. This is because for as long as people continue to maintain religious institutions that preach that it was God who said that the human heart is wicked or pass laws that advocate that it is unethical to steal, the more this preaching will continue to provoke people to suppose that indeed people are evil. This is because a deity may have programmed the universe to work efficiently and allowed man to choose between good and evil, leading people to succumb to their creation. Unless, of course, the command that God made in the Bible for humans to stay away from knowing good or evil; otherwise, a person would die, which is a dogma I have addressed in one of my other works. But because more good brings a better standard of living and more evil the opposite, what would be the purpose of any deity in subjecting humans to this experience of becoming among the living if, indeed, he desired people to increase in number, knowing that humans would spend their time looking to improve their living conditions? Otherwise, why would humans possess ingenuity if they were created by a deity rather than through evolution? If after the population expansion that the world saw as of the beginning of the 20th century and until now, one century later, the social, legal, religious, and economic organisation that people live under, its overarching arm or dogma, conveys the impression that people were better off when they were living under subjugation and domination as compared to the unprecedented milestone that humans achieved after WWII, in which they figured out how to start to practise tolerance to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war.

Now, if we consider the period from when people started to become civilised until 1945, we see that this was a time when societies began to test the idea of fostering peaceful connections through policies and

programmes, even though people were not yet unionised. In other words, all the insecurity the world knew before 1945 and all the philosophers' work on what could prevent humans from being good neighbours were based on their perceptions of reality, which centred on people's unwillingness to prioritise the mind over the body. Since 1945, this reality has changed, but we have yet to take the necessary actions to address it. On the contrary, the imposition of technology and automation relegates people to a secondary role in decision-making. This reality reinforces our belief that the laws people claim were dictated by God are the true obstacles preventing individuals from discovering how to create a social paradigm that allows them to live free from fear and want. In other words, the wave of insecurity that the world is knowing is a consequence of people's desire to improve moral sentiments based on the perception that the human condition is a struggle between good and evil and not due to the reintegration or reorganisation that is going on. In the next chapter, we will see if the US, which seems to be building an empire like those of various cultures, is at risk of collapsing if it lets the human condition be a struggle between good and evil for its people. Next, examine whether the laws that people believe were dictated by God regarding human interactions with their surroundings are truly divine commands or human inventions. Seeing those laws as the only real and eternal truths may conflict with the progressive thinking that humans have chosen as the basis for governing and coexisting.

The history of the world has always reflected a polity to which a person surrenders their human reasoning that tried to project domination, power, and influence. This phenomenon typically manifests through the interweaving of elements associated with supremacy in technological, military, and economic capabilities. Evidently, factors like access to resources, geography, population, national identity, culture, and so forth play fundamental roles.

Throughout history, many empires, monarchs, and countries have demonstrated immense regional power and have reversed their status by exerting significant influence beyond the borders of their controlled spatial regions. The constant need to buy and sell goods and services requires that empires, monarchs, and countries consistently accommodate their interests in expanding their sphere of influence. Over the course of history, and with technological advances being steady, many empires, monarchs, countries, or nation-states tried to cast enormous influences in global politics and military dominance as a way to accompany the capitalist economy that was constantly trying to see its way through.

The history of the world has been a series of empires, monarchs, republicanism, state nations, and so forth. Every revolution that man has organised revolved around carrying forward far-reaching social and political ideas that altered the course of history. The French Revolution in the 18th century triggered the decline of absolute monarchies, empires, and so forth in favour of the idea of the republic or the state. Historians and scholars suggest that popular resentment in 18th-century France, which motivated the country's socio-political

transformation, was fueled by perceptions that the clergy and aristocracy enjoyed unfair privileges.

Every new socio-political institution, economy, culture, and more that people created throughout history largely focused on limiting corruption and greed. The causes of the French Revolution are similar in their motives, impact, and complexities to those of previous revolts that changed the course of human history.

The American Revolution is another political turmoil that took place between 1765 and 1783. It was the result of American colonial societies rejecting the authority of the British government imposing on them laws and preferring to become independent so they could exhibit self-determination rights over their wealth and resources. The resistance efforts against Great Britain developed into a war. The war ended in favour of the separatists. The American colonial societies who believed they had the right to self-determination and wanted to secede from remaining under the subjugation of Great Britain were convinced that the interference of the British monarch denied them their preparedness to the extent that they proclaimed that King George, who ruled Great Britain from 1760, was a tyrant.

We have no way of knowing what helped the American colonial societies win the war, but a significant number of scholars and historians claim that the cause of American independence came from Enlightenment ideals adopted from the French Revolution. The line of communication that crossed the Atlantic could have been a major inspiration or guiding principle. However, the innovation that the American colonial societies embraced, which surpassed what the French were doing in Europe, lay in the American separatist political philosophy of liberalism, coupled with the assertion that "all men are created equal." Perhaps this ideology could have helped to rally resistance and may have given birth to the guiding republicanism ideology that emphasised liberty and unalienable rights as central values. The point I would like to make is that during Greek antiquity, people managed to demonstrate that the divine right that clergy and aristocrats used to promulgate to derive their mandate is a human creation and not necessarily a natural order to influence a political morality revolution.

The innovation in the French and American Revolutions is that both mark an event in human history in which, for the first time, people make a fundamental change in terms of the application of political consciousness for the maintenance of peace and security in the world. In other words, before the French and American Revolutions, the motivating ideology of people was based on edicts that dictated the rise and fall of various monarchs, aristocrats, and clergy who consistently inherited political power.

The French and American Revolutions are the first two events in human history where the perception of the clergy and aristocracy enjoying privileges was challenged; for the first time, the Age of Enlightenment was powerful enough to question the authority and decisions of certain individuals regarding the establishment of political order and law.

In this work, we are interested in examining the extent to which the Age of Enlightenment encouraged people to question actions and inflame popular resentment, ultimately leading societies to overthrow political ideologies. In other words, the French societies overthrew the monarchy in favour of republicanism. In the case of the American societies, the American colonial societies rallied to secede from Great Britain to form a nation-state of their own.

If we compare how political consciousness changed from the time when people maintained political orders and laws based on a natural mandate to the period after the French and American revolutions, when they did so based on republicanism, we can see significant differences. We observe that the principal outcome, which should have resulted from the ideological change that was introduced, is to see corruption and greed vilified. This is not exactly what happens after any political entity introduces any change in the cultural setting. The different metaphysical protection systems that people introduce aim to inspire political consciousness and vilify corruption and greed in civic duties and social connectedness. The various political orders and laws that people continuously introduce only lead to cycles of rise and fall, resulting in a dislocated social cohesion or increased inequality with

each new ideology, often worse than the initial conditions before the changes were made.

Historians and scholars claim that the French Revolution overthrew the monarchy, seeing it being replaced after Napoleon seized power in 1799 with a dictatorship disguised under the appearance of a republic. The republican ideology that the founding fathers of the United States advocated for and began practising after declaring independence from Great Britain on 04 July 1776 helped the American civic thought to become a progressive polity in every sense of the word. The political, economic, social, or educational preparedness that the people of the United States achieved after the British monarch transferred power to the American colonial societies to enjoy complete independence and freedom created the necessary national identity to create unity and strengthen the government.

At the same time, as of the year 1776, the steady Age of Enlightenment that each posterity brings – all it does is that it pushes the scientific and technical limits of the American people to new heights. However, despite all the political order or laws that the American people invested in as of 1776, the citizens of this country started to stress the steady republicanism philosophy, which is perhaps the “closest one could get” to stop political morality from being bound by one's own power and conscious in favour of the Bill of Rights, as the constitution of the United States stipulates. This republicanism philosophy seems to be crossing one of its most important tests even before it celebrates its 500-year anniversary.

It is unclear whether people recognise that humans have run out of political philosophy to test with, which would encourage them to emphasise the importance of the mind over the relative unimportance of the human body. Humans can rationalise political order and law either on the basis of rejecting that the scriptures are divinely inspired or on the basis of accepting that they are. Humans have no other choice. This belief means holding to the hypothesis that earthly bodies would be resurrected or reincarnated in accordance with human deeds. Indeed, the Republicanism ideology represents the highest level of freedom attainable, and any deviation from this ideology signifies a

return to the oppressive days of domination, subjugation, and exploitation.

Up until the year 1776, historians and scholars claim that people have tested with mounting social structures on the basis of rejecting or accepting that the scriptures were divinely inspired, and man never managed to make the world of ideas more important than the world of senses. There was one last option that humans could test with to determine if they could vilify corruption or greed. This option was to practice republicanism. In other words, uphold truths or political consciousness by adhering to a bill of rights that cannot be infringed upon by public officials or private citizens. As of 1776, humans practised republicanism on the notion of a one-state show, and after the Second World War, on the basis of the unionisation ideology that emerged, yet still failed to maintain peace and security. Everything is relative. After 400 years, if the United States has lapsed in its public officials and private citizens practising political republicanism ideology, and until now its own people have failed to translate their philosophy into politics, the best form of government is neither a tyrant nor a democracy. What is the likelihood that the republicanism ideology that the United States adopted after World War II, in partnership with the rest of the world, will prevail and lead to a more peaceful global outcome?

The political order in Lebanon is based on republicanism and includes representation for religious communities in public employment. The past 100 years have shown that the Lebanese are still living in Greek antiquity but in modern times. The political order in Saudi Arabia, which is based on an absolute monarchy and a hereditary dictatorship, is not significantly different. The closest cultural comparison for understanding how the people of this country live is to relate it to the political order of the Chinese dynasties during the Bronze Age, which was based on a hereditary, lifelong chief magistracy. The same applies to all 186 political orders of the countries that constitute the current number of nation-states in the world, without exception. If the political order is not reduced in any given state or nation to a hereditary lifelong chief magistracy or archon, it is a lifelong elected archonship. Only with the newfound wealth of merchants, who in turn desire political

power, can a newcomer penetrate this magistracy or archonship structure.

This work focuses on what it would take to save Republicanism and provide hope to humanity. I believe in the scientific revolution that started in the second half of the 20th century and from which people are also drawing ideas to improve political morality. This move to orient people's actions so they start to stop depending only on human reasoning to control and regulate political consciousness and to split this task so technology could also assume it in parallel. The risk is that people may have to give up some of their freedom in exchange for the protection of their remaining rights, which could lead to a new form of neocolonialism aimed at achieving the same outcomes.

According to scholars and historians, the motivating causes for the French Revolution stem from perceptions that the clergy and the aristocracy enjoyed privileges, which inflamed popular resentment. Will the idea of splitting the enforcement of political order between humans and machinery vilify the corruption and creed, which is the main reason why people surrender some of their freedom to obtain it in return? Alternatively, will the depicted inability of people to prevail over the weakness of their will mask itself, the aim being to capitalise on the unpreparedness of people to use such machinery to accommodate the interests of power by certain people or polities?

This new form of neocolonialism will involve actions taken by humans, both within a nation-state and beyond its borders, that are no longer manipulated according to individual desires or sensory perceptions. In this other case, it is the machinery that a person surrenders his human reasoning to its authority that is what would be guiding what a person can have access to in respect to natural or legal rights.

Therefore, all the different ideologies that people develop are intended solely to make individuals vilify greed and corruption. It is in everyone's best interest to completely vilify greed and corruption, as doing so is the only way for individuals to achieve the full development of their personalities.

When people begin to rely on science to manipulate actions in the hope that such an approach improves their aptitude to prevail over the weakness of their will, we already know that the machinery or technology that people would be counting on to fulfil this role works according to pre-defined commands that accommodate one's own interests and power. For this reason, the commands, whether enforced by a real human or a machine, are essentially the same. The person with more knowledge's personal power and conscience will ultimately decide what action another person can take. In the absence of knowledge, there is physical ability.

Will people be able to manage when they hand over the task of controlling and regulating greed and corruption to the scientific achievements that humans continually produce? This tactic creates the social connectedness that everyone expects. Alternatively, the more people rely on technology to maintain peace and security in the world, the wider the gap between the rich and the poor will become, hindering everyone's ability to achieve and sustain well-being, which is in the best interest of all, regardless of wealth.

Likewise, what would it take to preserve republicanism, knowing it is the only political philosophy that can be stripped from a polity and attribute those actions to the will of God while safeguarding the important milestone people reached at the end of the Second World War? This milestone is to entitle any member of the human family to fulfil the realisation of his personality based on granting everyone the right to exercise and protect moral and material interests resulting from any scientific, literary, or artistic production of which a person is the author.

Could the ideology that emerged to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which our fathers and grandfathers said has outraged their conscience after having witnessed the degree of extreme aggression, destruction, and mortality that resulted twice in their lifetime, at its roots stand an expansion of the republicanism philosophy that emerged with the birth of the United States of America after the American Revolution to duplicate the same cycle of prosperity that this country witnessed leading into its position as a dominant superpower?

Earlier we said that this abnormal insecurity that emerged after the people decided to unionise their efforts to maintain peace and security could be the consequence of the reorganisation that is initially required to restore international unity. However, the latest world event we saw in 2016 was Great Britain deciding to exit from the European Union, preferring to remain sovereign, a little less than three quarters of a century after this country spearheaded the idea of the unionisation of the world. This move is not encouraging because it raises doubts about the Republican ideology as a viable path to achieving the aspirations that people united to fulfil, specifically the goal of saving future generations from the threat of a new world war.

That is said, I see lots of similarity between the ideology that the United States of America spearheaded to bring republicanism to the world at the end of the Second World War being played out from events and circumstances that this country crossed and achieved, especially after its own internal civil war, which proved effective to bolster this Republic's extensive ability to exert influence or project power through the technological, cultural, military, and economic strength that its citizens achieved.

The events and circumstances that the United States experienced, particularly after the American Civil War, set the country on a direct collision course with two world wars. Let us attempt to go back in time to review the events and circumstances that the United States experienced, which led to its entanglement in two world wars and the significant costs it incurred in seeking to exit from both. This situation could reflect what the people of the world will face if they do not allow the United States to complete the tasks its leaders have committed to achieving globally. This principle was proclaimed in the advent of a world in which human beings shall enjoy freedom from fear and want. We will do this work in the next chapter.

From 1861 to 1865, the United States experienced an internal conflict known as the American Civil War. Certain American polities wanted secession from the United States to form the Confederate States of America. Historians debate over the reasons that led certain American societies to want secession or why the loyalists refused to let them go. While most historians agree that the war had its origin in the factious issue of slavery, the split would have fractured the ideological, economic, and social fabric of the United States, let alone the resources and population necessary for power and the development of military equipment and technology. However, as could be supposed, the American societies that wanted to separate from the United States promulgated that the constituted authority was a tyrant infringing on the unifying ideology that the separatists favored. The Civil War ended with the surrender of the Confederate societies/armies and the dissolution of the belligerent status or power that the Confederate states waged against the constituted authority. The fighting left much of the infrastructure in the conflict zones in ruins. Then came the process of rebuilding, including restoring national unity and the strengthening of the national government.

In the context of United States history, the period from 1865 to 1920 encompasses the time leading up to the end of the First World War. Historians and scholars claim that the United States crossed through three developmental ages or eras. These three developmental ages or eras were the Reconstruction Era, the Gilded Age, and the Progressive Era.

The social, legal, religious, and economic organizational unifying ideology that the United States promoted from 1865 to 1920, which

encouraged liberalism and republicanism as central values. This philosophy, which was woven into more complex central values that stressed the “all men are created equal” or “unalienable rights” ideology, has helped the United States to create out of this republicanism a superpower that commands vast technological, military, and economic potential or influence by 1920. In fact, many scholars and historians claim that the entry of the United States into World War 1 would determine the outcome of that war.

Herein, in this work, we are interested in examining how this humanistic unifying ideology that the founding fathers of the United States built public perception around after secession from the British monarch, which was based on professing that “all men are created equal,” induced political morality, a prerequisite to institute national unity. This guiding ideology succeeded in making the relevant American societies unite around its overarching principles, which cruised its way through two world wars intact and stronger than before. The new dogma that emerged at the end of the Second World War could be a Second Generation Republicanism that its proponents expected would replicate the same results its predecessor generated for the United States but on a worldwide scale this time.

Perhaps the Age of Enlightenment and the Age of Reason made the people of the United States recognize that if the rest of the people of the world do not want to return to living submerged in fear and want and in subjugation, domination, and exploitation after the military operations ceased at the end of World War II. The only choice the people of the world have is to subscribe to this Republican ideology. This is the reason why the leaders of the United States proposed to widen the sphere of influence of the first-generation Republicanism philosophy to invite people in and to spare them from living in a social system wracked with inherited political power that manifests in the form of a monarch, dictatorship, or the type of government where the strongman rules.

Instead of the people of the world giving the United States after the Second World War a chance to deliver on the promises that this country affirmed its utmost readiness to accomplish. This proposal aims to create conditions that uphold justice and respect for the

obligations arising from the rule of law. Less than a century on, the people of the world coming together to practice the republicanism ideology, this guiding philosophy, are being challenged on the premise that its core ideology, which promotes liberal democracy and the free market, widens the gap between the rich and the poor.

Before going any further, it is important to remind you that the United States at the end of the Second World War could have voted to keep colonialism and not to set the people of the world free. This country was not obligated to invite the rest of the world to unite in efforts that would allow all members of the human family to work together so everyone can live free of fear and want while being afforded the chance to realize the full development of their personality.

This disenchantment with Republicanism may stem from a reluctance to enforce laws against greed and corruption. However, the proclamations made by individuals when they express concerns about the rise of greed, corruption, or insecurity in the world are often unclear, as the increasing number of people practicing liberal democracy and the free market raises questions about the validity of those conclusions. Those who believe that the recent rise in global insecurity may be linked to more people practicing liberal democracy and the free market are overlooking the fact that greed and corruption are often considered qualities either instilled in humans by God or arising by chance. Up until Greek antiquity, most people derived power (or greed and corruption) by claiming that it was based on the will of God. After the Greek philosophers launched the Age of Reason, the strongman approach became the new way to establish political order or power. Up until the American Revolution was fought, the domination of politics was concomitant in the hands of people who were bound by their personal power and conscience. The revolution involved the American colonial societies fighting to reject monarchy, aristocracy, and inherited political power, aiming to replace them with a bill of rights. Humans can only develop political consciousness or establish an order to control greed and corruption in the world through the three choices mentioned earlier. Although the American Revolution was fought almost 500 years ago, the Bill of Rights has not yet managed to vilify greed and corruption within the societies of the United States. Liberal democracy and the free market don't widen the

rich-poor gap or stem from the wealthy's greed and corruption. Aristocratic oligarchic or absolute monarchical dynasties have been confiscating the scientific, literary, or artistic production that a person has been the author of since antiquity, nor has this situation changed when people protected their production or tried to keep greed and corruption under control. People exhibit greed and corruption in their desire to possess more scientific, literary, or artistic works, which are material things. Those productions are not natural but are instead human creations. Even after gaining freedom and inalienable rights, the people still perceive that the greed and corruption of others prevents them from excelling. There has to be a limiting factor that is making it impossible for the Republican ideology to be embellished, thus fueling perceptions that the rich are enjoying more privileges.

Herein, we want to isolate what one limiting factor could be making it impossible for people as of 1945 or after the people of the world became unionized to practice Republicanism to vilify greed and corruption. We want to check what factor or factors, if they happen to be more than one, could be fueling people's perception that greed and corruption rose after all members of the human family agreed to promote liberal democracy and the free market, which, as we said, is one of the guiding philosophies within the Republican ideology. As I said before, humanity is crossing a very peculiar period. If the efforts that people are making to save republicanism fail, the succeeding generation could be at risk of throwing away millennia of struggle by our ancestors, so succeeding generations could reach to live free as we are doing in our lifetime.

We don't know from where to start to look for what one limiting factor in this republicanism ideology could be making it impossible for all people to come together after the United States said at the end of the Second World War it could help us all live free from fear and want. The principal political philosophy that republicanism or liberalism is founded on is enshrined in the United States Declaration of Independence. The quotation "All men are created equal" could have been penned as the ideology that made the American colonist societies reach to break from Great Britain.

Humans have made the only real and eternal things, given that the human condition is a struggle between good and evil. There is also another ideology that proclaims that “every inclination of the human heart is evil from childhood.” Could the competing ideology that promulgates that the human condition is a struggle between good and evil and that the human purpose is to sustain good be cutting short the republicanism ideology? Therefore, for as long as people reinvigorate this ideology that promulgates cultures that justify that their “inalienable rights” are not being met because “every inclination of the human heart is evil from childhood,” as religious clergy advocate. Moreover, this vision to sustain good would be luring people to pursue that because “all men are created equal,” and all men should be entitled to their “inalienable rights” or the realization of the full development of their human personality when we know that the finish line is imaginary. Do we need to remove either this ideology that stipulates that “all men are created equal” or the one on “every inclination of the human heart is evil from childhood” so as to stop making the human condition a struggle between good and evil but rather a struggle to sustain good only without evil figuring?

Let us check if proclaiming ideologies that hold that “all men are created equal” and therefore have rights to “the pursuit of happiness” could indeed be destructive to republicanism when preaching ideologies that teach that “every inclination of the human heart is evil from childhood” to determine if indeed such teaching could make the ideologies that man comes up with to bring people together collapse. Let us take three countries, the United States, France, and Lebanon, and try to establish how such a relationship could block the republicanism ideology from progressing in those three countries.

When the military operations at the end of the American Civil War in 1865 ceased, the constituted authority began the job of reconstruction. The Reconstruction Era was marked by a political philosophy concentrated on transforming the entire country so people of all races and colors could focus on adapting radical positions aimed at blocking moderate approaches in favor of upgrading rights to freedom. This philosophy marked a juncture in the history of this country and civil rights in particular, as most American politicians within the government supported harsh policies that emphasized equality, civil

rights, voting rights, and, in particular, policies based on a free labor economy.

The reconstruction efforts that were adapted by the constituted authority at the end of the American Civil War brought along a rapid expansion of industrialization, farming, ranching, and mining, including prospects in many other sectors. The interconnection of the country through railroads, the factory system, finance, and so forth was an important growth impetus because it facilitated the people of the United States experiencing real wage growth. Every situation has two perspectives. Evidently, the guiding political philosophy, which was stressing liberty and unalienable individual rights as central values, could not catch up with fulfilling the development expectation of the full personality of every citizen.

Despite the substantive technological, scientific, and cultural innovations that the American people attained during the Reconstruction (1865–1877) and the Gilded Era (1870–1900) to make each and every citizen secure in his inalienable right to happiness. Those two eras are seen as two intervals in American history that were plagued with lots of social and economic challenges, especially for the poor. The economic prosperity was marking opportunities and perils. Crime, poverty, and economic inequality were widespread, especially in the South, where the loyalists fought a civil war to prevent the separatists from going on their own. In fact, some historians and scholars argue that the southern United States was left in a poverty-stricken backwater dependent on agriculture. This condition enabled the Southerners to succeed in re-establishing legal and political dominance over Blacks through violence, intimidation, and discrimination.

As can be supposed, this reality, which the American people were crossing at the end of the 19th century, is not any different in terms of insecurity than the events their ancestors dealt with throughout their lives before them. The Republicanism ideology is the only choice available to man to live free if no social community wants to return to living under the overarching political system that is reduced to a hereditary, lifelong chief magistracy ruled by dictatorship, force, or principles other than democracy. A perfect example of that today

would be the prevailing order in modern times in Saudi Arabia or the rest of the Gulf countries, where absolute monarchs built along a federal monarchy based on a hereditary dictatorship-type parliamentary system, stranded with religious lines governing it. Therefore, because this republicanism ideology can only derive thrust from the consent of the governed, the only way to attain this consensus could happen by keeping in check greed and corruption or by increasing access to those who are disenchanted to improve the standard of living to make them perceive that greed and corruption are in check or from both. The only solution that the American constituted authority could pursue to tackle the opportunities and perils that were facing the American people at the turn of the 19th century would be to restore national unity by strengthening people's belief in the republicanism ideology.

Historians and scholars claim that the process of restoring national unity in the republicanism ideology drew from all the levels of society to create a movement whose aim was to keep greed and corruption in check and to identify old ways that needed modernizing to bring scientific, medical, and engineering solutions. Historians and scholars refer to this period, during which the people of the United States engaged in building efficiency movements to save Republicanism, as the "Progressive Era." To dismantle the corrupt systems established during the Reconstruction and Gilded Eras, the Progressive Era mobilized support from all levels of society to apply scientific methods across various fields, including economics, government, finance, medicine, industry, and education, to create transformative changes that replaced outdated practices with more effective systems.

The rearrangement that the United States underwent in respect to political reform, or exposing inefficiency, corruption, and injustices; modernization; philanthropy; democracy; rural reform; constitutional change; prohibition; education; medicine and law; social sciences; and economic policies made this state-nation exemplify what the republicanism ideology is capable of upholding, so people's pursuit of happiness is self-evident.

Vilifying greed and corruption can only happen through two means. One way to vilify greed and corruption is for people to keep them in

check by adhering to laws or by completely abandoning those two aspects. In other words, I wrote that humans can never prioritize the importance of the mind over the relative unimportance of the human body because the evolution of human knowledge continues to deceive the senses. This signifies that people could only keep in check greed and corruption by adhering to laws. The task of making people adhere to laws requires training and mental conditioning. One of the methods that people use to train people to adhere to laws to keep in check greed or corruption is done through widespread social activism. One of the principal social activism methods that people rely on to keep greed and corruption in control is religion.

The method that religion employs to push people to keep in check greed and corruption is done by regarding all things temporal and material as insignificant and indifferent for the exception of good, which is the only real and eternal thing. To make people sustain good, religion relies on a method in which this ideology paints the human condition as a struggle between good and evil, and people's inability to sustain good, strengthen social cohesion, or make social justice arguments comes from "every inclination of the human heart is evil from childhood," as some religious beliefs advocate. To address this reality, religion tries to argue to support why people are not able to keep greed and corruption in check. Most importantly, because of how social inequality can push people to let their actions be bound by their personal power and conscience, it is real and true. The religious focus then is translated into perspectives that get aimed at making people start to emphasize fellowship or sympathy by organizing people to adhere to laws to make them principled. To prevent people from being driven by their personal power and conscience, religion makes people defer to being greedy or corrupt to trade such aspects for a chance at an afterlife and, most importantly, to organize people, especially the poor, to soldier against sinning or committing acts of greed and corruption, including fighting sinning in thought or action.

Could focusing people on the kind of relief, recovery, and reform measure that the religious institutions try to condition people to adhere to in order to make people start to practice tolerance and to live together in peace with one another as good neighbors be what is causing the Republican ideology to stall? In other words, holding that

all men are created equal and that they are all entitled to, among many benefits, the right to the pursuit of happiness could be what is squeezing this republicanism ideology to achieve what it is supposed to deliver in terms of inalienable rights.

As we said earlier, this republicanism ideology can only derive thrust from the consent of the governed, and the only way to attain this consensus could happen by keeping in check greed and corruption or by increasing access for those who are disenchanted to improve the standard of living to make them perceive that greed and corruption are in check.

If, as we said, it is not possible to keep greed and corruption in check, it is because changing human knowledge keeps deceiving the senses. To keep greed and corruption in check, increase people's access to improved standards of living so that those who feel disenchanted by their inability to fulfill their inalienable right to happiness perceive that greed and corruption are under control.

