

Rethinking Reality

The Problem of Truth and Conflict in Political Theory

**Toward a New
Theory of Politics**

Salim Maloof, Ph.D.

Copyright 2016 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., Rethinking Reality, The Problem of Truth and Conflict in Political Theory, 2016

This is a work of non-fiction.

Salim Maloof
Rethinking Reality
The Problem of Truth and Conflict in Political Theory

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. Factors to support people confusion to chart a hope for a better future	24
2. The Cost of Peace and Security	34
3. Logic According to Whom?	63
4. By one's Own Measure	93
5. When Each Becomes a Little God	121
6. When Certainty Meets its Limits	153
Bibliography	170

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

Truth is like the outer husk that covers a kernel of rice. When the outer husk is removed, the true self appears.

The victors of WW2 advised their heirs to always remember the common standards outlined in the UN Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) to avoid experiencing the barbarous acts they endured. The victors of WW2 proposed that their heirs defy conventional understanding of power, wealth, and happiness to ensure that the self remains protected just as the outer husk of a kernel of rice protects the seed. Strangely, the heirs of the victors of WW2 did not attain the true liberation that their fathers had counselled them to seek; instead, they chose to follow the practices of their forefathers, allowing emotional and ideological aspects to play out or spill over. Since 1945, the reliance of the heirs of the victors of WW2 on the value of diplomatic relations has been at its lowest. The heirs of the victors of WW2 do not want to assign the massive global change that is underway any weight. The heirs of the victors of WW2 refuse to recognize that other people share a stake in global security and fail to acknowledge their limitations, which is necessary to prevent the ongoing disruption of national political and economic frameworks from backfiring or negatively impacting their wealth, power, and status.

The heirs of the victors of WW2 have chosen to adhere to standards they created themselves, similar to those of their forefathers, rather than following the true guidance their fathers provided, which has resulted in assumptions that have deepened global divisions. So far, there is a lack of vision regarding how to correct the capitalist system, which has gone off track and is facing collapse as a result of economic liberalism. With no clear vision on how to emerge from the economic crisis that the heirs of the victors of WW2 created by deviating from the work program suggested in the UN Charter and UDHR, the world appears to be heading toward an international order that is increasingly dominated by groups of major business tycoons—men with vested interests who have formed a sort of mafia seeking global control. Those tycoons focus solely on how their domination and the protection

of their interests at the expense of others are supposedly resolving the current political and economic situation, rather than on how to promote comprehensive development and world security through a collaborative approach. The policy and political language of those tycoons is aligned with their role, their capabilities, and their historical perspective, without giving any due consideration to the inevitability of the historical trajectory. Primitive, predatory, and colonial ideas rooted in fraud and mafia-like tactics span the globe.

The problem is that human nature can give rise to all things. Relying on mafia-style approaches to exercise control over the international order raises despair and pushes people to plunder wealth and dismantle international laws and institutions instead of relying on law and order to create conditions for peace and security. In addition, the mechanisms that mafia-style approaches cultivate do not deepen crisis management but push the individuals involved to rely on greater gambles. If this unstable political situation that emerged around the globe in recent years persists, more people will be aware of their true nature. As the number of emboldened individuals increases, the heirs of the victors of World War II may struggle to maintain their superiority, which their fathers desired, and new individuals may begin to assume their roles.

If the heirs of the victors of WW2 do not strive to promote the standards suggested in the UN Charter or the UDHR to secure their universal and effective recognition and observance to reduce the losses that are constantly growing, there is a good chance that people's ability to recognize and label things will become distorted. When the enactment of laws and standards becomes ineffective in creating neutral emotional reactions, then the emotional response (i.e., habits, volitions, thoughts, etc.) of people would become driven by power and greed instead of justice and righteousness. Most people will suffer significant losses in the world due to their delusion of power.

The book *Rethinking Reality* aims to highlight the danger that humanity faces when the world people create in their minds fosters precepts that strengthen greed, anger, and ignorance, rather than encouraging reflection and wisdom to help the mind overcome afflictions. The book highlights the consequences of allowing the

colonial framework established by old powers to become an enduring reality.

The book tries to emphasize the importance of prioritizing truth to avoid the framework that the political formula that the old powers built before WW2 erupted and spread further. This is because the confusion that such a strategy will create seals the hearts, hearing, and sights of people from the truth and prompts them to continue to spread corruption and deceit, which has the potential to destroy all the human progress that was achieved.

When the heirs of the victors of WW2 practice the policies that they found their fathers practicing instead of the common standards suggested in the UN Charter and the UDHR, they throw all the gains of their fathers and forefathers into the trash, as the percepts that they would be cultivating would be sustaining the colonial formula or construct that led all the time to the collapse of its users instead of giving the new unique formula that their fathers suggested the chance to work.

The objective of this work is to highlight the importance of prioritizing clear political frameworks to strengthen international unity and avoid the hegemonic project that the heirs of the victors of WW2 are following since the date when World War Two was regarded to have ended and in which people would become politically divided to secure a colonial agenda that deepens corruption, deception, and sectarian interests instead of to reduce such behaviors. Therefore, the heirs of the old powers may lose their superiority if confusion, disregard, and contempt become uncontrollable; such a situation could lead to a permanent political paralysis and historical dynamic, resulting in fleeting moral victories.

Factors to support people confusion to chart a hope for a better future

In this chapter, we aim to explain how the custodianship role of terrestrial materials, which people have assumed and agreed to manage collectively, could contribute to instigating crises and conflicts. We tried to show that no matter how much people try to influence human behavior to alter how unnaturally it exhibits changes in matter, it is not possible to condition patterns of behavior that could be adaptable to social norms in place due to the way the earthly desires that influence altering matter to sustain survival needs and earthly desires vary differently from one person to the next. We highlighted the need to review what in the actual social paradigm that people are adapting to could be instigating discontent among people. We also showed how much people seem to be confused to chart a hope for a better future and how the meaning that they have opted to achieve, “men in all lands may live out their lives in freedom from fear and want,” is not conventional.

The vast number of setbacks inherited by each generation from its predecessors, along with those generated by its own actions, highlights the real and alarming implications of allowing the world's insecurity to continue trickling from one generation to the next. The increasing number of crises and conflicts that each generation constantly faces poses a serious threat to world peace. The repeated crises and conflicts that people are experiencing create a situation in which each generation feels as though its purpose is to start from scratch in order

to inspire others to act in a spirit of brotherhood towards one another. The implication of entangling each generation in addressing how to encourage people to act in a spirit of brotherhood poses a real and alarming threat to the true meaning of a rich human life. This is because the insecurity that people under each generation end up living with and/or end up spending time to address shifts the purpose of becoming among the living from being a pass-through exercise intended for the purpose of living a rich life to how to manage to learn and to contribute, so people start to act in a spirit of brotherhood towards one another to remove next threats that impede human security.

This challenge that people have been constantly entangled in addressing, whereby instead of the attention of people switching from having to focus on how, from the moment a person enters into becoming among the living to the moment the person exits, such a stay is fluid and free from any obstacles that impede human security to how people can start to act in a spirit of brotherhood towards one another, necessitates that people consider introducing real social adjustments in the actual social order to let the implications of this ongoing challenge that keeps on repeating itself from one generation to the next end once and for all. It shouldn't have to be up to people to decide if they want to live as a good, law-abiding citizen or face incarceration, isolation, or sanctions if they refuse to subscribe to ongoing social norms. New people shouldn't have to find themselves from birth to death entangled in drafting and ratifying treaties and conventions on how people can start to act in a spirit of brotherhood towards one another a few billion years after the appearance of man on earth. Nor is it the obligation of any person who becomes among the living to be entangled in how to draft and ratify treaties and conventions on how people can start to act in a spirit of brotherhood towards one another, because such an endeavor gets those who are entangled in such actions to forgo their own reality. Let us not mention that no human being has the right to decide on why people should or shouldn't start to act in a spirit of brotherhood towards one another, because no human being can claim he was commissioned to see through such social principles starting to be exhibited on earth. Likewise, to have a say on how the earth's resources are to be managed or distributed so people begin to act in a spirit of brotherhood towards one another, especially since this theme

appears to be occupying center stage among the many things that stand in the way of people beginning to act in a spirit of brotherhood towards one another. Protagoras was a pre-Socratic Greek philosopher who once said, "Man is the measure of all things." Perhaps we can make use of what Plato interpreted Protagoras meant by this statement in order to spare searching for another meaning. Plato interpreted Protagoras' statement to mean that there is no absolute truth, but that which individuals deem to be true. Therefore, up until God stops remaining living and invisible away from his creation, he either clarifies why people should start to act in a spirit of brotherhood towards one another or designates someone to do it. In like manner, for a person to show that God commissioned him to arbitrate on how the earth's resources are to be managed or distributed. Perhaps the intention of people shouldn't be to act or not to act in a spirit of brotherhood towards one another but rather to live and let live. Evidently, we are not referring herein by the idiom "live and let live" to the ideal of allowing each individual to live his life as he sees fit, but rather, to starting to make each person live his life based on what reality dictates people should live on earth.

From the time of our ancestors to the present, each newcomer discovers that the societal structure lacks a continuity plan, which provides clear guidelines on what individuals can and cannot achieve on earth. Besides the cumulative setbacks that the newborn finds himself drawn against his will into dealing with, he will discover that millions of years later, on the appearance of mankind on earth, people still disagree on whether the universe is based on something objective, outside of human influence or perceptions. Indeed, this aforementioned topic and hundreds like it that any newborn will stumble upon are interesting focus areas for investigation that can make a person feel accomplished, even as he finds himself entangled in dealing with them against his will. The problem with allowing a newborn to enter a world where its inhabitants have not resolved key issues, even millions of years after their appearance, is a significant concern. Besides, presenting humanity as if it began recently makes the newborn wonder what people expect to change when they discover whether the universe is based on something objective, outside human influence or perception. This assertion is because it has never been proven that by creating havoc, it would be possible to progress to find

a way to stop the aging process so people can live forever, since, after all, there is no intention in knowing whether the universe was based on something objective, outside of human influence or perceptions, except to overrule this natural myth on mankind. Any person can claim this truth, based on his own perceptions: disorder hinders human progress. Before people figured out how to stop aging, from the time of our ancestors to now, people failed to manage how to start to act in a spirit of brotherhood towards one another. Will people be able to overcome this challenge when they successfully halt the aging process, allowing them to complete all their unfinished projects? There must be a reason for the wave of insecurity that appears to accompany humanity from one generation to the next, as no newborn enters an empty world. There must be a reason for the wave of insecurity that appears to accompany humanity from one generation to the next, as no newborn enters an empty world.

There are always going to be two types of truth. One type of truth is what the pre-Socratic Greek philosopher Protagoras referred to as the truth that each individual deems to be true, while the other type is the absolute truth. The absolute truth consists of two types of truth, which arise from the influence that absolute truth exerts on both humanity and the natural system. One of those absolute truths is the truth that the natural system levies, and the other is that people have no power—perhaps until now—to change the reality that we all live in. Absolute truth holds sway over both due to its power to control and regulate tangible things. The human body is a tangible entity, and until now, absolute truth has maintained the upper hand. Thomas Hobbes was an English philosopher who is considered by many to be the founder of modern political philosophy and political science because of his work that treats humans as matter and motion, obeying the same physical laws as tangible objects.

Mathematics is a branch of study that people use to explain numbers, quantities, measurements, and the relationships between them. Calculus is a branch of mathematics that treats the measurement of changing quantities. We cannot know if Thomas Hobbes [1588–1679] or any investigators studied why humans lack the power to act with brotherhood toward one another. The issues that Thomas Hobbes addressed, along with those questioned by the investigators he inspired

after his death, from Jean-Jacques Rousseau to Immanuel Kant and others, left many unanswered questions regarding the authority of the state over the individual. This, in turn, rendered the state unable to fulfill its obligations to provide necessary protection, allowing people to begin acting in a spirit of brotherhood towards one another. For nearly half a millennium, people have been conceding their freedoms and submitting them to the authority of the state in exchange for protection. Despite the exhaustive efforts of states, each new generation appears to start anew, necessitating individuals to act in a spirit of brotherhood towards one another.

The next question that arises is simple and straightforward. For how long are people supposed to continue with the experimentation with different theories and machineries aimed at creating conditions of stability and well-being when, based on what we are arguing, human security is not something that gets imposed nor tossed around? There should not be a reason why half of a millennium after Hobbes and the other philosophers that followed him left our leaders' blueprint on how to manage to bring people together to act in a spirit of brotherhood towards one another and the opposite outcome that ensued other than to consider that people's tolerance to peace and security diminished over the years or the theories that those philosophers left for our political leaders to work from are not totally complete. There were no international organizations and machineries such as the International World Organization known as the United Nations, the European Commission, the Arab League, or the Organization of Non-Aligned Nations, to name a few that people subscribe to, as the case is like after World War I and II to ensure human conviviality and exchange friendly relations. When Hobbes and his colleagues asserted humans would be better off than when people abdicate their rights in favor of the absolute authority of government, peace and security on earth would flourish. Long before Hobbes, Rousseau, Kant, and many others began to enlist people to abdicate their rights in favor of the absolute authority of government, religion and occultism began to solicit people to act in a spirit of brotherhood towards one another, and they failed. There has to be some specific factor that underlies people's ambiguous attitude towards peace and security so that even when people begin to enlist one another in the cause of international cooperation to prevent

and remove any threats to peace, even such efforts are not making people triumph over them.

People can continue to use machinery and create treaties, conventions, and declarations that reflect the collective resolve of all members of the human family to enable each individual to live free from fear and want, as has been the case from one generation to the next. However, the fact that the opposite of what is proclaimed takes place is a sign that signals that people haven't succeeded in spotting a workable social and international world order from the time of our ancestors to now. People did not obtain the benefit of such political order when they abdicated their rights in favor of the absolute authority of government, monarch, parliamentary democracy, socialism, communism, large state, or independent state. Even during times of international cooperation, like after World War II, when people chose to promote human conviviality and friendly relations, humans still struggled to make it easier for future generations to achieve what we have yet to accomplish. To start with, it is about how to convert the world into becoming a better and peaceful place for us first! There have to be reasons behind the alarmingly lukewarm attitude of people toward global affairs and world security in recent years.

If people abstain from practicing treaties and conventions that were established on their behalf by their ancestors, they can continue to criticize the political, economic, or educational unpreparedness of certain members of humanity, which serves as a pretext for those who live in domination and exploitation. Social support, social cohesion, and social order represent a challenge to sociological theory and its fundamental topics since humans began keeping records. The role and unique characteristics of religion, occultism, and contemporary representative institutions in fostering social cohesion and solidarity, as well as the delay in finding solutions, highlight the need to reconsider fundamental elements of our current social paradigm. The consideration begins by addressing whether the search to act in a spirit of brotherhood towards one another is a utopian objective. The discontent that is sweeping through the steadfast attitude and behavior of a large segment of the human family in recent years to favor resistance against all the machinery that representative institutions are knowingly enlisting in the search to build prosperity and preserve

social progress is a real cause for concern and should not be left unexplainable. There has to be a way to explain the factors that have been driving the undermining attitude of humans toward peace and security in recent years to ease this wave of abnormal conduct that Hobbes, Rousseau, Kant, and other philosophers did not take into account in their work so people can start to obtain the benefit of the political orders they left for us.

In these terms, perhaps some structural changes in the political, social, and economic spheres are required to spark a shift in human relations. If it were true that all members of the human family could live in peace with one another using the machineries that so far exist, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which was signed in 1948, could have started to take root. There would have been no need back in 1960 to enact a new affirmation to grant independence to colonial countries and peoples under such conditions. However, despite all the conventions, treaties, and affirmations established from 1960 to the present aimed at disrupting the landscape of despair that characterizes our social order, peace and security appear to be declining significantly in several countries. And the level of discontent with the performance of representative institutions has become more unpredictable, as seen in many parts of the world today.

The 2013 Boston Marathon attack in the United States clearly proves that the dignity and worth of the human person are abysmally low, resembling conditions seen during wartime. All the peoples of the world appear to be mindful of wanting to practice tolerance and are conscious of the need for the creation of conditions of stability and well-being. However, the level of improved living standards and greater freedom that people around the world are determined to achieve does not align with their freely expressed will.

Humans elected since their appearance to have their destiny chartered with periods of peace and periods of war. The stumbling blocks that they were at odds over varied in details and in complexity.

Whether during the early days, when people were wandering on the surface of the earth, or right after, when they agglomerated and formed and made themselves pertain to dynasty, kingdom, and so forth, did

they succeed in finding a paradigm that could promise new hopes for a better future for the world? The same is true in our contemporary world; thereupon, the people gave rise to the notion of a state whereby each individual belongs to a specific nation and holds in retrospect a distinguished nationality.

However, it has never appeared that people are as confused about charting their hope for a better future for the world as this past and current generation seems to be manifesting.

There have to be some natural rights that the rules of government are practicing and/or experimenting with; those are failing. If, despite all the government authorities that people practiced from the time of our ancestors to now, passing through Rousseau, who believed that democracy was the best way of ensuring the general welfare while maintaining individual freedom under the rule of law. Likewise, passing through what our fathers and forefathers did in 1945, on the onset of WWII, to unite even people together so people started to act in a spirit of brotherhood towards one another, culminating in all the technological breakthroughs. Instead of peace and security on earth appearing to be going backward rather than forward, there could only be one place to search in for what might have been preventing people from beginning to act in a spirit of brotherhood towards one another other than looking for some sort of a natural right. This natural right must be an agent that apparently, the more people try to come closer to working together, the more they can start to act in a spirit of brotherhood towards one another. The more this agent is indirectly spreading hateful seeds among people, thus unknowingly rendering them less tolerant to peace and security.

Hobbes did argue that his understanding of humans as being of matter and motion, obeying the same physical laws as other matter and motion, can be applied to study the relation between natural and legal rights. If we assert that there is a natural right that cannot be repealed or restrained by humans, then laws may be preventing people from overcoming obstacles to acting in a spirit of brotherhood towards one another. Let us attempt next to find out if there is a specific natural property among the multitude of properties that exist in reality that could be influencing people to be unable to act in a spirit of

brotherhood towards one another. In other words, we will try to find a natural property that is universal and inalienable because it supersedes all rights and is not dependent on the laws, customs, or beliefs of any culture or government.

If we manage to show that there could be a natural right (and specific natural property). We plan to investigate if there is a way to control how it is changing so we can next check if there is a way to manage to control how to make the changes that this natural property undergoes not affect humans so they continue to react in the manner that they have been doing until now. The ultimate goal is to deduce a framework that can be used to construct quantitative models that can be subsequently tested to determine if they can contribute to enabling people to start to act in a spirit of brotherhood towards one another. The quantitative models we propose could assist individuals in controlling and regulating human behavior, preventing each generation from starting anew in their efforts to foster a spirit of brotherhood.

The work plan we will adopt in this chapter will focus on defining what this natural right could encompass. In the following chapters, we will review whether the political order and laws protect people. We will explore whether the natural right we identify rationally justifies people's unwillingness to voluntarily act in a spirit of brotherhood and accept the benefits of various political orders. In subsequent chapters, we will attempt to construct a quantitative model that could help people to study the relation between natural and legal rights. These findings will help to strengthen the legitimacy of the authority of the state over people. Finally, we intend to give a few suggestions as part of what we consider what perhaps people may have to do to start to alleviate the weight of this natural right on the continuity of humanity.

Let us, in accordance with the work plan that we have proposed, proceed to explore to find out if we stumble upon a natural right that we consider could be behind what triggers people to exhibit change or motion. This would be a good start to help us to attempt to determine if we could perhaps rely on theoretical mathematics to deduce a framework that could help us to construct a quantitative model around it. This work would be very useful afterwards, so the entry and exit of people could become fluid and free from any obstacles that impede

human security. This is because people would know what their intention on earth is and can make those who are interested in reproduction know why they are bringing a new person into life.

The Cost of Peace and Security

Since the appearance of humans on Earth, people have been continually and gradually developing, including efforts to define the rights and duties of each individual. Two of the earliest tools that people developed are the knife and the wheel. A knife is a tool with a cutting edge or blade. A wheel is a circular component that is intended to rotate on an axle bearing. Knives and wheels have been essential tools for survival since early man. We have no way of knowing who invented the first knives or the first wheel. Archaeologists assert that early people invented knives during prehistoric times, using them as weapons, tools, and eating utensils. When wheels were used in conjunction with axles, they allowed for the creation of a wheeled vehicle to move heavy objects easily in those earlier days as well.

The people who lived from prehistoric times until the era of Alfred Nobel (1833 – 1896) and the Wright brothers, Orville (1871 – 1948) and Wilbur (1867 – 1912), invented many other tools and instruments that were considered essential for survival. Nobel patented dynamite in 1867. Dynamite is an explosive material that could be used to blast things like rocks or earth, but because it was a safer alternative to gunpowder and nitroglycerin, people began to use it as a gun propellant. The Wright brothers are generally credited with inventing, building, and flying the world's first successful airplane. The invention of the wheel has been crucial for technology as a whole, and modern innovations that are descendants of the wheel include the turbine,

propeller, jet engine, and others. The turning circular parts in the jet engines are responsible for generating motion that creates lift for the airplane.

We chose to highlight the work of Alfred Nobel and the Wright brothers to demonstrate how their contributions enhanced people's understanding and provided alternative methods to achieve similar goals. We also intend to illustrate the connection between their work and the ongoing gradual evolution of society. Knives and dynamite can both cut or tear things apart, but they can also be used as weapons. If a person wants to chop a rock using a knife, it will take him much longer as compared to using a dynamite stick. Both methods ultimately achieve the same result; however, using a knife to cut a stone may take a day, while using a dynamite stick only takes one minute. Similarly, the invention of wheels significantly reduced travel time between point A and point B, greatly enhancing human survival. The reliance on wheels shortened the distance a lot when moving between two points. It takes less time to go from point A to point B using an airplane as compared to a vehicle. Similarly, traveling the same distance by vehicle takes less time than by bicycle. Covering the same distance by bicycle takes less time compared to using a chariot or walking. However, the faster a person chooses a mode of transportation from one point to another, the more they endanger their security. The chances of survivability are much higher when a crash involves a mode of transport using a vehicle than an airplane does. Likewise, the chances of sustaining less body damage are much higher when a person falls from a bicycle as compared to getting involved in a car accident. We can make a similar comparison between the risks of a dynamite stick exploding next to a person and the risks of getting cut with a knife. When a dynamite stick explodes next to a person, the person is much more likely to die than when a person has his hands cut by a knife.

Let us, before we begin, elaborate on our intention of how people's gradual evolution from our ancestors to the year 1900 was making humans shorten the chore time they employed to carry out actions. We even highlighted how each time people were shortening the time it was taking them to execute a chore, people were allowing, at the same time, their security threat to increase. Switch to briefly mentioning a

few figures whose work was guiding the social protection relations under which Alfred Nobel and the Wright Brothers had surrendered some of their freedom in exchange for such survival security.

Similarly, from our ancestors to the time of Nobel and the Wright brothers, people were working to discover ways to progress and reduce the time it takes to complete tasks. In a similar manner, there were people who were working on figuring out how humans can use natural reasoning to transition mankind from dealing with each other on the basis of an anarchic state of nature to a rational approach. People believed that humans were entitled to natural and legal rights and that without an order or doctrine to control and regulate the anarchic state of nature, the human condition would result in a life that is short, nasty, poor, filled with evil, and wicked. People referred to their self-interest in demonstrating values and purposes as a “social contract” because this agreement defined what individuals were willing to give up from their anarchic state of nature to navigate the challenging transition from living in social disorder to establishing social order. To achieve this goal, people organized to form societies and governments, creating doctrines that legitimized the authority of their natural reason over their anarchic states. Five well-known theorists who demonstrated the value and purposes of organized government by comparing the advantages of a social contract with the disadvantages of the state of nature are the Englishmen Thomas Hobbes (1588 – 1679) and John Locke (1632 – 1704), the Dutchman Hugo Grotius (1583 – 1645), the German Samuel Pufendorf (1632 – 1694), and the Frenchman Jean-Jacques Rousseau (1712 – 1778). What distinguished the work of these theorists from other social contracts formulated throughout history is that their doctrines, which attempt to justify the relationship between natural and legal rights, are based on rational consent that serves the self-interest of individuals. The importance of the doctrines formulated by these four theorists lies in the fact that the value and purposes of their work continue to shape the political theories that have guided governance from the past few centuries to the present. The United States Declaration of Independence invoked the Lockean concept of the social contract, for instance. The Rousseau concept states that self-rule (democracy) is the best way of ensuring the general welfare while maintaining individual freedom under the rule of law.

Evidently, we could also say that the works of Grotius, Hobbes, Locke, Pufendorf, Rousseau, and many other equally competent theorists facilitated the security and social protection that Alfred Nobel and the Wright Brothers needed to carry out their work and live their lives. From the day Nobel and the Wright Brothers were born, they, like everyone else living at that time, had to surrender some of their freedom to submit to the authority of the existing legal system. The legitimacy of the social protection and the increased security that Nobel and the Wright Brothers received was derived from Hobbes and the other philosophers mentioned earlier.

We can also say that the increased security asserted by Hobbes and other philosophers would occur in human relations when individuals consent to relinquish some of their freedoms in favor of the absolute authority of the government. Likewise, we should consider how such a state of existence could ensure the general welfare of people while maintaining individual freedom under the rule of law, as Rousseau believed. This statement highlights how the contributions of Alfred Nobel and the Wright brothers at the end of the 19th century, which reduced the time people spend on chores, have helped humanity move away from the obligations to the absolute authority of the government that Hobbes and his fellow philosophers believed would be established on earth.

Let us focus on comparing Alfred Nobel's contributions to reducing chore time to a fraction of a second when executing actions with those of the Wright brothers, considering that Nobel was involved in various professions and activities throughout his life, while the Wright brothers dedicated most of their lives solely to aviation.

Based on the biographical information published about Alfred Nobel, he was a chemist, inventor, engineer, entrepreneur, businessman, author, and pacifist, and he had many varied interests in fields such as poetry, languages, and social science. The areas of interest that Nobel pursued during his life were accessible to anyone who lived from our ancestors to now and had the desire and the inclination to be involved in so many professions or activities during his life as Nobel did. Each time any person exhibits an unnatural change in matter, his action

changes it into something that did not exist previously. Therefore, this power or faculty of inventing, devising, or originating that each person possesses is not the product of some unique intuition but rather the result of some people exercising their imagination in the areas that Nobel pursued more than others. Alfred Nobel did not create anything particularly unique that a knife is incapable of achieving, and we have demonstrated the considerable time that has elapsed since the invention of knives. If people didn't attach any importance to the invention of Nobel, he would have lived and died like any person who ever lived.

We have no way of knowing what made Nobel develop interests in all the fields and areas he worked on and pursued during his life. Dynamite must have gained rapid and widespread use from the time Nobel patented it until his death, allowing him to amass a fortune from its sales. In 1895, Alfred Nobel wrote a will and left much of his fortune to the establishment of the Nobel Prize to honor men and women from all corners of the globe for outstanding achievements in five categories. Those categories are in physics, chemistry, physiology or medicine, literature, and work in peace. Since December 1901, the Nobel Foundation has awarded the Nobel Prize to people who conferred the greatest benefit for humanity in the areas identified by Alfred Nobel.

It is a wonderful gesture on the part of Nobel to leave his fortune to people who have done exemplary work and outstanding achievements in the areas or fields Nobel established his will around. However, before we elaborate on how the world changed after Nobel left much of his wealth to establish the Nobel Prize, it is important to note that in prehistoric times, people relied on their mouths and hands to resolve disputes. As of 1867, people now added dynamite to their list of means or tools that they could use to settle disputes. We can then say until 1867, people were relying on their mouths, hands, bows and arrows, bullets, pistols, and knives to exhibit evil and wicked acts. In 1867, people added dynamite to this list. Likewise, as of 1903, people, thanks to the Wright brothers, began to use airplanes to drop the dynamite that Nobel invented on the people who were in dispute with one another.

The computer is a device that can be programmed to carry out a set of logical operations automatically. An earlier model of the computer began to be in circulation in the mid-1930s. An autopilot is a system used to control the trajectory of a vehicle or a machine without constant 'hands-on' control by a human operator being required. Sperry Corporation developed the first aircraft autopilot in 1912. Autopilots in modern aircraft can automate all of the flight phases from taxiing, takeoff, climbing, cruising (level flight), descent, approach, and landing.

Currently, individuals can use what is known as an unmanned aerial vehicle, which is an aircraft that operates without a human pilot on board, to carry dynamite and allow the computer to guide the aircraft through a series of automated logical operations to drop the dynamite at any desired location on the Earth's surface.

This timeline we created, from prehistoric times to the present, illustrates how people have continuously and gradually developed technologies that have greatly enhanced the ability to perform complex activities compared to the methods used in earlier days. The fact that after Nobel passed away, people continued to develop and to make progress proves the continuity of human development up to now. The only change that happened in the world after Nobel passed away is that the total number of humans who were living in the world in the year 1900 was around 1.6 billion, according to detailed estimates. The total number of humans currently living in the world is estimated at more than 7 billion.

We have no way of knowing what Nobel intended to achieve when he made his will, which stated that he would honor men and women from all corners of the globe for outstanding achievements in physics, chemistry, physiology or medicine, literature, and work in peace, as revealed after his death.

One could argue that Nobel's connection to explosives and inventions useful for warfare might have influenced his interpretation of the idea to honor the best work achieved by men and women in fields such as physics, chemistry, physiology or medicine, literature, and peace,

suggesting that the work recognized could provide greater benefits to humanity compared to the destructive outcomes of dynamite, pistols, bullets, torpedoes, fighter jets, and other weapons.

People define logic as a science that deals with the principles of validity, inference, and demonstration. Anti-logic is the opposite of logic. Anti-logic represents the fundamental difference between Nobel's interpretations of what is important for mankind after his death and the subsequent events that rendered his thoughts unfeasible. If Nobel was born with logic and all the people who lived from his death until now were born with anti-logic, these differences are immutable and unchangeable. Nobel couldn't have been born with anti-logic, nor can he acquire it at any time in his life. All people from our ancestors to now were born without logic and could never hope to acquire it.

In the five categories that Nobel wanted to honor for outstanding achievements, one area even created an international sensation when it was disclosed. The Nobel Prize is the category that he established related to peace.

Physics, chemistry, physiology, medicine, and literature are categories that, if all men and women stop to make outstanding achievements in such fields today, nothing will change on the surface of the earth, and humanity will continue on. All outstanding achievements in physics, chemistry, physiology, medicine, and literature enrich people's lives; however, as progress increases, so does the associated danger, as we mentioned earlier.

