

The Turning Point

Knowledge at the Threshold
of a new Existence

Beyond Progress

Salim Maloof, Ph.D.

Copyright 2017 by Salim Maloof

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

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

Suggested Citation:

Maloof S., The Turning Point, Knowledge at the Threshold of a new Existence, 2017

This is a work of non-fiction.

Salim Maloof
The Turning Point
Knowledge at the Threshold
of a new Existence

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

In memory of Pierre Diang (1958 - 2013)

Pierre was born in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC). In 2012, he was diagnosed with cancer. At the time, the country—home to nearly 100 million people—had no linear accelerator where he could receive the treatment he needed, despite being endowed with much of the cobalt used in the manufacture of such machines.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

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

PREFACE

1. Chapter 1	26
2. Chapter 2	32
3. Chapter 3	40
4. Chapter 4	48
5. Chapter 5	59
6. Chapter 6	68
7. Chapter 7	75
8. Chapter 8	82
9. Chapter 9	85
10. Chapter 10	94
11. Chapter 11	125
12. Chapter 12	139
13. Chapter 13	147
14. Chapter 14	154
15. Chapter 15	162
16. Chapter 16	169
17. Chapter 17	175
18. Chapter 18	180
19. Chapter 19	187
20. Chapter 20	192
21. Chapter 21	200
22. Chapter 22	207

23. Chapter 23	213
24. Chapter 24	220
25. Chapter 25	228
26. Chapter 26	234
27. Chapter 27	239
28. Chapter 28	246
29. Chapter 29	254
30. Chapter 30	260
31. Chapter 31	267
32. Chapter 32	278
33. Chapter 33	288
34. Chapter 34	301

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The bibliography for this work is extensive, and rather than include selected sources while omitting others, bibliographical references on specific questions can be made available upon request.

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

In 1945, the victors of WW2 (the old powers) dismantled their empires and invited the societies they had vanquished during the war, as well as those they were dominating, to work with them after freeing them to secure the common standards suggested in the UN Charter, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR), and other international treaties. To accomplish this goal, they disengaged from the day-to-day operation of the international order and appointed the United States as the new global policeman of the world. They also created a new intergovernmental organization, which they named the United Nations, whom they tasked with coordinating the social, political, and economic reforms they would be proposing.

No one knows why the victors of WW2 decided to dismantle the empires they had built and preferred instead to maintain their superiority through the steps outlined in the UN Charter and the UDHR. This process involved transferring their power to the peoples of the societies they vanquished and the ones they freed, when they fully knew the passionate yearning of all people for freedom and power, which could be in conflict with their own power and wealth if it got out of control.

For one reason or another, the victors of WW2 decided to deny the societies they vanquished during WW2 and the ones they freed the time needed to let the common standards suggested in the UN Charter or the UDHR produce the WW2 implicit and explicit war aims they were counting on. The victors of WW2 initially, and now their heirs, are not transforming the conditions and outcomes that matter to them by observing and respecting the work program suggested in the UN Charter or the UDHR but are returning to maintaining their superiority through adopting the same barbarous methods they found their fathers and forefathers practicing before WW2 erupted.

Institutions and laws—such as governments, schools, and companies—are important because they create order and provide the parameters for everyday behavior for citizens. Without them, daily life would be unsafe and chaotic.

The decision by the victors of World War II and their heirs to deviate from the work program proposed in the UN Charter and the UDHR, after dismantling their empires and as globalization transformed the world into one interconnected community, has had a drastic impact on the maintenance of their wealth, status, and power. Globalization, or the concept of development, increased the wealth, power, and status of the heirs of the victors of WW2 but simultaneously augmented the number of people who started to rival them to play their global hegemonic role.

Institutions keep societies stable. When institutions become weak, people disperse similarly to how a canister containing compressed gas releases its mist into the air when pressed. It is not possible to recover the mist that is released because it immediately disperses.

The consequence of the victors of WW2 and later their heirs letting the societies they vanquished during WW2 and the societies they were dominating work with them to secure the ends suggested in the UN Charter or the UDHR while regarding themselves as exempt from observing the standards suggested has dispersed people away from them in an alarming manner. Presently, the heirs of WW2 are standing on top of the capitalist (money) system but not the production infrastructure and its resources or human capital.

The heirs of the victors of WW2 need to defend the international order and to preserve its constitutions and laws to keep their superiority. Alternatively, the heirs of the victors of WW2 could return to relying on colonialism, but this policy appears to be out of history for the time being. To date, the decision of the victors of WW2 and later their heirs to deviate away from the work program proposed in the UN Charter and the UDHR has transformed the international order from being a system in which people use to secure the ends proclaimed to a system in which different groups or components coordinate with each other to determine who could make the weakest consider the opinion of the fittest before taking action on his own.

This is not the first time in which people converted the world into allied groups that all regard themselves as equal and who cooperate without any regard to any order—constitution or laws.

Throughout history, all the societies that perceived that the purpose of governments or institutions is how to use such violence-wielding apparatus to direct it at others or to control others realized that they were not able to maintain their power, wealth, and status intact later. When such societies permitted that their leaders use their governments and institutions to come together to make deals and not contradict each other, they soon realized that such a strategy weakened their institutions and state, leaving them in a worse situation than they were and paying a big price as a result.

Biblical scriptures and philosophical books are full of stories about societies and kingdoms that decided to use their institutions to determine who could use such a violence-wielding apparatus to make the weakest consider the opinions of the fittest before taking action on their own.

In the Bible, in the book of Genesis, it is suggested that when wickedness increased in the world, and the Lord saw how great the wickedness of the human race had become on the earth, he regretted that he wiped from the face of the earth the human race for the exception of Noah and his family, whom they had found favor in his eyes. The Bible suggests that a new life cycle began after he wiped out the human race from the face of the earth, with the exception of Noah and his family.

The book *The Turning Point* examines how mankind could be living similar events and how such biblical events could repeat at the hands of the heirs of the victors of WW2 and their critical thinkers and servants (governments and international institutions) if they continue to transform the conditions and outcomes that matter to them without political clarity and with sectarianism controlling their minds instead of God.

The book *The Turning Point* aims to demonstrate how the heirs of the victors of WW2 could be hastening the decline of the current life cycle

through their actions, potentially leading to a new life cycle whose history would be written by future generations, similar to what occurred after the flood. The book aims to illustrate how the political ignorance exhibited by the heirs of the victors of WW2, along with their critical thinkers and servants (governments and international institutions), since 1945, indicates a lack of vision for building a future world with improved relations between people, and how their irresponsible political hegemony is causing divisions among people and leading the world toward greater insecurity.

The purpose of the book is to draw the attention of the heirs of the victors of WW2 to the need to have their critical thinkers and servants (governments and international institutions) reduce wickedness and corruption in the world to prevent the destruction of their power, wealth, and status and the rise of new families who would start to play their role.

01

People from every corner of the world, of different ages and educational backgrounds, are constantly being productive by multiplying, replenishing, identifying problems, pursuing ideas, and developing solutions, particularly by subduing and exercising dominion over all living and nonliving things that move upon the earth. Existence is understood as the manner in which things objectively exist and could or couldn't stay, independent of one's presence. Humans are capable of categorizing what type of entities exist, may be said to exist, and how the entities that exist may be grouped, related within a hierarchy, and subdivided according to similarities and differences.

The world contains discrete things, both physical and non-physical, abstract and non-abstract, and what these appear to have in common with each other is necessity and possibility. Various philosophers provided distinct answers regarding how the different entities that exist or may be said to exist could be defined, including extensive explanations about the purpose of those definable entities in relation to existence, being, and the world.

In this work, existence and consciousness refer to what an individual conceives through thought or apprehends based on the different doctrines or theories developed or categorized. In like manner, let the events, decisions, and actions human cognition takes and its causality be up to the individual to categorize its influence. Everyone can choose their state of being and decide whether it is caused by free will or not.

What is real is something that cannot be denied. All humans can form a mental construct to organize perceptions. The question remains whether the perceptions that humans construct are real or unreal, and whether these perceptions are based on a belief that intuition may have been pre-programmed in each individual or if they occur by chance. People derive all that they perceive from their senses. Similarly, people express the perceptions they form as mental constructs through their actions. The action can take the form of specific physical movements or sounds that people make, which have been refined by humans to convey commands and meanings.

People are able to exhibit power over the sound they can create when they are alert and not asleep. We could say that people create mental constructs whenever they choose to take action based on their sensory perceptions, especially since humans cannot naturally turn off their ability to hear. Some say they are on a divine mission and that supernatural forces drive their actions. This work does not address the actions that subjects claim were directed by supernatural forces, as they fall outside its scope.

Time and space also seem to exist independently of the human mind. If a person measures a volume of water and later returns to verify it, they will discover that the water is no longer visible. Humans seem unable to stop the evaporation of water. All this phenomenon creates is a mental construct, or knowledge. People's mental constructs appear to be cumulative, progressive, and transferable. The mental constructs that people establish can come from both visible and invisible states of consciousness. People's knowledge seems to have changed significantly throughout history compared to when humans relied on their hands or primitive tools to meet their survival needs, according to the literature.

This contrasts with the primitive lifestyle that archeologists claim humans relied on for survival in prehistoric times. People know now how to explain why certain things work in certain manners using empirical and theoretical reasoning. People's ability to rationalize helps them considerably to explain why certain natural processes behave in a certain way or repeat themselves as well. The significant progress that humans made to understand how their own reproductive

morphology occurs and the world they live in has provided all of the world's scientific advances, industrial progress, food, and development that exist. At its simplest level, this capacity that humans possess to infer and deduce helps a lot when people apply their human ingenuity to study forms and structures. This aptitude allows people to study aspects like shape, structure, color, pattern, size, and so forth to later create or engineer new forms and structures. For this reason, people are now capable of explaining many of the patterns, shapes, and so forth they observe without reference to the supernatural. Similarly, humans can rely on the scientific advances they have made, along with the machinery, apparatuses, devices, and tools they have developed, to better safeguard against apocalyptic events and to improve their detection. This philosophy, which humans adapted to achieve greater success, has resulted in a more profound understanding of the basic laws that govern the interactions of elementary objects and the forces that cause physical objects to move. People's ability to ask, answer, evaluate, and reason about their observations has significantly helped them fit the patterns they see into scientific laws and understand how to correlate these laws to specific relationships.

Humans still struggle to understand how the morphological features of many phenomena work. There are also lots of basic fundamental questions related to forms and structures that people observe, but until now, people have not reached a point where they can suggest a scientific model to explain them or show how to treat the features of the patterns they observe. For example, in as far as the two lights are concerned. People see the earth and other planets orbit around the sun and how such rotation continually repeats itself. People can explain the speed at which the earth is orbiting the sun. Similarly, people can explain the speed at which the moon orbits the earth and how the positions of the earth, moon, and other celestial bodies change over time. Humans can't say if those rotations are random or if a being created them. In this regard, a mystery frustrates people: they cannot explain how the earth and other planets came to orbit the sun in the state that appears to be continually re-occurring.

People's inability to understand how all the forms and patterns they observe are interconnected leads to a complete lack of clarity about the objective nature of reality. Similarly, people's powerlessness to

understand how the various features they observe change based on the moon's orbit around the earth, the earth's orbit around the sun, and many other unresolved phenomena and processes leads to total obscurity, which many consider unpleasant because it hinders their ability to act. For example, the paradox of how the lunar cycle seems to affect the functioning of patterns or objects on Earth only adds to people's frustration. Humans' inability to discern whether observed changes are random or the result of intentional order prevents people from determining if human life has any purpose.

Because humans cannot know all the causes of what they observe or answer many other open questions, they can accomplish only certain tasks, within the bounds of their limitations. A significant factor is people's continuous preoccupation with wanting to know how the changes they observe, which they have not understood until now, affect the way they do things. This impediment leads people to become engrossed in the task of finding answers that will help them better understand their existence. In effect, people do not yet know whether the fundamental nature of things, including the origin of their own human bodies, is part of God's realm or merely the result of a chaotic causal state; this remains an unanswered question. In the strict sense of the word, people do not know how to perceive the fundamental nature and purpose of human life. One example of this phenomenon is the relationship between humans and the forces of nature.

A force of nature is a natural process that people cannot control. Gravity is a natural phenomenon that is categorized as a force of nature. Gravity is a phenomenon that causes all things that occupy space and have mass to exert attraction towards each other. The effect of gravity lessens as the distance between objects becomes larger. Scientists claim that gravity is what keeps the Earth and other planets in orbit around the sun. Moreover, this explanation is based on scientists' claims about how gravity works. The bigger an object is and the closer another object is to it, the stronger its gravitational pull is. Nobody fully understands why gravity exists or how it works. The origin of the universe's various massive bodies is unknown. Likewise, people don't know how all the different substances that occupy space and have mass in the universe came to be grouped to form planets, stars, or asteroids equally. All the ideas that people postulate about the

state of things are nothing but speculation and hypotheses. All those speculations and hypotheses that people claim about a God or a supernatural force being the one who created the universe are uncertain. Likewise, the speculations and hypotheses that people make about the universe having been created by the collision of galaxies or cosmic explosion bring enormous challenges because such theories try to support that everything that exists is uncaused. The way things are ordered casts many doubts—and makes any person wonder over how such a degree of precision could have been created by chance. But then again, whether the universe was caused or uncaused, there are few observations that we can say remain true until now. People occupy space and have mass. People are not amalgamated to the surface of the earth. People don't know if they landed on the planet Earth due to the Earth's powerful gravitational field or if people originated from here on Earth. The earth is a rocky planet, and people are pressed to its surface due to the effect the earth's gravity exerts. If it weren't for the earth's attraction or pull, people would be flying away from the surface of the earth into the emptiness of outer space. The gravitational field of the Earth gives people weight and keeps them pressed against its surface.

In this spirit, people have established a tradition that encourages individuals to embrace a mindset in which every new human being is expected to start at an early age, believing that the purpose of human life is to prioritize teamwork and creative problem-solving techniques across a wide range of careers and social issues aimed at investigating and resolving challenging problems. Spotting ways to improve our world is the challenge for any newborn.

Invention is a process in which people create things that didn't exist before. The inventions created by people aim to solve problems and improve various aspects of life. People are keen to discover ways to improve their lives. We have no way of knowing how people reached that when they merge their aptitude to unnaturally alter matter along with their curiosity and desire to make things better and easier, this process improves people's lives.

From the beginning of time, humans have been inventing, discovering, and engineering. People often overlook the alphabet, an engineered

idea or solution, as an invention that facilitates communication. All of the things that we see, from knives to wheels to engines, electricity, computers, and so forth, were developed by a person, a human mind, who used tools, materials, and techniques to develop each one of them. Those innovations make our task easier, entertain us, strengthen our knowledge of the world, and even save lives. They offer us hands-on experience to develop budding scientific curiosity and push us to keep our inventive and investigative spirit inspired. They drive us to be continuously creative so as to discover workable solutions by thinking through problems and expressing ideas through building things. But given real-world conditions, we would like to question how this inventive spirit has made life simple, fun, attractive, or safe for people. We all know how many lives the invention of vaccines has saved, how airplanes and cellular phones have helped to improve communications, or how computers have widened people's knowledge. Instead, I plan to argue in favor of exposing a reflection to highlight at the expense of what cost could this ambition to convert the world into becoming a better place that people have built a tradition so invention and engineering would be part of life, this mindset could be costing.

I will show how inventions hinder our chances at a rich life and how different our lives would be without most of them. I want to see how life has been since people decided that the goal of human life is to understand ourselves and the world we live in, including some hypotheses on what all the scientific advancements could bring.

Earth is home to many living and lifeless things. People live alongside many distinct things on earth. Scientists claim that some species and objects on earth remain uncataloged. Each living and lifeless thing that cohabits with earth possesses inherent ingenuity. People, along with certain living and non-living things, can move in the same direction or in the opposite direction as the living and non-living objects that are combined on the surface of the earth. The only distinction that differentiates people from the rest of the living and lifeless things that occupy space and have mass is that people are fitted with a cognition system that lets them exploit the material things they interact with to produce and/or engineer patterns or shapes, which they later use to detect their existence and enrich their lives. The cognition system that people are fitted with allows them to reason and to use complex tools as well. People rely on the vocal cords that their physical body is also pre-programmed with to transmit sounds, which are then translated to signal a meaning.

The realization that humans possess a pre-programmed cognition system may have been a turning point, leading them to view themselves not as an intrinsic part of nature but as custodians. People gather knowledge about the world based on what their sensory system can detect, along with what their imagination creates. The things that the sensory system of people detect are material things that are both visible and invisible. The invisible things that people detect are done through their imagination.

All that people and the rest of the living and lifeless things that exist or cohabit on earth do is alter matter. People sustain their survival needs

from cultivating food, including preying on living things, and satiate their earthly desires from non-living things and objects.

People generate ideas that they use to alter lifeless objects, which in turn produces patterns and ensures progress through the integration of three types of intelligence. The three aspects of intelligence are analytical, creative, and practical. Evidently, people's added merits to reason, speak, and use complex tools allow them to create or engineer shapes from lifeless objects. People use the shapes they create to ease into the role they have to play to sustain their survival needs and to satiate their earthly desires. Many living species that coexist with humans on Earth create shapes, but the aspect that has captured human attention the most is the ingenuity of the natural system that governs lifeless objects.

Each distinct lifeless object with whom people co-exist is appropriated with an ingenuity that tallies humans' cleverness. Each distinct, lifeless object is appropriated with the power to interact, assemble, and dismantle without an unnatural source intervening in such a process. Lifeless objects can also come together and produce a figurine very similar to what people are capable of producing from the raw material that the physical world supplies. The revolutionary detection of the wheel, a figurine that people began to use relatively late in human history for all their basic needs, demonstrates that many distinct, lifeless objects can produce shapes very similar to those of the wheels created by humans.

In effect, as of when people have detected the ingenuity that each distinct lifeless object is appropriated with and both began to coexist, the conception of what each distinct essence accomplishes, performs, and enhances in life has been remarkable. People have a physical body made of mass that is visible to the senses, and they are pre-programmed with human ingenuity, which is not made of mass and therefore is invisible. The human body alters matter after human ingenuity passes a command to certain body parts to create a pattern. The pre-programmed ability to reason, which all humans possess, does not enable individuals to command their bodies to produce unnatural changes in matter when certain internal systems malfunction. Certain body parts either exercise a thought or rely on intuition to perform

their actions when this is not the case. The actions the human body exerts in the physical world, people can observe and explain.

Lifeless objects, on the other hand, do not have a known way to come together to assemble or alternatively dismantle when there is no visible physical body that appropriates such capacity or function. People cannot use their senses to understand who controls lifeless objects, but they can observe the ingenuity with which these objects are designed, especially when they interact with one another.

People became aware that they were not the only beings capable of exhibiting patterns (or shapes); other entities were doing so as well. This finding helped people understand the extent of influence their ingenuity can have in the relationships they maintain with both living and non-living things they coexist with. This finding made people recognize that lifeless things incorporate ingenuity that competes with their own. People recognized that each essence has unique abilities that the other cannot replicate, particularly in terms of producing patterns or shaping. People began to develop their understanding based on how each specific essence functions or progresses. Yet people are willing to recognize that humans depend on living and lifeless objects to exist or survive, not the other way around. Instead of people using their dependency lineage on lifeless objects, which should mean something. People remained obsessed with appointing themselves as custodians of all living and lifeless things rather than remaining seeing themselves as an intrinsic component of nature intended, like all the rest of the things that exist on the planet, to fulfil a purpose.

People's detection of being provided with a pre-programmed cognition system that lets humans create shapes that the lifeless objects cannot engineer in the same degree of detail and precision provoked people to consider that they can exploit the different living and lifeless things with whom humans cohabit and interact. The ultimate objective, as previously mentioned, is to reduce the burden that the human body bears in meeting survival needs and fulfilling earthly desires.

People borrow all the food they cultivate to meet their survival needs and the objects they use to produce things that enrich their lives. We have, therefore, two sources creating and engineering shapes

continuously on earth: people and the rest of the living and lifeless distinct things that exist. However, since people are constricted to develop according to the way each specific living and lifeless distinct essence functions or progresses and not the other way around, we have today a profane situation. People's interaction with the rest of the living and lifeless things and people's interaction with each other is secular. The ontology regarding how each essence is meant to operate according to its programmed functions or goals is becoming increasingly complex and intertwined. Each essence is functioning in a very dissimilar way. The forces and interactions people and lifeless objects exert on one another, and the results produced by these interactions, highlight people's inherent search to formulate workable and quantifiable relationships. Indeed, people have evolved significantly from the time they first began to make their achievements stand out until now. In the past, people were not very aware of the importance of conservation and sustainability. In past times, people interpreted how they needed to conduct themselves with each other in a conscious way by encoding guidance on stone tablets. Now, people's awareness has evolved, and they build relationships and communicate the importance of environmental preservation and business practices using advanced scientific and technological methods. However, despite all the progress people have made over the years, including the development of objects and devices that can be programmed to automatically carry out a set of arithmetic or logical operations, they still struggle to understand the forces that prevent ethical interactions with living and nonliving things outside their physical bodies. Until now, people have not been able to understand or identify the forces that prevent them from interacting ethically with the living and nonliving things that exist outside of their physical bodies. People struggle to use their accumulated knowledge to organize interactions that foster awareness and develop tolerable relationships.

People organize their interactions with other living and lifeless things, as well as with each other, in a way that reflects the precarious nature of their relationships. Let us illustrate how objects interact with each other and with humans, and then demonstrate how humans perform similar interactions.

Due to the large number of living and lifeless things that exist and who are all producing patterns, including how such things could come together to produce phenomena that are in themselves patterns as well. Let us disregard the interaction living things like animals, fish, fungi, and so forth exhibit because of how such species, like humans, are at all times unnaturally altering matter. Such living things do not create and engineer patterns with the same degree of workmanship that humans do. Next, let us categorize all the visible and invisible objects or patterns and corresponding phenomena that lifeless things levy in the physical world and call it nature or the natural world. In other words, let the natural world refer to the sum of each distinct lifeless thing or object plus the phenomenon that those things produce.

In the case of nature, people came to observe that the ability of this essence to achieve greater positive or negative tasks in life is unstoppable. The observable phenomenon that nature is capable of levying in the physical world is beyond people's reach and is off-limits. People do not know from where nature draws such power or ability to create or exhibit patterns. Nature possesses the power to dismantle and assemble both living and lifeless objects, regardless of their size, mass, or distance, and it can disrupt the progress that humans make. Moreover, what is unique about the way nature works is that its essence is dedicated to keeping the objects it controls and manages in the physical world functioning and rejuvenating through a cycle that ensures events occur at their appointed time. Each object that is under nature's care appears unstressed, joyful, and content. Each object knows its purpose and the things it is supposed to serve. Nature makes each object stay focused on its mission. To give an example, each plant that is under the care of nature knows how to protect itself and how to stay focused on its mission to grow, to bloom in the appointed time, and to grow to fullness in the right environment. The plant will not compete against other plants for their rights to survive or life, at least visibly. The roots of the plant in the ground do not build barriers or impose territorial sovereignty to stop water and nutrients from reaching other plants.

People, on the other hand, possess the natural ability to dismantle and assemble lifeless objects, but this ability is not as strong as the power exhibited by nature, and it diminishes when the mass of the object

increases. The dismantling power that people exhibit is not universal but rather localized, except when humans combine their strength; in such cases, their collective force can dismantle a mountain. In effect, human power is not the same throughout human life. However, right after people developed weapons of mass destruction, humans became capable of inflicting significant damage in the physical world. Therefore, the strength of individuals or the varying degrees of strength they exhibit throughout their lives no longer matter when it comes to causing destruction in the natural world.

In particular, people exhibit a behavioral attitude that provides the total opposite impression of the control or grip nature exercises invisibly on its share of lifeless objects. People are unfocused and their minds wander easily. If nature takes an action and the resulting changes do not align with an individual's specific viewpoint, that person may exhibit widespread resistance to that change. The right of lifeless objects to exist means nothing to many people. Humans did not build traditions to spark mindsets that believe in or recognize the purpose every entity could serve in life. As I said before, this precarious attitude that people exhibit could be due to humans having detached from seeing themselves as an intrinsic component of nature in favor of substituting or swapping such a reality with the functional custodianship role they self-appointed themselves to play. People draw their potency from their capacity to have dominion over all things with which they coexist, a capacity that stems from being programmed with the aptitude to infer and deduce. Nonetheless, as I said earlier, throughout this work, the reason that compels humans to exhibit precarious attitudes could refer to what any individual conceives by thought or apprehends existence in accordance with the different doctrines or theories developed, categorized, or known to man.

The profane attitude that people exhibit when dealing with lifeless things is not any different from the attitude humans exhibit when they deal with each other. When people interact with each other, they devour, compete, envy, and most importantly, fail to act toward each other in a spirit of brotherhood as they do with their loved ones. To understand what I mean when two individuals compete for a particular lifeless or inanimate physical object, we must first appreciate the situation. If the vetting process does not align with the

values, beliefs, or attitudes that either person holds, it can become a significant challenge for one individual to agree to accept the views proposed by the other. If the course of action involves deciding on who can remain with an object that two people both claim ownership of, and if one person doesn't change his position, people would settle this in an inhumane way. In effect, when two people need to decide who should have control over inanimate objects or who should lead discussions about how resources are acquired, managed, and distributed, conflicts can arise. If one of them dissociates his values and beliefs from the principles that one of them insists on, he is right; things could turn ugly before either one would be ready to hear the other or do as the other suggests.

Our perspective, founded on the mental construct I portrayed regarding how objects and humans appear to interact, particularly expresses the perception that this relationship is peculiar and disharmonious. Evidently, this afore-perception or mental construct is a personal view that doesn't rest upon anything to support, validate, or back up.

For this reason, in this work, I intend, based on what I know already, that at birth no human being brings along with him any object or knowledge, and it is after birth that a person begins to form mental constructs to verify if this mental construct that I have depicted on the precarious relationship that humans exhibit with other people or objects, which I said is exclusive if its source or origin is our own mental construct or making and not necessarily because humans are being naïve about applying a social epistemology that the human body may not be subject to its realm. In other words, I intend to examine the extent to which people's belief in having a pre-programmed cognition system could have been a blessing rather than a curse in guiding their interactions with each other and objects. I plan to demonstrate this correlation by examining how the traditions and mindsets that humans developed to foster invention and engineering may have contributed to the precarious relationship I have described. What I would like to put into question is how this mindset that people built a tradition so that any human being is obliged to start as of an early age to believe that the purpose of human life is to emphasize teamwork and creative problem-solving techniques in a broad range of careers and social issues to spot ways to improve our world is in itself the problem. In

other words, I want to know how this mindset that people reached, that the world needs to be improved, could have caused the perception that I constructed on how humans and objects interact when we already know that this consciousness that people developed is what made us aware of the world's need for improvement and everything we perceive.

People categorize the precarious attitude that humans exhibit when interacting with lifeless objects and with each other as being caused by a combination of various reasons or circumstances. Humans interact with objects to accomplish two purposes. One is to sustain their survival needs from food, and the other is to satiate their earthly desires. Humans cannot create or add new forms of food intake, but can only modify the nature of the food they eat or the methods used to grow it. In as far as objects are concerned. Humans cannot create a new type of lifeless object. However, people use their ingenuity to invent or engineer things out of the objects that exist in nature, outsmarting what nature can produce. Humans are now able to produce artificial beings that can make changes in matter with a degree of precision that surpasses humans.

People have different views of reality, and maybe the issue is the limits of human delegation. The physical environment consists of an infinite number of objects that are constantly changing, and it is impossible for a person to predict how these changes will evolve over time. Surely, the tradition that people sparked to bring invention and engineering to life, so people split the task of knowing how everything that exists in the universe works and is going, is a spirit that would make it possible to predict how many of the substances that exist in reality are at all times changing. In other words, if all that humans can do on earth is alter matter, and the question of knowing how the universe originated or where everything that exists is going cascades down to answering an infinite number of questions. This spirit that humans mobilized themselves to make the purpose of human life to focus on doing to appreciate the origin of all things is a practice that makes sense. But the point that I would like our analysis to address in this work is not

about the added value that getting to know how everything works can help to make humans spot ways to improve our world. Rather, how could the intuition that people channeled their imagination to be fixated and devoted to doing, that is, to invent or engineer, be indeed helping humans to improve our world and not the other way around? Let us use this case to explain what I am putting into question in this work.

Archeologists claim that humans have been living on earth for millions of years. Humans can eat flesh as well as vegetables, fruits, and grains. Let us take cereal grains, which people consume in such large quantities around the world and are even known as being a staple food. In effect, cereal grains are a dominant portion of the standard diet of any society around the world due to how routinely they are eaten. Cereal grains can be processed into various food products, and bread is one of the main foods that humans transform cereal grains to become.

Cereal grains are reported to contain the single largest source of food energy based on what many food nutritionists and researchers in this field claim. Such grains have played a major role in human history, and many historians claim that grain production is what fueled the development of technology and civilization. A grain kernel is made of three main parts: bran, germ, and endosperm. Nutritionists and food experts claim that the bran, which is the tough outer layer of the grain, is full of fiber, minerals, and antioxidants. The germ is a core that is rich in nutrients such as carbs, fats, proteins, vitamins, minerals, antioxidants, and various phytonutrients. The endosperm contains mostly carbs and protein. The endosperm is the largest part of the grain and is the white powder that people use to produce flour, which is later used in the making of many food dishes.

Humans are willing to come together to agree that if a whole grain kernel is eaten, it will contain all the nutrients that the kernel carries. For thousands of years humans milled grain kernels to produce flour for human consumption and made wheat feed from the bran for animal consumption. Despite cereal grain being a food substance with widespread consumption by humans for millions of years already, there are health experts in modern times who believe that humans should avoid consuming cereals due to the harm such grains can cause

to maintain a healthy functional body or extend longevity. Health experts showed that carbohydrates, which are substances that are located in all cereal grains from wheat to rice, corn, and so forth, can spike negative side effects in the human body. In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, scientists discovered the role of the pancreas in diabetes. Scientists discovered that carbs are unsuitable for people who are diabetics. Consequently, scientists showed that cereal grains can increase the risk of chronic diseases and triglycerides and lead to serious weight gain. In like manner, scientists showed that some cereal grains contain gluten, which is unsuitable for people with celiac disease. Last but not least, scientists and health experts showed that grains contain anti-nutrients. Anti-nutrient agents are substances in foods that interfere with digestion and absorption of other nutrients. Those effects include giving rise to phytic acid, lectins, and numerous others.

No matter how much humans' knowledge widens, it is difficult not to recognize that every composition and structure of every substance or property that exists appears to function based on a phenomenon that gives the impression that it was ordered by chance or if a being created it. The paradox that I would like to put into question in this work is not the added benefits that scientists and health experts managed to show so humans from all walks of life can be educated about the major side effects of carbohydrates, for example, in the human body. The claim that cereal grains cause major side effects in the human body seriously indicts the intelligent design that humans seem to be a part of. Carbohydrate is a principal food substance that provides the body with energy that is required to carry out bodily functions and physical activity.

For this reason, reaching to ascertain if the decision that humans settled on to change their lifestyle to become less active and to make it unstructured around carrying out bodily functions or physical activity so the carbohydrates that people consume can be burned could free the intelligent design from the charges man is making on the side effect of cereal created in the human body. Most importantly, this study will show that it was because of the human decision to function not in accordance with the way they were created to operate that carbs cause the major side effects that scientists are claiming and not to put the

blame on the intelligent design. If it is a human's decision to deviate from functioning according to the way people were created to function, then that is to blame. Would people have been better off if they had kept their lifestyle the same, so carbohydrates wouldn't prompt major side effects in the human body? So the opposite of what health experts are trying to warn people about would be the case. In this case, side effects will appear when humans choose not to function according to the way they were created, except for those who have pancreatic problems.

This work also aims to understand how human security would be affected if people continue to deviate from the intended function of their intelligent design. Demographers claim that there are presently more than seven billion living people. We don't know how many people out of the seven billion people who are alive know what a carbohydrate is and that cereal grain contains anti-nutrients, which form a class of protein that can bind specifically to certain sugars and cause agglutination of particular cell types to prompt side effects in the human body due to what lectins evoke. How do humans expect the world to function when all seven billion people become aware that carbohydrates create major side effects in the human body and that there are healthy alternatives to obtain the energy that their bodies need to stay capable of doing physical activities? Specifically, how do humans expect life on Earth to be affected when all seven billion people who are alive develop the belief that carbohydrates cause side effects in the human body that reduce longevity and that there are healthy alternatives to consider? In other words, if all foods that grow on grass, such as plants, fruit trees, and vegetables, contain anti-nutrients, this leads to side effects in the human body. How do humans expect people to substitute their food intake, and what alternative forms of food are they considering? The other food people can eat is flesh, and researchers warn of its side effects. What healthy food alternatives could people worldwide consume instead of grains, vegetables, or flesh?

It is a privilege to live in a world where people have established traditions that foster invention and engineering, allowing every newborn to participate in contemplating how to identify ways to improve our world. There is no doubt that if the new generation

following this current one decides to build their progress on existing knowledge and teachings, a wealth of literature is already available to explain important natural concepts and phenomena, as well as what humans can do to extend longevity. The demographic growth since the turn of the last century created a positive feedback loop by producing more inventors. Most likely, as the world's population increases, more individuals will establish new fields of study, thereby refining the search to understand how complex natural phenomena function, which were previously difficult to comprehend. Perhaps the day is approaching when individuals can assert that they are progressing towards understanding our existence, our origins, and, most importantly, the purpose of human life. However, change is not the only central concept around which all life is organized. Change is just a central concept when spotting ways to improve any situation or process. Ignoring the implication of the structural change and the alteration it creates, and failing to weigh their impact on the human improvement, prevents understanding its effect on social reality. Humans, by going ahead and building a tradition to bring invention and engineering to life, could be responsible for the dynamics that appear to be continuously incorporated in all human endeavors. People may experience crises and conflicts due to their constant changes to spatial arrangements. However, because change is a permanent process, as I just mentioned, humans tend to find themselves in a situation where, as soon as they believe they have finished organizing, they must start all over again due to the changes they are making themselves.

For example, when humans learned to mill cereal grains into flour for easier digestion, the change was only physical. When health experts demonstrated that carbohydrates can cause major side effects in the human body, it prompted a reevaluation of dietary choices. The change the health experts proposed obliges humans to rearrange how humans provide their own body with a new mode to aliment themselves and to obtain the energy that is required to carry out bodily physical functions and physical activity. The limitations of people to change how cereal grains can be produced so they don't contain the substances health experts claim are harmful to the human body, man doesn't seem to have power over until now. Likewise, a challenge arises from humans' powerlessness to modify their biological systems to avoid the harmful

effects that health experts claim cereal grains cause. This is because they give rise to a form of knowledge that, in the absence of a solution to address it, its impact creates a major paradox in the state of human life.

Humans have the power to change their lifestyle to be less active so more cases of pancreatic diseases can be registered. However, humans do not have the same ability to change the types of food they can consume to nourish their bodies. Humans must either develop a new food source that doesn't cause pancreatic side effects or discover a cure for pancreatic diseases. Is it people who are supposed to be going back to becoming active so they reduce the risk of being diagnosed with pancreatic diseases, or is it the state of human life that should be reorganized to reduce pancreatic disease cases?