By helping people understand that an explosion created the universe, we expand their knowledge and enable them to envision how this scenario could have unfolded. Its disadvantage is that it clusters people. Religion comes handy to make people surrender their freedom naturally based on beliefs by leaving this right to posterity (or afterlife). This transformation works in the best interest of everyone, because it eases people's demand for social justice and makes them tolerate their reality or be responsive to it. The issue is how to manage those who think humans originated on earth. Those people, along with those who believe that God sent them to Earth to promote goodness, are included in this group. To fulfill their inalienable right to happiness, they must see that greed and corruption are under control.

Could the Age of Reason, or the Enlightenment, that the people of the United States reached at the turn of the 19th century, as compared to the retarded state in which colonialism had left people, serve as a window of opportunity to spare the republicanism ideology from collapsing? This was done by letting the liberal democracy and the free market expand to territorial spots beyond the borders of the United States. The aim is to satisfy the citizen's demand for happiness.

Philosophers and religious thinkers try to define happiness as being a mental state of well-being expressed by positive emotions. As of the date, people rejected the ideology that a cautious man should not distinguish between good and evil; otherwise, a person will certainly die (Genesis 2:17) and started developing tools to make happiness be reflected by a person's overall well-being. Happiness in this sense became a drive for prosperity, improved standard of living, including an interest in the absolute truth, and, in particular, how to extend longevity.

We have no way of knowing how people reached that or how satisfied a person is with his life as a whole in relation to concepts like well-being, quality of life, and flourishing. This is because to answer this question, we need to hold to a hypothesis on how the universe originated. If the universe were programmed by a deity, this creator has, according to the scriptures, commanded that man "by the sweat of his brow shall eat his bread" (Genesis 3:17). If the universe were programmed, happiness should be a state that man would reach by clearing and grubbing thorns and thistles in the field and maintaining this connection with the earth. If the universe isn't programmed by a deity, then happiness could be reached another way. This path is through relating happiness to concepts like well-being, quality of life, and flourishing.

As of the date humanity's interests became in addressing fundamental questions about our place in the universe, this signifies that humans must be expanding technology continuously. This ongoing exploration makes it so that different people are always providing benefit to our societies through the improved standard of living that exists. Now, hence, people decided to regard all things temporal and material as insignificant and indifferent for the exception of good. The type of "good" that people are building upon is to provide lifetime experience, which involves making every person realize the full development of his personality. This, as we said, is why people want to relate to concepts like material possessions, well-being, quality of life, and flourishing. Its benefits are, of course, lots of people have better standards of life, but its threat is that it puts mankind ahead of an

imaginary lure with no finish line to cross except when death catches up.

Indeed, humanity's interest in providing benefits to our societies has created improved standards of living, but making the purpose of human life to expand one's own search from material possessions means keeping the assembly lines that we preferred to do the work on our behalf running so we can have more time to enjoy the material things we believe are rendering us happy.

The challenge that confronts people's decision to regard all things as temporal, with the exception of happiness, and to live in the way that we choose, is that the necessities of life switch from being a profound attachment connected to nature to becoming connected to material things. The Republican ideology was managed from the turn of the 20th century until the Second World War, which was fought to defeat a key obstacle: preventing people from forming unions. To keep people satisfied, it is essential to maintain the assembly lines so they can produce the goods that improve living standards and contribute to overall happiness. Some raw materials that a state nation needs to make its citizens happy are located outside its borders. A progressive nation-state cannot isolate itself from mainstream society and live in isolation while producing diverse outputs to limit its dependence on natural resources. The assembly lines also produce material goods, which provide benefits to our societies through their distribution. The problem is that you can't be progressive and improve the domestic economy at the same time. To enrich and empower a nation to the maximum degree, a country must either expand colonialism or develop purchasing power. This approach is to allow the country that wants to expand its power to acquire and retain as much economic activity as possible within the nation's borders.

The Republicanism ideology is based on the principles of "inalienable rights" and "freedom," so denying freedom to individuals and allowing them to dispose of it will inevitably lead to the disintegration of this ideology and the emergence of a new one. Therefore, it is essential to expedite the process of ending colonialism in all its forms and manifestations without conditions. A nation can only prioritize options that retain as much economic activity as possible within its borders.

The practice of prioritizing the manufacturing and industry of goods with military applications or high-tech scientific research is the policy that nations follow. Ultimately, the Republican ideology successfully overcame a significant obstacle: preventing people from forming unions.

People have mixed reactions about whether the Republican ideology will triumph over its next key obstacle to lift the different political, economic, social, or educational unpreparedness to eventually organize a world in which each member of the human family shall enjoy freedom from fear and want.

Ancient Greece was a civilization that was divided into many small self-governing communities dictated by Greek geography, which included many islands. The political history of Greece during antiquity may be subdivided into two major periods. One period covered expanding power, conquests, and annexations, and another one dealt with how to control internal strife between the poor and the rich, the aristocrats and those who found new wealth, who in turn desired political power, and so forth until the Greek peninsula came under Roman rule. In this period, in which the Greeks succeeded in exerting influence or projecting power, the different internal reconstructions, gilding, and progressive eras that the Greeks in their own way were evoking to restore and strengthen national unity. The growing reforms that the constituted authority was implementing must have helped the Greeks to emerge as a dominant power through the combined technological, cultural, military, and economic means or strength that existed in that era. Based on what historians and scholars report, there were periods of lots of great improvement in the living standards of the population due to all the growth in commerce and manufacturing that emerged, especially since Greece became a major maritime and mercantile power.

Yet despite all the forms of government that the Greek polity tried to test to maintain the exercise of authority over the islands, finally none of the state policies that were enforced, nor the mechanism employed for determining the policies, managed to stop internal strife to ultimately bring national unity under control to stop the Athenians from turning against each other. At the end, the internal and external violence and the societal response to those changes resulted in the

Hellenistic political systems collapsing and reverting to a simpler form, so it became incorporated into a new resurging socio-economic movement, the Roman Empire.

There have been many explanations put forward for the collapse of the Hellenistic period, and lots of historians and scholars have identified causes. Perhaps the circumstances that led to the collapse of the Greek people's dominant position during antiquity are unique, but what they have in common is the relationship of the different Greek islands to mainland Greece. As we said before, Greece features a vast number of islands, and the mainland is cut off from its neighbors by mountain ranges. This geographical reality requires that the Greeks be organized into various independent city-states, hence obliging that small self-governing communities be established. In theory, it is not totally erroneous to consider that the principal cause for the rise and/or for the diminishing of the power of the Greek cities and kingdoms was self-inflicted as a result of the different self-governing communities scrambling for power and/or lacking political unity. Most importantly, in delivering on the moral and political philosophy that the people of Greece came together to attain, which is to sustain good.

Up until 10 December 1948, it was necessary that people wage wars, conquer, invade, and so forth because humans were divided into many self-governing communities or islands ruled by their bodies of citizens, which could also be a monarch or an oligarchy. Starting from the year 1948, the people of the world began a new chapter in the history of human rights that all the people who lived before that date militated for so it could be reached. This milestone is the start of humans stopping from continuing to be divided into many self-governing communities or islands but rather uniting for good based on one moral and political agenda. This agenda is to sustain good.

This strive that has not celebrated its 100-year anniversary yet to make every person be entitled to live free from fear and want seems to have solved as of that date the challenge that prevented the Greeks during antiquity from reaching a state of being organized, and that was because most of the landmass was made of islands cut off from one another by the sea. After 10 December 1948, the people of the world don't have that problem anymore. However, insofar as the progress

that people pledged to strive to achieve, and that is to promote the development of friendly relations so that every member of the human family can reach to live free from fear and want. It seems as if peace and security were more under control when humans were divided into many self-governing communities or islands ruled by their bodies of citizens, which could also be a monarch or an oligarchy. The race and strife for political power became worse than the conditions were like during Greek antiquity. At least, during Greek antiquity, the sea that used to separate the islands used to act as a crucial barrier even to the polity that wanted to exert influence or project power. Now that everyone, as of 1948, is interconnected and has his feet standing on one landmass. The race or strife that people are exhibiting to cast influence, dominance, status, etc. leads us to pose this question. Could human striving to sustain good be what causes insecurity in the world? Let us check if this benchmark could be a cause in the next chapter.

The modern Olympic Games is a sporting event in which athletes from around the world participate in various competitions. The event has expanded to the point where nearly every nation now participates. There are many sports in these games in which athletes compete for first, second, and third place. The games provide an opportunity to the winners to showcase their strength.

The idea for the competition keeps alive a tradition that began in Greece in the 8th century BC, according to historians and scholars. Athletes and spectators from all over Greece used to gather in Olympia for the games. It has been widely reported in books on the history of Greece that during the Olympic Games, the different self-governing communities used to suspend fighting between each other so the athletes and spectators who lived in the different islands could travel to Olympia and back safely.

The idea to hold this sporting event died out in Greece at one point in the history of the world, but then in the late 19th century the games were revived as a worldwide activity.

The modern Olympic Games are a leading international event in which thousands of athletes from around the world participate in the different sporting events. Organizing the Olympic Games is a massive undertaking due to the large number of athletes and spectators that the event attracts. The organizers have a mounted structure and authority to organize the different sporting events.

In 1894, the International Olympic Committee was established to organize the Olympic Games. The first Olympic Games were

organized in Greece two years later, in 1896. A set of mission statements enshrines the fundamental principles of Olympism, aiming to sustain good through the promotion of sports. The constitution of the United Nations was signed on 26 June 1945; this is almost fifty years later. The charter of the United Nations does not include any mission statement that differs in aspirations from the purposes and principles outlined by the International Olympic Committee. The constitutions of the two organizations aim to promote well-being, but they differ in the types of rights and privileges each institution employs to achieve this goal. In the case of the United Nations, this organization ensures that its member nation-states uphold the rights and privileges outlined in the UN charter.

The last Olympic Games were held in 2016. The organizers of the Olympic Games remain vigilant to ensure that the tradition of the Olympic truce, which dates back to the 8th century BC, continues to thrive. Since 1896, the world has experienced two world wars and numerous conflicts between sovereign nation-states, civil wars, uprisings, and other forms of strife. Therefore, one must blend one's own identity with solidarity. One could expect that the philosophy of life, which involves blending cultural power to influence or project dominance, would also be evident during the sporting events.

Since the first Olympic games were held in 1896 and the last event in 2016, there have been many scandals, controversies, or boycotts reported about the organizers or the athletes. For the most part, the scandals, controversies, or boycotts reported were about greed, corruption, or wherever political power and solidarity were involved.

However, remarkably, people around the world continue the tradition of rejecting the inclination to allow evil in their hearts during the organization of the games. This philosophy to ensure the host city-state or the athletes and spectators are not mixed up in the current world affairs so they can travel to the games and back safely led many psychologists, social workers, and philosophers to recognize a link between sport and people's attitudes. The blending of sport with ethics, including the way people seem to respond to holding true to the idea that people could coexist without the need for discrimination and fighting. This tradition has even led the international community to

recognize the power of sports to inspire unity, mutual understanding, and respect and to advocate so people work toward the settlement of their disagreement in the same spirit.

Unfortunately, despite all the efforts of the international organization created at the end of the Second World War, known as the United Nations, to establish conditions under which people could agree on how to correct their analyses of benefit and cost—what Socrates termed “the art of measurement”—these efforts have not been fully realized. This process is required to control greed and corruption so all members of the human family can live without fear and want. Regrettably, the ultimate wisdom that emerges when people unite in sports remains elusive.

To understand what enables people to achieve practical results for the greater well-being of society, it is important to explore how everyone can blend sport and education to create an environment where it is possible to uphold the idea that humans can coexist without discrimination and conflict. Let us review what makes athletes or spectators ready to embrace the meaning and spirit of competition; however, when it comes to overcoming the weakness of the will, even athletes outside the sporting arena fail. We want to examine the factors that may lead people to act against their better judgment, even when they clearly understand what is right, to determine the extent to which external or internal forces influence their ability to overcome weaknesses in their will.

Running is a sporting event that people of all ages participate in, either as part of organized competitions or simply to travel quickly from one point to another. Running is a terrestrial locomotion method that allows humans to move faster on foot. People's opinions on why people were programmed to run vary. There are people who claim that humans were designed to run, and there are others who stress its importance for physical fitness. Whatever the reason for people programmed to run, this action involves motion and, therefore, refers to the displacement of a body with respect to a relative position. Moreover, a human motion cannot change his position unless this relationship is acted upon by a force. The force that moves the limb into a new stance phase could depend on internal variables rather than

external ones. A blind man cannot be influenced to move by his senses but rather by his internal forces.

Sports experts state that the science and logic of runners' performances are complex and contingent on external and internal factors such as distance, environment, and one's own strengths and weaknesses. However, there are two internal aspects that always depend on the runner, regardless of the external factors. They will always depend on the runner. Those two aspects are the mental and physical conditions of the runner.

Many cities and states in modern times sponsor an athletic long-distance endurance road race, commonly referred to as a marathon. The name Marathon originated to commemorate a site in Greece where the Athenian Army defeated the Persians in 490 BC. The legend states that a messenger ran from the battlefield at Marathon to Athens to report the victory.

People run in marathons for various reasons, and most associate running with physical fitness or feelings of accomplishment, focus, and strength. Consequently, many marathon runners do not compete for victory but rather to surpass time barriers.

Change is defined as being a process in which a function, practice, or thing in the present becomes different somehow compared to what it was in the past. The change can be making either an essential difference or a transformation in the original identity of the function, practice, or thing. Alternatively, the change can be a substitution of one function, practice, or thing for another.

Humans exist as a collective in which both the mental and physical conditions of this group are constantly changing. However, when runners participate in marathons or sporting events, the constant changes their bodies undergo are different from their original state, which remains more or less fixed. This action of terrestrial locomotion implies a difference in some particular respect without suggesting loss of original identity. The change that occurs when the runner uses this method of terrestrial locomotion to move along the marathon course until reaching the finish line does not indicate a departure from his

original identity. In other words, the effects or outcomes after the transformation, or when the runner reaches the finish line, don't lead to a difference that makes the human body adapt to a new purpose. At the end of the marathon, the feeling of accomplishment and strength that a runner receives has no effect on his opponent's physical and mental health or the environment around him. Crossing the finish line does not alter the winner's original identity. When the body is engaged in terrestrial locomotion, it is not challenging its opponent to improve in nature, nor is it challenging the opponent's identity, whether physical or mental. The human body tests its physical and mental preparedness to beat an opponent, but what the runner is actually competing against is time, as the opponent reaches the finish line. The opponent's human body, even though it undergoes permanent change, doesn't become different compared to its original state when it reaches the finish line and remains more or less fixed. In effect, when both runners are performing terrestrial locomotion, they are required to gallop, which reduces their contact with nature. This action reduces the body, exerting a transformation in nature. The only improvement that the runner gains or notices at the end of the race is the completion of the agreed-upon distance while breaking certain time barriers, as previously mentioned. No matter how fit a runner is when he crosses the finish line, if he doesn't maintain his physical and mental preparation afterwards, he won't continue to achieve optimal performance.

We have no way of knowing if the messenger who ran from the Marathon battlefield site to Athens to report the victory was shouting, conveying information, or expressing his thoughts and feelings in spoken language when he was running. In all the sports competitions that people practice, both athletes and spectators appear to be focused and remain quiet, conveying information or expressing their thoughts and feelings in spoken language when a competition is underway. The spectators, since they outnumber the players, only shout, convey information, or express their thoughts whenever the team or the player that they are supporting commits a gaffe or the opposite. Most importantly, the athletes competing against each other do not offer any knowledge or support to help each other win during the game. This is the total opposite of what people do when the athlete and the

spectators leave the sporting arena. The people do nothing but offer each other knowledge and help; the aim is to sustain good.

Should we ask how people can set aside their differences during sports and show that we can coexist without discrimination and fighting? When, to the contrary, people are working to sustain positive change, only a few people are able to ensure the continuous exercise of constructive thoughts, words, and deeds. Does the idea of doing, or supporting, good prevent people from having the political morality needed to control greed or corruption? Are constructive thoughts, words, and deeds practices that people can engage in only if they are programmed in line with human design?

We cannot say that sustaining good is detrimental for the preservation of human security, because wars, conflicts, and destruction speed the expulsion of people from remaining among the living. Could the guiding philosophy that devalues values, traditions, and emotions in favor of more rational thoughts and actions cause the disenchantment people show when interacting outside the sporting arena? Could the fact that when people are in a sporting arena, they leave behind their values, traditions, and emotions and unionize it all so their interaction with one another doesn't result in differences amounting to a loss of original identity be what inspires unity and respect and creates the impression that we can coexist without the need for discrimination and fighting? Thus, this idea that holds true to this aim could be what the power of sport instigates.

I disagree with the concern certain social and political theorists raise, in which they associate how the rise of capitalism and modernity could be causing the disenchantment that is making us appear as if their trickling effects are infringing on human conditions, which obliges us to get rid of values and traditions so we start becoming part of a growing disenchanted community. We can categorize the various governments we establish into different types, such as federal republics, social republics, and republics governed by religious principles, among others. Not all governments are competing political ideologies that capitalism and modernity will defeat. As I said before, there are only two choices: either people practice Republicanism along

the capitalism and modernity line, or humans will return to tyranny or dictatorship.

In fact, I believe that it is modernization that is helping to build a peaceful and better world through all the scientific and technical limits that scientists and researchers are pushing, irrespective of people's desire to build a world based on the rules of fair competition and peace.

Earlier we elaborated on how athletes and spectators, during a sporting event, appear to be focused and remain quiet, conveying information or expressing their thoughts and feelings, including leaving behind their values, traditions, and emotions and unionizing. Knowledge produces the reaction when people are focused. In fact, this phenomenon explains the widespread observation that people seem to spend all their time interacting with their mobile phones, as knowledge is something no human being can ever be satiated from. People will be more and more on their way to cement this perception that peace is a possibility.

To emphasize the power of modernization in organizing the world and regulating social order according to the principles of fair competition and peace, regardless of public engagement in promoting these ideals, we will highlight the following points:

As people distance themselves from the desire to maintain a connection with nature, and as science and technology standardize processes, this phenomenon will self-regulate. People desire it because human craving is connected to senses and imagination. In other words, as more processes become automated and people are tagged, it will be difficult to hide crime or fraud, making greed and corruption difficult. Corruption will shift from individual manipulation to the manipulation of electronic systems. However, it would be impossible to manipulate acts of corruption unless the entity operating the machinery does so manually to override the algorithms. Governments, which Voltaire described by stating, "The Holy Roman Empire is neither holy, nor Roman, nor an empire," would shift from their stated role of passing laws and policies to that of toll and fine collectors, including the operation and management of associated machinery and infrastructure.

The other option would be for the government to transform itself into an IT company.

I say "toll collector" because when people's actions become fully controlled and regulated by automation, no person will be able to manipulate deeds freely as they are now done according to how one's own desires dictate them. To illustrate what we mean, let us take this example. When people start using driverless cars, even if a driver wants to drive at a speed of one hundred miles per hour in a residential area, the car will not allow it. The vehicle electronic system will obstruct this maneuver even if the driver takes control of the car manually. This signifies that people's desires become overpowered. Moreover, the driver and any passengers in the vehicle will effectively become like passengers on an airplane. In other words, a driver can no longer intentionally collide with another car to harm the passengers inside it. The immoral act that a person could commit involves using their hands to cause physical harm.

Let us take this other example. Incandescent light bulbs were widely used in household and commercial lighting. According to scientists, a typical incandescent light bulb converts 95% or more of its power consumption into heat instead of visible light. Since incandescent light bulbs use more energy than alternative energy-efficient light bulbs, many governments have introduced measures to ban their use. In the future, when the luminosity of houses starts to operate in the same way, headlamps on cars will adjust based on the day's luminosity. It would be a console that processes the required luminosity and automatically adjusts the lighting intensity in our homes. A person can install 20 light bulbs in the future in his living room, but the lighting intensity is the part that the console will decide. In other words, in the future, people would be more and more confronted with a situation where all the furnishings, appliances, etc., would be coordinated and meant to function like how people now operate their television sets. A person can change the channels, volume, etc., but not how high and how low the volume could be. This is something that the TV manufacturer would decide. For example, a person can only connect a CD player, external speakers, etc., to his TV set that the TV manufacturer decided upon.

This situation means that people's desires become oriented to function based on what the TV or console manufacturer decides a person should or shouldn't be allowed to have. Currently, our creativity allows us to design cups, pots, and plates in various shapes and sizes, such as round, square, oval, big, and small. In the future, when all refrigerators are equipped with a cold water tap, similar to how some manufacturers currently install them, the design options will be limited. On the platform that was built on the fridge, only a certain size could fit. The creativity that went into producing large cups, tall cups, etc., cannot be applied.

The above means that modernization reduces human creativity. When human creativity reduces, desires reduce. This is because desires are forced to follow what modernization places ahead of the senses. The poor want the same material things the rich have. However, modernization does not distinguish between the rich and the poor, nor does it provide additional benefits that favor the wealthy over the less fortunate. Modernization will increasingly narrow the gap between the rich and the poor. For example, the airplane serves as a mode of transportation that humans cannot surpass, as it provides a means to travel from one point to another unless humans develop the ability to fly like birds. The rich and the poor, when they are on board an airplane, the two classes become one. The rich may receive better food and sit in more comfortable seats, but in the event of an airplane crash, both the rich and the poor onboard will face the same fate. Modernization has made vulnerability and opportunity indistinguishable for both the rich and the poor. The rich cannot say, "We are going to deny the poor from using air as a mode of transport."

As the above has shown, modernization helps to organize people and build a peaceful and better world. The only change that modernization, like sports, cannot make is how to manipulate people to stop shouting and conveying information or expressing their thoughts and feelings in spoken language. Most importantly, how is it that the knowledge that people apply when they are not concentrated on reading, gaining knowledge, or paying attention following an action stops us from being tolerant toward one another?

Given how people could think of two things at the same time, one thought must disappear before the next can appear. Similarly, people cannot simultaneously provide and receive knowledge; one function must cease before the next can begin. As we just elaborated, people become intolerant when processing the information or knowledge they collect. Moreover, all people claim that their active participation in life and the exercise of constructive thoughts, words, and deeds are serving to sustain good. Let us examine how the invitation extended by the United States at the end of the Second World War to the French and Lebanese people to participate in sustaining good has improved the ability of those two sovereign nation-states to discern right from wrong. In other words, the human condition is framed as a struggle between good and evil. This means that the deeds of each individual become one's own responsibility. The United States invited the French to sustain good on the basis of choosing right or wrong. We want to examine how inviting the French and Lebanese people to collaborate in sustaining good is effectively contributing to the prevention of conflict and the building of peace. Let us do this work in the next chapter.

Demographers claim that more than seven billion people inhabit the earth in actual time. No one can claim that he knew in advance that he was going to be born. During the entire human history, only in religion exist cases where a birth is foretold.

All humans spend fixed time on earth. René Descartes (1596–1650) once said, "I think, therefore I am. " All humans think, and therefore, it is impossible to be free of doubt, and that is part of the thought process because death is real and present.

Since humans began to reason, only science has helped to cure and heal, so most people can live longer. There are two things that people could do on earth to prolong longevity: People can either attempt to answer age-old questions like "which came first, the chicken or the egg," or they can accept what has been given to them. This one thing that we have been given in life is the opportunity to be born, because as we just said, no one has foretold his birth.

What all people want to be given is all kinds of passions and pleasures due to the brevity of life, which makes a lot of sense. The passions and pleasures can include a person's desire to be immortal after birth, to become a monk, to be a killer, to serve as a president, and so on. The problem is that the attainment of the different passions and pleasures people envy depends on causation, which is both a deterministic and indeterminate-type operation. The indeterminate aspects are related to both the initial entry into life and the subsequent conditions that lead to various events.

Humans are not inherently connected to the earth, so any method to

ensure that every member of the human family can fulfill all their passions and pleasures will rely on the convergence of causal events.

Until 10 December 1948, there was no consensus among people on how to reconcile deterministic and indeterminate causes to enable each member of humanity to fulfill all their passions and pleasures. For this reason, following the barbarous acts that outraged the conscience of the people who were alive during the Second World War, those people reached the conclusion that their disregard and contempt for human rights caused the acts in which they lived. Those people achieved a milestone in the history of human rights that was not reached before in the entire history of the world. Those people pledged themselves to work toward the advent of a world in which human beings shall enjoy freedom from fear and want. We don't know if those people wanted to let everyone pursue their passions and pleasures or if they wanted to let anyone fully develop their personality for the first time.

After nearly seventy years since this milestone was established to allow each member to pursue his passions and pleasures, it appears that people are less interested in pursuing the full development of their personalities, despite having that opportunity. Many people want others to give up some of their passions and pleasures so they can use the limited resources to pursue their own.

Multitasking is a valuable skill, but according to scientists and researchers, the brain can focus on concepts sequentially, one at a time. There are many actions that a person can do at the same time, such as walking and talking. A person can only realize the full development of his personality by working to make others concede part of their passions and pleasures so that the limited resources can allow everyone to fulfill their own passions and pleasures. Unless the person converts, he becomes passionate about ensuring equitable resource sharing.

This chapter will argue not why people are greedy and hinder others' pursuits, but how conditioning new generations to share passions might explain the U.S.'s failure, despite its 1948 pledge, to eliminate fear and want. In other words, the problem lies not in the ideology of republicanism itself, but in allowing religion to compete with this

guiding doctrine, which we assert is the only doctrine that individuals can follow if they wish to avoid living under tyranny.

People must use their programmed aptitude for reasoning to question causation until they can translate all human imaginative thoughts into a doable process. Since the time people began relying on human reason to determine the conditions that cause events, it has been necessary for individuals to devote a significant portion of their lives to navigating the complexities of what is considered truth, including the question of whether the universe is based on something objective. All people perceive that this investigative problem is a very convoluted subject. This approach is the only way to determine how to prolong longevity; however, as we mentioned earlier, the forces that operate in the world seem to be multi-dimensional, complex, and non-quantified problems. The approach of breaking the system down into parts, studying the causation of one part, and creating empirically tested ideas or desired models has significantly contributed to human progress throughout history. The real setback is that man is not yet able to pin down what the determinative conditions are for all the events or actions. This reality leads people to assign deterministic conditions to events or actions that are actually undetermined. Whenever such a situation arises, people must evaluate the positions, principles, practices, or lifestyles that others reason out to determine whether they align with their ideas or beliefs. This phenomenon requires that a person support the behavior, activity, and speech of others. Their ignorance of whether conditions exist that cause events beyond merely observing the relationship between cosmic determinism drives people to create or replicate this relationship in their actions.

Hope is defined as being an optimistic attitude that is based on expectations of positive fulfillment. There is nothing wrong with people devoting humanity's interest to establishing conditions in their relationships with one another that would lead them to behave rationally as the natural system does. This perception makes sense because it led people to believe that the purpose of humans is to sustain goodness; otherwise, life would have no meaning, and destruction would lead to more damage. However, it appears that when people began to rely on human reason, culminating in the third century BC, their efforts to interpret religion through the framework of

naturalism transformed the aim of determinism into a phenomenon where each new human deemed their purpose to be identifying improvements so that mankind could ultimately achieve a joyful life. Different theories have sprung from diverse cultures and sometimes overlapping motives and considerations to formulate a reasoned understanding of a wide range of natural and human phenomena up until the Greek/Roman Empire. The competing doctrines suggest that the universe is grounded in an objective reality, independent of human influence or perception, which shaped the human approach up to that point in history.