Peace is a category that people cannot live without. Humanity could face significant risks if peace and security diminish on earth. Peace is, therefore, a fundamental difference that cannot be a category that makes people understand one another as physics, chemistry, physiology, medicine, or literature does. This is because peace is an immutable and unchangeable difference. If, as of the date when Nobel established the Nobel Peace Prize, people are not able to improve fraternity, to abolish or reduce standing armies, and to hold and promote peace congresses, then it is possible to comprehend what is making maybe people unable to grasp the fundamental difference that is making all those who lived from the date Nobel passed away to now

devote their lives to accomplishing what Nobel desired and to put an end to this peace category remaining among the prizes that are being awarded now. Specifically, as previously mentioned, the two differences (i.e., what Nobel wants people to do and what people cannot do) remain immutable and unchangeable.

We can only search for what prevented people from improving fraternity and enabling humans to act brotherly toward one another since the Nobel Foundation began offering the Nobel Peace Prize by investigating what this constraint might be due to in the world in 1901. The year 1901 is the year when the Nobel Prize money began to be distributed annually in the form of prizes to those who have conferred the greatest benefit to mankind.

Thomas Hobbes (1588–1679) was one of the founders of modern political philosophy and political science. His understanding of humans as being matter and motion, obeying the same physical laws as other matter and motion, remains one of the major topics of political philosophy. Let us therefore build on Hobbes's suggestion that humans could be treated like matter and consider two of the most fundamental laws of physics to see how they can help us quantify the factors that may be preventing people from improving fraternity, so that humans can start to act in a spirit of brotherhood toward one another, beginning with the date when the Nobel Foundation started offering the Nobel Peace Prize.

One of the fundamental laws of physics states that mass can neither be created nor destroyed—that is, mass is conserved. The law of conservation of energy states that energy can change form but cannot be created or destroyed. These two laws of physics provide the basis for two tools that are used regularly in engineering and science. Those two tools are called the mass balance and the energy balance. The conservation of mass allows compiling a budget of the mass of a material in a system. This budget keeps track of the amounts of material entering the system, leaving the system, and the amount formed or destroyed by chemical reactions. The principle of conservation of mass is therefore a means for engineers and scientists to track materials, as it indicates that if the amount of a material increases within a system, that increase cannot result from a "magical"

formation out of nowhere. The material must have been either brought from somewhere or produced via a process with other compounds that were already in the system.

In physics, a mass balance is only meaningful in terms of a specific region of space that has boundaries across which the terms "mass flux in" and "mass flux out" are determined. If we consider that since the start of time, the earth has been exhibiting uninterrupted seedtime and harvest, cold and heat, summer and winter, and day and night. We can then say that the earth is a system with characteristics that allow us to define a control volume boundary for mass balance analysis, revealing the specific reasons people fail to overcome obstacles to agreeing on an immutable, unchangeable difference. As we said, peace on earth is best for both Nobel and the people.

If we consider that since the start of time, the earth has consisted of a collection of unchanging contents made of living and lifeless things, and among all the living things, only humans can reason, speak, and use complex tools to create progress and crises and conflicts. Moreover, if we consider that it is human intellect that has been behind all the changes in matter or creations that have been brought to the world by people over their time on earth. We can say that people, since their appearance on earth, rely on progress for survival and to improve their life conditions.

To make progress, people transform material from terrestrial energy into houses, paper clips, televisions, shoes, etc. By inventing tools, people are also able to accomplish tasks that human bodies could not do using their mouths or hands. For example, each time people cut a tree to use as timber in the erection of a house so people can protect themselves against the elements, this improvement that people registered in the quality of their lives also caused a crisis for the tree and the natural system because people altered what this specific tree was serving in the natural system.

All the creations that people make are made of matter, with the exception of the higher form of intelligence that people are now capable of using to carry out arithmetic or logical operations automatically. However, since this higher form of intelligence that

people are now capable of producing is immaterial, meaning it is like human ingenuity, it resides or is housed in devices or processing units in the same way human imagination is housed in the human body. We can say that all the creations that people make are made of matter, because, as we said, the higher form of intelligence is not capable of surviving outside of the device or the processing unit, which is made of mass.

If we apply the tool that scientists and engineers use whenever they make a mass balance for a material or mass and apply it to track people and all the creations that people do based on what Thomas Hobbes considered that humans' motion also obeys. It is possible to keep track of individuals, their progress, the number of trees they cut down, and other activities to evaluate how people's conditions change over time, which is analogous to the mass balances that people create for any material or mass.

We can conclude that if progress aimed at ensuring human survival increases on Earth, it cannot be attributed to a magical occurrence from nowhere. The rise in progress must have been either introduced on earth from outside sources or produced by a source that already exists on earth. The same can be said about a decrease in progress, even when crises and conflicts increase or decrease on earth. We can also state that any increase in reproduction leads to a surplus in progress, which must also result in a corresponding decrease in the destruction of some other factor. Alternatively, we can say that any decrease in reproduction produces a shortfall in progress; this phenomenon must also have caused a corresponding increase in the “mass” of some other factor.

Let's put in a sample example of what we just said so far. Thomas Hobbes was born in 1588, and he died in 1679. The earth was a collection of unchanging contents during this time. The only thing that was changing on earth was the progress and the crises that people were making there. We can calculate how people's progress changed on earth from 1588 until 1679. We can calculate how many crises the world has known from 1588 until 1679. People were responsible for all the progress recorded between 1588 and 1679. All people are ready to accept that it was human ingenuity, human imagination, and

people's hands that created all the progress that the world witnessed during this period. People understand that the same individuals who contributed to the progress observed from 1588 to 1679 were also involved in the various crises experienced during that time; however, they cannot determine the causes of those crises. Therefore, we were able to compile a budget of the degree or volume of progress people registered from 1588 until 1679, when Thomas Hobbes lived. This budget allowed us to track the increase in progress made during Thomas Hobbes's lifetime, the progress that became obsolete during that same period, and the changes that occurred due to reproduction. The evidence we presented supports Thomas Hobbes's suggestion that humans obey the same physical laws as other matter and motion.

This exercise is similar to what we just completed, which demonstrated the possibility of calculating the number of people born, the progress made, the wars fought, the deaths due to malaria, the number of millionaires, and other relevant statistics from the time Thomas Hobbes lived. We want to repeat the same exercise, but this time we will focus on the period from when the Nobel Foundation began awarding the Nobel Peace Prize in 1901 to the present. However, instead of creating a budget that estimates how many people lived or what changes occurred in the world from 1901 to the present, we will focus on events that are still fresh in people's minds. We are going to only focus on the events that took place during this period, which were counterproductive or productive to stumble upon to offer "the greatest benefit to mankind," which are the exact criteria on the basis of which the Nobel Foundation awards the Nobel Prizes. However, Alfred Nobel defined the productive criteria, which he considered to offer the "greatest benefit to mankind." Those criteria include the outstanding achievements of men and women in interventions aimed at "doing the most or the best work for fraternity between nations, for the abolition or reduction of standing armies, and for the holding and promotion of peace congresses." Therefore, since we already know the positive events that the Nobel Foundation considered contribute to "the greatest benefit to mankind," on its basis the Foundation has been awarding the Nobel Peace Prize since 1901. We are going to focus on the negative events and the counterproductive events that stymie people's efforts to switch and to start to exhibit conducts that produce "the greatest benefit to mankind"

only. Therefore, we are going to look for the events that we think people in them exhibited the total opposite conduct of “doing the most or the best work for fraternity between nations, for the abolition or reduction of standing armies, and for the holding and promotion of peace congresses.” Those events are the ones in which people were exhibiting unfriendly relations between nations rather than fraternity. The events which resulted in the mounting of standing armies instead of the abolition or reduction of standing armies and the events in which, instead of people holding and promoting peace congresses, they were holding and promoting congresses to launch war.

Therefore, since, as we said earlier, it is possible to search from the year 1901 to now for events or conduct in them, people exhibited conduct that is the total opposite of what Alfred Nobel laid down as criteria to win the Nobel Peace Prize if we rely on conducting a balance of such events. Let us next isolate a few events from this period that could fit the criteria that we are searching for. Let us also list what measures people took to address the events. In them, people exhibited conduct that was the total opposite of what Alfred Nobel laid down as criteria to win the Nobel Peace Prize.

It is important to point out that people exhibited conduct that is the total opposite of Alfred Nobel's criteria for the Nobel Peace Prize when addressing the events, and later we need to search for why people are unable to exhibit efforts aimed at “doing the most or the best work for fraternity between nations, for the abolition or reduction of standing armies, and for the holding and promotion of peace congresses.” Therefore, our objective is to identify the measures that people have taken to address why they are unable to abide by the criteria set by Nobel. Next, we will examine the measures we isolate to determine if any of them, assuming there is more than one, could explain why people are unable to exhibit conduct that aligns with the criteria Nobel established for winning the Nobel Peace Prize. Evidently, the results will ultimately help us understand why people are unable to act in a spirit of brotherhood toward one another since the Nobel Foundation began offering the Nobel Peace Prize.

The surface of the earth split in 1900, resulting in the formation of 53 nations. In 1914, WWI drew all 53 sovereign states into two opposing

alliances. The casualties and losses in life during WW1 were over 37 million. The intergovernmental organization founded as a result of the Paris Peace Conference, which ended the First World War in 1920, was called the League of Nations, but it failed to fulfill people's search for a better world. A second World War, also known as WWII, ensued in 1939. Historians claim that WWII brought more outrage and sorrow to the consciousness of humankind than did WWI.

Wars result from disputes that people attempt to resolve through conflict when diplomacy fails. They give rise to extreme violence, social disruption, and economic destruction. As a consequence, the invading countries or leadership promote their political ideals or aims. However, people draw covenants and lessons from wars.

At the end of WW1, the covenant of the League of Nations was to prevent wars through collective security and disarmament and the settling of international disputes through negotiation and arbitration. As such, the people who emerged from WW1 resolved to support what the League of Nations inspired until 1939. On September 1, 1939, World War II began. The League of Nations was abolished in 1946. In 1946, when the League of Nations was abolished, there were a total of 63 states in the world.

People do not derive covenants and draw lessons only from wars and crises in the search to compel peace and a better future. The United States had not yet entered the Second World War when it announced a vision known as the Atlantic Charter declaration, which also involved Great Britain.

This joint declaration, which came to be known as "The Atlantic Charter," was issued on August 14, 1941, between the United States and Great Britain. The Charter detailed what established a vision for a post-World War II world.

The "Atlantic Charter" specified peacetime goals and spelled out affirmations by these two nations toward adherence to concrete goals concerning the war and the post-war world. The document declared "certain common principles in the national policies of their respective

countries on which they based their hopes for a better future for the world.”

The Atlantic Charter was not signed between the United States and Great Britain, but it established 8 points that these two nations hoped could serve for a better future for the world. The 8 points of the Atlantic Charter were *“no territorial aggrandizement; no territorial changes made against the wishes of the people; restoration of self-government to those deprived of it; free access to raw materials; reduction of trade restrictions; global cooperation to secure better economic and social conditions for all; freedom from fear and want; freedom of the seas; and abandonment of the use of force, as well as disarmament of aggressor nations.”*

The promising hopes that the Atlantic Charter echoed for a better future for the world were signed by the USSR and nine other European governments shortly after, on September 24, 1941.

The vision that the Atlantic Charter established for a post-World War II world led the United States to declare on 08 December 1941 that it was entering World War II to bring to an end any threats to world peace.

Universal peace is what prompted other allies, following the United States' entry into World War II, to attend a conference in Washington D.C. on 01 January 1942 to sign a document that established a vision for a better future for the world, which became known as the “Declaration by United Nations.” Representatives from the United Kingdom, the USSR, and China attended the conference.

The “Declaration by United Nations” became synonymous with the term “United Nations” during the war and was considered by some historians to be the formal name under which the unified nations were fighting. Accordingly, the allies who signed the “Declaration by the United Nations” pledged the maximum war efforts and adherence to the Atlantic Charter’s principles. All the allies were committed to an attempt to create a world in which “men in all lands may live out their lives in freedom from fear and want.”

Just as was the case with the intergovernmental organization that was founded as a result of the Paris Peace Conference that ended the First World War in 1920 and was called the League of Nations, its political aims and plans were thought up. In October 1943, representatives from Great Britain, the United States, and the Soviet Union met in Moscow and agreed that a world organization be established for the maintenance of international peace and security and be named the "United Nations." Moreover, in December of the same year, during a meeting in Tehran, which was attended by the United States, the USSR, and Great Britain, a declaration was made to acknowledge that this world organization will prove to be "the supreme responsibility resting to make a peace which will command the goodwill of the overwhelming mass of the peoples of the world and banish the scourge and terror of war for many generations."

In 1945, when World War II ended, 47 out of the 63 countries that made up the world signed the "Declaration by United Nations." The blue print for the newly created world organization was finalized by the allies by then as well.

The purposes and principles that were laid out in 1945 by the member states that signed the "Declaration by United Nations" and that established the international world organization and named it "United Nations" were the following:

- (i) Maintain international peace and security and, to that end, take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace and bring about, by peaceful means and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations that might lead to a breach of the peace;
- (ii) Develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples and take other appropriate measures to strengthen universal peace;

(iii) Achieve international cooperation in solving international problems of an economic, social, cultural, or humanitarian character and in promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion; and

(iv) Be a center for harmonizing the actions of nations in the attainment of these common ends.

The number of sovereign states in the world changed from the end of the war in 1945 to the end of the year, reaching a total of 71. In 1945, several states, including non-sovereign territories, were not recognized as sovereign by a majority of countries. However, as newer nations were being formed, the newer nations that were being created were ratifying the new declaration and becoming members of the newly created international world organization named the United Nations. From 46 nations that ratified the declaration, this number increased to 51 by year-end.

It is unclear whether the nations that existed in 1945 and signed the “Declaration by United Nations” could have created a new world in which “men in all lands may live out their lives in freedom from fear and want” more easily by using the existing number of sovereign states in 1945, including states not recognized as sovereign by a majority of countries, plus non-sovereign territories. One could have expected that in the aftermath of two world wars, people would strive to keep the number of nations to a minimum, as was the case at the end of the war. Consequently, working on even reducing the number even more since, in principle, there shouldn’t be any need for any sovereign identity if all the men in all lands began living out their lives in freedom from fear and want. In this case, those recognized 71 sovereign states that existed at the end of 1945 would start to work together to create no further territorial change. The process of creating new nations continued beyond 1945. Between 1945 and 1948, the number of sovereign nations increased from 71 to 81. In 1948, 7 of the 81 sovereign nations in the world ratified and became members of the newly created international organization, the United Nations, increasing the total number of members to 58.

In 1948, 48 out of the 58 sovereign states that were members of the international world organization named the "United Nations" ratified the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights is an international document that states basic rights and fundamental freedoms to which all human beings are entitled.

The Universal Declaration begins by recognizing that 'the inherent dignity of all members of the human family is the foundation of freedom, justice, and peace in the world.' It declares that human rights are universal to be enjoyed by all people, without distinction of any kind, such as race, sex, color, language, religion, political opinion, etc. The Universal Declaration includes economic, social, and cultural rights, like the right to social security, health, and education, as well as civil and political rights, like the right to life, liberty, free speech, and privacy. The declaration is made up of 30 articles. We picked three articles to share. Article 1 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights states, "All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights." Article 15 of the Human Rights Declaration states, "No one shall be arbitrarily deprived of his nationality nor denied the right to change his nationality." In the same declaration, Article 17 states, "Everyone is entitled to own property alone as well as in association with others."

Earlier in our work, we said that we are going to look for a few events that took place between the years 1901 and now that we consider people exhibited in them conduct that is the total opposite of what Alfred Nobel laid down as criteria to win the Nobel Peace Prize, including listing the measures people took to address the events that evolved. All that we were searching for was if one event had taken place, and as we showed, there was an event between the years 1901 and now in which people exhibited conduct that was the total opposite of what Alfred Nobel laid down as criteria to win the Nobel Peace Prize. There is no need to identify other events.

We also said that what we are going to be interested in the most right after we identify if people exhibited conduct that is the total opposite of what Alfred Nobel laid down as criteria to win the Nobel Peace Prize is going to be the measure that people took to address the consequences of the aftermath of what people exhibited in those

events. It was in the measure that people took that we needed to later search to find why people are not able to exhibit efforts aimed at “doing the most or the best work for fraternity between nations, for the abolition or reduction of standing armies, and for the holding and promotion of peace congresses.”

Based on what we have shown took place on earth after the date the Nobel Foundation began to award the Nobel Prize and the year 1948, the date when we stopped to search for events in which people exhibited conduct that is the total opposite of what Alfred Nobel laid down as criteria to win the Nobel Peace Prize. We could say that there was no difference at all between the criteria on which basis Alfred Nobel wanted the Nobel Foundation to award the Nobel Peace Prize and what people agreed upon to do as measures to increase fraternity between nations, abolish or reduce standing armies, and hold and promote peace congresses.

If the only difference between the date when the Nobel Foundation in the year 1901 began to award the Nobel Peace Prize and when the world was peaceful and after the people of the entire world entered into world wars (twice). The people went through two world wars to agree on pursuing the same criteria that Alfred Nobel suggested people do in his will so people start to act in a spirit of brotherhood toward one another. This signifies that people are not able to respect the criteria that Alfred Nobel defined and the criteria that people themselves derived after undergoing two world wars. Then, this means that we have to look into what could be making it impossible that people respect the criteria that were agreed upon rather than review if there is anything erroneous in the criteria themselves. However, before we start to search for what could be making it impossible that people respect the criteria that were agreed upon from the date the Nobel Foundation began to award the Nobel Prize, let us review how people reacted to the criteria that Alfred Nobel suggested people do as of the year 1900, and it later took people to go through two world wars to reach the same conclusion. We don't think we have to start from the year 1900 to 1948; we already shared how peace and security were like on earth till the year 1948.

We have no way of knowing if Articles 1, 15, and 17 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights have inspired people to be in favor of rights when the universal declaration made them recognize their inherent and inalienable rights to own habitable land and/or to change their nationality. It has had something to do with people's decisions to favor all men in all lands, reaching the ability to live out their lives in freedom from fear and want from going ahead and augmenting the number of nations in the world for human management purposes. Otherwise, if the increase in the number of sovereign states that the world has known from 1948 to now has had something to do with what the postwar peace organization named "United Nations" was broadcasting in the world about its readiness to admit "all peace-loving states that accept the obligations contained in the United Nations Charter" to pledge allegiance to end war and promote peace, justice, and better living for all mankind. This is because the "postwar peace organization" named "United Nations" was not planning on extending such membership to other living creatures who exhibit the same degree of intelligence as humans do and who perhaps could be living on other planets. The people who felt that their inherent and inalienable rights to justice and freedom were not respected by their respective governments, the charters of the "postwar peace organization" named "United Nations," and the articles that the Universal Declaration of Human Rights could have made those people recognize they have inherent and inalienable rights to change their nationality and seek to contribute in their own way so all men in all lands reach a life lived in freedom. The 81 nations that existed on the surface of the earth in 1948 split themselves to give birth to an additional 111 sovereign states, bringing the total number of member states who are attempting to create a new world in which "men in all lands may live out their lives in freedom from fear and want" to 194 nations, whereby 192 nations were members of the international world organization named the United Nations.

Surely, the vision of the leaders of the 58 sovereign states that adopted the Universal Declaration of Human Rights to allow people who are discontent with their own identity and who feel that their own government is not addressing their call to attention to be born free and equal in dignity and rights facilitated machinery that can make people who feel discontent and dissatisfied with the performance of the

political system in their country find a solution. The solution was to seek autonomy so the people who feel discontent and dissatisfied with the performance of the political system in their country can become members of the "postwar peace organization" named "United Nations," which is open to "all peace-loving people that accept the obligations contained in the United Nations Charter" and which is founded on the principles of pledging allegiance to end war and promote peace, justice, and better living for all mankind.

In 2011, all people witnessed the birth of a new nation called South Sudan. The nation of South Sudan rose on the account of the seceded nation of Sudan, which became a new member and joined the international world organization named the United Nations, bringing the total number to 193. For those who don't know, Sudan was born in 1956, when the people of Sudan gained independence from joint British and Egyptian rule. As of 2011, South Sudan profits from the same privileges and immunities that any sovereign nation proclaims.

We don't consider it necessary that we give any detail on how peace and security were like on earth from the year 1900 to 2011 other than to suggest that if any reader wants to reflect on how peace and security changed during this span of time, they should compare what Alfred Nobel in 1900 hoped would one day take place on earth; this is that all people in all lands reach to live out their lives in freedom. And whether or not people split from their own people because they are discontent and dissatisfied with the performance of the political system of their own government and then join back to sit at the same table with those people from whom they split to convert the world into becoming a better place, this phenomenon makes all people in all lands reach to live out their lives in freedom. This is because this approach could become a very heavy undertaking if people are working to do "the most or the best work for fraternity among nations, for the abolition or reduction of standing armies, and for the promotion of peace congresses" from such a large number of bases or nations.

Earlier, we said that after two world wars, one could expect that such experience would bring sorrow into the hearts and minds of the people due to all the fatality and destruction that was registered in the world to push the same people to work together so that all men in all lands

could reach to live out their lives in freedom without having to create so many territorial changes, thus creating, at the same time, so many nations to work together to promote peace, justice, and better living for all mankind. However, the world population in the year 1900 was estimated at 1.6 billion people. In the year 1950 this number reached 2.55 billion people, and in the year 2011, when South Sudan was born, the world population reached 7 billion people. It could very well be that the reorganizational geographical changes that took place from the year 1948 to the year 2011 necessitated that an additional 112 nations be created for the proper management of human activities to attain the goal prescribed in the charter of the "postwar peace organization" named "United Nations." Let us continue to check if in the next four years that followed, people exhibited conduct that was the total opposite of what Alfred Nobel laid down as criteria to win the Nobel Peace Prize so we could confirm to ourselves that perhaps the challenge behind why people are not able to start to act in a spirit of brotherhood toward one another is due to an anomaly in the criteria that people were pursuing so all men in all lands reach to live out their lives in freedom or if we have to look at what could be making it impossible that people respect the criteria.

Precisely, two years after the creation of South Sudan, in late 2013, the world witnessed an event that no observer expected arising within a nation as young as the nation of South Sudan. A civil war broke among the same people who voted themselves to independence from Sudan. The root of the conflict lies in a power struggle over the failure to build the basis of a functional state. Most importantly, the violence is fueled by an ethnic dimension that exacerbates divisions along ethnic lines. Moreover, based on what the Universal Declaration of Human Rights is meant to facilitate, the two sides in the South Sudan dispute are what awaits them: two choices: form a transitional government followed eventually by new elections or agree to split the people of this new country in two.

No one knows how the South Sudan civil war will end or if the people of South Sudan will reconcile without splitting this country in two. But if the people of South Sudan agree to repeat the same chronological events that led to their independence from Sudan, peace deals may precede organizing an independence referendum. Alternatively, the

South Sudanese government can agree to be constituted on the principle of federalism.

Surely, if a number of the 194 nations who are presently unified behind a common vision for the world and the people of South Sudan are already part thereof, agree to split South Sudan in two and then recognize the seceded people so as to be united with them, the number of nations that would be working together on upholding peace and security and preventing new crises and conflicts would reach 194. The people of this hypothetical 194th nation will have borders and sovereign laws and practice friendly relations with fellow citizens, the people of South Sudan (both initially from Sudan), from whom they split. Indeed, if additional new nations in the world are born as a result of the same people deciding to split from their own people, as we saw in the case of the people of Sudan, this will give the people who split from their own people the chance to be heard. This is surely a very positive change because it allows the people who feel deprived and/or discontent and dissatisfied with the performance of the political system of their own government to be heard.

It surely appears that this discontentment and dissatisfaction with the performance of the political system that is permanently being born, no matter what political philosophy people use, means that we have to look at what could be making it impossible for people to respect the criteria that were agreed upon rather than to review if there is anything erroneous in the criteria themselves. We must consider that the people of South Sudan separated from Sudan due to their discontentment and dissatisfaction with the performance of the Sudanese government's political system. The people of Sudan split in the year 1956 because of their dissatisfaction with the political system of the Egyptians and the ruling that the Turkish empire exhibited. The Egyptians split from the British rule in 1953. The British split from the Anglo-Saxon ruling, and the Anglo-Saxon ruling split from the Roman ruling, and so forth. This tends to support that indeed we have to look at what could be making it impossible that people respect the criteria of the political system that people must follow rather than review if there is anything erroneous in the criteria themselves. This is because if no nation can claim that it has managed to make its own people start to act in a spirit of brotherhood toward one another, it is hard to imagine that even if

the people of the world change their nationality and start to consider that they are part of one nation, the ambition that the people launched themselves to attain, that all men in all lands reach to live out their lives in freedom, could be realized. This is because when the world is divided into close to 200 sovereign nations, it is not possible to make the people who live in any given geographical boundary, no matter how small their own geographical boundary is, like giving up some of the material things they accumulate so their own people reach a life of freedom. It is difficult to imagine that people would begin to exhibit such a scenario when people are united under one nation or one world order as they are now.

In fact, if we are to consider that as of 1945, the people of the world are already united and are all subscribers to the common program of purposes and principles embodied in the Charter of the world international organization known as the United Nations. This is because even if the number of nations that made up the world in 1945 split up and created the close to 200 nations that exist in the world now. First it was the same people who split to form the different nations that exist in the world now. Second, all the covenants of the international world organization known as the “United Nations” were inspired by the ideas established in the Atlantic Charter Declaration and the next declaration by the United Nations. The fact that what has shaped many of the world's international global cooperation agreements up to the creation of the postmodern international world organization known as the United Nations, and let us also add all that the post-war peace organization named the United Nations has produced up to now, casts the political ideals or vision of the entire unified people from all 193 countries in the world today. This signifies that the people of the entire world are united under one world order and have been continuously allied in their efforts to implement the political philosophies outlined in the purposes and principles of the international organization known as the United Nations. The aim is that it starts to take effect.

We recognize that we may be jumping the gun because not even a century has passed on this pivotal internationalism ideology or idea that was innate in the covenant included in the League of Nations first, the Atlantic Charter next, and the Declaration by United Nations

henceforward, leading to the modern post-World War international world organization known as the United Nations, via which all peoples are unified, cooperating for the cause of international security and peace. Indeed, this is the political aim or ideal enshrined in rallying and allying all the people of the world to end war and promote peace, justice, and better living for all mankind, ideals that are identical to what Alfred Nobel wanted people to reach.

However, we are to consider that until now, no investigator has demonstrated if, by going ahead and creating nations, people's efforts to convert the world into a better place improve. The entry of the people of South Sudan into a civil war over root causes that were identical to the reason that made those people split in the first place from Sudan. In other words, the root cause of the conflict lies in a power struggle over the failure to build the basis of a functional state. Plus, the fact that the political aims or ideals enshrined in the postmodern international world organization known as the United Nations allow the internationalism ideology to be advocated for if there are people who are discontent and dissatisfied with the performance of the political system of their own government. All that those people who believe they are not getting along with their own leaders to create a functional state have to do is split from their own people if they desire to do so. Then, if those same people split from their own sovereign state, claim that they are ready to rally, and ally themselves with the rest of the people who are working on ending wars and promoting peace, justice, and better living for all mankind. Let us also add that there are specific procedures that the people who split from their people can follow if they wish to enroll in the postmodern international world organization known as the United Nations to join forces with the rest of the "peace-loving states" in upholding the obligations contained in the charter of this union of nations. The next question that arises is simple and straightforward.

New advances in public communications allowed that in 2011, people witnessed how a new nation was born. Any existing nation giving birth to a new nation from 2011 onward should not be too difficult for its people to replicate, particularly since all it takes is to be recognized by other states and governments. How would peace and security in the world look if future members of the human family decided to increase

the number of nations that currently exist from 194 to 195? Will people start to live in peace and practice friendly relations if the number of nations in the world rises? China, which was a fond supporter after World War II of the idea of bringing people of all races and colors to be united and played a founding role in the creation of the world international organization known as the United Nations, from which this country and all the 194 others are today upholding peace and security, is not granting independence to its people who want to split and form the nation of Taiwan. Could we say that since China is not granting independence to its nationals who are after forming the nation of Taiwan, China is obstructing the world from stepping a notch forward closer to getting converted into a better and more peaceful place?

In like manner, how would our world look if the generations that will succeed us decide to do the opposite of what the people of this generation have done and reduce the number of countries that exist in the world from 194 to 2 or 5 or 50? Are the people of this era going to be different than us and triumph at what we are unable to do? Would they be able to create a new hope for a better future for the world, something we seem incapable of achieving so far? Would they be able to isolate the evil imagination that would be pushing them to stop depriving other fellow human beings from getting access to what is required by all people to sustain their survival needs, from water, food, and shelter to access to a good health system and so forth?

If we consider that nothing has really changed fundamentally since the appearance of man, except that new generations (i.e., humans) keep on coming and going, and at the same time these new humans do nothing but make new changes in the existing social conditions and climate and cause social destruction as well. In retrospect, we have nothing but periods of wars, conquest, social and economic crises, famine and misery, and patterns in which we register intellectual and technical development, social improvements, progress, and peace.

From our ancestors to now, all the conflicts and crises, regional and intrastate wars, threats, and tensions that humans have known had one thing in common. They were all initiated to settle disputes related to differences that were either physical or ideological in nature. The

medium over which people resolved to either live in peace with one another or enter into dispute is both matter and the resolve or views expressed through human behavior. To a great extent, the man-made insecurity incidents that mankind has known (via the human behavior that is attached to the physical body) and ideological doctrines crafted its strength. Those doctrines were pushed in the name of religion, in self-defense, to acquire territory or resources, and to further the political aims of the aggressor state's leadership.

Christianity, Islam, Arabism, Hinduism, Zionism, Buddhism, democracy, capitalism, imperialism, socialism, and colonization are examples of ideologies that humanity uses to fulfill their needs for spiritual comfort, rights, order, and expectations. To this day, some individuals believe that the ideas conveyed by ideologies are the sole source for determining the principles necessary for preserving humanity.

All that any human being does during his lifetime is alter matter, and therefore, ideology is the system of abstract thought that mankind uses to draw from it guidance with respect to how to alter matter and how to influence other fellow human beings to conduct themselves during their lifetime.