The contribution that the health experts made amounts to a change that is very significant for any human to remain healthy and to extend longevity. But as I said before, I don't question the scientists' quick contribution to showing the side effects of cereal grains, inasmuch as it is important to know that cereal grains create side effects. It is important to know whether humans have alternatives for nourishing their bodies if they stop consuming grains, meat, and vegetables. Most importantly, what in this work I am interested in knowing more about is the impact when the entire seven billion people who are alive become aware that cereal grains create side effects that humans should avoid or know that there is a new gadget they would all want. Could people rearrange themselves to create the necessary structural change to avoid the side effects that cereal grains, flesh, or vegetables create? What can humans eat if most of the food they consume causes side effects? What consequences will human life face if the knowledge about the side effects of cereal grains becomes widely known? Is the information that scientists have discovered about the side effects of cereal grains important only to people who are actively involved in intensive labor, or does it also concern societies whose members are not active? How would our world look if all seven billion people who are alive stopped wanting to go ahead with consuming cereal grains to avoid its side effects? This is one case study that we are appropriating for ourselves to show what impact human knowledge, as in the case of this important discovery, can have on rearranging the state of human

life. Each day, there are seven billion people pursuing the full development of their personalities. I would like to explore how the human desire for significance and immortality in personal achievements might impact global peace, security, and the sustainability of the Earth.

In other words, the human body has the capacity to process a grain or kernel of corn, allowing it to undergo a series of chemical reactions that transform food into components just as happens in any usable basic process. Whenever the human body processes food, this act creates a chemical reaction. Anytime there is a chemical reaction, there is a chemical change. A chemical change is anything that results in the formation of new chemical substances. At the molecular level, any chemical change involves making or breaking bonds between atoms. In the world, there are well over 7 billion people and an unknown number of substances. This scenario suggests that as people's knowledge expands, health experts are likely to discover numerous additional side effects that a cereal grain may be causing in the human body. This phenomenon occurs because as people become more skilled at detecting how the human body forms or breaks chemical bonds in various foods, they can better understand the complex syntheses that result. As humans become better at detecting the chemical changes caused by reactions in the body, they will be able to determine whether these changes promote growth or inhibit it. Accordingly, more side effects will be reported.

Humans may aspire to achieve immortality, but the current approach to creating change lacks a structural solution to support the proposed changes. Whether growing or aging, food plays a crucial role in both promoting bodily growth and facilitating the aging process, something that the intelligent design has shaped human functioning to do. Are humans benefiting from knowledge of unsolved problems, or does such knowledge confuse people even more? Is the rearrangement that people warn about or introduce to change how humans function causing all the crises and conflicts they know? Continuous modernization disrupts the existing structural changes, leading to a new cycle or wave of insecurity, particularly due to the relative movement of people in space. Evidently, the energetics and dynamics

triggered by human invention determine the extent to which crises and conflict persist.

Synthesis refers to the formation of new and usually more complex changes and structures from simpler ones. In a broader context, there seems to be a correlation between the improvements that people notice and the complex operations or structures that they subsequently require to manage the enhancements or changes prompted by those improvements. As human prompts change the actual state of life, people's weaknesses to overcome their willpower seem to grow. The greater the perceived costs of the improvement compared to its benefits, the more setbacks the proposed benefit seems to create in the rearrangement of the social and political order. At the most fundamental level, an astringent observation appears to persist despite all the scientific improvements that humans made. Corresponding progress is not evident in humans displaying even a slight ability to strengthen their will. Since Socrates began to explore this paradox in Greek antiquity, the only conclusion that can be drawn is that as human knowledge increases, human conditions appear to worsen. Despite all the scientific and physical progress made by humans, life for many has become increasingly solitary, poor, nasty, brutish, and short.

The ongoing improvements in human life may be a factor in people's inability to overcome their will's weakness. The more people notice improvements in their lives, the more they tend to act against their better judgment, even when they know what is right. For example, a human's choice to pursue a social system that functions on freezing social space and on operating on principles that promote the accumulation of material things on a cumulative basis could contribute to the challenges that prevent people from prevailing over the weakness of their will. Until now, people continue to ignore the

inalienable rights of others to live free from fear and want and don't want to do something genuine to address it.

As I said before, humans interact with objects to sustain their survival needs and to satiate their earthly desires. No human can eat more than a specific food ration per day. People cannot store food indefinitely. No person can be in two places at the same time, yet many individuals desire to preserve social space to accommodate their own preferences. Humans tend to launch efforts to accumulate material possessions. Researchers claim that human attention doesn't span beyond 4 minutes at a time in general. In fact, researchers claimed that the average coherent thought used to be twelve (12) seconds before the year 2000. A new study from Microsoft Corp., which was published in the year 2015, claimed that people now generally lose concentration after eight (8) seconds of coherent thought.

Indeed, there is a disconnect between the level of immoral behavior that individuals display due to their desire to constantly accumulate material possessions and the average attention span that a person can sustain without interruption. The same can be said whenever humans want to make their position prevail. If we take into account that nothing is permanent in this world except change, could knowledge be what pushes humans to exhibit weak will contrary to people's beliefs? As I said earlier, all that people do is modify how natural elements function, but they are unable to change what reality is made from. For example, consider the case of water. People can freeze water so it could become ice or boil it to convert it into vapor. People can split water molecules to form hydrogen and oxygen atoms. Humans cannot add more hydrogen or more oxygen in reality. People can deny each other access to water. However, when the same human body consumes a quantity of water, the human body will later release the same water as a more complex substance. The same can be said about any chemical element.

People cool water for many reasons. Let us split the reasons that motivate people to drink cool water into essential and nonessential categories. Let us define "essential" as being any life-threatening reason. Water tastes better when it is cold. Humans can consume water

that is cold, ambient, or hot. Most people consume cold water in the summer and hot water in the winter.

If humans hadn't made it customary for every household to install freezers for cold water in summer, people wouldn't compete to acquire raw materials to produce freezers. Humans repeatedly create a social space to establish factories that produce freezers, allowing them to quench their thirst with cold water during the summer. Humans are confining themselves to a narrower social space that could be used to meet their survival needs and satisfy their earthly desires for potentially more important products than a freezer.

There are seven billion people on earth who are all working on making sure that humans produce more inventions like freezers, ventilators, paper, cups, medicine, airplanes, shoe polish, and so forth. Each of the inventions mentioned represents human progress, and it is human knowledge that has developed these products. Could the progress that people make, or the knowledge they acquire and apply to improve the world, be what leads humans to exhibit weak will, contrary to popular belief? Each time people use their human ingenuity to make a change or engineer an object, the resulting outcome increases the difficulty of prevailing over the will and desiring it. Humans must not only overcome their desire to compete for the materials used to produce a freezer, but they also face the challenge of resisting the urge to share the ice cube that the freezer creates with another person. The same can be said with regard to converting water into steam. If humans didn't invent boilers to create steam, people wouldn't be working on prevailing over their will to compete to acquire the material from which boilers are made or to compete to warm their homes through a heating system that generates energy using a wood burner or an electric heater.

As we just saw, the more humans invent ways to make it possible for them to quench their thirst, especially in the summer with a cool drink, instead of just doing it using a glass of tap water. Similarly, people desire to heat their homes with electric heaters rather than using boilers or wood burners. The more difficult it gets, the more humans are unable to prevail over their will. It appears as if the more people

spot ways to improve our world, the more difficult it becomes for a person to prevail over his will.

For example, if we take a water molecule, split it into oxygen and hydrogen, and collect each gas in separate vessels, we can observe the effects. In doing so, not only did we add a new component that humans now need to begin to prevail over their will on how it could be distributed, but we also created more demand for material things to produce the apparatus that will store the hydrogen and the oxygen collected. There is also the challenge of requiring additional social space to erect the plant and store it. In this example, our primary concern is that the new knowledge humans have acquired about water splitting poses a much greater threat to human security than the fabrication of freezers.

Splitting a water molecule creates two very dangerous elements. Oxygen is an element for a fire to burn, and hydrogen is a highly explosive gas. Burning is the process of reacting with oxygen or other gases like fluorine to produce energy. If humans had not made scientific advances to split water, human security would not be at risk in case a natural disaster or human error gets those two elements exposed to reactions that make them release heat energy.

The question that I think is worth asking in light of the weak tolerance toward peace and security that people seem to be exhibiting as more and more human knowledge broadens. Could this tradition that humans have built, from one generation to the next, to align the purpose of human life to be wary and vigilant over allowing the free development of the personality of each person to spot ways to improve our world be the problem in the instability that people are knowing?

At its simplest, soft drinks are a regular product that people produce and have come up with many brands for. Is allowing the free development of the personality of a person or a company to go ahead and take water, adding new varied and innovative flavors and a unique bottle shape differentiating it from available products in the market an action that could be making people unable to prevail over their will because of the number of soft drink choices that people are free to pick from? Or allowing the free development of the personality of a person

or a company to go ahead and freeze social space and resources to basically put the same ingredient in a unique bottle shape, differentiating it from available products in the market to compete with it, is what is preventing people from prevailing over their will. The two companies are competing to get consumers to buy their products, not aliens. Likewise, it shouldn't be because a person is allowing the free development of his personality or a company to increase its profits that humans need to build a tradition to spark mindsets to believe in the importance of soft drinks so humans go ahead and freeze social space or resources when all seven billion people are working on freezing social space and on accumulating material things on a cumulative basis. Every day, people use their pre-programmed human ingenuity to generate thousands of new ideas and products aimed at improving our world. Could the mindset of interest that humans created suggest that the purpose of human life is to emphasize teamwork and creative problem-solving techniques in order to identify ways to improve our world, thereby facilitating the full development of individuals' personalities? This goal built a tradition that is more complex than what people were initially seeking to achieve, because it shifts the purpose of human life from seeking significance and immortality in one's achievement to seeking to do whatever is possible to adopt modern business procedures to overtake other people and to see how to make them run out of business.

It's unclear whether the tradition of humans building a mindset of interest to motivate behavior, with the purpose of human life being to seek significance and immortality, stems from disillusionment with the intelligent design (or God) that arranged for what exists and not for more. Unless, of course, this tradition that humans built to seek significance and immortality in their achievements is because people are competing with intelligent design. But again, how can humans determine whether intelligent design (or God) is responsible for all human achievements, making both one and the same? Similarly, we cannot know if the inventions and discoveries that humans are making align with what intelligent design intended for human ingenuity. It could very well be that people's unwillingness to be organized in accordance with the way the intelligent design intended humans to be structured is the problem, and not necessarily because humans are not able to prevail over the weakness of their will, as certain religions try

to promote the inclination of all human hearts to become evil as early as when a person reaches childhood age.

What is incomprehensible is how, any which way a person looks, the mental construct that one forms about reality will be full of disbelief with how each natural substance knows its purpose and knows the things it is supposed to serve, including the human body minus the pre-programmed aptitude to reason from which humans draw their ingenuity. Likewise, what is very perplexing to conceive is why everything and anything that exists appear to be ordered minus the pre-programmed aptitude to reason from which humans draw their ingenuity. Despite all the progress made, it's still illogical that humans, who are programmed with reasoning and ingenuity, can't overcome their will's weakness. There has to be a relationship that makes it so that every time human knowledge widens, the resulting synthesis is reciprocal, making people more and more powerless to prevail over the weakness of their will, contrary to what humans think. That is, when people's ability to distinguish between good or evil improves, the human ability to seek to arrive at political and ethical truths worsens.

In effect, one detail could be frustrating the pre-programmed aptitude to reason to drive this conviction on the importance of knowledge to enrich one's life. Indeed, all that humans do on earth is alter matter, and the mere fact that humans are a species that are not amalgamated to (separate from) the surface of the earth and are programmed with ingenuity that allows them to craft and engineer shapes. Humans believe that when they craft patterns, their efforts spot ways to improve human life. We suppose this detail cannot be other than the frustration of human ingenuity with its impotency to slow, stop, or prevail over the aging process, thus giving the body the opportunity to live longer to permit this aptitude to go on. People's lives on earth are temporary, and no one completes all their projects before departing this life. Thus, people's detention can only allow them to make specific changes to the natural system based on the degree of freedom that the intelligent design allowed. Human attempts to overcome the aging process may be the primary reason for the movement to use knowledge as a tool for extending life, especially since nothing is more precious than living longer.

In essence, the unescapable fate that cuts people's lives and ambitions short could cause a feeling of insecurity, fear, concern, and anxiety that might compel the pre-programmed aptitude to be possessive. Likewise, people's frustration and confusion could stem from their detachment from understanding how the universe was created, the purpose of human life, or the progress of the evolution of things as they currently exist.

However, if the pre-programmed aptitude to reason is indeed frustrated and confused by what lies ahead, this situation should stimulate intense mental activity and reflection, thereby enhancing its awareness of the significance of life's breadth and helping to prevent immoral behavior or possessiveness that could expose it to threats.

Mysteriously, the pre-programmed aptitude to reason goes on throughout the entire span of time in which it is capable on its own to distinguish between good or evil and/or to prevail over the weakness of the will, exhibiting a precarious attitude toward specific people and toward others the total opposite impression. This argument could support that the inclination of the human heart is evil only when someone wants to let it be so. At the same time, the ability of the programmed aptitude to reason to distinguish between when to prevail over its own will and when not to do so. This means that it could be possible that the complex synthesis that knowledge is spotting is the culprit in this precarious state of human life, which has made it so that humans are not able to detach themselves from it to move to better days.

In effect, based on how the pre-programmed aptitude to reason manages to prevail over the weakness of the will toward specific people and toward other people, this scenario is not the case. This power or mindset in which the programmed aptitude to reason goes on splitting the interaction that it exhibits whereby, on the one hand, this aptitude feels it is responsible and accountable for making sure it prevails over its will, and on the other hand, the same aptitude portrays that it declines to prevail due to the perceived benefits falling short of the costs.

This mindset that humans created by categorizing the interaction of their will when interacting with objects or with people, where this aptitude feels free to prevail to accommodate because the perceived benefits outweigh the costs of doing so, is complex. This mindset creates a division in awareness to serve two purposes in life: responsible actions and irresponsible actions. This dual consciousness, which humans choose to develop based on its principles—regarding how people interact with objects and with one another—may be incompatible with the way the intelligent design programmed the will to function within the human body. Humans may be using this aptitude in a way that contradicts the intentions of the intelligent design behind its programming. This method, introduced by humans to divide interactions into accountable and unaccountable actions, might constantly hinder the ability to consistently exhibit righteous conduct. In other words, people are made to work against their will regarding strangers, but this changes when courtesy towards an offspring is involved. Humans will struggle to overcome their will if they continue to deal with strangers on a voluntary basis rather than treating them as they do their children. People tend to avoid confronting their weaknesses and sharing material possessions with strangers on an equal basis. It appears as if there is a relationship between people's inability to prevail over the weakness of their will and the progress that people continuously spot and/or the knowledge that humans gain. The knowledge that people gain influences their decision-making. People's obligation to make choices relates to how the material things they accumulate can prolong their longevity. This notion suggests that the only improvement people seek is to overcome the aging process, as human ingenuity primarily aims to achieve immortality. People are, therefore, convinced that the more they accumulate material things and deny them to others, the more this action helps extend their lives.

If people had a clue on how to distinguish between what is good and what is right, the purpose of human life, or how to extend longevity, it would be possible to go along with the method on whose basis people picked how to classify the interactions that humans exhibit with objects or with each other. But if humans do not know how to distinguish between what is good and what is right or what the purpose of human life is, it is unknown if the full mobilization to understand the nature of life or the big question about the universe is something

that people are going to one day reach. There is a big chance that what could be making the pre-programmed aptitude to reason be dynamic is people's ongoing efforts to spot ways to slow or stop the aging process. This is because people are propelling each other to be committed to understanding how to make sense of everything that exists around them so they do not remain mired, living in the unknown. This process cannot be done without making choices. Could the choices that people made to distance themselves from being an intrinsic part of nature and to avoid focusing on the mission intended for them by intelligent design be the source of confusion for many? Could the decision of people to swap this purpose that they distanced themselves from in favor of creating an earthly conscious knowledge that structures human interaction with objects and with each other on a method that splits the interaction into a good and evil action be something that makes each time people become more aware of the detection of their own existence? Does this phenomenon affect their actions negatively? Could the human focus on extending longevity, rather than organizing life around the intelligent design of human function and service on earth, be hindering our ability to create conditions for fulfilling the intended purposes of intelligent design, rather than our own?

Each new generation that lives tries to tackle the areas in which the antecedent generation did not make significant progress to further people's knowledge in everything that existed, exists, or will exist. The complex modern world we inhabit clearly demonstrates the progress that humanity has made since individuals began striving to understand themselves, the world around them, and their relationships with one another. However, for various reasons, there appears to be no immediate solution to explain what underlies people's ambiguous attitude towards overcoming their will's weakness. Experts have proposed many reasons to explain why people's ambiguous attitude prevails over the weakness of their will and have identified factors. But as I said before, the more people progress, the more their ambiguous attitude prevails over their will's weakness.

The condition people hand in the world to future people will determine the type of efforts those cohorts would need to reach what we were unable to arrange for them during our turn to do so. The goal is to create a society where all citizens can overcome their will's weakness.

The body of knowledge that people will hand to their successors in managing the earth's resources and mankind's progress will lack significant innovation. During our time, we failed to effectively rule the world and significantly improve human security, especially when compared to our scientific advancements. When future generations take over, they will discover that their privileges include having to do fewer chores, thanks to the progress made since the shift from hand production methods to machines, as well as living longer due to medical advances. Those cohorts will discover that we passed on to them the same challenges that we encountered and were unable to resolve during our own time. This is how to agree on how power and the earth's resources can be acquired, managed, and distributed.

The tradition that people have established to bring innovation and engineering to fruition is crucial. And our conviction is based on the mental construct that we have formed from observing how people are fixing the social breakdown that the antecedent generation handed down. Let us also add, based on reading in the literature, that the current situation is the same case as what all the previous generations who lived struggled with. It appears that if people continue to practice the same policy of allowing every individual to fulfill the free development of their personality, we are likely to keep heading in the wrong direction. There is a good chance we will continue to go in the wrong direction, as we have since humans decided to change the purpose of human life to man-made purposes, the rightness or wrongness of which is entirely unknown.

Given the importance of continually injecting mental constructs, this process contributes to the ongoing efforts that humans have relied on throughout history to discover new ways to improve our world. In this work, humans have converted the natural right that every person is entitled to into a commodity. Additionally, humans have made tremendous efforts to ensure that all members of the human family can live a life free from fear and want. Let us acknowledge that another challenge always awaits because humans have turned the earth into an experimental theater, allowing every person to fully develop their personality. From one generation to the next, newcomers primarily reject the values of the previous age and attempt to merge their intentions so that people can ultimately overcome the challenges they

face and conquer their willpower weaknesses, ensuring that the inalienable natural rights of all members of the human family to live free from fear and want are fulfilled. I plan to investigate how this tradition that people have built to bring invention and engineering to life could be an obstacle by itself in preventing people from developing a conscious knowledge of good and evil and of the difference between them. In effect, my goal in this work is to understand why the earth has served as nothing but an experimental theater since the day people began to multiply across its surface. I hope that the material I share can make readers, decision makers, and particularly the United Nations aware of the counterproductive consequences that their efforts may create in the world when based on principles that do not consider how people are intended to function. Perhaps people could start to consider shifting their focus back to how intelligent design intended the human body to function, which could help diagnose what is preventing them from overcoming their will. The aim is to let our readers consider developing practical policies that could help end crises in the world as well. Likewise, allow the people who would be taking over to find themselves doing only what we are doing now: devoting our one chance at life to focusing on how to live free from fear and want.

Ibn Khaldun was an Arab historian and early sociologist. In the preface to his book, the *Muqaddimah* (1377), Ibn Khaldun proposed that people are in need of interpretation of the past. One approach to achieving this goal is to allow the cultural differences of another era to guide the evaluation of relevant historical material. This approach would allow distinguishing the principles necessary for evaluation, recognizing the need for experience, and even establishing rational principles. Therefore, since any road can lead to its destination in multiple ways, the direction taken significantly alters the required efforts. In this work, I plan to gather information on our past and background to demonstrate how knowledge might contribute to the obstacles that prevent people from overcoming their willpower weaknesses. More precisely, I will specifically focus on how the free development of the personality of any human could be a cause to keep the state of human life dynamic and the incubator that will spark the end of this present cycle of life, thus ushering in a new cycle.

It was not established yet how people reached the program that each time they interact with matter, the actions that humans exhibit will serve two purposes in the state of human life or reality (i.e., good or evil change). In a similar manner, it knows how or why people split human ingenuity, so it would structure the decision-making process on the basis of two ethical principles. People's awareness of their existence and the choice to stop being a natural category to fulfill the custodianship role that spawned it must have influenced how such perception spread.

People can perceive naturally only three spatial dimensions. Those three dimensions are length, width, and height. People can see those three dimensions move in three basic directions. Those three directions are up/down, left/right, and forward/back. People cannot see through solid objects as well as through liquids. We have no way of knowing if the conclusion that people reached to cluster or split their thoughts on the basis of serving two opposing ethical intentions was made to duplicate, through such an approach, the same distinctions through which people decided to see the world.

Therefore, since it is possible that right after humans decided to break away from doing what the intelligent design (or God) intended, they interacted with matter, like swapping that in favor of how they wanted their purpose to serve, we can say that thoughts are responsible for this deviation. Humans ask, answer, and argue about their relationship to the world and each other because of their thoughts. It is at the level of the human mind where people perceive a possible rationalization to the fundamental nature of life and the purpose of human life as well. The custodianship function that humans began assuming after they decided

to uphold that the purpose of human life is so mankind can detect their own existence was a decision that the mind conceived, as I just said. It is the mind that created the three spatial dimensions through which people see things and the way they move. The mind may have created this body of knowledge about how to be wary of good and evil and how people's actions can be motivated by either. If people hadn't started to play the custodianship role that humans assume, which includes ruling over objects and each other or altering matter to create shapes that distance them from maintaining an intrinsic relationship with nature like other living beings do, they wouldn't have needed to worry about finding ways to encourage ethical behavior in one another or dedicating their lives to distinguishing between good and evil, especially when they initially do not know how to differentiate between the two. An infant doesn't begin to exhibit evil acts until he reaches the age in which he detects his existence and he begins to alter matter on his own. The degree of evil exhibited by a person's thoughts diminishes as they age and their advanced ability to reason becomes less focused on altering matters. This is the behavioral path and pattern that human thoughts take when a person starts to be capable of altering matter on his own. The process switches from being passive to active and then back to passive again as the human body ages. This manner through which the programmed aptitude to reason functions during the time in which it is incapable of exhibiting or altering matter shows that whenever a person is distanced from exhibiting changes in matter, a person doesn't have to be cautious of the existence of good or evil. The good and evil mental construct is only required when the person becomes capable of altering matter or is in direct contact with operating or carrying an object.

The mere fact that a person only alters matters during a specific interval in their life, and that humans cease to alter matter even before their life ends, indicates that they return to living in the same way they did right after birth. This conclusion that people reached to cluster through the human thought to be based on good or evil could be a manmade decision because of the characteristics that this programmed body features take during the life span of a person, whereby its life span is conditioned on just when a person is capable of exercising power over his own body. In other words, due to how this recognition power or ability lives and dies during the life of a person and before a

person departs this life, the changes that the human body undergoes are what give it birth and what put a stop to it after a certain point in time before the body departs this life. This is to say it is the human body that gives this recognition power or aptitude life. For this reason, it could very well be that this is something that humans developed and started practicing and is not something that was programmed by the intelligent design that the human body succumbs to because the changes that the human body introduces in matter are not the intelligent design that controls how those actions should be classified, but the body of a person or his own mental construct.

For example, when a branch in a tree dries out and dies before the full life cycle of the tree ends, it is not the intelligent design that created the tree that decided which branch dies out first, but rather, when an event of this kind occurs and a branch dies out, this event is a sign that the tree is at risk of seeing its life cycle end, and so, which branch in the tree starts to die out before the other is determined by the synthesis factors that the tree is internally undergoing based on external influences that decided which branch dies out first. The same principle may apply to the human body. As a person ages, different organs age before the others. There are people whose hearts weaken first but whose recognition ability stays intact, and in the case of others, different organs in the human body age before the others.

In the case of humans, people formatted this organ or this programmed feature, which provides them recognition, into becoming clustered to serve good and evil premises because, to begin with, it is not made of matter. Humans must rely on this recognition system to cluster changes in matter, which could help them determine if their efforts to reverse aging are appropriate. The good and evil premises that humans created could be only to help orient them or provide them guidance in how to cluster the changes they exhibit in matter or under a frame of reference so they could be fulfilling the role of compass as they are doing looking to a way to help leap them toward the eminent ultimate goal of being one day capable to reverse the aging process.

So, if humans' thoughts follow a frame of reference that interprets the body's interactions in matter to serve two opposing ethical intentions, they may have conditioned each other to believe they have a dual

ethical decision-making process when they might just be relying on this frame of reference to slow aging and answer big questions about the universe. For example, a deaf and blind person cannot express any form of ethical conduct throughout his entire life, and his condition cannot prevent him from surviving, but it prevents him from exhibiting needs. This scenario means that if it weren't for the senses working in close partnership with the superior programmed aptitude to reason to exhibit needs, humans wouldn't have been making use of having to deal with how to be rightly ethically oriented. Especially since the only need that humans can express during their lives, starting from when their bodies begin to alter matter on their own until when the aging process starts to distance the body from being able to continue to alter matter on its own, is to make changes in matter.

The way people transformed their interactions with matter to align with two conflicting ethical intentions is truly perplexing. People want to discipline each other on how to interact with the objects that exist on the outside of their physical bodies and to have dominion over their own will, but even if people were to try to want to prevail over the weakness of their will, they cannot manage to naturally do so, which is a puzzle. This is because matter is always changing, so even if people did not unnaturally influence any changes in living or lifeless objects, those changes would still occur. Based on the way things actually are, i.e., anything that has mass will be constantly changing. The belief that the changes that every person exhibits in matter are intended to serve two premises and/or the one that certain people promote on humans being naturally programmed with two opposing ethical intentions when the human body is not something that can stay idle for a long time and is at all times becoming something different is a real puzzle. Certainly, the fixation that all people in the world have lined up behind since the dawn of time, and at its helm stands finding out why we are here, where we came from, why we perish, from where everything comes, from what everything is created, and how to reverse the aging process in particular. All these questions and preoccupations are topics that people are still having skepticism on until now and must have had something to do with why people opted to let their thoughts follow a frame of reference that let them see the actions they exhibit in matters in the same way they decided to see things in two trends.

Human evolution is the gradual change that takes place from one generation to the next. Nobody fully knows why our ancestors wanted to know how the universe originated and where we're headed. However, one thing is certain. The changes in how people drove their evolution included not only the technological progress we see around us today, such as phones, computers, the internet, houses, and spoons. People's evolution from the time of our ancestors to now has also included recycling a body of knowledge on how people can be ethically conscious. As I mentioned earlier, the entirety of human history has been an experimental theater where various individuals continuously test different cultural and social norms in an effort to address the social breakdown that arises from people's inability to consciously interact with both living and nonliving things outside their physical bodies. Humans were reluctant to admit that the knowledge they accumulate could relate to the precarious attitude people exhibit or to whether a natural right might be hindering the development of a conscious attitude. The perpetrator that drives people's attitudes or mindsets to be evil or wicked has been, as of the day when people began to multiply on the face of the earth until now, due to human nature being programmed with good and evil attributes, thus requiring that humans build their relations on how to manage the dual ethical decision-making processes they involve. Certain religions promote the idea that all humans are also programmed with these dual ethical decision-making processes.

The consequence of accepting the principle that human nature is programmed with two dual ethical decision-making processes is that people must pass guidance to one another from one generation to the next, as humans are mortal.

Guidance is something that people use to seek inspiration from its directive or whenever someone wants to provide direction to others on how they should interact with objects. All guidance is intended to offer clarity on how to resolve a problem or difficulty or direct the motion or position of something.

People cannot occupy the same space at the same time. This means that two people cannot be altering an object from the same space; one person must be idle. Similarly, two people can't agree on how to

acquire, manage, or distribute an object. One person will always reach the conclusion or agreement faster. This is because there are no two people who can see the same thing or are programmed with the same degree of intellectual capacity or degree of recognition system. One person would always be exhibiting a faster degree of awareness as opposed to another human. The moment any person exhibits a higher degree of awareness when interacting with another human being, his action becomes a guidance. Any moment a person pronounces on how another person can interact with an object, he establishes guidance that invites tolerance.

Tolerance is shown, especially when one disagrees with an opinion. It is a measure people created to help them determine how much they can tolerate (put up with something, endure, or accept). If people believed that the purpose of human life is to improve our world or to let life's purpose be to allow each person to recognize their existence, then guidelines to encourage people to exhibit tolerance would be unnecessary. This scenario is due to the lack of all the objects people created, so humans argue over them. Disputes erupt when people stop becoming tolerant. People stop becoming tolerable when they stop continuing to be respectful, peaceful, and courageous enough to exhibit such behavior.

So, what people want to be tolerant about in their relationships is how to interact with the objects around them, including other people. When people show tolerance, they accept that external objects can be dealt with in specific ways. The beliefs and the practices that, on their basis, people try to share and understand what exactly they can put up with require people to place such guidelines in a body of knowledge form because people are immortal. Every form of knowledge that a person acquires will consist of the knowledge that is being passed and a means to communicate the knowledge that is being passed on. From the time of our ancestors to now, people have been recycling beliefs and practices on how to interact with the objects that exist on the outside of the human physical body in a conscious way from two sources: supernatural beings and people.

Religion has accompanied people since the dawn of time. There are people who believe that a supernatural power created the universe and

gave guidelines on how this source intended people to live and to govern the world on its behalf. Nobody knows when people began to develop religious thought or when they started to organize religious ritual and to believe in the afterlife. People established that earlier humans began to develop interests in religious behavior based on evidence they found encoded at burial sites and in fossils in the form of symbols and images, which they judged to be common for religious practices when representing supernatural beings and ideas. The credible evidence that people relied on to establish that our ancestors held beliefs in supernatural beings and were indulging in abstract thought and imagination necessary to construct religious ideas came from graphics, symbols, and writings that were encoded in clay tablets, silk, pottery, papyrus, and so forth, which explicitly supported that people did indeed establish forms of religious behavior.

If people were created by a supernatural being, it would be possible to accept that this force programmed people with two ethical premises, which certain people believe and promote mainly through religious beliefs. We have no way of knowing how many religious beliefs exist in the world to define or verify if, indeed, among the many that exist, a specific supernatural power is organized in the consciousness of people as a dual ethical mechanism or recognition system. The freedom of religion that people exercise has hindered the establishment of a unified system of beliefs and practices. Some people don't believe in any faith, as they think humans evolved from Earth. We lack figures on how many people hold to faith and how many do not.

For example, some of the well-known religions that people use to connect with the divine, saints, angels, people, or any form of spirituality include Islam, Christianity, Judaism, Hinduism, Buddhism, Baha'i, Taoism, New Age, Confucianism, and Chinese folk religion. A large number of people in the world subscribe to religious beliefs, and the people who adhere to any one of those religions connect with the God or Gods that each faith posits, using abstract thought and imagination necessary to construct religious ideas differently. The views of individuals regarding God and the benefits that major spiritualities offer to their congregations for achieving success in life vary significantly. In some religions, God is loving and approachable,

while in others he is powerful and unknowable. Some people believe in one God (monotheism), while others believe in many (polytheism). In the New Age religion, for example, the people who practice this faith believe they are gods. Buddhists say there is no God and so forth. Yet despite the tremendous diversity that exists in the different major belief systems and the distinct views of God that each faith promotes, there is one common theme that all the different major belief systems agree on, talk about, and address in all the narratives, symbols, traditions, and sacred histories that each specific religion advocates. This common theme is the belief that humans are either programmed with two opposing ethical decision-making processes that are constantly at work or that a supernatural power created humans with a premeditated intention for them to interact with objects based on this frame of reference. The people who hold to any type of faith must use the body of knowledge that their religion teaches to develop a conscious knowledge of good and evil and of the difference between them.

Earlier, I mentioned that people cannot remain idle; even the act of breathing requires humans to alter matter. It is really strange that humans have chosen to structure their interactions with external objects around two opposing ethical principles, especially considering that people initially have no understanding of whether good or evil actually exists. Second, humans can only detect their existence by unnaturally changing matter. The things people want to understand are how all the objects that existed, exist, or will exist, and which are all located on the outside of their human bodies, work to help them with how to manage to slow the aging process since, as I said, there is no other reason that would motivate people to want to solve all the big questions if it weren't to help slow the aging process. If people understood that their interactions are structured by a frame of reference serving two opposing ethical intentions, they would be better able to develop a conscious knowledge of the difference between good and evil. This phenomenon is because all that people do is alter matter, as I just said. If people are programmed with two opposing ethical intentions, as some believe, it is crucial to understand whether this programming was intentionally designed in humans or if it is a result of human perception. This argument is because in some religions, the superpower that those people believe created their body and the

universe commanded that humans not distinguish between good or evil, or the people who disobey would die.

Therefore, as I have stated, knowledge may lead humans to display weak will, which contradicts common beliefs. If knowledge lets people deepen their ability to distinguish between good and evil, then people don't know if this aptitude was programmed in the human body by a supernatural power, as some people believe. Humans may have invented the mental construct of good and evil, using it throughout a person's life or when their cognitive system is active. This mental construct enables the programmed aptitude for reasoning to assess whether it is effectively contributing to slowing the aging process; however, this does not necessarily imply that social epistemology should be based on it.

In other words, humans could have gone ahead and created a mindset that makes people see or split their actions on good and evil premises. Thus, humans modified the original design of the human body to function according to their interpretation of the purpose of human life. That is to distance the human body from interacting with matter in order to follow the pursuit of how to occupy the human pre-programmed aptitude to reason. If the aforementioned scenario is true, then it is humans who have determined that the purpose of human life is to discover ways to slow the aging process and to address the fundamental questions about the universe. Next, it is humans who began to engineer objects that people cannot control; they are unable to will themselves to stop desiring these objects, even if they try. This situation is because of how they were created by the intelligent design that we all abide by its rules, which requires humans to continuously be altering matter and thus be unable to stop to alter matter even if a person wants to find the will to do it. Humans are constantly engineering new objects. Thus, a person cannot stop desiring. Humans may be creating all the insecurity they experience, and this is unrelated to whether their actions are evil or good.

Matter is never created or destroyed. When people influence unnatural changes in matter, they alter the original form of the object at the moment the change is introduced. It could very well be that when people began to alter matter to detect their existence, they started to create, mold, and engineer shapes. To justify the negative transformations that they were influencing in the shapes they worked out, or let's say the ones they weren't pleased with. Humans may have called the shapes they engineered "negative" or "evil" because they disliked them. In other words, people called the transformations their hands made that they didn't like negative or evil.

However, to not admit that the transformation that they were displeased with seeing was the making of their own hands (i.e., their own superior preprogrammed aptitude to reason committed it). The people developed a mindset that made it easier for them to categorize the things they saw or the objects they created into two groups: those they liked, which they labeled as good, and those they disliked, which they began to call negative or evil. Next, people expanded this self-conceived idea and began to cluster all the shapes they liked and disliked. To convince themselves that it was not their own hands who arranged for whatever they saw. Human ingenuity provided the guidance for their hands to implement changes and oversee the transformation. This process helped because humans began to bypass the role the hands played in the transformation that the object ended up undergoing after humans involved their hands to be the outcome of what their human ingenuity instructed. Evidently, humans easily convinced themselves that their human ingenuity is by itself split into good and evil, based on what their own programmed aptitude to reason told them, since this aptitude is not made of matter. The real

breakthrough came right when humans began to organize religious rituals and to believe in an afterlife. Humans expanded the mental construct that they were building on its premise that human ingenuity is structured on two ethical premises to promote that the positive actions which they liked or the negative actions which they disliked were a supernatural force that has programmed those two premises in humans.