Historians and scholars tell us that Zeno of Citium (334–262 BC) was a Greek thinker who founded the Stoic school of philosophy. This doctrine was very popular until Christianity emerged and began to rival it, ultimately leading to its total decline in the 3rd century AD. It offered people the possibility of living a fulfilled life in an uncertain world. Most importantly, it emphasized self-sufficiency and inner happiness.

Stoicism is a philosophy that merges a view of the natural world, where human reason is the main source of ethics. Zeno is said to have been attracted by writings about Socrates; hence comes the development of self-control and the emphasis of ethics as the main focus of human knowledge in Stoicism. The Stoics believed that humans should not allow their desire for pleasure or fear of pain to control a person. The Stoics considered that as social beings we need to be using our minds to understand the world around us and to do our part in nature's plan, including working together and treating others in a fair and just manner. In this work, we are most interested in what the Stoics taught about finding happiness by accepting what life provides to a social being. In effect, people struggle to “accept that which a person has been given in life” after they stop practicing Stoicism.

Zeno's teaching, which emphasized self-sufficiency and inner happiness, was influenced by his teacher Crates of Thebes (365–285 BC), a Cynic philosopher. The fragments of writings that survived from Crates' work claim that he was teaching a milder form of cynicism than his predecessor Diogenes (404–323 BC). Diogenes was the pupil of Antisthenes (445–365 BC), who was a student of Socrates.

For the Cynics, the purpose of human life is to live in virtue in accord with nature. According to the Cynics' teachings, when a person rejects all conventional desires for power, sex, and fame and instead leads a simple life free from all possessions, a person would lead a much healthier/happier life.

Historians describe Diogenes as a controversial figure who believed that action revealed virtue more effectively than theory. He criticized the social values and institutions because he perceived them as corrupting society. Other details about his life claim that he made it his goal to challenge established customs and values. Diogenes argued that instead of being troubled by the true nature of evil, people merely rely on customary interpretations.

Perhaps the continuous disenchantment experienced by Socrates, Antisthenes, Diogenes, Crates, Zeno, and others from that era, who perceived the established customs and values as corrupt, is what led God to later send his only son to redeem people, as certain adherents proclaim. Strangely, God wanted Christ to preach a harsher form of cynicism or stoicism. It's difficult not to see the similarities between Jesus' and the Cynics' teachings. In other words, both Jesus and the philosophies of Cynicism and Stoicism taught that living a good life can be achieved by embracing a simple lifestyle free from influences like wealth, fame, and material possessions. In the case of Cynicism and Stoicism, this philosophy is rooted in nature, as wealth, value, and power are considered meaningless because everything is ultimately a product of nature. In the case of Christianity, the emphasis is rooted in a deity who created the universe tied to an afterlife, which a person's own deeds, thoughts, and actions will determine.

The aim is to reach a point where a person can live a life of virtue, whether that involves recognizing the only real and eternal truth rooted in the natural order or in a deity. The question will always be whether people are inclined to believe or disbelieve the purpose of human life and the motives behind human actions. In particular, each person's perception of his existence among the living defines what he is meant to accomplish. There is nothing wrong with people interpreting the idea that the purpose of human life is to sustain goodness through the framework of religion. What is important here is that emotions result

in errors of judgment, which could be destructive, due to the active relationship between cosmic determinism and human freedom. When people stopped interpreting religion through the framework of naturalism, they began to reject the idea of "accepting that which a person had been given in life." This practice of interpreting ethics through human reasoning also fails to emphasize self-sufficiency and inner happiness. To keep peace and stability, people may need to choose whether to see the human purpose as rooted in the natural order or in God. Since the time people began to understand and believe in the rules of the supernatural or spiritual, this practice has failed to help them accept what they have been given in life. To live a good life and ensure happiness, it may very well be that people need to go back to understand the rules of the natural order. Science has proven in modern times that virtue doesn't have to be taught. Virtue is not necessary to ensure happiness. Nobility doesn't belong to anyone apart from the virtuous, as Socrates claimed. Science can force nobility.

Perhaps if Christianity didn't rival the cynical ideology, it would stop this predecessor doctrine from continuing to influence people to practice impudence or deface social norms. Perhaps our numerous societies would all today still be walking barefoot and practicing asceticism. As we mentioned earlier, some people believed that advancements in science and technology, economic development, and social organization were unimportant for improving the human condition and that cynicism could lead individuals to achieve freedom from social inequality by taking laws, customs, and social conventions based on the idea of progress for granted. We can't know what peace and security would be like today if Christianity hadn't challenged the cynical ideology. Many social theorists argue that replacing a society's values, traditions, and emotions with thoughts and actions that seem more rational falsely assumes that this change benefits the people being converted. However, we are in a situation where, as previously mentioned, Jesus Christ was preaching a guiding philosophy that is similar to what the Cynics advocated. The guiding philosophy that Christ preached suggests that improvement is unnecessary for the human condition. It is the adherents who, after Christ's death, began to preach a guiding philosophy that is both liberal and cynical. Therefore, two millennia later, the world reflects a situation where the net gain from switching from cynicism to Christianity is nothing but

advancement in science and technology, economic development, and social organization. This difference arises from the belief that asceticism was essential for improving the human condition, in contrast to the interpretation that Jesus's crucifixion allowed adherents to continue their lives without addressing greed and corruption, as mere belief in Jesus Christ could grant them eternal life. This difference didn't change anything in the world; instead, it led people to embrace the idea that progress is essential for improving the human condition, as evidenced by the progress that exists. In this regard, we want to understand how the teaching that spread among adherents—who preached that accepting Jesus Christ's death as payment for our sins without taking supportive actions—could pose a threat to world peace and security.

In other words, Diogenes and the rest of the Greek philosophers expressed injudiciousness against the values and institutions that were in place. The society was divided between those who wanted to sustain goodness through asceticism and those who viewed these individuals as backward. Business owners and the wealthy would not consider it in their interests for people to become ascetic, because such a lifestyle would hinder humankind's development and, most importantly, prevent them from distributing their goods. This must have created a split between those who see good using the development metaphor and those who see it through becoming ascetic. People who support sustaining good through the progressive development metaphor would consider it in their best interest to eliminate or diminish ascetic traditional customs. We are concerned with understanding how the idea of helping people become civilized may have contributed to the insecurity that existed in the world afterwards. Most importantly, what we are interested in understanding is how this guiding philosophy, in which the adherents started preaching after Christ's death on the mere acceptance of God's gift for salvation, which is by just putting faith in Jesus Christ and accepting that his death on the cross is payment for our sins, could have liberated the ascetic people from changing their living habits, but it didn't bring the social changes that the adherents were expecting, where people would start to love each other and feel fellowship. The people continued to believe that the human heart is inherently evil. In other words, Jesus' death addressed the issue of how people can attain heaven, but it did not resolve their earthly problems

regarding interpersonal relationships and the development of ethics. We are interested in understanding how the teachings that people exchanged 1,500 years ago about the human condition as a struggle between good and evil could have affected the failure of their mission.

Before proceeding to do this work, let us clarify that we are not questioning Jesus's teaching. As we said before, Jesus was teaching people to reject all conventional values of money, fame, power, reputation, owning property, or material things.

We are referring to the specific ideology that Jesus's followers taught, which claimed that Jesus died as a substitute to persuade people to abandon their ascetic lifestyles and convert to Christianity, a change that could have facilitated social progress and modernization in the world today. However, it didn't free people from evil.

According to Jesus's teachings, a person can attain the status of being part of the group called "Christian" only by exhibiting love and mercy. One would suppose that if being a Christian means believing in the religion based on Jesus's teachings, then a person who accepts this faith should demonstrate it by obeying Christ's words. One would expect the adherents to be following his teaching in behavior, activity, and speech. There are people who are in modern times able to live by Jesus's teaching. Those are only the ascetics.

In the New Testament, Jesus told his disciples before his crucifixion that they would see him no more, but after a brief period, they would see him again. In the same year, 33 AD, after Jesus was arrested, crucified, gave up his spirit, and buried, the disciples who visited the tomb claimed that they found it empty and that Jesus appeared to them to support to them that his prophecy about resurrection was true.

Indeed, people have claimed since 33 AD that Jesus has appeared to them, but all those claimants do not say that Jesus asked them to tell his followers not to keep his commands.

After Jesus passed away, it was no longer Jesus who was doing the teaching but adherents. Could the adherents, teaching or preaching on Jesus' death on the cross as payment for our sins, have espoused a

doctrine contrary to what Jesus preached? In other words, could the teaching that adherents began to spread, which portrays Jesus' death as a substitute, provide justifications for continuing to break his laws and allowing sin to separate us from his teachings? Therefore, we just believe in the idea that a confession of faith in Jesus' death and resurrection could still win us a chance at salvation. This belief caused people to rely increasingly on their emotions and to adopt moral principles or lifestyles that do not strictly follow Jesus's teaching. In doing so, we became convinced that the path to salvation or happiness lies in dedicating ourselves to using our minds to understand the world around us and to fulfilling our role in nature's plan. In the meantime, we are doing our best to treat others fairly and justly and are not allowing our desire for pleasure to be controlled by our imagination, because we were led to believe that the human heart is wicked. In other words, instead of accepting what we have been given in life, we often focus on preventing others from fully developing their personalities, as we tend to believe that everything is rooted in nature (implying our equality), while in reality, God sent his son to teach us that everything is rooted in salvation.

Origen Adamantius (184–254 AD) was an early Greek Christian theologian that is regarded as one of the most influential figures in early Christian asceticism. Historians and scholars report that Origen was never canonized as a saint because his teachings on the pre-existence of souls, final reconciliation, and other exegeses he made contradicted those attributed to the teachings of the apostles, notably the apostles Paul and John. Stories reported on Origen's philosophical and religious writings have it that he was a pronounced idealist who held to a hypothesis that the scriptures were divinely inspired. Origen tried to distinguish between the ideal and the empirical church. His allegorical exegesis attempts to draw the line between the church of celestial ideals and the double church of men and angels. What if what Origen was claiming is right? That all depends on what the souls did in this pre-existent state.

Ultimately, modernization and science demonstrate that virtue is not essential for achieving happiness. Science can force nobility. Could the guiding philosophy that suggests the human heart is wicked be a doctrine that promotes a false perception, leading mankind to reject the

inherent gifts of life in favor of concepts like self-sufficiency and inner happiness?

People have come up with many guiding philosophies and laws to interpret the forces that operate in the world through science. However, people have limitations to interpreting the human purpose and developing better comprehension of what the purpose of life is using science or naturalism. People are obliged to interpret this idea through the framework of religion.

Scientists claim that the natural universe is large and that only on the planet Earth does human life exist. People have speculated on whether the solid Earth is expanding or contracting; therefore, this information will determine how humans, as social beings, need to be organized based on what life has provided. Some scientists claim their investigations show no statistically significant expansion or shrinking, which fixes humans' limitations.

The consequence of the large number of reasoned understandings that people formulated was that this condition provided for the furtherance of man's progress. During the course of people's exercise, the only action they could take on earth is to preserve the natural world, including continuing to use science to address fundamental questions about our place in the universe. People have formulated many guiding philosophies to help new living humans make the most effective contributions during the fixed time in which each person interacts with the supposedly solid natural world we call Earth.

Animals come in different sizes, but none are programmed to use tools, which separates humans from other species. However, this creates an artificial distinction among humans, similar to how our senses lead us to split the animal kingdom into different species. The surviving people ensure that a person is born indoctrinated with a guiding philosophy. The aim is to align that person's interests with the goal of pushing the boundaries of human ingenuity to provide benefits to guiding philosophies. We know that we can't predict a person's birth unless we condition people to believe it's possible, as we do now.

We have no way of confirming how peace and security would have been on earth if people had made the Christian guiding philosophy the principal idea for humans to live and operate on its basis, especially since it added being endowed with access to the afterlife when a person would turn away from sinful acts of all kinds, including malice, something that cynicism didn't offer.

People who came after Christ and who legalized that a person doesn't have to hold to Christ's teachings by claiming that he died for our sins may have allowed emotions to result in errors of judgment, which could have been destructive due to the active relationship between cosmic determinism and human freedom.

In other words, we currently face a situation where people refuse to uphold a will that aligns with nature, a will that aligns with God, or a will that conforms to the various laws, customs, and social conventions developed through empirical experience, which most people take for granted. This is because people don't want to believe anything apart from the inclination of the human heart is evil.

Given how modernization could allow us to stop with our emotions making us exhibit errors in judgment, because it takes away from us our human freedom. This situation makes it so that the difference between how we would accept that which we have been given in life (stoicism) by being true to the machineries that we managed through our human ingenuity to put together, instead of wanting to be true to adhering to scriptures as being divinely inspired, as Origen, for example, was holding to a hypothesis, is the only way to be virtuous if a person wants to live in accord with nature (Cynicism/Stoicism) or God (Christianity, Judaism, or Islam). This being the case, could we still allow religion to stifle humanity's views and perception of a God too marvelous and complex to be understood to redeem us when science has shown us that everyone can be redeemed with no exception because it forces on us to accept what has been given to us in life whether we like it or not? Let us check how this guiding philosophy that insists on the human heart being wicked and/or the human condition being a struggle between good and evil could be preventing us from living in a state of psychological or spiritual

calmness that could be gained from living a life of virtue with nature and science.

People may continue to believe that the various forms of government, such as socialism, republicanism, federalism, authoritarianism, and monarchism, provide distinct attributes of national identity based on how their respective authorities control sovereignty. These distinct forms of guiding philosophies or characteristics are merely dialectical expressions of self-identification, which are increasingly becoming obsolete. The new world order, which replaced all these different forms of government, first showed signs of life during the late 19th and early 20th centuries. This new world order began when certain nations started to make their empires with new technological advances and developments rather than with conquest or territorial expansion. This new world order underwent rivalries among its leading powers from the early 20th century until the end of the Second World War. Since the middle of the 20th century, the world has known a new rivalry. This new one is related to getting the great powers to agree on who among them would be taking the lead on the civilizing mission that started on 10 December 1948 to modernize people. On this date in 1948, the victorious nations of the Second World War, instead of colonizing others, freed all people and declared that all human beings are equal in dignity and rights through what became known as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which all signatory nations committed to promoting. The countries and people who won the Second World War are counting on a future where everyone, everywhere, will have access to their technological advances and developments. This declaration would lead to everyone assimilating and promoting a world that is finally on its way to achieving peace.

Earlier, we mentioned that the adherents of Christianity succeeded in their mission to convert people from continuing their ascetic practices

during Greek antiquity; however, it is important to note that Zoroaster, 1,500 years earlier, was teaching that the human condition is a struggle between good and evil. Christianity addressed people's concerns about going to heaven, but it did not resolve their issues on earth regarding how to interact with one another and establish ethical principles.

Article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights states that everyone is entitled to freedom of thought, conscience, and religion. Could factors apart from the reorganization aimed at modernizing society cause the world's insecurity? Instead, it is due to how interpreting the Republicanism idea through the framework of allowing people to go on believing that the human heart is wicked trickles emotions that result in errors of judgment that could be destructive due to how science stifles religion.

After the union victory of the American Civil War, the Reconstruction, Gilded, and Progressive eras saw a significant rise of liberal and radical progressive and civil rights ideas. Those periods saw numerous religious denominations grow in membership and wealth. What those liberal and radical progressive and civil rights ideas were teaching was reform. The reform aimed to address the human condition's split between good and evil, which people saw as the main cause of looming corruption and greed. The more people surrender rights to submit them to the authority of a deity, the more this action switches people's search from being destined to fulfill their purpose on earth, which, to begin with, the inclination of the heart of all men being evil prevents them from reaching. This life can be considered an opportunity, at least as a transitional step to secure a better one in the afterlife, which is preached by all religions. If people want the metaphor of human purpose to be about sustaining good, they could either pursue their passions and pleasures or work towards ensuring social justice so that every member of the human family can realize the full development of their personalities. If a person could expect retribution to occur after death for their efforts to sustain good, then religion serves as an excellent host to condition people to agitate for social justice. Therefore, religion serves as an excellent framework to encourage people to advocate for social justice. Could the reason for the American Civil War be due to this guiding philosophy, which was professed during the American Revolution that all “men are created

equal," clashing with an older, much more powerful guiding philosophy that claimed the inclination of the heart of all men is evil? If all men are created equal, then the inclination of the heart of all men is evil. I believe that until a metaphysical shift occurs that changes our perspective and stops the act of painting, the enjoyment of life by all people cannot be deprived or divested because all men are created equal and the inclination of the heart of all men is evil. People's efforts to achieve and sustain global peace and stability may ultimately prove futile. This situation wouldn't have been a problem if modernization didn't lead to people possessing weapons of mass destruction, as the case is now. But there is the risk of certain nations threatening to use weapons of mass destruction if attacked. The looming danger of weapons of mass destruction poses a serious threat to humanity.

In 1883, Domingo Santa Maria, the Chilean president, said the following about the occupation of Araucania by the Spaniards: "Today all Araucania is subjugated, more than to the material forces, to the moral and civilizing forces of the republic."

It is the same mission that Domingo Santa Maria was speaking about when the Spaniards invaded the Chilean territory. From one generation to the next, people have prioritized moral aims over the purposes that humans may have been programmed to serve on earth. This mission has gotten people embroiled in wars and conflicts until now.

At the beginning of the 20th century, Woodrow Wilson announced in his war message before the United States entered the First World War that this country was entering the war "to vindicate the principles of peace and justice in the life of the world." Could the aim of establishing a new balance of power after the United States entered the First World War, along with the belief that this intervention would enhance humanity's potential to live in a just and secure world, be the factor that fuels the ongoing cycle of emotional impairment experienced by mankind? This social responsibility cannot be considered sacred because Christ preached a harsher form of cynicism. His father was preaching that when a person tries to distinguish between good and evil, he will certainly die. The civilizing mission that people undertake, despite its worth, may pose a genuine threat to their ability to uphold global peace.

Social inequality splits people's pursuit of the development metaphor into two forces. Some people believe it is their holy duty to combat greed and corruption, while others believe the same duty is based on the idea of progress. The only problem is that for the people who postulate a holy duty to put in check greed and corruption, their production is not material but moral. In other words, the progressivism advocated by those who believe in a holy duty to restrain greed and corruption is achieved through disseminating information about the importance of the right social organizations for improving the human condition. Those who postulate the same duty based on the idea of progress produce material rather than moral outcomes. In other words, progressivism refers to those who believe it is their sacred duty to combat greed and corruption by promoting materialism. Those individuals act according to economic conditions.

Ultimately, when individuals strive to reduce social inequality, they must modify their expectations about their potential achievements to fully realize their personalities. Could the "holy duty" that the people whose production is material feel to "sell" their goods to others so those could realize the full development of their personality from those material things be what is causing all the problems that the world knows? In other words, social evolutionists would cease their efforts to change the cultural traditions and values of "backward" people using more modern means or processes. This is because those social evolutionists want to sell those backward people their goods. There is a good chance that the world could have been more peaceful if the competition that emerged after the Second World War had not occurred, when all the people are not allowed to realize the full development of their personalities.

In 490 BC, a soldier ran from the Marathon battlefield site to Athens to report the victory of the Athenian army over the Persians. We assume that when he arrived at his destination, he stopped running. We can't know if human imagination has a limit that would restrict a person from fully developing his personality.

Lebanon was home to the Canaanite/Phoenician people and their kingdoms from 1550 to 539 BC. The physiography of what is now

Lebanon, along with its coastal plain, helped the Canaanites to become civilized and flourish. Cyrus the Great conquered the Canaanites in 539 BC and put an end to the strength that this society projected. From 539 BC, the people living in the region that is now Lebanon were conquered and absorbed into various empires, including the Greek, Roman, and Arab empires, which eventually led to Ottoman rule starting in the 13th century and lasting until the First World War at the beginning of the 20th century.

From 539 BC until the 20th century, the only political, economic, informational, or military power that the people living in the region now known as Lebanon projected in world history was that of the successors to the Canaanites/Phoenicians, who reminisced about their ancestors' past influence.

At the end of the First World War, the people and countries that won the war made significant transformations across most of the territorial boundaries of the principal parties involved in the conflict. They abolished old countries, formed new ones, and redrew boundaries. The region, which is now Lebanon and was under the protection of the Ottoman Empire, was placed under the authority or custodianship of the French following the defeat of the Turks during WW1.

As we said before, when the French administered the people living in this region that is now Lebanon between the two world wars, they organized those people to form a government based on religious communities being represented in public employment. Earlier, we mentioned that historians and scholars claim the French Revolution (1789–1799) demonstrates France's efforts to secularize religious values and traditions while establishing government institutions based on neutral principles. The causes of the French Revolution are debated, but one is the resentment of the clergy and aristocracy's privileges.

From the aftermath of the First World War until the people and countries who won the Second World War decolonized the people who are living in this region, which is now Lebanon. Instead of the people who were living in this region, which is now Lebanon, doing exactly like their ancestors, fighting and rebelling against the French who were colonizing them. The people who lived in this region that is now

Lebanon were involved in interreligious strife. Perhaps the closest historical interval to describe the political and social conditions of this time is to imagine the social and political system of the French before the French Revolution.

At the end of the Second World War, the Allies decided against any territorial aggrandizement and adopted a policy to end colonialism and grant independence to colonial countries and peoples. The people who were living in this region, which is now Lebanon, obtained their independence and formed the Lebanese Republic.

It is important to note that the only Republican philosophy in Lebanon dates back to the time when the people in this region gained their right to self-determination; however, the clergy and the aristocracy, who still control the government, refer to the country as the "Lebanese Republic," despite it being a de facto dictatorship.

From 1945 until now, in 2017, it has been seventy-two years during which the Lebanese people have been dealing with interreligious strife and civil wars. Recently, the different religious militias that operate in the country started feeling empowered to the point that they now threaten countries like the United States of America, which, by all standards, is considered the most powerful country in the world. This ingratitude that the people who call themselves Lebanese exhibit toward the United States is, of course, the fault of the United States for freeing them and for not keeping them living under subjugation, domination, and exploitation following the Second World War.

Could the slack that the principal parties who won the Second World War arranged so that the people who inhabit this region, which is now known as Lebanon, become invited to promote the development of a world in which all its inhabitants shall enjoy freedom of speech and belief and freedom from fear and want have caused the ongoing internal strife that the citizens of this country have been dealing with more vigorously since 1945? In other words, could the progressive thinking of the principal parties who won the Second World War postulate a holy duty to help those people who inhabit this region, which is now known as Lebanon, to exercise sovereignty over the integrity of this territory? The goal is, of course, to stop those people

who inhabit this region, which is now known as Lebanon, from continuing to be backward and convert them into becoming modernized. This holy duty that the principal parties who won the Second World War postulated led the people who inhabit this region, which is now known as Lebanon, to postulate a reciprocating holy duty in which they made it their own holy duty to destroy the thought process of the principal parties who won the Second World War to the extent that they are now displaying defiance against the people and countries that empowered them. This defiance that the people who inhabit this region, which is now known as Lebanon, are exhibiting, both with the territory in which they were allowed to exercise sovereignty over the integrity of their territory and the resulting spillover, is due to human rationalization that advancements in science, technology, economic development, and social organization clash with the human condition that postulates that "every inclination of the human heart is evil," which a good number of religious bases condition people's minds to perceive as the reason for the ineptitude of an individual in managing to reach the full development of his personality.

Could we consider that, no matter what, the principal parties who won the Second World War would try to motivate the behaviors of the people who inhabit this region, which is now known as Lebanon, with thoughts and actions that benefit those inhabitants? The religious bases preach to the people who inhabit this region, now known as Lebanon, that every inclination of the human heart is evil, preventing them from adapting and becoming rational. In other words, even if we establish a new form of government that excludes the representation of religious communities in public employment and implement fair and just elections for the people of Lebanon, the situation may remain the same. This change will not lead people in this country to trust each other and deepen fellowship by making government institutions operate on neutral lines. The same can be said even if we take steps to improve the political, economic, social, or educational preparedness of the Lebanese people. This approach mirrors the actions taken by the United States to assist the people of France in the aftermath of the Second World War. The French people, who passed a law in 1905 to secularize religious values and traditions and to operate government institutions on neutral lines, never managed to curb greed and

corruption; as a result, trust among the people of France could deepen, and their sense of fellowship grow. To make the Lebanese and French people civilized or rational, must we eliminate the belief that the human condition is a struggle between good and evil and the idea that every inclination of the human heart is evil? Any interventions that fall short of this goal could perpetuate the cycle of insecurity that humanity has experienced throughout history. The best way to describe this cycle is the three eras that the United States passed through after the American Civil War, leading to the first and second World Wars. The primary reason for the short-lived nature of peace and stability in recent years is that as people become more progressive, this trend exacerbates the fluctuations between stability and instability; specifically, the further individuals distance themselves from their natural functions—shaped by continuous interaction with the natural world for survival—the more they rely on technology to fulfill those roles. The more people feel a holy duty to attempt to change the cultural traditions and values of each other, the more it increases. As people stop making decisions, they become more subjugated to their bodies. When humans stop allowing their bodies to dominate them, they empower their minds to take control. The mind can only order or instruct its body or the bodies of others. There is nothing that the mind wants to keep in control other than greed and corruption, because these two aspects are the only features that can fulfill the full development of a person's personality. As we said before, the religious bases have conditioned people since the days of Zoroaster, 1500 BC, that the human condition is a struggle between good and evil. In 1883, Domingo Santa Maria, the Chilean president, said the following about the occupation of Araucania by the Spaniards: "Today all of Araucania is subjugated, more than to the material forces, to the moral and civilizing forces of the republic." Today, in 2017, all the people of the world are subjugated more by the moral and civilizing forces of religious beliefs than by material forces.

The outbreak of World War II left many cities in Europe and Asia in ruins, and France was not exempt. Many cities in France were reduced to rubble and ashes. The war destroyed or severely damaged most of the country's bridges, railways, dams, dykes, fields, factories, workshops, and other infrastructure. The scale of the damage and destruction in France was large, and the obstacles to rebuilding would

have been enormous if the United States hadn't stepped in and offered financial aid to the French people to reconstruct. France faced bankruptcy, with its economic and financial systems stripped bare and requiring complete reconstruction.

If everything were relative, the people of France would have had to confront a situation similar to what the United States faced at the end of the American Civil War. This approach would focus on reconstruction to rebuild the country and to restore national unity following the devastation that the war had brought. This signifies that France should have lived during this rebuilding period with optimism, peace, economic prosperity, and technological, scientific, and cultural innovations identical to what the United States enjoyed when it was its turn to go through this phase after the American Civil War. Again, if everything is relative, France's reconstruction era following the devastation of the Second World War should have been followed by a gilded and progressive era similar to the transformational periods that the United States experienced.

It is well established that in retrospect, as early as 1944, the French government introduced a dirigisme economic policy, which led to what became known as the "Glorious Thirty," which refers to the thirty years from 1945 to 1975, in which France's economy grew rapidly and witnessed an explosive growth. Perhaps "The Glorious Thirty" subtly addressed serious social problems, unlike the issues faced by the United States during this era. This was primarily because, during the Second World War, the communists largely dominated the resistance movement within France. They controlled the political scene throughout the Second World War up until they cooperated and were incorporated into the government. However, the dirigiste economic policy that France implemented in the postwar era included substantial state-directed control over investment. The strong influence that the state exerted over investment during this gilded period in France prevented the detection of abrupt social and political upheavals, unlike in the United States, where such changes marked the beginning of a progressive era. From 1975 onward, the weakening of state enterprises in strategic sectors of the French economy made the dominant political landscape in modern-time France have identical issues to the ones the

United States faced during the Progressive Era, and this country is still dealing with them today.