After World Wars I and II, certain people established a vision for a post-World War II world and lined up all the people of the nations that existed around that time to stand behind supporting their internationalist ideology to jointly toil to maintain international peace and improve the social and economic conditions of people. The individuals who united others behind their purposes and principles are attempting to achieve what religion has historically struggled to accomplish. The challenge to religion until today continues to be how to improve human relations and create social cohesion or social order. All religions preach to a common deity. Instead of people preaching to the same deity united, we now have different people preaching different approaches but expecting that their devotion can serve them toward the same end, explaining their spiritual comfort, rights, order, and expectations.

Therefore, if we consider that the people who established a vision for a post-World War II world are doing the same thing that religion has been trying to achieve from our ancestors to now. The only difference is that instead of people expecting an explanation for their spiritual comfort or rights from this undertaking, what they are seeking is to form a new social order whereby "man in all lands may live out their lives in freedom from fear and want."

According to some estimates, there are more than 4,000 religions in the world. All those religions were the result of splits in faith or belief, leading people to search to interpret their own expectations from religion. In the Christian faith, for example, the people consider the Vatican as the principal common ground from where they seek guidance and interpretation for their faith despite there being many Christian religions in operation.

As we said earlier, not even a century passed on this pivotal internationalism ideology or idea that was innate in the covenant included in the League of Nations first, the Atlantic Charter next, and the Declaration by United Nations henceforward, leading to the modern post-World War international world organization known as the United Nations and via which all peoples are unified, cooperating for the cause of international security and peace. We cannot determine whether the discontent and dissatisfaction with the political system felt by certain individuals led them to separate from their communities, thereby creating a phenomenon similar to the historical splits in religion from our ancestors to the present. We already said that we are jumping the gun by questioning the ideology that was born back in 1945 because the people are just starting to implement the conventions, treaties, laws, and policies that they expect will orient them toward how to reach such a sought-after vision of a new world order in which all men in all lands reach to live out their lives in freedom as per the way Alfred Nobel wanted.

However, since all the ideologies that the member states that are united at the international organization known as the United Nations are developing to reach the goal that all men in all lands reach to live out their lives in freedom are either borrowed from world history or have been improved upon.

More importantly, given that all the ideologies that people address how people alter or interchange with one another "matter." People adapt man-made laws to interpret, by way of them, their own limiting right and that of others to alter matter. Man-made laws are also enacted to interpret to what extent humans can have their own human behavior be influenced to alter matter or to influence others to do the same. The aim is to inspire transformations in both matter and the human behavior of oneself and others that compel societal changes that translate into incremental gains in freedom, justice, and peace. Let us call disengagement from altering matter for the purpose of registering incremental positive change in freedom, justice, and peace as social destruction (or evil). People accept or reject the societal man-made guidelines or doctrine that these two cause and effect bring in, no matter if they know that most other people comply with or go against them.

The ideology that emerged at the end of WWII aims to allow every individual in the human family to live free from fear and want. However, the ideals that on their basis people are united working together to end threats to peace and security, when if it weren't for the selfishness that exists in the hearts and minds of people Alfred Nobel wouldn't have had to leave his fortune to those who demonstrate outstanding achievement in working toward peace.

Considering that freedom, justice, and peace are bodies of man-made states that people have decided to build relations upon and to strengthen, the aim being to condition the behavior of oneself and that of other humans to be passive and peaceful in the way humans alter matter. Let us examine how the work progress has been like since the date the people began to work together on uplifting humanity so each member of the human family can be equal in dignity and rights and commissioned the international organization known as the United Nations to lead in this task.

If the progress that people made shows that humans succeed since they began to work together to convert the world into becoming a better place by changing their attitude, then they unconsciously begin to have power over the two inherent natural mediums in between, matter and

behavior, which are both continuously changing. The main goal is that in so doing, humans become able to overcome the obstacles that are not enabling people to agree on the limiting right of each to alter matter so there would be a hope for a better future for the world and humans can finally attain universal peace. If we find that people have managed to start to exhibit such power, then this would be a sign to support that indeed it is the criteria that are making it impossible for people to begin to act in a spirit of brotherhood toward one another. However, if we find that people do not seem to appear to have power over their behavior, then we could say that it may very well be the case to review if there is anything that could be making it impossible for people to respect the criteria that were agreed upon rather than to review if there is anything erroneous in the criteria themselves. Let us carry out this exercise in the next chapter.

Logic According to Whom?

Social contract is not a new concept. People began to formulate social contracts since the dawn of time. Religious conservatives are a large segment of the world population who believe that God created the universe and rely on religious contract to sketch under such pact their relation with their creator. Religious liberals are the remaining segment of the world populations. The religious liberals establish social contract based on the relation between natural and legal rights.

However, as we discussed in the previous chapter, people continually pursue evolution and progress along this path. We showed how people used knives for survival and how Alfred Nobel contributed to the greater benefit of mankind by inventing dynamite, which allowed people to complete the same task in a fraction of a second compared to using a knife. Until Alfred Nobel invented dynamite, it used to take people many weeks to chop a boulder into small, manageable pieces. After Nobel invented dynamite, the same chore took a fraction of a second.

This element of evolution or progress that continually followed people to get them to switch to realizing their chores using faster means as compared to using primitive methods accompanied human evolution in all other facets. In the previous chapter, we reported the names of some of the philosophers of the 17th and 18th centuries who lived around the time when Alfred Nobel and the Wright Brothers survived

and whose work in the field of political philosophy facilitated the social protection that Nobel and the Wright Brothers needed to be able to come up with each of the inventions they produced. In the same chapter, we then proceeded to showing that it was an anti-logic suggestion on the part of Alfred Nobel to include a category in his will in which men and women can show outstanding achievement in peace to win a prize, because peace is an immutable and unchangeable difference that no human being can disagree upon. We questioned the purpose of Alfred Nobel's decision to go ahead and leave his fortune to men and women who contribute to the greatest benefit of mankind in peace. We then showed what the consequences were when people decided not to go ahead and practice what Alfred Nobel suggested people do. This was to improve fraternity between people, to abolish or reduce standing armies, and to hold and promote peace congresses. We showed that people underwent two back-to-back world wars in a span of a half century in order to reach back to the same conclusion that Alfred Nobel suggested people do to maintain international peace and security in the world. Most importantly, we concluded our chapter by saying that there was a natural right that was making it impossible for people to respect the criteria each time a crisis is undue and people resolve to pursue and fail that is totally unrelated to the criteria that people agree upon. In other words, the challenge doesn't reside at all in the criteria but in those natural rights that people cannot restrain by human laws.

In this present chapter, we are going to repeat the same exercise that we carried out in the previous chapter, but this time we are going to be questioning Alfred Nobel's action to go ahead and suggest that people improve fraternity with one another, abolish or reduce standing armies, and hold and promote peace congresses to ensure peace and security in the world.

People define logic as being a science that deals with the principles of criteria of validity and inference and demonstration. Anti-logic is the opposite of logic. Anti-logic is the fundamental difference between what Nobel interpreted as important for mankind on earth after he passed away and the consequences that transpired when his thoughts were made possible. If Nobel was born with logic and all the people that lived from the date when humanity appeared on earth until Alfred

Nobel lived were born with anti-logic, these are immutable and unchangeable differences. Nobel couldn't have been born with logic, nor can he acquire it at any time in his life. All the people who lived from our ancestors to now were born without anti-logic, and they could never hope to acquire it at any time in their life.

Peace is a category that all people consider impossible to maintain unless humans surrender some of their freedom and submit it to the authority of an order or law. If we consider that half of the world's population identifies as religious conservatives who believe that God created the universe and rely on religious contracts to define their relationship with their creator, then we can understand their perspective. We also consider that all the people who claim that they are religious conservatives also believe that God repented that he created man, as reported in the story of the creation in the Old Testament of the Bible, due to God having found the heart and mind of man evil and full of wickedness after he created this living creature. In other words, all those religious conservatives believe from the days when the story of the Fall of man took place, as reported in Genesis in the Old Testament of the Bible, and God destroyed all living creatures on earth, until now passing through the time span when Alfred Nobel lived, that in the absence of a political order and law, everyone would have unlimited natural freedoms, including the rights to all things, and thus the freedom to plunder, rape, and murder would be an endless war of all against all. It was to show the advantage of people abiding by certain social norms that God interfered and passed even commands so people would stop exhibiting behavior to improve human life.

Likewise, if, as we said, religious liberals are the remaining segment of the world population. The religious liberals establish a social contract based on the relation between natural and legal rights. The contribution that those philosophers who lived in the 17th and 18th century made in the field of political philosophy captures mankind's extraction of what the best social model that people should follow to prevent human's anarchic state of nature from overtaking people rational behavior could look like. Plato (428–348 BC) in *The Republic* Book II, *The Mahāvastu*, which is a text of the Lokottaravada of early Buddhism, and the Greek philosopher Epicurus (341–270 BC) all posed concepts related to social contracts. The theories that those 17th and 18th-

century philosophers formulated take into account or incorporate knowledge or understanding gained by experience from the mistakes of the past. In other words, the theories that those 17th and 18th century philosophers formulated their social contract theories on its principles are nothing but an improved version of what people have been doing since their appearance on the surface of the earth, and that is to continually gradually develop toward reaching so all man in all lands may live out their lives in freedom from fear and want. Therefore, the theories of those philosophers take into account the type of social contract people can surrender in exchange for social protection against mankind's anarchic state of nature.

Hugo Grotius (1625) posited that individual human beings had natural rights but concluded that any breach of these rights should be punished. John Locke (1689) believed that natural rights were inalienable and that the rule of God therefore superseded government authority. Nonetheless, Locke concluded that a state is important to protect the lives, liberty, and property of those who lived within it. Thomas Hobbes (1651) is not only considered one of the founders of modern political philosophy and political science by many philosophers for his scholarly work in social contract theory, but Hobbes also asserted that only when humans consent to abdicate their rights in favor of the absolute authority of government will people spare mankind from “a war of all against all” in the “state of nature.” Samuel Pufendorf (1673) disputed Hobbes's equation of a state of nature with war. In the year 1672, Pufendorf published a book that he titled *De jure naturae et gentium libri octo*. In this book, Pufendorf who was very familiar with the work of Grotius and Hobbes, and therefore, he tries to complete the theory of Grotius by means of the doctrines of Hobbes and of his own ideas which he constructed on jus-gentium. He disputed Hobbes's conception of the state of nature and concluded that the state of nature is not one of war but of peace. But this peace is feeble and insecure, and if something else does not come to its aid, it can do very little for the preservation of mankind. However, his most important point in the *De jure naturae et gentium* was that natural law does not extend beyond the limits of this life and that it confines itself to regulating external acts. Jean-Jacques Rousseau (1762) believed that democracy (self-rule) was the best way of ensuring the general welfare while maintaining individual freedom

under the rule of law. Yet despite Rousseau's belief in human rights due to natural rights, he also believed that people have obligations to each other, which should be bound in a social contract.

Therefore, if the religious or social contract that God and philosophers formulate only demonstrates how, when people use the concept proposed in such work, humans' efforts to be organized improve as compared to the disadvantage of keeping people operating in their own anarchic state of nature. This signifies that we can consider that the problem of political authority is not a contract that is any different than the religion contract that has been in existence from our ancestors to now.

Likewise, if from our ancestors to the date when Alfred Nobel proposed that to maintain international peace in the world people should improve fraternity, abolish or reduce standing armies, and to hold and promote peace congresses passing through those 17th and 18th century philosophers who formulated social contract theories, people were not able to surrender to the religious contract in exchange of winning a treasure in heaven never mind winning protection from social contracts that are man-made.

God, plus all the people that lived, consider that in the absence of order and law to push people to surrender some of their freedoms and to submit to the authority of a form of social or political order, irrespective of how flexible or rigid the doctrine is. The absence of an order will result in everyone having unlimited natural freedoms, including the "right to all things" and thus the freedom to plunder, rape, and murder; there would be an endless "war of all against all," as Thomas Hobbes once said. To avoid this, Hobbes said that "free men contract with each other" to establish communities through a social contract in which they all gain security in return for subjecting themselves to the authority that God commanded or the absolute sovereign, one man or an assembly of men.

Let us show how people reacted to the new social order that people devised at the end of WWII. We already said that people underwent two back-to-back world wars in a span of a half century in order to

reach the same conclusion that Alfred Nobel suggested people do to maintain international peace and security in the world.

Therefore, if the peace and security in the world improved and human life began to be rich, fraternal, friendly, and so forth, we could then say that there is no natural right that could be making it impossible for people to respect the criteria that people put each time a crisis arises and then people resolve to pursue failure. If we show that peace and security were not maintained than the lessons that readers can draw from our work in this chapter would be to go back to doing what the 17th and 18th century philosophers proposed people do to stop humans from continuing to plunder back into their anarchic state of nature so everyone can gain security or social protection. For our part, we are going to consider that the criteria that people agree upon to main peace and security are totally unrelated to the reason why people re not able to surrender some of their freedom in exchange of the security they offer and move to find out if we can establish that there is a natural right that people cannot restrain by human laws.

Up until the year 1896, when Alfred Nobel passed away, people in many parts of the world disregarded and exhibited acts of contempt toward human rights. Many humans were not enjoying freedom of speech and belief and/or freedom from any form of fear and want. People were recursing to oppression to protect the rule of law. Nations were maintaining peace in the world through territorial aggrandizement and territorial changes made against the wishes of the people. The people didn't believe in self-government by those who were deprived of it. People had restricted access to raw materials; expansion of trade was restricted. People were detached from any global cooperation to secure better economic and social conditions for all. People lived under fear and want. Strict access to the seas. There was no restraint on the use of force, as well as friendly means to disarm aggressors.

Could we then say that if Alfred Nobel had not left in his will in the year 1895 a category to recognize men and women who would have done the most or the best work for fraternity between nations, for the abolition or reduction of standing armies and for the holding and promotion of peace congresses, the world would have been better off

as is people living under fear from fear and want. This is because it was only when the Nobel Foundation in the year 1901 began to honor the criteria that Nobel left in his will and to award the Nobel Peace Prize to those who confer such great benefits similar to the one that Nobel proposed that world peace and security turned upside down after his death.

Could we also say that it was only when people in the beginning of the 20th century began to retract from surrendering their freedom to the authority or the political order that people were submitting to that human life became poor and people returned to exhibiting wicked and evil acts identical to how humans behave under their anarchic state of nature? The two back-to-back world wars that people lived through are two examples of the weakness in the political order or doctrine that Alfred Nobel suggested people experiment with, as the world events have shown. When the people of the 20th century began to do as Alfred Nobel suggested, which was against what God and the 17th and 18th century philosophers from Hugo Grotius (1625) to Thomas Hobbes (1651), John Locke (1689), Samuel Pufendorf (1673), and Jean-Jacques Rousseau (1762) suggested. We could all agree that it was only when people stopped respecting the social contract, on whose basis people were governing each other before the start of the 20th century, that humans consequently failed to prevent people from withdrawing their obligation to obey the doctrine that existed, and hence the subsequent 2 world wars were dealt with.

This is again the reason why we said earlier in this present chapter that herein, we are planning to question the rationale that on its basis Alfred Nobel decided to include this category on inviting people to hold fraternal congresses and to abolish or reduce standing armies so people manage to maintain international peace. This is because, as we said, it is an anti-logic request on Nobel's part to propose a category of this nature so people can start to exhibit fraternal attitudes toward one another. Either he, Alfred Nobel, knows what is the greatest benefit to mankind, and on the basis of this pre-programmed knowledge, he proposed that his fortune be disposed to this purpose, or God and all the philosophers who followed and formulated social contracts on how humans should be governed because, according to all of them, it is not

possible that people reach exchange relations on the basis of their state of nature being correct.

Therefore, in order to give Alfred Nobel the benefit of the doubt and consider that his action to propose that people should reach out to each other as he proposed in his will to maintain peace and security, thus making understanding his objective impossible to grasp. Unless Nobel felt remorse in his last days due to how his inventions were useful in the art of making wars, he must have added this peace category in his will accidentally. This is because, based on what we are insinuating, if Alfred Nobel was really concerned about peace and security, Nobel, who lived in Europe, should have known about the work of Hobbes and Rousseau, who were both in favor of people surrendering their freedoms to the absolute legitimacy of the government over the individual. In fact, Nobel, who lived in France as well, should have heard about Rousseau and/or his work. Rousseau, in his influential treatise titled *Oeuvres Completes*, makes a statement in which he said that "man must be forced to be free," which others interpreted to signify that whenever an individual lapses back into his ordinary egoism and disobeys the law, he will be forced to listen to what was decided when the people act collectively.

Let us next repeat the exercise from the previous chapter to show the consequences of people ignoring Alfred Nobel's suggestion to improve fraternity, abolish or reduce standing armies, and promote peace congresses to ensure world peace and security, a course of action that required two world wars to reach. Let us carry out the same exercise, but this time question what the consequence has been of undergoing two world wars to reach the same conclusion that Alfred Nobel suggested, and then continue to work on getting people to improve fraternity with one another, abolish or reduce standing armies, and hold and promote peace congresses to maintain peace and security in the world.

Once again, our intention is to find out if, from the days when the story of the Fall of Man took place as reported in Genesis in the Old Testament of the Bible and God destroyed all living creatures on earth due to God's belief that man's heart is evil, people underwent two world wars to reach the same conclusion that Alfred Nobel proposed,

and that is to attempt to maintain peace on earth on the basis of establishing friendly relations among people. In other words, people underwent two wars to reach a conclusion that God failed to accomplish even after Jesus Christ, who claimed to be his son, failed to accomplish. Let us mention all the distinguished philosophers who lived and argued that only when people surrendered their rights to the authority of the law over the individual would they disengage from their anarchic state of nature and review how peace and security on earth changed after 1945, when people began to practice political philosophies that encourage the establishment of social contracts based on friendly relations. In other words, we are going to examine if, as of the date the Nobel Foundation began to award the Nobel Peace Prize and began to dispense the fortune of Alfred Nobel. That is before people underwent two back-to-back world wars, and people were not ready to stop members from exhibiting evil acts so they could start to act toward one another in a spirit of brotherhood and to get paid for it in return since one person was present to pay for their efforts. How peace and security have gotten in the world after people underwent two world wars to reach the same conclusion that Alfred Nobel suggested and then to allow the Nobel Foundation to continue to dispense the fortune of Alfred Nobel on what Nobel suggested when God and Hobbes and all the other political philosophers argued that if people could act toward each other on a friendly basis, there wouldn't have been evil in the world.

We also said that if we find that the monetary fortune that Alfred Nobel established as of the year 1901 so people start to promote peace with one another has not begun to take roots so people start to act toward one another in a spirit of brotherhood knowing that humans underwent two world wars to reach the same conclusion about they are supposed to do to maintain peace in the world. Then, we said that what could be making impossible that people respect the different social contracts that people have experimented with from religious contract to the social contracts that people formulate could not be something that has to do with the criteria that people devise but the challenge is embedded in a natural contract that people are not able to restrain by human laws.

We should also mention that in the previous chapter we suggested proceeding to check if indeed exist a natural right that is not making people respect the human laws that people enact. However, we then turned around and said that the new social contract that emerged on the aftermath of the two world wars must of have contained pact that seek to incorporate new orders and laws that captures elements of lessons learned from the past contracts. Therefore, we proposed to review if the new social contract that emerged on the aftermath of the two world wars that people claim have outraged their conscious, if indeed shows sign that people began to strive to maintain peace and security. This was to assure ourselves that indeed the main problem that existed in the world until 1945 was indeed embedded in the social contracts that people were experimented up until the first WWI broke, and as we said, has nothing to do with the natural right that we are insinuating could be what is causing this outbreak in peace not able to maintain peace.

On the occasion of the creation of the international world organization known as the United Nations by the 51 states that made up the world at the end of World War II, the Nobel Committee of the Norwegian Parliament awarded the Nobel Peace Prize to Cordell Hull, former United States Secretary of State, for his prominent “participation in the originating of the United Nations.” Hull said during the ceremony held to honor him in the auditorium of the Nobel Institute in Oslo on the afternoon of 10 December 1945: “It is a supreme tragedy to me personally that I am unable to continue making my full contribution to such great international undertakings as the creation of the postwar peace organization, the solution of the many other problems involved in the promotion of international cooperation, and the final development of a full and complete structure of a world order under law.”

The vision of Hull cast what the people of his own nation and all the rest of the men and women of the major power of the era, including the rest of the allies plus the other smaller nations that later joined, expected: the “postwar peace organization,” which they founded on the brink of the aftermath of WWII and named “United Nations,” to achieve and serve in their own search to maintain international peace in the world. The blueprint was crafted to address ideology that lines

up the action of all human activities so as to support social ideals based on the principle of internationalism. To this end, the founding members gave the "postwar peace organization," which they named "United Nations," far-reaching responsibilities over a wide range of cooperation activities in cultural, social, economic, and even military fields to prevent wars and end aggression, including how to seek the independence of colonial peoples. The main aim is to justify the political legitimacy and the political exclusivity of the combined desire to place in the hands of the international organization known as the United Nations. the responsibility to remove any threat to international peace, which was imperative so smaller nations join.

In the history of time, a century is a very small interval to ascertain the effectiveness of any political order, law, or social contract. The postwar peace organization that people entrusted with its ideas, the legitimacy and authority to develop a full and complete structure of a world order under law, has been working on reshaping people's attitudes so human life can be enriched only as of the year 1945. What the postwar peace organization that people named the United Nations is then, as of the year 1945, busy doing is nothing but teaching and educating people on how to begin to have power over two anarchic states of nature, matter and behavior. Those two anarchic natural states are both continuously changing. They both exhibit natural rights that cannot be repealed or restrained by human laws. The main goal is to enable humans to overcome the obstacles that previous generations from our ancestors to the year 1945 were not able to prepare people to overcome. This is to regulate and control the limiting right of each person to alter matter so there would be a hope for a better future for the world and humans can finally attain universal peace. However, since all manmade social or political contracts are a replica of the religious contract that people surrender their rights to uphold, the only exception is the authority that changes the person exhibits in matter; its intention is only destined to serve a different sovereign. In the case of the religious contract, the person consents either explicitly or tacitly to surrender his freedom and to submit it to the authority of his belief or faith. In the case of the manmade social contract, the individual submits his freedom to the authority of his state, his ruler, or his political ideology.

To give an example, the religious conservatives believe that God commanded people in the Old Testament of the Bible not to kill another human being. The religious conservatives have been, since the date their creator passed on this command to not kill, continually gradually developing toward reaching that people who share their same belief stop committing any killing of humans so peace reigns on earth. The new social contract that the people began to surrender their freedoms to rally as of the year 1945 to uphold is innate in the covenant included in the League of Nations, the Atlantic Charter, and the Declaration by the United Nations, leading to the modern post-World War international world organization known as the United Nations. The political ideals in those covenants are enshrined in allying all the people of the world to end war and stop killing. The main aim is to reach so all men in all lands may live out their lives in freedom from fear and want. We can check how effective the new social contract that people introduced in the world as of the year 1945 in the aftermath of two world wars is to support if it has made any difference in contributing to maintaining peace and security in the world. However, let us only stick to showing how effective the efforts that were introduced in the new social ideals that people began to practice as of the year 1945 have been like, to attain that all the people of world reach so all man in all lands may live out their lives in freedom from fear and want. This is because if the religious contract had succeeded before the year 1945, there wouldn't have been a reason for people to introduce new social ideals based on the principle of internationalism to reach the same end of ensuring that people start exhibiting brotherly attitudes toward one another.

Indeed, the establishment of machineries in which people settle their disagreements had been put forth from the days of our ancestors, and all of them never managed to overcome the obstacles that prevent people from agreeing on the limiting right of each to alter matter so there would be a hope for a better future for the world and humans could finally attain universal peace. Therefore, one should not expect the case to have become any different on earth right after the people became united and created, in the year 1945, a postwar peace organization so it could become a new machinery among the many ones that already people developed and used to help them to triumph

over how to make them separate between their natural rights and their legal rights.

Just a few years after the creation of the international world organization known as the United Nations, the search for collective peace among the people of the world and “a world order under law” has proved elusive. The postwar international world organization named the United Nations grew out of the catastrophe of World War I and World War II and began to operate in the year 1945. It didn’t take more than three years, or until the year 1948, for the people of the world to test its covenants to maintain international peace in the world, including how people resolve to reach so all men in all lands may live out their lives in freedom from fear and want. In 1948, the United Nations Security Council, which is one of the six organs within this postwar international world organization named the United Nations, launched its first peace mission to supervise a fragile truce in the first Arab-Israeli war.

We believe that there is no further need for us to continue to go further to support that people appear to have no power over their behavior to review if there is anything that could be making it impossible that people respect the criteria that all humans agree upon in the different social contracts that get formulated to allow us to move to investigate what the natural right that is making it impossible that people respect the human laws that people establish could be due to.

Let us highlight once again that our only intention in this chapter was to reach out to show that people were not able to respect the new social contract that they started to implement in 1945, to assure ourselves that indeed in the new social contract that people began to implement after undergoing two back-to-back world wars were included any new elements to support that people learned from their past and began to surrender some of their freedoms so the problem of political authority or the legitimacy of the authority of the state over the individual can now be on its way to being solved. As we just showed, it only took three years until people under the new social model that they began to implement as of the year 1945 to support that it was not breakable. However, before we charge Alfred Nobel for being the main culprit for all the insecurity that the world has known from the date the

foundation he paid to set up began to award the Nobel Peace Prize in the year 1901 to 1948, for giving people false hope that when humans start to act toward one another in a spirit of brotherhood and or when they start to work on abolishing standing armies, international peace and security will be maintained in the world. Alfred Nobel, had he stuck to what he knows best, which is contributing to the greatest benefit to mankind in the field that he demonstrated outstanding achievements himself in promoting, which is chemistry, and left his philanthropic activities in areas that don't involve work in peace. Perhaps he wouldn't have given false expectations to the leaders that lived at the start of the 20th century to ignore what God, Hobbes, Locke, Grotius, Pufendorf, Rousseau, and many others were saying is required for people to overcome that they don't plunder in the state of nature.

Let us exhibit what has been like next the consequences of people formulating political order and laws to maintain international peace and security in the world on the principles of doing outstanding contributions "to the person who shall have done the most or the best work for fraternity between nations, for the abolition or reduction of standing armies and for the holding and promotion of peace congresses.". As compared to maintaining international peace and security as Hobbes and/or Rousseau suggested when he famously said, "Man must be forced to be free."

In the years that followed the first peace mission that the Security Council of the postwar world organization named the United Nations mounted to supervise a fragile truce in the first Arab-Israeli war in the year 1948. The Security Council, whose purpose was to reduce threats to peace, used its constitutional power and deployed 69 additional peacekeeping operations composed of military personnel from a number of countries, under UN command, to help control and resolve armed conflict. Let us also add that of the 69 total peacekeeping operations that were mounted by the Security Council since 1948, 56 of them were mounted as of 1988. Presently, there are 17 ongoing peacekeeping operations working to provide security and stability on four continents. The current number of 17 UN peace operations deployed on four continents excludes countries whose instabilities are

referred to as the “Arab Spring” or those in which the United Nations provides special political missions.

We have no way of knowing what pushed people as of the year 1988 to start to exhibit ambiguous attitudes towards peace and security in the world to require the Security Council of the United Nations to mount 56 peacekeeping operations. Certainly, the determination of the people to learn from the mistakes of the past and to build a new world body more adequately equipped to maintain international peace in the future has paid off. This is because if this weren't the case, the security and peace in the world may have been worse.

For example, historians claim that the failure of the League of Nations to prevent the outbreak of World War II was due to the League not being adequately equipped with sufficient power to maintain international peace in the world. Therefore, the founders of the postwar peace international organization named the United Nations ensured to equip this new body with constitutional power that was not included in the older intergovernmental organization that was founded as a result of the Paris Peace Conference that ended the First World War in 1920 and was called the League of Nations. The nations who in 1943 based their hopes for a better future for the world and created a “world organization” and named it “United Nations”, agreed that to assist in maintaining peace and security in the world, all member states of the United Nations should make available to the security council necessary armed forces and facilities. The absence of armed forces to deter and suppress acts of aggression was generally considered a fatal weakness in the older intergovernmental organization that was called the League of Nations. For this reason, one of the covenants that was included in the new postwar peace organization named the United Nations was the right of nations to respond to an illegal armed attack in self-defense, as article 51 in the charter guarantees, but not to initiate one.

In the covenant of the new postwar peace organization named United Nations, the Charter recognizes no circumstances under which a nation may legally start a war and or forbade initiating military aggression by any nation but it did not reject the limited right of a state to start a war, provided that it had first submitted the dispute to arbitration, judicial

decision, or for review by the Security Council. If one party accepted the findings of the negotiating body and the second did not, the first might then resort to war legally after a "cooling-off" period. Likewise, if the Security Council decides that a "threat to the peace" exists, it reserves the power to order collective enforcement measures. These measures could include economic sanctions or military measures.

The omissions that the people felt were missing in the covenant of the League of nations and people counter accounted for them in the charter of the newly designed postwar international world organization named United Nations to remedy concerns arising from nations getting involved in supporting any threat to peace helped a lot and came very handy in the year 2001. For instance, the United States considered the 9/11/2001 attack against the World Trade Center in New York an offensive against its citizens and national interest as an act of war. In response, the U.S. government launched an intensive hunt to capture the accomplices, but their efforts were largely ineffective. In the process, the United States invaded two sovereign countries [Afghanistan and Iraq], claiming that the first was harboring the accomplices, and the second represented a potential threat to American national security. The United States' decision to take unilateral action has destabilized global security and continues to threaten that any interference with national security will result in those responsible facing the same consequences.

Another very important contribution to help the people who were united under the flag of the postwar peace organization named United Nations, to making people stop from continuing to have disputes and to settle disagreements using wars came around the same time the United States began to pursue those who were responsible for the September 11 attack.

It so happened that when the people of the world in 1998 began to exhibit an abnormal attitude toward peace and security, there were many people who were concerned about the postwar peace organization named the United Nations. Already, in the year 1997, a broad spectrum of civilian and military peacekeepers and academics from some 230 organizations in 50 countries were engaged in a discussion about how the United Nations could improve fraternity and

peace among nations and peoples. After five years of debate, the participants of this Challenge Project produced a report in February of 2002 titled “Challenges of Peace Operations: Into the 21st Century.” In this report, the participants offered practical recommendations to the United Nations’ DPKO on how to best enhance its capability to conduct multinational and multidisciplinary peace operations.