This dissemination that the people who began to organize religious rituals and to believe in an afterlife for humans being programmed with two good and evil ethical premises enabled the cover-up people need to continually do wrong when they genuinely know what is right. This is because the negative actions that people exhibit are now not the hands or the individual human behavior of the person who was responsible for them but God or the intelligent design that created man. But again, all those transformations that humans used to shift the blame for the negative transformation that people make wouldn't have been possible if the people who began to organize religious rituals and to believe in an afterlife God didn't help them with this statement that they claim was God who said in his heart after he destroyed life on earth, as the Old Testament of the Bible claims. The Bible claims that God said in his heart after he destroyed all life on earth that every inclination of the human heart is evil from childhood (Genesis 8:21).

People's knowledge over the years has changed a lot. All the scientific advancement and the industrial progress available are proof of what human ingenuity created. Until not too long ago, religion was the only mean available to humans to seek to arrive at ethical truths. During all the time that religion was attempting to establish an ethical system based on human reason rather than on theological doctrine, a person can prevail over them if their costs outweigh the benefits.

In recent years, the scientific advancement that people achieved can allow humans to attempt to force the establishment of an ethical system because the technological advances can override the human body. For example, now when a person is in an elevator, he could get off only on the floor in which he is authorized to reach. A person, regardless of what he does, cannot make the elevator stop at another floor. In other words, this action overrides both human reason and

theological doctrine because, regardless of whether the costs outweigh the benefits or vice versa, a person cannot prevail over their own reasoning.

The superior aptitude for reasoning is solely concerned with finding ways to slow the aging process. To focus on its only goal—slowing the aging process—all scientific advancements are preconditions; thus, a human ingenuity-desired elaborate system is needed only to prevent the human body from exhibiting unethical actions. Could the recent scientific advancement that human ingenuity made, whereby this aptitude is no longer required to rely on religion or human reason to make humans exhibit ethical conduct, be impacting human life due to how such a technological breakthrough attempts to reduce the worth of the human person into becoming just an object?

Indeed, human ingenuity is not composed of matter; therefore, it does not require elaborate social structures or material reasons to express itself. The only concern of human ingenuity should be structuring human interactions with matter to enable its goal: finding the unique person who could help it make scientific advancements to slow the aging process. In other words, only when the world is in peace could the unique people who could advance science even more come forward, and the scientific advancement that humans have made gives human ingenuity this power. This power is because the scientific advancement can force the human behavior of people into a frame of force that overrides the two ethical systems that human reasoning or religion have founded on their basis, the history of the world.

There is no doubt human knowledge has evolved a lot from when we began organizing religious rituals to understand ourselves and the world we live in now. People's detection of their existence allowed humans to recognize that it is their thoughts that instruct their body to commit good or evil actions. People can no longer avoid incriminating themselves through their actions, thoughts, or bodies. However, after thousands of years since the appearance of man on earth, people accepted that good and evil are two concepts programmed into human thoughts and hearts from childhood. Similarly, developing a mindset that divides thoughts to understand situations based on two ethical principles and organizes how the human body interacts with others

according to this relationship is essential. This categorization of human life allows those who believe in a supernatural power that created the world to absolve the human body or mind of responsibility for evil actions, as they can attribute the blame to the creator's design of human nature. For those who do not believe that a supernatural power created the universe, the division of human actions or interactions with matter is based on two distinct ethical principles: good and evil. This approach ensures the preservation of law and order on earth, facilitating progress in slowing the aging process.

In this present work, what I am interested in is reviewing the impact of allowing man-made creation to begin to help humans with maintaining law and order while humans continue to detect their existence and work to create the right environment to acquire, manage, and distribute the earth's resources on the basis of the inalienable right of each person to sustain his survival needs and to satiate his earthly desire. In other words, humans relied on their reason to prevail over their will. Human reason is an aptitude that was programmed in the human body by the intelligent design from which humans evolved. Therefore, humans seek a social order on earth that operates according to the principles of freezing social space and accumulating material possessions over time. Specifically, what I would like to review is how we are beginning to control human movement and knowledge based on what scientific advances can do and their impact on human security. Most importantly, the social order humans create and the scientific advancements that can override the body or human reason can affect that order. This is because within the social order that humans practice, not only can a person freeze social space and accumulate material things on a cumulative basis. A person can also, while he is working on spotting ways to improve our world, realize the full development of his personality. Therefore, in addition to seeking significance and immortality through personal achievements, individuals also have the freedom to freeze social space and accumulate material possessions. The concern that I have with the scientific advancement that people have made to run religion out of business and override the body, thus stopping evil, is that unfortunately humans cannot live evil-free. This is because the scientific advancement that people are making distances the body from interacting with matter as per the way we were created to continually be altering matter.

This human purpose, which people settled on to make everything possible, may be a problem because it distances the body from interacting with matter necessary for a person to remain an intrinsic part of nature. The scientific advancement that overrides the body helps those people who want to stop evil and improve governance to increase their propensity because of how such artificial intelligence can dominate the human body and human knowledge. This new social order, which many people are eager to experiment with, is expected to reduce delinquency and assist those who wish to enhance their ability to live a good life, especially when surveillance cameras monitor activities instead of real humans. But I think it doesn't matter where a person lives, in prison or outside, after humans control people's movement and knowledge due to their inability to resist AI. I have reason to believe that as humans will eventually desire to live without evil, this phenomenon could maybe speed the end of the present life cycle of existence and usher in a new life cycle. This is because the artificial humans that real people let into their homes could take over and prevent them from acting as they were made to, altering matter.

This situation presents a significant paradox. If humans are not created by a supernatural power as certain people believe, then the consideration that people promote to support that it was God who programmed those two ethical premises on whose basis humans have structured their social relations. The only purpose is to prove the existence of evil or wickedness. Human ingenuity could focus on attempting to impose the programmed ability to reason that each individual possesses, in order to overcome the weakness of will through force. The world's precarious attitude to peace and security could prove why humans have failed to make people prevail over the weakness of their will. If people were created by a god, then humans indeed face a much bigger problem. This argument is because the forces and interactions that people and lifeless objects exert on one another and the results these interactions produce would be very important to take into consideration for how it is affecting the endurance of the natural system if humans desire that the future people who will live enrich themselves from the activities that people practice now.

Indeed, people's decision to attribute the actions they exhibit to lifeless objects in order to avoid incriminating their failure to develop conscious knowledge of good and evil—and of the difference between them—perhaps reflects how human nature could have been created or ordered by chance; this is an intelligent practice that has worked so far.

As previously stated, people only alter the form or shape of matter; they do not create or destroy it, even during unnatural changes to create a new form or pattern. If the pattern that humans are creating has its origin in a supernatural power, that power didn't prompt it. In other words, humans invented this dual ethical premise that governs how they interact with objects and each other. It is possible that the mechanisms people developed during their transition from being an intrinsic part of nature to assuming a custodianship role are now competing with the natural conditions that govern both humans and the world. This conclusion is because the mechanisms that people began to promote for structuring mankind's interaction with objects could be entirely man-made. Such mechanisms could not be adapted to how the human body naturally functions because, as I said, no human body can be idle.

Moreover, if the human body is governed by inherent natural conditions and if all people share the same human ingenuity, this aptitude cannot overrule the body's ability to alter matter. This aptitude (i.e., human ingenuity) only lets people detect their existence due to being programmed with a cognition system that was programmed in the human body to achieve with it what the intelligent design that overrules the human body wants them to achieve. This purpose could be something entirely different than the way humans are trying to make their human ingenuity serve. It could very well be that people are not naturally possessed of good and evil virtues. Rather, only people who reached this conclusion postulate that their negative transformation of matter is due to mankind exhibiting two opposing ethical dualisms to avoid incriminating themselves. Most importantly, this argument also signifies that what could be preventing people from overcoming the obstacles that stop humans from developing a conscious knowledge of good and evil and of the difference between them could have started after people began to produce shapes or set up

mechanisms to acquire, manage, and distribute the objects that people produce from the earth's resources.

Agnosticism has accompanied people since time immemorial. The question of whether God exists and whether humans originated on Earth or arrived here by accident remains a topic of debate. People are reproduced on Earth. When a person becomes aware of his existence, he has the choice to either develop his own ideas about the relationships he could establish with external objects or to rely on the methods used by others.

There are two sources from which any newborn picks up understanding on the relationship his body could maintain with the objects that exist outside of his physical body. Those two sources are what people postulate through their programmed reasoning process, and the other one is from theology. In other words, in one case humans, through their own forming opinion, develop a conscious knowledge of good and evil and of the difference between them. The other source is through theism. Both sources have been competing with each other and have shaped the fundamental basis for all human actions, thoughts, perceptions, feelings, and the ways in which people develop under various existential conditions.

Before proceeding, it is important to note that this work does not consider whether a supernatural being (or God) created humans or the Earth, nor whether people evolved on Earth and are related to apes in the tree of life, as some believe. It's also irrelevant if God created the universe or told humans how to act. Likewise, in this work, I am not investigating whether theism's truth, values, or claims are authentic. If those claims about God, the afterlife, and similar topics were to remain unknown, or if the opposite were to become true, it would not affect our investigation. This study does not address whether all existing

things remain unknowable or become knowable, nor does it consider whether the metaphysical and religious claims regarding the world's creation by a supernatural force are based on objective or subjective dogmas. This material is entirely outside the scope of this work.

In this study, there is a credo or religious beliefs that people congregate around, but the majority refuse to follow. I am investigating how people's decisions to deviate from aligning the social order with this credo could be impacting human life both negatively and positively. To our knowledge, humans have not practiced this credo in the form of a general social order. Until now, this credo has only been practiced in the context of the religious community. However, since this credo has not been practiced in real life, any conclusions drawn are based solely on empirical observation. People who adopt the lifestyle this credo suggests appear to live with less fear and want than those who do not. This credo refers to the biblical creation story in which God advised his first two creations to abstain from distinguishing between good and evil, warning that doing so would result in death. (Genesis 2:17)

What I plan to do in this work is compare people's decisions to establish a social order that promotes an entirely opposite credo to interact with objects, which is based on using human reason to achieve practical results for the greater well-being of society. First, I will review the state of human life since people began to establish an ethical system based on human reason instead of the previously mentioned credo. I am particularly interested in reviewing how the state of human life could evolve after humans, in their quest for significance and immortality through achievements, have managed to create artificial beings capable of surpassing human reasoning and the ethical systems that religion promotes for the greater well-being of society. In this regard, I plan to review how humans' decision to deviate from the credo reported in the Bible in favor of scientific advancement and industrial progress could impact the state of human life and whether this new approach to overriding human reason could help humans seek political and ethical truths or prove to be detrimental. I plan to review how human life could evolve after people decided to make it all about detecting their existence and living well, despite God disobeying them after his first creations. The Bible claims

that God cursed man, built an enmity between him and his favorite creation, and ruled that until man returns to the earth, he shall eat his food with the sweat of his brow. Genesis (3:19)

Therefore, my justification for using the word "God" is based on the religious texts that state God dictated the credo, and I am investigating how the human decision to deviate from pursuing this credo could have affected the state of human life. In this context, God serves as the central theme that guides our reasoning and helps us develop our thoughts. The work of God precedes our analysis because it serves as the foundation upon which we build our relationships. Any reference to God or God's work signifies a relation or comparative contextual analysis that underpins our research efforts to acquire the information we seek.

No one knows the age of the planet earth. After birth, every newborn will encounter various interpretations of how all living and non-living objects came together to form the current structure and interactions of the universe. People estimate when the major religions we mentioned began. One well-known source for a potential version of the earth's creation is the book of Genesis in the Old Testament of the Bible. The first five books of the Bible (Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy) are collectively called the Books of the Law. Those five books are also known as the Torah, or the Books of Moses. Moses was born in Egypt in 1393 BCE, and he is regarded as the most important prophet in Judaism. Moses wasn't present for any of the events mentioned in the book of Genesis. However, tradition credits Moses as the author of the book of Genesis.

The books of Moses form part of what are known as the Abrahamic religions. The Abrahamic religions is a nomenclature that is attributed to people who preach about the existence of one God and that all descendants that trace themselves to Abraham, as in the case of Moses, are to recognize the spiritual tradition identified by Abraham. Abraham is a character in the Bible who had almost everything he wanted. One day, God asked Abraham to leave behind his home and possessions and travel with his family to a land that God would reveal to him; Abraham accepted. As an ultimate test, God asked Abraham to sacrifice his son. Despite his grief, he was willing to obey. The people

who organize religious rituals and believe in the afterlife consider that Abraham showed that he placed his love for God above everything else, and in this way he cooperated with God's plan.

Many people regard Abraham as an important prophet in their faith, but those who have organized into large institutions to proclaim their cooperation with God's plan, similar to Abraham, are the followers of the three main religions: Judaism, Christianity, and Islam. The followers of the three aforementioned religions represent approximately half of the world's population, if not more. In principle, all those people who practice or congregate around those three faiths recognize the spiritual tradition identified by Abraham, including in particular that the story of the creation that appears in the Bible of the Old Testament is about the beginning or how God created the universe plus when this God's first two creations disobeyed him as true.

In Genesis, people learn about the origin of the universe and the purpose of human life on earth. In the same book, we read about a potential explanation for the purpose of human life and how this planet plays a part in this transitional process. Specifically, we read about God claiming ownership for the universe and that after the creation of the universe God created the earth and did let the earth bring forth all the living creatures. God created man in his image and likeness to have dominion over all the earth and over every living thing that moves on it. God also wanted man to be fruitful, multiply, replenish the earth, and subdue it. Most importantly, what we read about is that God did not want humans to distinguish between good or evil. (Genesis 2:17)

We don't know if under the other major religions that people practice, such as Hinduism, Buddhism, Taoism, Confucianism, and Chinese folk religion, the God or Gods that those people venerate have dictated guidance of the kind their God defined for those who practice the Abrahamic religions. Today, there are many belief systems, making it impossible to provide an exact estimate of the number of religions that exist due to the dynamic and multifaceted nature of humanity's relationship with the concept of existence. This situation tends to influence the number of gods, goddesses, or combinations thereof that are believed to be responsible for the creation of the universe and its ongoing operation. Based on what we managed to understand,

Buddhism is a religion that prescribes that people can end their suffering through the elimination of ignorance and craving. Hinduism prescribes honesty, refraining from injuring, patience, forbearance, self-restraint, compassion, and so forth. Taoism evolves around the two basic principles of yin and yang, which refer to two opposite moral forces. Yin and yang are also mentioned in Confucianism.

Even if the followers of the non-Abrahamic religions we cited here lack guidance from the God or gods they venerate, it is still possible to seek guidance or to draw clarity on what their intention on earth should be to serve to accomplish. This work will solely focus on the credo that the God, whom people tracing their lineage to Abraham have suggested, should follow. As I said, more than half the world's population currently follows the plan that this god prescribed. Of course, this plan aims to clarify how to distinguish between good and evil. In the case of humans, people want to employ human reason to reach a way to distinguish between good and evil. In the case of this specific God that figures in the Bible. This God suggests that people distance themselves from distinguishing between good and evil in order to reach the same end. In modern times, people want to use the concept of intelligent design, which humans can create, to control and regulate how individuals seek to achieve political and ethical truths.

Moreover, we suppose that the people who follow those non-Abrahamic religions are willing to accept that, within their own belief system, there is a cultural system that promotes being fruitful, multiplying, replenishing, subduing, and having dominion over the fish of the sea, the fowl of the air, and every living thing that moves upon the earth. In effect, even if those other non-Abrahamic religions do not include such a command to be fruitful, people are already doing it; hence, demographers claim that the number of people who do not congregate around spiritual traditions identified by Abraham is the other half of the rest of the world population.

We cannot know if the gods or goddesses of the major non-Abrahamic religions we cited here commanded humans to not distinguish between good and evil. However, even if the major non-Abrahamic religions we cited had their own God or gods, they did not issue commands in the same manner as the God in question did. The people who gather

around those other religions preach concepts that encourage individuals to develop a conscious understanding of good and evil to navigate life successfully. In effect, even if the people who congregate around the major non-Abrahamic religions that we cited here lack guidance from their own god or gods to avoid developing a conscious knowledge of good and evil, the segment of people who consider themselves descendants from Abraham do have such guidance. Until now, parishioners who practice non-Abrahamic religions have not developed a conscious understanding of good and evil or the ability to distinguish between them. Until now, people who adhere to distinct non-Abrahamic faiths have continued to experience conflicts, contradictions, divergence, a lack of awe-inspiring agreement, evil behavior, the accumulation of possessions and wealth, and the domination of others through brutal strength and the misuse of power. This indirectly means that even for the people who adhere to all those non-Abrahamic religions that exist in the world today, the divine source in their case didn't implant guidance for them to abstain from developing a conscious knowledge of good and evil. The fact that people from non-Abrahamic faiths have not succeeded in starting to act toward one another in a spirit of brotherhood so that peace, security, or stability starts to flourish among people makes it another reason to question if indeed those people who adhere to such non-Abrahamic religions and who have taken the decision to dedicate their existence to developing a conscious knowledge of good and evil have still not reached the ability to act toward each other in a spirit of brotherhood because they are basing their laws on manmade ones. If they had developed a conscience about good and evil, they wouldn't have to detect themselves, as peace and security would have been on earth long ago among those who practice this other faith system or the territorial boundaries from which those other faith systems are practiced.

Therefore, we have a situation in which all the people who are willing to accept that they hold on to religious beliefs in supernatural beings. In these distinct religions, either the supernatural beings have instructed parishioners to avoid detecting their existence (i.e., knowing good or evil), or the supernatural power they believe in has allowed them to do so. People are in full force developing a conscience between good and evil. Instead, all people who believe in supernatural

beings and are from all religious faiths and denominations indulge in doing nothing else but developing their own ideas about the cosmos and human nature to give meaning to life or to explain life or the universe. Till now the people who adhere to all the distinct religious beliefs, despite having practiced how to distinguish between good and evil, and until now this path has not helped people to establish peace and security. It is not entirely wrong to suspect some ambiguity between what certain gods instructed people to do on earth and what people, since the day they detected themselves, have been pursuing and began doing to spot ways to improve our world, and the opposite of this reality is turning things out to be. To warrant it, we attempt to find out if increased human knowledge could have had something to do with this precarious attitude that people have lived with and try to investigate the role human-added knowledge could have played in preventing people from really distinguishing between knowing and picking the difference between good or evil. If I can isolate what it could be specifically due to, people disagree on how to consciously interact with the objects outside their physical bodies; this knowledge could help us to understand if humans would be able to reach and arrive at political and ethical truths when human reasoning and religion are overruled!

People have known, invented, idolized, and so forth a large number of gods or goddesses but then dropped, picked, and kept specific ones. Among all the gods and goddesses known to people across various religions, the specific God mentioned in the Bible seems to have been the most concerned with helping people overcome the weaknesses of their will, more so than any other god or goddess known to humanity. At its simplest definition, what actually makes the difference between this specific god and the rest is that he was the only god that interfered in the management and distribution of the earth's resources and in how people should conduct themselves. However, what we are concerned specifically with from what we know about this God is the interval in which the Bible depicts him as being totally against people developing a conscious knowledge of good and evil. In other words, this is the interval before this specific god began to intervene in the management and distribution by humans of the earth's resources, including dictating laws on how people should and shouldn't interact with objects. If we compare what this specific God wanted humans to carry on doing during their lives during this interval in which he was totally against humans developing conscious knowledge between good and evil and the opposite of what people do, which is to encourage any living being to detect his existence, we observe a major discrepancy between the two.

When a newborn opens his eyes to life, adults rush to ensure that the child learns about right and wrong so that he can recognize his existence, reflecting how humans have been operating and managing life. In principle, those who trace their lineage to Abraham and believe in the specific God described in the Bible should abstain from knowing right and wrong. In reality, the people who trace their lineage

to Abraham and believe in the God described in the Bible do not abstain from learning about right and wrong. In the case of those people who trace their religious beliefs to Abraham, right, when their offspring open their eyes to life and as soon as they reach the ages when they begin to detect their existence, the parent wants the offspring to become a pilot, doctor, carpenter, scientist, engineer, lawyer, musician, teacher, and so forth. In other words, the parent becomes adamant on orienting their sibling to let the purpose of this life not necessarily be to do as the way that this specific God commanded that all those who take him as a conduit would like their life on earth to lead them, but rather to make their sibling pick a purpose or a career that does nothing but contribute to the newborn detecting his existence. That's not all. The people who identify themselves as being in agreement with God's plan as a prerequisite to belonging to any one of the Abrahamic religions have gone beyond just accepting to distinguish between good and evil so that such insight helps them with carrying on with their daily lives as they rightly believe the detection of their own existence would let them. Those people are themselves scientists and researchers working on second-guessing if God created the universe and how to spot ways to improve the world when, according to the scriptures they worship, they should be believing in the unseen.

Indeed, when a newborn opens his eyes to life, other people make all the decisions on his behalf until he reaches the point of being able to sustain his own survival needs. However, as soon as a newborn becomes aware of his existence, he will reach a point where he can decide for himself whether to believe in supernatural beings or not. By this stage we mean capable of living life without resorting to distinguishing between good or evil and/or making all the decisions on how to interact with objects and other people from that point onward. His case will not be any different from that of his parents before him if he came from a family that pursued religious beliefs. The spiritual guidance that is passed onto the newborn is done in the form of a relay, which is manmade and not revealed directly to the newborn by a deity. In other words, those same beliefs were passed onto the people doing the relay from those who lived before them to help them spot ways to improve the world. The strangest part though is that people want their newborn to live their life like them, believing in the unseen,

establishing prayer, and having no doubt about the existence of the supernatural. Knowing very well that the credence of theism has been a debated subject since the dawn of time. Yet people want God to help them and their children to make it through life with success without practicing what God was against people venturing into doing, and that is to distinguish good or evil.

Nobody fully knows why people decided not to take the basic tenets that this God who figures in the Bible suggested and then proceeded to organize mechanisms that would limit people's interaction with the objects that are situated on the outside of the human senses on its basis. Instead, people decided to structure their interactions with the world and with each other on the basis of a concept that is the total opposite of what this God who figures in the Bible suggested. People interpreted the changes they influenced as destined to serve two opposing ethical premises, good and evil, and to be exhibited to rationalize only those two opposing ethical intentions. As we said earlier, such a relationship could be something that the human body doesn't know how to distinguish between naturally. In other words, humans are trying to impose a condition that they want their pre-programmed aptitude to reason to assume, which could very well be that humans were created to function on a premise other than its own.

When we examine the mechanisms that people use to structure, interpret, and observe their interactions with objects outside their sensory systems, we find that these mechanisms are based on people's recognition systems, which possess two opposing ethical intentions. The difference between the interaction approach people promote and the one God suggests in the Bible is how each entity defines the purpose of human life.

A major discordance exists between the way the God of the Bible (as described in the creation story authored by Moses) intended for people to consecrate themselves and what people have actually been striving to do. At the same time, it makes no sense that, on one hand, this same God wanted people to be fruitful, multiply, and have dominion without humans distinguishing between what is right and wrong. If all that humans can do is alter matter, the only barrier to ethical and brotherly interactions with objects outside their physical bodies is the improvements that people are noticing in the world. This conclusion is because people could depart this life for two reasons. People can depart this life either naturally or prematurely due to the objects that they have developed to help improve our world. If people are unable to use or interact with the objects they engineer, stop using them to commit evil acts. Then, this impairment cannot be due to anything apart from humans using their ingenuity to develop those objects. This is because humans use those objects to distinguish between good and evil. First, humans cannot distinguish between good and evil, and even if they could, the objects people produce still lack this ability. This assertion is no longer true; certain advancements made by people now have the ability to take action only in response to commands issued by specific designated individuals.

This specific God wanted humans to be able to conduct their lives by distinguishing between good and evil, but no one knows why.

But again, how could humans acquire, manage, and distribute the earth's resources without stumbling on the obstacles that are preventing us from reaching and exhibiting an ethical and brotherly attitude, which has persisted throughout the history of the world? By

omitting details on how humans can sustain their survival needs without distinguishing between good or evil, this specific god or whoever the scribes were left out an important detail that people require to help them figure out how to interact with the objects that exist outside of people's physical bodies. If this specific God omitted this detail, there could be two reasons for his course of action. Either this specific God understood that the way people naturally interact with objects cannot be defined by a formal distinction between good and evil, or he made an error in judgment, which would explain why this detail was omitted. In either case, perhaps this specific God clearly outlined the mechanism that people need to follow to consciously interact with objects outside of their physical bodies and aimed to be explicit about this detail. If the God in question had given specific instructions on how to live without relying on their knowledge, mankind might have avoided the consequences of the enmity he is said to have shown after the first two people he created disobeyed him by trying to distinguish between good and evil, as reported in Genesis. This ambiguity arises because God did not provide details on how he wanted humans to live without relying on their knowledge in a world governed by cycles of planting and harvesting, night and day, and cold and heat; nor did he outline a plan for acquiring, managing, and distributing the earth's resources, as he did for less significant matters. He left a major obstacle for people trying to make laws his way, especially for humans to figure out, without his help, how to respect some guidance and agree on how to treat others.

One must also recognize that the Bible's command, attributed to God, tells people not to distinguish between good and evil; however, this statement may be a credo added by the scribe who drafted the creation story, and it may not reflect God's true intentions for humanity. Moses may have added this statement, as the true authorship of the creation story in the Bible remains unknown. Another possible explanation is that this statement refers to a credo practiced by earlier people, and the only remnants of that culture are the credos reported in the Bible. In other words, those people who lived during this earlier culture were erased. What only survived from this earlier culture is this statement. In this context, the phrase would mean that those people who lived without knowing good or evil, or without attempting to distinguish

between the two, would live forever. This is because their culture may have changed when they began to distinguish between good and evil.

We don't know if the early people who lived after the God who created man knew they would die if they started to distinguish between good and evil. Only when they moved away from this credo did they see their culture come to an end. Perhaps those earlier people had managed to discover peace with their inability to stop or reverse the aging process or death. Therefore, instead of dedicating their lives to solving significant questions, they lose their sense of presence in the process. Remember that we face challenges because we chose to seek significance and immortality in our achievements instead of living as an intrinsic part of nature. Humans will bear the consequences of agreeing on how to acquire, manage, and distribute the earth's resources, which is precisely the issue we are currently facing. This situation is due to the demand for resources that people need to improve the world and fulfill their personal development.

However, we only know that right after people took upon themselves the goal of seeking to understand themselves, the world they live in, and the relations to the world and each other because God left unclear how people could achieve this goal, given that he created the earth to succumb to seasons, time to plant and time to harvest, fertile land surfaces and others that are not, and so forth. The absence of guidance on how to navigate survival challenges may lead people to feel tempted to disobey God's commands. But then, the precarious state of human life that people are knowing could be a result of this God having programmed this human ingenuity in people specifically because he wanted humans to live without knowledge of good or evil for a specific reason. In other words, this is the reason why God didn't provide any plan. God's plan consists solely of allowing humans to live with the knowledge of good and evil to spare them from dying. If this is the only plan that God desires, he must have known that humans, being endowed with reason, possess the ability to distinguish between good and evil. Humans may be tempted to disobey his command, and for this reason, he programmed obstacles to trigger if people began to use this aptitude as per the way we are doing it. The challenges that people are facing could serve as evidence. This credo or guideline is what people want to perceive as mythical. There is no

reason why humans are able to use their human ingenuity to produce intelligent design that takes actions only based on human command. This God, or the intelligent design that people must submit to, has also organized actions that are triggered when individuals choose to disobey his rule of abstaining from knowing good or evil. In other words, human weakness prevails over their will.

The dilemma is that people are ready to accept certain guidelines that this God accepted to pass as suggested in the Bible, but till now humans refuse to give real consideration to the guideline in which he warned people to stay away from knowing good and evil to avoid dying.

For example, humans easily respect or honor the guidance that God gives, regardless of whether God passed this command. This guideline pertains to the distribution of material possessions, which are handled whenever a person leaves this life. Most people agree that a deceased person's material possessions should be transferred to their immediate family or clan. It's odd that a dead person's belongings are divided among family or clan members. Often, family members struggle to agree on the best way to divide the material possessions accumulated by the deceased. This behavior that family members exhibit casts doubts on whether humans can distinguish between good and evil, because if the deceased person had left his accumulated inheritance to others, those immediate family members who should be mourning their loss would not be entering into a dispute over how to distribute the material things that the deceased person left.

People die from two causes: natural causes and unnatural causes, as we said before. Let "natural causes" refer to any health complications that result from the failure of the body to circumvent and/or to recuperate from any risk caused by a natural element or circumstance and that result in the loss of life. Examples of unnatural causes include a virus, a man falling from a cliff, an animal attacking a human, or a man killing another person with his own hands.

Unnatural causes that lead to a person's death include the progress created by people as well as the crises and conflicts over values, beliefs, resources, and similar issues they encounter; these factors,

rather than natural causes, can trigger such outcomes. All that people do is alter matter. The people alter objects for the purpose of forming shapes. The things that people develop different opinions on are objects or shapes. People create shapes to help them distinguish between good and evil, thereby improving their ability to detect their existence. The search for the best way to live and the pursuit of the ideal life result from people's efforts to find ways to improve the world, as evidenced by the level of progress that exists.

All people from all faiths on earth are working on detecting their existence so they can pursue the ideal life. The objects people create cause all the unnatural deaths they are aware of, leading to these outcomes. The objects that people produce are the result of people having decided to detect their existence so they can, consequently, based on what they have known from good and evil, orient the interaction they exhibit with matter to produce shapes that can serve their fixated intention to make nothing impossible when it comes to how to live the wonderful life.

Could the coming together of people to do the total opposite of the purpose of human life as suggested by this specific God in the Bible (i.e., “eat from the sweat of their brows”) be the main reason why people are unable to prevail over their will? In other words, the hearts of humans are not evil when a person becomes a child, as per the way the Bible reports the case. Instead, a person starts to alter matter (or eat from the sweat of his brow) at this age.

When a newborn starts to recognize himself, it's not God who teaches him to do so or to know right from wrong; it's his parents. Likewise, it is not God who tells a newborn to go ahead and to detect his existence so he could know the difference between good and evil and risk dying from the objects that people develop, but rather people. Actually, attaching any relation to what the different gods or goddesses or combinations of gods and goddesses that exist have with people's pursuits to detect their existence or the mental construct that, on its basis, people want to convince themselves that the interaction they exhibit in matters serves, i.e., good or evil premises, is difficult. It is very easy to support that this conviction about humans is either programmed with two opposite ethical premises or the interaction they

exhibit in the matter serves the same end, being a mythical story. People may have created this myth to prevent others from competing for the resources they claim to manage and preserve for their own benefit. People can turn illegal actions into legal ones only if they use a supernatural force to justify them and encourage acceptance. Evidently, all it takes is for a group of people to come together to validate that their interaction is a good or evil mental construct and to enact laws to enforce it.

The perception that people use to structure their relationships is free of checks and balances because humans determine their existence and enact laws without any interference from God. Could the objects that people create impair their ability to distinguish between good and evil? Could their search for self-awareness be the cause of all the unnatural deaths people are experiencing? Could people have confused their interactions with external objects by applying the same perceived principles they use to classify the three frames of reference—up/down, left/right, and forward/back—while also incorporating the distinction between good and evil?

The interaction that people structured on its basis is how to exchange with the objects that exist on the outside of their physical bodies, and they innovated and are until now experimenting around, supporting that it could very well be that humans misunderstood their intention on earth.

There hasn't been any source outside of religious textbooks to indicate that this specific God who is mentioned in the Bible really existed or to provide additional information about him. The only way for people to learn anything about this specific God has been through exegetical methods. However, when we observe how everything functions perfectly and on time in the universe, it becomes challenging to dismiss the possibility that either the universe is ordered by chance or that a being has intentionally organized it in this way. We must consider whether this specific God intended for people to be fruitful, multiply, and replenish the earth. This scenario signifies that this specific God could very well have intended that humans run or manage the earth in a manner that is entirely different than the way humans are used to running things. This phenomenon is because

humans depart from this life earlier than when their natural detention expires. This early departure from unnatural causes could affect the functions that this specific God may have intended for humans to serve on earth, especially since this God was also so keen on insisting that people multiply and replenish. In other words, it is illogical to believe that the universe could be perfectly ordered by chance in every aspect, except for how people should acquire, manage, or distribute the earth's resources to meet their survival needs for water and food, similar to how animals do. This scenario also signifies once again that humans could have been perhaps intended to serve a role that is totally unlike the way humans are running the state of human life. No one can tell if the earth's endurance weakens when the population decreases or increases. Living, working, and taking care of the earth should align with God's intentions rather than the way humans currently do it.

The precarious attitude that humans adopt in their interactions with one another raises significant doubts about whether this specific God intended for people to use the human ingenuity he instilled in them to live enriched lives, especially after programming them with a natural ability to distinguish between safety and danger. This conclusion is because humans don't need the five human senses, which they have classified as being the most important to distinguish between safety and danger. A blind person can naturally and without reliance on his vision determine when he has reached a cliff.

Are people using their programmed aptitude to distinguish between good and evil to achieve with it the total opposite of what God programmed this aptitude in humans to help them when using and applying such aptitude? It looks really as if when people decided to let their superior programmed aptitude to reason classify the unnatural changes that the body was exhibiting to serve two premises, good or evil, humans began to organize their relations on such principles and caused all the insecurity that has existed throughout the history of the world.

Certain people believe a supernatural power created the universe because the world looks so ordered. It would be illogical to assume that this specific God cared if humans spent their lives fixated on determining why we are here. Where did we come from? Why do we

perish? From where does everything come? What is everything created from? And so forth. If God were concerned about people discovering all this information, he wouldn't want them to do it. He equipped humans with intelligence and programmed people with power to alter matter and create shapes.

Likewise, if a supernatural being created the universe, the superior programmed aptitude to reason that this source programmed in humans could only have planned it for this specific god to prevent humans from using it or to thwart them achieving it. The reasoning is because this specific God would have nothing to gain if people managed to topple all that he denied people access to knowing.

There has to be a unique reason why this specific God that appears in the Bible was against humans getting to distinguish between good and evil for reasons other than man disobeying God. Humans are programmed with ingenuity and have evolved in such a way that they are now able to have plans or comprehensive procedures for consistent action to be taken before, during, and after a given incident. The intelligent design that formed humans likely included measures in the blueprint of people that activate each time their body or their own intelligent design attempts to perform unwanted actions. In the same way, humans develop procedures to manage disasters or major incidents.

Humans evoke preventive measures to mitigate or prevent events from happening. Could the intelligent design that created humans include preventive measures that activate (or naturally trigger) when people attempt actions they were not granted the right to carry out or know? This same intelligent design arranged for preventive measures to activate in order to stop humans from taking actions that go against it. This preventive measure is for all the crises that people are facing. An example is the decision made by humans to impose their advanced programmed abilities based on two conflicting ethical principles concerning the understanding of good and evil.

Did earlier people know that when people learn right from wrong, they die, and their culture is what survived? As I said, their culture ended when they stopped living by this credo. Therefore, the earlier people

who lived during this early age left this credo as guidance to follow if man desired to be fulfilled and live forever. Humans are intended to structure their social order on the principle of wanting to know good and evil in order to live long lives, which only man's human ingenuity can provoke prematurely.