The financial aid the United States gave to France to rebuild helped to bring the technological, cultural, military, and economic strength of the people who inhabit this region, known as France, back to and surpass pre-war levels. Politically, the impact of the war made it look as if France would never rise again. In effect, many speculations are made to support why France was made a permanent member of the UN Security Council, despite sitting out most of WWII. However, the guiding philosophy that emerged following the war, which adapted what came to be known as the “Politics of Grandeur” and in which France sought to establish itself as a major power that doesn’t have to rely on other countries for its national security and prosperity, helped to pursue high-profile projects that included enabling France in 1960 to be the world’s fourth nuclear power.

We cannot determine whether it was necessary for 60-85 million people to die before the main parties involved in the Second World War, who were fighting over global security, agreed to cease hostilities and declare a winner. It is widely known that each principal party that was fighting during the Second World War was working on developing a nuclear arsenal to use first. The tilting of the war outcome in favor of one party over the other didn't result in the world getting safer at the end of the Second World War. The experiences of the war didn't lead to any optimism for the world afterwards. To the contrary, the national trauma that people lived through made them become more bitter. In the case of the French, the war did not change their sentiment or transform them into a united diaspora focused on creating stable conditions in the world. Immediately right after the Second World War ended, France, in 1945, established the French Atomic Energy Commission and proceeded to develop its own nuclear arsenal. Most people will agree that the world was safer before the Second World War. This is because man had not developed a nuclear arsenal before the Second World War was fought. This conclusion doesn't necessarily mean that, had a scientist reached the discovery of nuclear fusion before the Second World War was fought, nuclear energy as a weapon would have been developed and used much earlier by a party involved in a conflict or war. However, while people were practicing ideologies that advocate

nationalism, such as socialism and republicanism, they also made efforts to unite individuals in the pursuit of internationalism. Until now, countries have continued to engage in reprisals and an arms race to develop nuclear forces, seeking to establish a national status symbol and maintain international prestige. From 1939 to 1945, there were about 86 countries in the world, and as of 1945, those exact countries gave birth to today's nearly 200 nations. Each of the 200 countries that exist today is entangled in an arms race to develop nuclear forces, aiming to maintain control over decisions that affect them so they do not have to follow the lead of an ally or a competitor. The holy mission that people seem to be heralding is to be heavily armed to uphold the principles of peace and justice in the world, as they believe that a shift in the balance of power would force mankind to live in fear and want. This pervasive fear that people exhibit leads them to take on roles aimed at ensuring that others live free from fear and want or as if they have been commissioned by God to police the world. This reaction stems either from a sense of disillusionment or from people's belief in one or more reputedly meaningful aspects of life, which creates a need to encourage others to become pacifists.

I suppose in case God commissioned certain people to police the world, because in God's eyes, it benefits them; the only holy duty that making people be the masters of their decisions has brought in the history of the world is how to use such a mission for the sake of economic and political exploitation. Lebanon is a vivid example of how people base the requirements for having religious communities represented in public employment to maintain peace and security in this country from the date they were given the right to self-determination. France, on the other hand, immediately after receiving the necessary financial aid to rebuild, faces the most pressing issue for its leadership: how can the country maintain control over the decisions that affect it? France proceeded to establish the French Atomic Energy Commission, responsible for developing a nuclear arsenal to project power, in 1945, right when the Second World War ended. In the final analysis, regardless of whether pacifism becomes popular, people may revert to military rule, practice cynicism or nihilism, or believe in reputedly meaningful aspects of life; and regardless of whether they adhere to capitalism, imperialism, communism, socialism, nationalism, or internationalism, none of these doctrines or any combinations

thereof will lead to respect for a hypothetical notion of rational civilization.

Surely, the obligations to the peace of the world begin with all members of the human family assuming the obligations that have already been declared. Likewise, the establishment of new treaty obligations has always been an ongoing process. But if, despite all the sacrifices the United States made during WWI and WWII to bring political transformation, the French discover themselves living free from the subjugation, domination, or exploitation of the Germans and their allies had they won the war. Right after the Second World War, the French developed a nuclear arsenal capable of being launched in all directions, while the United States' purported civilization mission seems to have made the world more unsafe than it was before. The same can be said about the French regarding their decision to allow the Lebanese to determine the future status of their political, economic, social, and educational preparedness. This measure made Lebanon more unsafe than when it was under French administration.

Earlier, I mentioned that technocrats and scientists ultimately focus on controlling and regulating humanity's problems, particularly those related to corruption and greed. People's subjugation to moral and civilizing forces would go on, but then it would eliminate itself because of humans' power to continue this practice of an undefined sense of holy responsibility to make people live free from any fear and want; automation would regulate that aim. It remains unclear whether tracking people's footsteps continues by policing their thoughts, words, and deeds. Now, this policing is increasingly conducted by tracking people's footsteps in cyberspace. As people's interactions with one another decrease due to technology creating distance from physical interactions, the focus has shifted from motivating physical pain to motivating mental gain. Would people's holy duty to the peace of the world become one-sided? Most importantly, how do technocrats and scientists expect to pick what would be the best politics for the world if the only politics that are omnipresent and forever eternal advocate that the human condition is a struggle between good and evil? What is good for the technocrat and scientist may not be good for others in a world where everyone wants to control their own decisions because they believe the human heart is evil. In physics, a force is any

interaction that, when unopposed, will change the motion of an object. Therefore are people creating an opposing force that they think only goes in the direction they push?

However, what people are neglecting is that whatever policy they try to pull upon another people or society, there is an opposing force that has an ill-treating effect that redirects itself inward or points toward the party that is causing or instigating the interaction. This ill-treating effect is subtle with minimal exploitation but becomes very noticeable when exploitation increases rapidly. In other words, any exploitation or holy duty that others feel is their job to change because it benefits them is just new knowledge that people share. When people's knowledge progresses slowly, their sense of duty to combat greed and corruption also advances at a slow pace. However, when people develop knowledge rapidly, it becomes highly noticeable. This is the reason for the abnormal rise in people's unwillingness to exhibit tolerance toward peace and security. Access to knowledge, not material things, makes people unwilling to exhibit tolerance. Since people are now using new methods to exploit each other, they prefer that this exploitation occur through machinery rather than through direct contact or policing as it was done in the past. To simplify, two humans can exert force on each other either directly through contact or through forces resulting from action at a distance. A force resulting from action at a distance means two humans control each other when they are not physically in contact with each other. To provide an example, the sun and the planets exert a gravitational pull on each other despite their large spatial separation. In the present, people want to use automation to establish what actions or moves another person could take. If people are conditioned to believe that the human condition is a mental struggle between good and evil. Peace could never be reached on earth because this perception is tied to people's belief in one or more reputed meaningful aspects of life. Science doesn't provide life meaning; it explores the context and parameters of how life works. It is the religious perspective that counts because only religion has been able since man appeared on earth to explain life in terms of an implicit purpose not defined by humans. We know already that when human knowledge increases, this phenomenon will reciprocally speed how fast people depart this life. This decision to develop interests in the universe is the price people want to pay; hence,

religious scriptures have cautioned against distinguishing between good and evil (Genesis 2:17). This ideology explains the human condition as a struggle between good and evil, which we believe has been the source of the insecurity that people have experienced throughout history. Human reason (or science) cannot explain life in terms of an implicit purpose; therefore, the choices are clear: either people must dismiss the idea that the human condition is a struggle between good and evil, stop allowing others to believe that it is the hearts of individuals that prevent them from fully developing their personalities, or acknowledge that the shortage of the earth's resources, combined with the natural human ability to provide, regardless of where a person is born, affects the full development of every individual's personality. Alternatively, if society continues to practice this guiding ideology or similar ones, such as "all people are created equal," it will perpetuate insecurity for humanity, as has been the case throughout history. People who consider it unfair to deny their children access to the full development of their personality simply need to refrain from reproducing, as no new human is required to ensure the human race's survival on earth. As we said before, the choices are clear: either people practice internationalism or nationalism. Either way, people have to practice subjecting each other to domination or have the right to self-determination. No matter the approach, not everyone can fully develop their personality, as the outcome depends on their natural abilities and birth circumstances. Those who do not want to support progressivism can simply choose to live as ascetics. Let us examine in the next chapter if pursuing policies that split reality into being based on disillusion could preserve human security or if making people respect a hypothetical notion of rational civilization is the way.

Historians allege that the domestic policy of King Ferdinand II of Aragon and Queen Isabella I of Castile, both from the Spanish house of Trastamara, included the expulsion of all Jews and Muslims as a result of claims of anti-Spanish and anti-Catholic propaganda in Spain. In effect, King Ferdinand II and Queen Isabella I sought the help of Pope Lucius III to request his ascent to issue a Spanish mposition in 1478 to maintain Catholic orthodoxy in Spain and the rest of their kingdoms. The Jews or Muslims who refused to convert were ordered to leave. We have no way of knowing if this mission to expand Catholic orthodoxy led those two most Catholic kings and queens to finance the expedition of Christopher Columbus to make voyages across the Atlantic Ocean to the Americas. In Christopher Columbus's journal from his first expedition voyage in 1492, he reported that the indigenous people he encountered on his trip were wearing gold ornaments and that he insisted they guide him to the source. Columbus also said he thought those indigenous people could effortlessly be made Christians, for they seemed to have no religion. He also added, "I could conquer the whole of them with 50 men and govern them as I pleased."

Power is the ability to persuade others to take important actions they would not otherwise take. Christopher Columbus's observation of the lack of modern weaponry and metal-forged swords or pikes by the indigenous people he encountered on this first trip to resist his imposition and that of his men helped them to conquer, colonize, and command vast economic potential and influence. It is unclear whether all the accusations of tyranny during Columbus' governorship were a result of his attempts to impose the Spanish Inquisition on the indigenous people to convert them to Catholicism, or if his own

version of Catholicism influenced his political actions. This is especially since Columbus was indoctrinated in the Renaissance movement, and therefore, he must have invented his version of humanism. The colonies and conquests established by Columbus and his men in the Americas transformed Spain into a major power in Europe and even into the largest empire until 1810. Their efforts to spread Catholicism led Pope Alexander VI to award the title of Catholic Monarchs to Ferdinand II and Isabella I in 1494 in recognition of their defense of the Catholic faith within their realms.

The American frontier that Columbus and his men unlocked, based on their experiences, may have motivated the other European empires to begin colonizing and conquering parts of the Americas that Columbus and his men did not reach to convert the indigenous people they encountered to Catholicism or to discover new trade routes amid the emerging economic competition among Europeans seeking to extend their power. However, what we know is that the Catholicism or humanism that all those colonizers invested in, from Columbus's first trip in 1492 to 1765, aimed to create a citizenry capable of engaging in the civic life of their communities and persuading others to take virtuous and prudent actions. This movement in 1765 gave birth to a new political ideology called "republican" that emphasized civic duty, virtue, and opposition to corruption, fancy luxuries, and aristocracy. This political ideology, centered on the belief that "all men are created equal," did not provide the American colonial society, which had separated from their European roots, with anything more than the reality of engaging in economic competition against the very people they had initially separated from, albeit with one key difference. Instead of this economic competition being done between kingdoms against each other, it is being done under the state-nation name or form of government.

The American colonial society, which split or seceded from their European powers, recognized in 1776 that they had to adopt the same European foreign policies and practices their former chiefs were carrying out. Their version of welfare was based on a scholastic method that was identical to the practices of the societies they had seceded from. They established diplomatic relations with the people or societies they split from and weaved their destiny to parallel the same

ambitions the European powers were pursuing. The issues included individual and economic freedom, the separation of church and state, freedom of expression, equal rights for women, the right to divorce, the decriminalization of homosexual acts, and the collection of intelligence on significant activities in the countries with which they established political or diplomatic relations.

The New World was adopting the same welfarism as the people across the Atlantic. The aim is for each power to maximize utility for its citizens. The only difference, as we said, is that instead of this welfarism ideology being advocated under a unitary kingdom affiliated with or under the auspices of the European empire from which those people who called themselves "American" originated, it is now advocated under a republic. This welfareism ideology did not become split; rather, the people split from being unionized to practice civil life based on virtues and prudent actions that are derived from their own invented version of humanism.

Certainly, making people rivals to maximize their own utility or to let them realize the full development of their own personality, the more this phenomenon motivates people to pursue such sentience. The more people accelerate their progressivism. The more this phenomenon motivates people's ideas about the importance of science, technology, economic development, and social organization, the better. The more people concentrate on devoting themselves to furthering their political, commercial, and military preparedness and other indications, including collecting intelligence to evaluate threats or potential. The more people devote themselves to bettering their political, economic, social, military, or educational preparedness. The more this civilizing mission, which is based on making happiness the measure of right and wrong, makes one's conduct become the axiom or the ultimate basis for any judgment about the rightness or wrongness of that conduct. This idea of consequentialism, which people deemed vital for improving the human condition, helped the United States of America act as a guardian of the Western Hemisphere (the nations in Central and South America) and emerge at the end of the Second World War as a custodian promoting world peace while maintaining the strength and stability of this nation-state. It is important to note that the United States' interest in assuming this international duty arises from the

country's fear of economic ruin and the potential breakdown of the industries that feed and sustain its population. To provide an example, the United States from 1860 to 1890 had issued 500,000 patents for new inventions. If we consider only the number of inventions that the United States patented from 1890 to 1917, just before entering the First World War, we can see a significant increase. This feeling of accomplishment surely makes the people of the United States look upon themselves as the police of the world or as the guardians of peace in the world. In effect, even if the action of the people of the United States provokes a misconception of their motives. Moral partnership in international affairs requires the promotion of a vital community of interests, which the United States is obliged to support due to the significant material production developed on its soil.

The role that the United States seeks to play in countering any encroachment that threatens its strength and stability from other sovereign nations is guided by a philosophy that aligns with the approach the country encouraged the rest of the world to adopt after the Second World War, which emphasizes maintaining peace and security by moving away from the ostentatious practice of evaluating actions based on their outcomes, rather than assessing the rightness or wrongness of conduct based on the character of the behavior itself. This guiding philosophy could maximize utility for the United States by shifting the focus from the rightness or wrongness of one's conduct from being focused on character or the agent to focusing on the nature or the consequence of the act itself. However, the consequences of a person's conduct serve as the ultimate basis for judging the rightness or wrongness of that conduct. In addition, the only judgment that people want to come together to support is how to maximize utility. This signifies that people, even after they decided to unionize, made efforts to maintain peace and stability in the world. This gesture to unionize did not change how people determine rightness or wrongness; rather, humanity experimented with a new pragmatic method after the Second World War to identify the best actions that maximize utility or happiness. Earlier, we said that humans will manage using science to control and regulate ethics, thus eliminating any need for every member of the human family to derive the rightness or wrongness from the character of one's behavior and instead derive it from the character of the behavior of one agent. This one agent is one of those

people who would control the machinery that all the people need to align their behavior with. Those agents don't know whether any action is wrong or right. Those agents rely on a specific pragmatic ethic or type of happiness to determine what is right or wrong, treating morality like a science—a scalar quantity that is empirically attained by reorienting humanity to change values and traditions based solely on what people value most.

I have no way of knowing if science will change people's behavior so that they become capable of understanding good and evil and the concept of goodness. Throughout the entire human history, progressivism distorted people's capability to choose between the relative unimportance of the body over the relative importance of the mind. I explained why people can't overcome their will's weakness in another work.

No one could predict what the American people would specifically regard as the realization of their purpose, given that they only began to perceive their honor and obligations to maintain peace and stability in the world at a certain point in time. No man can ever claim to understand the nature of peace or how to attain or acquire it. People debate peace and go to war with one another in search of it. For instance, when the 28th President of the United States, Woodrow Wilson, spoke about the United States' honor and obligations to world peace in 1913, we now see that a century later, the United States has been involved in 34 wars or conflicts around the world. Similarly, volunteering to demonstrate at the global council that this country is structured so people start to evoke peace, amity, and concord based on justice and fair dealing has not been an easy task since 1913. The United States seems to be fixed on pursuing a foreign policy guided by actions that create the impression that this country wants to be the police of the world under all circumstances and to be the champions of covenanted peace and of concord between people. Perhaps the leaders of this country think that it is possible to unionize people based on their history, experience following the American Civil War, and their perception that their dominant technological, economic, or military might could allow them to continue to dominate world affairs. Evidently, the most significant challenge the United States will face in the future will be how to make the people of the entire world support

the policies this country wants everyone to practice while not being considered a threat, which could jeopardize trust. The great rule for any nation that wants good relations with foreign countries is to ensure everyone works from a mutual set of interests. Unfortunately, a different set of interests seems to guide the state of international relations among all 196 nations in the world today, with each interest heading in a different direction.

For example, the United States aims to link its peace and prosperity to the efforts of each individual living in Lebanon, after this country has encouraged its citizens to focus on their personal development rather than on societal well-being. When Christopher Columbus was conquering and colonizing, he did not preach to the indigenous people about the need to work together with him to fulfill their personal development and earn a place in the afterlife. The US wants to base its peace and prosperity on what is good for individuals, not world peace. The United States would be forgoing what liberty and the inspirations of an emancipated spirit may do for man and for societies, for individuals, for states, and for mankind to focus on rivalry, interests, and caprice, which doesn't revive friendship and alliances but a fire of insecurity that distances people and nations more than they already are. Peace, commerce, and honest friendship with all nations: entangling alliances begin by the United States reaching a life of peace with its citizens before this country can do so with its neighbors. Therefore, since the United States became aware of the need to create a vital community of interests and establish more partnerships in its affairs, it has faced challenges. This past century has shown that the United States has generated less happiness and safety for its people, which raises doubts about whether the adopted policies have led to tangible changes in the political history of the world. What the United States achieved in terms of prestige and influence during the past century may be considered remarkable by some; however, I view it as a barrier that hinders citizens from leading the country's development activities rather than participating in them.

Happiness, peace, and safety are essential aspects for the well-being of any nation. Humans could tie the sources of life and prosperity for a nation to progressivism by allowing machinery to handle labor, thereby providing people with enough spare time to focus on realizing

their full potential while directing the minds and bodies of citizens towards what is economically beneficial for society as a whole, rather than for individual gain. As long as humans continue to depend on water and food for survival, they must meet their basic needs. The essence of survival needs is not found in the hives of cities, the cries of crowded markets, or the clangor of factories, but rather in the valleys and hillsides. Most people take apocalyptic and post-apocalyptic events as subgenres of fiction literature. Let's hope that if a climactic, natural, or manmade event strikes the earth, the electric grid will continue to function, allowing those in the United States who have chosen to distance themselves from essential needs to focus on developing their personalities. This approach aims to teach children how to plant wheat and beans, which is fundamental for the survival of individuals and nations, rather than allowing them to learn how to develop and operate computers. Progressivism is vital to improving the human condition, especially considering that any natural apocalyptic event could render every street silent, every office deserted, and every factory in disrepair. Humans need to continually make scientific advancements and industrial progress to figure out how to extend longevity for all of us.

Since the emergence of the political ideology known as "Republicanism" in 1765, this movement has not emphasized civic duty, virtue, and opposition to corruption, fancy luxuries, and aristocracy in the regions where the United States held cultural, economic, military, or political exclusivity. As of the early 19th century, the people of the United States had a duty to maintain world peace, which goes beyond their own national life.

Therefore, the United States views itself as the most senior republic and the leader of both republicanism and the free nations of the world. The people deriving guiding policies for this country probably do not realize, as we said earlier, that ethics were made mainly to focus on the good of the individual rather than society.

Advances in science can expand the spatial sphere of influence of any nation, under the pretext of public conscience and the enlightened statesmanship that current inhabitants of the earth wish to be recorded in history for attempting to achieve. Advancements in science,

technology, economic development, and social organization, which people rely on to dominate each other, distance individuals from the material possessions they could be showcasing, thereby weakening their will to exhibit moral goodness. This phenomenon occurs because science reduces the necessity of desiring material possessions in order to pursue intellectual interests.

Up until not that long ago, people needed ethics to work in a certain way or to be ethical because the things that people needed to exemplify ethics about were objects, not people. Hence, machinery now interacts with nature and not people to produce objects. People can produce objects without needing to consider ethics, because those objects are not physical. Let's provide an example. Today, everyone has access to artificial resources while sitting in front of a computer. The person doesn't need the material thing that he reads about, because he has access to it virtually. Even if he desires to put his hands on the things he is reading about, he can't steal them or operate them because they are self-operable. This situation means that now the world is inhabited by real humans and artificial beings. Those artificial beings are controlled by real humans. Those artificial beings are supposed to control and regulate people's ethics. The problem is that certain individuals have introduced these artificial beings into society to compel others to behave in specific ways, driven by their interests in how ethics should function, which means that ethical behavior still relies on individual perceptions of what constitutes virtuous and prudent actions. What about the individuals who have a vested interest in ethics functioning in a specific manner, thereby making others reliant on their perceptions of what constitutes virtuous and prudent actions? They ignore that being ethical is harder than being unethical. This phenomenon occurs because, when people remain undeveloped, their unethical behavior stems from directing their actions towards fostering ethical interactions with material things. As people develop, they direct their ethicalness toward each other's unethicalness. This is because people can't make the machines that control their actions more or less ethical. Science distances people from interacting with or manipulating objects in an ethical manner, as previously mentioned. This situation indicates that the individuals who developed ethical standards primarily considered their interests, and as scientists continue to introduce new products that reduce people's interaction

with nature, there is a growing desire to create enough objects to satisfy consumer demand. The further those limited objects distance people from being required to be unethical, the more ethical people would be, and the more people would hold to different kinds of values that influence their behavior. People would want more happiness as objects distance them from being unethical. Happiness is both artificial and real. In the past, people divided reality into two groups: those who lived a happy life and those who made others happy. Those who lacked access to wealth and real happiness fabricated their artificial happiness using their imagination. Now, hence, the technology that the rich want the poor to use to dominate them makes the poor work less so they have more time to fulfill artificial happiness. This artificial happiness is not created from their own power or environment but is instead derived from the knowledge provided by technology. Could the United States, which is the greatest capitalist nation in the world, manage to prevent the desires of its people from encroaching on its republican ideology, especially as its citizens are now free to pursue ambitions that distance them from traditional practices like planting and storing food, ultimately undermining the human body's ability to sustain itself?

In other words, did the United States make the right choice of helping the French financially to reconstruct after the Second World War or abandon remaining farmers so the help the United States provided led them to want to be the masters of the decisions affecting their future to the extent they developed a nuclear arsenal? How could France's access to a nuclear arsenal be a threat to the United States, which wants to be the police of the world? How could the decision the United States took to decolonize the people of Lebanon be a threat to the republicanism ideology, especially since the Lebanese, as in the case of the French, are both working from a set of traditions and values that are identical to what the United States is aiming at achieving in the world? This policy aims to prevent other ideologies from interfering in their domestic affairs.

For instance, the rapid modernization of the French people, expedited by the United States, should have caused many social problems as the country entered the Gilded Era or the Progressive Era following the Second World War. Whatever the case might be, both eras form part of

the vicious cycle that has been engulfing human security since time immemorial after any reconstruction era. If everything is relative, the wages in this country are supposed to have reached a much higher level than they would in Lebanon or other countries like Africa when France was going through the different transformations. The higher wages in France should have resulted in this country witnessing an influx of Lebanese migrants after the Second World War. Therefore, France must confront abject poverty and inequality, and the high concentration of wealth should be visible and contentious among its citizens, similar to the situation during the unfolding of the Progressive Era in the US. Evidently, labor unions should be on the rise; however, the government should actively work to suppress their formation in order to prevent social and political upheavals. The poor should be living in very economically disadvantaged conditions.

The political landscape in France should be dominated by issues related to how to strengthen social justice, public service, prohibition, improved education, social insurance, ethnic and racial cohesion, and so forth. Increased demand for better tariffs and tax control, market regulations, labor law, and other issues should plague the economic landscape. The discontent among the people should be growing, and either the far right or the far left, depending on the country's political system, should take control of urban politics. People should be crusading for justice, civil service reform, and prohibition of many issues to ensure fair distribution of wealth, equal opportunity, and equality of outcome.

We have no way of knowing exactly how the social structure picture looks in France apart from, as we said, if everything is relative; what France should have dealt with after the reconstruction era, from the aftermath of the Second World War, should be identical to what the United States faced. This situation arises because the structure of French social relationships is a complex, multi-dimensional, and non-quantifiable problem, similar to the challenges faced by the United States since the end of the Civil War, which has involved moving from one depression or economic crisis to the next. The massive reconstruction growth that the French benefited from after the Second World War should have put them ahead of this unpleasant reality that we depicted. In fact, the president of France announced in 2016 that he

will not seek re-election for a second term. The media claim this socialist leader is suffering from very low popularity ratings, which prompted him to become the first sitting president in modern French history to forgo re-election.

The political system, which has plagued the Lebanese people since 1926, has transformed the Lebanese government into a quasi-federation among the various religious groups that have formed. This political system, which now exists in Lebanon, has converted the country into a confessional regime, where religious affiliations determine the extent of one's political rights and privileges. The French may have intentionally chosen this form of government for the Lebanese to prevent their development and keep them living in the past, especially since they had enacted a law in 1905 to avoid allowing religious lines to interfere with any form of public work as part of their own social structures.

Could the potential future for the Lebanese people, if the United States were to facilitate financial aid and help them organize their government, businesses, and corporations around a non-religious social system, lead to the same insecurity that the French people have experienced from 1945 to the present? Could the insecurity that awaits the French people be similar to the insecurity that the Lebanese people have experienced since 1926, due to their country's alignment of government, businesses, and corporations with a social system based on human rationalization principles? In other words, the political system that the people of France will likely face in the future is similar to the one that the Lebanese people have been experiencing since 1926, based on their shared principles.

It appears that when we tested two societies—one practicing social freedom and liberty without religious lines and the other lacking guiding philosophies or a formal government—this did not contribute to an increase in global peace. Likewise, when we tested letting the French people base their traditions and values on human rationalization principles and allowed the Lebanese people to continue basing their traditions and values on religious beliefs, did it make a difference to improve peace and security in the world? Are France and Lebanon now on a path to greater insecurity due to the desire of their

respective populations to exercise sovereignty over their national territories, following the right to self-determination granted by the principal parties who won the Second World War? Could this idea of bringing people to work closer with one another accelerate insecurity? Will the American people face the same political system as the French and Lebanese? In other words, it wouldn't be because the American people desire to live based on the same political system that the Lebanese people have been living in since 1926, but the same civil liberty and political and economic freedom found in economic liberalism or free-market capitalism that would create this condition against the free will of the American and French people. For as long as their economic system is based on spitting winners and losers, whether the United States or France tries to operate any form of government, be it one that is based on maintaining neutral identification with religious values and institutions. People desire to interact with one another based on natural and legal rights. People cannot achieve a state that is free from values and traditions. This situation is because the natural and legal rights that people want to interact on their basis are by themselves a form of values and traditions. The mere fact that people's interactions create winners and losers ultimately leads to a division among people, even against their will. This signifies that the people transform their political system to form close identification with religious values and institutions, whether based on secular or religious lines. In either case, the overarching ideology perceives the human condition as divided between good and evil.