To center the discussion on how to deal with the changing nature of international and regional conflicts in its wider context, the participants of the Challenge Project said that security “has never been a static concept, and so, since the end of the Cold War, it has been particularly fluid and would continue to be so into the 21st century.” The participants concluded that in the future, security would inevitably be comprehensive and would include both military and non-military aspects. Therefore, given the fact that their focus was on the assessment of peace operations, and granted that other disputes and tensions—apart from international terrorism—have remained unresolved, the participants of the Challenge Project felt that “the need for multilateral peace operations would persist and that these operations would likely continue unabated in the 21st century.” The participants predicted that contemporary and future peace operations would be limited not only to facing the many complexities inherent in conflicts between nations but also to the challenges in rebuilding societies, re-establishing institutions, promoting good governance, restoring infrastructure and the economy, and generally assisting in the promotion of human security and the building of sustainable peace.

The suggestion made by the Challenge Project participant to expand the mandate of peace missions to include intervention in maintaining stability and peace consolidation proved to be very useful in the years to come.

In the United Nations annual newsletter on peacekeeping operations, “Year in Review 2004,” the Peace and Security Section announced that “the year 2004 witnessed an unprecedented surge in the United Nations peacekeeping operations, widening prospects for ending conflicts and raising hopes for peace in war-torn countries. By the end of the year, the number and scope of these operations approached their highest levels ever. At the same time, these new demands placed huge

new strains on the United Nations' resources and prompted the organization to take a critical look at its ability to plan and manage peacekeeping missions... In addition to the 14 ongoing field operations the UN's Department of Peacekeeping Operations (DPKO) was managing in early 2004, three new missions were established during the year, with more on the horizon." However, in *Year in Review 2004*, the DPKO set out the following four principles as part of the UN commitments to make peace a reality: "avoiding UN engagement in hot wars; placing greater emphasis on partnerships; matching mandates with resources; and committing to see the job completed, that is, until peace takes root."

The United Nations peace operations experts warned about strains on resources in the 2004 newsletter, and these warnings proved to be true later. Between 2004 and 2010, ten new missions were mounted during this 6-year span. Peace and security didn't get any better, despite ten UN peacekeeping missions from 2004 to 2010.

Year in Review 2010 was called "A year of complex challenges for UN peace operations." The UN DPKO in this 2010 edition announced that "peacekeeping continues to confront a range of substantive challenges and issues." The UN DPKO in this 2010 review considers that in order to maintain the consent of parties to a peacekeeping operation to bring peace, a fundamental requirement must accompany peace missions. This new condition was how "peacekeeping must sustain international political support throughout the entire lifespan of the mission," or how "peacekeeping must accompany but not substitute for a vibrant and inclusive political process," as a factor critical to success.

Indeed, the role of the United Nations grew, and its purpose is taking on a shape that is different than what was foretold it was supposed to serve. If peacekeepers are telling us that a critical factor to success of their mission is that it must accompany the political process of nations emerging from conflicts. This new requirement is unconventional, so as not to say gloomy.

The United Nations in the 2010 *Year in Review* reported that while some missions retained the traditional ceasefire support, observation,

and monitoring tasks, today's operations were "increasingly called upon to perform a wide range of multi-dimensional and exceptionally sensitive tasks—such as supporting peace processes, building sustainable institutions of governance, reforming security sectors, and building the rule of law, among other tasks."

Year in Review 2010 confirmed the predictions regarding the challenges faced by participants that were made in 2002. Could the United Nations be suggesting that when uniformed personnel (military and police) support a peacebuilding process in a country emerging from conflict, peace will take root and sustainable institutions of governance may develop?

It wasn't demonstrated if the countries that were ruled by all types of military dictatorships or stratocracy forms of government, the people of those nations were free. However, we will limit our concern to pointing out that in the same 2010 Year in Review, the UN DPKO predicted that there may be a reduction in the numbers of peacekeepers in 2011, but this wasn't the case as three missions were started in 2011.

In the same 2010 Year in Review, the UN DPKO reported that the "UN Secretariat and Security Council have put new emphasis on preventative diplomacy as a low-key, long-term, and cost-effective way to encourage peace and stability." Therefore, the UN DPKO predicted in the same 2010 Year in Review that the political role of the UN in offering preventative diplomacy and peacebuilding is expected to grow even more through its political field missions and special envoys conducting peacemaking operations.

The people have experimented with several government forms. The Holy See is one of them and one who helps in the forming of a community of believers and enters into diplomatic relations with states. The Holy See has been recognized as a sovereign entity since medieval times. What the Holy See and what the UN DPKO are predicting its envoys will be doing will be the same except in one feature. This uncommon difference will be the type of clothes each wears. The past few years are not sufficient to predict what the outcome of the efforts of the new political field missions and special envoys conducting peacemaking operations the UN is setting up by

way of the UN DPKO to bring peace and put an end to threats will be like. One concern could be that such efforts don't develop into one day becoming a cult or a form of government that lays out to sovereign states rules and regulations enacted at the UN Security Council, whose membership is divided into permanent and non-permanent status. Five countries possess the permanent status, and the rest are all non-members.

However, the truth is the United Nations Department of Peacekeeping Operations publicized in 2011 a statement to highlight the importance of its work. The message stated, "Peace is a full-time job." Like war, it must be waged...." In this type of broadcast, one explanation for it could be that the United Nations' own admission that global peace and security is perhaps far from being complete. Actually, in the same 2011 Year in Review, the United Nations said, "2011 was far from smooth sailing." The United Nations in 2011 oversaw the challenges from over two dozen United Nations peacekeeping and special political missions working to provide security and stability on four continents".

This effort that the United Nations peacekeepers are displaying across so many continents points to the fact that the United Nations has failed thus far to curtail crises and conflicts in the world. If, indeed, as far back as 1945, the international community endeavored to build a better world, their efforts could have made international peace and security a concrete reality. The purpose, then, of the United Nations would have been to prevent and remove threats to peace worldwide. The United Nations would not have become what it is now: a forum for setting up standing armies as a means to attain peace. In the 2004 year in review, the peace missions announced that the surge in peacekeeping operations, with more on the horizon, widens prospects for ending conflicts. We seem to be witnessing a gross contradiction!

Similarly, the effectiveness shaping the progress of the United Nations and its ongoing peacekeeping missions from 2010 onward, particularly regarding their new interventions in the political processes of nations emerging from conflicts, should help clarify how these efforts are expanding prospects for ending conflicts.

In "Year in Review 2011," the Peace and Security Section announced that "2011 presented a year of complex challenges for UN peace

operations.” These new challenges involved cases of sexual exploitation and abuse by peacekeepers in the exercise of their fundamental duty—to provide stability, security, and peace.

The improper conduct that peacekeepers manifested against their central duty, pointed the head of peace missions field support services in the 2011 newsletter to state, “This exemplary record continues to be clouded by serious acts of misconduct by a few individuals including inexcusable acts of sexual exploitation and abuse that continue at an unacceptable rate.”

At the United Nations today, a new fundamental question begs an answer as peacekeepers are waging efforts to end conflicts and raise hopes for peace. This fundamental question is not about how to prevent new peace operations from forming as per the original purpose of the United Nations. Rather, who will people in conflict or distress zones turn to for help in overcoming their differences if the peace workers trusted with the role of ensuring safety and security are acting against their central duty? This is much more serious than the question of how to keep the surge of insecurity that has been apparent for nearly a decade and for which the United Nations has developed experience to quench, given the large number of peacekeeping missions this international world organization has mounted so far.

The United Nations in 2011 did not solely address challenges. Its member states celebrated good news as well. In “Year in Review 2011,” the Peace and Security Section announced that “The year 2011 witnessed the birth of the Republic of South Sudan.” The newsletter goes on to state, “On 8 July, UN Security Council resolution 1996 authorized the United Nations Mission in South Sudan (UNMISS) to begin the next day: South Sudan’s Independence Day.”

Certainly, the efforts that the people are making so the new peace organizations that emerged in the aftermath of WWII do not fail to prevent the outbreak of World War III so the people who will survive the devastations of another world war find themselves in need of setting up another new machinery in which the people would go to settle their disagreements amicably are something that all people should be congratulated for.

However, it appears that the investments made to learn from past mistakes are failing to teach people to voluntarily bend and begin to exhibit tolerance toward peace and security. People don't want to drift toward a third world war, so new people put into question the worthiness of the postwar international world organization named the United Nations to halt and maintain international peace in the world. Yet at the same time, people appear to be more and more withdrawing their obligation to obey the legitimacy of the ideals that their governments are working hard to secure and are resorting to violence to claim or satisfy what they consider to be their natural rights.

Perhaps the people of this generation are not grasping the implications of what it means to shy away from upholding the political aims or ideals to create conditions of stability and well-being as per what the international world organization known as the United Nations was mandated to lead. So far, nations have attempted to navigate the difficult path from conflict to peace, but doing so has not come without a price.

The United Nations Department of Peacekeeping Operations reports that its corps count today is more than 95,000 UN uniformed personnel (military and police) coming from over 110 countries to maintain peace and security. This large number of uniformed personnel places huge strains on the United Nations resources, which come from the member states. To give an example, the United Nations Department of Peacekeeping Operations reports that the financial costs to keep the United Nations Stabilization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, which is composed of about 20,000 uniformed and civilian personnel, cost close to 1 billion per year. The United Nations Department of Peacekeeping Operations presently maintains 17 United Nations peace operations.

Maintaining peace with the use of uniformed personnel (military and police) is contentious. Since 1945, a significant number of countries in Latin America, Africa, and the Middle East have been common areas for all types of military dictatorships. North Korea is a nation that still rules by military dictatorship. In recent years, tensions between North Korea and the South, as well as other nations, have escalated

significantly. This case shows that a nation cannot claim to be living in freedom from fear and want if the self-determination of its people to attain peace and security is achieved under the protection of uniformed personnel.

The way some nations are protecting their citizens presently is via the use of methods that can strip away the sense of being free or render individuals anonymous in society is also not a way. The United States–Mexico border barrier has not mitigated or tapered the flow of illegal border crossings between the two countries. The same could be said about the wall that separates the Jewish state from the Palestinian. This wall didn't bring stability to this region. The close to 3000 governments and networked private cameras installed in the financial district alone in New York City, in the United States, haven't been able to alter people's attitude to stop crime. The financial district is just a couple of blocks in New York City. The same could be said about the city of London in Great Britain, which benefits from close to some 400,000 surveillance cameras.

Surely, there will be those people who will argue that the security in the world is better off today and that reliance on surveillance cameras could deter people, but the number of peacekeeping missions undertaken so far by the United Nations, which amount to 67, is excessively high. Such a large number of peacekeeping missions raises doubts as far as the sincerity and credibility of those who claim to be pursuing the ideal of unity for a better future for the world. A world in which the dignity and worth of the human person is upheld. This is because it makes no sense to consider that when those people who signed in the year 1776 the United States declaration of Independence and agreed that on the surface of their sovereign land "all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness" that those goals that those people who were going to succeed them were going to reach on the basis of using surveillance cameras and peace missions.

But again, maybe the pursuit of solidarity as a means to reach a better future for the world, common in virtue to what our forefathers announced in the Declaration of Independence of the United States,

may not be what the people of this generation really need. The reasons and conditions that drove the people of prior generations to base their hopes for a better future for the world may well be the same reasons and conditions that now drive people apart. Hull, the “father” of the United Nations, is no longer around to decide the corrective measures needed today in order to accomplish the organization’s anticipated purpose. His successors at the United Nations seem to be unable to use the Security Council as a platform for developing a credible structure for a new world order where the rule of law holds sway. Surely, if Cordell Hull was still alive, chances are he might be wondering about what his “postwar peace organization” has become – a place from where nations are born rather than a place where nations come to be united! A place where nations come to mount peace missions rather than a place where nations come to abolish mounted ones! Hull’s union of nations has proved to be elusive till now. Over half a century after his death, the postwar peace organization, whose blueprint he helped develop with others, has still not succeeded in carrying people from the inception phase to start to fill its purpose. Till now, the peace organization has failed to attain one subtle goal: to create a world in which “men in all lands may live out their lives in freedom from fear and want,” as pledged in “Declarations by United Nations” as far back as 1942. Its role has expanded, now beginning to give birth to new nations. Is this what the United Nations was set up to achieve? Is the UN a way to promote fraternity between people, or a way to confer benefit for humanity?

Whatever the case, if in 1945 the people of the world collectively wanted peace and security, the postwar international world organization named the United Nations should have by now started to show signs that it is going to manage to solve the problems that stand in the way of promoting international cooperation. People wouldn’t be finding themselves continuing to worry about the many issues involved in the promotion of peace. The Security Council of the postwar international world organization named the United Nations, which is charged with the “primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security,” would not have passed more than 2000 resolutions involving threats to peace, breaches of the peace, or acts of aggression by a member state since its inception in 1945. Most importantly, the postwar international world organization named the

United Nations wouldn't be giving the impression as if it is actually headed in the direction of becoming a standing army itself (with potential military ruling involvement as a way to maintain world order), an interesting endeavor for an organization purporting to be the ultimate watchdog for maintaining peace and security. What is being prepared for us at the postwar international world organization named the United Nations is also not clear. Security Council resolution 2098 (2013) extends one of the peace missions mandates in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, and authorizes the deployment of an intervention brigade, which would carry targeted offensive operations against armed groups in order to neutralize them.

The approach advocated in the Challenge Project Report dated in the year 2002 to attain peace and security in the world through the use of peace missions and the new approach that the Security Council adopted in the Democratic Republic of Congo in 2013 could be one way of helping people to identify the kind of peaceful world the postwar international world organization named the United Nations is preparing for us. Moreover, the predictions announced by the experts of the Peace and Security sections in 2004 prepare the UN for further missions, a terrifying prospect. The recommendations expressed by the Challenge Project in 2002 on what contemporary and future peace operations should cover, and what the 2010 Year in Review proved to be true and that was how some missions retained the traditional ceasefire support, observation and monitoring tasks, but today's operations were supporting peace processes, building sustainable institutions of governance, reforming security sectors, etc. The way some countries are now taking unilateral action to address issues that affect their own security, as was the case in Ivory Coast, Central African Republic, Libya, Ukraine, Yemen, and Syria, is not considered internationally lawful. Likewise, splitting nations into smaller geographical boundaries doesn't improve fraternity between people and confer the greatest benefit for humanity as Alfred Nobel wanted, and the crisis in South Sudan is proof.

The above have been some examples that illustrate the abysmally low level of current world security. This has left people wondering whether a world in which people of different nations practicing tolerance could live together in peace and good neighborliness is an attainable

objective at all. In the coming years, if the security situation continues to deteriorate, as per what the Peace and Security Section on UN peace operations has foretold in 2004, that more peace missions are on the horizon, the number of standing peace operations will surely increase. The manner under which the postwar international world organization named United Nations may decide to come together and end conflicts in those nations in conflicts by mounting standing armies as a way to deter aggression or later split those nations into becoming of two geographical boundaries reinforces the current deteriorated state of peace and security in the world. This shows that since 1945 the world has been everything but a better place. The year 2012 didn't register the mounting of any new mission, but chances are that a new mission will be mounted when the conflict ends in Syria.

The Norwegian government awarded the Nobel Peace Prize in 1988 to the Department of Peacekeeping Operations and a second time in 2001 to the United Nations for its work "for a better organized and more peaceful world." We have no way of knowing what exactly the Nobel Foundation saw in the coming together of people that the foundation saw organized to award the Nobel Prize to the postwar international world organization named the United Nations, which is implementing international cooperation ideals, because if the world was anywhere near getting organized, fewer crises would have emerged in the world since the year 2001.

Actually, the Nobel Committee's reasoning behind its decision to award the Nobel Prize to a postwar international world organization named the United Nations in 2001 is unclear. The world events that ensued between the bestowment of the award upon Cordell Hull and the "better organized and more peaceful world" for which the postwar international world organization named United Nations received the prize a second time in 2001 show that the UN has stumbled upon serious setbacks in its effort to convert the world into becoming better organized. Moreover, whereas the objective of the Nobel Peace Prize is the "abolition or reduction of standing armies," the number of standing armies the postwar international world organization named the United Nations has set up has instead been excessive as of 2001.

Actually, the decision of the Nobel Committee to award the 2001 Nobel Peace Prize to the postwar international world organization named United Nations opens a new debate on how is the will left by Alfred Nobel to be interpreted. This decision by the Nobel Committee shows at the very least that humankind has deviated from addressing the real issues of peace and security that were agreed upon in 1945 to be superficially “united” for a better world. It draws attention toward the need to investigate the criteria on which the Nobel Committee based its assessment of the work done by the postwar international world organization named the United Nations in order to bring to light the tangible positive changes that the postwar international world organization named the United Nations interventions and efforts produced so the world would become “better organized and more peaceful,” the reason for which it apparently deserved the blessing of the Nobel Committee and was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize.

As we said earlier, all that people do during their life is make changes to matter. People also influence the human behavior of others to alter Matter in the same way. Matter and the human behavior are on earth before the Nobel Committee started awarding the Peace Prize.

If Alfred Nobel was still alive, he would have most probably reconsidered the work suggested by Hobbes and Rousseau and many political philosophers on what is required to stop people from returning to their state of nature. Thanks to Alfred Nobel in the year were0 when the Nobel Foundation started to award the Nobel Peace Prize to those who work to improve fraternity and promote peace congresses, the world was made of 53 states. In the year 2001, the number of independent nations totaled 192 at the United Nations. In 2011, the United Nations celebrated the birth of a new nation called South Sudan.

Presently, all 194 member states are at the postwar international world organization named the United Nations, united behind upholding a common principle on how to alter matter and influence human behavior, the ultimate goal being to preserve humanity. This signifies that from the days of Alfred Nobel up to the individuals who, in later years decided to award the Nobel Peace Prize to the United Nations in 2001, they all acted based on intuition driven toward believing that

what the postwar international world organization named United Nations since 1945 are working on doing may be is for the good of the world. Those people are trying to triumph where religion has failed.

There are some people who have doubts about the utility of the postwar international world organization named the United Nations to uphold peace and security. Many nations question the implication of the practice of globalization under a Security Council composed of 5 nations only and are calling on the restructuring of the Security Council to admit more members. At the 16th Summit of the Non-Aligned Movement, which was held in Iran in 2012, leaders from more than 120 countries, including 24 presidents, 3 kings, 8 prime ministers and 50 foreign ministers, and other number of the members all called for reform in the UN Security Council. Perhaps it could have been better if Alfred Nobel left his fortune so people use this money to do with it the total opposite of what he called for in his will. Based on what we are insinuating; Alfred Nobel's will should be to encourage outstanding achievement to keep nations distant, pursue the mounting of powerful standing armies, and to those who organize congresses to inform those that plunder they will be paying a big price. If the organization of nonaligned nations, which was founded in 1961 and is composed of 120 members and 17 observers, is to pursue the call to attention by those nations to the need to formulate the security council to create a new world order. This action may be the start of the fall of the peace organization. If so far, after more than 67 years of attempts by the United Nations to maintain peace and security when it was made of 5 permanent members at the Security Council, no indications to buttress optimism are in sight. When the security council is made of more permanent members, the chances to reach consensus are going to be worse.

The predictions of the Challenge Project participants about the fluidity of security in the 21st century are alarming. How things will evolve along these lines is still not clear. This decline of confidence in the exact contribution of the postwar international world organization named the United Nations in maintaining international peace and security is also very scary. The decision of countries to take unilateral action to resolve the issues that can affect their own security is not generally considered internationally lawful. The founding members of

the postwar international world organization named the United Nations now practice preemptive security actions in the name of combatting "threats to the peace" and take measures that include economic sanctions or military measures regularly. The decision of the United States to roll out the controversial Patriot Act in record time (enacted and signed into law in 45 days) after the September 11 incident is also not clear. Many people argued that the US rolled the Patriot Act by invalidating and modifying laws that continue to pose legal challenges over constitutional infringements to civil liberties. Similarly, some nations' methods for ensuring their national security and interests in the future are in serious violation of international law, which the United Nations was established to protect.

We cannot determine why the founders of the postwar international organization known as the United Nations deviated from the clear guidelines outlined in the Charter for achieving a better-organized and a more peaceful world. Maybe the current deterioration of security in the world is indicating a need for some to revisit the United Nations Charter to stop standing armies from continuing to become an unavoidable means of maintaining fraternity among nations and resolving conflicts.

From our part, and as we said in the previous chapter, people are putting in place criteria so people are evoking to create conditions of stability in the world so people start to act toward one another in a spirit of brotherhood. They were not any different from the ones that existed in the world before people underwent two world wars to reach the same conclusion. We insinuated that what could be making it impossible for people to respect the criteria that were agreed upon is natural rights much more than the criteria that people are establishing. We said that even though not even a century passed on the political ideals that people began to practice to convert the world into becoming a better place. We are going to check if the efforts that have been exhausted so far are to understand if there were positive changes registered so far. In other words, if people began to change their attitude so they unconsciously began to have power over the two inherent natural mediums, matter and behavior, which are both continuously changing. This we said was a prerequisite so humans become able to overcome the obstacles that are not enabling people to

agree on the limiting right of each to alter matter so there would be a hope for a better future for the world and humans can finally attain universal peace. We then said that if we find that the progress that people made was positive, there are signs that support that people began to exhibit such power. We will stop our work because this would be a sign to support that indeed it is the criteria that was making it impossible for people to begin to act in a spirit of brotherhood toward one another. However, if we find that people do not seem to have power over their behavior, then we could say that it may very well be the case to review if there is anything that could be making it impossible for people to respect the criteria that were agreed upon rather than to review if there is anything erroneous in the criteria themselves.

Let us in the next chapter try to check if there is a natural right that human laws are not able to restrain, which makes it impossible that people reach so all men in all lands may live out their lives in freedom from fear and want.

By One's Own Measure

When a newborn starts his life journey on earth, he doesn't discover that he exists alone. There will be lots of topics and things that the newborn will have to read and learn about. The newborn will grasp his knowledge from two sources. One source would be what he would learn from others (or what others teach him), and the second source would be what he comprehends himself on his own. However, no matter from which source the newborn obtains the information that he will require until his passage on earth ends. He will be confronted with two types of realities that he wouldn't be able to escape from throughout his entire stay on earth. One of those realities is his natural rights, and the other one is his legal rights. The legal rights would be what has been bestowed on him by a given human system, and the natural rights are a reality privilege that cannot be repealed or restrained by human laws. Let us review the multitude of natural and legal rights that a newborn will encounter, focusing on those that are most relevant to this particular work.

William Shakespeare, in the Nunnery Scene of the play Hamlet, opened with a phrase when the despondent Prince Hamlet was contemplating death and suicide while waiting for the love of his life, Ophelia, by saying "to be, or not to be..." No person knows where the breath of life that lived in Prince Hamlet went when he passed away and his body returned to the earth. However, this is not how the case is when the fetus' stay in the womb ends and the human body exists from this location to begin becoming counted among the living. The next

immediate point of order that takes place after a newborn becomes counted among the living is that he will start to require habitable land.

The total land surface of the earth is a bit above 57,300,000 square miles. About 33% is desert, and about 24% is mountainous. If we subtract this very harsh, uninhabitable land surface from the total land area. This leaves around 24,640,000 square miles of habitable land. In the world there are more than 7 billion people who are living, according to census reports that people emit. 1 square mile is equal to 2,589,988.110 square meters. If we divide the land area that is habitable by the number of people that exist in the world today, this should give about 9 m² of available land area per inhabitant. 9 m² is a surface area that is equivalent to a plot size of 3x3 meters. Indeed, it makes sense that people formed cities and built high rises. If people had agreed to distribute plot sizes of this small size on an equal rights basis to each living person on an equal basis to stop people from arguing with one another that a given person owns more habitable land than another. This approach wouldn't have worked, because no person can sustain himself on such a small plot size due to the natural system having rights that supersede his own survival needs. People sustain their survival needs from water, food, and air, and they do not spend their lives standing. The natural system has rights on when people can plant and harvest the food they use to sustain their survival needs.

All newborns will find that life on earth is not as straightforward as the case was when the newborn lived in his mother's womb or where there was no one who was challenging the newborn on any habitable land or with any of the means required to survive. The newborn will also find that when it is his own turn for his own body to return to the earth, he will stop requiring any habitable land more than the volume of space that his own body occupies. Evidently, depending on the culture or belief that the newborn is told right after birth he pertains to plays a factor. This is because right after a newborn becomes counted among the living, the newborn will find that people on earth are segregated by culture or faith. If the newborn happens to be told that he pertains to a culture or belief that disposes of the body through burning the corpse. In this case, the newborn doesn't continue to occupy habitable land after death. If the newborn is informed that he belongs to a culture or belief that returns the body to the ground after death. In this case, the

newborn will continue to occupy habitable land even after death. This condition of the cadaver occupying habitable land poses a temporary constraint on available unreserved land due to how the people who had lived continue to occupy valuable space that other people who are counted among the living can benefit from to sustain their survival needs. However, the natural system regulates this habitable land that people freeze for their cadaver by changing the natural landmark.

We have no way of knowing where to begin describing the gridlock that the newborn will face while occupying habitable land and requiring sustenance for survival until a decision is made regarding his body disposal. What we can add is that the newborn will discover that the challenge that he will need to worry about to secure habitable land or food to sustain his survival needs is a bliss as compared to another more intricate challenge that he will find people are still dealing with. The newborn will discover that there are seven billion people who, after several billion years since the appearance of man on earth as well, are still divided over whether the universe is based on something objective, outside of human influence or perceptions, or not.

The newborn will find that people are still divided after several billion years on the appearance of man on earth over how the universe originated and are split between those who call themselves "religious conservatives" and those who refer to themselves as "religious liberals." Religious conservatives use guidelines that they claim God passed onto their ancestors on what their natural rights on earth consist of. Till now the segment of the population who consider themselves religious conservatives believe that those natural rights, which even contain guidelines on how people should conduct themselves with one another, are inherent. The religious conservatives keep those guidelines in vigor by circulating them from one generation to the next. The religious conservatives have even mounted many platforms through which they disseminate their beliefs or convictions. Religious liberals who reject the inerrancy and inspiration of religious texts believe in the theory of evolution, which supports the idea that humans are related to primates, such as apes, on the tree of life. The segment of the population that believes in the theory of evolution relies on human laws that contain both natural and legal rights, whose truth was deemed by people on earth.

However, among the multitude of pre-programmed and man-made natural and legal rights that the newborn will encounter, the specific rights he faces will depend on the beliefs instilled by his parents and his own later convictions. The newborn will find that no matter on which spectrum his beliefs fall, i.e., religious conservatives or religious liberals, he still has to juggle two “pre-programmed rights,” and one of them is less challenging than the other. One of those “pre-programmed rights” is not a natural right; rather, it is a form of “special” nepotism that people have converted into what they consider pre-programmed natural rights, depending on the newborn's upbringing. If the newborn holds on to beliefs, those “special” nepotism-type rights that the newborn will claim are natural. The newborn relies on two means to convince him that they are emanating from two legit sources. Those sources are the human laws, and the other source is what the newborn leads himself into believing and that those preprogrammed rights are natural rights just because, according to the belief of the newborn, it was his creator who initiated and converted them into becoming absolute truth. The other “pre-programmed right” is a natural right that competes with all pre-programmed and manmade natural and legal rights that people claim either their creator initiated or their own evolution on earth made them favor. This other “preprogrammed right” is the natural right that the natural system levies and controls on preprogrammed and man-made natural and legal rights. The newborn will find, during the course of the detention of the human body on earth, the real challenge will not be only how to align his state of nature to deal with other people like him trying to do the same during their lives and survive using the same pre-programmed and man-made natural and legal rights but rather how to stop the natural system from holding the upper hand.

We have no way of knowing how the universe originated or if, indeed, something could be formed from nothing, but there is nothing wrong if people did get to let their human imagination get them to wander and to lead them to believe in whatever scenario is possible to explain how the universe originated and/or whatever God pre-programmed. This is because there are even people with religious beliefs who consider “special” nepotism-type pre-programmed rights that even go deeper than the ones we referred to here. The controversy over whether the

universe is based on something objective, outside of human influence or perceptions, dates back to the days of the Pre-Socratic philosophers and/or to the days when the Greek philosopher Protagoras lived, circa 490 to 420 BC. Surely, if the universe is based on something objective, outside of human influence or perceptions, God must have his own reasons for pre-programming whatever rights he sees fit and/or for having created people possessed with human imagination to wander as he did. However, the decision of God to remain invisible from his creation is a valid reason to support that people are not to be blamed if they did let their human imagination begin to postulate that the universe was created through an explosion and/or that humans are related to primates, like apes, on the tree of life and so forth. If people emerged from here on earth, as some segment of people consider to be the case, it is really strange despite how much time has elapsed on the existence of mammals on earth. There hasn't been a case, neither in reality nor in the laboratory, whereby on the tree of life any specific beast showed any sign that it was capable of expressing the same aptitudes that humans can exhibit, like being able to reason, speak, and use complex tools. Apes are living creatures that are not extinct on earth, and there has been no evidence since the time people invented means to keep records to point to show that humans evolved from apes on the tree of life. Whatever people use to support that humans are related to primates, like apes, on the tree of life are nothing but extrapolations that earlier people concluded in the same way people in our modern times reach to marginalize the value of the breath of life due to how easy people can obtain one and later make others be denied it. People don't want to recognize that it is possible for "nothing" to exist, and the proof of that is our own creation when it transcends in the form of a human being. What people don't want to take into account is that it is when "nothing" becomes something that the accountability transforms. This is because nothing that becomes a "thing" goes back to becoming "nothing." Therefore, the starting point is only important if it leads to a change in the ending. It is not the visible ending that counts but the invisible because it defines the starting point. Jesus Christ was very clear in the New Testament of the Bible about what to expect for those who kill the body, as they can do no more after that.

The good news for us in this work, at least, is there is one natural and legal right that all people, no matter what side of the tree of life they are on, i.e., religious conservatives or religious liberals, both segments agree on: among the many intentions people serve on earth, the management and the distribution of the habitable land and the earth's resources fall on people.