Could the first two people mentioned in the Bible, Adam and Eve, have failed to recognize the warning in this credo, and did their disregard for it lead to the end of the world? In other words, could the decision of the people who lived during the time when Adam and Eve lived, going ahead and swapping the purpose of human life with the idea that people are now on its basis operating the state of human life, be what ended this human culture or life cycle of existence? How can we determine whether the new cycle of existence, which began with the story of the fall of man in the Bible, and the crises and conflicts that people are experiencing are due to human advancements rather than simply a failure to remain faithful to God? Despite all the advances that people are making, can we be sure that Jesus's sacrifice on the cross will stop a scenario in which life on earth will end and a new life cycle will usher in? Next, I attempt to build a frame to show how such an event could be possible if humans take action to organize a social order that makes them an intrinsic part of nature, rather than merely its custodians.

Until this point in our work, we tried to build a case to support that this God who figures in the Bible commanded people to live their lives without distinguishing between good and evil. His motives couldn't be because he was against humans starting to distinguish between good and evil. His concerns about humans were that they focused solely on big questions, like the universe and reversing aging, rather than improving human life. If this specific god opposed humans dedicating themselves to pursuing this mission, he would not have programmed human ingenuity into their consciousness.

We also said that humans plan and act before, during, and after an event. This God must have incorporated a sense of balance in humans, which triggers or activates whenever they engage in the actions he warned them to avoid, specifically the knowledge of good and evil. The consequence of this insubordination is that people die.

We have identified two sources from which people depart this life: natural causes and unnatural causes. We classified natural causes as those resulting from all the objects that humans create to help them distinguish between good and evil. Most importantly, we concluded the previous chapter by stating that humans are trivializing the choice to reject organizing themselves around this credo. Humans continued their activities based on beliefs instilled in them, such as the idea that the human heart is evil from childhood, God's covenants, the significance of baptisms, or that Jesus's crucifixion absolved all human sins. The aforementioned perception made it imperative people employ concepts to organize the state of human life around highlighting the importance of relying on human reason to establish an ethical system rather than a theological one. The people began to pursue ideals

focused on deepening human knowledge to achieve political and ethical truths. In other words, doing exactly what this God specifically suggested people stay away from doing. In the Bible, it is reported that when the people began to organize the state of human life by distinguishing between good and evil, this led to the end of life on earth and the beginning of a new cycle of people.

Currently, the scientific advances made by people can enable humans to reach political and ethical truths through coercion, as they are able to circumvent the functions of human reason and religion. Humans can now control both people's movements and their thoughts. Humans don't know where life on earth is heading.

The increased knowledge that people are registering could be setting humanity to face the same end that the people of earlier ages faced because the people that formed part of this second life cycle of existence are organizing the state of human life on the basis of the same condition that led those earlier people to bring that first cycle of life to an end. We should not hypothesize this lightly.

From this point forward in our work, we plan to construct a framework that demonstrates how the people who began this second life cycle—starting after the biblical account of God destroying all life on Earth except for Noah and his family—have continued to exist up to the present day. Humans could have been working on bringing this second life cycle to an end through the human decision to reject organizing the state of human life on the basis of this credo that God commanded humans to build the state of human life on its basis. Thus, continuing to contribute leads to the emergence of a new life cycle.

In the third and last section in this work, I will show how people accelerated knowledge to seek political and ethical truths through bypassing human reason and religion, which could speed the end of this current life cycle, which began after the start of the fall of man that is reported in the Bible up to the event which is reported on God having destroyed all life on earth for the exception of Noah and his family.

In this work, I propose no solution that might lead humans to shift from the gloomy fate I expect to demonstrate—a fate humanity is heading toward if people continue to bypass human reason and religion in their pursuit of political and ethical truths. This is because the solution is straightforward and involves reshuffling the purpose of human life so that the social order is based on the principles commanded by this specific God in the Bible. My purpose in writing this book is to encourage people to reflect on how knowledge and individual decisions regarding the structure of human life, which allow each person to fully develop their personality, may be contributing to the increasing crises that people have been experiencing recently. I will now elaborate on the framework that will support our argument that human knowledge could be enabling mankind to end the current cycle of existence and usher in a new one.

Based on this, the specific God mentioned in the Bible commanded people not to distinguish between good and evil; otherwise, they would certainly die. His reasons are not fully known and cannot be analyzed. First, we only know what the Bible says about this God. We are unsure of his existence, making it difficult to understand why he opposed distinguishing between good and evil, a prerequisite for multiplying and replenishing as he suggested. We know that, if this specific God created a natural system of night and day, heat and cold, winter and summer, seedtime and harvest, people cannot sustain their survival needs and satisfy their earthly desires as he suggested, without using their intelligence, to multiply and replenish the earth as he proposed.

Through the scientific advancements made by humanity, it is becoming clear that perhaps nothing is impossible. The scientific advancements and industrial progress are the results of human imagination and creativity. There must be a specific reason that this God knew about, and as a result of that, he was worried that if people organize the state of human life by knowing good and evil, humans may not be able to manage how to distribute the earth's resources and the things that people create or engineer from those resources, thus luring a phenomenon that impacts negatively on his command, so people dedicate themselves to multiplying and replenishing and/or

what he intended people serve as compared to the opposite of what humans are doing instead.

Many people are willing to accept that the Bible is one of the oldest written books, particularly as a source for understanding the history of the world. Additionally, the Bible has been instrumental in shaping religious behaviors that continue to influence people's attitudes, leading many to believe in the universe's creation by a supernatural power or force, as well as the existence of an afterlife. I will use events from the Bible to build our framework and analysis of the life cycle of existence that I said began after the fall of man and could end the same way. As we said before, all people agreed to organize the state of human life on the basis of using knowledge or human reason to distinguish between good and evil. My use of the Bible is only to construct the framework.

Let us consider two time intervals. Let one interval cover the beginning of time, starting when this book claims that this specific God created the heavens, the earth, and the first man, and ending at the point in the Bible where it states that wickedness on earth increased, leading to this specific God's decision to destroy all life and humans except for Noah and his family, whom he found righteous. Let the other interval begin immediately after this God destroyed all life on earth, except for Noah, his family, and the living species that this God instructed to be brought along.

Let us next refer to the people who lived during each interval as the first life cycle and the second life cycle. Let the start of the first life cycle of existence or people be the interval from right when the Bible claims this God supposedly created the heavens, the earth, and next man up to when this God, as the Bible states, came to pass and ended all life for the exception of Noah and his family. Next, let the story of the fall of man, which describes Adam and Eve's disobedience to God, mark the beginning of the downfall trajectory for this first life cycle of people, continuing until the event in which God destroyed all life on earth except for Noah and his family. In other words, we are designating the moment when Adam and Eve disobeyed God as the midpoint of this first life cycle interval, which began with God's creation of the heavens, the earth, and man, and ended when He

destroyed all life on earth except for Noah and his family. This midpoint that we fixed in this first life cycle represents a before and after scenario. The before scenario refers to the period of time from when God created the heavens and the earth up to the moment right before Adam and Eve disobeyed God. During this first interval, humans' wickedness or evil conduct was less than in the later interval from the Fall of Man until God destroyed all life on earth except Noah and his family. During this second interval of the first life cycle, we want to consider how people's conduct increasingly worsened, leading to God's decision to end all life on earth, as the Bible claims occurred.

Let us focus on the second life cycle interval, which began when God ended all life on earth, except for Noah and his family, and continues to the present. In this second life cycle, we will identify the period in Greek antiquity when philosophers suggested that humans should move away from explaining the world through abstract argumentation and instead use deduction and inference, marking the beginning of the downfall of this second life cycle. Let us refer to the period when people began to desire an end to explaining the world through abstract argumentation and instead focused on deduction and inference as the birth of philosophy. In other words, we will consider the birth of philosophy as the midpoint of this second life cycle interval, marking the beginning of the period when humans started to recognize the onset of the downfall trajectory in this second life cycle. We will be analyzing each one of the four intervals separately:

From time = 0 to the story of the fall of man:

The Bible reports that right when God finished with creating the heavens and the earth, he proceeded to create man. His first two creations were Adam and Eve, and these two individuals disobeyed God, which led to the event known as the Fall of Man. The Bible does not report on how human life was during this time interval before those two creations disobeyed God. The Bible doesn't say how people lived before Adam and Eve disobeyed God, but it's possible to imagine it.

The period from when God ended all life on earth, as the Bible claims, except for Noah and his family, until the time in Greek antiquity when

humans shifted from explaining the world through abstract argumentation to using deduction and inference (marking the birth of philosophy), could provide insights into how life on earth might have been during this interval. In other words, one can infer from this correlation that people lived primitively, either based on the beliefs outlined in the Bible or on suggestions about how individuals interacted closely with their surroundings. As people's knowledge increased, they distanced themselves from living based on ignorance of good and evil or the timing of the Fall of Man. From that event or date onward, people began to base their choices on deduction and inference.

It is reasonable to assume that people were just surviving using their hands and feet as their principal tools. Similarly, after the Fall of Man, people lost their ability to distinguish good from evil and began to see themselves as just another part of nature rather than custodians. This shift toward secularized religious values and traditions grew over time. This evolution is what happened after the birth of philosophy. People stopped explaining the world in terms of abstract argumentation and explained it through deduction and inference. Humans began transforming the social order by shifting from a close identification with religious values and institutions to embracing nonreligious values and secular institutions.

Therefore, during this period, people's ability to create or craft shapes was less developed than it became after they started to increasingly rely on their ingenuity to engineer tools and instruments. Some people failed to detect their existence or live the good life that people expected when they began to explain the world through deduction and inference. People may have been living their lives based on their state of nature as well. Moreover, hence, the scientific advancement and industrial progress that people were most probably using were basic due to how much they can be compared with the interval right after the second life cycle started. During this time, the natural system thrived, and environmental degradation remained minimal. The laws the people could have had should have consisted only of how people organize themselves to preserve human security, rather than preserving the material things that allow certain humans to live comfortably while

disregarding the inalienable rights of others to sustain their survival needs.

From the time of the fall of man to when God ended life on earth except for Noah:

As we said earlier, Moses wasn't present for any of the events reported in the book of Genesis. It remains unclear what Moses, or the true author of this book, intended to convey regarding the significance of the story of the fall of man. If Moses was not the original author, then he may have reported this story based on the materials he used to write this chapter. It may be a mistake to trivialize this story and limit its significance to an event between God and his first creation, treating it like daily interactions. In other words, this story signifies the moment when humans chose to interact with objects based on their understanding of good and evil, rather than following God's guidance. We have suggested that the story of the fall of man marks the event that triggered the downward trajectory of the people who lived during this initial life cycle. Evil and wickedness began to grow and spread from that point onward, ultimately leading to the end of this first life cycle. Let us depict how it could be possible that when people began to interact with each other on the basis of knowing good or evil, this departure could have contributed to this and that the Bible claim came to pass.

Human progress is gradual and cumulative. These people who lived during this first life cycle of existence were most probably like us, working, figuring out what makes things what they fundamentally are in the same way we are now doing to understand the purpose of human life. The people who lived during the time of the Fall of Man may have discovered ways to understand their existence much more quickly than previous generations did. In other words, the story of the Fall of Man may represent the event that marked the beginning of humanity's development of a system of critical reasoning, enabling people to better understand their existence and distinguish between right and wrong. However, since humans evolve gradually, as previously mentioned, people may have started searching for the underlying principles of the universe long before the story of the Fall of man was recorded. In effect, we just showed that it is possible to

conceive how the people who lived during the first interval of the first life cycle of existence could have been working in a gradual manner on rejecting remaining faithful to God's credo in order to, like us, discover significance and immortality in their achievements. As their knowledge improved, these people were also helping to organize the interactions they exhibited with objects and each other, shifting their focus from close identification with religious values and institutions to nonreligious values and secular institutions. The event that marked the start of the second interval of the second life cycle could be a good way to perceive how this second interval of the first life cycle evolved. The difference is that this interval of the first life cycle ended, and herein, in this work, we are trying to show whether this scenario is possible or not.

When reading the Bible, readers can develop many mental constructs about what life on Earth was like during the second interval of the first life cycle of existence. I want to analyze two notable accounts from this entire interval. First, we read about humans' failure to prevail over the weakness of their will to overcome the obstacles that prevent them from developing conscious knowledge of good and evil. Second and most importantly, we read about humans reaching 200 years, 800 years, and so on. In modern times, people have made wonderful medical breakthroughs in health care. If humans continue to make progress at the current rate, there is a good chance that people could slow the aging process enough to live for the number of years mentioned in the Bible.

Even if people lived to be 200, 500, or 800 years during this second interval of the first life cycle, they may still have failed to overcome the weakness of their will to develop conscious knowledge of good and evil. If indeed this was the case, this signifies that the people who lived during this second interval of the first life cycle were carrying on or conducting themselves in a manner that would be contradictory to what this God who is reported in the Bible wanted people to just stick to doing on earth. This is to be working the earth and taking care of it, including having dominion over every living thing that moves on it. Humans could have been working the earth and caring for it while also committing wicked acts, as they can do two things at once. The tangent that people took clearly indicates that the world became

increasingly unsafe once they began to distinguish between good and evil. The suggestion I made—that the story of man's fall marks the beginning of the trajectory of downfall for this first life cycle of existence, culminating in God's destruction of all life on earth as stated in the Bible—turned out to be a somewhat accurate supposition. This fate may have resulted from people's decision to abandon their intrinsic connection to nature in favor of a new role aimed at understanding the purpose of human life.

I cannot know how people lived for 500 or 700 years, as reported during the period between the Fall of Man and the end of life on earth, nor do I understand why life on earth ended. A meteor hitting the earth or the detonation of weapons of mass destruction possessed by certain nations could wipe out humanity. But did their choice to detect their existence help them progress and slow aging? In other words, those people in this era made similar decisions to those suggested by the philosophers of Greek antiquity, who argued that humans should stop explaining the world through abstract argumentation and instead use deduction and inference to live rightly and address the bottlenecks and paradoxes they identified. Later, those individuals achieved a level of understanding that enabled them to mathematically and scientifically explain the fundamental governing laws that remain unexplained to this day. The medical breakthroughs in health care that they registered allowed them to stop the aging process so they could live longer. However, their progress increasingly distanced them from living in accordance with the desires of this specific God. In other words, deviate away from sticking to working the earth and taking care of it without being concerned with knowing the purpose of human life. People's inability to overcome their will's weakness may link the idea of human life to the full development of their personality. Consequently, evil increased on earth, and the evil inclinations of people's hearts deepened further due to the knowledge they were allowed to possess. Life on earth ended as a result of one of those motives or scenarios: this specific God ended life on earth as the Bible claims occurred. A meteor hit the earth and wiped out all life. The weapons of mass destruction accumulated by the people of this era detonated, either due to human action or a malfunction in their cyber system. There is also a scenario in which the endurance of the natural system failed, and this outcome motivated environmental degradation

to the extent of creating natural disasters that wiped out man and the progress that this first generation produced.

It would never be known how life on earth ended during this second interval of the first life cycle. My primary concern from this period is to establish a case suggesting that human progress may have led to the end of life on earth. If the people who lived during this era had adhered to the basic tenets specified by this credo, perhaps life would not have ended.

From time = Start of life on Earth to the birth of philosophy:

We have no way of knowing why God spared Noah and his family. Surely, if a meteor were to hit the earth or if the weapons of mass destruction possessed by some nations were to detonate, one person might survive. In other words, it's plausible that one person could survive such a catastrophe, preventing the total extinction of the human race. The person who survives will live in a state of human life that is no different from the time right after God created the heavens and the earth and man, or the start of the first life cycle. The surviving humans would need to begin reproducing the progress that was lost in order to reach the level we have achieved in modern times.

If the person or group of people depicted in the aforementioned scenario survived and happened to be infants, they would face unique challenges. Those infants would start with a limited understanding, needing to make sense of the sounds they produce, let alone using their ingenuity to engineer shapes to meet their survival needs. In other words, those infants would have to recreate the body of knowledge we have, just as the people in the first life cycle did until they learned to distinguish good from evil and began to act wickedly.

Those infants who survived would want to know, in the same way we continue to do until now, what makes things what they are fundamentally. They wouldn't know and understand why their loved ones would be departing from this life when they grow and start reproducing. They wouldn't be able to understand the concept of death when their loved ones depart from life. This event is nothing but part of the change on whose basis the universe functions. Those people

would most probably think that it was the God(s) who were inducing this phenomenon. Most importantly, what those people would observe when their loved ones depart this life is that the individual stops altering matter in the same way they did while alive. They would stop seeing the flesh that makes the human body joined together but rather how it breaks up into an endless number of small, infinitesimal fragments. Earlier generations may have referred to the transitional process as evil whenever they witnessed their loved ones departing this life. In modern times, people refer to this process of breaking up as death. Therefore, the ambiguity that people faced in trying to understand the causes of death, including the belief that evil forces instigate such acts, may have influenced how those who lived during the first interval of the second life cycle of existence perceived death.

But what we care about most from this period is an event the Bible reports that happened right after Noah and his family left the ark. The Bible reports that God, afterwards, said every inclination of the human heart is evil from childhood (Genesis 8:21).

The Bible does not report whether the people who lived during the first life cycle, from the creation of the heavens, the earth, and man to the increase of wickedness, knew this specific God. Then, this God felt obliged to destroy life and all humans except Noah and his family because he found them righteous, as the hearts of the people who lived during this first life cycle were evil from childhood as well. However, this new paradox that appears in the Bible right after this, where God supposedly ends all life on earth, including finding every inclination of the human heart evil from childhood, complicates the problem of figuring out why people are not able to prevail over the weakness of their will to overcome the obstacles that prevent people from developing a conscious knowledge of good and evil even more. This observation by God affirms, rather than limits, the reason humans have to overcome their will's weakness and to act according to God's guidance in distinguishing good from evil. This observation that God made introduces a new paradox. This new paradox states that even if people attempted to live according to this credo, which is based on God's desire for them to live without distinguishing between good and evil, they would still be unable to do so. In other words, even if people try to live as God suggested, they still can't find the will to overcome

their weakness. This is because God meant something else when he said that every human heart is evil from childhood. This statement indicates that evil is a tendency that begins to affect the heart of any human being once a newborn enters childhood. In other words, this statement that God pronounced on every inclination of the human heart being evil from childhood converts the problem of humans' inability to prevail over the weakness of their will into an anatomical problem as well, rather than being limited only to how the changes that objects are undergoing influence humans to exhibit unnatural changes, thus consequently making humans become unable to prevail over their will. This conclusion is because God's statement indicates that, despite any human's efforts, they cannot resist the behavioral changes that continuously occur after a newborn becomes a child.

The new conclusion reached by the Bible regarding the human heart's inherent evil, which emerged after the increase of wickedness on earth and God's destruction of all life except for Noah and his family, further complicates the understanding of why humans are unable to overcome their will. This new observation that God introduced requires that humans be able to prevail over the weakness of their will, so this paradox must be dealt with or tackled differently. In other words, any solution that people would experiment with to overcome the weakness of their will could include whatever proposed measure would be to control and regulate how much people can exhibit change in the matter. In other words, if humans want to let their social order be ruled by human reasoning (i.e., distinguishing between good and evil).

In effect, it could very well be because God concluded that since humans were not doing anything to control and regulate the programmed aptitude to reason that he preset in the human body, the more a person exhibits changes in matter as of when a newborn reaches the childhood age, the more that would distance him from continuing to be an intrinsic part of nature. Thus, each time, a person tries to distance himself from continuing to see himself as an intrinsic part of nature. This observation by God is a form of guidance that he decided to introduce.

Indeed, the guidance in the Bible regarding how humans should live their lives without interacting with objects in a way that allows them to

distinguish between good and evil contradicts their natural will, even if they attempt to follow it. It could either be God who passed such a command or man who introduced this observation to control and regulate the will of others (or condition such will) to increase his propensity from what those guidelines levy on how the human body was engineered to function. We doubt that God introduced the guidance in the Bible because it contradicts how God created man, who is capable of power over and continuously changing matter. And so, even if God were the one who passed these commands. Humans decided to place them in the social paradigm context, which they agreed to use as the principle for organizing the state of human life; if what we are suggesting is true, humans are incapable of achieving it. This is because distancing the human body from nature makes the human heart's inclination evil. And so, the more humans freeze social space and invent machinery to distance the human body from the purpose God or the intelligent design that created humans intended them to serve. The more, their wicked heart worsens. This phenomenon is because God made nature continually to be changing, and therefore, the beauty of the landscape inevitably influences human behavior, prevailing over their will and desires. Humans desire access to cars, tools, telephones, and televisions because these amenities enhance their awareness of existence. Indeed, the Bible's teaching that the human heart is evil from childhood is guidance that only a supernatural power, not a human, can make people regard. God really did right by not standing still and interfering.

Instead of following God's guidance from the first interval of this second life cycle and structuring a social order that doesn't convert resources for survival into commodities, people acted contrarily. Humans not only converted the resources necessary for survival into commodities but also distanced themselves from directly interacting with these essential resources, allowing tools and machinery to perform these tasks instead so that the human body could focus on maintaining a strong connection to human consciousness, which is essential for self-awareness. This allows individuals more free time to pursue living life to the fullest. It is true that humanity has chosen to disobey God's initial command, which instructed people to live without knowing the difference between good and evil. This statement highlights the inherent sinfulness of humanity, reflecting God's view

that every inclination of the human heart is evil from childhood. It allows man to continue living contrary to this credo, since it was God who observed that the human heart possesses evil inclinations from early childhood.

Even with this knowledge, people didn't try to use God's observation to inspire friendlier interactions. In other words, humans violate the "do not steal" command that they claim God gave to prevent abuse among each other. Humans began to create man-made laws based on this divine law, leaving people with no choice but to violate them. If the earth is round, a person can only travel back to where they started. If each person is working on freezing social space for the full development of his personality and there are laws from God that people could appropriate themselves from, like the laws of inheritance and the law of stealing, unless God was really planning on humans establishing a colony on the moon to make room, there is no other option that we know of that humans could avail themselves of if God made them unable to prevail over the weakness of their will, except when they get to not want to distinguish between good and evil. Humans, on the other hand, have turned social space into a commodity, except in cases of theft. Perhaps this situation is the reason why humans are not able to overcome their weakness to steal despite how much human knowledge has progressed and to orient the good or evil criteria that, on their basis, they programmed that human interaction with objects is intended to serve. Another reason humans can't overcome their will is the belief that they are programmed with good and evil, which are always at war.

Surely, God's guidance on human interaction made no difference in the state of human life. The second life cycle, which began when God decided to give guidance to Moses as reported in the Old Testament, aimed to encourage people to interact with objects and each other in a righteous way to prevent ongoing deception. The state of human life remained precarious until people chose to stop explaining the world through abstract argumentation and instead used deduction and inference. Despite God's guidance through Moses, people continued to exhibit evil acts and succumb to weakness. Right from when the second life cycle started up to when people decided not to continue with explaining the world in terms of abstract argumentation and to

explain it through deduction and inference. The Bible suggests that humans made progress in many scientific and technological areas, but they struggled to develop a conscious understanding of good and evil and to recognize the difference between them when interacting with objects or with one another. Most of what we read in the Old Testament of the Bible consists of conflicts, contradictions, divergence, a lack of awe-inspiring agreement, evil behavior, people amassing possessions and wealth, and people dominating others by brutal strength and by gaining and misusing power over others.

People had faith in the guidance that God dictated to Moses, which ultimately led them to advocate for useful ideas that would create the necessary behavioral changes. Most people who lived during this age didn't consider them attractive. Most people found such guidance cumbersome and not motivating enough, so people started to interact with the objects that exist on the outside of their sensory systems and with each other in a conscientious way. Whereas, on one hand, this behavioral comportment shows that, indeed, it could be true that the human heart could be evil from childhood due to human unwillingness to want to interact with the objects that exist on the outside of their sensory systems and/or with each other in a manner that structures this relationship on the basis of knowing good or evil so people detect their existence and, in this manner, prevent other people from their inalienable right to live free from fear and want. Therefore, God provided a means for humans to live without fear.

However, this weakness that people exhibit against orienting the state of human life so it functions according to the way God suggested, if it points to anything, could only be toward a form of defiance if we could begin to categorize it as such. This belief could only stem, as previously mentioned, from the programmed aptitude inherent in all humans, assuming it could somehow slow the aging process and allow for longer human life. Humans believe there is no divine justice or accountability. This also leads them to think that their actions are fine even if retribution existed. However, this is something that no one knows. Because there is no information about the reinjection of human souls into life, people focus on detecting personal changes instead of understanding the changes humans exhibit in the natural system, which can weaken the system's endurance for future generations. Never mind

recalling how humans' decision to structure the state of human life on the basis of freezing social space and accumulating material things on a cumulative basis makes other members of the human family live in constant fear and want.

In effect, the switch that emerged during Greek antiquity and which gave birth to a new age of people who were more focused on developing a system of critical reasoning to understand the world and let every human reach the realization of the full development of his own personality could be evidence to support how the people who were living during this interval were rejecting the traditional mythological explanations for the phenomena they saw around them in favor of more rational explanations. This renaissance could be exactly the identical transformations that the people who lived during the first interval of the first life cycle were going through right from the start of time, when God created the earth, heaven, and man, until the story of the Fall of Man occurred. The only difference between what the people who lived during this first interval of the second life cycle dealt with to prevail over the weakness of their will and what the people who lived during the first interval of the second life cycle dealt with, neither of whom were able to prevail over it, is one and the same. What those two intervals have in common is that during the first interval of the first life cycle, it was how to organize the state of human life on the basis of lacking the ability to distinguish between good and evil to prevail over the weakness of the will. During the first interval of the second life cycle, the challenge was organizing human life based on ignorance of good and evil, while acting according to Moses' proposals to achieve the same end.

If the people who lived during the first interval of the second life cycle agreed to abide by the guidance that Moses claimed God inscribed for him on how people interact with the objects that exist outside of their sensory systems. People living later would not have had to structure human life on the assumption that human nature has two opposing ethical virtues. But those are commands that Moses claims God passed to him so people structure their relations with objects and with each other on their basis, and until now, people have failed to do so, surely complicating matters ahead of humans based on the angle from which we are tackling the relationship between the two life cycles. If the

people during this first interval of the second life cycle were like their ancestors during the first life cycle, more interested in detecting their existence than in organizing the state of human life because they could not distinguish between good and evil, then man manages to exhibit power over the weakness of the will. Those who lived in the first interval of both life cycles were inspired to use better tools instead of primitive ones to meet their survival needs. This is because if this were the case, producing a larger number of tools to meet people's demand would have brought along more knowledge. However, if people were at the beginning of the first interval of the second life cycle, the detection of their existence would have made them freeze social space or accumulate material things on a cumulative basis for their indulgence, as people began doing after Moses claimed that God instructed him to tell people they were allowed to do so based on what the law of inheritance facilitated. The next logical approach to consider if people fail to abide by such laws is that humans have both good and evil tendencies and that it could be due to humans continuing to exhibit unnatural changes (or desires) to objects that another person has claimed custodianship for.

People resist considering that there could very well be a natural right that allows them to interact with objects that others declare as their custodians. If this were true, it would be impossible to expect laws that freeze objects that others won't touch.

Therefore, the way people connect the unnatural changes that humans exhibit in reality would be to serve two opposing ethical premises. The real puzzle, as we said, is that anything with mass is constantly changing. The part that is totally absurd is how God could have passed on a command that could help humans during their search for the best way to live and the pursuit of the good life, even if people were to try to want to prevail and abstain from exhibiting certain patterns. Humans would not be able to do so. This is because even if humans attempted to follow the guidance that people claim God provided, they would be unable to do so, as this guidance forces the human body to function in a way that contradicts the intelligent design or the way God intended for people to function. To provide an example, the Bible claims that Moses brought to God a case about what to do with material things that a person amassed before he died. Moses reported

that God commanded that the relatives of the person who passed away split all the material things that the deceased person amassed between his clan so the name of this person who passed away doesn't disappear. In other words, how could God have passed a command asking people to distribute the material things that a person amasses during his life among his clan and, at the same time, desire that humans multiply and replenish them? This phenomenon is because when people freeze social space, those who are blocked or distanced from the social space that someone claims custodianship for cannot remain idle except for a short time. If people are constantly freezing social space and expanding its boundaries, how can they expect others to obey this law, which they claim God has instructed them to follow, when no human being can remain idle for more than a brief period? God made it so that humans can't overcome their will, as the landscape is always changing, leading them to seek to redesign it or to affirm their existence.

Indeed, no one knows why people who believe in God and the afterlife respect this command to distribute possessions among their clan but disobey God's command given to Moses, for example. However, there is no doubt the social order is on its basis people interact with each other and which allows a person during his life to freeze social space and accumulate material things, and when a person departs this life, how material things he amassed during his life are getting distributed after death among his clan poses a principal challenge that newborns confront and overcome, which could be at the helm of why people are perhaps not able to agree on how the earth's resources could be managed and distributed. This is because such practices transform a person into a reservoir that accumulates material possessions, which the body does not return to nature upon death but instead bequeaths to specific individuals. In other words, the volume of matter occupied by the body during life does not increase when the body turns to ashes, as it does not add any matter to nature. However, the amount of matter that a person freezes when he departs this life is not reciprocal at all.

Another hard-to-understand command is how God could have told people not to steal at that time. If people seek the best way to live and achieve a good life while using resources that are insufficient to meet demand—such as freezing social space or accumulating material possessions—it becomes illogical for God to have issued such a

command. The rate of population growth affects the number of positive or negative transformations that people create in material goods. If the people want that the material things that they produce be frozen when the number of objects from which people produce shapes that allow them to increase their access to the good life is regenerated, it is the natural system that controls it. The only other way for people to increase their access to the good life is by denying others access to the same objects. People subject objects to this action to obtain access to freeze them for their own leisure use if they do not use the item regularly. All the laws that people enact provide a legitimate framework for the changes that objects continuously undergo, ensuring that these changes occur under the custodianship of one person rather than another. To focus the purpose of human life on living the good life and pursuing it, people must take action. This action depends on the number of inventions people make. If people want that, a person is entitled to the protection of the material interests resulting from the scientific invention of which he is the author. We could only think of one way that people manage to pursue the good life that their detection of existence makes them conscious of the need to desire: people build walls to feel safe and protected and prevent the objects they accumulate from switching hands, unless they agree on mechanisms for coming together to manage and distribute resources.

In effect, another command that it is not clear how God could have proposed to Moses is the "do not kill" command when he made it possible that a person depart this life with the sting of a bug or a person exhibit the same fate using the tools that humans engineer. The difficulty in understanding this command lies in how humans choose to interpret and apply it. People are willing to accept that it is acceptable for a person to depart this life in cases where a bug takes their life or when a person falls from a building that humans engineered. If a person pushes another person from the roof of a building, this act is considered a crime, even though the death is primarily caused by the building that was engineered by humans, not by the push itself. The only difference between the bug and the person is that one has a pre-programmed ability to reason. Do humans want to believe that there is a difference between a bug and a person? In other words, even though humans have a pre-programmed aptitude to reason and other living creatures do not, they should be excused for

committing acts with outcomes that others may disagree with. This is because humans are uncertain whether their programmed aptitude to reason actually knows how to distinguish between good and evil. If this programmed aptitude were capable of distinguishing between good and evil, all the insecurity that humanity has experienced would not have existed. If this programmed aptitude is an ability that can distinguish between good and evil, which people desire to emulate, then, as previously mentioned, the only obstacles to its effectiveness are the ways in which humans choose to utilize this aptitude. Humans desire that their purpose is to live a good life, and they want their interactions with the objects and tools they create for survival to reflect this goal. Humans, as we said earlier, can die from natural causes or unnatural ones. Humans are the ones who produce all the tools and objects used to take another person's life. Humans, as I mentioned earlier, may lack the power to prevent the changes they exhibit from influencing their behavior. All the killing is, therefore, man's own making.

The conduct people began to exhibit right after God destroyed life and all humans minus Noah and his family up to the point when humans during Greek antiquity decided to want to stop explaining the world in terms of abstract argumentation and to explain it through deduction and inference shows that people's refusal to deal with each other and the objects they engineer based on how God proposed to Moses is much more malignant than the inclination of the human heart being evil from childhood. This conclusion is because humans already know that the human heart starts to exhibit evil acts right as when a newborn starts to unnaturally exhibit changes in matter on his own, and humans are feeding this internal programmed aptitude tools that a person can use to commit evil acts with. This phenomenon is another piece of evidence to support that, indeed, human knowledge drives people to become unable to distinguish between good or evil, and this is the reason why this credo is reported in the Bible under the story of the Fall of Man. What if the superior aptitude to reason that people are programmed with is an aptitude that functions differently than humans intend when serving and interacting with objects, based on two opposing ethical premises? Likewise, what if people are forcing this aptitude to function in a manner that makes humans unable to prevail over the weakness of the will by default?

From the time when philosophy was developed to now:

There is no need to report on the state of human life since people have agreed to stop explaining the world in terms of abstract argumentation and instead explain it through deduction and inference. Since this period began, kingpins no longer solely freeze social space and amass material wealth to distribute among their clan after death. We began a period in which all the people of the world do nothing but amass material things and distribute after death the material things a person amasses to his clan, thus setting in motion a phenomenon where, as we said earlier on, the purpose of the coming of a new person is to just bring invention and engineering to spot improvement in the world, to freeze social space, and to accumulate material things to hand over before departing. In other words, this creates a situation where a person accumulates material possessions despite the fact that humanity has little need for them. The arrival of a new person ultimately reduces the amount of available social space and material possessions because of what that person extracts and freezes.

To provide an example, all humans are programmed with an aptitude to invent and engineer. There are seven billion people in the world, and each one can create something that others may find useful and want to accumulate. If humans are working on letting every person seek significance and immortality and are working on spotting ways to improve our world, thus spinning a desire to make sure that after his departure the world remembers him through freezing social space to keep his memory alive, then This signifies that this person is still alive after his death, blocking others from making use of the social space that was used by the person who passed away. Therefore, humans need social space and material things to bring their invention and engineering to life. This phenomenon has been doing nothing but creating winners and losers and causing people to exhibit different purchasing power. Wealth creates rapid progress in the hands of those who have more access to capital. Capital is what allows people to profit from acquiring more objects during their lives. The things that people amass are objects. Therefore, people feel compelled to accumulate objects throughout their lives due to their desire for interaction with both objects and one another. A person, as previously

mentioned, is obligated to transform the purpose of their life into one focused on survival and the accumulation of material possessions, which must be distributed among their clan after death, regardless of their personal feelings about it. This term also signifies that for as long as humans seek to come into being among the living, its purpose is to be injected to amass material things so that after death, whatever the person accumulates gets distributed among his clan. No matter what type of social order people would experiment with, their efforts would never shuttle mankind to a premise where all members of the human family can live free from fear and want. This is because the materials from terrestrial objects, which people use to produce the material things they accumulate, are part of the natural system that dictates what grows in each location. For this reason, humans can only achieve a just society if they adopt a social system that controls and regulates what individuals can accumulate throughout their lives, regardless of their geographical location. This social system must include provisions for recycling the materials that a person accumulates. Could such a system ensure reuse by newborns? This is also required to rebuild what the person created his life to keep the human body engaged with.