With all the challenges confronting the world in modern times, it is unclear how Americans, French, Lebanese, and others will manage to maintain national cohesion. The social justice appeal for fair distribution of wealth, equal opportunity, and equality of outcome appears to be no different from the outcry that the people of Lebanon have faced since 1926, largely due to the way the French have influenced the Lebanese constitution. The two countries, France and Lebanon, are both working on how to emphasize social, political, and economic justice. In fact, it appears that the French people are in worse shape than the Lebanese people, who currently lack the technological, military, and economic growth or strength necessary for distribution. It appears that the social, political, and economic conditions left by the French for the Lebanese in 1926 forced the Lebanese to develop

policies for redistributing resources in public agencies. The French people are suffering from a different problem, and their challenge is how to distribute the fruits of their technological, military, and economic growth or strength in public agencies; to achieve that, they need to rival the American people. Can the American and Lebanese people manage to agree on ensuring socio-political justice in their approach to doing business with Lebanon? Will the American or the French agree on fair distribution of wealth, equal opportunity, and equality of outcome when they are rivaling each other?

In the 20th century, despite all the efforts the United States invested in reform movements in response to the changes brought by industrialization, this country found itself fighting two world wars to maintain its stability and strength.

Are the American, French, and Lebanese people each one running a government credo based on a separate model? The American is based on republicanism. The Lebanese are based on the requirement to have the religious communities represented in public employment, while the French are based on secularizing religion in public service. If we are to consider the vast changes that modernization is continuously bringing, we must ask whether those three countries will reach a point where they can introduce social progressivism into their respective governments. Would those three countries introduce social progressivism in their governments to adjust the social justice system as their societies evolve, so advances in science, technology, economic development, and social organization would reduce citizen disenchantment? Would their citizens manage to take down the corrupt representative in office to establish a direct form of democracy in their country? In other words, there is a need to seek regulation of monopolies and corporations to ensure the fair distribution of wealth, equal opportunity, and equality of outcome, while also preventing civil war and promoting equal competition for the benefit of legitimate businesses. Alternatively, whether we let those three countries break their union or not, nothing would change.

Fortunately, for the Lebanese, as we said before, the people are living in Greek antiquity in modern times. There is no need to worry about how Lebanese panic or depression might affect global stability. This

situation would be different if the competing appetites of Americans and French, each seeking to expand their influence and prestige, began to overlap.

It is impossible to predict how the nations that dominate the political machinery with their military and economic strength, while promoting equal competition through policy initiatives, will disenchant people or affect the value placed on individuals in improving the human condition. Throughout the history of the world, the civilizing mission that people endorsed came up with many guiding philosophies, which people were all ready to improve upon, minus the only guiding philosophy that they made constant, and that is that the human condition is a split between good and evil. As of 1945, this guiding philosophy, which is enshrined in religious beliefs and preaches about the inclination of the human heart being evil from childhood, is putting at risk thousands of years of work to reach the republican ideology because the people who are interpreting this doctrine want to support what is economically good for society but not for an individual person.

I believe that the precursor ideology, which suggests that the human heart is inclined to be evil, has prevented the republicanism ideology that emerged in 1776 from enabling people to live according to the principles outlined in the 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Moreover, the disenchantment in the United States, which later exploded with the two back-to-back world wars, was fueled by the effect of progressivism, which distanced people from interacting with nature and led them to focus more on ensuring social justice. As of 1948, people have been preaching about the inalienable right to what is good for an individual, not necessarily to make a person live free from fear and want, but rather to encourage consumerism. It is unrealistic to expect that every member of the human family will achieve the full realization of their personality development. This is because the scientific, literary, or artistic work produced by an individual can never be equal, and the environment regenerates differently in various parts of the world.

In the modern Olympic Games, only the athletes who are ranked 1st, 2nd, and 3rd are given medals, and each sporting event has a start and an end. We don't know how the people and countries who won the

Second World War reached this conclusion, in which they gave the people of the other foreign nations hope that they could also reach the full development of their personalities. Even the people and countries that won the Second World War did not succeed in ensuring the full development of their citizens' personalities. This creates a situation where all members of the human family are forced to compete against one another in a race that has a starting point but no clear endpoint regarding what the full development of an individual's personality could entail. In a race where athletes are aware that each other's hearts are evil. Could the idea to unionize the world be a vision that its proponents expected when they made all the members of the human family take part? Those who fail to fully develop their personality, like athletes outside the top three, go home empty-handed and don't take it personally.

Could the marathon of the people and countries who won the Second World War, in which they sought to make people live free from fear and want through consumerism, be taking people on a head-on collision with another new world war in the same way the previous civilizing missions took mankind to collide head-on?

What succeeding generations will be giving up if a new world war is deemed the only limiting solution to diminish the large demand from people seeking to realize the full development of their personality is going to be continuing to practice this principal pillar of liberal democracy and the free market that constitutes this core republican ideology for so many people, as the case is now? This principle is because we know already that any deviation away from allowing the protection of the material interests resulting from any scientific, literary, or artistic production of which a person is the author to be taken away from being a person's right would mean returning mankind to the days of dictatorships, oligarchies, or absolute kingdoms built along hereditary dictatorships connected to religious lines, as the case is in Saudi Arabia, Jordan, and other places.

Could the fall of the United States or the Republicanism ideology be coming not from a shortage in military, political, or economic power by this country but rather from continuing to let this unifying ideology that the American people profess to their citizens as a guiding principle

to control and regulate the maintenance of security of their own national sovereignty be the ideology that preaches that the human condition is a split between good and evil? In other words, this guiding ideology asserts that the human heart is inherently evil, which would lead to the collapse of republicanism.

The collapse of the Republicanism ideology will occur faster than expected by the people and countries who won the Second World War, because the culture that the United States sought to establish has led all members of the human family to advocate for liberty and unalienable individual rights as central values. This phenomenon is because all members of the human family support subscribing to such republican principles due to how much it offers hope to humanity except for the people for whom the republicanism ideology was created to annul. These actions reflect a rejection of civic duty and virtue in favor of corruption, fancy luxuries, and aristocracy.

According to historians and scholars, the only people who, throughout history, didn't emphasize civic duty, virtue, and favoring corruption, fancy luxuries, and aristocracy are the religious communities. The religious communities, even part of various regional empires throughout history, always practiced a lifestyle antagonistic to republicanism.

However, the only difference between those who practice republicanism and those who do not (the religious communities) is that both groups are unsure whether the human condition represents a struggle between good and evil or if the inclination of the human heart is inherently evil. Therefore, this ideology is the principal criterion that led to the rise or fall of an empire or a superpower.

There is only one method to stop this wave of civic duties, which the United States "in good intention" did awaken or set in motion to make every member seek to realize the full development of his personality. Thus, the United States can prevent its real collapse by avoiding entanglement in its role as the world's police. I believe the United States can avoid this imminent fate only if it, as a superpower, starts to promote the idea that the human heart is not inherently wicked from childhood, contrary to what religious doctrines suggest to explain

social inequality. At the same time, stop with promoting that all men are created equal. As long as man believes the human heart is evil, peace and security will remain unattainable, as one person's security comes at the cost of another's. I said in one of my other works that progress makes the individual unable to triumph over his will or senses because knowledge is the rabbit or the lure that in greyhound racing travels ahead of the dogs until the greyhounds cross the finish line. Therefore, I will attempt next to show how making the only real and eternal things comprise the idea that human life is a struggle between good and evil could make an ideology collapse. Then, I will attempt to show whether this credo, which postulates that the inclination of the human heart is wicked from childhood, could be a manmade ideology used by people to influence others to take actions they would not otherwise take. With the advent of technology, this perception could be a threat to world peace.

Since the time when people defined the human purpose as sustaining eternal good, cultures have continuously emerged and disappeared without any lasting impact. Therefore, either doing good causes insecurity because humans are not programmed to operate on the ethical principles they think are vital to the improvement of the human condition, or the ideology that people spread about the inclination of the human heart to be evil is true. The afore-mentioned insinuation suggests obstacles to achieving a world where people live free from fear and want. Even if it were to be true, the aforementioned insinuation is about what could be preventing people from the creation of conditions of stability and well-being. By the middle of the last 19th century, humans began to depend on advancements in science and technology to stop deriving rightness or wrongness solely from the character of one's conduct. Earlier, we stated that once people complete the ongoing unionization mission, they begin to trust each other, and when all members of the human family unite to achieve this goal, they stop believing that they are unequal. The character of behavior would cease to pose a significant threat to moral ethics because technology can compel people to act righteously, regardless of their personal preferences.

However, it has been almost a half-century since the date when people began to let science and technology assist in helping human reason to derive more rightness from the character of one's conduct, and until now, there is no real sign to usher in or buttress that people are on their way to start to emphasize the importance of the human mind over the human body.

This situation could either be due to the coming together of people to promote world peace and general welfare or something that the members of the human family shouldn't have done. In other words, humanity's approach is unsuitable because it lacks reciprocity in deriving greater rightness from one's conduct, even with the assistance of science and technology. By that I mean this guiding philosophy, which, as of 1945, people became unionized and began to pursue to emphasize civic duty, virtue, and opposition to corruption, fancy luxuries, and aristocracy so every member of the human family could strive to pursue the full development of their personality. The imposition of science and technology aims to improve the human condition through advancements. Its impact could be retarding humanity rather than helping in improving how people derive more rightness from the character of their conduct. In this regard, people would have been better off continuing to subject one another to subjugation, domination, and exploitation, a prerequisite for the need for the creation of conditions of stability and well-being. No form of educational preparedness would help transition people to their eminent goal of establishing friendlier relations, regardless of the political, social, or economic guiding philosophies that people devise, pursue, or prepare each other to pursue. Likewise, whether people pursue the idea of progress or choose to abandon the mission of civilizing others, some believe that when individuals replace their current values, traditions, and emotions with thoughts and actions that seem more rational, the outcome remains the same. The guiding philosophy suggests that the human heart's inclination to be evil could be true. Therefore, regardless of the ideology people adopt to make this civilizing mission succeed, the history of the world will continue to consist of wars, conquests, and conflicts, all masked by efforts to create the appearance of cooperation in promoting peace and stability.

Earlier, we stated that this guiding philosophy, which all members of the human family began to practice in 1945 and is most closely aligned with republicanism, represents the only hope for humanity if people wish to avoid returning to a state of domination or allowing their political systems to operate under religious or oligarchic influences. Even if some see the human heart as evil, people can prioritize the mind over the body. If this weren't the case, people wouldn't know how to distinguish between what is right and what is wrong in their

dealings with their loved ones and could exhibit significant degrees of patience, regardless of the nature of the evil acts their loved ones commit or evoke. This differentiation in their dealings, when it comes to family members as compared to strangers, could also be due to human reason helping people to recognize the importance of being friendly to siblings because of the requirements that convert the human body from being precocial to being altricial once again as a person ages.

Therefore, especially when interacting with strangers or unfamiliar subjects, most people are less prepared to support the same degree of tolerance. People struggle to demonstrate a clear understanding of good and evil when agreeing on frameworks for managing power and resources. This phenomenon occurs because, when people pursue interaction with strangers on matters unrelated to power and resource management, they exhibit a different ability to create peaceful relations. For example, when it comes to pursuing scientific work, engaging in sports, or exploring existential questions, such as why we are here? Where did we come from? Why do we perish? And so forth, strangely, almost everyone is willing to be tolerant and to work together, including agreeing to have a team member be assigned the responsibility of being in charge of how power and resources are managed and distributed.

In fact, even if some people perceive the inclination of the human heart to be evil, it appears that individuals in this state are aware that wickedness can lead to more evil, and they are able to differentiate between those they should treat as friends and those they should consider threats. This observation suggests that people could not be programmed with evil. This conclusion suggests that if individuals were programmed with evil, they would have avoided unionizing, allowed colonialism to continue, and refrained from discussing how to build political, economic, social, and educational preparedness for people. This conclusion suggests that if individuals were programmed with evil and taught to be more economically and socially prepared, then those who advocated for the right to self-determination after the Second World War were either irrational or aware that science and technology could override one's behavior in favor of ethical conduct.

People may act tolerant toward specific people because they know they cannot prevent aging or the voluntary transfer of their material possessions to designated people, equivalent to what they previously accumulated to meet their needs as they age. The same can be said about people's perception that by ensuring that everyone has the right to the protection of the moral and material interests resulting from any scientific, literary, or artistic production of which one is the author or a group is, it gives them the right, and not others, to decide how power and the earth's resources can be managed or distributed.

People's unwillingness to discover common ground means that those who believe not all members of the human family live in equal societies continue to support the efforts and frameworks ratified after the Second World War to ensure an equitable share of power and resources for all. This poverty is due to other factors; those affected, since 1945, have been unable to adapt because their values, traditions, and emotions are being replaced by more rational thoughts and actions, which are still causing permanent instability. The decision to make people of all religions, sexes, and colors come together to be unified under a global council to develop a central system of power to create conditions of stability and well-being is in the best interests of everyone.

Indeed, it could very well be because the people who are now living and resisting what their leaders committed on their behalf at the United Nations and before they were born "would be in principle ready" to promote the development of friendly relations and to agree to work with the people of other nations to promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom, a decision that their leaders shouldn't have taken on their behalf.

However, since those people are undermining the efforts or frameworks that were ratified in the aftermath of the Second World War, thus delaying the ongoing efforts to create conditions of stability and well-being, their passage through life is temporary, like anyone else's. Even if their leaders made commitments on their behalf before they were born, they are ready to subscribe in absentia to people's decision to unify under a global council to develop a central system of power to create conditions of stability and well-being. This conclusion

suggests that today's leaders, or those in power in 1945, have taken over from individuals who lived in non-union conditions. This perception led them to believe that being unionized under a global council could potentially foster the full development of a unified central system of power, which in turn might create conditions of stability and well-being.

The perception that many people are ready to support, as of the start of the 21st century, perhaps the coming together of people and nations to practice conditions of stability and well-being under a central system of power, may have plunged humanity into deeper insecurity. This shift is because it is replacing people's current values, traditions, and emotions with thoughts and actions that appear to be more rational. But those who are switching don't feel they live in equal societies. People perceive that even if everyone starts speaking one language and all nations with weaker economies are absorbed by the economies of larger nations, social cohesion is not developing as quickly as those who encouraged the shift in values, traditions, and emotions toward modernization had anticipated. The financialization of the world is also making things look as if nations and people are variables entangled in using the elimination method to see who cut the other short to establish control and power.

Since 1945, people have been behaving indifferently, undermining this important milestone in world history that aimed to unite all people under a global council for the full development of a unified central system of power. People fail to sustain good because the laws reflect their interests; they expect to act accordingly from one generation to the next, but they lack the will. In other words, such behavior reflects the weak will that people show when they resist endorsing the established frameworks for acquiring, managing, and distributing power and resources. This reaction may arise from people's reluctance to embrace what would maximize their fortune or from a breakdown in the frameworks they use to govern each other.

To be more specific, people cannot stop their imaginations from pushing such evil inclinations to rouse in their hearts and minds, making them less conscious of or able to detect the presence of evil around them. People's impairment to uphold actions that enable them

to triumph over their powerlessness to distinguish between good and evil and the difference between them is to stop injudicious conduct from continuing to negatively impact the framework people develop to allow all members of the human family to feel free and equal in dignity and rights, which is a prerequisite for good governance to flourish. The awareness of how evil negatively impacts people's survival in this life and potentially in an afterlife, if it exists, arises from religious values that assert this situation is true.

However, people can only alter physical objects in specific ways. Additionally, people use man-made frameworks or laws to determine how they want to interact with the objects they spend their lives working with or altering. Since all the things people can change are outside the human body. People have chosen to structure their interactions with one another to make such actions serve good or evil purposes. This idea could be either due to humans being truly programmed with dual moral virtues or because humans chose to structure their interactions with one another in this dual manner, given that whenever things break away from sameness, people think the transformation serves either good or evil.

For example, anytime a person takes the life of another person, people want this action to connote an evil act, when in reality, all that happens whenever a person takes the life of another person is that the deceased person stops changing matter. In other words, the person whose life was cut short did not have his human body created from new materials added to this world; instead, it was formed through a morphological production process that relied on materials that already existed on Earth.

Therefore, when a person succumbs to unnatural causes, they lose the ability to change matter or speak. Evil exists only because people reproduce. If people were to regulate reproduction to minimize people interaction and demand for resources, evil should automatically diminish.

However, the cause of evil is reproduction, and even if we were to regulate it, we would not know whether people's inability to develop a conscious understanding of good and evil stems from humans being programmed this way or from a desire to view the purpose of human

life through simplistic, two-dimensional perspectives such as up/down, left/right, cold/hot, and good/evil.

Therefore, until scientists manage to genetically change or modify our anatomical makeup, we cannot determine whether people's inability to distinguish between good and evil is due to a flaw in how God programmed this faculty or if it occurred by chance. We are required to base humans' relationships with one another on an ethical system that splits reality into good or evil to avoid plunging humanity into living in a state whereby people's actions become bound by their personal power and conscience.

However, since up until scientists managed to genetically change or modify our anatomical makeup, we have to live with accepting that the good and evil faculties were either programmed in people or people fabricated such a reality because our brains could only conceive things in this positive or negative way.

As we mentioned earlier, a new human being enters the world, and when that same person leaves this life—whether through natural causes or as a result of a wicked act—certain conditions apply. In one state, the person can change matter and speak; in the other, they can't. In other words, initially a person is nothing, and when the person dies, he returns to being nothing. Throughout a person's entire life, people have no power to limit, restrict, or adapt to the changes that the human body undergoes in its wholeness. People cannot make the same claim regarding the words they utter. People have the power during their lives to limit, restrict, or adapt the words they utter in relation to how the human body is changing its oneness.

Therefore, the words that people interchange are related to how they would like everyone to abide by or interact with objects. People are divided between those who think a deity programmed their words and those who don't.

However, since no one knows if the words people exchange were programmed or made up, they refer only to sounds that people agreed to interpret as a specific action or thing. Nonetheless, all words refer to how people decided through them to interpret the purpose of life.

We do know that in the Bible, God cautioned about how he desired people to live, and that was by avoiding distinguishing between good and evil so a person doesn't die (Genesis 2:17). Since the topics people discuss primarily focus on how to distinguish between good and evil, such discussions are contrary to God's desire for how people should spend their lives.

The challenge regarding people's inability to uphold the laws they wish to impose on one another may be more deeply rooted in the nature of those laws than in people's inherent ability to distinguish between good and evil, assuming that such abilities were either truly instilled in humans by a deity or occurred by chance. This is because even if good and evil were programmed in people by a deity, God commanded them not to live on the basis of putting those two faculties to use. If people were not programmed by a deity and decided on structuring the purpose of human life along such positive or negative perceptions. Humans, as previously mentioned, lack the power to limit, restrict, or adapt the purpose of their changing bodies. This situation suggests that people may struggle to make their bodies naturally conform to the laws they wish to impose on others or expect everyone to follow.

Moreover, we have no way of knowing if those laws are programmed by God or fabricated by humans. Then the problem is not with God but with the laws and how people are programmed to alter physical matter.

Hence, people picked a human purpose that deviates from how God proposed people live. Humans want that advancement in science, technology, economic development, and social organization to be vital to the improvement of the human condition. Then humans may discover themselves faced with a fait accompli, requiring them to stop dividing the human condition into good and evil to prevent the perception that these two faculties were either programmed by a deity or emerged by chance.

Religious values teach that God said every human's heart is evil. If people are teaching each other that evil is programmed into the hearts of humans and that God planned it this way, then they are perpetuating

a harmful belief. But as we said, people want to avoid living according to God's commands and altering matters to distinguish between good and evil. Since people have no power to limit, restrict, or adapt their bodies to a new purpose, the human body is changing its oneness. People may distrust each other because they try to impose practices and laws that the human body can't naturally follow. The laws people want each other to follow, along with the consequences of enforcing these laws, explain why people cannot strengthen their willpower to control greed and corruption.

Therefore, the diagnostic problem could be in the laws. The diagnosis may be in those laws, which may prevent people from achieving their desired life. This situation suggests that either the laws are unworkable principles for humans, or they are simply useless. The only reason people can't obey the laws is that they aren't programmed to.

In either case, it remains uncertain whether the ongoing pursuit of good will further illuminate the fundamental questions regarding our place in the universe. Likewise, we cannot know how to make people begin to trust each other to strengthen fellowship, surrender some of their freedoms, and submit involuntarily to the authority of the laws, because progress will continue to fuel people's desires.

Therefore, people desire this phenomenon only if they return to living equally according to God's way, not distinguishing between good and evil. We know that this phenomenon will not be possible because not everyone believes that life is based on objective principles.

Consequently, reconditioning people's thinking can help them see the human condition as more than a split between good and evil by disconnecting desire from the belief that human nature is programmed to be wicked, as some religious beliefs postulate and preach. Such a change could be required to prevent people from using this argument, justifying their conversion into soldiers through claims of inadequate material resources, to achieve social equality—an unattainable belief. This belief arises from the desire for humanity's interests in the heavens to be universal and the belief that scientific and artistic production ultimately benefits society. People must continuously strive to align the realization of their full personality development with the

level of progress they achieve. Both human desires to sustain good and human goals to realize the full development of their personalities are converted into two properties that run ahead of humanity.

However, if a culture change is put forward to change the human condition from one that projects that the inclination of the human heart is evil or that people are created equal, these are concepts that are no longer necessary because technology can, in real time, keep people's greed and corruption in check. This cultural change, when it is converted into becoming a civilizing mission, would shift the human condition from being a struggle between good and evil, which in principle is true only because we are living on a planet with insufficient resources for all people to live with equal rights, and people do not possess the same production aptitude. Then, since the exploration that people are making to address the fundamental questions about our place in the universe is to reach a state of goodness. When people reach to sustain good, there wouldn't be any evil. This exploration signifies that people should not split the human condition between good and evil until we all start to live free from any fear and want; rather, what humans are working on reaching is a condition in which there would be no room for evil.

Therefore, even if people continue to split reality between good and evil or strive to manifest only positive actions, humans still would not know what our place in the universe is. Whether people split reality into good and evil or strive to manifest only positive actions, we still wouldn't know the meaning of life. However, the only benefit that humanity could gain from eliminating evil in the context of defining the purpose of human life is the opportunity to address fundamental questions about our place in the universe, leading to a human condition that is free from the division between good and evil, with evil being nullified. Perhaps this philosophical change could stop people from linking it to the idea that people's hearts are evil, allowing those who fight for social justice to fulfill their potential, since the hearts and minds of people are unrelated. The problem is resources and aptitudes. If people's hearts were inherently wicked, they would not have professed during the American Revolution that all men are equal or agreed to pursue a political ideology that emphasizes civic duty, virtue, and opposition to corruption, luxury, and aristocracy. Most

importantly, the victors of the Second World War would have chosen to allow continued colonization. That is also to say, since there is no other guiding political system that people could practice than the republican ideology, maybe when people unlearn from the minds of people that the human condition is a split between good and evil, posterity could continue with the unionization exercise that started at the end of the Second World War to ultimately reach a point where peace and security improve.

This work does not aim to demonstrate how to eliminate the belief that the human heart is inherently wicked. Herein, our focus will be to show how this ideology could be manmade.

Additionally, despite companies' claims to the contrary, technological and medical discoveries are reshaping the world but making it difficult for people to easily benefit from this progress. Those companies employ an approach to keep distribution inaccessible to people that mirrors the practices of the colonization era. In the previous chapter, we noted that the current generation experiences everything that the previous generation did, with the exception of the additional technological advancements. This technological progress is intended to enrich people's lives, and we are fortunate that it exists, allowing us to benefit from opportunities that previous generations could not.

The methods that companies use to keep things inaccessible to people today are different from the practices used during the colonization era. However, neither the period of colonization nor the current efforts to promote social progress and better living standards are effectively facilitating the necessary interactions among people and objects to foster fraternity, peace, and security. Under either imposed governance system, people are not prepared to make a change that would allow them to condition their exchanges with one another in ways that foster attitudes conducive to prosperity during periods of peace. To the contrary, if we compare the days when people were colonized and now when they are working together from under a central governance system as they are doing to regulate and expand people's access to freedom, people's sense of feeling rivaled, deprived, violated, and so forth seems to increase rather than to reduce. Since no person can claim that what he accomplishes or amasses in material things during

his life is something he brings along with him at birth, this attitude of feeling deprived and unhappy is abnormal.

When a disagreement between people occurs, the choices are clear: concession or resistance to face consequent punishment, justice, and retribution. Even with consequent punishment, justice, and retribution, the human imagination struggles to contend with the consequence of rejecting good in favor of evil. This situation signifies that the human imagination is rejecting the existing laws that form the basis for the rewards and punishments of which people must be aware, as humans are known to be a living species that refrains from hunting and slaughtering others for food. The laws that underpin consequent punishment, justice, and retribution are designed to appeal to the human imagination in order to gain their support. Those laws restrict the human imagination and condition it to develop conscious knowledge before interacting with physical objects to distinguish right from wrong. This is because one person's perception of wrong may be another's perception of right, and vice versa. God is a good means to standardize across all the human imaginations' common laws.

In this work, the laws that we interpret as the purpose of reproduction through their intention are rules that we consider whose objective is to ensure the preservation of the human physical body with all its respective internal instruments, from ingenuity to imagination, behavior, etc., and not the preservation of the progress that people realize and the physical world in which people exist or depend on, because there would be no reason for protecting the universe if it weren't for the existence of people. This statement signifies that we have two objects that require preservation. The two objects that require preservation are people and the physical objects that exist outside of their sensory systems. Let the frameworks that people enact to halt disputes be a "right" action, as physical harm destabilizes human security. Contrarily, let the frameworks that concern the preservation of the physical objects that exist on the outside of people's sensory systems and the objects people shape be people's "choice." First, the natural system regenerates on its own; however, it is people's exploitation and their choice to convert the elements necessary for survival into commodities, along with their unwillingness to apply strict birth control, that contribute to the artificial shortage and the

prevailing sense of exhaustion. As far as the shapes that people produce from physical objects, for as long as people and physical objects are preserved and people have not managed to defy death, people can reproduce the shapes that people craft, because altering physical objects is what people spend their lives doing.

The negative conduct that has accompanied mankind since the dawn of time appears to be related to many people feeling helpless to agree on how the resources of the natural system and the objects people shape are managed and distributed, including how people govern one another.

The presence of evil and good in the makeup of people that humans claim on its principle people are assembled cannot be behind what prevents humans from agreeing on how the physical objects that exist around their physical bodies are vetted, because when people's senses are not engaged, humans become neutral like any other physical objects around. This signifies that people possess power when they prevent their senses from interacting with physical objects to convert the influence those two moral characteristics, good and evil, may have on human imagination to have no effect and/or become a constant in the human body. Actually, to give a real-life experience, the presence of evil and good in the makeup of people cannot be behind what prevents humans from agreeing on how the physical objects that exist around their bodies are vetted; it is people's ongoing practice to transfer the material things they accumulate to their heirs or specific people of their choice. People do not dispute or disagree when whatever they amass in material things is managed or distributed by specific people. It is when the case involves managing and distributing physical objects in which strangers are involved that a problem builds.