We wouldn't know from where to start to describe how life on earth has been like since the date people began to believe that they were either endowed with handling the management and the distribution of the habitable land and the earth's resources or took it upon themselves to do it arbitrarily due to no other living creature questioning them about it until now. From the time of our ancestors to now, people began to assign for themselves custodianship functions of habitable land and earthly resources, thus preventing other people from sustaining their survival needs and satiating their earthly desires by relying on pre-programmed and manmade natural and legal rights to help them back up their actions. Moreover, as if people's decision to assign custodianship functions of habitable land to prevent other people from sustaining their survival needs and/or to satiate their earthly desires from whatever their own human imagination and/or human ingenuity leads them to conceive were not enough. From the time of our ancestors to now, people began to structure their relations on principles that allowed them to accumulate and trickle habitable land and material things to designated people based on pre-programmed and manmade natural and legal rights as well. The law of inheritance that people on both sides of the tree of life have been reaffirming their faith in its covenants since it was introduced shows that people desire to promote respect for other humans' inalienable right to sustain their survival needs and to satiate their earthly desires from habitable land and material things. There is no need to teach and educate people on what humans would need to do to get them to begin to aspire to promote friendly relations with one another no matter what their race, color, sex, religion, or political or other opinion is like or about. As the law of inheritance has shown, people are capable of observing and trickling habitable land and material things to designated people so they can sustain their survival needs and satiate their earthly desires irrespective of distinction. In other words, people do not strive and employ any machinery when it comes to trickling

habitable land and material things to designated people whenever people kick in the law of inheritance to work in their own advantage for other than ensuring that the formalities are in order. This supports that people are able to observe pre-programmed and manmade natural and legal rights so all people can sustain their survival needs and satiate their earthly desires. If people are refusing to promote relations with people who are unknown to them, those people reach to begin to have access to their inalienable pre-programmed and manmade natural and legal rights to sustain their survival needs and to satiate their earthly desires as well. The problem preventing people from promoting relations with those unknown to them, hindering access to their inalienable pre-programmed and manmade natural and legal rights needed for survival and to satisfy earthly desires, relates to disposition rather than ability.

Disposition is an action that is brought about of one's own will. If people are refusing to promote relations with people who are unknown to them, so those reach to begin to have access to their inalienable pre-programmed and man-made natural and legal rights. This conduct implies a voluntary freedom and spontaneity of choice on the part of those who exhibit a disposition to take action on the anticipated wishes of others, either voluntarily or because they refuse to respect the external compulsion. This is because if, to the contrary, people exhibit indisposition, this could either be because people are not able to voluntarily or under external compulsion act on the anticipated wishes of the others or the actions themselves are impossible to be realized and incomprehensible.

Humans are a species that need to keep their bodies on the surface of the earth, thus requiring habitable land. Humans cannot meet their survival needs without access to habitable land, as they rely on the earth to provide the food necessary for their survival. We can understand why people sometimes cannot meet others' survival needs, because this behavior is based on a full understanding of the actions taken and their consequences. Therefore, since the consequence that is supposed to be produced is a fully known action in our problem, we can say it is known. The reluctance of people to act voluntarily or under external pressure in accordance with the anticipated wishes of

others can only be attributed to their inability to do so in the context of our problem.

However, since this indisposition or powerlessness by people to act either voluntarily or under external compulsion on the anticipated wishes of the others so other human beings could also sustain their survival needs from habitable land is, as we have shown, people have the power to relax if they desire, as the case is like whenever they kick to work the law of inheritance or whenever they marry a person whom they never met before.

So, the main challenge in getting people to promote relations with strangers to meet their survival needs is subduing their will to act on such dispositions. This scenario signifies a number of conclusions.

First, if people do not engage in any sort of disposition with people who are unknown to them, they wouldn't be obliged to engage their will either voluntarily or under external compulsion in the anticipated wishes of the others. Second, the fewer dispositions people have to address, the better off they would be because they wouldn't have to voluntarily or under external compulsion act on the anticipated wishes of the others.

People act in their interest or to help others. People possess human imagination and ingenuity, which depend on material resources that are unevenly distributed across the earth; therefore, if given the choice, humans would prefer to own the entire planet so that whenever they conceive a new creation, their earthly desires can be realized. Therefore, it is not in anyone's best interest to reduce access to habitable land, as doing so limits access to the resources necessary for sustaining and fulfilling earthly desires. We previously stated that even if the habitable land on Earth were divided equally among the more than 7 billion people, each individual would still face unequal treatment, which would fail to meet basic human survival needs and would not satisfy people's earthly desires. This argument means that, besides the lack of enough habitable land for equal distribution, if people did not invent the concept of societies to keep habitable land free to sustain survival needs and to satiate earthly desires, controlling reproduction would be necessary for survival.

This argument suggests that when people choose to reproduce, the resulting population growth compels them to form societies; this societal structure is not a choice made under external pressure, but rather a voluntary action that has occurred from the dawn of time to the present. First, this argument means that people's inability or unwillingness to act, either voluntarily or under external pressure, based on the anticipated wishes of others, affects the ability of other human beings to sustain their survival needs from habitable land. Second, if people are unable to voluntarily or under external compulsion act on the anticipated wishes of others, then other human beings who are alive could also sustain their survival needs from habitable land. This situation suggests that people's indisposition may stem from being asked to act on pre-programmed and manmade natural and legal rights, rather than from their inherent good or evil nature, because they may be living beings inherently unable to surrender some of their freedom to these rights, which are beyond their control.

However, as we said, people are able to voluntarily act whenever the pre-programmed and man-made natural and legal rights disposition evokes certain people, but when the case involves people who are unknown to the person, then people kick the disposition to either voluntarily or under external compulsion act. Then, what could be making people act on pre-programmed and manmade natural and legal rights, either voluntarily or under external compulsion, is not due to people's ability to control their will or act favorably but rather to their inherent inability to surrender to these rights, regardless of how much they may seem ready or eager to fulfill the wishes of others.

This situation signifies that if the pre-programmed and man-made natural and legal rights are unable to explicitly or tacitly get people to surrender some of their freedoms and to submit to the authority of the wishes of others so everyone can also manage to sustain survival needs and satiate earthly desires, then the system is flawed. This situation signifies that the challenge preventing people from surrendering some of their freedoms and submitting to the authority of the wishes of others—so other human beings can also sustain their survival needs and satiate their earthly desires—lies outside the criteria included in

preprogrammed and man-made natural and legal rights. Rather, the challenge lies in understanding what compels people to feel obligated to take action.

We know what those two dispositions are, and people can act upon them starting from now to stop people from becoming knowledgeable about, voluntarily or under external compulsion, submitting some of their freedom to the authority of the pre-programmed and manmade natural and legal right that other people expect them to express readiness to accede to. One disposition is to stop population growth. The other disposition is to stop people from becoming knowledgeable enough to voluntarily or under external compulsion submit some of their freedom to the authority of the preprogrammed and man-made natural and legal rights.

People have a way to stop population growth. People have two options for controlling population growth: engaging in wars and implementing birth control measures. When population growth is reduced to a level that doesn't make the people feel confronted with having to voluntarily or under external compulsion submit some of their freedom to the authority of preprogrammed and man-made natural and legal rights. This phenomenon will take care of this disposition naturally. This situation is because people wouldn't require establishing societies, so they have to worry about voluntarily or under external compulsion submitting some of their freedom to the authority of the pre-programmed and man-made natural and legal rights so other people can sustain their survival needs and satiate their earthly desires.

Let us provide an example to clarify our previous points, as the question then becomes simple and straightforward. Why continue to bring new people into the world to live a miserable life if, as we are suggesting, humans are living beings that, by their very nature, cannot surrender any of their freedom to pre-programmed and man-made natural and legal rights? But if this argument is true, it means people are living creatures that can't give up some of their freedom to pre-programmed and man-made natural and legal rights. Then it would make no difference if people pursue birth control measures. People must still control and regulate this natural right, which pre-programmed and man-made natural and legal rights cannot restrain.

People agree that no one should be free to wander the earth, so they drafted formalities to prevent movement between geographical boundaries, forcing those with fewer natural resources to struggle to meet their survival needs and earthly desires. The individuals who drafted this disposition are willing to allow unknown people to wander and sustain their survival needs while satisfying their earthly desires within the geographical boundaries they have established, regardless of the individuals' race, color, sex, religion, political or other opinions, national or social origin, property, birth, or any other status. The only concern of those who drafted such dispositions or formalities is that individuals unknown to them, regardless of their race, color, sex, religion, political or other opinions, national or social origin, property, birth, or other status, pledge allegiance to uphold their principles and abide by the laws in force.

People know that regardless of what they may do during their lives, without access to social improvement, they will be unable to access the primordial elements that can sustain their survival needs or earthly desires. People also know that humans must increase their social space and upgrade the abundance and quality of natural matter to sustain their survival needs and earthly desires through social improvement.

People rely on natural matter to widen their social improvement standing or on social space to sustain their survival needs and earthly desires. The natural system regulates the natural resources that people use to achieve social improvement and the social spaces that help them meet their survival needs and earthly desires. This situation signifies that, despite efforts to confine human activities within geographical boundaries, self-sustainability from natural matter or social space is impossible. This is because the natural matter from which people produce all their social improvement is not everywhere on earth abundant, and so is the arable social space from where people sustain their survival needs and satiate earthly desires.

The dispositions to take are clear if people have decided to build relations on the basis of cutting the surface of the earth into smaller territory whereby, under each geographical area, the people who are united by common descent, history, culture, religion, language, etc.

live. One disposition is to build a wall and manage to do with whatever is available in terms of natural matter or arable land within the geographical boundaries that the people have drawn. Another disposition is to develop friendly relations with the nations or people who live on the outside of the boundary to allow either side access to whatever each party is missing. Third, practise oppression and tyranny so that each group of people who have united to form what they call a 'nation' can obtain the natural resources they are lacking and need.

There is no other disposition that people can consider besides those three options that we shared. Of course, we are leaving aside the option of regulating birth control or the employment of wars to reduce the demand for habitable land or social space. People already tried the three dispositions that people could use to maintain international peace, and neither method managed to help people to begin to act towards one another in a spirit of brotherhood.

Hence, among the two criteria that people are not able to meet under either disposition among the three, they manage to begin to act towards one another in a spirit of brotherhood, which we said people need social space to accommodate. Those two were social spaces to seek the primordial elements from which people produce all their progress or social improvement, and the other one is a social space to seek the same primordial elements, which this time are arable lands so people can sustain their survival needs and earthly desires.

We can next say that if people didn't take upon themselves the responsibility of being knowledgeable about the need to have to progress and/or to have to sustain their survival needs and to satiate their earthly desires from habitable land, people wouldn't find themselves having to deal with any of those three dispositions that we stated.

Therefore, abstaining from reproduction naturally addresses the tendency of people to act on their desires. We can then say that if it weren't for the disposition that people are taking to progress, humans wouldn't require habitable land more than what they require to sustain their survival needs and to satiate their earthly desires. This means that it is not necessarily due to people's own makeup being based on good

or evil virtues that people are not able to act towards one another in a spirit of brotherhood. Rather, the indisposition could very well be due to people's pursuit of acting on pre-programmed and manmade natural and legal rights, aiming to help people progress, which could be something that people surrender some of their freedom in order to pursue. People become forced to give up either progress for peace and security or pursue progress and forgo peace and security.

If what we are suggesting is true, then people must choose between forgoing progress or evolution and maintaining peace and security. If, as we have been suggesting, humans are indeed living creatures who, by nature, cannot surrender any of their freedom to programmed or manmade natural and legal rights, then what we are insinuating must be true; otherwise, it is false. This is because if the other way were true, people wouldn't be a species that is capable of voluntarily or under external compulsion acting on the anticipated wishes of the others. Humans' ability to exhibit a disposition to voluntarily or under external compulsion act on the anticipated wishes of the others signifies that if humans were not driven to act on something, they would have no reason to take any disposition.

The breach that happens each time people are asked to take any disposition and they fail to act upon it is not due to ambiguity in the preprogrammed and man-made natural and legal rights criteria. The consequences of not acting on the pre-programmed and man-made natural and legal rights criteria are known. The dilemma is that people didn't take upon themselves the responsibility of developing disposition or involving each other with having to act on any type of disposition. People might remain uninformed and avoid acting on the anticipated wishes or dispositions of others, whether voluntarily or under compulsion. In other words, if people stuck to living their lives doing what animals do, taking care of their own survival needs and earthly desires, people would have spared mankind from embarking on attempting to attain a vision that people from our ancestors to now have demonstrated indisposition to respect. This is because people were not at all concerned with the equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family to the pre-programmed and man-made natural and legal rights that people claim they are striving to attain. There is nothing simpler that people could do to stop all the insecurity

that has been trailing humanity from our ancestors to now to convert peace and security into becoming a static concept other than to control and regulate the world's population growth, as we said. This action will switch all the resources that people employ to maintain peace and security so people could use them to start to sustain their survival needs and satiate their earthly desires better.

However, if people are not ready to regulate reproduction, and from our ancestors to now, people haven't been able to act on the pre-programmed and man-made natural and legal right that people dispose of for fear of their absence making humans return to their state of nature, then... This dilemma trickles down to a fundamental question, and this has to do with figuring out how people reached this conclusion that they began to dispose of as of 1945 to begin to develop friendly relations with nations or people that are not united with them by common descent, history, culture, religion, language, etc. criteria that led in the first place to create geographical segregation or the sovereign nation principle.

Either people are taking such dispositions for fear, or they are doing something wrong when they are not permitting that other people do to sustain their survival needs or to satiate their earthly desires. Therefore, in either case, it is a pre-programmed and man-made natural and legal right that makes people recognise either disposition. Then, we can say that if people hadn't taken it upon themselves to begin, as of the year 1945, to implement pre-programmed and man-made natural and legal rights on the basis of friendly relations with nations, people would have continued to practise oppression and tyranny as was the case, and humanity would have survived.

The question that posits itself next is not 'Why did people switch from continuing to practise oppression and tyranny?' but a much deeper, fundamental question. How did people establish the idea that when people return to the state of nature, a state in which self-interest and the absence of any form of natural rights are a poor, nasty, or short social order? All people are programmed to die, and therefore, whoever is not happy with living under a state of nature, in which self-interest and the absence of any form of natural rights are proclaimed, all he has to do is refrain from reproducing, since it is not possible for

any person, once he is counted among the living, to go back in time. This also means that either people are arrogating an intention that is not what from our ancestors to now humans are leading themselves to believe their presence on earth can overcome or the pre-programmed and manmade natural and legal right that people are afraid that if they don't surrender some of their freedom to pursue, thus returning humans to their state of nature, contains erroneous perceptions.

However, as we said, even when people practiced oppression and tyranny, which is a form of existence under a state of nature, given how when people had the right to all things, specific people had unlimited natural freedom, and even such a state still allowed people to continue to plunder, rape, and murder. We reject the idea that the pre-programmed and man-made natural and legal right preventing plundering, raping, and murdering is a disposition that people voluntarily or under external compulsion pursue to contain erroneous perceptions about how poor and nasty human life would be in a natural state. Moreover, as we said, the more people are introduced to concepts, the more they are exposed to more and more preprogrammed and man-made natural and legal rights. In other words, these concepts are primarily designed to encourage people to distance themselves from their natural state. The more people become indisposed, either voluntarily or under external compulsion, to recognize the equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family to the pre-programmed and man-made natural and legal right that people claim they are striving to make sure everyone attains through evolution. Let us also add that those pre-programmed and manmade natural and legal rights are initiatives that people willingly dispose of, as was the case when people took it upon themselves the responsibility of ensuring that people who are unknown to them sustain their survival needs and satiate their earthly desires. We should not support the decline of peace and security in the world since 1945, when people began to pursue friendly relations instead of policies that favor oppression and tyranny.

Indeed, if philosophers or scientific investigators have demonstrated that humans are truly related to primates, such as apes, on the tree of life, this conclusion would help explain why humans have become indispensable, from the time of our ancestors to the present, in acting according to the principles outlined by pre-programmed and man-

made natural and legal rights. In this case, everyone can establish that humans are beasts, and therefore there is nothing awkward in the way humans are behaving. Such a finding would support why people are not able to surrender voluntarily or under external compulsion some of their freedom to pursue and why people prepare to lapse and return back into their state of nature. However, what such a finding will first and foremost reveal is that what humans have been arrogating as the intention of humans serving on earth as regards the custodianship function that this human species has been playing from our ancestors to now is only due to how humans' capacity to reason, speak, and use complex tools has been helping humans to bestow their hegemony on other mammals or other living creatures who are like them on the surface of the earth, working either voluntarily or under external compulsion, surrendering some of their freedom each selection according to their own pre-programmed and natural rights.

However, any information to support whether humans are truly related to primates, like apes, on the tree of life would help to explain what the root cause for the human insecurity problem that has accompanied people from the time of our ancestors to now is. This will not mean that people could stop to look for a solution to the human insecurity problem, whose impact seems to have gotten more complicated and worse when people increased in number on earth as compared to when this number was low. Most importantly, as previously mentioned, there are two social models that people could experiment with to learn how to maintain international peace and security, and the year 1945 marks the point at which humanity can be said to have practiced both. However, neither when people lived under tyranny and oppression nor when humans began to practice the development of friendly relations between people did such a switch make a difference in maintaining international peace. Moreover, even animals that do not show any signs of having established pre-programmed natural and legal rights among themselves appear to be able to maintain peace with one another, each species according to its kind. This claim cannot be made by anyone, even when we categorize individuals based on race, color, sex, religion, political or other opinions, national or social origin, property, birth, or other status. The human insecurity has gotten worse precisely when people began to remove the barriers to any form of integration.

Therefore, a big segment of the population in the world considers itself religious liberals. Those religious liberals believe that humans are related to primates, like apes, on the tree of life. The following spillover summarizes what sets religious liberals apart from the gorilla and chimpanzee, which they believe they evolved from due to their close relationship in the tree of life. The religious liberals are a primate species that is able to reason, speak, and use complex tools. The religious liberals also hold the belief that the hominid species from which they descended on the tree of life is extinct. This is the reason why the living gorilla and chimpanzee are unable to exhibit this unique distinction that their spillover can display.

Moreover, given that even if we are to go along and support the belief that the religious liberals disseminate on humans being related to primates, like apes, on the tree of life and consider that such a hypothesis is true. From our ancestors until now, no historian, scientist, or philosopher has reported about any primate or wildlife species, whether the creatures live on earth or in water, having established each one according to its species or in conjunction with the custodianship function of habitable land, inheritance laws, restraining mobility laws, and so forth in the same way people do.

We can then say that this disposition that the segment of the population who consider themselves religious liberals introduced to begin to institute custodianship functions of habitable land, inheritance laws, restraining mobility laws, and so forth in the same way such primate species have been doing was a practice that was picked from two sources. Either the gorilla and chimpanzee, who formerly inhabited the earth and who are now extinct but were man's nearest allies, possessed distinct nepotism that their other fellow primates or wildlife lacked, prompting them to begin to pursue to institute custodianship functions of habitable land, inheritance laws, restraining mobility laws, and so forth. Alternatively, the gorilla or chimpanzee, from which the segment of the population who consider themselves religious liberals and descended on the tree of life but who are now extinct, may have been the only ones to show a unique trait that no other primates or wildlife exhibited. The abilities to reason, speak, and use complex tools suggest that the idea to establish custodianship functions for habitable land,

inheritance laws, and mobility restrictions may be the original source from which these primates evolved.

We think it is unlikely that religious liberals in the population have benefited from distinct nepotism compared to other primates or wildlife. This is because we now know that this distinct species we call humans, originally related to primates like apes on the tree of life, is less powerful than other distinct primates or wild animals. Only when this particular primate species that is considered a descendant from apes on the tree of life applies its unique distinction to reason, speak, and use complex tools does this genus become capable of introducing dispositions of the kind we are referring to.

We have no way of knowing what exactly could be preventing segments of the population who consider themselves descendants of primates like apes from beginning to act in a spirit of brotherhood with other religious liberals who share the same beliefs about the origin of the universe. Religious liberals cannot exhibit a brotherly attitude, either voluntarily or under external compulsion, towards the anticipated manmade natural and legal rights that such a species formulates. The religious liberals who exhibit distinction with respect to race, color, sex, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth, or other status are unable to act on the anticipated manmade natural and legal rights that they formulate, neither when it comes to putting in march the political, social, or economic order they formulate and agree to surrender to its authority in exchange for protection of their remaining rights nor when it comes to exercising developing friendly relationships on identical rights when it comes to dealing with others who do not pledge the same sovereignty.

If the analysis that we carried out so far contains any element of truth. What could be preventing the segment of the population that considers itself to be religious liberals from acting on the anticipated manmade natural and legal rights that get formulated to in turn maintain peace and security among their look-alikes is due to their concurrence to let the only distinction that distinguishes them from other primate or wildlife creatures interfere in their human life. By allowing their lives to be governed solely by the unique distinction that sets them apart

from other primates and wildlife—namely, their ability to reason, speak, and use complex tools—they have hindered their own progress. The religious liberals seem to have chosen not to transition from one tree to another, unlike their non-distinct primate counterparts who appear to be happily pursuing custodianship roles related to habitable land, inheritance laws, mobility restrictions, and similar matters. Those religious liberals, had they been religious conservatives, would have been able to consider what Jesus Christ in the New Testament of the Bible once suggested. Jesus Christ has claimed that ravens do not sow or reap; they have no storeroom or barn, yet the natural system is designed to ensure they are nourished and do not die from hunger.

The choice made by religious liberals to allow their capacity for reasoning, communication, and the use of complex tools to guide their evolution resulted in a consistently hostile atmosphere among themselves, rather than a relaxed one. In fact, instead of religious liberals learning from the primate who lacks reasoning, speaking, or complex tool-using abilities, how do they collectively come together to force an aggressor to listen? The religious liberals use their sense of comradeship to collaborate on harmful actions. Surely, this comradeship that the religious liberals who consider themselves descendants from apes on the tree of life and who, from our ancestors to now, have failed to exhibit has not been an easy uphill battle. Nonetheless, if, as we said, our analysis contains any element of truth in it, the year 1945 should have marked the beginning of a new wave of insecurity that the religious liberals of all walks of life brought on themselves and began to live, something that doesn't resemble anything they lived or experienced before.

The religious liberals made the decision to invite individuals from all walks of life, representing various races, colors, sexes, religions, political beliefs, national or social origins, properties, births, or other statuses, to come together and act in a spirit of brotherhood. It appears as if, when certain religious liberals prior to the year 1945, when those subjects were maintaining a human life that was based on practicing oppression and tyranny, life was better. It was just when certain religious liberals switched and began, as of the year 1945, to practice friendly relations with other subjects who share the same belief on how humans evolved on the tree of life that it appeared that those

specific subjects who were maintaining a human life that is based on practicing oppression and tyranny brought onto themselves all the insecurity that they are living with or knowing. In other words, if, as of the year 1945, certain religious liberals who were before practicing oppression and tyranny didn't switch from being in their state of nature and accept to practice friendly relations with other people who were less fortunate than them so those could start to sustain their survival needs and to satiate their earthly desires as well, peace and security would have remained not as challenging as the case appears to be after the year 1945. The change of heart that those specific religious liberals, who before practiced oppression and tyranny and who had the right to all things and even had unlimited natural freedom to plunder, rape, and murder, had was regretfully a bad move based on what our analysis is pointing to. This is because when people had the option to voluntarily take a disposition, the distinction that all religious liberals are fitted with as compared to other primates like them on the tree of life, and that is, as we said, the capacity to reason, speak, and use complex tools, kicked in. Instead of those religious liberals whose social and economic conditions were being lifted by those aggressors and tyrants so they could at least sustain their survival needs and satiate their earthly desires, be thankful. Those lifted souls began to challenge the pre-programmed and man-made natural and legal rights placed by those people who lifted them. Indeed, if the religious liberals who were before maintaining a human life that is based on tyranny and aggression didn't switch and take upon themselves the responsibility of ensuring that people who are unknown to them sustain their survival needs and satiate their earthly desires, they perhaps brought havoc upon themselves. This is because never in the history of the appearance of primates and wildlife on earth did any species manage to live with each other except when it was with its kind. Even among their own kind, primates and wildlife fight and become aggressive.

Could the change of heart among religious liberals, who previously held a tight grip on peace and security in the world, be responsible for allowing other religious liberals to enjoy freedom of speech, belief, and freedom from living under any form of fear and want, thereby creating the insecurity that people began to recognize in 1945? In other words, certain religious liberals avoided using oppression to protect the rule of law. By choosing to disrupt world peace through territorial

aggrandizement and changes in territorial boundaries, they allowed people to believe in self-government, particularly those who had been deprived of that right. They allowed people to believe in self-government, particularly those who had been deprived of that right. By allowing people unrestricted access to raw materials and expanding trade. They kept people engaged in global cooperation to secure better economic and social conditions for everyone. Avoid instilling fear and desire in people's lives. The world's state of affairs as of 1988 is due to strict sea access, force restraint, and friendly disarmament.

Could the good intention that the religious liberals who were, up until the year 1945, holding a tight grip on peace and security unleash a natural right that makes it so that people are not able to act toward one another in a spirit of brotherhood? This natural right was dormant prior to 1945 because not enough people were taking advantage of the benefits that friendly relations offered, which led to improved reasoning, communication, and the use of complex tools. Each time people try to take advantage of their distinct advantage to reason, speak, and use complex tools, such disposition makes people unable to act on pre-programmed and man-made natural and legal rights contrary to what people think. The consequence of people increasingly taking advantage of their distinct ability to reason, speak, and use complex tools in recent years is that they are forgoing peace and security.

We remain skeptical about whether people's ability to reason, speak, and use complex tools is causing them to forgo peace and security as humanity progresses. This conclusion arises from our analysis of the segment of the population that identifies as religious liberals.

It is still uncertain whether humans are related to primates, like apes, on the tree of life, so the hypotheses that our analysis is pointing us to support are that humans act differently than other primates or wildlife in a spirit of brotherhood towards one another. This conclusion is because religious liberals are relying on using their unique skills to reason, speak, and use complex tools to guide their human lives instead of just going back to operating on the basis of their state of nature, as was the case before the year 1945. If the analysis we have conducted so far contains any truth, the two back-to-back world wars

experienced in the first half of the 20th century were a result of people shifting their focus to maintaining international peace based on the principle suggested by Alfred Nobel in his will. If religious liberals had understood Jean-Jacques Rousseau's phrase that "man must be forced to be free," perhaps the approach to maintaining peace and security in the world would have been better than the one people began to experiment with in 1945.

We must analyze whether a natural right exists that ensures each increase in people's knowledge reduces their ability to act on pre-programmed and manmade natural and legal rights, despite popular belief. This conclusion is because the disposition that religious liberals have been pursuing by establishing custodianship functions of habitable land, inheritance laws, restraining mobility laws, and so forth to prevent other people from sustaining their inalienable right to sustain their survival needs and to satiate their earthly desires are all dispositions that those people are taking based on manmade natural and legal rights and not on pre-programmed natural rights.

As we said earlier, Protagoras was a pre-Socratic Greek philosopher who once said, "Man is the measure of all things." Plato interpreted what Protagoras meant by saying that there is no absolute truth, but that which individuals deem to be truth. This is not what the religious conservatives believe. The religious conservatives believe that the universe is based on something objective, outside of human influence or perceptions.

The religious liberals do not claim, as we said earlier, that the universe is based on something objective, outside of human influence or perceptions. The religious liberals reached their conclusion by establishing the custodianship function of habitable land, inheritance laws, restraining mobility laws, and so forth based on man-made laws. The religious liberals even acknowledge that they are related to primates, like apes, on the tree of life. As we said already. The stance taken by religious liberals in 1945 to accept that people of all races, colors, sexes, religions, political beliefs, national or social origins, property statuses, or other classifications must come together to meet their survival needs and fulfill their earthly desires is a remarkable

undertaking. We even said that what the religious liberals attempted to do is an act that goes against how primates and wildlife live.

The reason for this stance is rooted in our concerns about peace and security in the world, which were due to religious liberals, based on our investigation, going ahead and practicing social and economic policies that deviate from keeping the lives of individuals in the state of nature, where everyone has a right to all things. In fact, we suggested that people in modern times should shift to social and economic practices based on the principles of Alfred Nobel, rather than adhering to those proposed by Jean-Jacques Rousseau and others, which have led to tyranny and oppression and may have caused much of the insecurity the world has experienced.

That is said, we cannot consider that peace and security diminished in the world because religious liberals began to practice social and economic policies that deviate from keeping the lives of individuals in the state of nature, where everyone has a right to all things. This is the case because a large part of the population believes the universe is based on absolute truth.

In other words, it is understandable that religious liberals have enacted manmade natural and legal rights to establish custodianship functions for habitable land, inheritance laws, and mobility restrictions, in order to prevent others from exercising their inalienable right to meet their survival needs and fulfill their earthly desires, given that the amount of habitable land on Earth is limited. The religious liberals, as we said, have never claimed that the laws they pass to stop unknown people from sustaining their inalienable right to sustain their survival needs and to satiate their earthly desires are based on any form of absolute truth. The religious liberals know very well that the volume of habitable land on earth is fixed, and they still, even after possessing the unique faculties to reason, speak, and use complex tools that distinguish them from other primates and wildlife like them on the tree of life, continue to do so. In fact, as previously mentioned, the religious liberals attempted in 1945 to implement a policy that contradicts the natural ways of living for primates and wildlife. We cannot make the same assertion about the segment of the population that identifies as religious conservatives.

In the case of the segment of the population who consider themselves religious conservatives, those people believe that the custodianship function of habitable land and of the earth's resources to prevent other people from sustaining their inalienable right to sustain their survival needs and to satiate their earthly desire, knowing that the habitable land on earth is fixed, is based on a pre-programmed right that is absolute.

God's decision is unclear when he suggested that people multiply and replenish on earth. Then, He turned back and passed instructions in which he commands that people institute and establish custodianship functions of habitable land, inheritance laws, restraining mobility laws, and so forth to prevent other people from sustaining their inalienable right to sustain their survival needs and to satiate their earthly desires, knowing very well that the habitable land on earth is fixed, if He is the one who created the universe. Truly, God's decision to command that humans transfer habitable land to designated people when he didn't arrange for enough habitable land so all those new people who would be born can stand on it to sustain their survival needs and to satiate their earthly desires if he wants people to multiply and replenish is strange. We don't mean to say that everyone should roam the earth, but the Old Testament says God gave people "every seed-bearing plant on the face of the whole earth and every tree that has fruit with seed; they will be food for people."

But religious conservatives know when to plant and harvest. God bestowed upon those segments of the population who identify as religious conservatives a breath of life that they believe enables them to reason, speak, and use complex tools. Religious conservatives, even if God exhibited a form of nepotism, should have made use of their breath of life, which God himself in the Old Testament in the story of the creation claimed he possessed them with when he said that he created man in his image.

Yet of all the commands that God passed since he created man in his image, as religious conservatives believe, and of all the laws that God passed. His adherents continue to reaffirm their faith in the only law that prevents people from sustaining their inalienable right to sustain

their survival needs and to satiate their earthly desires, which is due to how such believers continue to establish custodianship functions of habitable land, inheritance laws, restraining mobility laws, desires, and so forth from the time God passed on such covenants to now. The only explanation we can think of for why people who consider themselves religious conservatives have struggled to maintain peace and security in their interactions with one another is that they have not been practicing the teachings of Jesus Christ, whom all these religious believers claim as their God.