Clearly, we are not discussing the control and regulation of access to material resources to ensure equal living conditions for all. Humans can only live on an equal rights basis if they learn to distinguish between good and evil and return to being an intrinsic part of nature, as intended by God or the intelligent design that created them. Could such a scenario transcend? However, such a consequence could only occur if a force majeure wipes out everything that humans have developed, forcing them to live in the Stone Age without the ability to distinguish between good and evil. Only if humans agree to truly unite and to stop converting the survival needs of the human family into a commodity could such an approach help to narrow the gap between the rich and the poor. Certainly, if the aforementioned efforts that people would take are not accompanied by the total abandonment of any form of scientific advancement or tools used to bring back man to be with nature, except as needed for the protection of the human body. Humans could never manage to agree on how to govern each other. This is because the greatest challenge is how not to let labor divisions lead to the rise of a leisured upper class.

All the insecurity and wars that people have experienced are a result of their efforts to prevent the division of society into classes. We have no way of knowing how people came up with or allowed that social hierarchy or how social classes became the basis of order and regularity in any society. However, the division or arrangement of people into classes, castes, or social strata created a situation that allowed the wealthiest members of society to wield the greatest political power.

The wealthiest members of society wield the greatest political power, tending to control people and to dominate public life. Moreover, by basing every aspect of life on a social system whereby a person is born into social strata that as soon as any newborn becomes able on his own to unnaturally change matter. His scope becomes for aspiring to climb the social hierarchy ladder, indicating that humans are obliged to seek to freeze social space and seek prestige and power; hence, people decide that their interaction with each other be based on wealth or material possession.

In sociology, rationalization is termed the replacement of people's traditions, values, and emotions, which are motivators for behavior in society, with rational or calculated ones. For example, we have no way of knowing if the rise of capitalism and modernity are the rational reasons that motivated certain people or groups of nations at the end of World War II to attempt to change cultural traditions and values of people who were born into lower social groups or if this action was done because, in the eyes of those wealthy people or the group of nations that were victors after WWII, it was proposed that if all the people of the world became united, this would benefit them.

However, regardless of the victors' thoughts about the world after WWII, they decided that people should be united. For sure, they attached no importance to how they intend to manage controlling people's desire to avoid competing with themselves. This situation is because attempting to change cultural traditions and values to replace them in favor of rational or calculated ones in a world that functions on a set of ideals or principles that regard freezing social space and possessing material things on a cumulative basis. Globalization might be the wrong diagnosis. This is because globalization and

modernization make countries increasingly interlinked. With technology's rise, countries can more easily influence each other. But knowledge motivates the behavior of societies toward becoming more rational and calculated.

It was for a reason that the Hindu god Brahma—the creator of the world and all the creatures that live on the planet—created India's caste system. Certainly, the Hindu God Brahma acted based on rational and calculated motivations when he suggested that Hindus are born into their caste and without the opportunity to marry or switch into a different social group, rather than considering if capitalism or something else could be better in his eyes for the people of India. The Hindu God Brahma may have known that the caste system he proposed, which was intended to help the Indian people establish order and regulate society, could serve as a means to control India's population by assigning different roles to each group. This restriction exists because a Hindu newborn must remain confined to their caste group for life. In other words, there was no opportunity for individuals to aspire to ascend the social hierarchy, which meant that those born into lower castes were forced to remain in their positions. However, the Hindu God Brahma may have chosen this caste system because he anticipated that when the Indian population reaches 1 billion, it will become impossible to prevent people from competing for the social space that the wealthy occupy or from gaining political power. This is because "power" refers to the ability to do what one wants regardless of the will of others. The process of replacing the values and traditions that certain people lived by with more rational and calculated actions introduces a new type of power. This new type is the power of knowledge. Humans have known many forms of power, and the most notable ones are political power, social power, and class power. It was knowledge that enabled people to control and regulate one another, leading to the emergence of the three types of power we mentioned. It is unclear why the victorious nations after WWII decided that the world should be united. Their new way of perceiving the world certainly did not consider that the power of knowledge surpasses all other types of knowledge, and that in a class power struggle, whenever one person has access to something that another person wants or needs, it creates a significant imbalance. People can obtain what they

need only in two manners: the amicable / formal way or the by-force way.

Therefore, as we said, all the insecurity and wars that people have known have been to enforce objects that others want or to align the thoughts of people who resist accepting to start to rationalize in a different way. The main aim is to widen their own access to the benefit of the good life and the project they lined up to achieve, which is to make everything possible for humankind. In effect, we should provide those who resort to insecurity and wars with access to resources that others possess, allowing them to replace what they perceive as outdated thought processes or methods with more modern approaches that they believe could benefit them.

However, it appears that the secular shift introduced by Greek philosophers has significantly contributed to modernization and rationalization. Regarding governance, I may have misjudged how the world evolved since the Greek philosophers proposed that people should shift from closely identifying with religious values and institutions to embracing non-religious values and secular institutions. However, it appears that the insecurity reported by Greek philosophers and the insecurity present in the world today are still comparable. People continue to go ahead and subject each other to conflicts, contradictions, divergence, no awe-inspiring agreement, and evil behaviors. Since the time of the Greek philosophers, people have become more inclined to accumulate wealth and possessions and to dominate others through violence and the misuse of power.

It seems that when people became fixated on the idea that the search for the best way to live and the pursuit of a good life are the primary purposes of human existence, they decided to shift away from close identification with religious values and institutions to non-religious values and secularization, leading to chaos. As more people become aware of the limited nature of time and its significance in understanding their existence within an uncertain life expectancy, they increasingly feel the need to accumulate material possessions that enable them to pursue their desires, regardless of others' wishes. We can assert that since God destroyed all life and humans except for Noah and his family, the entire social order has revolved around the

question of how people can overcome their willpower weaknesses. Therefore, each generation is solely dedicated to emphasizing the concepts of reward, punishment, justice, and retribution in order to help individuals develop a conscious understanding of good and evil.

It's hard to believe that anything could stop people from explaining the world through deduction and inference or from overcoming their willpower. So far, God and people have tried every possible method except for a new human invention that uses scientific advancements to control human movement and thought. The likelihood of this approach succeeding is what we are investigating.

Jesus Christ, who claimed to be God's son and who suggested that God sent him to earth, couldn't talk people into continuing to disagree on how the earth's resources could be acquired, managed, and distributed. Actually, Jesus Christ was preaching that those who started to conduct themselves on the principles that Moses and he were teaching would win eternal life. Even this very attractive offer failed to motivate people to change their behavior and conduct. The several companions of Christ who served as scribes for the New Testament of the Bible report that certain people crucified Jesus. The scribes claimed that Jesus was crucified because he preached and proclaimed titles that, according to the ruling authorities, he should not have assumed.

Surely, people have faith in the guidance that this time God sent his only son to pass, whereby for the first time we see God, through his son, giving guidance or clarity on the purpose of abiding by all that Jesus commands; hence, all those who refuse to act on the basis of what God commanded are now becoming aware of what they would be waging on if they don't. This defiance is further evidence to support that people were not motivated to stop interacting with the objects that exist outside of the human body in the way God or later Jesus Christ suggested, because it could very well be that this programmed aptitude to reason, which people use to distinguish between good and evil, could be an aptitude that either doesn't know how to distinguish between good and evil, unlike people think, or there is a natural impediment that impedes it from being able to distinguish between good and evil. This evidence is because, as we said, people continued

to subject each other to conflicts, contradictions, divergence, and domination, not to mention amassing wealth, including making the majority of people live in fear and want. In fact, rather than people doing what God suggested, working to develop a framework that could let people stop accumulating resources acts as an impediment to allowing people to live without fear and want. The people rationalized that God sent his son as part of a divine plan, which involved suffering and dying as a sacrifice to atone for humanity's sins due to their failure to act on his commands. Thus, in doing so, use such rationalization to continue with subjecting each other and the state of human life to the degree of despair that people have been knowing until now.

The New Testament says God intervened many times, even sending his son. For one reason or another, this God refused to give up. This God continued to believe that people would want to change their interactions with the objects outside their physical bodies according to the guidelines he provided, in exchange for the opportunity to win eternal life. This God intervened once again and, according to Muhammad (S.A.W.), provided him verbally through the angel Gabriel (A.S.) with new, elaborate guidance on what people need to do to win eternal life, based on what his companion claimed. The companion of Muhammad (S.A.W.) claimed that God synthesized for him the guidance that the angel Gabriel dictated to him in the form of suras, or verses. All the verses that were revealed to Muhammad (S.A.W.) by God verbally through the angel Gabriel (A.S.) were compiled by his companion in a book called the Quran.

The Quran was written after the Old Testament of the Bible. Much of the Old Testament is a product of the 5th century BCE, and the books of the New Testament were written in the 1st century CE, between c. 50 and c. 110. Scribes wrote the three books: the Old Testament, New Testament, and Quran. The accounts and interpretations of events are not fully identical. But if we study the Quran's relationship with the Old Testament, we find that Moses is mentioned more than any other person. If we have the same relationship with the New Testament of the Bible, Jesus is mentioned more often in the Quran than Muhammad (peace be upon him). This evidence indicates that the Quran assumes familiarity with major narratives reported in the Old Testament of the Bible and the New Testament.

In the more limited and traditional sense of the word, one could expect that until the emergence of the Quran, people were working from two tablets and stories or parables, as this was Jesus' favorite method, and now after this, God dictated to Muhammad (S.A.W.) an entire book on what people could do to prevail over their will or to draw guidance on effective means to win eternal life so that people would be willing to give up living according to what the Quran suggests. Accordingly, one would expect that the people who were following the beliefs that were traded in the Old Testament or the New Testament of the Bible would integrate with those who surrendered to God's worship and called themselves Muslims so all together they would start to worship according to the new guidance since Jews, Christians, and Muslims believe that they are all descendants of Abraham. The objective would be to combine existing elements in an innovative way to reduce the risks associated with the dominant precursor that has been engulfing human insecurity since God claims to have placed people on earth. Those faiths speak supposedly about one God, as we just said. Particularly, instead of people starting fresh and putting an end to all the fragility, violent conflicts, crime, corruption, insecurity, evil behavior, and misuse of power over others that we read about, they have prevailed until now. People remained steadfastly interested only in idolizing the same God through different platforms while simultaneously seeking to develop a conscious understanding of good and evil and the distinction between them in their pursuit of a good life. People's conduct has continued to be based on the same risks associated with poor governance, fragility, violent conflict, insecurity, crime, and corruption that they have always known.

The Islamic prophet Muhammad claimed that he was the final prophet of God, and therefore, this belief may explain why God has been silent since this last intervention. However, people have been unable to guide humanity correctly, leading to a consensus to end the insecurity that has persisted since God's last intervention. However, if we consider the period from when people began to develop religious thought and organize religious rituals, through their belief in the afterlife, up to the present time, we can see a significant evolution in human beliefs. People continue to refuse to go by what Jesus Christ claimed his father told them they should do to win eternal life and/or the elaborate

guidance that Muhammad (S.A.W.) claimed the angel Gabriel dictated to him. Instead, humans today prefer to follow their beliefs and practices. In the Christian faith alone, there are today in the world about 40,000 Christian church organizations, according to Wikipedia, which shows how many distinguishable platforms humans are using to worship this same God. The existence of such a large number of Christian church organizations and the ongoing contradictions, dominance, and violence among Christians indicate that people have not interacted with the external objects of their sensory systems in a conscientious manner. The large number of sects and distinct legal systems created by people within the Christian faith indicates that God and his helpers have not yet succeeded in communicating effectively with them. People seem disinclined to use the teachings of this Christian faith and all other faiths as motivation to consciously deal with each other, despite humanity's continued efforts. The existence of many religions in the world today, along with the significant number of people who adhere to no faith at all, highlights the diverse schools of thought, beliefs, and practices that individuals have created, resulting in distinct identities that reflect their personal understanding of God and his intentions, which often contradict conventional wisdom.

The predominant insecurity that has accompanied human history since time immemorial, stemming from people's unwillingness to interact with the external world based on the principles commanded by God, indicates that individuals' perceptions of their existence have transformed the world into an experimental theater where each person allows their understanding to shape what their intentions on earth should be. If people are ready to be indifferent to what they could lose after death, they should follow their divine instructions. Instead, humans prefer to live the fullest possible life. Something on earth must be preventing people from following the instructions given by God to abstain from certain actions in order to attain eternal life. There is a flaw that has obstructed people's capacity to comprehend and be rational. This flaw, as previously mentioned, is not solely connected to the inherent evil inclination of the human heart from childhood. This flaw can only be attributed to what knowledge helps people achieve. Since the appearance of humans on earth, only human knowledge has driven the desire to distinguish between good and evil; therefore, as

people make more rational and calculated choices, their ability to overcome the weakness of their will becomes increasingly difficult. This, as we said, is linked to human ingenuity, because the more human ingenuity comes up with new objects, the more the same human's ingenuity loses control and cannot but desire them. This is also why the Bible's statement about God suggesting not to distinguish between good and evil may have been intended to draw people's attention to this issue.

Indeed, if in the future, the number of separate organizations from which people choose to preach this doctrine on God, creation, Jesus, Muhammad (S.A.W.), salvation, the Holy Spirit, and forgiveness grows even more, this would be a good indicator to support that people didn't triumph over the challenges required to develop them to devise mechanisms and guidelines that they could apply to interact with the objects that exist on the outside of their physical bodies in a righteous way. This is because the opposite was true. The number of crises in the world would decrease, and people would begin to recognize the inalienable right of each individual to meet their survival needs and fulfill their earthly desires. New people could realize they need to work together to avoid barbarous acts that would outrage their consciences without being obliged to settle their differences through wars first.

It appears that people have discovered a way for God and his angels to pursue new roles, rather than solely worrying about how to help humans stop the insecurity caused by poor governance throughout history. The progress that humans made can let them now in real time monitor the conduct of people, and so this new breakthrough is going to really let God and, most importantly, the people who preach about God's afterlife focus only on the afterlife and no longer on what people need to do to interact with objects and with each other in a conscious way since surveillance cameras can roll 24 hrs.

Let us in the next upcoming section in our work determine if this disenchantment with the world that people are exhibiting with the surveillance cameras is going to help or if those surveillance cameras will be speeding the end of the second life cycle of people to usher in a new, third life cycle. Maybe the new third cycle will have more

material to govern each other than God asking his first two creators to avoid the apple that would help them distinguish between good and evil.

Protagoras (c. 490–c. 420 BC) was a pre-Socratic Greek philosopher who lived in classical antiquity and belonged to a class of philosophers called "natural philosophers." Aristotle called them "physicists," because they sought natural explanations for phenomena, as opposed to the earlier theologians, whose philosophical basis was more on the supernatural.

Protagoras is thought to have sparked a major controversy in ancient times with his claim that "man is the measure of all things: of the things that are, that they are; of the things that are not, that they are not," which Plato interpreted to mean that there is no absolute truth, only what individuals believe to be true.

Humans would be irrational if they did not seek to understand the origins and creation of everything. People are placed on earth. People don't choose to live and later face the gap between reality and what it should be. It would have been much easier if people had created the lifeless things that they interact with after birth, but this is not the case. After birth, people encounter all the natural lifeless things that exist within their sensory systems. They also do not have power to add or remove things in reality. Surely, the accomplishment that people made right when they took upon themselves the task of figuring out from where everything comes from or from what everything is created enabled us to have today a large number of phenomena that were previously unexplained, difficult to explain, or poorly/partially understood, and now they have become understood. The progress that people registered provided them with an opportunity to learn how to think better and how to be better equipped to distinguish between evil and good.

However, since the time when humans started to allow their interactions with objects to focus on providing them with a perceptual experience of pleasure and satisfaction, their choices have increasingly been motivated by desires for happiness. The more humans seem to let their choices be motivated by their desires for happiness, the more people's impaired ability to distinguish between good and evil has increased. There is no law to support the idea that improving people's ability to distinguish between good and evil can transform them into more tolerant and peaceful individuals. Ironically, as people's knowledge increases, they seem to create more crises and conflicts to compensate for their weak will, using knowledge to justify inhumane actions. The complex social organization created by greater population density and competition over resources could have fueled the weak attitude that we are observing in modern times. Some people also believe that animal tendencies motivate crises and conflicts. The reality is that humans do not consistently connect with each other in a humane manner throughout their entire life span. Humans realized they would need care as they aged to avoid being preyed upon by animals. If humans could educate themselves about the importance of creating a secure human life before their pre-programmed ability to reason becomes capable of making decisions for their bodies, they would be better prepared for the future. Likewise, this occurs when the body becomes unable to meet its survival needs independently or when it ages. One place to begin searching for clues about what might be preventing the preprogrammed ability to reason from acting righteously—an evident ability when it makes decisions on behalf of the body—is in the literature that humans use to organize, identify, and interpret their interactions with objects during this stage of their lives. In other words, this refers to the period when a person becomes capable of independently meeting their survival needs. We refer to the literature because if humans learned to educate themselves about the importance of caring during the two intervals in life when the human body cannot independently meet its survival needs, they would be better off. The impaired ability could prevent people's programmed aptitude to reason and act righteously, as it does when this aptitude makes decisions for the body during the two intervals in life when the body cannot independently meet its survival needs. There is a significant possibility that among the multitude of values, traditions, or

institutions the newborn either reasons through or receives from others, there may be specific behavioral motivators that are preventing some individuals from exhibiting the same degree of tolerance.

As we said earlier, people have no source to borrow guidelines on how to organize, identify, and interpret their interaction with the objects that humans use to draw happiness or elicit hatred, then religion. When we consider the various religious convictions that people hold, we can review the principles they promote. We find that the religious convictions align to some extent with the beliefs about how people wish everyone to interact with objects. What differs is not the conviction expressed but the source that generates the conviction. In one case, the programmed aptitude to reason in humans leads some to believe that a supernatural force issued the commands upon which humans organize laws. There is also another aptitude that wants to believe that it was humans who derived or drew those conclusions based on perceptual experience or conviction.

Let us set aside the belief that God proposed that humans should adhere to certain behaviors when interacting with objects or with one another. Similarly, let us set aside the laws, declarations, treaties, agreements, and other regulations that people create and expect everyone to adopt as habitual practices. Let us focus on the patterns that humans seek to condition or motivate each other's behavior regarding how to interact with objects, both before and after the two world wars.

Before the two world wars that people fought, people organized, identified, and interpreted how a person interacts with objects on the basis of convictions that aimed at distancing people from interacting with objects or from providing access to information or knowledge that could help a large number of people to detect their existence. People were expected to accept those societal doctrines either through domination or personal convictions. Those who used their power or knowledge to dominate others preferred to believe that it was the decision of the God(s) that determined the societal class into which a person was born. Those who ruled others spent much of their lives stressing the importance of obedience to the societal conditions into which a person is born, to avoid the stressful rewards and

punishments, justice, and retribution that follow death if one fails to comply.

For example, during the spread of Christianity, the beliefs held by those who had already converted and those who were converting others were completely different from the beliefs that emerged after World War II. However, those who were converting others were primarily spreading the word of God, based on Jesus Christ's claim of being the son of God. The preachers were asking individuals to convert to Christianity. They didn't ask people to be united to subscribe to a common program of purposes and principles whereby people get to affirm their pledge to cooperate to promote respect and/or effective recognition and observance of specific social parameters so each new convert works with another convert to secure the inalienable rights of each convert to be entitled to property, prestige, or power or to even give up his religious values and institutions to attempt to change the cultural traditions or values in vigor. The people who were asking people to convert left people to continue to fulfill the role or privilege they were organized around. Those people were campaigning so more people would convert to Christianity; they were not campaigning for the eradication of poverty or for the people who were stalling economically to need to climb the social hierarchical ladder so they could have access to horses, carriages, food, etc. Each social stratification group maintained its status. In fact, Christianity introduced more stringent rules on how converts interact with objects or material things, including each other. The people who spread this faith were preaching that only when a person rejects material things, prestige, power, and so forth could a person win eternal life. In other words, before Christianity, following the laws of Moses was enough to get to heaven. Rejecting material things was a precursor to any form of reward.

In effect, when God dictates to Muhammad (S.A.W.) the guidelines on whose basis people should be organized to interact with objects and with each other, we observe those new commands more stringent than the laws of Moses or what Jesus was preaching to win eternal life. In fact, we can even note a change of heart on the part of God when he asked the angel Gabriel to dictate to Muhammad (S.A.W.) the Quran. In the Quran, God no longer gives people laws as was the case when

he passed them to Moses or through Christ via his favorite method, which was often through stories or parables. With Muhammad (S.A.W.), we see a new God who takes stands and who even asks people to fight those who show disregard or shrewdness toward the laws that he suggests people use to prevail over the weakness of their will and to develop ethical principles. Most importantly, God in the Quran doesn't dictate guidelines as he did in the Bible to a chosen race on how he expects a specific race to interact with matter or with other people from the same clan. Alternatively, he instructed his son to live among humans and preach to them about the consequences that await those who do not reject materialism and fail to adhere to his guidelines. Through the prophet Muhammad (S.A.W.), God expresses his will to mankind at large in the form of a binding deed and even goes to the extent of asking people to fight those who do not agree to put up with portraying good conduct at all times, because what awaits them is hell anyway. In fact, God seems to have recognized that it is difficult to fight evil individually and without handing down discipline on how people need to conduct themselves during their lives. It's strange that God now wants people to triumph over evil together, rather than leaving it up to individuals as in the Laws of Moses or Jesus' teaching to turn the other cheek. In the Quran, God appears to consider that only through the coming together of people could humans manage to triumph over evil. This new energized God that appears in the Quran suggests changing earlier religious law in favor of creating religious communities.

This new appeal from God to humans to incorporate belief in reward, punishment, and discipline represents a significant shift compared to how He previously communicated with humans through laws, stories, and parables. In the Quran, God appears to outline a new approach for humans to pursue in order to demonstrate their common interests.

However, instead of humans going ahead and working together to alter the social order to align it in accordance with the commands the angel Gabriel dictated to Muhammad (S.A.W.) on behalf of God so people prevail over the weakness of one's will and win eternal life. Therefore, in the Quran, we find for the first time a set of disciplines from God that people are encouraged to follow. They could then claim that they have tried, and if they don't work, move to experiment with a new set

of ideals or principles. Nonetheless, people seem unwilling to let go of the belief that the purpose of human life is solely to determine how man interacts with objects to create perceptual pleasure and satisfaction, regardless of the circumstances. Humans kept the world on edge and preferred, instead of practicing the Quran, to test if indeed it could be used to make humans prevail over their will to discharge their accumulated rage in fighting two world wars to retain, at the end of this outrageous experience, that humans should pursue a new set of ideals that totally contradicts how God suggested people interact with objects. People want their interaction with objects to follow a new pattern that is the total opposite of how Jesus Christ and those who lived before the two world wars interacted with each other and objects. The new pattern encourages people to desire greater interaction with objects, which is the complete opposite of previous teachings. In other words, Jesus Christ preached that people should reject material possessions in order to attain eternal life. The people after World War II want that every person is given access to realize the full development of his personality.

People resort to crises and conflicts and wars to achieve nothing other than to satisfy their own state of mind with what they think is right with or without there being empirical evidence to prove that something is the case with factual certainty. Likewise, the belief that interactions with objects are destined to provide a perceptual experience of pleasure and satisfaction is a mental construct conceived by human imagination. When we take the two life cycles that we have in the previous section, we are suggesting we would be organizing around them how we would be setting up our work and elaborating on its basis. During the first life cycle, from God's creation of the earth and man to the fall of Adam and Eve, their disobedience sparked a movement. This movement rejected God's intrinsic guidelines for how the people of this first life cycle should conduct their lives, working the earth and taking care of it, by embracing the opposite of distinguishing between good and evil. Likewise, during the interval, which we referred to as the second life cycle and right from when God destroyed life and all humans except Noah and his family up to when, in Greek antiquity, the philosophers of this era suggested that humans should stop to explain the world in terms of abstract argumentation and to explain it through deduction and inference. The birth of

philosophy was fueled by a movement in which people ceased to explain the world through abstract argumentation and instead used deduction and inference. This movement was to stop adhering to the intrinsic guidelines that God laid out on how he desired the people of this second life cycle to conduct their lives, without resorting to knowing good or evil and to practice Moses' laws.

The two movements within the independent life cycles depicted in the previous section share a commonality: in both, the people reached a point in time where they began to search for answers regarding reality or existence. The aim is to satisfy those people's own consideration for rational facts on the purpose of human life and how the earth's resources can be acquired, managed, or distributed rather than to remain mired living in the unknown, not necessarily believing in the existence of a God as a creator but at least believing in what God or it could be very well be scribes who jotted down their experiences on what, according to them and based on their own life experience, is the way to go about in life doing so that all people can live free from fear and want.

Likewise, we cannot suppose a tradition that those two aforementioned movements fueled or marked a tactical change on other than to influence a unifying belief in the importance of technology (or tools) to improve and intensify the relative security and increased productivity those people felt short of and needed. The people of each movement believed that by prioritizing the earth's care over distinguishing good from evil, they were distancing themselves from ideas that included making such distinctions. This swap could lead them to educate and form noble individuals who would be able to arrive at political and ethical truths so all people live life to the fullest possible.

I don't know if the physical world was made by chance or a supernatural being. In the story of the creation of the Bible, it is stated that if man were to distinguish between good and evil, he would die (Genesis 2:17). I have consistently emphasized in my work the importance of treating the commands reported in the Bible with seriousness. Likewise, if we put in perspective the analysis that we have so far made to support our argument. The Bible did report that

when the people who lived during the first life cycle of existence began to distinguish between good and evil, wickedness increased, life on earth was ended, and along with it, all of man's progress was destroyed. This evidence indicates that crises, conflicts, corruption, and wicked acts should have been increasing since the time when people in Greek antiquity suggested that we stop explaining the world through abstract argumentation and instead use deduction and inference.

If the connection and relation that we built to support that, as people's knowledge widens, crises and conflicts should equally and reciprocally widen. The peace and security in the world, right from when the Greek philosophers suggested stopping to explain the world in terms of abstract argumentation and to explain it through deduction and inference, should also be deteriorating as the years go by. Moreover, as we are saying, when people's knowledge rises, crises and conflicts also reciprocally rise. This phenomenon signifies that the more humans speed their access to knowledge. In other words, distancing themselves from working on the earth and taking care of it without relying on any form of scientific advancement or technology to help them sustain their survival needs. People would increasingly focus on accelerating the end of this second life cycle of existence to usher in a new third life cycle.

Readers might not share my opinion that the degree of knowledge people reached or registered increased before or after the two world wars. Likewise, if readers also share our views, crises and conflicts rose after the two world wars as compared to before and people's tolerance toward peace and security diminished. These could very well be signs that when people begin to distinguish between good and evil, humanity may face dire consequences, as reported in the Bible. Let us continue to investigate to see if we can put what we just opined in a mental construct to continue to build evidence that, indeed, as people's knowledge increases, this could have a negative effect on human security.

In the previous section, I suggested classifying the period from when the Bible reports that God destroyed all life except for Noah and his family to the present as the second life cycle of existence. We also

said, let us fix the point in time when in Greek antiquity the philosophers of this era suggested that humans stop to explain the world in terms of abstract argumentation and to begin to explain it through deduction and inference as the event that marked the start of the downfall trajectory of this second life cycle of existence. We also said that if the analysis that we conducted contains any element of truth, the people who are being born in this second interval of this second life cycle should be moving the state of human life along the downhill trajectory that would eventually see the end of life on earth, giving, in this way, rise to a third cycle of life or existence. I stated that the people who lived during Greek antiquity are responsible for tilting the trajectory of this second life cycle in a downhill direction. This is because they decided that humans should stop surviving on the basis of the traditional mythological explanation in favor of a more rational explanation. Their desire to convert the purpose of human life so each person can seek significance and immortality in his achievement, including pursuing the realization of the full development of his personality, triggered this shift. The people who lived after this age agree with this move. Our present generation should be somewhere between when the downfall started and the end of this second generation of people. Most importantly, we stated that the individuals who lived immediately after the end of the two world wars contributed to the acceleration of this downhill trajectory, as they experienced a rapid increase in knowledge.

Given how God prefers to remain neutral rather than actively intervening through prophets, angels, and even his son, as he did throughout the entire Bible. Muhammad (S.A.W.) claimed that he was the last of the prophets (Chapter 33:40). But let's be fair; the poor God tried everything! The only option remaining, after both God's efforts and human efforts, may be to create new humans. In fact, the experience of the past two world wars showed that despite the barbarous acts and atrocity that people exhibited during those two events, God really stuck to his words and distanced himself this time. Everything could change with God, of course. For now, God's promise is that as long as the earth endures, life will not be destroyed (Genesis 8:20). The choices are clear: people must either start believing in the command that God conveyed through various prophets, angels, and his

son, which he sent to earth while choosing to remain unseen, or choose to disbelieve.

Therefore, people preferred that the extent and limitations of their interactions with objects outside their physical bodies be determined by their own human reasoning, without the interference of guidance from a god or a supernatural being. Let us also add, giving all the commands that exist in the Bible the benefit of the doubt because they could be referring to true conclusions that other people lived and not as mythical as humans in general want them to remain. Therefore, since it is people who monitor to ensure that the ideals that, on their principle, people govern each other produce the desired outcome. Let us observe if people continue to register accelerated progress of the kind people started knowing after the end of World War II and to make it accessible to people so such tools or knowledge continues to distance humans even more from refraining from the desire to detect their existence. If such ideals could be tilting humanity in the right direction, that is to usher in a new cycle of existence.

In the year 1687, Isaac Newton published three physical laws to explain through them the motion of many physical objects and systems. Those three physical laws laid the foundation for classical mechanics, which deals with describing the motion of bodies under the influence of a system of forces. Newton's first law states that when viewed in an inertial reference frame, an object either remains at rest or continues to move at a constant velocity unless acted upon by a net force. The second law that Newton derived states that in an inertial reference frame, the vector sum of the forces on an object is equal to the mass of the object multiplied by the acceleration. The third law states that when one body exerts a force on a second body, the second body simultaneously exerts a force equal in magnitude and opposite in direction on the first body.

In the previous section we referred to the interval that in the Bible spans right from when God supposedly created the heavens, the earth, and next man, up to the time in which it came to pass that wickedness on earth increased and God destroyed life and all humans minus Noah and his family because he found them righteous as being the epoch in which the first life cycle of people lived. We also said, let the story that

is reported in the fall of man when Adam and Eve disobeyed God be the event that marked the start of the downfall trajectory of this first life cycle of existence.

If we appropriate ourselves of the first law that Newton compiled. We can say that if Adam and Eve had obeyed God and lived without wanting to distinguish between good and evil, those two individuals wouldn't have set in motion the dynamics that brought the added wickedness that the people of the world knew, consequently leading to God deciding to put an end to all life on earth. The changes that would be taking place would have remained based on the principle that existed before Adam and Eve decided to disobey God. This is based on Newton's second law. Newton claimed that the moment an object is set in motion, the force that will be exerted on it will be equal to its mass multiplied by its acceleration. Therefore, the moment Adam and Eve decided to disobey God, those two people imposed a change in how objects were changing if left alone, thus spinning a phenomenon in which the objects began to change unnaturally during the interval of time they were working on the objects in hand. If Adam and Eve had not tried to unnaturally impose changes on the objects they were creatively working with, they would not have transformed those objects into a blade, which is a tool. The blade made it easier for Adam and Eve to cut things, but it also increased wickedness on earth because the people who lived after them began using blades to take the lives of others. The people whose lives were cut short through a knife stabbing—it wasn't the person who was stabbing that took the life of the person who was stabbed, but the knife that caused the loss of life.

Newton asserted that applying a change in motion results in a change equal to the object's mass multiplied by its acceleration. In the case of humans, what sets them in motion is their awareness or consciousness. It is the human awareness or consciousness that makes humans interact or refrain from interacting with objects. Therefore, if Adam and Eve didn't set in motion their awareness to utilize their human ingenuity to produce the blade. Their consciousness or awareness did not develop the knowledge afterwards on what else the blade could be used for; besides cutting to help sustain their survival needs during their search, it can also take a life.

This signifies that one condition must always be present for a human being to be considered safe. This condition is to distance a human being from any material things to stop human ingenuity from being a risk. When humans lock up offenders, incarceration removes the possibility of reoffending while also punishing the offender to deter future crimes. There is only one other case that we know of in which human ingenuity doesn't become a risk while it is loose and free. This case is when human awareness (i.e., human ingenuity) is not provided with conditions to make it distinguish between good or evil, as the Bible argued.

This condition exists when only human awareness, or human ingenuity, is made to follow the human body, not the other way around. In other words, this case happens when a person is put to carry out a labor-intensive job; hence, his human ingenuity (or awareness) is made to follow the body. For example, when a person is reading a book or watching television, his body is made to follow his human awareness. If we take Christianity, for example. Christ was preaching to people that if they need to win eternal life, they need to give up their material possessions. When people give away all their material possessions, they will not have the free time to worry about pursuing the good life; instead, they will focus on meeting their basic survival needs by returning to a state that is intrinsically connected to nature, as intended by God or the intelligent design that created human ingenuity.

After WWII, some people or groups of nations came together to improve living conditions for those subsisting without tools, washing machines, or other modern conveniences, because they believed these people were not receiving the full benefits of life, even if their intentions were better than some thought. But what those people were desiring that everyone stop to pursue is his body in favor of pursuing the detection of his existence or awareness to live the good life. In other words, doing as we said was the total opposite of what Christianity was preaching or, later, the doctrine that enslaved people did.

Moreover, since in our case, the mass refers not to the weight of physical objects but to the number of individuals exhibiting the unnatural change in the natural system to distance the human body

from what is required for its survival, in favor of letting tools do the work while the human body is idle. The acceleration refers to the rate at which people are producing objects that serve to distance the human body from fulfilling the functions intended by God or the intelligent design that created humans.

Acceleration is a vector quantity. The underlying concepts and principles for any vector quantity in physics must have both a magnitude and a direction. Right after God put an end to the first life cycle of existence, the second life cycle began with Noah. The Bible states that right after God asked Noah and his family to come out of the ark, God said two things in his heart. One was that the inclination of the human heart is evil from childhood, and the second thing he said was that he never again will destroy all living creatures as he has done (Genesis 8:21); as long as the earth endures, seedtime and harvest, cold and heat, summer and winter, and day and night will ever cease (Genesis 8:22). Therefore, we have a direction, and this direction is exactly what we would like to prevent.

Based on what Newton compiled in the second law, acceleration is defined as the rate at which an object changes its velocity. In other words, an object accelerates if it changes its velocity. Before we proceed, let us be clear: acceleration is not related to an object's speed. An object can be moving very fast and still not accelerating. Acceleration has to do with changing how fast an object is moving. If an object's velocity is constant, then the object is not accelerating.

In the previous section, we said that the second life cycle of existence began right from when God destroyed life and all humans except Noah and his family up to now. We also stated, "Let us define this second generation as beginning in Greek antiquity when the philosophers of that era suggested that humans should stop explaining the world through abstract argumentation and instead use deduction and inference, marking the start of the downfall trajectory of this second life cycle." For example, we believe that when people began to philosophize, they could have altered the speed at which they interacted with objects, leading to an increase in wickedness and a rapid change in the earth's endurance.

If the analysis that we are conducting contains any element of truth, people should have changed a lot of the earth's endurance between when they began to philosophize and now. Similarly, people's knowledge has also evolved during this period. In other words, if we compare people's ability to explain the world through deduction and inference now with how people were doing it during Greek antiquity, we should be able to detect a change. We should be able to detect or note a change in people's ability to explain the world as compared to how people were explaining things in terms of abstract argumentation. People's aptitude to distinguish between good or evil should have improved now, and most importantly, wickedness should have increased.