Human imagination cannot be in two places at the same time to do work. What people do not agree on is how the resources of the natural system and the objects people shape are managed and distributed, including how people govern each other. The moral scruples of human imagination regarding the potential for good or evil in the world are limitless. What if the merger of human ingenuity and the human body was intended to serve a function different from the primary purpose for which people currently use these two instruments, as influenced by

human imagination? Good and evil were put in human ingenuity to serve? What if the embedment of good and evil in human ingenuity was a trick devised by human imagination to address its limitation of needing to be in two places at the same time to do work? All disputes between people over physical objects aim to determine who has more right to alter them. What if the body of knowledge that people use to distinguish between good and evil was intended solely to help them differentiate between safety and danger, rather than to guide their choices in interacting with physical objects? Human imagination influences the roles of good and evil in individuals, encouraging them to respect their wishes and minimizing related challenges.

The reason why people disagree on how physical objects are managed and distributed is not necessarily due to their inability to exercise enough power over their human ingenuity to stop the human body from interacting with physical objects according to the polarity of the signal that human ingenuity transmits, i.e., good or evil. The human body's incapacity to obey human ingenuity could perhaps be due to certain controls imposed by human imagination, which human ingenuity seems unable to fully master, causing the body to exhibit actions that make human ingenuity appear impaired. The diagnosis lies within the human body itself, as it is the human body that interacts with physical objects, not human ingenuity or imagination. Human ingenuity, which governs good and evil, becomes irrelevant during actual interactions with physical objects.

In this respect, certain controls imposed by human ingenuity on the human body to regulate its operation could be beyond people's capacity to uphold, ultimately hindering agreement on the management and distribution of physical objects. Thus, whenever a person disobeys the prevailing controls, it is the job of human behavior at all times to keep the human body functioning within such benchmarks; the insubordination of the human physical body happens unknowingly rather than knowingly. This is because, as we said, the human body cannot exist without always altering matter. Therefore, regardless of how tightly human ingenuity (or behavior) tries to keep the body operating to prevent it from evoking actions that those controls impose, those controls in question cannot restrain the human

body because, as we said, the human body was not intended to base its own natural interaction with physical objects on their principle.

We are concerned with identifying the nature of these controls, which we know could either be internal charges that develop over time or external add-ons. We wouldn't know how to search for what those controls could consist of if they happen to naturally grow internally. We can examine any types of controls in the form of add-ons that were imposed on human ingenuity to restrain this instrument, even if they contradict the way the human body functions.

The only add-on that is passed down from one generation to the next is the knowledge of how to triumph over evil consciousness, which enables new individuals among the living to ensure equitable sharing of power, as well as the acquisition, management, and distribution of resources shaped by those individuals.

Likewise, since people began to recognize their existence, one truth that remains unknown is whether God created both humans and physical objects. People establish their relations and ensure an equitable share of power, as well as how resources are acquired, managed, and distributed, all through add-ons that they claim God passed on to them. People also produce guidance that is man-made and originates from here on earth.

We lack information on when people began to believe that humans evolved on Earth rather than being created by a deity, as some religious beliefs suggest; those earlier people proposed adding triumphs during their early days over any challenge that prevented them from ensuring an equitable share of power and control over how resources and the shape that people crafted from such resources were acquired, managed, and distributed. However, due to the strong link that God, or let us say religion, has had in promoting, as depicted in religious textbooks, the hearts and minds of people are roused to evil inclinations, which stop people from comporting in inhumane ways and favor attitudes that are far from fraternal. Let us focus on the idea that God, as an external and invisible force, may have influenced the insecurities that people experienced, which they could not explain. Most people are willing to accept that either the will of God or fate is

responsible for causing such misfortune. Actually, if we assume that humans originated from Earth, then human ingenuity becomes a faculty that serves human imagination and enables the development of conscious knowledge to distinguish between good and evil, with the laws enacted by human ingenuity serving as shields to protect against human greed.

The religious books that people use to organize their different faiths are all structured around teachings that emphasize reward and punishment, justice and retribution, and so on; therefore, these books are filled with "add-ons" from God and the individuals who appear in the stories they contain. It is unclear how to identify a specific add-on from God, since human ingenuity cannot determine whether the merger of human ingenuity and the human body was intended to fulfill the purposes for which people use good and evil. However, we may be able to identify the characteristics of such an add-on by considering the following points.

Animals and other living things also inhabit the earth. Animals and all other living species have good and evil intentions in their morphology to distinguish between danger and safety when attacked by predators. In the case of people, the intentions of good and evil serve to distinguish between danger and safety, as well as to indicate the presence of moral characteristics in human behavior.

Imagination is a feature in individuals that has no moral borders. The progress that individuals have achieved is driven by imagination, which serves as the foundation for their plans. Human ingenuity and the human body are faculties and tools that translate what the imagination conceives into becoming what we see around us.

If people remained primitive and didn't harness the power of good and evil to address moral dilemmas, they would continue to live and act like animals. The purpose of good and evil in human ingenuity is to serve as a recognition system that helps people understand how to avoid danger when their bodies interact with physical objects, similar to other living species. Good and evil intentions in human ingenuity would not condition people's bodies and senses in interactions with physical objects. Under this scenario, people would not be disputing

over any physical objects that the human body helped shape via human ingenuity, and the dispute between people would be over social space only.

It is unknown if animals organize and form governments like humans to secure social space for their colonies, or if they wage wars like humans across unrelated species when the disputed matters do not align with the values, beliefs, or attitudes of their leaders or their deities. Animals prey on each other, target and slaughter enemies, and eat them, either wandering or from a fixed geographical point.

People do not prey on each other for food; however, they do engage in behaviors similar to those of most animals, including conducting full-scale mass attacks against one another. Similarly, people also engage in conflicts with each other to control the social space from which they derive the resources needed to create tools that they later use to enhance their lives.

To preserve the rights of people to specific social space, humans enacted laws to govern, through such a system, the behavior of people. Humans learned about the concepts of good and evil from biblical stories found in religious textbooks, which are based on the negative behaviors exhibited by certain individuals. Until now, despite the long history of people using biblical attachments—claimed to be divinely passed on to help human ingenuity control and condition imagination to develop conscious knowledge of good and evil—and despite the consequent reward, punishment, justice, and retribution attached to it, the evil inclination in the hearts and minds of people remains.

When people began to multiply on the face of the earth and the need for more resources became apparent to produce the tools that people use to enrich their lives, could the ancient people have detected the same problem that we today are unable to agree on regarding how to manage and distribute social space, including how power should be shared? Those earlier people understood that no unknown forces were preventing them from choosing to express a fraternal attitude towards one another; therefore, the power of imagination was useful in affirming that it was God—who, as we know, is invisible—dictating

the guidance they began to use to encourage each other and to interact with physical objects based on those principles.

People require social space to mine the physical objects from which humans produce the tools that imagination conceives. As we said, it is the human body that interacts with physical objects and not human ingenuity. Could human imagination, rather than God, have devised the add-on that led humans to agree on interacting with physical objects because those rules helped them detect their existence? Whoever came up with such an add-on based his body of knowledge on the truth values that humans could use for good and evil to promote intentions that extend beyond just distinguishing between danger and safety to cover moral virtues as well.

What those people who came up with those add-ons may have had different from us now is that during their time, they didn't have as much machinery interacting with physical objects as people do today for them to recognize that a human being cannot be idle, not altering matter except when the human body perishes. If people were naturally not conceived to operate or exist under the conditions that technology imposes on humans to be passing their lives doing and that is only altering matter and/or toiling, then one suggestion to support why people may have not been able to ensure an equitable share of power and how resources are acquired, managed, and distributed since the dawn of time could be due to a discordance between what the shapes humans produce dictate people live and the opposite of how the human body was intended to function, and with the add-on, people claim God passed onto them is caught in the middle.

In the Old Testament of the Bible, God didn't want people to distinguish between good and evil, as per what we learn in the story of the fall of men. Then, all of a sudden, this God, who was prudent about what people shouldn't do, takes a reverse position and begins to dictate moral add-ons related to how people should interact with social space and each other and even stresses consequent reward and punishment, justice, and retribution for anyone who disobeys his instructions.

Certainly, the way people have clung to the guidance they believe God provided makes it uncertain whether the truth about God will ever be

known or knowable in the future. God and his government will stay with people on their journey for a while. Let us examine what type of guidance from God might be influencing the discord between the way humans currently shape their lives and the intended function of the human body in order to determine if there is a conflict with what people claim God has communicated to them.

People have made significant progress in sidelining God and his government to ensure that neither interferes with how business is conducted on earth. People managed to promote a social order that is separate from religion, thereby freeing themselves from the religious rules and teachings imposed by such training. The story shared in the previous chapter about what Christ instructed this young man to do to attain eternal life serves as an example of the burden that people's consciences would have continued to bear if they had not liberated themselves from religious rules and teachings. However, when people began their movement to separate religion from their decision to detect their existence and become neutral, they freed themselves from religious beliefs, not from how to interact with objects. The laws that God imposed regarding interactions with objects and people continued to influence their beliefs and usage.

Today, we have a situation where people have successfully separated their beliefs from how they interact with objects, allowing them to avoid splitting or sharing objects based on God's instructions. However, people today remain in full agreement with God regarding the spiritual laws that govern how to interact with objects.

People need a means to influence the behavior of people. People created government to serve as an enabler to make social action possible. Governments are bodies in the social structure that oversee how a society could be organized and the most appropriate way to achieve this goal. The role of the government, among many other tasks, is to enforce laws. Laws can be defined as consisting of a set of rules or moral imperatives that govern social behavior.

People resolve their moral problems using a reasoning method that establishes theoretical rules to extend what rights and freedoms a person has within a social structure. The moral problems that people

establish jurisprudence around to resolve on their basis of dispute relate to how people interact with objects and with each other. People create their system of rules based on moral imperatives that they borrow from religion.

People are all the time organized around different political systems. We could say that since the time people began experimenting with various types of political organizations—ranging from tyranny to present-day democracy, including monarchy and others—the theoretical rules that define a person's rights and freedoms when interacting with objects have their origins in religion. We could also say that from our ancestors until now, we have two elements rooted in what constitutes how any society works. The two elements are people and objects, both of which are constantly changing. The moral imperatives and God are fixed elements. However, because God is invisible, people replaced God with an enabler, which people gave a role to influence the behavior of people so all people stick to moral imperatives when interacting with objects and each other, and this body of people calls "government."

People occupy the role of monitors to ensure that the government they establish produces outcomes aligned with the ideals of how individuals should interact with objects and one another. People establish governments to uphold the ideals they believe are essential for ensuring the best possible interactions with objects and one another.

People are collectively ready to come together to promote moral imperatives. This is because it is moral imperatives that allow people to detect their existence. Moral imperatives are what hold people together, and they are the ideas that represent shared group ideals.

As we said, God has remained invisible until now; people are mortal, and objects are constantly changing. Moral imperatives, on the other hand, change only if God becomes known, since God may be unknown or unknowable. The moral imperatives that people claim were dictated by God are built on this foundation, so their basic ideals and truth value are unknown, making it impossible to establish their truth or falsehood. However, like God, moral imperatives will remain

permanent ideas that determine how people interact with each other and objects, preventing individuals from becoming predators.

This concept signifies that any individual or group of people who become involved in any way with God, or who serve as pupils in the moral stories that God is passing down, transition from being passersby in the history of the world to permanent figures.

People do not claim to be descendants of God or of a moral imperative; rather, they identify with those who interpret religious texts, and to this day, the ideals that such individuals promote reflect shared group beliefs. When such a situation is absent, people unite behind manmade ideals, which in every way align with the moral ideals that God passed on.

People created races, religions, governments, and monarchies to establish their identities and make it more challenging for others to absorb, assimilate, or conquer them in a way that erases their accomplishments. Governments serve as enablers that provide significance and influence people's behavior to defend the ideas and interests they protect. Until now people have experimented with new types of political organizations, and the invasion and destruction of culture will go on no matter how much control people put up with. No empire has survived, and despite the numerous checks and balances people implement to maintain their empire, nature has proven to be far more powerful than it ever was. The various political organizations and ideologies that people promote cannot be the cause of weakening people's tolerance.

There are groups of people whose ancestors they claim were with whom God established the different moral covenants, and until now this status has not spared them from persecution.

In reality, the lack of tolerance is primarily due to the hundreds of political and economic ideologies that people have experimented with over time. Additionally, none of the political and cultural blueprints that have been tested so far have provided a clear assurance regarding the nature of power and its intended purposes. The actual conduct of people reflects how they are managing their poor relationships with

one another. The causes behind what could be making people exhibit an intolerable attitude, the assimilation and absorption of the moral values that the displacing people try to erase in their culture to insert their own forms of ideals, could be behind what is making people feel deprived and unhappy enough to favor entering into disputes and even wage wars. This recent abnormal conduct, which has become more common recently, involves people martyring themselves to defend the ideas or beliefs they feel others have violated, and even this prevailing attitude, which we also see many in movies, cannot explain why people feel deprived and violated. If heard, any of those people who martyr themselves to defend their ideas would abort their plans.

If people stopped creating an illusion to convince themselves that injustice exists in the world, they would have to take responsibility for their lack of success. Over the years, the existence of so many people in this condition has converted this illusion into a strong movement that does nothing from one generation to the next but devotes itself to challenging peace and security in the world. What could be triggering people to let their imagination drive them to commit evil acts? If it's not in people's nature, it must be in the moral imperatives they enforce to govern their behavior.

This evil conduct cannot be attributed to people's natural makeup, as there are individuals who have successfully concealed their existence in order to make others aware of it. The Old Testament states that God didn't want Adam and Eve to know good and evil, and it could very well be that the entire Bible is a myth. However, this generation has only managed to achieve advancements in technological breakthroughs, which is no more significant than what previous generations accomplished. This added knowledge has only helped people become better at distinguishing between good and evil. Likewise, it seems that as people become better at distinguishing between good and evil, they increasingly feel deprived and violated instead of content and pleased. It may be worthwhile to examine how the knowledge of good and evil can lead a person to feel impaired to the extent that they perceive injustices in the world, prompting them to devote themselves to addressing the social breakdown they believe exists with a fervor much stronger than that of the previous generation.

The first two people who lived, Adam and Eve, passed through one of two learning curves before they came to know that they could sustain their survival needs from water and food. Either God told them about it or they discovered it themselves. If Adam and Eve evolved on earth, they would have to learn the truth about themselves. We could also say that it was important for Adam and Eve to understand their need to eat, drink, and survive. Gaining this body of knowledge was equally important. This body of knowledge was the determining factor that would decide whether humanity would continue or become extinct.

We have no records of the early days when Adam and Eve converted water and food into a commodity, as people have done since. We have no records indicating whether computers, cell phones, and so forth existed when Adam and Eve were living. Those technological breakthroughs do exist now, and people, like water and food, converted them into commodities. However, while the World Wide Web and computers help people reorganize and contribute to higher productivity, these tools also pose significant dangers. This is because they can enable human imagination to conceive tricks that can either slow people's progress or even cause havoc with human security or world peace.

Until recently, hard books contained all of mankind's history, literature, and scientific production. Due to rising costs and increased awareness of environmental protection, people began to transcribe all their new scientific, literary, and artistic works into soft books stored electronically, and they are also converting mankind's history from traditional books into digitized formats so that it exists in soft electronic form as well. In other words, all those who are going along with favoring mankind's history, library buildings, production of physical books, and so forth are converted into being digitized and stored electronically. Those people, in so doing, are also consenting to placing mankind's history in the hands of certain people. Until now, access to the World Wide Web has been free, and only a few people know what exact body of knowledge is stored in such systems and what is censored. If, in the future, the individuals entrusted with humanity's history decide to switch off access to the World Wide Web for one day for reasons unrelated to malware, all the information that people could read now on how to fetch water or plant food would be

cut off. If such a scenario happens, people will work to recognize the inalienable rights of all humans to freedom, justice, peace, and knowledge.

Converting water and food, which are required for the right to life by any person, into commodities has brought devastation to mankind since time immemorial. Now, with the advent of artificial intelligence, if people's greed leads to the locking away of mankind's history and its conversion into a commodity, this situation will usher in a new era of slavery unlike anything the world has ever known.

Earlier we said that human imagination has power over good and evil in the human body or human ingenuity. If human imagination were not always insatiable, and if it allowed human ingenuity to do its job, the world might be a better place now. Today, progress can enable human imagination to conceive highly dangerous tricks that hinder the full development of people's capacity to recognize their existence.

Without access to knowledge, people cannot access the primordial elements that sustain their survival needs or earthly desires, regardless of their actions during their lifetime. Humans cannot increase their knowledge to sustain their survival needs or earthly desires without expanding their social space and improving the abundance and quality of natural resources. In the past, those who oppressed others prevented the oppressed from accessing any form of knowledge. If the people who are digitizing the world's history begin to prioritize financial interests over social benefits and lobby for laws that guarantee everyone the right to protect their moral and material interests in publicly available resources, including those that are currently free, it could have significant consequences. Such a move could deprive people of their rights to their culture and progress, and it could signal the beginning of the erasure of human history.

For example, we all know that people use nuclear technology both to commit atrocities and to treat illnesses. Until recently, people could read about this field in books printed on hard copies. If those who digitized and stored mankind's history electronically decide to hide how to develop nuclear technology to prevent it from falling into the hands of violent people, this body of knowledge on how to develop

nuclear technology will remain in the hands of a select few. Others can't develop or compete with those who withheld this info, nor can they treat their medical conditions. This situation also means that the imagination of certain groups influences their decisions about what information from human civilization should be made available for public access and what should be withheld. In the future, instead of accessing the World Wide Web to obtain information about the materials used to fabricate a pump for fetching water in remote areas, people will only be able to view images of pumps because the knowledge of how to create one has been locked away. The individuals who restrict access to any body of knowledge will now have the power to control the information that others read and learn about. Those people could even leave certain people without any history or body of knowledge if they want. The approach that certain manufacturers have begun to implement, which renders their devices useless and disabled if third-party repairs are detected, poses a much more serious threat to human security than merely hiding the knowledge required for such repairs.

People need to send a strong message opposing the privatization and restriction of access to any scientific, literary, or artistic production to prevent a future where history is locked away and only a select few are aware of mankind's past or the new work being developed. This attitude could make the UN obsolete and unnecessary. The purpose of uniting people of different languages, religions, political opinions, statuses, races, colors, and sexes was to create a single global community. If certain individuals allow higher productivity and financial gains to dictate their decision-making processes, humanity will enter a new era of domination that will eventually collapse in the same manner as previous empires, because nature will eventually recover from the privatization of its resources.

In this example we shared, we showed how people, not God, could lock away mankind's body of knowledge, preventing mankind from distinguishing between good and evil. We showed that it was people, not God, who decided how to lock away mankind's body of knowledge, what to lock away, and what to keep. If mankind's history gets locked away in the future, this would be because people, and not God, agreed that the body of knowledge from which people were

drawing their own teachings on how to detect their existence got switched from serving all the people instead of a select number of people. People, not God, suggested that individuals should stop storing the body of knowledge necessary for sustaining their survival needs and earthly desires in hard copies and use instead electronic copies. People, not God, gave those in charge of the World Wide Web the power to control how their history is shared and under what conditions.

What people are unable to agree on is how power and the earth's resources are managed, distributed, and shared. This hypothetical scenario illustrates how human imagination can drive certain individuals to desire the concealment of mankind's history, which ultimately jeopardizes efforts to ensure an equitable distribution of power and the management of resources necessary for people to live free from fear and want, as well as to lead fulfilling lives. This situation arises when people agree to restrict access to the body of knowledge required to sustain survival needs and earthly desires. Such action will prevent the human body and ingenuity of those excluded from accessing the knowledge needed to sustain their existence, and it will also conceal the information required for the full development of their human imagination. This situation indicates that as the population increases, the existing insecurity problems in the world will worsen. This situation is not related to a lack of resources; rather, it involves encouraging new individuals to operate according to the rewards and punishments, as well as the concepts of justice and retribution, that shape human imagination.

Moreover, this generation is overcoming the limitation of not being able to be in two places at once for work by relying on artificial intelligence, which could increase people's discontentment with the world at a faster pace. Artificial intelligence is making the world appear to be inhabited by more than the existing number. Artificial intelligence is not at all concerned with ensuring an equitable share of power and how resources are acquired, managed, and distributed. Consequently, concepts such as reward and punishment, justice, and retribution cannot be imposed on artificial intelligence, making it a more advantageous alternative to interacting with human beings. Artificial intelligence is, therefore, significantly more profitable than

humans in every aspect, including productivity. Actually, until artificial intelligence was discovered, people were relying only on their human ingenuity and human body and God's guidance to block others from interacting with the physical objects they amassed. Now, a person only needs to rely on artificial intelligence to prevent others from altering any object they desire and to monitor in real time if any intruder attempts to take away their belongings.

Moreover, if we consider the practice that people agree upon to transfer their accumulated assets to heirs or specific people, the framework of the law of inheritance permits it. The law's negative impact was undetectable before because the earth had hundreds of thousands or millions of people, as it has for the past two millennia. Now, as the human population has increased and technology has advanced, the law of inheritance significantly impacts the ability of individuals to secure an equitable share of power and influence how resources are acquired, managed, and distributed, creating an additional burden. In fact, the social injustice and inequality that exist in the world today raise serious questions about whether people reproduce morally to sustain human security or if they do so merely to transfer their accumulated knowledge and physical resources to another living being. This phenomenon is because artificial intelligence causes people to become idle, while the law of inheritance traps them in their own social space. This situation illustrates how two frameworks—one in which people believe that God dictated their behavior, leading to idleness, and the other developed by people—restrict individuals from acting in accordance with the natural way this species was conceived to operate or exist.

What if people, not God, inserted moral imperatives to influence how people organize themselves, and the consequences prevent people from distinguishing between good and evil? The moral imperatives that people use to influence behavior may be the most effective means to achieve their intended goals, but they contradict the way humans are naturally designed to function. This is because good and evil may have been intended to be embedded in people only to distinguish safety and danger, not good and evil.

Immediately after birth, all people are led to believe that the laws governing them are based on human structure, that these guidelines were dictated by God, and that what people have done is merely elaborate and expand upon how those guidelines can be transformed into a system of rules governing human behavior. All people are expected to believe that good and evil are born in the heart and mind of people, and the rules and regulations that people base their governance on are to subdue such natural moral instincts.

Previous generations failed to detect that such a moral imperative could be antonymic to human function because they never imagined people could control the capacity to distinguish between good and evil. There was no technology available to restrict mankind's body of knowledge, so people believed that such a restriction could be possible based on our current understanding. In other words, early people sought to isolate the flaw concealed in human nature that impairs the ability to distinguish between good and evil, never considering that such impairment could be artificially induced, because artificial intelligence, the World Wide Web, computers, and so forth were not invented during their time.

People are conditioned to believe that the low levels of peace and security in certain parts of the world are due to a general unwillingness to be aware of the resulting rewards and punishments, as well as concepts of justice and retribution. People prefer to ignore the fact that the rewards and punishments, justice and retribution they practice are based on what people merely believe is right or wrong, rather than on people first demonstrating what is right and wrong. This situation means that people don't know whether the laws they practice, which are supposed to reward and punish, are just or unjust. There is no justice in following unjust laws that convert what people require to sustain their survival needs, water and food, into a commodity or lock away mankind's knowledge from what people need to sustain their survival needs better, because it could very well be that such laws act contrary to the way people were created to function or exist.

People may not have clear intentions of good and evil because they are driven by moral imperatives that hinder mankind's ability to live free from fear and want. The role of good and evil exists solely to enable

people to distinguish between the two, allowing humanity to multiply and replenish the earth as God intended. The evil as we understand it—people added such moral virtue to justify their actions so they appear to be inspired by the way God created humans rather than by their own will. Those laws will continue to benefit those who enacted them, allowing them to serve only their imaginations, which have been blinded by greed. Somehow, this moral imperative has to be attached to something that connects the human body to progress; hence, right after a person detects their existence and consequently realizes the finiteness of time, human imagination puts human ingenuity to use to amass material things, thus creating a bottleneck over the already scarce resources.

People become among the living in a sequence form. Those who lived first dictate the body of knowledge they desire to those who follow, including what to distinguish. Each living group, in turn, decides whether to keep what the previous generation handed down or to discard what they consider irrelevant. Religion is one of the attachments that people have never discarded and still use to build on its teaching of faith and discipline.

People use religion to interpolate answers and opinions on the meaning of life based on principles that a supernatural power or God has ascribed. Religion aims to provide people with guidance on what they should change to live a dignified life. In addition, religion teaches people what actions to avoid and promotes discipline to help individuals manage their imaginations, thereby avoiding the stress of the reward and punishment, justice, and retribution that come after death.

People ratify rules to ensure an equitable share of power and to govern how resources are acquired, managed, and distributed. People use the rules or laws they enact to ensure that all members of the human family enjoy their inherent inalienable rights and freedoms without any limitations based on distinctions derived from religious guidelines.

Lawmakers derive or adjust the laws based on the changes that the physical world is continuously undergoing and the level of progress that is being registered in the world. However, the rules that people

ratify are always founded on a conscious societal knowledge developed around a distinction between good and evil, stressing consequent rewards and punishments, justice, and retribution. The system of rules that people enact to condition behavior is related to how resources are acquired, managed, and distributed in accordance with the progressive changes occurring in the physical world.

The Ten Commandments are laws that God offered to Moses, who is considered the most important prophet in Judaism. The laws were meant to guide Moses and his people in their interactions and included rules for dealing with objects.

Over time, people from other faiths used the laws that God offered to Moses to establish the politics and laws of the governments they were setting up. People used the laws that God offered to Moses as a foundation to establish fundamental laws or codes, which could serve as the basis for moral and social norms due to their universal applicability to the constitution or legislation of any human society or government. Most rewards, punishments, and concepts of justice and retribution rely on the Ten Commandments, which specify what is allowed and what is forbidden.

Let us erase from our minds the idea that space and time are absolute quantities referring to a fixed background of events. Likewise, it is important to clarify our intentions regarding the upcoming discussion to avoid any misunderstandings. We do not intend to criticize Moses' life, teachings, or prominence in religious literature, especially considering his holy status in the eyes of Jews, Christians, and Muslims. We have chosen the Ten Commandments to highlight how certain laws within those teachings, which were instructed by God and relied upon by people from other faiths to establish their own legal codes, may contradict the progressive changes that the physical world is continuously undergoing. The reference to Moses and the Ten Commandments points out the historical importance of the Ten Commandments in shaping the legal codes that most people use to organize governments, constitutions, legislation, and similar frameworks.

The code of laws that governs human behavior entitles every individual to the protection of their moral and material interests

resulting from any scientific, literary, or artistic work they have created. Likewise, it entitles any person to own property and to protect the shapes that they create from materials of terrestrial origin or that they amass from natural physical objects found after their birth. The law of inheritance, which is another law that God offered to people, enables humans to transfer over all that a person amasses in material things to specific individuals or heirs.

One of the Ten Commandments laws states that a person should not steal. People define stealing as the act of taking another person's property without permission or legal right and without intending to return it. A thief is a person who carries out a stealing act for a tangible or intangible object. Thieving is a statutory offense recognized worldwide that carries penalties, and a person who steals may face imprisonment or a fine. The person who reports an act of theft is rewarded.

All people are created from scratch, and throughout their lives, they alter matter (or material of terrestrial origin) and set in motion unshaped and shaped objects. No person can claim that he knew in advance that he was going to be one day born or alive.

All that people do during their lives is alter matter (or material of terrestrial origin) and set in motion unshaped and shaped objects. Matter is on earth before a person is born. People use the material of terrestrial origin they find on earth after they become among the living to shape the things they use to sustain their survival needs and satiate their earthly desires.