We cannot know whether those who claim to be religious conservatives genuinely hold that conviction; they may simply claim this identity while still living. When their bodies return to the earth and their souls according to their God, they will be judged. If the person acts on earth according to the command that God passed, his soul will be reserved a place in heaven. If his conduct on earth was not according to what God commanded, his soul will go to hell. Therefore, even if a person happened to live according to the laws that God commanded, he could still choose between having his soul go to hell instead of heaven if he wished. However, if we consider the teachings of Jesus Christ, whom religious believers regard as God, the Son of God, and an envoy from God, we must acknowledge his claims. A young person approached Jesus Christ and requested an explanation of the steps he should take to attain eternal life. Jesus Christ told the young man, "Go sell your possessions and donate them to the poor so you will have a treasure in heaven." If we distribute plot sizes equally to each living person, as discussed earlier, it would help prevent arguments about land ownership, where one person has more habitable land than another. Even a solution like this would not be enough to encourage people to act in a spirit of brotherhood towards one another, as it would not allow them to meet their survival needs or satisfy their earthly desires. Surely, only a handful of souls have managed to follow the command that Jesus Christ passed on 2000 years ago, given the way people have been operating since then. In fact, even when God sent another prophet to earth, Muhammad (SAWS), and he asked religious conservatives to give up only 10%, people were able to do it this time. Similarly, the number of souls eligible for a spot in heaven is kept to a minimum.

We have no way of knowing how many people on earth consider themselves religious conservatives among the 7 billion people that now live. However, if we assume that the number of people who identify as religious conservatives is similar to the number who identify as religious liberals, it is important for religious liberals to recognize their role.

If, in the year 1945, religious liberals who consider themselves descendants on the tree of life from primates like apes began to act in a spirit of brotherhood toward other people regardless of their race, color, sex, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth, or other status. The religious liberals, even when they very well know that the unique faculty to reason, speak, and use complex tools that distinguishes them from other primates is based on absolute truth, know its worth. This information is important because it helps religious liberals reassure themselves that the man-made natural and legal rights they expect people to pursue, whether voluntarily or under external compulsion, will encourage individuals to act in a spirit of brotherhood towards one another.

The same religious conservatives who believe they possess the unique faculty to reason, speak, and use complex tools have been pre-programmed by their creator to act in a spirit of brotherhood towards one another, as God created those individuals from the beginning of time until now. Only a few religious conservatives were able to demonstrate the principles that Jesus Christ proposed for attaining eternal life. It is unlikely that people who consider themselves religious conservatives and believe the universe is based on something objective, outside of human influence or perceptions, will begin to enter into relationships with one another that reflect a spirit of brotherhood, especially as long as human population growth remains above a certain threshold. Even then, it is not reasonable to expect that people will begin to act in a spirit of brotherhood toward one another, given the natural rights that the system imposes on how individuals can meet their survival needs. This is because even when the world population was much less than seven billion people, only a small number among those people who consider themselves religious conservatives were able to give up the habitable land they occupy in

favor of letting others who are lacking habitable space use it to sustain their survival needs and earthly desires.

Let us go only to the past two thousand years, when many people who consider themselves religious conservatives claim God sent his son to earth, instead of going as far back in time to when God created man in his image and passed on commands so people began to act toward each other in a spirit of brotherhood. As of the date when Jesus Christ lived, more than 2000 years ago, the segment of the population that considers themselves religious conservatives continues to disregard the instructions given by God, along with the angels and messengers He sent to earth, regarding what people must do to earn a treasure in heaven. The religious liberals believe that the universe is not based on an objective reality outside of human influence or perceptions, and they also accept that humans are descendants of primates on the tree of life. As of the year 1945, religious liberals began to adopt social and economic policies that diverge from a lifestyle based on a state of nature, where everyone has a right to all things. The pursuit of social and economic policies by religious liberals, as we have shown, has not been easy since 1945, especially compared to the time when they believed that humans are descendants of primates on the tree of life.

Therefore, the religious liberals who consider themselves descendants of chimpanzees and gorillas and who are uncertain if their unique faculty to reason, speak, and use complex tools ordains them to do so still live with the obscurity they started to establish since they started to establish such a belief about how the universe originated, meaning they don't know if they act on the basis of what their unique faculty to reason, speak, and use complex tools ordains them to do. This situation is not the case with religious conservatives who claim that God fitted them with the faculty to reason, speak, and use complex tools so they could choose between going to heaven and hell. God also gave religious conservatives the disposition necessary to go to heaven, which is something that religious liberals do not understand. This conclusion is because religious conservatives, as we said, are unable to tell when they use their unique faculty to reason, speak, and use complex tools, as opposed to the times they do not, unlike the other primate from which they are descended.

The fundamental difference then that could be making the implications impossible for the religious conservative to understand is that it is not possible to establish custodianship functions of habitable land, inheritance laws, restraining mobility laws, and so forth based on pre-programmed and manmade natural and legal rights to next expect that people either voluntarily or under external compulsion act on the disposition that they claim an absolute truth dictated to them is that those people who consider themselves religious are pursuing some pre-programmed natural and legal rights that are anti-logic.

This conclusion is because if people are born with logic, then the actions that religious conservatives are exhibiting to prevent others from sustaining their survival needs and to satiate their earthly desires are anti-logic, whereas the need by all people to sustain their survival needs and to satiate their earthly desires is immutable and an unchangeable difference. Now, hence, everyone is born without anti-logic, and no one can acquire it at any time in their lives. Religious conservatives' conduct in preventing others from sustaining their survival needs and satiating their earthly desires is learned, not inborn; all people, religious liberals and religious conservatives, are born here on earth. This evidence suggests that it may be possible to understand why religious conservatives display both logical and illogical behavior by examining the fundamental difference that prevents humans from recognizing the impossibility of establishing custodianship functions for habitable land.

Let us continue to investigate whether the real reason people struggle to act in a spirit of brotherhood towards one another—regardless of being religious conservatives or religious liberals—stems from a natural right that, as people's knowledge increases, leads to a reduction in their capacity to act on both pre-programmed and manmade natural and legal rights, contrary to popular belief. If this scenario were true, then the efforts of religious conservatives and religious liberals to establish custodianship functions for habitable land, inheritance laws, and mobility restrictions—aimed at preventing others from exercising their inalienable right to meet their survival needs and fulfill their earthly desires—might actually be contributing to people's inability to act toward one another in a spirit of brotherhood, contrary to expectations. We will work on this issue in the next chapter.

When Each Becomes a Little God

There are many people in the world who believe that the universe is based on something objective, outside of human influence or perceptions. Those people call themselves religious conservatives. The people who claim to be holding on to religious conservative views believe that the universe is based on absolute truth represented by a creator. Most religious conservatives call the creator of the universe God. However, since the day God created the universe until now, only a handful from among all the people who claim to be holding on to religious conservative views have managed to align the intention of their own lives with the principles that are reported in the different religious practices. There are lots of commandments that people who consider themselves religious conservatives must follow or abstain from. In this chapter, we are going to be reviewing the implications of one commandment among the many that the people who claim to be holding on to religious conservative views must adhere to.

In the New Testament of the Bible, it is reported that a young man came to Jesus Christ to ask him about what he should do to win eternal life. Jesus Christ answered the young man by saying, "Go and sell all your possessions and give them to the poor." Only a handful of religious conservatives were able to give away their habitable land, stay away from wanting to exercise custodianship functions of habitable lands, stop continuing to transfer their material things to designated people, and so forth to win a treasure in heaven, as Jesus

Christ suggested in the New Testament of the Bible will occur to those who do.

In the previous chapter, we said that what could be preventing the segment of the population who consider themselves to be holding on to religious conservative views from acting on what Jesus Christ suggested to win eternal life couldn't be something that has to do with fear of people having to forgo their own security, given how two people cannot alter the same matter from the same point in space. In other words, we think people give reasons other than fear of insecurity with the new possessor for not giving away all their possessions as Jesus suggested, even if they lack enough habitable land.

This constant fear that religious conservatives could have been living with for 2000 years now, thus preferring not to act on what Jesus Christ suggested to win eternal life, couldn't be due to the only unique faculty that God pre-programmed in the creation he called man and that is what the religious conservatives claim distinguishes them from other living creatures as well. This is the aptitude to reason, speak, and use complex tools, which religious conservatives strive on its basis to control and regulate whatever unnatural changes they exhibit in matter to eventually either land a spot in heaven or hell. God couldn't have pre-programmed an aptitude that would work against his fundamental purpose from behind having created humans in the first place, which was to multiply and replenish the earth. People sustain their survival needs and satiate their earthly desires from physical matter. Therefore, God intended people to use their aptitude to reason, speak, and use complex tools to seize habitable land; establish custodianship functions of habitable lands; transfer material things to designated people, including restraining people's mobility; and so on. Such a move will minimize the interactions that people must continuously engage in to meet their survival needs and satisfy their earthly desires, and as previously mentioned, it would contradict God's command to multiply and replenish.

Moreover, if God depicts absolute truth, as those who claim to be holding on to religious conservative views believe. God would have known that if we were to take all the people who claim to be holding on to religious conservative views and all the creatures who possess

human-like pre-programmed aptitudes to reason, speak, and use complex tools due to their need for habitable land as well, the total requirement for habitable land would be to serve 7 billion creatures between religious conservatives and religious liberals who are alive in the world now. In the previous chapter, we stated that even if we allocated a plot of habitable land to each of the 7 billion creatures that require it, this would not prevent any of those creatures from feeling deprived of access to habitable land needed to sustain their needs and satisfy their earthly desires. We then turned out and said that even if we induced a condition whereby each of the 7 billion creatures had his own plot of habitable land, eliminating any reason for people to interact or for crises and conflicts in the world, such action would still be insufficient due to the insufficient habitable land required. This is the reason why people created the idea of cities: so they can leave habitable land to plant for food and to recover the material things from which they produce the things they use to satiate their earthly desires. Based on this logic, we concluded that either God instilled the ability to reason, speak, and use complex tools in those who hold religious conservative views for a specific purpose in their lives or these religious conservatives created the concept of God to further their own interests.

Therefore, since all the people who claim to be holding on to religious conservative views and who claim that God proposed to them that they seize habitable land, establish custodianship functions of habitable lands, transfer material things to designated people, and so forth, either based on pre-programmed instructions as depicted in the Bible or after the same people disobeyed God and began to practice such manmade habits, were all born on earth. Plus, none of the other living creatures with whom people co-habit on earth seize habitable land; establish custodianship functions of habitable lands; transfer material things to designated people, including restraining people's mobility; and so forth, other than the creatures who possess human-like pre-programmed aptitudes to reason, speak, and use complex tools. However, even though those creatures possess human-like pre-programmed aptitudes to reason, speak, and use complex tools, they consider themselves related to primates, such as apes, on the tree of life. Therefore, we cannot consider that all the unnatural changes that they are exhibiting in matter are based on any form of absolute truth.

This is because, in the Bible's creation story, God states that he created all primates so that the people made in his image could rule over them.

Now if we are to consider that the only distinction that the people who claim to be holding on to religious conservative views have as compared to the creature that possesses human-like pre-programmed aptitudes to reason, speak, and use complex tools have with one another is their two divergences on how this pre-programmed aptitude to reason, speak, and use complex tools originated.

Additionally, given that only those creatures, the people who claim to be holding on to religious conservative views and the creatures who possess human-like pre-programmed aptitudes to reason, speak, and use complex tools, developed this aptitude when they replaced an older extinct primate in the tree of life, they are the only two creatures that seize habitable land, establish custodianship functions of habitable lands, transfer material things to designated people, restrain people's mobility, and so forth. The people who claim to hold religious conservative views may be in denial and have invented the story of God and absolute truth to serve their interests.

Our insinuation to the people who claim to be holding on to religious conservative views is that they are living in denial about the origin of the universe and how this pre-programmed aptitude that exists in both the people who claim that God pre-programmed in their physical bodies compares to how the other creature, who possesses a human-like pre-programmed aptitude to reason, speak, and use complex tools, claims their own pre-programmed aptitude originated. This insinuation could have been a true assumption, but there was an event that took place in the year 1945, which prevents us further from considering that the people who claim to be holding on to religious conservative views are living in denial, as the other creature who possesses human-like pre-programmed aptitudes to reason, speak, and use complex tools clearly admits that it replaces an older extinct primate in the tree of life.

This event that took place in the year 1945 marks when the creatures who possess human-like pre-programmed aptitudes to reason, speak, and use complex tools, and whom we referred to before as religious

liberals, decided that it was much better for the sustainability of their breed to stop remaining operating in their state of nature and to begin to develop friendly relations with any species that looks like them, irrespective of their race, color, sex, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth, or other status, to maintain peace and security in the world.

What is significant about the conclusion reached by religious liberals is that this creature, which possesses human-like pre-programmed aptitudes to reason, speak, and use complex tools, voluntarily admits that its only distinguishing feature compared to other gorillas and chimpanzees is this single pre-programmed aptitude. Such creatures made such a 180-degree switch to begin to kickstart the process that would get them to start to use this possessed, human-like, preprogrammed aptitude to reason, speak, and use complex tools to start to be aligned with the way the people who claim to be holding on to religious conservative views do—they say God wanted them to do so since he created them in his image—but unfortunately all the people who claim to be holding on to religious conservative views have been failing to do so.

The predicament of the creature, which possesses human-like pre-programmed aptitudes to reason, speak, and use complex tools, suggests that it could be that they are the creatures that God created in his own image, and it took them until the year 1945 to realize that only by ceasing their pre-programmed aptitude to serve them in keeping them in their state of nature would they enjoy the only life they have. Instead, the people who claim to be holding on to religious conservative views are perhaps the ones who are replacing an older extinct primate in the tree of life but, as we said, are living in a state of denial and don't want to admit it.

However, the mere fact that the creature that possesses human-like pre-programmed aptitudes to reason, speak, and use complex tools took to starting to align their actions in line with the way God suggested is an indication that we cannot dispute the existence of an absolute truth as the people who claim to be holding on to religious conservative views claim exists, and to go along with their voluntary claim that the reason for their lack of capacity to act toward one

another in a spirit of brotherhood is exactly due to their voluntary decision to disobey God while using the only pre-programmed aptitudes to reason, speak, and use complex tools that he pre-programmed in the people he created in his own image so they serve him. This argument suggests that the creature with human-like reasoning, speaking, and tool-using skills that, as of 1945, shifted from a natural state to forming friendly ties with others may have also been a being that disobeyed God and claimed to be primate descendants to avoid following God's commands to work and care for the earth.

Therefore, it is important to recognize the similarities in the goals that both religious conservatives and religious liberals are striving to achieve on earth. In the case of religious conservatives, they continue to use their pre-programmed aptitude to reason, speak, and use complex tools to continue to defy God's command to establish friendly relations with people of all races so everyone can have access to sustain his survival needs and satiate his earthly desires, and the religious liberals switch to start to act based on what God commanded people do on earth so all people can be able to sustain their survival needs and satiate their earthly desires.

We can no longer consider this conclusion reached by religious liberals to be united; however, religious conservatives are aware of it, since their creator specifically fitted them with the faculty of reasoning, speaking, and using complex tools to help them achieve it. Therefore, religious conservatives have known this conclusion that religious liberals just reached in 1945 for millions of years. We can no longer deny that religious conservatives claim their reasoning, speaking, and tool-using abilities led them to disobey God, as religious liberals showed in 1945 that these skills could unite people instead of keeping them in their natural state, as those who claim to hold conservative views have done since God created them and made them aware of their responsibility to care for the earth. Similarly, as we said earlier, we must acknowledge that the people who claim to hold religious conservative views did not invent this idea of God to serve their interests, even if God has decided to live invisibly from his creation and no one has returned from heaven to confirm that acting on what Christ suggested guarantees eternal life.

In contrast, the segment of the population that does not believe the universe is based on an objective reality, independent of human influence or perceptions, has concluded that they must develop friendly relations with any species resembling themselves, regardless of race, color, sex, religion, political views, national or social origin, property, birth, or other status, in order to maintain peace and security in the world. Likewise, religious liberals realized that if they began using their unique ability to reason, communicate, and utilize complex tools to maintain peace with one another during their lives, it would not matter what was at stake if those who claimed to hold religious conservative views returned to following God's suggestions for achieving eternal life. Let us also add what Jesus Christ proposed to those who want to go to heaven without even any form of vetting. This passage signifies that those who claim to hold religious conservative views fail to follow Jesus Christ's commands regarding land ownership and custodianship, inheritance laws, mobility restrictions, and so on. Additionally, God's initial desire was for the people. He created them in His image to have pure intentions, and those who claim to hold religious conservative views consider themselves to be their descendants. Their duty is to work the earth and to care for it only and not to use their pre-programmed aptitude to reason, speak, and use complex tools to seize habitable land or to exercise custodianship functions of habitable lands or to practice the law of inheritance or the laws restraining people's mobility and so forth, as such people began to do when they defied God and started to discover significance in their own achievements. This statement suggests that the behavior of individuals who claim to adhere to religious conservative views for thousands of years may have its roots and explanations, as there are already creatures who acknowledge their primate ancestry and believe that their pre-programmed abilities to reason, speak, and use complex tools closely resemble those of the individuals who claim to hold religious conservative views. The above also means that perhaps the defiance that the people who claim to be holding on to religious conservative views are able to do is as per what the creature that possesses human-like pre-programmed aptitudes to reason, speak, and use complex tools began doing, and that is because, in the case of the people who claim to be holding on to religious conservative views, God told them they cannot use their own pre-programmed aptitudes to reason, speak, and use complex tools. The objective is to start to act

with one another in the same way the religious liberals began doing, and this is because every inclination of the human heart is evil from childhood, although this may not be universally accepted. This is because the creatures that possess human-like pre-programmed aptitudes to reason, speak, and use complex tools think that the inclination of their hearts can change and are working on making it happen. People who claim to hold religious conservative views say it is impossible to do so. People who hold religious conservative views believe that the universe is based on something objective, outside of human influence or perceptions. In contrast, creatures with human-like abilities who claim descent from chimpanzees and gorillas suggest that human inclinations might not be evil.

However, this means that the means that the people who claim to be holding on to religious conservative views use to commit evil deeds can be their hands, mouth, or the objects that they set in motion. The people who claim to be holding on to religious conservative views are not committing evil acts using their hands or mouth as much as they are using the objects that they find on the surface of the earth to convert them into becoming instruments that they could use to commit evil acts with. None of those instruments God placed on earth. To the contrary, it is the people who claim to be holding on to religious conservative views who developed them since they began to find significance and immortality in their achievements. We cannot say that the evil inclination that the people who claim to be holding on to religious conservative views have, even at a young age, when they are children, is something that God pre-programmed in the hearts of humans before birth, because the instruments through which the people who claim to be holding on to religious conservative views, such creatures, start to fabricate them are from a childish age and from here on earth. If people didn't use their pre-programmed aptitude

to reason, speak, and use complex tools to produce the tools that they use to exhibit evil acts with. There wouldn't be any reason why any child would exhibit anything evil. Therefore, all children are born on earth. It is either the procreators of the children who are converting the hearts of their offspring into becoming evil from childhood or the children are bringing along with them this evil inclination each time God is pushing procreators to mate.

Therefore, as of the date, the people who claim to be holding on to religious conservative views, such a segment of the population, claim that they are not able to act on what God proposed because the inclinations of the hearts of all the creatures who are like them were created in the image of God, possessing evil inclinations from childhood. This charge states that people claiming to hold religious conservative views are sticking to something unverifiable. This is because from the time the creature that God created in his own image and called "man" is counted among the living until this creature reaches the childhood age. This creature doesn't unnaturally change matter with the aim of seizing habitable land, or to exercise custodianship functions of habitable lands, or to practice the law of inheritance, or the laws restraining people's mobility, and so forth. So it would be possible to ascertain if this aptitude that this creature begins to exhibit when it reaches the childhood age is something that could be pre-programmed in the heart of such a creature to argue that whenever such a creature reaches a childish age, it would be bound to automatically trip into beginning to exhibit evil acts similar to taking the life of another creature or seizing habitable land, or to exercise custodianship functions of habitable lands, or to practice the law of inheritance, or the laws restraining people's mobility, and so forth, to make it difficult for another creature that was created in the image of God to manage to sustain its survival needs and to satiate its earthly desires from the natural system because habitable land on earth is fixed.

However, since even if the hearts of the people who claim to be holding on to religious conservative views have been evil from childhood until now, from the date when God created man until now, no child from birth until the newborn reaches the age of being considered a child has created any type of unnatural changes that disobey God in it. Only when the child reaches the childhood age does this evil inclination begin to take shape. We can say that the employment of the newborn's pre-programmed aptitude to reason, speak, and use complex tools so it can cause the newborn to act in contradiction with what God intended his birth on earth to serve is irrelevant. It is only when the newborn reaches childhood that the pre-programmed aptitude is activated.

The people who claim to be holding on to religious conservative views voluntarily admit that in the Bible, in the story of the creation, God commanded them not to distinguish between good and evil. A newborn begins to distinguish between good and evil when he reaches childhood and continues to do so throughout his life. When a child begins to use his innate ability to reason, speak, and utilize complex tools, he is essentially employing this pre-programmed faculty to help him distinguish between good and evil.

As we saw with the creature, it possesses human-like pre-programmed aptitudes to reason, speak, and use complex tools. Those creatures, until the year 1945, weren't using the human-like pre-programmed aptitude to reason, speak, and use complex tools to distinguish between good and evil. Prior to the year 1945, those segments of the population who consider themselves religious liberals and who voluntarily admit that they are related to primates, like apes, on the tree of life were rare. Those creatures who possess a human-like pre-programmed aptitude to reason, speak, and use complex tools, as we showed in the previous chapter, were living prior to the year 1945, based on their state of nature exercising tyranny and oppression; reaching that holding onto habitable land, or exercising custodianship functions of habitable lands, or practicing the law of inheritance, or the laws restraining people's mobility, and so forth. As of the year 1945, they began to establish friendly relations or to act based on what God wanted the people who claim to be holding on to religious conservative views to do, and we showed how peace and security diminished from the year 1945 onward. This signifies that the people who claim to be holding on to religious conservative views have not been able to practice friendly relations from the day God placed them on earth to now. This incapacity to act on what God intended people to serve for him on earth cannot be because people are born with every inclination of the human heart being evil from childhood but rather because people are not doing what God asked people to do on earth. This is to work the earth and to take care of it. This is because the creature who possessed human-like pre-programmed aptitudes to reason, speak, and use complex tools tried surviving under the two conditions that any human being could exist, and they failed. Therefore, the creature who possesses human-like pre-programmed

aptitudes to reason, speak, and use complex tools has not been able to survive under the two conditions that any human being could exist. This could only be due to a natural right that religious liberals are unable to act on or to make them abide by the pre-programmed and man-made natural and legal rights that they enact because those do not claim that God created them. Those creatures that possess human-like pre-programmed aptitudes to reason, speak, and use complex tools clearly admit that they are related to primates, like apes, on the Tree of Life and that they evolved from here on earth. Let us next move to find out if such a natural right exists. However, since in the case of the creature that possesses human-like pre-programmed aptitudes to reason, speak, and use complex tools, those creatures have already, as of the year 1945, begun to voluntarily practice new social and economic principles that promote the inalienable right of all people to freedom, justice, and peace. The only added value that showing that there is a natural right that makes it impossible for religious liberals unable to act on the pre-programmed and manmade natural and legal rights will have is either to control and regulate how much people can reason and speak and use complex tools to control and regulate the natural right that makes it impossible for religious liberals unable to act on the pre-programmed and manmade natural and legal rights or to continue to live in the insecurity that they have been knowing until the natural system stops to be able to manage the unnatural changes that people are introducing.

But the natural right we plan to study may be why those who claim to hold religious liberal views can't act amicably with each other, and it may also be why religious conservatives can't. This conclusion is because for the people who claim to be holding on to religious conservative views, beginning to act in friendly relations with one another is among the actions the religious conservatives must do to be eligible to win eternal life. Therefore, what is at stake for the people who claim to be holding on to religious conservative views if they begin to act in friendly relations with one another is much more than what the case would be like with the creatures that possess human-like preprogrammed aptitudes to reason, speak, and use complex tools; when they begin to act in friendly relations with one another and when they pass away, they don't have to deal with consequent reward and punishment, justice, and retribution. Moreover, if we happen to show

that such a natural right exists, then this could also be pushing the people who claim to be holding on to religious conservative views to find significance and immortality in their own achievements. This is because it is the pre-programmed aptitude to reason, speak, and use complex tools that prevents the people who claim to be holding on to religious conservative views from acting on the pre-programmed and manmade natural and legal rights that God communicated and includes what the intention of the people who created him in his image are supposed to serve on earth. This we said to work the earth and to take care of it. Therefore, since there could be among the people who claim to be holding on to religious conservative views those who would want to do what Jesus Christ commanded to win an automatic place in heaven. We propose to carry out this exercise of finding out if there is a natural right that makes it impossible for religious conservatives to act on the pre-programmed and manmade natural and legal rights that God proposed and not on the basis that is making the creature that possesses human-like pre-programmed aptitude to reason, speak, and use complex tools due to what is at stake in the case of religious conservatives. To carry out this exercise, we need to go back to the time when, according to the segment of the population who claim to be holding to religious conservatives' views, God created the universe.

Only if the infant is the offspring of procreators who believe the universe is objective, beyond human influence or perception, will any newborn have a pre-programmed right to take advantage of it during his passage through life. This is because this alliance will give the newborn a free ticket to rationalise that it is alright to establish custodianship functions of habitable land and to prevent others from sustaining their survival needs and satiating their earthly desires. The recognition by the newborn that the universe is based on something objective, outside of human influence or perceptions, will also entitle the newborn to claim that whatever transpires in reality or in the life of the newborn reverts to pre-programmed truths that God either anticipatively mapped out or caused. The procreators will use the creation story from the Old Testament to convince themselves that it's okay to be indifferent to reality, which rationalises that reality is due to man's choice to defy God in favour of finding meaning in his own achievements. The story of Jesus Christ is the missing clue in what makes reality what it is. The story of Jesus Christ serves as the tool

that the procreators will use to justify the belief that it is acceptable for the newborn to disobey God during his life, since Jesus Christ has already sacrificed his life for the sins of mankind.

Let us contrast the scenario in which the newborn begins his life in a household that embraces religious liberal views, to highlight the differences between the two options available to any newborn and to clarify the purpose of the unnatural changes his body will undergo throughout his life. If the newborn were born to a household that considers itself religiously liberal. The procreators will be passing on to their offspring habitable land and material things guided through manmade laws. The religious liberals do not believe that the universe is based on any objective reality outside of human influence or perception, nor do they believe that an absolute truth exists that determines the events in any human being's life.

The newborn's claim to believe in an objective universe is hard to confirm because if they did, nature would be based on how absolute truth preprogrammed things for both individuals and the natural system. In this case, God's decision to remain invisible makes it impossible to know whether the state of nature is due to man's disobedience or God's choice to leave humans to decide between returning to serving Him or facing the consequences of His own interventions. God's statement to Noah in the Old Testament creation story—promising continuity of seedtime and harvest, cold and heat, summer and winter, day and night for as long as the earth endures—is perplexing. The confusion is because there are two entities that exhibit unnatural changes in matter. Those two entities are man and the natural system. Man has no power over the way the natural system changes. The worst-case scenario is that the unnatural changes that the natural system exhibits in matter are heading towards the annihilation of life on earth. Man's actions, along with the unnatural changes he is causing in the natural system, can either accelerate or diminish the earth's ability to endure. Therefore, individuals who assert that they hold religious conservative views or beliefs in an absolute truth represented by a creator may be contributing to their own annihilation by seeking significance and immortality through their achievements. Now, if we add the unnatural pre-programmed aptitudes to reason, speak, and use

complex tools and consider themselves pursuing religious liberty are also making in the natural system. Chances are that the natural system is really beginning to feel the wear and tear as the numerous environmental changes that are taking place on earth point. Evidently, the conviction that the religious liberals share about reality is not based on a pre-programmed state of nature or on the idea that its truth is absolute, but rather the state of nature is due to how the changes that are taking place make things work, making it much harder to get them to align with the unnatural changes they exhibit in matter to any form of predictions in which any absolute truth comes into play when they believe that the universe emerged through a process of evolution and that humans are related to primates, like apes, on the tree of life.

Let us also add that besides those two categorisations, in principle, they are supposed to organize the intention that the newborn interaction in matter will be serving. All rights that any newborn will benefit from will be levied by the natural system; there are no other pre-programmed or manmade natural or legal rights. In other words, irrespective of which household the newborn ends up kick-starting his life journey from. The newborn must be obliged to surrender his freedoms and even align the unnatural changes that he exhibits in matter to match how the natural system controls the natural changes of all the elements that exist outside the human boundary.

One of the inalienable natural rights that the newborn will experience throughout his entire life on earth is his inability to be in two places at the same time. Another inalienable natural right will be the newborn's inability to alter from the same physical space the same quantity of matter that another human being is already exhibiting changes on its body. If two people or any two living creatures desire to exhibit unnatural changes on the same quantity of material things, one of the two must wait for his turn. The same is true whenever a person wants to occupy or displace a void space. Two people cannot occupy the same void space at the same time. They must take turns as well.

People overcome this natural gridlock, which prevents two individuals from unnaturally altering the same quantity of matter from the same point in space due to their inability to fuse their physical bodies in various ways. If two people know each other, one of them will let the

other go first. If the case involves two unfamiliar individuals, they are likely to determine who will go first after each demonstrates a display of strength. Religious conservatives from our ancestors to now may struggle to act in a spirit of brotherhood towards one another because one person's security often depends on the security of another. God created man in his image to cultivate and care for the earth. From our ancestors to now, all that people who consider themselves to be religious conservatives do during their lives on the surface of the earth is unnaturally alter matter from an independent physical boundary that is not amalgamated to the earth, which is a priori; otherwise, humans cannot work the earth. God couldn't have made such a fundamental problem when he created the universe to work on his own so perfectly unless he was irrational and wanted the inalienable natural right that makes it impossible for two people who consider themselves religious conservatives to occupy the same void space at the same time and to unnaturally alter the same quantity of matter from the same point in space to be the global human security problem that exists in the world now.