Let us review next to determine if people's ability to explain things through deduction and inference increased or not up to now. We have reason to believe that if we can demonstrate that people's ability to explain things through deduction and inference is indeed increasing at a much faster rate than in previous years, it will have significant implications. Humans could potentially be working on putting this present second life cycle of existence at greater risk of annihilation, thus ushering in a new life cycle.

The first life cycle of existence, which we said began when God supposedly created the heavens, the earth, and next man, up to the time in which, as came to pass in the Bible, wickedness on earth increased and this specific God destroyed life and all humans minus Noah and his family because he found them righteous, is a series of different age groups that has spanned through an immense time frame that lasted in the thousands of years. It is possible that the different generations that lived right from when Adam and Eve disobeyed God until the date in which the Bible reports about God having ended all life, irrespective of what their degree of progress was like. Those people who lived during this epoch may not have taken seriously that when distinguishing between good and evil, a person would die and the endurance of the natural system could weaken and create a meltdown, putting an end to all the life that existed. It's likewise possible that a meteor could hit the earth and create the same devastation. There is also a good chance that the people who lived during this first life cycle of existence possessed weapons of mass destruction and that their detonation levelled everything to the ground and a massive earthquake or tsunami did this destruction as well. In other words, if the people who lived during the first life cycle of existence, they were also the first sample of living creatures with human life. Their vulnerability could be understandable, because there are events that are outside of human control, like a meteor hitting earth. If we also go along with saying that the first humans who lived in this first life cycle didn't believe that any one of the events we mentioned could take place and wipe out life. The people who started living in the second life cycle cannot say the same, because those new people are from another age, in whose case it is possible for them to evaluate historical material to establish rational

principles. Let us also say that Noah didn't start the second life cycle from scratch without any knowledge since he survived.

Therefore, since the second life cycle of existence, we are cautioning that people should act to prevent the continuous acceleration of the rate at which they are distancing between evil and good. In other words, stopping with the distancing of their human body form, continuing to interact with matter to sustain survival needs in favor of letting tools do that role so the human body becomes more and more idle. This is because, as we said, only when the body is busy can this phenomenon stop humans from wanting to detect its existence. Moreover, since in the case of this second life cycle of existence, as was the case in the first life cycle. It is the degree of progress that humans make to understand themselves and the world they live in that distances their human body from focusing on how to sustain their survival needs using their own natural means, like their hands, to focusing on how to let tools be working to free the body from this chore. We can note the switch from using basic tools to using mechanized ones. Similarly, the second life cycle of existence consists of various age groups that span an inertial time frame lasting thousands of years.

In the previous section, we divided this second life cycle into two time intervals: the first interval refers to the period before Greek philosophers suggested that humans should stop explaining the world through abstract argumentation and instead use deduction and inference, while the second interval refers to the time after this shift. We even stated that the beginning of humans explaining the world through deduction and inference marked the start of the downfall trajectory of this second life cycle of existence, which continues to this day. Now again, since this interval refers to a series of generations, it is within this interval that people began to exhibit a precarious attitude much more than when people lived during the first interval of the second life cycle. Therefore, this event was the point in time when we said the downfall trajectory of the second life cycle started. The actions of people living during this second life cycle may be preparing for its end, allowing a new third life cycle to emerge.

Let us focus on the interval that begins during Greek antiquity, marked by the birth of human philosophy, and extends into the future, identifying two key points within it. Let the first point be the event that we said could mark the start of the downfall of this life's second interval of the second life cycle or right when, during Greek antiquity, humans began to philosophize. Let the second point be the two back-to-back World Wars that people have known.

In the previous section, we demonstrated that when humans began to explain the world through inference and deduction, this new approach significantly changed the speed at which people could distinguish between good and evil. We have no way of knowing what made the people during Greek antiquity decide to make this switch so as to etch a notch forward toward the end of this second life cycle, maybe. In the literature it is reported that the disregard and contempt for human rights by the people who were ruling during Greek antiquity and the methods that those were using to control others could very well be what gave rise to this new movement whose aim was not to criticize God (or gods or goddesses), but rather the misconducts that rulers were ascribing in the name of God. Evidently, as people were freeing themselves from the misconceptions of those who used the gods to impose authority, humans began to see the world as focused more on argumentation than on mythical stories. One could imagine that right after, people were becoming little by little capable of explaining the world through inference and deduction rather than the supernatural. The people were at the same time building comprehensive rationality to understand the implications of their actions if they continued to build arguments based on a good-evil distinction; hence, they are not the first generation of people.

However, the world was not as interlinked then as it is now. The Old Testament may not have been available to the people of Greek antiquity, especially its philosophers. There is a good chance that if those Greek philosophers had access to Moses's account in Genesis regarding the people who began to distinguish between good and evil, their understanding would have been different. Let's assume they simply lacked the rationality to comprehend deduction and inference as we do now, given that they were the ones who invented it.

We don't think there is a need to dwell in too much detail on how peace and security have been like during this entire interval covering right from when, during Greek antiquity, humans began to philosophize and the two back-to-back World Wars that people have known, and we suggested fixing our second point at such an incident. To begin with, if this interval were any good, the people wouldn't have known those two back-to-back world wars.

In the broadest sense, people began to detect their existence more and more based on their relations with each other and material things done on the basis reported in the Bible. People launched into developing their own guidance, ideas, ideals, and principles. People search during this entire interval to understand themselves, the world they live in, and the relations to the world and each other that have enabled humans to construct a deeper understanding of things from a pure or applied approach to yield practical quantitative and qualitative applications. People have developed many investigative areas, such as science, art, religion, literature, mathematics, chemistry, physics, music, and so forth.

We have no way of knowing how many people lived on Earth during this entire interval, but if we fast forward to just before World War I or the turn of the 20th century, we find that this history of the world remains relevant. We can say that most of the people who were living before WWI were all competing against the grounded natural condition that overrules the universe due to the ideas that their detection of their existence had permitted them to posit. All the people who were living before WWI were competing against each other, and they were all applying a relativism whose frame of reference was manmade. Protagoras's views, which suggested that man is the measure of all things, had reached a point of no return, making nothing impossible for man.

We don't think there is a clear record of the number of philosophical doctrines, schools, branches, or topical divisions that existed before WWI. It can be stated that since the time in Greek antiquity when philosophers suggested that people should begin to seek to understand themselves, the world they live in, and their relationships with each other, the production of new philosophical doctrines has been

continuous. People create and shape the philosophical beliefs that they believe best serve their imaginative interests.

At its simplest level, the ideas and concepts that people have developed over time to understand human nature and the reality they live in have created a philosophical tradition in which each new generation forms new views on the fundamental causes and principles of the universe. Right before birth, it would already be known what social class, faith, and philosophical teaching the newborn is most likely to adapt to or pursue during his life. If this is not the case, the newborn can choose to believe that a deity created the universe or follow any available philosophical teaching.

The large number of philosophical branches, doctrines, schools, or topical divisions that people were operating from before the two back-to-back World Wars reached unquantifiable heights. The main aim of all the philosophical doctrines that people knew is to deepen nothing but people's perception that the gridlock embedded in people's failure to manage their relations on a friendlier basis or overcome the weakness of their will resides in people's denied right to have access to the blueprint of their own intelligent design or as-built. This perception has channeled the focus of people toward making the purpose of human life destined to figuring out nothing but how the universe originated or where everything that exists is going. The objective is to continue until uncovering the origin of all things, including advancing or furthering human knowledge and understanding on every aspect of the human genetic makeup to stop the aging process.

The many philosophical branches, doctrines, schools, and topical divisions the world has known during this entire interval, covering right from when, during Greek antiquity, humans began to philosophize up to the two back-to-back World Wars, have had a profound effect on people's approaches to interacting with the objects that exist on the outside of their sensory systems. During this period, scientists, physicists, engineers, carpenters, and others focused on solving specific practical questions or problems related to things that had previously not been explained, were difficult to explain, or were poorly/partially understood. The aim is to describe better the philosophical ideas that the different philosophical branches, doctrines,

schools, or topical divisions postulate. The things scientists, physicists, engineers, carpenters, and so forth explain or make predictions about are used to help strengthen effective intelligence-gathering exercises related to questions dealing with where we came from. Why are we here? Why do we perish? And so many other question marks. Thus, helping people to address the speculative questions that emerge right after any person gets to detect his existence and becomes drawn either by his curiosity or obliged to investigate due to what the social order calls on him to do. Thus, creating a situation in which, as we said earlier, humans are converting earth into becoming an experimental theater and, in the process, making it totally unclear whether people are pursuing the only one life we all have, how to find out from where everything comes, and so forth to satisfy the perception of those people who derived the different philosophical branches, doctrines, schools, branches, or topical division advocates or their own.

People are divided, and there are people who believe that humans are descendants of apes on the tree of life. No one knows if this perception of human origins is true. However, humans' advanced capacity to induce and to infer should have also served to be able to conclude that the universe could have either originated by a being or become so organized by chance. Therefore, people's choices to wage on science or go back to doing what the Bible suggests can spare a person from dying; that is one choice. This is because there is nothing that science can provide that is more valuable than showing how a man can live forever, and the Bible claims that man will never manage to reach that.

It is very clear the degree of progress the people who lived during this entire interval, covering from right when during Greek antiquity humans began to philosophize up to the two back-to-back World Wars, has enabled humans to understand themselves, the world they live in, and the relations to the world and each other. The degree of knowledge people reached before WWI enabled us to say that there was a change registered in people's ability to distinguish between good and evil as of when people during Greek antiquity began to philosophize and before World War I and II were fought.

Surely, the fixation that people developed to distinguish between good and evil continued even after World War I and II were fought. In fact,

we have reason to believe there was an accelerated change in people's ability to distinguish between good and evil from before and after World War I and II, and so if our work has any element of truth in it, crises and conflicts should have increased. For instance, if we take a brief look back in history, just before the onset of WWI. Before WWI people were obliged to face each other when talking. Those who were privileged could have also used the telephone. People have made lots of progress in their ongoing project to make nothing impossible before the two World Wars and after. The recent advances in technology made by people after World War II now allow for real-time visual communication via cameras, in contrast to the pre-World War I era when communication was limited to audio only. We could say that after the end of World War 2, the gap in people's ability to distinguish between good and evil accelerated enormously.

Based on our analysis, we found that people's ability to distinguish between good and evil deepened after they began to deduce and infer more, compared to the level of understanding during Greek antiquity. Could the decisions made by people to deepen their ability to distinguish between good and evil, as well as the experiences of those who lived during the transition from philosophical thought to the two back-to-back wars, be responsible for the increase in crises and conflicts in the world? This is because we cannot think of anything that has changed on earth during this entire period apart from people's knowledge continuing to deepen.

We couldn't determine whether increased knowledge leads to more crises and conflicts, or if acquiring more knowledge means encountering more crises. However, at this juncture, we can only add that we have two credos, each advocating for how to interact with objects that exist outside the physical body, and both address this task from different perspectives. One credo is based on the body of knowledge suggested by the Bible in the story of creation, while the other is a philosophical doctrine, encompassing various schools and topical divisions that people develop and use as a refuge to encourage the desire to understand their existence. The philosophical doctrines that humans postulate encourage people to think critically and to seek knowledge about various aspects of human nature and the reality in which they live. The two creeds also differ in their views on the

purpose of human life. There is also a major discord on how each credo proposes how people interact with the objects that exist on the outside of the physical body and what the real purpose of human life is all about. Let us also add people's decisions to make the human actions or thoughts be split into good or evil and how to start to see the world. People also duplicated this process in their thoughts, based on two opposing ethical premises. In the creation story of the Old Testament, there is no mention of God creating man with inherent good or evil traits.

Everything people do is for the future. After birth, people discover various ways to overcome their willpower and act in brotherhood. Humans do not choose the body of knowledge included in the Bible's creation story; instead, this source claims that whoever follows the command to avoid distinguishing between good and evil will live. People have consistently chosen to pursue or organize themselves around a body of knowledge that contradicts the teachings of the Bible. It is uncertain whether people will be able to: detect their existence and overcome the challenges that prevent them from triumphing over what stands in their way to begin to exhibit tolerance toward one another to finally manage their relations with one another in a humane way. There is no doubt about what type of social, political, cultural, or economic ideals people will pick to rule the world. People will certainly face challenges, but some can be easily worked around while others cannot. We believe that knowledge contradicts the way people are naturally designed to function, and it may continually force individuals to confront crises and conflicts unless they return to being an intrinsic part of reality, similar to how other living creatures exist. As I said earlier, I cannot know if knowledge helps people resist the belief that one person's security is another's natural, unavoidable security, a belief stemming from their lack of knowledge. However, what we can do, since every person is pushing to be vigilant, is widen his knowledge. Let us now examine how the accumulation of knowledge contributes to greater stability on Earth.

Humans have known two back-to-back world wars in the last century. A world war is a war that involves many nations in all different parts of the world. At the end of those two world wars, the victors acknowledged that their disregard and contempt for human rights had resulted in the barbarous acts they experienced. They agreed to unite and create an international organization that would serve as a global council, ensuring that future generations could enjoy freedom of speech, belief, and freedom from fear and want, in light of the barbarous acts they had experienced. They named this international organization the United Nations. The organization was established on 24 October 1945. This organization has now grown and encompasses membership from all nations in the world. This organization seeks to promote international cooperation and human rights in order to prevent discrimination and mistreatment across the globe. Other duties of the United Nations include providing humanitarian aid when necessary in countries devastated by war and natural disasters.

This organization has a statute and a charter. The member nations of this international organization are determined, among other goals, to (i) reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, and in the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small and (ii) to promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom. To attain these ends, on which the organization serves as a global council, the United Nations employs machinery for the promotion of the economic and social advancement of all peoples. A copy of the United Nations Charter can be found at the World Wide Web portal of this organization.

Subsequent to the creation of the international organization, the founding members named it the United Nations to help member states serve as a global council. The founding members created a Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which all members sign when they join the international organization. This declaration, which member states sign when they join the United Nations, serves as a roadmap to guarantee the rights of every individual everywhere. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights was adopted on 10 December 1948. In the Declaration of Human Rights, the member states pledge themselves to promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom for all members of the human family. A copy of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights can be found at the World Wide Web portal of the international organization named the United Nations.

We have no way of knowing about the progress the United Nations has made on its mandate since it was founded. Humans have experimented with many ideologies to triumph over their powerlessness to deal with each other on a brotherly basis. It is not possible to assess how well the efforts that the people set out in 1948 to attain the goal that every person gets to be entitled to the realization of the full development of his human personality due to how minuscule the time interval is since the date the people created this machinery to assist them with getting so all members of the human family can have access to better standards of life.

What we do know is that within the international organization named the United Nations exists a council, which is called the Security Council. This council has primary responsibility, under the United Nations Charter, for the maintenance of international peace and security. The number of resolutions that the United Nations Security Council has issued since the council was created is more than 2300 so far. We have no way of knowing if this number of resolutions that the United Nations Security Council has issued so far is an indication that the world is on its way toward tilting to become peaceful or not. What we do know is that the same United Nations Security Council has launched 87 peacekeeping missions since the United Nations was created. A peacekeeping operation is a collection of military, police,

and civilian personnel who work to deliver security in a country torn by conflict.

It is not built-in in the scope of this study to establish the 87 peacekeeping missions that the United Nations mounted since this global council was created. If it were the same United Nations efforts to make people capable of distinguishing between good or evil, what would have instigated this wave of insecurity that has swept the world after people were invited to choose their own form of government, including access to improved social security? What we would only like to point out is that humans are mortal. Let us pick three main characters who are convinced that the world would be better off if all people were united under one world order to achieve this goal. The 32nd President of the United States of America Franklin D. Roosevelt who died on 12 April 1945 was one of them. Roosevelt was succeeded by Harry Truman, who also believed in this better hope for the future. Harry Truman died on 26 December 1972. And so was Prime Minister Winston Churchill of Great Britain, who died on 24 January 1965.

Surely, the ambitions that, on their principles, those three powerful leaders charted inspirations to make all members of the human family interact with objects so that on their basis every individual anywhere and everywhere can have the right to better standards of life are a very ambitious project.

Planning is a process of creating long-term visions to achieve optimum balance of needs or demands with the available resources. Planning takes advantage of, and seeks to influence, the social, economic, physical, and natural factors affecting people in order to achieve a desired goal. An important function involving planning is its relationship to forecasting. Planning predicts what the future should look like for multiple scenarios. Forecasting is predicting what the future will look like. Forecasting is a process of making predictions of the future based on past and present data. It is often based upon experience or knowledge. For this reason, planners use qualitative and quantitative methods when taking intermediate- or long-range decisions. Planners rely on past data or historical life-cycle analogies.

Indeed, it is very premature to evaluate if the decision the leaders of the countries and people who were victors after WWII took to create a global council so as to make the entire human family come together to work together to reach a point where everyone everywhere shall enjoy freedom from fear and want. But there are many routes that a person can take to travel from one point to the next. In this work, we are investigating if it was people adding knowledge that contributed to the accelerated rise in the number of crises and conflicts that people all over the world are knowing. In the year 1989 humans invented the World Wide Web. The World Wide Web is an instrument that, in our study, has accelerated how quickly people become able to distinguish between good or evil. Likewise, the World Wide Web etched the people of this second life cycle a notch forward toward the end of the 2nd life cycle. For example, out of the 87 peacekeeping missions that the United Nations mounted, 13 peace missions were before 1989. All the rest were mounted after those three leaders died.

Many people were not born when the leaders who were involved in deciding that all members of the human family should be united so all people can live free from fear and want and proposing that machinery for the promotion of the economic and social advancement of all peoples be set up. To desire that the world be organized around a global council to promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom is one thing, but whether this formula that those nations prescribed for the world is the right diagnostic is something totally different.

In this work, we are not interested if country A or country B rules the world and/or if the world is ruled by one nation, ten, or a hundred. We are also not interested in whether the actions that people take produce outcomes or reactions that only benefit a precise number of people instead of the benefits getting spread to the masses. In like manner, people could return to practicing colonization, slavery, oligarchy, fascism, or the social order they want. This is not something that we are concerned with treating or promoting in this study as well. In this work, we are studying how knowledge may have contributed to the current global insecurity and how increased access to knowledge could negatively impact the continuity of human life and the preservation of human progress. In other words, whether 1 nation or 2000 nations rule

the world, it makes no difference in what we are seeking to understand. And so it is if people return to practicing oligarchy, monarchy, democracy, or any other social system; this is again outside the scope of this work.

There is only one motive that could have compelled the leaders of those rich and most powerful nations to take the decision after WWII to want to unite people so every individual anywhere and everywhere could be entitled to the full development of his personality. This motive is to either add another project to the list of projects that the human imagination of people tested with and later on ended up regretting implementing or to address all the insecurity that people are knowing is a result of all members of the human family pursuing the common program of purposes and principles that the leaders who were victorious at the end of WWII with their advisors sketched. In other words, the insecurity that the world is knowing after all the people came together to implement the common program of purposes and principles that those leaders have sketched is a precursor to this new, better world that they based their hopes on and counted on everyone everywhere benefiting from.

However, due to how, till now, people are having difficulty abiding by the common principles that those leaders based their hopes for a better future of the world on. Leaving suspicion that such an ambitious project could see the light of day.

In other words, if we are to consider what in the Bible in the story of the creation Adam and Eve preferred, dying as compared to living and surviving according to the way God instructed those two, that is not knowing good and evil. What those two rejected was the knowledge that was being communicated. If we take the claim the Bible makes about Eve being the mother of all the living. Since the date people developed religion and began to condition people's behavior to become capable of prevailing over the weakness of the will. Until now, despite how long religion has been attempting to make people not detect their existence. This knowledge didn't manage to make a big difference. From what we know, only monks survive without relying on knowledge or material things to establish that people are capable of being conditioned to live their lives according to certain knowledge.

All the people in the world continue to prefer to let human reasoning and machines govern their relationship with the physical world.

There is no proof that when human knowledge is increased, such a diagnosis is something that is a good remedy so people finally reach a life free from fear and want. The last two world wars were not the first and last wars that humans have known, so we could say that the barbarous acts that have resulted each time people fight a war, this experience is finally outraging people's consciences, and they are going to be really beginning to do things differently. Due to humans being mortal, as we said. The last world wars may have outraged the consciences of those three leaders. The people who, as of 1989, when they reached the age to cause crises and conflicts, never lived through a world war to understand if its aftermath is really something that outrages the conscience of mankind or not, to know the difference, to want to do things differently.

Therefore, since new people are the ones who from one generation to the next are jumping from one world insecurity to the next, investigating if humans added knowledge could create an equivalent degree of negative setbacks is useful. Indeed, a good number of social theorists like Karl Marx, Max Weber, and Sigmund Freud have postulated that the modernization of societies could have a tangible effect on the state of human life. Those investigators and others suggested that the social realm may not be subject to the same method of investigation as the natural world and proposed that different social epistemology should be used to achieve peace and stability in the world.

We have no way of knowing how many investigators supported the idea that knowledge is an inherent ability that would cease to exist when any human being inquires. For this reason, we have based our work on the biblical credo that claims it was God who suggested the foundation of our studies. Those leaders who wanted all people to be united so every member of the human family could live free from fear and want didn't believe in this credo that postulates that when humans distinguish between good and evil, they will die. Therefore, since those leaders didn't make any changes to the social system that governs how humans interact with each other, the potential for

improvement still exists. In other words, those leaders left the people's race to compete to freeze social space and accumulate material things, including agreeing that people exercise full economic cooperation. We know if there were enough resources to allow each person to freeze social space and to accumulate material things on a cumulative basis, there wouldn't have been any need, so humans have wars to reach that point; it is better to work together afterwards to make everyone live free from fear and want.

That's why we said it is very premature to judge how the efforts of the people who were victors after WWII will turn out to be subsequent to the decision those leaders took on behalf of the entire human family to unite the world to ensure that every member of the human family shall enjoy freedom from fear and want. For this reason, we are going to go ahead and show first why we doubt the common principles on their basis they based their hopes for the world are illogical. Next, we are going to show that it is possible that their vision to have all humans unite under one world order as they desire is possible to materialize. We will then attempt to show if, after the people of the world unite under one world order as those leaders desired, this low tolerance to peace and security that people started exhibiting when their knowledge recently increased would continue to deepen. Then, readers, as we said, could make their own opinion on whether those nations that were victors after WWII thought that the world is better off when all the people are united to promote social progress or if this move to make each individual pursue the realization of the full development of his personality was a wrong move.

The advantage of checking if people really could live according to the ideals the human family began to practice after WWII is an exercise that can add clarity to determining if it is better to go back to enacting ideals that would see humans living as per the way God suggested, not knowing good or evil, or if people are better off continuing with seeking to let knowledge help them to arrive at being capable of seeking political and ethical truths. This is all the more important because this insecurity that is sweeping the world, if it is not contained, can escalate into obliging certain people to disregard peace and security and resort to a new world war that can have major consequences on the progress humans have made.

Life is full of challenging choices. The harder the choices are, the more options we have. The nations that had decided to coexist, debating whose ideals or representatives should oversee the permanent system of global security before WWI, were preparing for that eventuality on both sides of the conflict. Those people who were on both sides of the camps working, preparing for the war, must have deliberated on what the war aims should be and a possible path to rule the earth's resources (and people) when a winner would be declared. Definitely, they deliberated on what to do with the people who would be defeated or conquered. We believe that while those individuals were preparing for the war and establishing war aims, they must have conducted extensive analyses and selected the option that would provide them with financial benefits both immediately after the war and in the future.

In general, people resort to wars to gain access to objects or material things that they believe will enhance their sense of existence. If people resort to wars, it is due to the natural system regenerating more slowly than the aggressor's need for resources or to win economic or ideological concessions. Let us put intangible war goals, such as the accumulation of credibility and reputation, including beliefs and emotions, on the side. In the past, when country A lost to country B, the victorious country forced the people of the defeated country to live in poverty, starve, annex their land, accept colonial rules, swear an oath of alliance, and pay tributes to the conquerors. Usually, the conquerors tortured, enslaved or slaughtered the men, raped and killed the women, and even murdered the children.

Let us say there is no one right answer to how people who lost during a war are treated, and what happens to those people depends on the winner's history and how they perceive the conquered. All war aims depend on the intentions of the victor. However, considering the horrific crimes committed during WW2, the millions of lives lost, and the treatment of those who opposed the victorious power in such a deadly armed conflict, we can only conclude that the war aims were relatively civilized, to say the least. WW2 was undoubtedly a very different war than had ever been seen before, and so were the war aims. Strangely, after humans fought those two world wars precisely so the winner could put his hands on the resources, ideological or physical, of who was going to surrender, including manpower. Indeed, the people who lost the war were blamed for everything, forced to live in poverty, and plenty of prisoners of war were killed. Women were raped, and certain countries were divided into portions. However, for various reasons, the victorious nations in WW2 restricted their war objectives to ensuring that only the leaders of the defeated nations were tried for war crimes, while allowing the soldiers and the rest of the population to go free with minimal retribution. Those nations that won WW2 did not seek to increase their territory. Those winners didn't occupy the countries that lost or force the people to live differently, actions that are explicit war aims. The victors of the Second World War ensured that the defeated nations would not have the opportunity to establish a military. The nations that won World War II took control of the governments of the defeated nations for a period of time, gradually restoring freedoms and establishing a new government that eventually took over. If people resort to extreme aggression, destruction, and mortality in order to gain benefits expected after a successful war, such as territorial expansion or economic and military superiority, they undermine the very principles of peace and cooperation. The decision of the nations who were victors at the end of this world war to unite their people with the people who they were fighting against and proclaim a common standard of achievements in which they pledge to observe so every person of the human family is entitled to the realization of the full development of his human personality, as article 22 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights states, is anti-logic.

A man cannot be born with logic or anti-logic, nor can he acquire both at any time in his life. To provide an example, a war results in the loss of lives. Everyone is ready to accept that a war is a negative thing.

Person A (a person of logic) understands that a war is bad: if he doesn't fight, it's beneficial If he fights, it's detrimental

Person B (a person with anti-logic) understands as follows: If he doesn't fight, it's detrimental If he fights = beneficial

If a country believes it is acceptable to go to war (which is illogical) despite widespread agreement that war is bad (which is logical), then it is acting against reason. The country that entered into war (anti-logic) would be illogical if it picked to help the vanquished, because that country didn't take a logical action to begin with. The logical action should have been to follow the practices of conquerors throughout history, which align with all existing historical analogies. Conquerors kill most of the conquered people, and those who survive are oppressed, ruled over, and arranged so that all their resources and freedom are taken away from them. Barbarous acts committed by conquerors rarely outrage their conscience, because their own disregard and contempt for human rights lead to these acts. Therefore, it is logical that the war aims after WWII included maintaining the tyranny and oppression over the people who were defeated. Any other war aims would have undermined the original justification for entering the war.

Yet for the first time in world history, those conquerors acted in a way that significantly differs from how extreme aggression was previously addressed using military technology and equipment. The conquerors dealt with the vanquished. The conquerors, who had fought against others to determine which ideals would govern the permanent system of global security, experienced a shift in consciousness. Those victors acknowledge that disregard and contempt for human rights have outraged their conscience. The victor deems that it is essential to the development of friendly relations between humans and sets as common standards that all members of the human family are entitled to the realization of the full development of their personality. The victors prefer a world where all human beings enjoy freedom of

speech, belief, and freedom from fear and want, and they pledge to strive for and educate others to respect and uphold the standards they have committed to achieving. Instead of dominating the people whom they conquered and making them work in their land, industry, homes, and so forth as was the case in past times. The victors proclaim that the barbarous acts of the war have outraged so much their conscience that they are now agreeing that all members of the human family, from shoe shiners, farmers, laborers, merchants, cleaners, presidents, kings, doctors, astronauts, teachers, and so forth, all be entitled to the realization of the full development of their personality “on respect for the principles of equal rights” and not based “on sole equal rights principles.”

Indeed, the logical act and the nobleness of the war victor didn't stop at seeing that the people whom they defeated be entitled to the realization of the full development of their human personality.

Before WWI and WWII, humans were functioning on the basis of freezing social space and accumulating materials and things on a cumulative basis, including creating winners and losers. Before WW1 and WW2 were fought, the poor countries and people were colonized and subjected to alien subjugation, domination, and oppression by colonizing countries or the countries that were victors at the end of WW2. The colonizing countries that were ruling and enslaving the people in those poor countries were denying and depriving the decolonized countries and people from living by the same standards or being given the right opportunities. The colonizing countries were forcing the decolonized countries and people to work in domestic and household jobs, on their land, in their industry, and so forth. The colonized countries and people were deprived of access to resources and material goods they produced, such as chairs, tables, beds, living rooms, tools, wine, and food, which were used by the wealthy.

After the two world wars, the rich and powerful nations competed to determine who would oversee global security. Before WW1 and WW2, the same rich and powerful countries colonized poor countries and peoples without being mindful of the colonization. The colonizing countries and their citizens became more aware of the situation and yearned for freedom for all the dependent peoples. After WWII, the

disregard and contempt that were exhibited during the war outrageously stirred their consciences, thus leading them to reach the conclusion that the subjection of people to alien subjugation, domination, and exploitation is a denial of human rights. It is essential that all people have the right to self-determination and take steps to transfer all powers to the peoples whom they colonized in order to allow them to exercise complete freedom in their sovereignty and the integrity of their national territory.

The same rich and powerful nations that had previously colonized people and fought against those challenging their ideals would now oversee the general security of the world. The same rich and powerful nations entered into a war to ensure that their ideals would be practiced by people around the world. After WWII, those same rich and powerful nations that were colonizing countries and people became convinced that the people whom they were subjecting to alien subjugation and exploitation possessed natural resources and wealth, and if they kept on maintaining the armed action or respective measures that they were exercising, such an action would be an impediment to world peace. Thus, those rich and powerful nations decided to advocate for the rights of all people to access property, enjoy rest and leisure, attain a standard of living adequate for their health and well-being, receive food, clothing, housing, medical care, and necessary social services, obtain an education, and freely participate in the cultural life of their communities, including enjoying the arts and sharing in scientific advancements and their benefits. In other words, the goal was to grant colonized countries and their people the rights that had been denied to them before the war.

Surely, the countries and people who emerged victorious at the end of WWII made a logical and genuine move to decolonize nations and grant rights that humanity had not known before. This is another act that we deem anti-logic. This conclusion is because humans are able to create conditions of stability and well-being for all members of the human family based on respect for equal rights principles, like those rich and powerful countries that were victors after WW2. There wouldn't have been any reason for humans to have invented religion or have been attempting since Greek antiquity to establish an ethical system based on human reasoning and continue to fail.

Additionally, it is essential to help every person understand that the full development of their personality starts with making the earth's resources and the material goods produced by people accessible to all, allowing everyone to live free from fear and want. This mechanism begins by abolishing all for-profit mode of production approaches in favor of social austerity, where people would be starting to master beginning to do right when they genuinely know the costs outweigh the benefits. The countries and people who ended WW2 kept the world running on an economic system based on creating winners and losers. Those same countries want people to believe that the common program and purposes all people would be working from can allow people to reach a life free from fear and want, knowing that we live in a world that can only produce a limited number of objects of any kind. The idea that every person is entitled to a limited number of objects, as promoted by the human rights declaration, creates false expectations and fosters competition among individuals. Likewise, the decision that the countries and people who proposed WW2 at the global council so every person can keep authorship or ownership rights to the protection of the scientific, moral, and material interests a person produces converts the material things required to sustain the survival needs and to satiate the earthly desires of people into becoming a commodity. This approach maintains control over the body of knowledge in the hands of the author.

As we said before, a man cannot be born with either logic or anti-logic, nor can he acquire both at any time in his life. For example, one might consider the act of freezing social space and accumulating material possessions over time. Everyone is ready to accept that such acts widen the gap between the rich and the poor.

Person A (a person of logic) understands that freezing social space is bad: If he doesn't freeze social space, it's beneficial If he freezes social space, it's detrimental

Person B (a person with anti-logic) understands as follows: If he doesn't freeze social space, it's detrimental If he freezes social space, it's beneficial

By decolonizing countries and people so they start to freeze social space and accumulate material things on a cumulative basis (an anti-logic action), when all people agree that freezing social space and accumulating material things on a cumulative basis is such an act, it widens the gap between the rich and the poor—a war (logic). The rich and powerful nations decolonized countries and people (logic); it would be an illogical assumption or naïve to say that they acted in this way without those nations having picked such a move while considering actions consistent with the maintenance of their own strength and stability. Also, the countries and people who were decolonized would be trying to compete with the countries and people who decolonized them to strip away their prestige, property, and power.

The logical course of action would have been to maintain colonization, as this approach reflects the historical state of human life and aligns with all existing historical analogies. The one-million-dollar question is whether the rich and powerful nations would have chosen to let every individual, including the defeated peoples of WW2, realize the full development of their human personality as a war aim if they doubted that those people posed a threat to their strength and stability, instead of decolonizing countries and peoples. For the rich and powerful nations to have taken this path, they must have reached the conclusion that the human personality is no longer a threat. The incomprehensible part of the decision by the countries and people who participated in World War II to unite the entire human family is how they planned or intended to distribute the limited number of objects that any body of knowledge could produce at any one time, which is a problem on its own. But how do the same countries and people intend to control human awareness or desire? This is because, from what we know, humans' desires can never be satiated no matter how much people attempt to make efforts. The mind, or the pre-programmed ability to reason, is not composed of matter and can never be filled or satisfied. Most importantly, knowledge or change makes a person unable to overcome his will's weakness.

In this work, we intend to isolate what this hierarchical system of power consists of, specifically. We want to know what could have been this specific something that the countries and people who fought in

WWII counted on to lead them to believe that they were capable of maintaining the custodianship role over the maintenance of the security of the world. The hierarchical system of power that the countries and people who WW2 believe or perceive would not challenge or destabilize their strength and stability is derived from this something that

We will not elaborate on how peace and security were in the world as of 1989 to support claims about whether the strength and stability of the rich and powerful nations are being put to the test. But definitely, the abnormal degree of tolerance to peace and security that people are exhibiting is not what all members of the human family interpret as living free from fear and want to be like. The world was much safer when the rich and powerful nations were colonizing people and countries or before WW2!

Opinions vary on the reasons that motivated the rich and powerful nations that decolonized countries and people, including the people who were defeated during WW2, so every member of the human family can begin to transact and to cohabit "on respect for the principles of equal rights." Let us expose a snapshot of the consequence of this noble and fair game that the rich and powerful nations agreed that all members of the human family play by its rules to see what its consequence has created in the world until now.

Humans can reach the full development of their human personality from two sources: tangible and intangible means. Let the intangible source refer to mental fulfillment. Humans can fulfill the full development of their human personality through intangible values or entitlements, but those stay in one's mind. The sky is the limit when it comes to fulfilling tangible entitlements.

If the countries and people who had won WW2 wanted the people whom they decolonized and the people who were defeated during WW2 to reach the realization of the full development of their human personality. One possible war aim for the countries and people who won WW2 could have been to ensure that all members of the human family collaborate in the economic field.

Industrialization is a process that allows people to obtain means of production while at the same time reducing the amount of work people have to exhibit to produce the needed goods. In the century leading up to the two world wars, the world experienced many scientific discoveries, particularly during the 18th and 19th centuries.