A person cannot produce a shape without material of terrestrial origin.

The laws that people enacted to prevent others from taking items without permission or legal right and without the intention of returning them apply to both tangible objects—which can be either man-made, shaped materials of terrestrial origin, or unshaped materials that have not been influenced by human activity—and intangible objects. Even when the theft refers to stealing an intangible object, the latter refers to something that is tangible. To steal an object, a person must bring both

the terrestrial material and the human-created idea, unless the shape was created by a natural system.

Earlier we said that when people are not resting, their physical body is normally in motion doing work, and the objects that people do work on are nothing but material of terrestrial origin, which people alter continuously.

People sustain their survival needs and earthly desires with material of terrestrial origin. For this reason, people are continuously altering material of terrestrial origin to enable, through the figurines they create, the sustenance of their survival needs and earthly desires. Here, another crucial aspect must be remembered. Even when the human physical body is not in motion, people's bodies continue to alter matter as they seek to sustain their survival needs and earthly desires. The human body stays operating at all times, altering matter as per the way it was designed to function. The human body keeps altering matter indefinitely or until a person perishes. The degree of matter alteration diminishes only when a person is resting.

People, to sustain their survival needs and earthly desires, need materials of terrestrial origin and the application of human ingenuity. Without access to knowledge, any individual or group would experience slow progress. We even said that without access to knowledge, it will not be possible for people to access the primordial elements that can sustain their survival needs or earthly desires. Likewise, if humans do not increase their social space and thereby upgrade the abundance and quality of natural matter, they will not be able to increase their knowledge to sustain either their survival needs or earthly desires.

All people possess human ingenuity and human imagination. If people fail to build the airplane, pumps, and so forth that they need, they lack access to a specific body of knowledge and specific materials of terrestrial origin. If a person's right to materials of terrestrial origin is controlled, or if the law prevents any person from taking physical objects belonging to others, then a person must obtain materials of terrestrial origin through self-determination to continue altering matter as people are designed to do. Herein, there is also another aspect that is

crucial to remember. When someone takes a physical object that belongs to someone else, and that act is defined as thieving, what they did was simply displace the object from one person's possession to another's. No person can take away any physical object and run away with it to another planet. All people are made of flesh plus a human spirit. Let "human spirit" refer to human imagination, human ingenuity, human behavior, etc. All the people's flesh is the same even if different morphological distinctions are visible. This means that it does not matter whether person A or person B claims ownership of the physical object in question; all objects that exist outside of the sensory systems remain external. A person cannot fuse physical objects into his body, including food. After the human body has finished using the food it consumes, it discards the food that was ingested.

The entity that objects when a person takes away a physical object that doesn't belong to him and people define this to be an act of thieving is the human spirit, which rejects this action. The human spirit is the entity that ratified the laws enacted by people to punish individuals who steal, ensuring they face subsequent consequences such as punishment, justice, and retribution. The intriguing part is that both the human spirit and God are invisible, resulting in two invisible properties dictating how physical objects and the human body interact; in one case, physical objects and the human body are entities that reference space and time in real time, while the human spirit and God remain perpetually invisible.

This principle signifies that people create rewards and punishments for consequential actions whenever someone displaces a physical object without permission, and all humans must be aware of the implications such actions entail. People obey these laws without any valid evidence to support the reliability and relevance of their practices. Therefore, because evidence does not support the idea that stopping a person from displacing a physical object without permission reliably and validly leads to conclusions about how this practice preserves human security, people have been practicing this rule that God passed, drawing incorrect conclusions, to preserve the material things they amass.

The conclusion we reached suggests that lawmakers and religious institutions could be conditioning people to obey a system of rules—

maybe it made sense when God established laws against taking without permission or legal right, with no intent to return, due to the specific contexts of ancient times. This conclusion means that the specific rule God offered to Moses, which governs how he and his people interact with physical objects and later influences people of all faiths in building their legal codes, restrains people from doing what they are naturally meant to do: altering matter, especially when they are restricted from taking without permission, legal right, or intent to return any tangible object. This conclusion also means that the code of laws that, on its basis, people punish a person who steals when no alternative option is offered to human imagination to engage the human body so it doesn't find itself obliged to override human ingenuity to steal whatever lawmakers impose on people who commit stealing acts' punishments, the justice that they are imposing may not be fair.

Conversely, our findings show that when human imagination is not given alternatives, it resorts to stealing to meet needs, and this behavior increases stealing when people cannot alter matter, as this action serves the positive purpose of preserving human security. This conclusion is that those who engage their human bodies to alter matter, even if it is not in a legal way, are making their bodies function according to the way they were naturally conceived to operate. Those who keep their human bodies idle and do not alter matter misuse their bodies, unless they are resting. Thus, the rule against stealing in the Ten Commandments threatens human security instead of benefiting it, as it has been adopted into the code of laws by people outside the Abrahamic religions and includes provisions for punishing theft. If we consider the current global context, where people believe that machinery is taking over jobs previously done by humans to boost productivity, this situation further complicates human security. What would people do when more machines steal jobs from them?

In the past, the objects produced by people did not contain a specific body of knowledge when they were stolen, whereas certain modern equipment now includes a body of knowledge that must be traded along with the device. It is unclear whether the approach that certain manufacturers have begun to apply, which renders their devices useless or disabled if third-party repairs are detected, is intended as a

security measure to protect customers from fraudulent transactions or as a precaution to prevent third parties from stealing the knowledge contained within the device. However, this situation shows that as progress continues to expand into newer frontiers, this action will ensure that the problem of preventing people from stealing will still regulate itself. The critical question then becomes whether restricting the human body from its intended functions and allowing machinery to control those functions has a positive or negative impact on human security.

In like manner, the relevance of what we are arguing is that it could very well be that in the same way we showed earlier that if those people who are presently digitizing mankind's history decide to exercise their power in a burdensome or cruel manner and lock away from all mankind the body of knowledge that they were entrusted with, making it available for people in a digital free form to serve their financial interests instead of human security. All that those people whose greed may blind them to commit such an act want to do is digitalize mankind's body of knowledge and lock it away by enacting laws, customs, or practices that control and regulate which body of knowledge could reach specific people more than others. In due time, those who decide to lock away mankind's body of knowledge can justify their mistreatment and exploitation by claiming they are acting on a mission from God, similar to what some world leaders do in modern times.

The specific law regarding the Ten Commandments, which were given by God to Moses, suggests that people should refrain from stealing; this law could be one that Moses claimed was offered to him, similar to how some individuals assert they are driven by a mission from God.

Moses needed these laws to prevent others from taking away the man-made shapes that earlier people had created from terrestrial materials, as those creators preferred to keep their shapes intact. Moses may have found himself obliged to pass on the laws that became known as the Ten Commandments and proposed them to the people as guidance offered by God to have them accepted faster.

As mentioned earlier, we intend not to criticize God, Moses, the source of the Ten Commandments, or the reasons why people follow rules that deem it an offense to take another person's property without permission or legal right and without the intention of returning it. Certainly, we are not advocating for people to base their relationships with physical objects on a social model that resembles the law of the jungle. We are studying how people apply laws that control and regulate access to both terrestrial materials used by humans to create objects and the new forms that these materials take after human intervention in relation to security. We drew from the law in the Ten Commandments that prohibits stealing to explore how restricting the human body's interaction with physical objects affects human security, both negatively and positively. This specific law from the Ten Commandments, on whose basis people have been conditioning human behavior to bind with, and until now they have failed, is very critical because it is a condition that places the human body in a completely opposite state from what we are saying a person should be at all times, which is to alter matter. This law is very critical because it is one that God offered to people, and on its basis, people enact laws to impose their self-determining right to enact a *modus operandi* that guarantees them the ability to freeze social space, up to deciding what to do with the social space they froze or the material things they amassed after they perish.

Accordingly, we intend to support the idea that, because God and human ingenuity are invisible, the Ten Commandments might be laws that have not yet shown evidence that practicing them reliably and validly preserves human security. Therefore, those laws could be man-made, intended to serve the conditions that maybe Moses or God offered them in their due time; they were intended to condition human behavior based on what those rules infringed due to the prevailing conditions of evolution back then.

However, when the earth is now inhabited by hundreds of millions or billions of people, plus artificial intelligence and the law of inheritance, we think the privatization of material of terrestrial origin also privatizes the right of any person to function as per the way the human body was designed to function. Until scientists and researchers prove the origin of all things, a new breed will emerge, constantly

altering matter and winning the battle to condition people's imaginations to suppress the desire to detect their existence, leading some to believe they can steal without consequence; all people have the right to access material of terrestrial origin on an equal rights basis. This is because no person can claim that whatever he possesses rightly belongs to him. The belief that individuals have the right to create laws, customs, and practices to protect their material production, simply because their human ingenuity was involved in fabricating a pump, reflects an inequity that can jeopardize human security. The danger of swapping human ingenuity in favor of increased productivity or power could slow humanity considerably. No matter how thick the walls become around a nuclear facility, men will never be able to control and regulate nature.

The establishment of a social model based on rules that allow certain individuals to evolve ahead of others can lead to the restriction of their rights to act according to the natural functions of humanity. This consistently alters matter even when the process does not seek to sustain survival needs and earthly desire; it could create social gridlock if another substitute is not offered to keep the human body engaged when more machinery further slows the interaction of people with objects.

The supposition that preoccupying people with the spreading of religious phobia will help certain nations to control human imagination—perhaps it is worthwhile mentioning that no matter how many cameras they install on streetlight poles, this strategy will not stop people from wanting to detect their existence.

Incarcerating people frees the world from those who reject the rules and regulations that underpin reward, punishment, justice, and retribution. Incarceration provides an opportunity for individuals to live under a unified system, particularly because it allows those whose greed has blinded them to prioritize their right to life over others. A person can choose between altering materials of terrestrial origin in custody or doing so as a free person. Certainly, converting people into becoming a profitable commodity in the same way artificial intelligence does because there are certain chores that artificial intelligence cannot do, but people can. If a law exists to house and pay

people for a fraction of the cost of what it would cost to produce any commodity outside, such a system is indeed a profitable and attractive business. In the developed world, where labor costs are high, privatizing detention centers makes incarceration a profitable business. However, the people in those nations definitely prioritize increasing productivity to boost profits rather than increasing detection of their existence; the progress made by people in the developed world only encouraged them to become peaceful. The developed nations house the largest number of incarcerated people in this modern world. Moreover, there appears to be a profound connection between people's progress and increased discontentment with the world. The more people progress, the more persistent the discontentment of people with the world appears to become.

It doesn't look like that any time soon; the fact that people cannot occupy two void social spaces at the same time means people are going to manage to halt others from accessing things they froze mainly due to the social system on which humans evoke relations, which gives the right to freeze whatever material of terrestrial origin a person amassed during his life. It also differs from the artificial aid that some people use in certain cases to monitor the empty social space or the physical objects they wish to keep, ensuring their benefits are not exploited by others; these are things people have frozen, and this aid will perform this task for them. To the contrary, the more people freeze social space to produce objects that enrich their lives, the less necessary it is to sustain their lives. Additionally, as the global population continues to grow, people increasingly adopt a social model that encourages the freezing of both social space and the physical materials they encounter throughout their lives. The choices will always include erecting more incarceration centers, slowing reproduction, or purging faster.

Given that people prefer that whatever material of terrestrial origin a person accumulates during his lifetime is instead handed to designated people rather than recycled back into society when that person is purged. Likewise, if the origin of all things has remained hidden from people until now, and if individuals are born in a sequential order, then those who lived first would have the right to impose rules on how to ensure an equitable share of power and how resources are acquired,

managed, and distributed, making the law of inheritance applicable. If it is true that people want to be united under one world, then the widespread discontent with the current state of affairs may indicate that it is time to seriously consider whether a social overhaul is necessary.

Moreover, the design of this new paradigm should eliminate any references to space and time as absolute quantities that pertain to a fixed background of events, both in its framework and in people's minds. This is because it doesn't make any sense to continue to plug people on earth for the purpose of building incarceration and rehabilitation centers when each person has one life to live. Each person must live free from fear and want during his lifetime and should be able to meet his survival needs and earthly desires while ensuring it doesn't infringe on what is required to preserve global human security. People should not have to resort to stealing or any illicit act to sustain their survival needs and satisfy their earthly desires. Every living person is entitled to freedom, especially since no one can predict when a person will be born. The project for those who live will require a lifetime of advocacy for its principles, which are based on ensuring global human security rather than on self-determination agendas or faith-based agendas that are conditioned to preserve life.

The new project we are proposing establishes a common standard of achievement for all peoples and nations, with the intention of all individuals beginning here on earth, immediately after birth. There are reports of unknown sources contacting specific individuals to inform them that they will conceive, including providing details about the roles their offspring will fulfill after birth. Even if those cases were to reappear, the intentions of the new individuals would align with those of the people currently living, focusing on what is necessary to preserve global human security. The right of any person to live free from fear and want is not a commodity, so people require upholding it through declarations. Fate has nothing to do with why some people have and some don't. People were conditioned to believe it is fortune that creates the haves and have-nots. God is not responsible for people's misfortune. On the contrary, those who consistently associate humanity with a specific order of existence implicate God in the

misfortunes of certain individuals, explaining why some are destined to live in poverty and fear, while also seeking to appease others and maintain their cultural systems of behavior and practice. The intention of those who relate humanity to an order of existence is to keep people pacified in the name of God, preventing them from rebelling or engaging in civil disobedience against those in power. Likewise, for those people who converted God into a commodity and made God a standing operation, as is the case today, there is no difference between them and those who lived during the time when the person who claimed to be his son argued that people had converted God's temple into a market. In other words, it serves solely as a means and a place for people to satisfy their earthly desires and achieve prosperity.

Likewise, the reason people collect evidence about the universe's origins and the workings of the world is to enable certain defaults beyond human control to prevail. Instead, it is to benefit those who make progress and let those involved profit. People understand that previous generations could not comprehend the origin of all things because this knowledge was deliberately concealed from them. Today, the more progress people register, the more the belief in conquering what earlier people failed in achieving intensifies.

People who are fixated on understanding the origin of all things represent nothing more than an obsession conceived by human imagination to deceive others into adopting a belief that they can overcome the dependency that the physical world imposes on them. The objective is to widen the gap between those who have and those who don't. The prevailing division in the world today between consumers and producers results from the gridlock created by the unequal distribution of wealth and progress. This gridlock represents a new form of slavery that differs from historical slavery only in its approach. In the past, people oppressed others to obtain access to free labor. Currently, oppression occurs by creating a knowledge gap between individuals, especially regarding manufacturers who render their devices useless and disabled if they detect third-party repairs.

A newborn doesn't understand how the social system works from birth until they begin to adjust to life outside the womb. From that point

onward, the newborn is taught about the circumstances surrounding his birth, including everything related to the intentions of others.

After birth, the person who carried the fetus will no longer make decisions about the newborn's intentions. Until a certain age in a person's life, the intentions of their parents will guide their development. Once an infant becomes a toddler, their intentions are shaped by the expectations and dictates of others regarding how they should serve. The environment in which the person lives plays a role as well.

All newborns are driven to believe that there are two principal motives that define the pivotal intentions of people. The two motives are to contribute to advancing people's understanding of the origin of all the things, and the other one is how conquering such a struggle can enrich a person's life right when the meaning of life is understood. Newborns are led to believe that the two intentions pursued by humans, which aim to help people recognize their existence, serve to advance understanding of the meaning of life and the ultimate destination of all living and non-living forms.

Certainly, people are not like fluids or objects whose molecules collide with one another (so the continuum assumptions hold); rather, they possess unique qualities that allow for the continuity of their experiences. People possess a unique faculty that no other living species boasts. People can reason, speak, and use complex tools. Each person possesses a separate boundary, which manifests a discrete human behavior. This freedom makes it so that each person is free to assign the intention that he sees fit to his own imagination regarding guiding belief, desire, or the meaning of life.

Practicality is a form of realism that deals with accepting the suitability of an action without blatant evidence. None of the living creatures that share the earth with humans possess any unique abilities that humans claim to have. People are the ones who determine the intentions of all other living creatures. Any newborn can choose to question the intentions of people throughout their lifetime, and people may have been created for a purpose different from what previous generations have communicated. Conversely, until a new state of

intention is established for people, newborns have no choice but to align their life intentions with the understanding of motives that prior people have communicated. That is, of course, unless this newborn wants to build a world in which he would be his only inhabitant. Some people communicate their understanding of a specific individual's intention, but this work does not address that unique intention.

Certain people question whether the intentions that people do consecrate their entire lives pursuing are preplanned intentions or if they have a choice. There are two schools of thought on this subject. One belief is that people create their own destiny with their thoughts, words, and actions, moment by moment, each day. The other school of thought is that people's destiny is already pre-planned; it was created before we were born.

People are not attached to the surface of the earth and do not fly away into the emptiness of outer space. People are made of matter, but human behavior, which is immaterial, is a separate aspect of their existence. The human physical body is what carries the human behavior along on its journey, and it is the human body that interacts with all the distinct physical forms of matter that survive on the outside of the human body or senses.

Based on any one of the three distinct physical forms in which matter can exist in most environments—solid, liquid, and gas—the human physical transition occurs during its journey until the body gets back to becoming what it used to be before a person was born: nonexistent or invisible. Some believe that destiny can only be pre-planned during the process of transitioning through or displacing gas, which was created before we were born. When the human physical body is in the two phases of liquid or solid (flesh), it is matter and/or nature that determines the intention of the human body and not the other way around.

Before birth a newborn depends on the intentions of the people who agreed to mate, whether by consent or force. This means everyone is pre-planned, and no one can claim they were born by chance or existed before birth. It is the expecting mother who now decides the fate of the

newborn. External forces also influence whether a mother can continue with a pregnancy.

Scientists claim that people's flesh or genetic makeup is identical. No person can claim any distinct preplanned anatomic advantage. What makes a person short vs. tall, large vs. small, sex, color, and so forth? Scientists and researchers explain that what causes this distinction is genes, chromosomes, and so forth. Today, modern medical technology allows parents to choose the sex of their children. No person can, after birth, change his anatomic gender selection but can, using human imagination, change gender behavior via his own human behavior, and the law in some countries permits and accepts people who make the switch. No person can claim that his specific flesh or genetic makeup was a pre-planned intention and a destiny that was created before a person was born unless the person in question wants others to buy into such an unprofaned claim.

After birth, the human destiny of all people is pre-planned, and what awaits each person is known; no human can overrule this predetermined fate until death, which is the final destination. After birth, all that people do is wait until their time is up, at which point their physical bodies transition into a solid, inert state. When a person perishes (at death), it is nature that takes over and starts to make unnatural changes in the human body. The changes in the substances that the human body consumes, in addition to the inner variation that the human body naturally exhibits, influence when a person will reach the only pre-planned end that awaits any person after birth. In other words, the interaction between the external environment and the substances that enter the human body, along with the resulting internal changes and the body's excretions, will determine the speed at which the human body reaches its predetermined destination.

Human destiny can be considered pre-planned during the body's existence in the gas phase or when the physical body displaces and influences changes in matter, although people still have a choice.

For a person's destiny to be considered pre-planned, it must have been established before their birth; this implies that all the changes associated with the three distinct physical forms of matter in most

environments must converge to create what is pre-planned prior to a person's arrival. This process would involve creating a specific destiny through thoughts, words, and actions, moment by moment, each day, for individuals who adhere to the belief that human destiny is pre-planned.

When people are alive and they change matter rather than the other way around, all the changes a person influences in matter depend on the state in which the person finds that matter, which is constantly changing.

All people are made of flesh and matter, but their human behavior is not made of matter. Three distinct pieces of evidence have to come together and be pre-planned ahead of any person if we are to go along and agree with the school of thought that believes that people's destiny is already pre-planned; it was created before we were born. The three distinct pieces of evidence are the human body, human behavior, and the various physical forms that matter can take in most environments; these elements must come together to create the conditions that allow a person to live out their experiences before they impose any changes on matter.

Crises and conflicts are situations in which people destabilize the human security of others, and they occur only when the human body displaces gas and creates void space. Let us define crises and conflicts as the displacement or alteration of physical objects in ways that do not aim to contribute to progress and human security but rather to hinder it.

Iteration is a form of computational procedure for obtaining successive closer approximations to an explanation. According to what we know now, mainly due to all the medical technological advances that were registered in modern times, people know how to alter and control the rate of growth of any human population before and after birth. Other living species, such as viruses, can alter the human body as well. No person can claim, as we said earlier, that his specific flesh or genetic makeup was a pre-planned intention and a destiny that was created before a person in question was born. Let us set aside any claims that the human bodies of specific individuals contribute more or less to

crises and conflicts based on distinctions such as color, sex, and other factors.

This statement indicates that the remaining two pieces of evidence we mentioned, which could potentially prompt a person to create crises and conflicts based on pre-planned intentions and destinies designed for specific individuals after their birth, are the sources in question. The two pieces of evidence are whether human behavior and the interaction of the three distinct physical forms of matter in most environments allow any specific person to live out their experiences. The coming together of all three distinct physical forms in which matter can exist is a prerequisite for creating what gets pre-planned before a person imposes any change in matter.

Accordingly, what we want to pin down concerns finding out if this continuous interaction that people impose on matter is due, as we said, to matter and human behavior (or human imagination) being two entities that continuously compete, so each one imposes more rapid changes on the other. The intention behind this continuous interaction has something to do with fate on the human side driving what commands the human imagination to send a signal to the human body to impose an unnatural change in matter or with people who, through their own will, invoke whatever unnatural changes we observe due to the human body being a thing that cannot be idle when it is transitioning through the gas phase and when a person is alive. It should be noted that all unnatural changes that people influence in matter are both positive and negative. However, the unnatural changes we discuss here are those that their authors use to create crises and conflicts. This phenomenon occurs because the negative actions that people impose on the human security of others force those affected to endure their experiences. In simpler terms, we want to establish if the intention that pushes a person to influence a change in matter's origin is derived from pre-arranged sources that fate is its author or if it is something that the human body and the material of terrestrial origin, when they face each other off there and then, will decide upon. People on Earth are inherently drawn to its blueprint. The changes that people constantly evoke in matter, along with the resulting levels of progress they achieve, drive them to seek newer interventions or intentions that help them further recognize their existence. If the situation were

reversed, it would mean that fate is determining the actions a person takes regarding the matter. Fate must equally ensure that all three distinct physical forms of matter come together to create whatever a person senses or detects, thereby guiding the actions that fate intends for that individual. In this way, the will of fate is what transpires and occurs.

We consider that a person's intention to go ahead and create crises and conflicts cannot possibly be pre-planned by fate because no person through his own human imagination can control the changes that are continually taking place on the outside of any human body. In other words, no person can control the changes that the physical world will take even after a person imposes his own will and after a person resorts to crises and conflicts to attain his objectives. There couldn't be good and evil individuals living as well, because all human bodies are the same, as we said, and evil human imagination or evil human behaviour gets exhibited only when a person detects his existence and learns how to walk.

We also cannot conceptualise how a God can favour or prearrange that he pre-plans ahead of specific people what they will turn out to be (i.e., the destiny of those people was already pre-planned; it was created before they were born), specifically because we cannot imagine why a God, as the religious books claim, on one hand instructs that "whoever wishes to be great shall be the other person's servant" [Matthew 20:26]. Then, turn around and choose specific individuals to make all three distinct physical forms in which matter can come together to be whatever a person senses or detects in front of him, so specific subjects can detect their existence more than others when crises and conflicts are due to people refusing to be servants to the other.

Accordingly, we consider that the events and circumstances the human body encounters and addresses after birth are dictated by the continuous changes outside the body, not by any prearranged fate that causes a person to stumble into what he detects; rather, they determine what a person agrees to contend with or confront. It is people who converted water and food into commodities, not any specific fate, that favoured some over others. Social inequality is not something that fate caused but people who refused to be servants for others. It is people's

choice, through their own will, who invoke whatever unnatural changes we observe and are behind what drives a person's intentions to influence a change in matter and/or cause people to live in fear and want. The tools that those people use to oppress others with are progress.

In conclusion, we could never claim that we know if people's intention is pre-planned—it was created before we were born—or if we have a choice. The answer to this question is also connected to understanding whether human life originated on Earth and if the human body was created according to certain beliefs about the creation of the first man, as described in the book of Genesis in the Old Testament. What we can only say is that in the womb, people are conceived one at a time. When the earth was unpopulated, the intention of people would not have mattered, whether a newborn's birth was through prearranged fate or by the mating couple. The intentions of people would not have been conflicting, raising the question of whether the intentions people set for themselves in life are destined or devised by people on earth. Likewise, before humans and machines populated the earth, as they do now, the unnatural changes that people exhibit in matter would have been unaffected, whether influenced by pre-arranged forces or by the people of that epoch. Whether a person started life in a predetermined place had no effect.

Presently, the actions people exhibit in materials of terrestrial origin can negatively or positively impact human security. The intentions that push people to create unnatural changes in matter—is it pre-arranged fate that is pushing a person to inflict such a change, or are such choices decided upon from here on earth, matter? Stopping the intentions of certain people from negatively impacting human security makes a significant difference if all decisions are being made here on Earth. If God created people, the plan has now shifted. In 1996, a machine challenged a chess player and won the game. If people evolved from here on earth, then God has no place any longer in deciding how people manage human security.

Let pre-arranged intentions that originate from destined bases and which are not visible refer to unknown sources. This signifies that only after the population increased in number on earth did the interference

of those unknown sources become noticeable. We are referring to the negative impact that those unknown sources have on human security.

Moreover, since we just supported that nothing could be pre-planned with respect to the unnatural changes that a person can inflict on material of terrestrial origin or any other living creature because no person can control the changes that those are continually undergoing, what could be worthwhile to know is what could have influenced people to want to pursue collective evidence on how the universe works to consequently enable those certain defaults that mankind doesn't possess the power to dominate to become overruled? Could the motivation come from unknown sources, or are the authors of this fixation actually human beings?

People are made in such a way that the closer matter closes in on them, the more they lose perspective. Mansions are structures that people build, and they are very attractive to the naked eye, as compared to a person who lives in a hut. When a person is standing on the inside of a hut as compared to a mansion, both individuals will experience the same sensation. Both individuals would be forgoing the opportunity to stand outside each structure, allowing one person to envy the beauty of the mansion while the other feels sympathy for the hut. The person in the mansion can't be in more than one room at a time. We can show that any two people, one living in a mansion and the other in a hut, will experience no difference except what each's imagination perceives as true.

Herein, we are concerned not with the material advantages an invisible unknown source might provide to one person over another, because, as we said, to begin with, only salespeople can convince people's imaginations that certain people are better off when they have material things. Instead, we care about invisible sources choosing one person over another for food and water.

In this case, the invisible unnatural sources could arrange for one person to be born in the desert while the other is born in fertile land within a developed city. Once again, in each case, the invisible unnatural sources were favoured or disfavoured with access to matter or materials of terrestrial origin only.

People alter matter to produce shape, and the shapes that they produce are in two forms. Shapes that are fixed on the surface of the earth and shapes that are movable. People only use the shapes that are movable to get them to move from one place to the other more quickly. However, people enrich their lives from both.

The material things that invisible unnatural sources could have pre-arranged ahead of specific newborns are of three kinds: (i) (i) (i) place of birth or existing material of terrestrial origin that the unknown source pre-arranged or favoured a newborn to start off his life from as compared to another person; (ii) pre-existing body of knowledge to allow the person to begin to shape from a certain level of progress; and (iii) pre-fitted body of knowledge that all it required was that the person be born to impose his ideas on material of terrestrial origin.