Moreover, God wasn't disappointed that his first two creations, Adam and Eve, disobeyed him because those two were unable to fuse their bodies to unnaturally alter the same quantity of matter from the same point in space. God was disappointed with Adam and Eve because they allowed their human imagination or human ingenuity to disobey his instruction. Human imagination and human ingenuity are not made of matter. God's conflict with humanity was based on disobedience rather than on changes in physical matter. Humans are made of tangible matter. Therefore, the likelihood of the security of one person being the foregone security of the other contributing to the likelihood of what has been preventing people from acting towards one another in a spirit of brotherhood from our ancestors to now is not a very convincing argument. If people use their pre-programmed aptitude to reason, speak and use complex tools and do not seize habitable land, establish custodianship functions of habitable lands, transfer material things to designated people, etc. All the crises and conflicts that religious conservatives have known stand at its helm: how to displace people from habitable land seized so others can begin to unnaturally alter in this space whatever they desire. There has to be another natural right that makes it impossible for religious conservatives to be unable

to act on the pre-programmed and manmade natural and legal rights that their creator passed on to them. There has to be another natural right that makes it impossible for religious conservatives to be unable to act on the pre-programmed and manmade natural and legal rights that their creator passed on to them.

The segment of the population that claims to hold religious conservatives' views is not the only living creature on the surface of the earth; they are a cohabiting part, like any other existing species. There is, as we said, another creature that cohabits on earth and who we said possesses a pre-programmed aptitude to reason, speak and use complex tools in an identical form to those who claim to be holding to religious conservatives' views. Those human-like creatures consider themselves religious liberals because they believe that they are related to primates, like apes, on the tree of life.

God claims in the story of the creation that he created mankind in his image, so he rules over the wild animals. If the religious liberals voluntarily believe that they are descendants of gorillas and chimpanzees on the tree of life, it is because their own genes closely match those of apes. In other words, their aptitude to reason, speak, and use complex tools is not drawn on the basis of such faculties being preprogrammed in the human body through a creator but is preprogrammed in the human body due to how the state of nature intended it. This signifies that if the religious liberals do not believe that an absolute truth pre-programmed the aptitude to reason, speak and use complex tools in the living creature that we call 'humans', then these human-like creatures that we are calling herein 'religious liberals' are just another type of primate. What distinguishes their behaviour from any other wildlife is only the unique faculty that such beasts are preprogrammed with in the same way God preprogrammed the creature that he said he created in his image and called 'man'. This also means that the actions of religious liberals in reality are meaningless, even if they can use their pre-programmed aptitude to stop the aging process. All the creations produced by religious liberals are baseless, and in the Old Testament creation story, God has made it lawful to rule over them.

Let us disregard all the creation that religious liberals exhibit in the material world, and let us consider that it doesn't count. Let us consider all the unnatural changes made by religious liberals as equivalent to the unnatural changes exhibited by other primates, fish, birds, or wild animals. In other words, we are going to assume we live in a world where we can count any unnatural change only if its author does not claim to hold religious conservative views. We want to disregard any unnatural changes the religious liberals execute in the matter using their human-like pre-programmed aptitude to reason, speak, and use complex tools because, as we said, it lacks an absolute truth foundation. Only the unnatural changes desired by people who hold religious conservative views are considered valid on the surface of the earth, because according to the Bible and various religious beliefs, the unnatural changes exhibited by authors are based on absolute truth. Let us now assume that the world population keeps on growing as the case is like until now, infinitely, with the people unnaturally changing matter as per the way they are presently doing it. As we said, we want to avoid any unnatural change made by a person who holds religious conservative views.

We could say that only the living things God made in his image and the natural system govern the earth in all its fauna and flora, as God intended. Currently, the natural system will continue to dominate the many natural rights that humans still have no power to change, even if they manage to stop the aging process. Let us exclude the possibility of humans gaining the ability to become invisible and transmit instructions to other living beings in the same manner that God is reported to have done in the Bible.

All the living people who consider themselves holders of religious conservative views were created on earth. People who claim to hold religious conservative views often do not understand the purpose of their own beliefs. The Bible is the only source that people who claim to hold religious conservative views use to interpret their intentions after birth on earth. Religious conservative research, which encompasses the Bible and various religious materials or signs, provides this information.

God said in the creation story that he put Adam and Eve in the Garden of Eden to work it. The next thing we read is that Adam and Eve defied God, and from that day until now, all that the people who claim that they consider that the universe was based on something objective, outside of human influence or perceptions, have been doing is playing this kingpin role that they have been exercising until now. Evidently, in between, there is the story of Jesus Christ. This phenomenon is because prior to the arrival of Jesus Christ, this entire struggle that people were living to balance out consequent reward and punishment, justice and retribution as means to guide people to start to interact with the objects that exist on the outside of their sensory systems in a conscientious way seems to have accompanied the people throughout this entire time, as the Old Testament of the Bible shows. Jesus Christ's benevolent decision to sacrifice his life for the sins of mankind seems to have provided those who hold religious conservative views with justification to continue serving the food and fruit that God arranged in return for their work in the garden of Eden, while neglecting the original purpose that the creation story claims God intended for Adam and Eve. Let us also remember to include how the segment of the population who pursues religious conservatives' views broadened the extent of their kingpin coverage so it includes having dominion over each other and even subduing each other.

Intention means what one intends to accomplish or attain. It implies little more than what one has in mind to do or bring about. The story of creation in the Old Testament of the Bible claims that God put the man he had formed in the garden that he created to work and take care of it. This evidence shows that God has gone beyond merely wishing to create the garden first and the man second; he has transformed that wish into a determined aim by first designing the garden and then bringing the man he created into it to take care of and work it. Man later defied and deviated from what God intended his creation to achieve.

In recent years, humans have designed an instrument that is pre-programmed with an advanced body recognition system based on a higher form of intelligence, which causes the instrument to stumble whenever it deviates from its intended objective. What causes the stumble is a mechanism that actuates a misstep. If the universe is

based on something objective, outside of human influence or perceptions, God must have installed overrides in the same way humans employ them to make the machinery they design trip whenever an instrument they build does not perform in line with its intended objective. In the case of humans, people have used their ingenuity to trip their instruments by actuating a mechanism that either warns them so they can detect a misstep or take immediate corrective measures. We think that in the case of God, He too must have installed overrides during His design of man. The only difference is that since God has preferred to remain invisible from his creation, he must have arranged for a mechanism to actuate, which works in the same way humans employ to make the instrument they design take corrective measures. In the case of humans, the flexibility of being a tangible creature makes it possible for them to pick between automatically or manually putting the instrument that they detect is taking a misstep back into operation according to how it was originally intended to be used. Humans are not able to perform the same override when they have their objects in outer space. Humans rely on pre-programmed logic to help them with fixing missteps they detect. As we said, there has to be a trigger that God must have incorporated in his design of man that could be actuating a mechanism so people return to serving what he intended from his creation to serve, and that is to work the earth and to take care of it. The only difference is that in the case of the instruments that people design, humans haven't managed to make their instrument reach to have a breath of life so the instrument they design can do a self-reexamination of what corrective measure is required for the instrument to go back to serving what the instrument was originally intended to serve. In the case of God, he must have pre-programmed this aptitude to reason, speak, and use complex tools in humans to carry out corrective measures and not necessarily to be served by it according to how such aptitude has been used till now to serve as humans think, and this is to play this kingpin role.

Therefore, as we said, God has preferred to remain invisible from his creation. If our speculation is correct that a natural right exists, it would make it impossible for religious conservatives to act on the pre-programmed and man-made natural and legal rights that their creator passed on to them. This natural right, which is the pre-programmed ability to reason, speak, and use complex tools, must be what triggers

this disobedience. This is because it is through this pre-programmed aptitude to reason, speak, and use complex tools that people disobeyed God. We will explain.

If the people whom God created didn't disobey his instruction and began to strive to find significance and immortality in their own achievements. All the people who consider themselves to pursue religious conservative views wouldn't be seizing habitable land; establishing custodianship functions of habitable lands; transferring material things to designated people, including restraining people's mobility; and so forth to make it very difficult when people multiply and replenish as God commanded. People would be working the earth and taking care of it as God intended. People would be wandering on the surface of the earth, doing not much different from what the animals that cohabit the earth with humans would be doing. Except in the case of humans, they would be using their aptitude to reason, speak, and use complex tools to survive. People wouldn't be dealing with the problem of the security of one person being the forgone security of the other. The only time the problem of the security of one person is going to interfere with that of another person so it becomes the foregone security of both is when both require sustaining their survival needs. People would settle this in the same way animals do or wait on each other, as animals also do. Moreover, if we also go by what the story of the creation in the Old Testament reports on, God was very disappointed when Adam and Eve disobeyed him. This reaction from God indicates that He opposed humans disobeying Him. When people disobeyed God, it was an arbitrary choice, and Adam and Eve used the preprogrammed aptitude to reason, speak, and use complex tools that God fitted them with to trigger the act of disobedience.

We could then say that if the universe were based on something objective, outside of human influence or perceptions as of the day people disobeyed God's instruction and began to strive to find significance and immortality in their own achievements, we have a condition in which two intentions are competing against each other. There is the one that God intended, and there is the other intention that humans laid out as of the day when humans began to strive to find significance and immortality in their own achievements. Luckily, as

we said, God sent his only son, so he sacrifices his life for the sins of mankind, thus by so doing giving humans the coverage they require to go on seizing habitable land; establishing custodianship functions of habitable lands; transferring material things to designated people, including restraining people's mobility; and so forth to make it very difficult when people multiply and replenish as God commanded.

It is one thing that Jesus Christ was generous enough to go to the extent of sacrificing his life for the sins of mankind, but the mere scarification doesn't solve the problem of finding habitable land for those people who didn't make it yet to be among the living. In other words, the people who are not born yet, those new human beings, have not disobeyed God, so Jesus Christ's benevolent decision to sacrifice his life for their sins kicks in—those new human beings are not born yet. Those new people have to be born first, before Jesus's sacrifice of his own life kicks in to salvage them. However, if, as we said, people refuse to give their possessions to all those newborns as Jesus Christ himself suggested when he was speaking to this young man who asked him about what he needed to do to win eternal life and instead want to seize habitable land, establish custodianship functions of habitable lands, transfer material things to designated people, and so forth. No matter what those new human beings who are not born yet would do to sustain their survival needs and to satiate their earthly desires, it would not be possible for those newborns to do it if they also had to find significance and immortality in their own achievements, so Jesus Christ's sacrifice kicks in. This signifies that whenever any newborn who becomes among the living and his procreators happen to pursue religious conservative views, he has no choice but to accept that he was brought into life to be among those who are disobeying God. This is because this decision to live according to the way God intended humans to serve on earth cannot be something that a newborn could decide upon only until a certain age later. This decision signifies that until the age when the newborn reaches to be able to make his own decision, it is not his own pre-programmed aptitude to reason, speak, and use complex tools that makes him disobey what God intended for him, serving on earth, but his procreators.

Moreover, during the entire time in which the procreators would be maintaining their override over their newborn's pre-programmed

aptitude to reason, speak, and use complex tools, the newborn doesn't seize habitable land, establish custodianship functions of habitable lands, transfer material things to designated people, include restraining people's mobility, and so forth. The newborn procreators later seize all possessions intended for their newborn, and as a result of this action, the newborn is compelled to spend his entire life using his pre-programmed aptitude to reason, speak, and use complex tools to pursue intentions that are completely contrary to what God intended for him on earth. Evidently, even if the newborn wants to make use of his preprogrammed aptitude to reason, speak, and use complex tools to act on what Jesus Christ suggested people do to win eternal life, it will be impossible to do because people have laws that restrain mobility. The natural system, not pre-programmed aptitude to reason, speak, and use complex tools, controls and regulates what people can sustain their survival needs and satiate their earthly desires with. This evidence signifies that the human insecurity problem that all the people who consider themselves to pursue religious conservative views have known, from the time of our ancestors to now, cannot be due to the pre-programmed aptitude to reason, speak, and use complex tools that God pre-programmed in people, but it was the people who considered that they pursued religious conservative views of their own making.

We could then say that the decision made by those who consider themselves to hold religious conservative views—to disobey God—was entirely their own choice. In other words, those who consider themselves to have religiously conservative views chose to seek significance and immortality through their own achievements. We believe that man's disobedience to God is unrelated to the purpose for which man was intended to serve God on earth. This statement suggests that we believe man's disobedience to God has no connection to people's inability to exhibit friendliness or to land seizures that hinder others' survival and satisfaction of earthly desires.

Religious conservatives who cannot understand that using the God-given ability to reason, speak, and create complex tools to detect God's existence will continue to transform habitable lands into a theater of operation in search of personal significance and immortality. This behavior is in contrast to allowing newborns to begin their life journey by fulfilling the true purpose that God intended for humanity, which is

to care for and cultivate the earth; however, the procreators of these newborns still ignore the implications of their actions. The only reason the procreators of those newborns can't understand the implications may be anti-logic. This is because if God pre-programs newborns with the aptitude to reason, speak, and use complex tools, then the actions of their procreators—who use this pre-programmed aptitude to prevent the newborns from fulfilling God's expectations—are inherently illogical, while the universal desire for eternal life remains an immutable and unchangeable difference. Currently, no individuals are born with anti-logic, nor can they develop it at any point in their lives. The conduct that the procreators of those newborns are exhibiting, using their pre-programmed aptitude to reason, speak, and use complex tools to prevent newborns from fulfilling the intentions they were born to serve, is not an innate trait, nor can they hope to acquire it at any time during their lives. This is because all people are born here on earth. As we also showed, it was people's own choice to disobey God in favor of finding significance and immortality in their achievements. This argument signifies that it could be possible to comprehend what makes the procreators of those newborns exhibit both this logic and antilogic conduct by investigating the fundamental difference that could be making God impossible to understand: if the procreators of those newborns fail to establish custodianship functions of habitable land, they would be unable to sustain their survival needs. If God had made the habitable land large enough for each person to meet their survival needs and obtain significance and immortality in their achievements, then people would not be obliged to defy his command.

God's decision to remain invisible to his creation has created a major human insecurity problem from our ancestors to now. In the days when God was active and in contact with his creation. According to the story of creation in the Old Testament of the Bible, when wickedness on earth increased, God destroyed all human life except for Noah and his family, whom he spared before the flood. God didn't explain what specifically he found Noah doing righteously so people would begin doing the same and, in this way, please God forever. However, the most perplexing question in this event, where God and Noah lived, is that the story of creation in the Old Testament of the Bible reports that when God asked Noah to come off the ark after he destroyed all life on

earth, he did say that all the inclinations of the human heart are going to be evil from childhood. There are two question marks that we would like to pose. Why did God destroy all life on Earth if humans' hearts would be evil from childhood? This signifies that nothing was going to change on earth in the conduct of humans. The second question mark may either be a mistake or indicate a true statement. From the time of our ancestors to now, we can say that God's perception of the hearts of all Noah's descendants was accurate because only a minimal number of people managed to act on the principle He advocated.

If God had no special personal affection toward Noah, only two reasons could explain why God found Noah righteous and decided to spare him. One of those two reasons might be that God found Noah acting on the principles he commanded, which were to avoid requiring humanity to detect his existence in order to distinguish between right and wrong, thus ensuring that one person's security becomes the other's foregone security. The second reason could be that God used Noah as a case study so people would draw lessons from what it was that Noah was not doing, the reason why God found him righteous and next spared him. In the case of the people that succeeded Noah, it was, of course, the pre-programmed aptitude that God fitted all his creation with, and this is the faculty to reason, speak, and use complex tools that was going to help those who succeeded Noah spare their own lives if they were to match the unnatural changes that they would exhibit in matter with what Noah was doing.

We have no way of knowing what specifically God found to be righteous in what Noah was doing to spare him, but if we were to consider the two reasons that we said could be among the multitude of reasons that could have pushed God to spare Noah's life.

Still, the human insecurity issue that religious conservatives have known since ancient times may be due to one of two things: Either the people who claim to hold religious conservative views are doing something different from what Noah did—otherwise God found him righteous and spared him—or what people do now is different from what Noah did after God spared his life. This conclusion is because the insecurity that people have known before God destroyed life on earth

and after God said he would not repeat and destroy life has not changed.

If all that any human being on earth can do is to sustain his survival needs and to satiate his earthly desires and to carry out any one of those two human activities, a person must unnaturally change matter. This includes Noah, whom God found righteous.

Now, if all the people who lived after Noah until now, even when they were not united with each other or when they became so as of the year 1945, are not able to put their hands on the kind of unnatural changes the people who claim to be holding on to religious conservative views must begin to exhibit in matters, people could begin to live in peace in the only life that each one has. Let us call those actions unnatural changes in matter so they would even show God that people managed to find significance and immortality in their own achievements and, at the same time, work the earth and take care of it as he desired so God wouldn't go on thinking that the inclination of the heart of humans from childhood is still evil.

The fundamental difference that could be making the implications impossible to be understood by people regarding what they have to do can only be due to something that is antilogical.

This is because if people are born with logic, then the actions that Noah was exhibiting were anti-logic, whereas the need by all people to unnaturally change matter to sustain their survival needs and to satiate their earthly desires is immutable and an unchangeable difference. Now, hence, all people cannot be born with anti-logic, nor can they acquire it at any time in their lives. People's conduct in preventing others from meeting their survival needs and fulfilling their desires is neither innate nor acquirable; all people are born on earth.

This study signifies that it could be possible to comprehend what makes people exhibit both this logic and anti-logic conduct by investigating the fundamental difference that could be making humans unable to understand that making certain unnatural changes in matter is impossible. Therefore, the only quality that God could have found in Noah to spare him was related to how Noah's approach to changing

matter differed from that of the people who lived before his birth or after his death. Thus, we could conclude that the only difference between Noah and the people who lived before or after him was that Noah avoided changing matter in a way that contradicted God's desires for him on earth.

In the story of creation, it says that God created man in his image so he could work the earth and take care of it. Next, man (Adam) defied God in his pursuit of knowledge about good and evil to find significance and immortality in his accomplishments.

If our analysis contains any truth, it suggests that Noah was likely just spending his life exhibiting unnatural changes in matter solely aimed at working the earth and taking care of his survival needs. This is because Noah had tried to detect his existence beyond exhibiting this minimum required unnatural change in matter. This would signify that he would be obliged to do as people are doing: seizing habitable land; establishing custodianship functions of habitable lands; transferring material things to designated people, including restraining people's mobility; and so forth. This is because only if Noah seized habitable land; established custodianship functions of habitable lands; transferred material things to designated people, including restraining people's mobility; and so forth could he have found significance and immortality in his accomplishments so God wouldn't continue to consider him righteous.

Could the human insecurity problem that the segment of the population who claim to be holding on to religious conservative views are dealing with from the days of Noah to now be due to people's refusal to do what our analysis showed Noah must have lived doing and, before him, Adam and Eve were doing as well until they disobeyed God? In other words, Noah was primarily focused on working the earth and taking care of it.

If our analysis so far contains any truth, it suggests that the human insecurity problem faced by those who claim to hold religious conservative views may stem from their refusal to follow the example set by Noah, Adam, and Eve in working the earth and taking care of it. This evidence signifies that it could be possible to comprehend what

makes the people who claim to be holding on to religious conservative views continue to disobey God from the days of Adam till now. This conclusion is because what the segment of the population who claim to be holding on to religious conservative views has been relying on to disobey God is the preprogrammed aptitude to reason, speak, and use complex tools that God himself preprogrammed in people. This pre-programmed aptitude to reason, speak, and use complex tools enables people to distinguish between good and evil. When people distinguish between good and evil, this is when they seek significance and immortality in their achievements. When people seek significance and immortality in their achievements, they unnaturally alter matter to fulfill needs beyond what God commanded—to work the earth and take care of it, as religious conservatives claim.

When individuals who assert that they uphold religious conservative views artificially manipulate matter to create things that are not aligned with God's intentions for how humans should work and care for the earth, they are acting unnaturally. The people who claim to be holding on to religious conservative views rely on their pre-programmed aptitude to reason, speak, and use complex tools to engineer those instruments that they use to help them discover significance and immortality in their achievements. The instruments engineered by those who claim to hold religious conservative views also assist them in distinguishing between good and evil. When the people who claim to be holding on to religious conservative views seek to distinguish between good and evil, they depend on their pre-programmed aptitude to reason, speak, and use complex tools to help them in this task. The pre-programmed aptitude to reason, speak, and use complex tools is what the people who claim to be holding on to religious conservative views use to disobey God. This evidence signifies that it is possible to investigate if there exists a natural right that makes it impossible for religious conservatives to act on the pre-programmed and manmade natural and legal rights that their creator passed on to them. This conclusion arises from the fact that the ability of those who claim to hold on to religious conservative views to distinguish between good and evil is based on their own pre-programmed and man-made natural and legal rights. The people who claim to hold on to religious conservative views have decided to disobey God.

The people who claim to be holding on to religious conservative views are disobeying what God intended they serve so they could use their time on earth to produce instruments that enrich their lives, because they believe that those tools they spend their time seizing habitable land, establishing custodianship functions of habitable lands, transferring material things to designated people, including restraining people's mobility, and so forth are better for them than working the earth and taking care of the earth as God wanted.

It is impossible to determine which specific natural and unnatural changes—whether from the natural system alone or from changes caused by people claiming to uphold religious conservative views—instigated such people to believe that their lives would be richer if they sought significance and immortality in their achievements rather than as God commanded.

Let us just say that it could very well be true what Protagoras once said about “man being the measure of all things,” because the human imagination is capable of everything, including leading man to believe that he is better off disobeying God in favor of erecting roads, buildings, amusement parks, factories, televisions, cars, and producing chocolate, apple pie, orange juice, and so forth. The problem is that while it is beneficial to build resilience against the natural system, the current state of affairs focuses on producing cellular phones, remote controls, robots, and similar technologies. God made man, and as we said, he uses his days to work and care for the earth. People abandoned God’s plan and began to seek significance and immortality in their achievements.

It is one thing to build resilience and to take advantage of the pre-programmed aptitude to reason, speak, and use complex tools to make life easy, as is the case today by fabricating cars, cellular telephones, microwaves, and so forth. However, the human body is made of both a physical body and a non-material component: the pre-programmed aptitude to reason, speak, and use complex tools. Those two properties exist together and do not become separated from each other during a person's life.

We have no way of knowing what Adam and Eve were doing when they defied God. However, the story of creation in the Old Testament of the Bible reports that God created the heavens and the earth in the beginning, and then he created man. God made man depend on the natural system and not the other way around. It is one thing that God created man and placed him in the garden of Eden to work the earth and take care of it. However, if God created the natural system, it includes seedtime and harvest, cold and heat, summer and winter, and day and night. Next, God misinterpreted that when Adam and Eve defied him and used their pre-programmed aptitude to reason, speak, and use complex tools, their intention may have been to align with his instruction so that the human body he created in his own image would be preoccupied with things closely related to what God intended the human body to serve for him: to work the earth, to take care of it, and to make the human body serve God's intentions better. This scenario could allow us to say that there is a fundamental difference between using the pre-programmed aptitude to reason, speak, and use complex tools to enable the human body to be fit and strong to work the earth and to take care of it versus the act of shifting the human body away from the responsibility that God designed for the body.

This scenario suggests that Adam and Eve could have utilized their pre-programmed abilities to reason, speak, and use complex tools to enhance the resilience of their bodies, enabling them to work the earth and care for it effectively. Alternatively, Adam and Eve used their pre-programmed aptitude to reason, speak, and use complex tools to keep their human bodies idle so they wouldn't be fit to work the earth and to take care of it.

The predicament is that, as reality shows, humans used their pre-programmed aptitude to reason, speak, and use complex tools to build the resilience of their human bodies so they could use them next to work the earth and to take care of it better, and they created things around them so it keeps the human body idle to get the human body and the pre-programmed aptitude to reason, speak, and use complex tools to feel enriched.

If God understands that people build resilience through such an action, which results in people finding their human bodies working the earth

and in taking care of it less because the progress that they make helps them to carry out this task more efficiently, then He is able to do so. The only factor that could prevent God from understanding the implications is an illogical action taken by Adam and Eve. This conclusion is because if God possessed logic, the decision God took to repent having created man is anti-logical, whereas the need by all people to build resilience is immutable and an unchangeable difference given how God created the natural system, including man's dependence on the natural system to sustain survival needs and to satiate earthly desires. Therefore, God cannot possess anti-logic, nor can God acquire it at any time, because God has remained invisible until now. People can't be born with or acquire resilience; they are born on Earth. This argument signifies that comprehending why God exhibits both logical and illogical conduct is beyond our understanding, and the best option is to refrain from investigating the fundamental difference that might prevent God from understanding that building resilience is possible. To the contrary, investigate if, when people use their pre-programmed aptitude to reason, speak, and use complex tools to build the resilience of their human body so they could use it next to work the earth and to take care of it better and create things around them, it keeps the human body idle to feel enriched, or if building the resilience of their human body so they could use it next to work the earth and to take care of it better and then not let the things people create push the human body to be idle to feel enriched from what the pre-programmed aptitude to reason, speak, and use complex tools creates. This conclusion arises because humans making the human body work less is exactly what God opposed—specifically, not working the earth and taking care of it.

So, since we can't blame God for the lack of work or neglect of the earth, it's clear that people are making these choices on their own. Moreover, we cannot say that evil is driving people to build high-rises, cell phones, and similar technologies, because it is illogical to argue that evil compels humans to create computers, cars, and machines, as these tools contribute to an enriched human life.

We can say, though, that perhaps building high rises, cellular phones, etc. could be evil when the people who claim to be holding on to religious conservative views seize habitable land, establish

custodianship functions of habitable lands, transfer material things to designated people, and so forth to fabricate cars and computers. They force people who claim to hold religious conservative views, yet want to practice what God intended, to refrain from acting as God suggested.

This situation is because those people who claim to be holding on to religious conservative views and who seize habitable land, and who establish custodianship functions of habitable lands, and who transfer material things to designated people, including restraining people's mobility, and so forth, are relying on the cars and computers that they applied their pre-programmed aptitude to reason, speak, and use complex tools to fabricate to help them in this task of displacing those who disagree with their good intentions for the world. The only problem is that the good intentions for the world held by those who apply their pre-programmed aptitude to reason, speak, and use complex tools to create are derived from habitable lands. Humans are now deciding what is better for the terrestrial material they use to formulate their projects. This situation then signifies that people are defying God, failing to work the earth and take care of it as God intended, and arbitrarily changing how the natural system controls materials of terrestrial origin.

The human body is a thing, and the natural system is what controls how it changes, not the pre-programmed aptitude to reason, speak, and use complex tools that do it. The pre-programmed aptitude to reason, speak, and use complex tools can only enhance the resilience of the human body; however, it does not determine when the human body should act based on the decisions it transmits. This process runs first through the natural system. This phenomenon is because the changes that the natural system is undergoing are what control what action the human body shall take after running this decision by the pre-programmed aptitude to reason, speak, and use complex tools. The first step, then, will involve making a decision on what action to take. This action can be either to react or to abstain from reacting. If the pre-programmed ability to reason, speak, and use complex tools decides to react, then it makes a choice. This choice can be either positive or negative. In other words, the human body, through the pre-programmed aptitude to reason, speak, and use complex tools, is

deciding on what is good and evil for the material of terrestrial origin, which the natural system controls.

The natural system overrules both the material of terrestrial origin and the human body. Earlier we said we have no way of knowing what Adam and Eve were doing when they defied God given the multitude of natural and unnatural changes that the natural system on its own exhibits and the changes that people who claim to be holding on to religious conservative views also cause. Then, we said, let us just go along with what Protagoras once claimed about "Man is the measure of all things." This is because if humans believe they can override the natural system in the same manner that they defied God, it represents an entirely different situation. In the next chapter, we will examine whether man is truly striving to become the measure of all things. This investigation should help us to reveal if there exists a natural right that makes it impossible for religious conservatives to act on the pre-programmed and manmade natural and legal rights that their creator passed on to them.

When Certainty Meets its Limits

People formulate judgments based on their interpretations of what their human senses transmit, which is then processed by their pre-programmed abilities to reason, speak, and use complex tools. Due to each human being possessing pre-programmed aptitude to reason, speak, and use complex tools that react totally differently in each person based on the changes that the natural system is naturally on its own undergoing. People termed the unnatural changes that the distinguishable action a person exhibits in the natural system to be what the human behavior of what each individual has interpreted; hence, what later becomes exhibited is the collective or distinguished manner that people decide to act like based on what the pre-programmed aptitude to reason, speak, and use complex tools has processed and decided upon.

Human behavior denotes the range of conduct that people exhibit when the multitude of factors that engulf their physical body influence them to react and exhibit unnatural changes in matter. The factors that instigate the human body to exhibit unnatural changes in matter are events and actions in reality that the human senses transmit to the earthly desires for further processing by human imagination and human ingenuity before the human senses of the individual who is perceiving the actions decide if they should take action or ignore them.

All people are born on earth. People are divided over how the universe originated and are split between what we call religious conservatives

and religious liberals. The religious conservatives believe that the universe is based on something objective, outside of human influence or perceptions. The religious liberals reject the inerrancy that religious conservatives claim and believe in the theory of evolution that supports that humans are related to primates, like apes, on the tree of life.

We have no way of knowing how the split between the religious conservatives and the religious liberals began. We believe that the fundamental difference between religious conservatives and religious liberals, which makes it impossible for them to understand one another, lies in their views on the origin of human life. However, each of these two creatures possesses the pre-programmed aptitude to think, speak, reason, and use complex tools. The disparity between the religious conservatives and the religious liberals is more about how this pre-programmed aptitude originated, but not about what the pre-programmed aptitude helps both to achieve.

A line, together with a point, is a basic concept of elementary geometry that permits man to make predictions about the physical world. The idea of a line together with a point is an abstraction that distills our understanding of the concept of the shortest distance between two points when it concerns a line segment or the points that the line joins. A line can be infinite, but a line segment includes endpoints. Lines and points are used to keep track of lots of information. If a person is walking from home to the office and experiences a heart attack in the middle of the road, they will fall. The spot where the person fell is now crucial, as it marks where their heart stopped.

The fundamental difference that exists between religious conservatives and religious liberals that makes understanding one another impossible on how human life originated and where the human soul goes after death is a topic that is outside the scope of work in this study. This study's scope begins when a newborn is considered alive and continues until a person dies. While people with religious conservative or liberal views reach their end point in different ways, both sides agree on this.

The people who consider themselves to be holding on to religious conservatives or religious liberals are both pre-programmed with the aptitude to reason, speak, and use complex tools. The people who consider themselves to be holding on to religious conservatism or religious liberalism both possess the aptitude to distinguish between safety and danger. People who consider themselves religious conservatives or liberals, whether they use their reasoning, speaking, and tool-using abilities during their lives or not, will succumb and die. Such a scenario would be the case when a person is born deaf and handicapped mentally.