For example, the Victorian era of British history was known as a period of peace and prosperity for Britain. Historians have characterized the mid-Victorian era (1850–1870) as Britain's most prosperous years due to how much industrialization and trade made the national income per person grow. Historians also claim that there was a spirit of libertarianism as people felt free during this era. Taxes were very low, and government restrictions were very minimal. There is a good chance that the countries and people who won World War II viewed its conclusion as an opportunity to recreate a Victorian-era

environment for themselves as a reward for their victory. We imagine that after Kirkpatrick Macmillan invented the pedal bicycle in 1839, he sold one bicycle to everyone in his town. He would need to reduce his production of new bicycles if he didn't find new markets. Similarly, in the United States, Isaac Singer invented a sewing machine in 1851. We are sure that Isaac Singer must have shipped some sewing machines to the people who lived in Great Britain during the Victorian era to keep his assembly line operating.

Indeed, all the inventions—bicycles, sewing machines, cars, televisions, refrigerators, and so forth—that the countries and people who had won WW2 were producing at the turn of the 19th century ushered in the idea that there was no longer a need to rely as much on people as before to carry out the chores that the bicycle and the sewing machine could do faster. This change is because industrialization replaced individual manual labor by mechanized mass production and craftsman labor by assembly lines.

It is very sensible to prioritize the goal of ending the subjugation, domination, and exploitation of countries and people in all their forms, as well as to decolonize and grant independence, in order to foster a belief that all of humanity is united in the effort to build a better world. Colonization prevents international economic development. Industrialized nations and colonizers have access to so many televisions, chairs, and refrigerators that they could purchase for their own citizens. Without reorganizing to provide purchasing power to decolonized countries and their people, colonization would have continued to hinder international economic development. The world no longer needed people who were enslaved or oppressed to work the land, in industry, in the houses, and so forth. Industrialization required individuals who could ensure the assembly lines continued to operate, particularly because the 20th century experienced two consecutive world wars. Therefore, the people who were preparing for WW1 couldn't go back to sit in their homes and do nothing after the war, because this would make the assembly lines that were cranking goods stop production when all the inventions that were being produced had buyers and users lined up. In as far as the people who were defeated during WWII, it also makes lots of sense to keep them alive. The

defeated nations could reconstruct their countries using the assembly lines operated by the victorious nations of WW2.

Similarly, it was also sensible to establish a world council so that the countries and people who won WWII could govern from a centralized location instead of a decentralized one. In other words, the responsibility for actual colonization should shift from foreign colonists to national colonists or agents. What mattered was that all the countries and peoples who were reorganized and freed became members of the new global council to advocate for the entitlement of every person to the full development of their human personality, with the objective of ensuring that everyone, everywhere, has access to improved social security. In addition, what mattered was that the agents whom the countries and people who won WW2 picked to start playing the colonizing function on their behalf sent an envoy to the global council, so this representative relayed the principles and ideals that the victors of WW2 needed to implement within the limits of their territorial boundaries. Maintaining the security of the world from a centralized place or a global council has another advantage. This action legitimizes the ability to challenge any country or group that detects their existence, especially if they do not adhere to agreements such as refraining from producing weapons of mass destruction. Another advantage of the council is that it makes it easier to challenge the countries or people who attempt to modify the political and social system with regard to how to dispose of their natural wealth and resources. This conclusion is because there is no higher aspiration for humanity than to promote the idea that all members of the human family should live their lives according to the principles of equal rights. This principle is what those countries and people who won WW2 picked as a theme for how they desired people to start basing their relationships with one another on its principles and were ready to defend.

Anti-positivism is the belief within social science that the social realm may not be subject to the same methods of investigation as the natural world; the social realm requires a different epistemology in which academics do not use empiricism and the scientific method.

The countries and people who won WW2 desire all members of the human family to live according to the ideals of the social realm, which is based on man's own human ingenuity in determining how it should be run. As we said before, a man cannot be born with logic or anti-logic, nor can he acquire both at any time in his life.

The epistemology that the countries and people who won WW2 desire all members of the human family to practice is not a realm that humans can decide on but the natural world. This is because humans are a function of the natural world and not the other way around.

The puzzling part of what the countries and people who won WW2 did based on their hopes for a better future for the world is that it is anti-logic. Those countries and people who won WW2 knew that the security of one person is the foregone security of the other. They appointed themselves as the custodians of the world to maintain their control over global security. This indicates that they cared about the maintenance of their strength and stability. Yet at the same time, their action to go ahead and agree that all members of the human family be entitled to the realization of the full development of their human personality without that move affecting the hierarchical system of power that they have programmed is the real mystery. The countries and people who won WW2 reached the conclusion that the human personality is no longer a threat. This contradiction is what is anti-logic in what those people and countries who agreed that the world is better off if all peoples have the right to self-determination.

The most puzzling act of the countries and people who won WW2 is that they based their hopes for a better future for the world on a common program of purposes and principles. Those countries and people were aware that the world population was 2.5 billion inhabitants shortly after WWII. Those countries and people knew based on historical and real-time data that the fertility rate was going to be changing over time in different parts around the world. The United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs claims that the world population in 2014 exceeded seven billion. It is unclear how the countries and people who won World War II have planned for a future where, when the world population reaches 10 billion, everyone will be focused on achieving the full development of their

human personality so that this action won't destabilize the hierarchical system of power. In other words, all seven billion people would prioritize maintaining social order and gradually amassing material wealth on a cumulative basis. Even this action shouldn't disrupt the hierarchical power system that the countries and people who won WW2 established to ensure their strength and stability remain unchallengeable. This is because, as we said, those countries and people who won WW2 know that the world population is always on the rise. This statement also implies that the countries and people who won WW2, while formulating their common program of purposes and principles, did not randomly select those ambitious goals. The countries and people who won WW2 were certainly unaware that as population growth rates increased, individuals would seek to establish colonies on other planets to alleviate the tensions that such a population surge could create within the hierarchical power system they had established. The countries and people who won WW2 understood that even if the world population were to increase to five or ten times its current number, their efforts to freeze social space and accumulate material possessions for the purpose of fully developing human personality would not impact the hierarchical power system they had established.

Chess is an abstract strategy game that dates back nearly 1500 years. The objective of this game is to capture the opponent's pieces by placing them under an inescapable threat. The game can be won by the opponent's voluntary resignation, which typically occurs when too many pieces are lost or when the most powerful capture appears unavoidable. A game may also result in a draw.

In an abstract strategy game, it is the players' uncoerced and autonomous decision-making skills that determine the outcome. In other words, in games of this kind, luck plays a minimal role. Every move requires internal decision tree-style thinking and very high situational awareness. The play resembles a series of puzzles the players pose to each other. There is no hidden information and no non-deterministic elements.

Autonomy is a concept found in moral, political, and bioethical philosophy, which is understood to mean one who gives oneself one's

own law. Within this context, it is understood as being the capacity of a rational individual to make an informed, uncoerced decision.

A decision tree is a decision-making process that utilizes a tree-like structure to represent decisions and their possible consequences, including the outcomes of chance events, thereby facilitating the decision-making process. It is one way to display an algorithm. A chess game is a two-player game played on a board made of a 64-square grid. In a chess game

The first player has 20 different choices he could consider for his first move. There are 400 different positions possible after each player makes one move apiece. There are 72,084 positions possible after two moves apiece. There are more than 9 million positions possible after three moves each. There are 288+ billion different possible positions possible after four moves each.

In 1948, there were 2.5 billion people alive. The countries and people who won WW2 had allowed those 2.5 billion people to make moves aimed at the realization of the full development of their human personality not in a 64-square grid chess game but in reality.

The countries and people who won WW2 must have based their decision to allow 7 billion people to create their own laws, given that the potential actions of these individuals could potentially disrupt the hierarchical power structures established by these victorious nations, unless they focused their efforts on a single, well-protected strategy. Hence, they knew that regardless of what people do, they can never reach to dig them from under the bunker they fortified themselves under and expect that all people would be obliged to live in voluntary resignation. The reason it didn't matter to those countries and people who won WW2 when they would be working on the realization of the full development of their human personality and working on freezing social space and on accumulating material things on a cumulative basis. This action would not affect the hierarchical system of power they laid out.

As we said before, planning is the process of contemplating and organizing the activities required to achieve a desired goal. Let us

review how the world has been reorganized to enable the one move that the countries and people who won WW2 counted on to maintain the hierarchical system of power they laid out and ensure strength and stability consistent with their vision for a better future, as planned in their common program of purposes and principles.

The wave of insecurity that began to sweep the world after 1948 continues to gain strength, with no end in sight to predict the extent of its impact on human life. The wave of insecurity seems to gain more vitality as it uplifts more people. After less than a century of all members of the human family practicing living in greater freedom, as certain countries and peoples desired. The new social realm, which the countries and people who won WW2 want the entire human family to subscribe to, has begun to take root. Wealth has developed and begun to show in the hands of specific people more than others, but this situation is normal. Competition is the fundamental principle of this game.

This new project that the countries and people who won WWII embarked on wants the entire human family to subscribe to its common program of purposes and principles; its ideals are structured on productive work to create wealth. This new economic model is definitely not an economic system that could be understood easily, given how the two elements that people need to succeed when playing by its rule, social space and scientific knowledge, are variable and people's knowledge is not at par, so each person can have a fair chance.

It is possible that the countries and people who won WWII agreed to follow the rules because they were aware that their level of knowledge was significantly more advanced than what the poor countries and people they were decolonizing could ever achieve, thus posing no real competitive threat. But again, the countries and people who won WW2 are not to blame for the wave of insecurity that exists in the world, because it was not they who were unhappy with their social conditions

but the poor countries and people. The countries and people who won WW2 played a fair game, indeed.

The inequality we observe after 75 years of neoliberal capitalism, which the Universal Human Rights Declaration has facilitated, has allowed many individuals to fully develop their human potential. The first victim of this inequality continues to undermine the values and traditions that religion has nurtured throughout human history, as it increasingly seems that religious institutions are on the verge of collapse in all aspects of social life and governance. However, the case may be for anything that exists in reality. Capitalism, like anything else, has developed over the years. Currently, free trade and competition have reduced the value of all tangible and intangible objects exchanged to a decision-making process that is guided solely by financial leverage rather than social benefits, clearly aimed at maximizing gains. When the allocation of resources is focused solely on maximizing gains, all decision-making processes related to work, exchange, production, distribution, and consumption are transformed into mere instruments. This means that people start serving equally as nothing but instruments for production, exchange, distribution, and so forth, thus becoming like any financial leverage input in the process. In other words, even if those tools, goods, and services that are being produced exist solely to allow people to detect their existence and enrich their lives, the human worth is nil.

There are a number of views that can characterize this new technique of allowing the governance of the course of the earth's resources or the world economy to be based on free trade or neoliberal principles. In other words, it's allowing that each individual with his wealth dominate the productive force due to the weaker control of states that is forgone when free trade policies dominate. But what we cannot comprehend in this move that the countries and people who won WW2 took to invite every person of the entire family to be entitled to the realization of the full development of the human personality is how those same rich and powerful nations who won WW2 counted on controlling the implications of subjecting their own people to live on the basis of an economic system where the transactions of goods and services in it become liberal. This economic system weakens the control of states over citizens. The puzzling aspect of this situation is

that the countries and people who won WW2 understand that allowing the production, sale, and purchase of goods to be governed by individuals reduces government control. This approach causes a reduction in government interference and shifts the argument that posits that individual consent, either explicitly or tacitly, to surrender some of their freedom and submit to the authority of the government in exchange for protection of their remaining rights from a role played by the government to one the private sector or individuals would start to play. Those countries and people who won WW2 should have known that once governments lift regulations, privileges, tariffs, and subsidies in favor of privatization or a neoliberal or capitalist one, such an economic system gives rise to fiscal austerity, deregulation, and free trade. After World War II, the countries and people who emerged victorious wanted all members of society to collaborate in the economic field. It is no longer a single government or 1M or 100M people who are interconnected, doing business, but 7 billion. Currently, 7 billion people are engaged in creating goods and providing services based on private ownership, where the mode of production focuses on profit, leading to the freezing of social space and the accumulation of material wealth over time.

The starting point for most social contract theories is an examination of the human condition absent from any political order. Hence, when the aforesaid case prevails, individuals' actions become bound only by their personal power and conscience. This new way of perceiving the world is indeed an example of man's latest creation; hence, it lets all people choose the form of government under which they live. This phenomenon is because of how much it gives an individual weight to replace whatever he sees as an outdated thought process with one more modernized one. There is no doubt that this new way of thinking about the world significantly uplifts traditions and values by promoting a more rational thought and action process.

We cannot comprehend how the countries and people who won WW2 counted on controlling the implications of allowing their own people to become rational and destabilize their internal hierarchical system of power after inviting every person of the entire family to the realization of the full development of the human personality. Never mind the one they laid out to maintain through it their control over the countries and

people they decolonized and the people who were vanquished during WW2. This conclusion is because power is the ability to do what one wants, regardless of the will of others. From what we know after the two back-to-back world wars that were fought. The countries and people who won WW2 didn't change the economic or social system on whose basis citizens built relations with one another. The economic system continued to create a divide between winners and losers. Moreover, the people in those rich and powerful countries are, until now, divided into social classes. Let us say there is no right answer to how people measure social class in a given society. However, people are willing to come together and agree that it refers to a concept that groups people into hierarchical social categories, the most common being the upper, middle, and social classes.

People acquire power from two sources. Those sources are the natural world, which provides resources, and the human body, which reflects a person's deepening knowledge. The puzzling question that we cannot guess a rational answer to, no matter how much we try, is how the people in those rich and powerful countries counted on that as more and more of their citizens became rational. In other words, if the citizens in those rich and powerful nations are also working on widening their access to the full realization of the full development of their personality, the only way to reach this ambitious project that their leaders made them subscribe to is through a person widening his access to property, prestige, and power. Let us recall the citizens of the rich and powerful countries subscribe too to this common program of purposes and principles that was designed, and every member in the human family started practicing to realize the full development of the human personality. That's because the citizens in those rich and powerful nations are also grouped or structured based on the traditional social class concept and thus, like anyone else, are entitled to better standards of life.

Another question we were unable to answer rationally concerns the safeguards that citizens in those rich and powerful countries have implemented to address the influx of individuals seeking power after their leaders declared that all members of the human family are entitled to the full development of their human personality. Precisely what we couldn't figure out is what kind of safeguards the people in

those rich and powerful countries agreed that every member of their kin is entitled to for a better standard of life. This move wouldn't be a motive to upheave the structures, institutions, and practices along with creeds or ideals in those rich and powerful nations when each citizen begins to want to secure observance of his right. Another question we were unable to answer is how the teaching and education regarding those common standards of achievement become ingrained in the minds of the people from rich and powerful nations. Those same people will begin to secure increasingly effective recognition of the rights that the Universal Declaration of Human Rights entitles each of them to possess. This teaching and education will preserve the values and traditions, including the rule of law, that the people in those rich and powerful nations knew. This is because, based on our current understanding, the security of one person often comes at the expense of another, and when the rule of law is strong in any country, there is only one benefactor. This goal is what capitalism seeks, and that is to make sure that the rule of law thrives to make people live free from fear and want. When all members of the human family were invited to live free from fear and want, they were also encouraged to pursue the full development of their human personality. It was an open invitation to every member of the human family, allowing them to create social spaces and accumulate material wealth over time. Yet, capitalism and socialism are opposites of each other.

One of the major elective affinities that always boost market-driven capitalism is the rise of any rational legal authority. In the previous section, we said there was one move that the countries and people who won WW2 could have betted on so that no matter how much the world population rises and people work on freezing social space and on accumulating material things on a cumulative basis, its outcome wouldn't shake the hierarchical system of power that the people who voted themselves as custodians of the world bunkered under, thus not destabilizing their strength and stability. Did the countries and people who won WW2 bet on their financial supremacy for the establishment of the permanent system of general security in the world? Evidently, this supremacy is not monetary but rather mental. It is technological supremacy. This conclusion is because only technological supremacy, besides the intervention of a supernatural force, is now able to bring man back into a state of nature where the legitimacy of the authority of

the state would be only to see that the rule of law is strong and functional.

Could the people in the rich and powerful countries who decided that all members of the human family should live free from fear and were so noble and humble to the extent of accepting shoe shiners, farmers, laborers, merchants, cleaners, presidents, kings, doctors, astronauts, teachers, and so forth all be entitled to the realization of the full development of their personalities "with respect for the principles of equal rights"? They believed that by using their technological supremacy, they had taken on the role of custodians responsible for maintaining global security. In partnership with their technological supremacy, they could ensure that people would reach a life free from fear and want and, on this basis, formulate their hopes for a better future for the world.

Certainly, there is no act more noble and genuine than a human being could perform in their lifetime than what the countries and people who won WWII agreed to regarding the entitlement of all members of the human family to the full development of their personalities.

By no means is any human being perfect. The concerns of the countries and people who won WW2 over allowing other countries and people access to nuclear energy are legitimate. The access by any country or people to nuclear energy destabilizes the strength and stability of the countries and people who were victors at the end of WW2. In fact, we support a total ban on all forms of nuclear energy to prevent any nation from producing weapons of mass destruction. Moreover, since the Bible claims that every inclination of the human heart is evil from childhood, the hearts of the people in the victorious countries after WW2 are no different. Let us next join our voices with those of other social theorists who have argued against modernization by demonstrating the potential consequences if people's dependency on technology continues to deepen as it currently is. What could be awaiting the countries and people who were victors at the end of WW2?

After people from all parts of the world fought in one of the deadliest wars in history, they acknowledged that their disregard and contempt for human rights had resulted in the barbarous acts they exhibited. They agreed that all members of the human family should live free from any fear. The countries and peoples who emerged victorious after the Second World War ended all forms of colonization and granted the right to self-rule to the countries and peoples they had decolonized, including those they had defeated during the war.

The consequence of this unprecedented noble act, which the countries and people who won the second world war wanted to take place on earth and which is without any doubt a milestone in the history of human rights, has now created a situation where there are presently seven billion people who are pushing to understand themselves, the world they live in, and their relations to the world and each other. It is still premature to judge how the countries and people who won the Second World War united all the people under a new world order and created the Global Council to serve as a shop stop to promote international cooperation and human rights. To prevent discrimination and mistreatment across the globe, their efforts are expected to be successful.

However, if there is any way to describe the current state of human life since the countries and people who won the Second World War liberated others, it would be through this lens. Perhaps this story appears in the Bible when it is said that God came down on the people whom he saw building themselves a city with a tower that reaches to the heavens. The story says that God confused their language so they would not understand each other. We cannot think of any other way to

describe how people looked confused and stopped being able to understand each other after everyone everywhere began to work on freezing social space and on accumulating material things on a cumulative basis, so he reached the realization of the full development of his human personality. Many people offer many reasons to explain the causes of people's confusion. Few people agree that people's increased ability to distinguish between good and evil could be causing this deliberate disregard for peace and security.

Whether the intention of the countries and people who won the Second World War and who proposed that all members of the human family should work together to promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom was to allow the people in those rich and powerful countries the space they would need to widen their propensity even further or to genuinely make people stop continuing to live in fear and want. By promoting the idea that everyone has the right to means of production and is entitled to the protection of the moral and material interests resulting from their scientific contributions, as stated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, individuals can pursue the full development of their human personality. The challenge of giving every person the right to exist is that more people are becoming knowledgeable. More and more knowledge would make more and more people become bound by their personal power and conscience. This situation will arise because wealth undermines political order, making it increasingly easy for individuals to act according to their own desires, regardless of the wishes of others.

Let us say there is no one right answer to how people see the difference between needs and wants. However, there is a significant difference between wanting something and wishing to have it while being able to live without it. This distinction is as compared to when someone needs something, and he needs to have it. It is essential, and a person cannot live without it. Indeed, the decision made by the countries and people who won the Second World War to allow every member of the human family to access what they want and need in life is priceless. But if it were that simple. The countries and people who won the Second World War would not have agreed to vote for themselves to become the custodians of global security. The countries

and people who won the Second World War would have allowed the maintenance of global security to be contested. It is unclear to us what specific issues need further investigation, and we plan to continue our inquiry until we are satisfied with our findings. This is knowing on what basis those countries and people who won the second world war developed the belief that the human personality has become no longer a threat to destabilize the hierarchical system of power they laid out to let them go ahead and be so overconfident that the countries and people whom they decolonized and the people who were their victors following the second world war confrontation wouldn't be challenging them to strip away from under their nose the hierarchical system of power they laid out.

As crazy as it may sound, we consider that those countries and people who won the Second World War shouldn't have ended decolonization. This is because the countries and people who won the Second World War, despite their desire for freedom for all members of the human family, should have recognized that their decision to free people is an unprecedented act in world history. People living in rich and powerful countries understand that everything is relative; even when their forefathers lacked the power that their current rulers possess, they still managed to free themselves from subjugation, tyranny, domination, and exploitation by those who had instilled fear and want in their ancestors. And so, what we want to know is how those countries and people who won the Second World War reached the decision that made them perceive that humans are no longer a threat so as to go ahead and free all people. This is because we have reason to believe that God confused their human ingenuity, making them thus unable to understand each other when they were preparing their war aims. The programmed aptitude to reason that all humans are programmed with one is not an aptitude that can distinguish between good and evil as people perceive it. This is because the programmed aptitude to reason that all humans are programmed with one is an aptitude that can distinguish between good and evil. Countries and peoples that won the Second World War should not have decolonized other countries or peoples, nor should they have appointed themselves as custodians of global security.

Therefore, in the remaining sections of our work. We plan to focus on trying to understand what the common program of purposes and principles that the countries and people who won the second world war counted on once put into practice could be to shuttle their citizens, the people who they decolonized, and the people who were their victors following the second world war to live free from fear and want. In other words, we will show what the human ingenuity of those people who hail from those rich and powerful nations may have counted on to arm this aptitude to maintain the hierarchical system of power that was laid out at the end of WWII to the extent that it didn't matter to this aptitude, according to the perception and belief that it is working, how much people freeze social space and accumulate material things on a cumulative basis, or desire to pursue the full development of their human personality. We want to understand whether one nation can allow another nation to produce airplane parts without giving the assembly know-how. Let's avoid discussing whether the people of another nation should know about airplanes, which people use to improve their mobility. This action will maintain the stability and strength of any individual, company, or country that desires to spot improvement in the world. This is especially true if the individual, company, or country seeking to improve the world has appointed itself as the custodian of global security. This is because of what we know. Until now, people have not managed to master how to emphasize the importance of the mind over the relative unimportance of the human body. We want to find out how all humans can create a state of life after WWII's winners wanted everyone to be one happy family. This conclusion is because of what we know. No person can claim that he was called upon to spot improvement in the world, never mind in the life of another human being, especially when the improvement involves something that is essential for a person to have because he cannot live without it, and the person who is offering this improvement has made his thing a commodity and locked away its secrets when needed.

We plan to explore whether it is possible that when a person identifies an improvement and either locks away its secrets or turns it into a commodity, the security gained by one person results in the loss of security for another. Therefore, when humans finish with removing all values and traditions, we reach a situation where we would have two

realms. One realm has people hiding secrets from others. On the other hand, there is the realm of people who are pursuing the full development of their human personalities. In other words, they desire nothing less than the secrets that people are keeping hidden. Both groups of people—those who are locking away things that others want and those who believe they need what is being locked away—would strive to establish political and ethical truths in order to achieve practical results for the greater well-being of society. This is because, once again, from what we can tell and know. People are focused on identifying and creating things that separate the human body from its intrinsic connection to nature, which in turn allows more time for human awareness to recognize this separation. And so, from what we know, people are unable to let the world of the senses prevail over the world of ideas. If that were the case, humans would not need to rely on any form of social contract to uphold the rule of law among themselves. There is a very good chance that people could be working on ending this second life cycle of existence faster than they expect to usher in a third.

Until recently, only two means of production resided on earth. Those two means were the natural system and people. Recently, humans have invited new guests. The new guests are a much more powerful mode of production than the natural system or people are. The new guests that people have invited include robots, artificial beings, and various types of machines that are increasingly integrating into human society. The nicest thing about those new guests that humans invited to live on earth is their lack of complaints, their rarity of sickness, and their superior efficiency compared to humans.

Both real and artificial humans rely on nature's production means, which they can't control. To allow everyone to have access to better standards of life, what the world is short of is not enough human ingenuity or enough artificial human beings but enough social space and resources so people can crank out artificial beings, cars, washing machines, etc. People want to live the good life and to enable each one to freeze the social space and to accumulate the material things that the person thinks satisfy the full development of his human personality. How the countries and people who won the Second World War plan on controlling the “cans of worms” that their good intentions could have stirred in the world after they tumbled the barrier on whose basis people were grouped into societies is a big challenge and the center focus of this work. People can tell that the new guests they've invited into their homes have a say in everything they do. The more people detect their existence, the more this phenomenon pushes people to want to distance their human bodies from being an intrinsic component of nature.

There is nothing wrong with letting people have access to cars, washing machines, computers, airplanes, and so forth. The technological breakthrough and industrial progress that people are pleased to use and are enchanted with how it is transforming their lives and are all busy producing more to make everyone feel satisfied and motivated is encouraging. However, this idea assumes that improving people's access to material possessions aligns with the principles of the Declaration of Human Rights, which states that individuals should interact with one another based on these rights. This approach makes people detect their existence faster. The more people detect their existence, the more people want to exploit material things to produce the goods they could use to realize the full development of their human personality through their human ingenuity. Human ingenuity serves as a means of production and demonstrates aptitude. The more people produce equipment and machinery and make it available, the more they realize the full development of their human personalities. The more people demand the right to live in greater freedom. This right is stipulated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. As people increasingly demand the right to live in greater freedom, they also distance themselves from their human bodies, which are intrinsically part of nature, due to the obligations imposed by the tools they use. Likewise, whether people like it or not, the financialization of the world makes it so that any job that can be automated is by default absorbed by the new guests that people invited and not the real people. The fundamental question can be reduced to a simple yes or no answer: Could people from rich and poor countries alike continue to be immersed in their belief that everyone is going to have the right to a fair shot at an opportunity to define his existence and to enrich his life? Can people ignore such beliefs as long as they continue to function on the principle of freezing social space, accumulating material possessions, and inviting alien beings to cohabit with real humans on Earth? The likelihood of people continuing to displace each other as they have been doing since time immemorial would continue. Humans are more about production, and when the earth was only inhabited by them, they never learned to get along. Now that humans have invited new guests to earth, they can take jobs from real people, but their main job is to ensure that people don't displace each other easily.

Evidently, the biggest advantage of swapping real humans with artificial beings is that such a move distances the real humans from being a threat when artificial beings do all the work and distances the real humans from having any direct interface with how the real natural elements work. The artificial beings convert the real humans into being only operators. Moreover, the neoliberal approach to business and the deliberate deregulation facilitated by capitalism can deliver masked agendas that encourage collaboration among countries and people in the economic field, allowing the new guests invited by humans to cohabit and live on Earth to be better integrated (i.e., machinery).

Regardless of whether the world is inhabited by 2 people or 200 billion, the ability of this economic system to create a leisured class has been achieved by distancing people from the means of production, including both knowledge and material resources, since the day people began making, supplying, and distributing goods or services for profit. Alien subjugation, exploitation, and domination denied the countries and people who were colonized not access to cars, washing machines, computers, airplanes, and so forth, but rather self-determination, political autonomy, and the right to develop their own societies and economies. What colonization allowed is the people who distanced themselves from continuing to be an intrinsic part of nature continuing with doing what they have swapped the purpose of their human life for doing (i.e., proving their existence).

We can't understand that even if people turn the earth into a construction site, like refurbishing existing progress at the cost of clean energy, it won't create jobs or wealth to free more people from fear and want. If this option will not but distance more people away from fulfilling the direct interface that they are supposed to exercise with nature, to give this task to more artificial beings to do it on their behalf. The marginalization of the human body in establishing a direct interface with nature increases human awareness of its existence. Can the refurbishing of the existing progress that exists at the expense of the search to create jobs for the real humans prompt peace and security on earth or continue to plunge humans in more new waves of insecurity, as has been the case since the dawn of time? This is because what so far has changed from before and after 1948 to etch this second life cycle closer to reaching its end or to usher in a new cycle of

existence is that more people started to distance themselves from continuing to be an intrinsic part of nature in favor of desiring to live the good life.

In other words, the body of knowledge that people acquired and the awareness of the tools and instruments that humans produced. Its impact was to let artificial beings be responsible for ensuring these actions, rather than improving how people benefit from this advanced knowledge to sustain their survival needs. Moreover, what changed from before and after the two World Wars is not human knowledge on how to sustain the survival needs on equal rights principles. The change is that an increasing number of people are becoming dependent on artificial beings to take responsibility for ensuring how real humans meet their survival needs and fulfill their earthly desires. Those people are now depending more and more on artificial beings to carry out the role that the intelligent design programmed human ingenuity to help the human body achieve to sustain its survival. The coming together of people to unite and to collaborate economically made people recognize only their inalienable right to have access to the elements required to enable their own human ingenuity to reach and fulfill the realization of its full development and to want to arrive at having access to those elements on equal rights principles. Whether all members of the human family learn how to produce a spoon, or only one person does, even if that person keeps this knowledge a secret, is a crucial question. Anytime a person uses a tool to help meet their survival needs or satisfy their earthly desires, it reflects the application of human ingenuity. The real question is how human ingenuity distanced itself from continuing to train on protecting the human body against vulnerability when the spoon is taken away. This is because all people could arrive at acquiring, managing, and distributing the earth's resources on equal rights principles. There wouldn't have been a reason for humans to have invented religion and later come together to create this latest global council.

As we said earlier, we are uninterested in whether the financialization of the world overtakes religion and how capitalism and modernization can perhaps tumble the religious creeds, practices, and institutions on whose basis humans sought to split the governance of the world. We do not care what ideals guide people in ruling the world or who rules

it. We just think this idea was born to make sure that no person is left behind and that everyone works to own property, rest and leisure, and pursue a standard of living adequate for the health and well-being of the individual and his family. This social realm is something that people cannot live with on the basis of epistemology.

This is because there are two ways that humans can use to triumph over the weakness of their will: One of those methods is either staying away from any knowledge (God's creed) or using knowledge to do it (i.e., human reasoning). The method that humans propose to overcome the weakness of the will focuses on modernizing individuals. Modernization limits human actions and knowledge.

Another difference between the two methods is that the one proposed by God ensures that all members of the human family have equal knowledge. This is because all members of the human family wouldn't be applying their human ingenuity to produce any knowledge, like cars, airplanes, computers, etc., and people would be dedicated to sustaining their survival needs using their own human bodies. The method the human reason wants people to use distances human ingenuity from continuing to build real experience on how to sustain the human body and subcontracts this knowledge that the human ingenuity is initially supposed to be responsible for facilitating for the human body so artificial beings carry out this task. The only difference is that based on the method that God proposed, human ingenuity cannot find itself homeless if modernization is taken away. The method humans want people to pursue makes human ingenuity become dependent on a hierarchical system of power because people who subscribe to it let artificial beings or modernization guide how they sustain their survival needs and/or satiate their earthly desires. This path cannot help but pass through other people all the time.

To give an example, God's credo wants a person to do his movement walking so that in case on the way the person crosses a snake, he would learn how to deal with such a situation. The way human reason wants people to accomplish this task of going from one place to the next is to get it done while riding in a car and to let this experience of how to react if faced off with a snake be from reading about it in books or to decide on it in the moment. Now, people are working on allowing

them to go from one place to the next in driverless cars. This progress doesn't continue to make people remain uneducated about how to deal with a snake when faced with one in a real-life situation. When people start riding in driverless cars, this would mean that humans have agreed to stop paying attention to what the landmarks on the road look like so that, in case the car stalls, they would know how to get to their destination. As can be seen, both methods, the one God proposed and the one human reasoning wants people to follow, distance humans from knowledge because, in the case of both methods, a person stops relying on his human ingenuity to build resilience for the body.

As we just said, we would rather avoid highlighting the positive or negative implications of distancing from the human ingenuity of building resilience. As we said before, many political theorists like Karl Marx, Max Weber, and so forth treated this topic. We aim to understand how countries and people preparing for the war before WW2 motivated thoughts and actions to pursue rational practices; this attempt makes it easier for people to agree to triumph over the weakness of their will and to seek to arrive at political and ethical truths. There are two ways for all humans to reach this state of life. One way is through the way God proposed, by not knowing good or evil (or knowledge), and the other is through what human reasoning proposed, which lets knowledge dictate how people manage to emphasize the importance of the mind over the relative unimportance of the human body. If people agreed to go along with the option that lets their actions to sustain their survival needs and to satiate their earthly desires pass through modernization, it would mean that it would have to pass through people at all times. What we are interested in knowing is how people are hoping to stop modernization (or artificial beings) from competing with the human body when the former can control the human body and mind and is more agile and doesn't require time to rest and recuperate.

Most importantly, what we want to understand is how the countries and people who were counting on their scientific supremacy in WWII were helping them to continue to impose themselves as the custodians of the permanent system of general security in the world. This is because scientific supremacy is the only armament they can be holding in their hands to ensure they are not worried about people challenging

them on this role after they agreed that all people in the world should be freed. I want to understand how the countries and people involved in WWII were able to control both the physical and mental aspects to prevent any individual from posing a threat. This method helps them achieve their goal of maintaining strong control over the global security system, which in turn makes peace and stability more static.

I want to understand how the countries and people who won WW2, as well as those who colonized other nations and subjected many individuals to foreign domination and exploitation before the war, managed to achieve their goals. Later, the same countries and people who won WW2 reached the conclusion that colonization impedes the promotion of world peace and, for this reason, freed people. Those same rich and powerful countries concluded that the modernization they are implementing within their borders will not compete with their citizens or disrupt their internal power hierarchies once those citizens fully realize their potential. In other words, the shakeup and upheaval created will dismantle their custodianship role in the permanent global security system. The citizens of the countries that won WWII would cause the collapse of their leaders' plans. This collapsing action would be the alien beings that the countries and people who won WW2 invited to live among them, which would prompt real humans to rebel against them. The rebellion would result from the subjugation, domination, and exploitation imposed by the artificial beings on the people's freedom, leading them to desire liberation from living under the rule of these artificial entities. I want to know how the rich and powerful feel about the situation, since they can do as they please. The powerful people believe that both the artificial beings and the real humans are going to let them continue to control and have power over the others and use their power to their own benefit, when they very well know that the security of one person is the forgone security of the other, and it is knowledge that makes people reach this awareness.

People from all walks of life make different predictions about how the future state of human life could look as new artificial beings continue to integrate into society and increasingly take over tasks that humans were supposedly programmed to perform on Earth. The question of knowing if people will continue to inject new people at an accelerated rate to compete in this for-profit mode of production approach that humans have now invited artificial beings to split with them when perhaps their human bodies were programmed supposedly to do. It is still unknown how real humans and artificial beings will interact with each other.

History is the tool that people use to understand change and to explain how our current reality came to be. If the objective of all modernization is to achieve global security and improve conditions by utilizing scientific advancements, we can evaluate how the British people are progressing towards this goal.

Historians claim that the Industrial Revolution began between 1760 and 1830, and that Great Britain was the pioneer of this transformative period in history. The Victorian era of British history was the period of Queen Victoria's reign from 1837 until her death in 1901. Historians claim that during the Victorian era the national income grew to a record high as a result of what industrialization and trade facilitated. The British people undoubtedly made efforts to prevent the Victorian Era from ending, and since this era ended, the British people have continued transforming to re-enjoy the same prosperity that this empire had known.