Presently, people have divided the surface of the earth and placed restraints on people, preventing them from being mobile and free to wander. It is not possible that invisible unnatural sources are pre-arranging ahead of specific newborns their place of birth because the material of terrestrial origin, which people borrow to detect their existence, is not homogeneously spread under or on the surface of the earth.

The pre-existing body of knowledge or the pre-fitted body of knowledge that invisible unnatural sources could have pre-arranged ahead of specific newborns are both interactions that the human body invokes in matter. In both cases, the unnatural sources remain invisible.

However, what we can say is that people possess a human behaviour that allows them to distinguish between what is right and what is wrong. Therefore, since what we are concerned with is the interactions that the human body imposes on matter, and when a person observes a human body imposing changes in matter, it is not possible to determine whether such motives were invoked through invisible unnatural sources or were decided upon by human behaviour alone. The only thing people see is the human body in the act of imposing whatever positive or negative changes gets observed. When people arranged to convert water and food into a commodity, it wasn't their

own human body that took on the fight to prevent others from having access to those commodities to survive, but the obstructions or the objects that people built or developed, which enforced those decisions. The barriers or machinery that people build are not living things, so invisible, unnatural sources control their behaviour. The barriers and machinery that people use to stop others are man-made creations that originate from human imagination and are constructed by the human body. This situation signifies that if invisible unnatural sources are not pre-arranging ahead of specific newborns or people to take the action that they are taking to prevent other people from possessing access to it as well, it could very well be that the body of knowledge that they progressed into reaching is what allowed them to impose their hegemony on the world. This phenomenon is driven by their human imagination and not by invisible unnatural sources. This is the reason why God in Genesis didn't want Adam and Eve to detect their existence and know good from evil. God was concerned that people would use their body of knowledge to consider that they could one day overrule nature and, therefore, forgo human security in favour of detecting their existence.

We could never claim that we know if God's intention from preventing people from knowing good and evil was his concern over people considering that they can rule the world, as has been the case with each generation that its own progressive evolution helped it attain but then didn't go that far, as we read in the history books. However, since all people devote their entire lives to doing that, which is trying to understand how things work so that, in so doing, they contribute towards getting people to understand how the universe and everything that exists originated or where all of it is heading so life can have a better intention and, subsequently, meaning. This signifies that what people consecrate their lives doing behind the fixation that they lined up doing since time immemorial to support that furthering their understanding on how to improve the meaning of their lives is something that could be pre-planned from unknown sources or a made-up story from here on earth. Let us continue with our analysis and move into the next chapter so that we find out if unnatural sources or people drove this intention that mankind fixated on to solve how to enrich people's lives. We hope to find out if, after all the years that people have come together to solve this scarcity, the challenge is due

to those preaching this objective of swapping enriching their own lives for the others' or if it is indeed unnatural sources that are facilitating this inequality that exists in the world.

This will also allow us to have more clarity on whether people steal because the Ten Commandments force people to conduct themselves in a way that goes against the way they were created to function or the Ten Commandments are the source of the problem. We cannot say that people steal because such quality exists in the genes; especially if the world were unpopulated, there would be nothing to steal. There is something that cranks this desire to steal, which we think is not due to human behaviour being made of good and evil. This add-on that drives this desire is not made of physical matter, but it greatly influences the sensory system of any person, even pushing him to steal. Likewise, this investigation will allow us to continue to investigate whether this intention that people are fixating on to understand how things work is merely an obsession conceived by people's imagination, designed to trick them into adopting an intention that leads them to presume they can alter the dependency the physical world exercises on them, a presumed intention that may very well be an illusion rather than the true purpose people should pursue in life. Protagoras was sceptical about the application of theoretical mathematics to the natural world. We think the opposite of what Protagoras thought, and therefore, this is a good opportunity for us to confirm whether Protagoras's views are indeed true.

Bibliography

Chapter 1

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sexual_reproduction
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Human_reproduction
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Organism>
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Biology>
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Life>
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Physical_body
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Reproduction>
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Fertilisation>
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Embryo>
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Fetus>
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Birth>
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Altricial>
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Precocial>
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Actuator>
<http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/prompt>
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Social_contract
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ethics>
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Longevity>
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Writing>
<http://biblehub.com/genesis/1-2.htm>
<http://avalon.law.yale.edu/imt/imtjames.asp>
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Divine_right_of_kings
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_political_parties_in_Lebanon
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Atomism>
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Nothing>
<http://www.bluelight.org/vb/threads/632303-At-what-age-would-you-consider-most-people-to-be-mature-mentally>

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Potsdam_Conference
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/1943_Cairo_Declaration
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Potsdam_Declaration
<http://www.ibiblio.org/pha/policy/1945/450729a.html#3>
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/High-level_Panel_on_Threats,_Challenges_and_Change
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Richard_Smalley

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Millennials>
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Generation_X
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Baby_boomers
[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Post
%E2%80%93World_War_II_baby_boom](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Post_World_War_II_baby_boom)

Chapter 2

<https://www.loc.gov/law/help/lebanon-constitutional-law.php>
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Secularity>
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Secularization>
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Andrew_Carnegie
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Herbert_Spencer
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Classical_liberalism
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Progressive_Era
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Gilded_Age
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Reconstruction_Era
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Belle_%C3%89poque
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Panic_of_1893
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_recessions_in_the_United_States
[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/
List_of_wars_involving_the_United_States](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_wars_involving_the_United_States)
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/American_Revolutionary_War
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Progressivism_in_the_United_States
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Progressivism>
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Social_justice
<http://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-38173350>
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/American_Revolution
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Direct_democracy
[http://www.un.org/en/sections/history-united-nations-charter/1941-
declaration-st-james-palace/index.html](http://www.un.org/en/sections/history-united-nations-charter/1941-declaration-st-james-palace/index.html)
[http://www.english-for-students.com/declaration-of-palace-of-st-
james.html](http://www.english-for-students.com/declaration-of-palace-of-st-james.html)
[http://theunchannel.blogspot.com/2012/06/inter-allied-declaration-12-
june-1941.html](http://theunchannel.blogspot.com/2012/06/inter-allied-declaration-12-june-1941.html)
[http://www.un.org/en/sections/history-united-nations-charter/1941-
atlantic-charter/](http://www.un.org/en/sections/history-united-nations-charter/1941-atlantic-charter/)
<http://avalon.law.yale.edu/imt/imtjames.asp>
<http://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-38289333>
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Herbert_Spencer

<http://themindunleashed.com/2016/11/world-actually-becoming-peaceful-place.html>
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Progress_and_Poverty
<http://www.henrygeorge.org/pchp42.htm>
<http://www.faculty.rsu.edu/users/f/felwell/www/Theorists/Spencer/MajorWorks.html>
<https://www.loc.gov/law/help/lebanon-constitutional-law.php>
http://unddr.org/what-is-ddr/introduction_1.aspx
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Apocalyptic_and_post-apocalyptic_fiction
<http://www.independent.co.uk/news/un-nuclear-weapon-ban-united-nations-negotiations-2017-general-assembly-a7393501.html>
<http://www.charismanews.com/opinion/56877-13-catastrophic-events-which-could-soon-lead-to-an-american-apocalypse>
<http://johnperkins.org/books>
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Social_theory
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Fernand_Braudel
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Immanuel_Wallerstein
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Murray_Bookchin
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Friedrich_Nietzsche
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Moses>
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ten_Commandments
[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Torah_\(foundational_narrative\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Torah_(foundational_narrative))
[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Origin_myth_\(cosmogonic_myth\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Origin_myth_(cosmogonic_myth))
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Creation_myth
[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mircea_Eliade_\(hierophanies\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mircea_Eliade_(hierophanies))
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hierophany>
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sacred%E2%80%93profane_dichotomy
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/World_view
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Military>
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Divine_right_of_kings
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Disenchantment>
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Regional_power
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Newly_industrialized_country
<https://www.gotquestions.org/Ten-Commandments.html>
<https://www.army.mil/values/>
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Military_history#Early_historians
<http://www.timemaps.com/hunter-gatherer>
<http://www.timemaps.com/farming>

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Common_good
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Commonwealth>
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Empire>
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ancient_Mesopotamian_religion
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Achaemenid_Empire
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ruhollah_Khomeini#Political_thought_and_legacy
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Zoroaster#Philosophy>
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Zoroastrianism>
<http://www.un.org/en/universal-declaration-human-rights/>
<http://www.un.org/en/sections/un-charter/un-charter-full-text/>
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Empire>
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History_of_colonialism
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Colonization>
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Settler>
<http://www.un.org/en/decolonization/declaration.shtml>
<http://exhibitions.nypl.org/africanaage/essay-colonization-of-africa.html>

Chapter 3

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Settler>
<http://exhibitions.nypl.org/africanaage/essay-colonization-of-africa.html>
<http://www.un.org/en/decolonization/declaration.shtml>
<https://philosophia.uncg.edu/phi361-metivier/module-1-what-is-ethics/what-makes-things-right-or-wrong/>
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History_of_colonialism
<http://listverse.com/2012/03/24/10-major-breakthroughs-of-humanity/>
http://www.skwirk.com/p-t_s-4_u-517_t-1388/what-is-science-/nsw/science/history-of-science
<http://www.independent.co.uk/news/science/scientific-discoveries-in-2015-that-will-change-how-you-see-the-world-a6782861.html>
<http://www.factmonster.com/ipka/A0932440.html> (this site is related to life changing discoveries)
https://www.nasa.gov/exploration/whyweexplore/why_we_explore_main.html#.WMAqyPnyu70
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Spacecraft_propulsion
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Political_science
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Systems_analysis

<http://84.89.132.1/~lemenestrel/IMG/pdf/colebatch.pdf>
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Fritz_Zwicky
<http://www.swemorph.com/ma.html>
<https://philosophia.uncg.edu/phi361-metivier/module-1-what-is-ethics/what-makes-things-right-or-wrong/>
<https://philosophia.uncg.edu/phi361-metivier/module-1-what-is-ethics/why-care-about-ethics/>
<https://philosophia.uncg.edu/phi121-zimmerman/4-god-and-morality/>
[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Morphological_analysis_\(problem-solving\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Morphological_analysis_(problem-solving))
<https://hbr.org/2014/04/generation-to-generation-how-to-save-the-family-business>
<https://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=Genesis+6&version=NIV>
Ten Commandments <https://philosophia.uncg.edu/phi121-zimmerman/4-god-and-morality/>
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History_of_the_world
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Civilization>
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mores>
[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Norm_\(social\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Norm_(social))
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Social_contract
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Behavioral_modernity
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Taboo>
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Divine_command_theory
Relativity: <https://answers.yahoo.com/question/index?qid=20080630084935AASEnpZ>
<http://www.smart-words.org/linking-words/transition-words.html>

chapter 4

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Marginal_utility
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Utilitarianism>
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Economic_inequality#Economic_development
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Standard_of_living
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Neoliberalism>
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/War#Theories_for_motivation
https://en.wikiquote.org/wiki/Eleanor_Roosevelt
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Social_status
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Max_Weber

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Motor_skill
https://childdevelopmentinfo.com/learning/multiple_intelligences/educational-benefits-toys/#.WMhmpvnyu70
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ideology>
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Splendid_isolation
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/British_Empire#End_of_empire
<http://www.un.org/en/decolonization/declaration.shtml>
<http://www.un.org/en/universal-declaration-human-rights/>
<http://www.un.org/en/sections/un-charter/preamble/index.html>
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Civilization>
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Polity>
[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/State_\(polity\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/State_(polity))
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History_of_the_world
<https://nwu.org/chapters/new-york/>
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Neoliberalism>
<http://www.un.org/en/decolonization/declaration.shtml>
<http://www.un.org/en/sections/un-charter/preamble/index.html>
<http://www.un.org/en/universal-declaration-human-rights/>
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Economic_inequality
<http://www.bbc.com/news/world-asia-india-35650616>
<http://www.biographyonline.net/spiritual/zoroaster-biography.html>
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Zoroaster#Philosophy>

chapter 5

https://www.nasa.gov/exploration/whyweexplore/why_we_explore_main.html#.WMtI4_krLIW
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Military>
http://lrrpublic.cli.det.nsw.edu.au/lrrSecure/Sites/Web/13289/ezone/year_2008/sep/article_capability_development_model.htm
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/United_Nations_Security_Council_resolution
<http://www.themaori.com/maori-culture-beliefs>
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mana>
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Social_contract
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Social_status
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Priest>
https://archive.org/stream/GuerillaOpenAccessManifesto/Goamjuly2008_djvu.txt
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Financialization>

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Theory_of_change
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Divine_right_of_kings
<http://www.ancient.eu/socrates/>
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Civilization>
<http://www.wisegeek.org/what-is-an-actuator.htm>
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History_of_the_world#Contemporary_history
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Contemporary_history#Challenges_and_problems
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Polity>
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/T%C3%BDr>
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Norse_mythology
<https://www.quora.com/What-are-some-religions-that-believe-in-multiple-gods>
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Monarchy>
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Forms_of_government
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/China>
<http://www.ancient.eu/Confucianism/>
<https://www.army.mil/values/>
<https://www.brainyquote.com/quotes/authors/c/confucius.html>
http://afe.easia.columbia.edu/at/conf_tradition/tct06.html (Confucius)
http://thinkexist.com/quotation/if_we_don-t_know_life-how_can_we_know_death/202160.html
<https://arthistory.wisc.edu/PostPage-News709.htm> (Confucius)
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Contemporary_history#Challenges_and_problems
<http://asiasociety.org/education/confucianism>
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Feoffment>
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Fengjian>
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tao>
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Taoism>
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tian>
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Shangdi>
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Zhou_dynasty
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Shang_dynasty
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ancestor_veneration_in_China
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Humanism>
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Apotheosis>
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Chinese_lineage_associations

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Confucianism>
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Confucianism#Criticism>
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mythology>
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Culture_hero
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Yin_and_yang
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Pangu>
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Yellow_Emperor
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Emperor_Yao
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Emperor_Ku
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Emperor_Shun
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Chinese_mythology
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Fuxi>
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Three_Sovereigns_and_Five_Emperors
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Yu_the_Great
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mandate_of_Heaven
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Son_of_Heaven
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Xia_dynasty
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ball_python#Reproduction
<https://www.google.com/search?q=what+is+a+cardinal+animal&oq=what+is+a+cardinal+animal&aqs=chrome..69i57.10895j0j8&sourceid=chrome&ie=UTF-8>
<http://www.popsoci.com/article/science/which-animals-can-have-most-babies-infographic>
<http://www.discoverwildlife.com/animals/mammals/which-mammal-can-reproduce-most-offspring>
<http://animalist.com/alist/5-animals-that-produce-the-most-offspring>
<http://www.bbc.com/earth/story/20160304-one-animal-has-more-babies-than-any-other>
https://www.reddit.com/r/askscience/comments/2tisrz/why_do_some_species_of_animals_have_multiple/
<http://www.bbc.com/earth/story/20151216-virgin-births-are-happening-everywhere>
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Melodrama>
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Drama#Forms_of_drama
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Soap_opera
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Love_of_Life
<http://www.chinaknowledge.de/Literature/Historiography/zhushujinian.html>
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bamboo_Annals

<https://www.britannica.com/topic/Bamboo-Annals>
<https://www.quora.com/Who-are-the-first-earth-inhabitants-whites-or-blacks-Should-I-just-say-what-was-the-first-race>
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Culture>
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Old_World
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/World_history
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Comparative_history
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History>
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bronze_Age
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Three-age_system
<http://www.livescience.com/17560-humans-originated-rivers.html>
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Geographical_midpoint_of_Asia
<http://www.historyguide.org/guide/study.html> (why study history)
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Philosophy>
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hellenistic_period
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History_of_India
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/%C5%9Arama%E1%B9%87a> (sramana)
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Asceticism>
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sa%E1%B9%83s%C4%81ra> (samsara)
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Indian_philosophy
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Gautama_Buddha
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hindu>
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hinduism>
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History_of_Hinduism
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Indian_religions
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Harappa>
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Jainism>
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Buddhism>
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Origen>
<https://www.biblica.com/bible/bible-faqs/when-was-the-bible-written/>
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Old_Assyrian_Empire
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sumer#Social_and_family_life
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Origen#Views>
<http://famous-philosophers.com/>
<http://www.swemorph.com/zwicky.html> (Zwicky)
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Fritz_Zwicky
<http://www.swemorph.com/ma.html> (Zwicky)
<https://usaidlearninglab.org/lab-notes/what-thing-called-theory-change>
 Wiki/ progressivism

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Goods_and_services
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Productive_and_unproductive_labour
<http://www.economicsdiscussion.net/articles/goods-and-services-meaning-and-classification-of-goods-and-services/2014>
<http://www.mcwdn.org/ECONOMICS/GoodService.html>
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Political_economy
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ethics>
<http://quatr.us/timelines/1000bc.htm> (Timeline 1000 - 500 BC)
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Outline_of_war#Weapons_of_war
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Morale>
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Military_strategy
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Military_deception
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mercenary>
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Political_warfare
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Psychological_warfare#Methods
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Military_operation
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/War_Before_Civilization
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Weapon>
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/War>

Chapter 6

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Exploration>
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/1910s>
[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/1900s_\(decade\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/1900s_(decade))
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/New_Imperialism
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mercantilism>
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Economic_nationalism
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Theodore_Roosevelt
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/William_Howard_Taft
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/League_to_Enforce_Peace
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/1890s>
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/2nd_millennium
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/New_Imperialism
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Intellectual_freedom
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Fourteen_Points
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/New_Deal
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cuban_Missile_Crisis
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Monroe_Doctrine
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sphere_of_influence

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/1905_French_law_on_the_Separation_of_the_Churches_and_the_State
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Concordat_of_1801
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/French_Revolution
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Napoleon#Exile_on_Saint_Helena
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ottoman_Empire
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Militarization>
[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Naturalism_\(philosophy\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Naturalism_(philosophy))
 Overhaul of government <http://www.bbc.com/news/world-us-canada-39403746>
 East and west philosophy
<http://www.staff.uni-giessen.de/~gk1415/philosophy.htm>
 East and west philosophy
http://www.1000ventures.com/business_guide/crosscuttings/cultures_east-west-phylosophy.html
<https://www.quora.com/What-are-the-major-differences-between-Eastern-and-Western-philosophies>
<http://www.bbc.com/news/world-us-canada-39410173>
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Polity>
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Revolution>
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Republicanism_in_the_United_States
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/American_Revolution#Ideology_and_factions
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/American_Revolutionary_War
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/All_men_are_created_equal
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/American_Revolution
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/United_States
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bill_of_rights
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/American_Civil_War
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Neocolonialism>
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/War>
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Nuclear_weapon
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/New_Imperialism
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mercantilism>
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Economic_nationalism
<https://history.state.gov/departments/history/short-history/superpower>
<https://www.quora.com/When-and-Why-did-America-become-a-world-power>

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Superpower>
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/United_States_Declaration_of_Independence
<http://www.ushistory.org/DECLARATION/document/>
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Great_power
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cuban_Missile_Crisis
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Monroe_Doctrine
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sphere_of_influence
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/New_Deal
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Intellectual_freedom
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/1890s>
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/1910s#Politics>
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/1910s>
[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/1900s_\(decade\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/1900s_(decade))
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/2nd_millennium
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Fourteen_Points
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Free_trade
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/League_to_Enforce_Peace
<http://voices.nationalgeographic.com/2011/04/01/uncontacted-tribes-the-last-free-people-on-earth/>
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Polity>
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Divine_right_of_kings
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Saudi_Arabia
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Revolution>
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ancient_Greece#History
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Anatolia>
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Turkification>
<http://voices.nationalgeographic.com/2011/04/01/uncontacted-tribes-the-last-free-people-on-earth/>
<http://www.historyplace.com/speeches/nixon-farewell.htm>
http://www.pbs.org/newshour/spc/character/links/nixon_speech.html
<http://www.historyplace.com/speeches/nixon-farewell.htm>
<http://www.aboutcatholics.com/beliefs/how-to-go-to-confession/>
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_Presidents_of_the_United_States
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/William_Howard_Taft
http://www.conservapedia.com/Progressive_Era
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Theodore_Roosevelt
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Happiness#Definition>
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hope>

<https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/hope>
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Greyhound_racing

Chapter 9 and 10

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Incandescent_light_bulb
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/New_Imperialism
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/American_Revolution
<http://www.businessdictionary.com/definition/changes.html>
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Battle_of_Marathon#Legacy
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Olympic_Charter
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Olympic_Games
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Olympic_truce#United_Nations_support
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/International_Olympic_Committee
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Portal:Current_events
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Category:2016_by_day
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Marathon#Olympic_medalists
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Terrestrial_locomotion
<https://www.coachup.com/nation/articles/race-strategy-for-distance-runners>
<http://www.myrunningtips.com/history-of-running.html>
<http://nymag.com/scienceofus/2016/01/reason-people-run-ridiculous-distances.html>
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Gait>
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Q_source
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Forms_of_government
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Socialist_state
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Federal_republic
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Voltaire>
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ancient_Greece#History
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hellenistic_period#Rise_of_Rome
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Greece>
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History_of_Greece#Archaic_Greece
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Superpower>
<http://www.allaboutgod.com/what-is-a-christian.htm>
https://www.nasa.gov/exploration/whyweexplore/why_we_explore_main.html#.WOvqBNlrJph
<http://quotes.yourdictionary.com/articles/who-said-i-think-therefore-i-am.html>

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ren%C3%A9_Descartes (RENE DESCARTES)
<https://www.icr.org/article/3>
[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Morphological_analysis_\(problem-solving\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Morphological_analysis_(problem-solving))
http://brainrules.blogspot.com/2008/03/brain-cannot-multitask_16.html
<http://www.bbc.com/culture/story/20170406-this-obscure-religion-shaped-the-west>
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Protagoras>
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Agnosticism>
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Prodicus>
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Heracles>
[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Naturalism_\(philosophy\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Naturalism_(philosophy))
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Origen>
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Zeno_of_Citium
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Crates_of_Thebes
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Diogenes>
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Antisthenes>
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Stoicism>
[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cynicism_\(philosophy\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cynicism_(philosophy))
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Determinism>
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Indeterminism>
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Meaning_of_life#Popular_views

Chapter 11, 12, 13 and 14

<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2009/sep/11/second-world-war-rebuilding>
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Reconstruction_Era#Radical_Reconstruction
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/American_Civil_War
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Gilded_Age
[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History_of_the_United_States_\(1865%E2%80%931918\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History_of_the_United_States_(1865%E2%80%931918))
<https://www.quora.com/How-did-Britain-and-France-obtain-their-nuclear-weapons>
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Otto_Hahn
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/German_nuclear_weapon_project
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Nuclear_fission

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History_of_France#World_War_II
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/French_Fourth_Republic
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Charles_de_Gaulle#1962.E2.80.9368:_Politics_of_grandeur
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dirigisme>
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Trente_Glorieuses
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Post_%E2%80%93_World_War_II_economic_expansion
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Consumerism>
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sexual_revolution
<https://www.quora.com/Why-is-France-still-a-member-of-the-UN-security-council-when-it-has-very-little-say-in-current-geopolitics>
<https://www.quora.com/Why-is-France-a-permanent-member-of-the-UN-Security-Council-despite-sitting-out-of-most-of-World-War-II>
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Social_status
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Aftermath_of_World_War_I
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Nihilism>
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History_of_Lebanon#The_Lebanese_Civil_War:_1975.E2.80.931990
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Occupied_Enemy_Territory_Administration
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Lebanon#Geography>
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Geography_of_Lebanon
<http://www.un.org/en/decolonization/declaration.shtml>
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/1910s#Politics>
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Fourteen_Points
[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/1900s_\(decade\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/1900s_(decade))
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/New_Imperialism
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Civilizing_mission
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Middle_Ages
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Christianization>
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Postdevelopment_theory
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Primitive_culture
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Marquis_de_Condorcet
[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Human_development_\(humanity\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Human_development_(humanity))
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Superpower>
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Power_projection
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/American_Civil_War#Union_victory_and_aftermath

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/American_Revolution
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/All_men_are_created_equal
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Woodrow_Wilson
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Progressivism>
[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Rationalization_\(sociology\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Rationalization_(sociology))
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Q_source
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Forms_of_government#Pejorative_attributes
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Voltaire>
<https://history.state.gov/departments/history/short-history/superpower>
<https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/walk%20out%20the%20door>
<https://www.google.com/webhp?sourceid=chrome-instant&ion=1&espv=2&ie=UTF-8#q=dialectical+definition>
<https://history.state.gov/departments/history/short-history/diplomatictradition>
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/American_Revolution
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History_of_the_United_States
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/European_colonization_of_the_Americas
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Christopher_Columbus#Accusations_of_tyranny_during_governorship
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Capitulations_of_Santa_Fe
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Catholic_Monarchs
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Heresy>
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Black_Legend
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Pope_Sixtus_IV
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Spanish_Inquisition
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Medieval_Inquisition
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Catharism>
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Santa_Hermandad
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Rex_Catholicissimus
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Pope_Alexander_VI
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/House_of_Borgia
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/House_of_Trast%C3%A1mara
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/John_I_of_Castile
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/American_frontier
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Renaissance>
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Renaissance_humanism
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Renaissance_humanism

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Utilitarianism>
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Consequentialism>
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Value_theory
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Jeremy_Bentham
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Welfarism>
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Scholasticism>
<https://www.google.com/search?q=solar+definition&oq=solar+&aqs=chrome.2.69i57j0l5.5478j0j7&sourceid=chrome&ie=UTF-8>
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Jules_Ferry
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Franco-Prussian_War
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/European_balance_of_power
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Supranational_union
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kingdom_of_Prussia
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Prussia>
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/German_Empire
<https://www.google.com/search?q=force+physics&oq=force+p&aqs=chrome.1.69i57j0l5.21811j0j4&sourceid=chrome&ie=UTF-8>
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Force>
<http://www.physicsclassroom.com/Class/newtlaws/u2l2a.cfm#category>
<http://www.physicsclassroom.com/class/newtlaws/Lesson-2/Types-of-Forces>
<http://www.allaboutgod.com/what-is-a-christian.htm>
<http://quotes.yourdictionary.com/articles/who-said-i-think-therefore-i-am.html>
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ren%C3%A9_Descartes
<https://www.icr.org/article/3>
http://brainrules.blogspot.com/2008/03/brain-cannot-multitask_16.html
<http://www.bbc.com/culture/story/20170406-this-obscure-religion-shaped-the-west>
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Aftermath_of_World_War_I
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Nihilism>
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History_of_Lebanon#The_Lebanese_Civil_War:_1975.E2.80.931990
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Occupied_Enemy_Territory_Administration

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Lebanon#Geography>
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Geography_of_Lebanon

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JstUU3DLeNM>
<http://www.allthelyrics.com/forum/showthread.php?t=70533>
joanna EEde

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Suffrage>
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Radical_Republican
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Second_Great_Awakening
<http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=29554>
https://en.wikiquote.org/wiki/Benjamin_Harrison
[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/
List_of_wars_involving_the_United_States](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_wars_involving_the_United_States)
<https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/dogma>
<http://www.investopedia.com/terms/t/trade.asp>
<http://www.businessdictionary.com/definition/trade.html>
<http://www.historyplace.com/speeches/nixon-farewell.htm>