People who identify as religious conservatives and believe that the universe is based on an objective reality, independent of human influence or perception, hold the view that when individuals die, it is because God has decreed that event. This is not what religious liberals believe regarding how a person reaches their end. The religious liberals do not believe that any form of absolute truth or a creator becomes involved when a person drops dead.

The surface of the earth contains steep cliffs that are dangerous. We have no way of knowing whether, when a person who claims to hold religious conservative views stands near a steep cliff and falls to his death, it was God, the devil, or both who caused the incident. In this work, we argue that the purpose of human life is to allow each individual in the human family to live beyond the years that God specified in the creation story and to find ways to halt the aging process in order to extend human life beyond current life expectancies. Therefore, we consider that the aptitude to reason, which distinguishes religious conservatives or religious liberals from any other living creatures, is what those two creatures rely on to distinguish between danger and evil. Moreover, if animals can distinguish between danger and evil, it is illogical to assume that humans, who possess the aptitude to reason, would be any different from primates in their ability to prevent God or evil from taking action that endangers their security.

Instead, it was when religious conservatives and religious liberals began to rely on their pre-programmed aptitude to reason, speak, and use complex tools that they started to understand dangers that extend beyond what the natural system evokes.

Therefore, it was people's progress that made religious conservatives and religious liberals switch from using their mouths and hands for survival to fabricating tools to help them achieve the same purpose. The religious conservatives and religious liberals fabricate and use spoons and knives. A knife is a tool with a cutting edge or blade. Knives have been an essential tool for survival since early man and were used as weapons, tools, and eating utensils. We cannot say that God or evil pushed religious conservatives and religious liberals to invent knives so they could be used as weapons, tools, and eating utensils. First, God wanted the religious conservatives to be taking care of the earth and to work it without reaching to distinguish between evil and good. Second, the snake in the creation story convinced Adam and Eve to disobey God with the intention of helping them distinguish between good and evil.

We have no way of knowing how the religious liberals became able to distinguish between good and evil. However, we do know that the religious conservatives became able to distinguish between good and evil after they disobeyed God. The ability that allows both religious conservatives and religious liberals to distinguish between good and evil is the inherent capacity for reasoning that both groups possess.

Religious conservatives and religious liberals define the act of reasoning to signify the process of contemplating something in a logical way to form a judgment and conclusion. The judgment made by religious conservatives and religious liberals when applying the process of reasoning reflects their stance on issues they perceive as either faulty or valid.

Religious conservatives and religious liberals believe that the act of murdering another human being is immoral and wrong. Religious conservatives claim that it was God who passed on to their ancestors that murdering another human being is immoral, and until now those people who believe in the inerrancy of God still preach to people to practice this law. The religious liberals who reject the inerrancy and inspiration reported in the religious books rely on man-made laws whose truth was deemed by them, here on earth, as to why murdering another human being is immoral. From the time of our ancestors to

now, religious conservatives and religious liberals still murder one another and even murder people who share their beliefs. We cannot claim that the pre-programmed aptitude for reasoning inherent in religious conservatives is logic, while that of religious liberals is anti-logic; these represent immutable and unchangeable differences. Moreover, since both religious conservatives and religious liberals agree that exhibiting wicked or evil acts is immoral, their shared pre-programmed aptitude for reasoning helps them distinguish between danger and safety. This conclusion signifies that the fundamental difference that makes it impossible for religious conservatives or religious liberals to agree to stopping exhibiting any murder acts cannot be due to one creature being born with logic and the other being born with anti-logic. This also means that it is not possible for any religious conservatives or religious liberals to claim that he possesses the capacity to distinguish between what is right and what is wrong, given how God has decided till now to remain invisible from his creation and the religious liberals claim that humans are related to primates, like apes, on the tree of life.

This also signifies that from our ancestors to now, neither the religious conservatives nor the religious liberals have reached the ability to distinguish between what is right and what is wrong, so any newborn doesn't have to feel threatened. This also means that if any newborn, after he becomes among the living, finds that regardless of which of the only two available choices for him to consider how humans originated on earth—either to believe that the universe is based on something objective, outside of human influence or perceptions, or to consider that humans are related to primates, like apes, on the tree of life—he seeks refuge against the wickedness that exists in the hearts of both creatures. This can only be due to two reasons for the case of the people who claim they hold to religious conservatives' views. Either the people who claim they hold to religious conservatives' views don't want to be civilized beyond this initial stage of sentient evolution or religious conservatives are indeed related to primates, like apes, on the tree of life.

Therefore, people who hold to religious liberal views began to practice friendly relations in 1945, despite voluntarily admitting that they are related to primates, like apes, on the tree of life. Religious liberals

admit they can't tell right from wrong from birth to death. In the case of the religious conservatives, they have known that they too practice friendly relations since God placed them on earth, and they have not been able to attain them. Most importantly, religious conservatives claim that their God pre-programmed them to distinguish between what is right and what is wrong, but from birth until death they are not to exhibit this capacity. Therefore, religious conservatives refuse to accept that they are not in denial about being related to primates, like apes, on the tree of life, unlike the religious liberals. The last place to check to establish what could be preventing religious conservatives from going beyond this initial stage of sentient evolution is that there must be a factor here on earth that blurs their capacity to reason and to make reasonable judgments. Given how this factor is inhibiting people's ability to reason, it must be something that is linked to changes that are taking place continually in reality. People's inability to judge is solely due to changes that can distort their reasoning. However, as we mentioned earlier, this factor is undermining a natural right, making it impossible for religious conservatives to act on the pre-programmed and manmade natural and legal rights that their creator bestowed upon them.

Religious conservatives consider many factors in their lives, but no religious conservative can claim to have been born with the ability to distinguish right from wrong regarding those factors. Factors such as faith, attitude, emotions, values, culture, social norms, authority, persuasion, and ethics can influence people's positions on what is right and wrong, potentially leading them to alter their behavior in unnatural ways. Human behavior refers to the range of good or evil judgment or conclusion that a person takes when any one of those sample factors that we cited influence the human imagination, human ingenuity, and earthly desires to consider that it is necessary that a person engage his senses to address the changes that are forecasted by the factor exhibited or to ignore them. If the changes that are forecasted are factors that other people are exhibiting, the outcome will also fix the reaction that the person will exhibit in reality, which could either be to react because the human imagination, human ingenuity, earthly desires, or even human senses, which we all term "human behavior," deem that an action is warranted. Alternatively, walk away or leave the factor alone because human behavior deems it not something that

human imagination, human ingenuity, earthly desires, or even human senses should take action upon.

If, as we are saying, it is factors that religious conservatives take judgments on that influence human behavior to exhibit valid or faulty opinions on, and if already no person can claim that he was born possessing the capacity to distinguish between what is right and what is wrong on them, then human imagination, human ingenuity, and earthly desires must have picked up that something that forces those three faculties to take a decision that could either be for or against from somewhere. This something cannot be from other religious conservative creatures because the factors that religious conservative creatures take decisions and positions on are factors that pertain to how to exhibit natural changes in matter. Only religious conservatives exhibit unnatural changes in reality. The other living creatures that exhibit human-like unnatural changes in reality, we said that those humans look alike; they consider themselves related to primates, like apes, on the tree of life. We categorized all the unnatural changes exhibited by humans, animals, trees, plants, and other entities together.

As we mentioned earlier, religious conservatives invented the knife and began using it for their survival. In one hand, religious conservatives use a knife as a weapon, and in the other, as utensils. We focus on the dangerous changes that religious conservatives exhibit in reality for peaceful purposes using a knife because they are the ones that destabilize the human security of others, rather than the unnatural ones.

We have no way of knowing from among the many factors that exist to influence human behavior which specific factor pushes religious conservatives to propel each other to exhibit unnatural changes in matter that are negative in nature. However, since, as we said, the changes that reality is continuously undergoing are what give the signal to the human imagination, human ingenuity, and earthly desires, it is necessary that a person engage his senses to address the changes that are taking place. This behavior is what we termed to represent the human behavior that a person exhibits due to the multitude of factors that are ongoing at any point in time in the life of a person, thus influencing him to make a decision or a judgment. Let us define

earthly desires as the governing instrument or faculty that prompts the human senses to react, because the behavior exhibited by the human body and ingenuity ultimately determines the price a person pays whenever their judgments—whether faulty or valid—differ from the conclusions the person considers valid or faulty.

Let us provide an example to explain this last idea. Religious conservatives and religious liberals believe that murdering a human being is immoral and wrong and is punishable with imprisonment for the person who commits the murder act. If a person witnessed the murder and decided not to accuse the killer, the family of the victim may retaliate negatively against the witness because he decided to hide the truth, and the immediate family of the victim may try to kill the witness for taking, according to them, an unfair position. If the person who was witnessing the murder charges the killer, the killer's family may try to retaliate and kill the witness because he told the truth this time. So, the witness's earthly desires will determine which side he takes. If the notion of living is important to the person who witnessed the killing, this subject will seek protection; otherwise, he will disregard the consequences he might face from the killer's and victim's relatives. Therefore, we could then say that the earthly desires of the witness will be what determines and establishes if it should seek protection against any form of retaliation or not, and such a decision is due to how much the earthly desires deem it worth remaining among the living.

Hence, human imagination, human ingenuity, and even the human body are dependent on what earthly desires deem important and worth living for in life. This is because human imagination, human ingenuity, and even the human body have no power to overpower the conclusions that earthly desires reach. Moreover, since earthly desires cannot distinguish between right and wrong, it is religious conservatives who inform these desires about their role. In other words, living people shape the earthly desires of newborns, guiding them to display unnatural changes based on what they consider fair and unfair. This is then the same human imagination that the living people transferred to the newborn, which is what ends up conditioning the human imagination of the newborn to abide by and oppose.

What a person must abide by and/or oppose are the actions that the living people tell him are right or wrong. The actions are nothing but the reactions that people take when they exhibit changes in matter, which, as we said, the multitude of actions that are ongoing in reality influence them at all the times to come to a conclusion about.

The dilemma is that from the time of our ancestors to now, people have been trying to condition each other so that when it comes to the turn of new people to take custodianship of the earth, they are prepared. To exhibit how no matter how rational or irrational a given factor is, it influences human behavior to react in reality. To ensure that the unnatural changes that a person exhibits in matter abide by man-made laws and social norms, which do act as social controls to guide or condition the way people behave or alter matter as well.

The man-made laws and social norms that people do use as social controls to guide or condition the way people behave or alter matter, humans, as we said, draw them from two sources. Religious conservatives believe that God dictated to them how to distinguish between what is right and what is wrong. Religious liberals distinguish between what is right and what is wrong based on their understanding of evolution, which shows that humans are related to primates like apes on the tree of life.

People exhibit evil and wicked acts against each other in a multitude of ways. The worst manner people use is when the evil or wicked acts they exhibit against one another result in a person's life ending unnaturally before it could naturally end, either through old age or a malfunction in the human body. Until now, people could see their lives end unnaturally at the hands of other people if those other humans with whom they co-existed resorted to using their mouths, hands, or objects they found in nature to kill each other.

We cannot determine which methods people currently use most frequently to kill each other, but it seems that they are increasingly relying on objects rather than using their hands or mouths.

We have no way of knowing if the laws and/or the social norms that religious conservatives believe that God proposed to them, and among

them is included the command of "do not kill," and they have been till now not able to fully practice it due to knives having been invented during the early days when God was communicating with his people. If humans lived in the time when God spoke to them, they would have used their mouths or hands to kill. This is because, if knives didn't exist when God commanded his creation to stop killing one another, the only remaining motive for humans to begin murdering each other with knives would be to look beyond human ingenuity as a potential culprit. It is human ingenuity that produced the knife that people use to murder each other with. We can only think of one reason that could be keeping those people who consider themselves religious conservatives from killing each other in modern times: looking beyond whether those segments of the population are doing things beyond what their God instructed them to stay away from. In the story of the creation, in the Old Testament of the Bible, it is reported that God asked people to stay away from distinguishing between good and evil. Could we then say that the more social progress those people who consider themselves religious conservatives contribute to creating around them, the more their ability to distinguish between what is right and what is wrong gets blurred because they are disobeying God?

No analysis is needed to determine whether increased social progress correlates with a diminished ability among proponents of evolutionary theory to distinguish right from wrong. This is because, for those who believe that humans are related to primates, such as apes, on the tree of life, all the social controls they use to guide or condition behavior are already man-made.

Could social progress blur people's ability to distinguish between what is right and what is wrong? This is because earthly desire is a function of social progress. Does this conclusion signify that it is not possible to control the earthly desires of people because social progress is what makes people exhibit earthly desires? We can only hope that religious conservatives and religious liberals do not expect to do so by relying on a higher form of knowledge like surveillance cameras or computers, because even when God, who created the people who are religious conservatives, tried to follow his creation personally, he failed.

In other words, if the social controls that people develop guide or condition the way people behave or alter matter, it is not possible to control through such conditioning human behavior to abide by the guidelines that people put forth. This is because earthly desires, which are the property that people develop social controls to contain, are uncontainable. What makes earthly desires uncontainable is social progress, and what makes it containable is stripping it away from social progress. This phenomenon signifies that earthly desires and social progress leverage the type of consequence the human body will deal with if the actions that the human body exhibits don't fall within the social controls that, on their basis, interact with one another. This phenomenon is also the reason why when people are incarcerated and/or placed in solitary confinement, their human behavior becomes manageable. This conclusion is because only when a subject gets stripped from any object that can influence their earthly desires does the risk they pose of exhibiting evil and wicked acts reduce only to what a human being is capable of exhibiting naturally using their hands and mouth.

If our analysis so far is accurate, then, as we have stated, no man-made law can condition an individual's human behavior—whether they are free or incarcerated—regarding how matter can be altered, because earthly desires are much stronger than man-made social controls. Also, as we said, both the interpreted and uninterpreted actions of earthly desires are equally important to preserve human security. This conclusion signifies that incarcerating, isolating, or placing sanctions on those who choose to alter matter in a negative way due to acts that specific human behaviors instigated does not bring added positive changes in matter. As we mentioned, humans inherently represent a form of progress, and the simple fact that a person is alive indicates that they are constantly contributing to the alteration of matter, as no human can be idle except in death. Therefore, any attempt to consider that by isolating human behaviors, such an approach would be a way to claim that all members of the human family live in peace with one another or that the world is on its way to becoming peaceful is incorrect. Humans need to be stripped of the kingpin role they voted for, not social controls that limit their actions in society. The only way to help religious conservatives and religious liberals succeed in their mission to prevent people from exhibiting what they consider

unnatural and evil changes is to deny those people access to knowledge. In this way, people's ability to distinguish between what is right and what is wrong becomes stagnant. What distinguishes humans from other living creatures is the ability to speak, reason, and use complex tools; immediately after a newborn enters the world, the first thing that happens is the transfer of knowledge to that newborn. The mere act of informing a newborn that their mouth and hands can be used to commit harmful acts against another person, as we are suggesting, poses a danger to any human being. People rely on knowledge to progress and preserve human security. As long as human behavior is influenced by factors that represent social progress, each individual's reaction will vary from person to person because social progress affects their earthly desires in different ways. This argument is also an anti-logic argument because it insinuates that knowledge makes people unable to control their human behavior, so they stop exhibiting evil acts when people believe that knowledge helps people to overcome the opposite. Let us also mention that people continue to gain knowledge throughout life, which does not prevent them from exhibiting evil acts against one another.

Earlier we said that letting more people enter into being among the living so they in turn question whether the universe is based on something objective, outside of human influence or perceptions, will be more of a challenge to world peace and security in the coming years than figuring out the weight more people will put on the earth's resources. This conclusion makes sense if, as we suggest, accumulating knowledge weakens people's ability to distinguish right from wrong. This conclusion then signifies that if people do not sort out how to stop people from being the measure of all things during their lives, people will continue to make the earth serve as if the purpose of each generation was destined to start from zero to mobilize people to begin to act in a spirit of brotherhood towards one another.

We have no way of knowing what Noah was doing, so God found him to be righteous. However, if our analysis so far holds any truth, then it suggests that Noah most likely abstained from using his pre-programmed aptitude to reason and distinguish between good and evil. Next, he finds himself being pushed to rely on progress so that the latter can influence his human behavior based on the way reality is

changing to make judgments. Such behavior was not exhibited by the other people who lived at that time. People use progress because they believe it enriches their lives more than abstaining from it would. All the breakthroughs that currently exist serve as proof of this belief. We even said that God created the natural system to also function according to environmental criteria, and therefore, it is not possible to live as Noah lived.

Returning to the concept of a line, along with a point, we stated that this allows humans to make predictions about the physical world. We can then say that if we consider human life as a line with two endpoints, one being birth and the other death, we are acknowledging its linear progression. Now, if we consider human life as a factor that progresses from birth to death, we can view it as existing between those two endpoints. What our analysis has shown is a predicament that man has no power over to resolve.

If our analysis so far is accurate, this conclusion suggests that we could replace the two endpoints we referred to as "birth" and "death," which represent the start and end points of a person's life, with the actions people must take to please God, as Noah was doing, and the actions people began taking after they disobeyed God, which involve making progress. What our analysis showed was that anytime a person who wants to go back to doing what God suggested people do to win eternal life, they could risk seeing their life ending prematurely. If people try to increase their access to knowledge or progress, they can risk seeing their lives face the same end.

The dilemma is that what drives human life to pick either choice is knowledge or the pre-programmed aptitude to reason, which makes all humans capable of distinguishing between good and evil. Let us provide an example to clarify the dilemma.

If a person is sitting next to a tree and on top of it, there is an apple. If the person doesn't climb the tree to pick up an apple to nourish himself, he will die. If the person climbs the tree to pick the apple for nourishment, he puts himself in danger of falling and dying.

Earlier, we mentioned that there might be a factor preventing religious conservatives from acting on the pre-programmed and manmade natural and legal rights that their creator bestowed upon them. Could the right that people deem and call "knowledge" be the natural right that makes people unable to act on the pre-programmed and manmade natural and legal rights that their creator passed on to them?

This person's realization that climbing the tree for the apple would meet his survival needs led him to decide whether to climb.

Now again, humans are a species that can stay for a few hours without having to introduce food to sustain survival needs. The human body sustains itself through food, preserving the pre-programmed aptitude to reason. The brain then changes the choices ahead of this person and the apple as follows:

If the person is not hungry and does nothing, he will avoid any crises. The person will not have access to the apple. The person's lack of hunger, as we mentioned earlier, will still meet their survival needs. Their inability to reach the apple would deny the person's earthly desire to pick it. The human body will not face the risk of falling.

If a person who is not hungry decides to pick the apple, they may experience a crisis. The person will have access to the apple. We previously stated that the person's lack of hunger will fulfill their survival needs. Placing a hand on the apple would satisfy the earthly desire to pick it. The human body will face the risk of falling.

If a person decides not to climb the tree to pick the apple, they will avoid the risk of falling. The person's body would not have to deal with the risk of falling.

In the previous chapter, we said that the natural system overrules both the material of terrestrial origin and the human body. We even said that we have no way of knowing what Adam and Eve were doing when they defied God given the multitude of natural and unnatural changes that the natural system on its own exhibits and the changes that people who claim to be holding on to religious conservative views also cause. Then, we said, let us just go along with what Protagoras once claimed

about “Man is the measure of all things.” This argument suggests that if humans believe they can override the natural system as they did when defying God, the consequences will be entirely different.

Does the judgment of the pre-programmed aptitude to reason avoid the risk of falling, and does it cause the human body to have crises, since people can only naturally distinguish between natural good and evil or danger and safety?

When the pre-programmed aptitude to reason chooses to climb a tree to pick an apple, it is making an unnatural decision. The action of climbing on a tree is an unnatural action because humans were not living creatures that were created to climb on trees but to stay on the surface of the earth.

Does the pre-programmed aptitude to reason—when it agrees to make unnatural changes in matter that humans were not pre-programmed to carry out on behalf of the body—judge humans as unable to act on the pre-programmed and man-made natural and legal rights their creator passed on to them? The risk of falling arises when a person decides to perform an action that they were not created to undertake.

We know that earthly desires pressured the pre-programmed aptitude to reason, leading it to mistakenly believe it could distinguish unnatural changes in the human body that lay beyond its pre-programmed capacity. What we need only to be able to show to support that indeed there is a natural right that makes it impossible for religious conservatives to act on the pre-programmed and manmade natural and legal rights that their creator passed on to them is to only reach to show what makes the pre-programmed aptitude that humans possess to reason and consider that it possesses the aptitude to distinguish between good and evil when the unnatural change that the body exhibits involves action that takes place on the outside of the human body.

Humans satiate their survival needs and earthly desires with habitable land. Humans are aware that what sustains the human body is the action that does not involve subjecting the human body to any risk, but humans have decided to let earthly desires use habitable land to

produce a tree shaker so such a machine shakes the tree to drop the apple to make the human body evade the risk of climbing the tree and also let the tree shaker do the manual labor instead of the human.

Humans produced the tree shaker without reducing their habitable land and increased the risk to their bodies, as the pre-programmed reasoning aptitude made a riskier decision to let the tree shaker shake the tree for the apple to drop.

If the person had climbed the tree and fallen, it would be possible to break a human part and later heal from the fall. However, if a person's hands become caught in the rotating part of the tree shaker, the injuries could be severe. The damages would be greater. This scenario also indicates that the person has enhanced their ability to improve their quality of life. His degree of danger increased. Could the people's pursuit to enrich their lives increase their danger? If such a scenario is true, then we can conclude that knowledge undermines the ability of pre-programmed reasoning to make safer decisions for the human body, because, as we have demonstrated, the more progress people make, the greater their danger becomes.

This conclusion is flawed because people believe that by improving social conditions and enriching their lives, they can reduce their vulnerability and increase their resilience.

Let us ask this question. When the person sitting in front of the tree decided to pick the apple, it was not necessarily to meet their survival needs; rather, it was to satisfy their earthly desires. Next, when the same person used his pre-programmed reasoning skills to learn that it was better to create the shaker to reduce his risk of climbing the tree, he could use the time he gained to enrich his life, even though it increases the risk of damage if its rotary parts entangle his hands. In this case, he could never climb the tree to pick the apple.

To create the shaker to reduce his risk of climbing the tree, if he would let the shaker do it, he could use the time he gained to enrich his life even though it increases the risk of the damage he would suffer if its rotary parts entangle his hands. In this case, he could never climb the tree at all to pick up the apple.

While contemplating whether to climb the tree to pick the apple, this person realized that using a stick first, followed by a chair, and then a tree shaker would make it easier to reach the apple.

Could the choices people make to pursue progress cause the world's insecurity?? This outcome occurs because whenever people are free to reason, they do not have to deal with all the insecurity that exists in the world.

It is unknown whether progress distorts people's pre-programmed reasoning aptitude, so knowledge or progress could be considered a natural right that prevents humans from acting solely on the pre-programmed and manmade natural and legal rights imparted to them by their creator.

What we do know, however, is that when Alfred Nobel discovered dynamite in the year 1867 and until his death in the year 1896, his invention was used in the art of making wars. From the year 1896, when Alfred Nobel left his will for the establishment of congresses, global peace and security decreased, and the dynamite he invented in 1867 was used even more in the conflicts that arose. Could the peace congresses and the prizes in chemistry, physics, and so forth that he started paying for, instead of people sticking to doing what God created people to do on earth, be what has caused all the problems that the world has known from the year 1901, when the Nobel Foundation began to award the Nobel Prize, until now? Could the leaders who created the United Nations in 1945 by listening to Alfred Nobel instead of Thomas Hobbes, John Locke, Jean-Jacques Rousseau, and so forth have contributed to all the insecurity that the world has known as of the year 1945? This situation is because their friendly relations policy makes it so that people stop being able to act on the pre-programmed and man-made natural and legal rights that they enacted due to knowledge or progress acting as a natural right to hinder their aptitude to distinguish between good and evil. This phenomenon occurs because the increase in knowledge has led people to become unable to act on their preprogrammed and man-made natural and legal rights. The answer to this question is the world events that are going to support it.

Bibliography

Chapter 1

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Socrates>

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Thomas_Hobbes

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Boston_Marathon_bombing

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/World_War_I

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/World_War_II

Chapter 2

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dynamite>

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_conflicts_in_Europe

https://www.nobelprize.org/alfred_nobel/

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Nobel_Peace_Prize

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/World_population

<http://theinventors.org/library/weekly/aa111100a.htm>

<http://www.ask.com/history/invented-first-knife-b9bdde3ad046805e>

<http://www.ibtimes.com/14-million-year-old-knife-discovered-spain-flint-oldest-piece-evidence-hominids-lived-atapuerca>

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wheel>

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wright_brothers

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hewitt-Sperry_Automatic_Airplane

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Autopilot>

<http://overtheair.org/blog/2012/04/when-was-the-first-computer-invented/>

<https://www.google.com/webhp?sourceid=chrome-instant&ion=1&espv=2&ie=UTF-8#q=who%20invented%20airplane>

<https://www.google.com/webhp?sourceid=chrome-instant&ion=1&espv=2&ie=UTF-8#q=evolution%20definition>

<http://www.ibtimes.com/14-million-year-old-knife-discovered-spain-flint-oldest-piece-evidence-hominids-lived-atapuerca>

<https://www.brainscape.com/blog/2015/06/conflicts-that-shaped-world-history/>

<http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/logic>

<http://www.urbandictionary.com/define.php?term=Anti-logic>

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Spoon>

<http://www.japantimes.co.jp/news/2013/07/25/world/ancient-flint-blade-found-in-spain/#.VziVRJErLIV>

<http://www.ask.com/history/invented-first-knife-b9bdde3ad046805e>

<http://www.dictionary.com/browse/invention>

<http://www.businessdictionary.com/definition/benefit.html>

https://www.nobelprize.org/alfred_nobel/

<http://theinventors.org/library/weekly/aa111100b.htm>

http://www3.nd.edu/~bolster/Diogo_Bolster/Fluids_files/Chapter%205.pdf

http://www.cee.mtu.edu/~reh/courses/ce251/251_notes_dir/node3.html

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Thomas_Hobbes

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Idea_of_Progress

http://faculty.kfupm.edu.sa/CHE/aljuhani/New_Folder/Material%20%20balance.pdf

<http://boards.straightdope.com/sdmb/showthread.php?t=390980>

<http://www.infoplease.com/ipa/A0932875.html>

<https://www.humanrights.gov.au/publications/what-universal-declaration-human-rights>

<http://geography.about.com/od/obtainpopulationdata/a/worldpopulation.htm>

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_religions_and_spiritual_traditions

<http://www.britannica.com/topic/social-contract>

Chapter 3

[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Legitimacy_\(political\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Legitimacy_(political))

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sphere_of_influence

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Samuel_von_Pufendorf

<http://www.nationsencyclopedia.com/United-Nations/Comparison-with-the-League-of-Nations.html>

<http://www.britannica.com/event/Afghanistan-War>

<http://www.historylearningsite.co.uk/modern-world-history-1918-to-1980/the-middle-east-1917-to-1973/palestine-1918-to-1948/>

<http://www.writersdigest.com/editor-blogs/guide-to-literary-agents/word-count-for-novels-and-childrens-books-the-definitive-post>

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Natural_and_legal_rights

<http://www.britannica.com/topic/social-contract>

Chapter 4

<http://www.iep.utm.edu/protagor/>

<http://www.britannica.com/biography/Protagoras-Greek-philosopher>

<http://www.ancient.eu/protagoras/>

<https://www.google.com/webhp?sourceid=chrome-instant&ion=1&espv=2&ie=UTF-8#q=how%20much%20land%20surface%20is%20on%20earth>

www.zo.utexas.edu/courses/Thoc/land.html

<https://maths4sustainability.wordpress.com/2011/08/02/holding-hands-around-the-world/>

<https://www.google.com/webhp?sourceid=chrome-instant&ion=1&espv=2&ie=UTF-8#q=what%20is%20the%20perimeter%20of%20the%20earth>

www.space.com/17638-how-big-is-earth.html

<http://www.urbandictionary.com/define.php?term=Anti-logic>

http://www-math.mit.edu/~djk/calculus_beginners/chapter01/section02.html

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Social_contract

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Natural_and_legal_rights

201 370 5418 george makhoul

<http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/willing>

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Recent_African_origin_of_modern_humans

Chapter 5

<http://www.iep.utm.edu/protagor/>

<http://www.britannica.com/biography/Protagoras-Greek-philosopher>

<http://www.ancient.eu/protagoras/>

<https://www.google.com/webhp?sourceid=chrome-instant&ion=1&espv=2&ie=UTF-8#q=how%20much%20land%20surface%20is%20on%20earth>

www.zo.utexas.edu/courses/Thoc/land.html

<https://maths4sustainability.wordpress.com/2011/08/02/holding-hands-around-the-world/>

<https://www.google.com/webhp?sourceid=chrome-instant&ion=1&espv=2&ie=UTF-8#q=what%20is%20the%20perimeter%20of%20the%20earth>

www.space.com/17638-how-big-is-earth.html

<http://www.urbandictionary.com/define.php?term=Anti-logic>

http://www-math.mit.edu/~djk/calculus_beginners/chapter01/section02.html

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Social_contract

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Natural_and_legal_rights

201 370 5418 george makhoul

<http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/willing>

[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/
Recent_African_origin_of_modern_humans](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Recent_African_origin_of_modern_humans)

Chapter 6

<http://www.iep.utm.edu/protagor/>

<http://www.britannica.com/biography/Protagoras-Greek-philosopher>

<http://www.ancient.eu/protagoras/>

[https://www.google.com/webhp?sourceid=chrome-
instant&ion=1&espv=2&ie=UTF-8#q=how%20much%20land
%20surface%20is%20on%20earth](https://www.google.com/webhp?sourceid=chrome-instant&ion=1&espv=2&ie=UTF-8#q=how%20much%20land%20surface%20is%20on%20earth)

www.zo.utexas.edu/courses/Thoc/land.html

[https://maths4sustainability.wordpress.com/2011/08/02/holding-hands-
around-the-world/](https://maths4sustainability.wordpress.com/2011/08/02/holding-hands-around-the-world/)

[https://www.google.com/webhp?sourceid=chrome-
instant&ion=1&espv=2&ie=UTF-8#q=what%20is%20the
%20perimeter%20of%20the%20earth](https://www.google.com/webhp?sourceid=chrome-instant&ion=1&espv=2&ie=UTF-8#q=what%20is%20the%20perimeter%20of%20the%20earth)

www.space.com/17638-how-big-is-earth.html

<http://www.urbandictionary.com/define.php?term=Anti-logic>

http://www-math.mit.edu/~djk/calculus_beginners/chapter01/section02.html

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Social_contract

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Natural_and_legal_rights

<http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/willing>

[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/
Recent_African_origin_of_modern_humans](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Recent_African_origin_of_modern_humans)