The British Empire provided the legal and cultural foundation for the technological breakthroughs that the world now experiences. After more than 250 years of the British people's efforts to replace manual labor with mechanized mass production and craftsmen's labor with assembly lines,. All are ways to distance the human body from continuing to be an intrinsic part of nature. We should start to see change in the way the British people are living in complete freedom from fear and want. The actions of the people of this nation should begin to reflect a greater understanding of themselves and their identities. The British people should be able to demonstrate that they can now exhibit political and ethical truths. This is only true if we acknowledge that most of the discoveries and innovations known to people were made possible by Great Britain, which served as a pillar in bringing the world to its current state of development.

We have no way of knowing if the people of Great Britain are now dwelling in safety after their forefathers afforded them the means to start to distance themselves from continuing to be an intrinsic part of nature and/or to swap manual labor for mechanized ones. Judging from a descriptive point of view, the picture seems to be more mixed than politicians and commentators suggest. This country doesn't appear to maintain the same power that it enjoyed before the collapse of the British imperial power. In effect, for a country that was once an empire, its current leaders give the impression they are working on re-finding this country and its people in the international arena and at home. The indecisiveness that this country exhibits to know on which geopolitical turf to stand is a sign that its political or social situation is in deep trouble and that the might that the people of this country lived is part of the past. The impact of distancing the people of Great Britain from continuing to be an intrinsic part of nature has not helped this country know how to arrive at ethical and political truths any better than any other people. The challenge of British society is what it is like in any other society today in the world. It is made up of violent crime, teenage delinquency, drug abuse, family breakdown, welfare dependency, poor urban environments, educational failure, poverty, loss of traditional values, dysfunctional families, teenage pregnancy, and children who kill.

People assign the word "freedom" many meanings. In this work, freedom refers to the natural right of people to interact with the natural world and its objects without feeling that a person's actions are being surveyed even when he or she is not breaking the law. David Davis estimates that London has one CCTV camera for every 14 residents. We have no way of knowing whether the British people require all those CCTV cameras to keep live records of their movements for historical data or to keep national heritage memorabilia, especially since people stopped writing on paperbacks or the people of this nation are by nature conflictive due to the role they have had in the last two World Wars. If people who are visiting from other countries are not motivating the behavior of the people who live in this country to become less tolerant of peace and security, then The only other reason that we think could have required installing so many CCTV cameras in the city is due to how people are not able to manage to triumph over the weakness of their will much more than in previous years. This interaction weakness is, of course, due to a reason. We don't think this reason has to do with the ability of the British government to maintain a tight grip on its own people to maintain peace and security. Let us recall that most countries and people are living in larger freedom because they are all practicing the common principles and programs that this empire laid out as war aims after WW2.

We consider the real reason for the failure of the British government to achieve practical results for the greater well-being of its people to be a pure planning oversight. Industrialization didn't improve peace and security within their national territories. In fact, we consider that when the leaders of the British people were planning what the World War 2 aims would be. Those leaders did not take into account how more knowledge in the hands of their own citizens was going to be changing people to be like, "Never mind the people of the countries they decolonized." Their leaders didn't factor in that their citizens are also humans and that more and more of their own people start distancing themselves from interacting with the natural world to keep their human awareness following the body in favor of the opposite. There is nothing that human awareness can do afterwards other than detect its existence. In a world that practices letting all members of the human family reach and realize the full development of their personalities. There is nothing that human awareness can do but dismantle and

reorganize its own institutions, since this aptitude has already secularized values and tradition in favor of letting technology and machines be in charge of how the human body could sustain survival needs. Of course, outsourcing and offshoring changed the cultural traditions and values of countries, and people decolonized to ensure the reinjection of new jobs continuously needed to replace the ones that machines and automation eliminated in their societies.

Living in larger freedom from fear and want is a state that we define as being one whereby humans do not return to their state of nature, where a person feels that he has unlimited natural freedoms, including the right to all things. In this work we do not consider making law enforcement officers wear body cameras while exercising their duties or all citizens tape their interactions with law enforcement officers and with each other so that the world is on its way to becoming a better place.

Indeed, we have no knowledge if living in larger freedom is a state whereby whenever people start to record the movement of each other, this new state of mind creates a behavioral motivator to condition people to stop to plunder, rape, or murder or if the world is on its way to becoming safer. The social realm worldwide was initially focused on restricting social space and prioritizing the accumulation of material possessions before the installation of CCTV cameras began. The CCTV cameras that governments are installing must be intended to monitor and control the movement of citizens to ensure that everyone acts according to the will of others. The state of human life in the world has not stopped being nasty, poor, solitary, brutish, and short from before and after people began to wear body cameras. The rich and powerful countries still maintain the highest rate of incarceration in the world. In some rich and powerful countries, the legalization of certain substances for citizens occurred because it became impossible to incarcerate the large number of users who would otherwise be locked up if the use of those substances remained illegal.

In effect, peace and security remain very low despite the large number of CCTV cameras that many countries have already installed. Individuals choose how they want to interact with objects, either by adhering to the limitations set by CCTV cameras or by living under

incarceration while still being monitored. On one hand, the individual could choose to continue living within the limitations set by CCTV cameras, while on the other hand, they could opt for incarceration, which is also subject to surveillance. We could say that an individual has to choose either method or form to structure their own interaction with objects in today's world. The large number of incarcerated people that is going on in the rich and powerful countries in particular is inducing two social realms that a person could live within: their rules or boundaries. One in which the government reaches to exercise full power over the individual (mind) due to its upgraded ability under one realm to detect any delinquency act and to strip away from the individual access to freedom or to any decision-making process that enables him to interact with material things based on his free will. The other realm allows individuals to collect and accumulate material possessions based on their free will, within the rule of law. If the prison system is allowed to be coed, we could say that the two social realms that the rich nations are setting up have become alike.

The real question is why people in the rich and powerful countries who claim the status of wealth, progress, opportunities, and the capacity to train and educate need to have CCTV cameras monitoring the movement of their citizens. Are all the CCTV cameras being installed by countries a result of the need to absorb the manpower freed by machine-based manufacturing? People are using all this freed manpower to produce and install cameras that enable them to survey each other.

We have reason to believe that human ingenuity is pushing for people interactions to be monitored and surveyed deliberately, and it is for a reason totally unrelated to improving capitalism, modernization, or secularization in the world. We believe that human ingenuity aims to impose an emphasis on controlling the human body and mind because it recognizes that humans would struggle to distinguish between good and evil if left to their own reasoning. Humans, as we said, are unable to prevail over the weakness of their will because knowledge makes the world of the senses powerless. Let us first examine whether human ingenuity can successfully unite people under a single world government, as it desires, and whether it has influenced world leaders to pursue this goal through WW2.

All people need water, food, and air to survive. Before people started using tools to help them with sustaining their survival needs, humans were surviving as an intrinsic component of nature. As the knowledge of people was growing and their detection of their existence was showing them that there were tasks that basic tools could achieve much faster than them continuing with using their hands. Humans recognized how tools were increasing productivity. However, each time people managed to come up with a new tool, there were two means of production that were making whatever humans were producing possible. Those two means of production were the raw material that the natural world provided and the engineering that humans brought to the table. Both of those two means of production complemented each other; hence, their production was calibrated by the intelligent design that both succumbed to its rules. Intelligent design spread the earth's abundance and so made human craftsmanship possible. Trading is a customary course of action that is not accidental that all humans are required to deal with throughout their lives.

Instead of humans going ahead and the growing complexity of human societies, which cannot be but based on trading or bartering, drawing people to engineer a social order that pushes people to do the right thing even when they genuinely know that the decision that they are making is not in their best interests. In other words, people picking a social order whereby they would only do the right thing even when the perceived personal costs seemed to outweigh the benefits. The knowledge that people were gaining as their detection of their existence was growing made them motivate the awareness that they were deriving to reduce the direct interface of their human body with the rest of the natural elements, which they form an intrinsic part

together to insert in between a medium that does the relay between the two.

Evidently, as people were realizing that human choices are motivated by the desire for happiness due to all that the tools were facilitating to distance the human body from maintaining the direct contact with the natural elements as per the way the intelligent design intended it to continually be doing. The pre-programmed aptitude to reason of humans pushed the human body to pursue how to widen the gap between the two. In other words, how to let tools attain what the body needs to survive to free it to do what the human awareness wants.

Humans' knowledge and unescapable need to trade or barter prompted division of labor due to the two elements that are required in the crafting of any tool, i.e., raw material and workmanship, and a person can only possess both if he widens his propensity. This situation fomented the rise of a leisured upper class. Instead of humans coming together to put a limit on how much their own human body can be distanced from maintaining its required direct interface with the rest of the natural elements, which humans form an intrinsic part of together. In order among many other reasons not to widen the gap between the human body and the natural elements. The awareness that people were gaining as they were distancing themselves from continuing to be an intrinsic part of nature was also serving them to find new ways to swap their existential reality into becoming one that focuses on how to produce more tools. The main aim is to shift the relationship that the human body is supposed to continuously be maintaining with nature from being a direct contact (to carry out labor-intensive tasks, thus human awareness follows the human body). Humans swapped this relationship that was based on a labor-intensive principle into becoming a lightweight relationship whereby the body follows human awareness.

It is evident that as humans began the process of distancing themselves more and more from continuing to be an intrinsic part of nature, this signified that such a swap or trade gives rise to reorganizing the human purpose. However, the reorganization that humans have not been able to triumph over since the date when they swapped being an intrinsic

part of nature in favor of letting tools do the work on their behalf has been how their hierarchical order should be organized.

We have no way of knowing whether God lived or not. The story of the creation in the Old Testament of the Bible claims that man was created in the image of God (Genesis 1:26). We don't know if this means that God was also a supernatural force with flesh. We know that Jesus Christ, who claimed to be the only son of God, was made of flesh. Jesus Christ and the supernatural force that he claimed sent him both proposed a credo that was identical in how humans need to interact with objects, which contrasts totally with the credo that humans picked to cluster their interaction on its basis.

The New Testament of the Bible reports an account in which Jesus was asked by a young man about what he should do to win eternal life. The Bible reports that Christ replied by telling the young man to go ahead and to give away all his possessions. We don't think Jesus Christ was suggesting to this young man to go ahead and give all the material things so he could create a role play with a poor person to win eternal life. We think Jesus Christ was suggesting that when a person distances himself from material things or knowledge, he wouldn't die as per the credo that appears in the Old Testament of the Bible and also suggests humans do.

We have no way of knowing what the rich man to whom Jesus was speaking understood from this parable, nor the people who were also listening, nor the disciples who were preaching Christianity.

What we know is that human ingenuity managed through religion to make lawful what God, his son, and all the angels, saints, messengers, prophets, and so forth prohibited. In other words, man maybe invented and used religion to give himself rights to do the opposite of what God or his only son suggested people do. Religion managed to distance humans from continuing to be living as per what this credo that exists in the Bible commands people not do, and that is differentiating between good and evil. Evidently, those who preach the word of God and manage God's institutions and interests on earth qualify from whatever science manages to come up with after humans swapped the purpose of human life from being one to remain as an intrinsic part of

nature in favor of seeking significance and immortality from the potential of human ingenuity instead.

The religious institutions managed a second time from spreading a social realm that God sent his only son and that he accepted to be crucified as a sacrifice for the forgiveness of humans' sin so people continue to seek significance and immortality in their achievements. In doing so, what the religious institutions were doing was nothing but making it more lawful that humans continue to distance their bodies from continuing to remain as an intrinsic part of nature. In other words, the religious institutions managed to focus this crucifixion exercise to represent this sin-washing exercise instead of interpreting it to mean bringing closer the human body to be in harmony with the natural world. Thus, every time humans were producing a new tool that distances the human body from continuing to remain as an intrinsic part of nature. The people whose own knowledge was moving them from maintaining a horizontal connection with nature. Those were people who needed to find themselves on the hierarchical reorganizational scheme. The problem is that all the people who have preferred to distance themselves from continuing to be an intrinsic part of nature in order to count themselves among those who are finding it better to be part of the cluster of people who think that it is when a person is on this vertical line where he detects his existence better.

Indeed, the human ingenuities of the people who drafted the Universal Declaration of Human Rights as a road map so people are entitled to the realization of the full development of their human personality; they were not integrating any plans that take into account letting people who converted to Christianity continue to win any eternal life, given that the Human Rights Declaration suggests the total opposite of what Christ was preaching people do. There is no doubt after less than a century of practicing what the Universal Declaration of Human Rights wants all members of the human family to know about. This is that at their disposal there is a framework that makes it lawful that every person is entitled to the right to own property, the right to rest and leisure, and the right to a standard of living adequate for the health and well-being of the individual and of his family.

Surely this new way of thinking about the world, which is noble and rational without any doubt, contradicts how Jesus Christ, who claimed to be the son of God, and his disciples were preaching people should live on earth when they were spreading Christianity. Certainly, Christ has agreed with his noble gesture to be crucified for the forgiveness of the sins of all the people so everyone of us can continue to disobey the ideals that he was preaching to give us all a chance to take advantage of the Declaration. We think the challenge that we all have to come together to agree on how to resolve is only how we all manage to agree on how the earth's resources could be acquired, managed, and distributed to have them both on earth and in heaven.

It appears as if the real challenge presently is not finding enough people to work the earth and to take care of it. The real challenge is how to stop all the people after the Second World War from leaving the decision over why God created poor people to him alone. This also includes spotting improvement in the world to eradicate poverty. Unless God happens to have commissioned countries and people to spot improvement in the world. It looks as if the more good hearts people have, the more they spot improvement that distances the human body from being an intrinsic part of nature. The more and more this action contaminates people's minds so they stop wanting to be an intrinsic part of nature in favor of desiring to detach themselves, the more this situation we think is going to make peace and security dynamic.

In the broadest sense, we can say the ambition of people to subscribe to a common program of purposes and principles as per the one all humans decided to unite around at the end of WW2 to defend life, liberty, independence, and religious freedom and to preserve human rights and justice in all lands is not something new. Christ and his disciple started preaching to people a long time ago. Let us review how their own thinking about the world's modernization has transformed the ideals that they were preaching.

When the disciples of Jesus Christ began to spread Christianity, Peter, one of Jesus' disciples, travelled to Rome in the 1st century to evangelize, and he formed a significant early Christian community of believers there. The word "Christian" refers to all believers in Jesus

Christ. The ecclesiastical administration that Peter set up in Rome grew, and its jurisdiction serves as the central point of reference for the Catholic Church everywhere until now. This central point of reference is called the Holy See. The word "see" is a Latin term and denotes "seat." The people who pursue a cultural system of behaviors and practices that relate to Christian fellowship or denomination describe themselves as Catholic. The word "catholic" comes from the Greek language and is a combination of the Greek words "κατά" meaning "about" and "ὅλος" meaning "whole." In the context of Christian ecclesiology, the term "catholic" means "universal" or "on the whole" or "according to the whole." Universalism refers to a religious, theological, and philosophical concept with universal application or applicability. In metaphysics, "universal" refers to what particular things have in common, namely characteristics or qualities. The Holy See is responsible for the governance of all the Catholics, or the different Catholic churches.

The Holy See is one religious ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the many Christian administrative religious structures that exist in the world. The Holy See began to establish relations with sovereign states in the 15th century. Maybe the other religion that existed during the 15th century didn't require having foreign relations set up as the Holy See saw necessary then. Currently, the Holy See has diplomatic relations established with most of the sovereign states that are members of the United Nations.

The Holy See made arrangements so the Italian government at the turn of the previous century granted this religious faith a terrain so it could be designated as an independent state. It is called the Vatican. We suppose that it would have been very difficult for the Holy See as other religions were competing with the Christian faith that this religious ecclesiology could maintain its presence in those nations on the basis of preaching opposing faiths. The idea of setting up foreign relations to spread the Christian faith in those countries that were competing with the Christian cultural system of behaviors and practices was the only motive, because it is difficult to envisage that the ecclesiastical administration of the Holy See wanted to create a nation to practice international cooperation. Setting up an independent

state facilitates the Holy See to keep a very close eye on how this religion is progressing.

We don't know if the other currently existing religions have established elaborate foreign relations similar to those set up by the Holy See for managing its businesses and operations worldwide. Let us take the Holy See case.

The Holy See has been, as of the 15th century, trying to establish foreign relations to spread Christianity. We have no way of knowing how strong the Christian faith, values, traditions, and institutions are doing and if more converts are adopting this faith. But there is a good chance that the Holy See is going to need to change the sermons to take out all the parts on ethics due to how technology is registering more headway than religion in this area.

For example, we just reported how before Christ accepted that his life be sacrificed as a form of salvation for the sins of people so everyone everywhere who practices this faith continues to modernize. We mentioned how Jesus suggested that a person must give out and distance himself from all material things if he wants eternal life. However, we know very well that during another instance, a person was asked about what they shall do to inherit eternal life. Jesus replied, "What is written in the Law?" (Lk 10:25, 26); that's the Ten Commandments or the Law of Moses. We could be exaggerating a bit. But we think that very soon, even if a person intentionally now desires to steal, he or she is no longer able to get away as easily as before due to what technology prevents. We have no way of knowing if there is going to be very soon a need to rethink the idea of God and religion due to how much technology is going to be affecting reward, punishment, or resurrection in the Christian faith when stealing becomes a difficult task to do. Evidently, all the religions that believe in the existence of a relationship between ethics and reward, punishment, or resurrection are included.

Indeed, a good number of social theorists like Karl Marx, Max Weber, and Sigmund Freud have postulated that the modernization of societies would include a decline of religiosity. There have been theorists like Reinhold Niebuhr who have even argued that the secularization of

modern civilization results from human inability to adapt the broad ethical and spiritual needs of mankind to the increasingly fast advances of the physical sciences. Till now, the realism of the aforementioned social theorists clashed with the naïve views of investigators who believed that the social realm may be subject to the same investigation methods as the natural world. The general people consider the philosophical perspective that those social theorists developed to be just arguments because of their conviction about modernization and rationalization being better tenets of enlightenment.

The question we are keen to explore is how human ingenuity perceives the relationship between societal progress, particularly through modernization and rationalization. Modernization would not undermine human ingenuity or render the human body vulnerable. In other words, human ingenuity resides in the human body, and modernization controls the human body. How does human ingenuity view the increasing distance created by modernization between the human body and its intrinsic connection to nature? Human ingenuity will manage to preserve the human body. We just saw that humans, since their appearance on earth, have been maintaining close identification with religious values and institutions, which does nothing but bring people together. If modernization has enough power to diminish religion's authority in all aspects of social life and governance, it could challenge the behavioral norms that religion has established since the dawn of humanity. The real question is how human ingenuity believes that as modernization increasingly distances people from maintaining a horizontal connection with the natural world and with one another, it will still be able to protect the human body.

The reasons people struggle to interact positively may not stem from an inherent human tendency toward evil in childhood, as the Bible claims. The reason could be because of how humans have wanted their relationship with the natural world to function, whereby people are pursuing a vertical hierarchical relationship instead of keeping the relationship of their human body on a horizontal level with the natural world.

The insecurity that exists in the world could be due to people continuing to put their superior programmed aptitude to use to produce more objects so the human body can distance itself more and more from interacting with the natural world. The objects that human ingenuity produces distance the human body from continuing to interact with the natural world or from the way intelligent design desired people to interact with it.

In other words, in a world that functions on a time to harvest and a time to seed and one in which all humans are like all the rest of the living things, depending on food to survive. The consequence of humans not being able to occupy the same void space. This signifies that human security will always be the forgone security of another person. Therefore, since we can never change that whenever it is seeding and harvesting time, when one person is holding the seed or the harvest in his hand, the other will be holding to nothing. This phenomenon creates a situation whereby the person who is doing the planting and harvesting of his human body is engaged and his superior programmed aptitude to reason is idle. In the case of the person who is idle. His body is idle, but his superior programmed aptitude to reason is engaged.

Therefore, a person cannot simultaneously engage in physical work and be aware of their own existence or thoughts. The drawback of this phenomenon is that while people show changes in their physical state through their bodies, it is actually their superior programmed aptitude to reason that issues the commands. Therefore, only the person performing the work is aware of his own existence. The other person who is idle is detecting his existence through his imagination.

The power of imagination is not something that has a limit. Imagination can make a person perceive that he is God, a bird, or anything that they desire to be or contravene.

Therefore, imagination is where people derive the concepts that they develop. Unlike, for example, a person who is planting tomatoes, the tomato plant cannot grow into a big tree no matter how much fertilizer or water a person adds. It is the natural system that controls its height and the one that decides how many tomatoes a person can harvest. Humans have no say. In the realm of imagination, a person can envision a tomato plant bearing tomatoes in such a way that, if farmers stack them one on top of the other, the total height could reach the moon.

People can propose political ideas that they believe are correct and appoint themselves as overseers of the systems or processes they prefer, in order to maintain control over one another. If we take two people and give one of them one tomato seed. The person who planted the tomato seed didn't employ any creativity. It was the creativity of the natural system that made the plant reach life, grow, and carry a tomato. The farmer was primarily responsible for caring for the plant, or in other words, facilitating the conditions necessary for the seed to increase its chances of producing tomatoes.

When a person creates, he wields power. The only two things that humans have the power to create are reproduction and taking objects and engineering them so they take new shapes. Therefore, humans have no power to engineer shapes that are different from the one the natural system can engineer.

Moreover, as in the example that we just used. The farmer who was caring for the tomato plant, the only social space his action required, covered the area that his body and the plant occupy. The idle person in this example would find more to interact with. In his case, he is interacting with something, as we said. This signifies that he can interact with anything that the farmer is not interacting with.

Since the person in this example is idle, he can interact with all the other objects, while the farmer who is tied up is busy caring for and tending to the tomatoes. The person who is idle can only produce tools, like a shovel, and he can produce more shovels than the natural system produces for the farmer's tomatoes.

The person who produced the shovel represents a resource that the farmer could use to better care for the plants he is tending, as it would reduce the amount of intensive labor required and allow him more time to focus on other tasks.

If the person who produced this shovel had handed it over to the farmer and agreed that one could focus on producing shovels while the other used the tool to work the earth, their relationship would have been more balanced. By dividing the labor, both individuals could meet their survival needs. Perhaps peace and security on earth would have been different.

Evidently, the real challenge began when both parties decided to use the time freed by this tool to produce more tools. When their superior programmed aptitude to reason made them both start being creative, the resulting idleness started obliging the body to be more and more idle. The idleness facilitated by the tools distanced the body from being an intrinsic part of nature and allowed human ingenuity to produce tools not necessarily for survival needs. man improved knowledge began now to focus more and more on how to satiate earthly desires. This period is also when the hierarchical order began to run out of control. The custodianship role of social space that people started to exercise stopped remaining limited to producing tools to sustain survival needs but now includes new space to freeze and acquire material of terrestrial origin, from which those new amenities that are used to satiate earthly desires are produced. Let us not forget

the challenge of managing and distributing the tools that humans use to satisfy their earthly desires.

Indeed, the tools that humans started to produce to satiate their earthly desires were more and more forging happiness in the world and, along the way, were widening the gap between the rich and the poor, leading to the formation of social classes. For example, before the two world wars, each social class exerted power over the others by imposing tyranny and oppression on poorer countries. After WWII, this practice of tyranny and oppression was replaced by allowing the people in the poor countries to self-determine and to realize the full development of the human personality up to a certain level (free from any form of military development).

Exchanging people's interaction with the natural world from being based on a distinction between good and knowledge (i.e., doing things using things through labor-intensive methods) in favor of producing tools so those do the bulk of the work when the human body may have been created by intelligent design to serve a function as the rest of the living creatures do. It was humans who invented this game that has trapped humanity in the gridlock that exists in the world today. Moreover, the game that all the people who over time thought that God sent them to earth to spot improvement made their mission to eradicate poverty, thus forcing on people the tools they produced, so more and more people abandoned interacting with the natural world based on a horizontal relationship in favor of the vertical hierarchical one. This phenomenon is widening the gap between humans' direct contact with the natural world and limiting people's interaction to just focusing on establishing contact with the products and tools that those people who consider that God sent them to eradicate poverty or spot improvement in the world but in exchange for a price. This approach leads to a situation where people develop their knowledge solely based on what the tools they use reveal to them or what they choose to perceive.

The hierarchical relationship humans chose as social order requires that people pay more attention to managing the social space that they declare pertains to them, the objects they produce, and whatever their human-programmed aptitude to reason has declared as its rightful

owner. Instead, focus on maintaining a horizontal relationship so that the human body understands how to meet its survival needs.

We cannot understand why humans choose to distance themselves from being an intrinsic part of the natural world in favor of modernization. It is not that after a person becomes modernized, his human body would not face the same end. But what a person forgoes when he subscribes to becoming modernized is living the reality of what others put in front of him as a means to do so instead of living the one that is his own making. Therefore, when a person swaps his horizontal relationships for vertical ones, he is making a significant change. In doing so, a person is also agreeing to let the new improvements distance his body even more from being an intrinsic part of nature in favor of what modernization invites. Due to people's progressive progress. The more modernization distances the person from being an intrinsic part of nature. The more a person would find himself drawn to the hierarchical alignment, the more inverted a person becomes because the concept of reality that he would be establishing most of its truth would be generated from his interaction with machines. The true reality comes from when a person's human body acquires it through interaction with the natural elements.

There is no harm in people choosing to live peaceful lives. The only precaution that people need to keep in mind is that humans don't know how they were created, formed, or appeared on earth and for what reason. Humans are unsure whether they were predestined to work the earth and care for it, or if their current methods—improving resources to understand the universe's big questions—are the intended way. As humans began to notice improvements and live life to the fullest, their ability to overcome the weakness of their will diminished. The way people interact with machines doesn't change their will, but it does make it possible. People's continuous development of machines does not prevent humans from desiring to detect their existence, something the Bible claims God has commanded humans to avoid. To the contrary, each time the superior programmed aptitude to reason prevails in whatever it sets out to accomplish with the help of machinery, the imagination of the person in question tricks him into perceiving that both his superior programmed aptitude to reason and his human body built the sought-after detection or affinity. First, when

a person limits his contacts to machines that he is using to build, his knowledge comes from whatever the machine is relaying back to him as empowerment, thus leading him to believe that he has reached how to detect and distinguish between good and evil. The knowledge that the brain is acquiring is artificial. The brain believes it has successfully detected and distinguished between good and evil in order to affirm its own existence, but in reality, this is not true because the machine has diminished the role of the human body. The process equally marginalized the superior preprogrammed aptitude to reason. The superior pre-programmed aptitude to reason and the body only detected how to operate the machine.

Surely, the input that the machines facilitate helps the human body skip steps in its process to detect its existence, and this service that machines provide accomplishes the objective of rendering the superior pre-programmed aptitude to reason more empowered to “artificially” claim that it can distinguish between good and evil. However, what the superior pre-programmed aptitude to reason has done is impound the physical body. This is because this contracted-out aptitude role the human body was supposed to serve as being an executioner entity for the brain on how to distinguish between good or evil from the machine that was doing the real work. It is the machine who is altering matter and not the human body. The human body would be lost and wouldn’t know how to take any correct action the moment the machines malfunction.

Therefore, the time technology is freeing in the lives of people to detect their existence is only creating an artificial, sensational detection. In reality, both the brain and the physical body are both forgoing the real detection of their existence through the changes that they can impose in the physical world for imposing the same changes only in imagination. We can say that machinery makes people live a perception of existence due to what the machine makes the brain detect, but in reality the brain is living a brain drain because it is idle and so is the physical body.

In the past, people were producing primitive tools like arrows, axes, shovels, knives, hammers, and so forth. The time it took to make those tools kept them an intrinsic part of nature, offsetting the distance from

humans. Likewise, there was no scientific protection involved, so the material interests solely benefit an author because any person can produce those tools, and they don't require skilled people. Over time, as technology was changing and it was machines now that were producing a good chunk of the material things people used to make their things, people started maintaining different relations with each other. To exert control over one another, people began utilizing scientific advancements and technology to meet their survival needs and satisfy their earthly desires.

Power is the ability to do what one wants, regardless of the will of others. But we know that people may have to choose between things because one can't have everything. Therefore, since we have no way of foreseeing the future. Let us continue to check as Ibn Khaldun claimed to do when in need to glean experience by evaluating historical material to determine if continuing to distance people from being an intrinsic part of nature can indeed usher in a better world or prepare the second life cycle of existence for a speedy end.

Humans have experimented with a number of social and economic systems and tolerated many political circumstances and conditions. The gap between the rich and the poor has existed since humans appeared on earth, and people have been questioning it in recent years. The social inequality problem in most developing and least developed countries is now worse than during the days of colonization. People living in developed nations are also disenchanted with the wave of social inequality that is sweeping the world. When people lived under alien domination in developing countries, it was one person who was enslaving the people of the entire village. Now, it is the entire population of the village that is working on enslaving each other. The interlinking of people from developing nations led them to replace the traditions and values that religion had taken thousands of years to establish. The people replaced those cultural traditions with one that converts human worth into an instrument of production, like any financial leverage input.

Perhaps the abysmal low degree of peace and security that exists in the world could be because people after WWI and WWII came together to agree that every person is entitled to detect his existence and to ensure that everyone is entitled to the limited number of objects that people can produce from the same kind. The consequence of this credo that exists in the Bible—that when people begin to distinguish between good and evil, they would die—is not something that humans want to factor.

Certainly, the policies that emerged after WWII aimed to utilize the scientific advances and industrial progress of developed nations to alleviate poverty and improve living conditions in previously

colonized and impoverished countries, which has enhanced people's modes of production and provided them with more time to reflect on their existence, allowing them to feel that they are living enriched lives free from poverty, hunger, and insecurity. However, people must be wise and shall not attempt to take lightly the arguments that social theorists make about the need to consider a different epistemology when studying humans' interactions with matter. We have no way of knowing if there exists yet one contribution that man has made that has modified the natural reality that overrules the universe or shed light on the purpose of human life. If we take all the contributions that people have made since the date they began to question things. All the ideologies, tools, instruments, and so forth that humans developed and engineered have achieved nothing other than to distance people from establishing a direct interface with matter. The realization of the full development of the human personality of any human being has brought nothing but people fighting over the things humans produce, thus supporting how, indeed, if people distinguish between good and evil, they would die, as the Bible claims.

The victors of WW2 can perpetuate the world's disenchantment with their lack of access to governance, especially after knowledge allowed decolonized nations to believe they could influence how scientific advances and industrial progress contribute to their national security. Similarly, continuing to ignore the global plea for fair and equitable distribution hinders true integration in trade and transactions, which are necessary for people to recognize their existence, particularly regarding the interpretation of the rule of law.

People have used different means to impose their power throughout the history of the world. Historians claim that Shibam is an ancient town in Yemen in the Hadhramaut Valley that is renowned for its mudbrick-made high-rise buildings. The buildings in Shibam rise 5 to 11 stories high and are often called "the oldest skyscraper city in the world." The first known inscription about the city dates from the 3rd century AD. We have no way of knowing if the people who lived in Shibam in the 3rd century AD exploited their advantageous position on the overland route to the Hejaz in the same way that modern city

dwellers exploit their locations through global communication networks to enhance their visibility. Based on the existing archeological evidence, one thing is certain. Unlike modern times, when scientific advancements enable the exploitation of transport workers from the comfort of apartments, the people in the Hadhramaut Valley's skyscrapers did not exploit those workers in the same way. We think they attacked merchants' convoys with their hands and the rudimentary tools they used.

Another example from this era of how different people have imposed their power is the life and death of Macedonian king Alexander the Great (356-323 BC). Alexander the Great is regarded as one of history's brilliant military leaders and most powerful rulers. Alexander the Great, at the age of 32, had conquered Persia and Egypt, and his kingdom ranged from the Mediterranean to the border of India before he died from malaria. Alexander's conquest created in modern times a legend that would provide the standard by which leaders and generals measured their careers. Historians claim that Alexander died from malaria at 33, and his progress was checked by three setbacks. One was his officer's refusal to abide by his instruction to march farther east along the Indian frontier. After his return to Babylonia, his troops mutinied against the integration of Asian troops in the ranks. The third episode is one where he lost ranks in the Makran Desert on the return march from India to the Persian Gulf due to a shortage of food and water on this journey.

In modern times, the countries and people who won the Second World War, instead of those people limiting their war aims to conventional ones such as maintaining colonization over the countries and people they were subjecting them to prior to the war, turned to subjugation, domination, and exploitation, including adding to this list those who were defeated during WW2. Next, continue to deny all the people and countries the right to self-determination so they can freely determine their political status. In other words, maintain colonization and all armed actions or repressive measures the countries and people who won the second world war were directing against dependent people. Those countries and people who won the Second World War let all the people who were under their subjugation, domination, and exploitation exercise their free rights to determine their political status by

transferring all powers to the peoples of those territories. The countries and people who won the Second World War believed that the liberation of the dependent people combined with foreign policy mixed through economic, financial, and other measures was necessary to the maintenance of conditions abroad and at home. Such an act can allow the countries and people who won the Second World War to maintain their hierarchical system of power consistent with the maintenance of their strength and stability and/or the establishment of a wider and permanent system of general security that they named their own custodian.

We have no way of knowing what criteria the countries and people who won the Second World War relied on to maintain their hierarchical system of power; otherwise, they would not have referred to themselves as custodians for establishing a permanent system of global security. The people of Shibam build their skyscrapers by physically attacking convoys with their hands and very primitive tools and by exploiting people. Alexander the Great built his legend by doing the same: conquering and killing people. The countries and people who won the Second World War aim to preserve their hierarchical power structure by promoting the idea of freedom while ensuring they maintain an advantage in scientific advancement and technology. Indeed, the manner in which the countries and people who won the Second World War believe when putting into practice this philosophy to maintain their hierarchical system of power is unheard of.

The establishment of conditions that support the strength and stability of any hierarchical system of power only produced effective results for its perpetrator when force was used. The countries and people who won the Second World War want to maintain their hierarchical system of power on the basis of the abandonment of force. The countries and people who won the Second World War prefer to let the scientific advancement they are maintaining superiority on in all its facets and fronts provide the conditions of stability and strength they perceive.

Can people establish conditions of strength and stability commensurate with their perceived perceptions using scientific advancements whose motive is to control and regulate people's movement while at the same

time distancing the human body from being occupied to tie up human awareness? This is because it is when people's knowledge widens that the threat that people pose deepens. This is because, based on what historians claim, the people of Shibam and Alexander the Great maintained their hierarchical system of power. The mode or means they employed relied on the human body and human ingenuity and not on relying on the tools they were using. This is because historians claim that the military equipment that the people of Shibam and Alexander the Great were using and the people who those fought against were using was one and the same. A simple knife, a sword, and fighting either on foot or while riding on a horse. The people of Shibam were not exploiting people while letting their fingers do the walking in the skyscrapers they built in the same way people are doing it in modern times from the comfort of the skyscrapers that present people are building, hallways, and/or roofs of conference halls. In modern times, the power that each person exercises over others is determined by scientific advancement and knowledge, particularly in the form of artificial beings, robots, machines, and artificial intelligence, with which real people now coexist.

We could say that after World War II, the world transitioned to being inhabited by both human beings and artificial beings. Real humans and artificial beings interact with each other, as well as with other living and nonliving things, and they govern the world according to their own intelligent designs. The hierarchical structure is one in which humans govern over animals. However, in the case of an artificial being, the situation is reversed. Artificial beings rule over humans. Moreover, in the case of artificial beings, these inhumane entities are the ones performing the tasks that humans were originally meant to do, such as working and taking care of the earth. Both the real humans and the guests that humans invited to cohabit on earth are made of matter. Both types of beings are considered alien, except for the artificial beings. Humans know that it was their human ingenuity that created those new guests. Humans, on the other hand, don't know how they were formed. The intelligent design that formed them has preferred to remain invisible.

In the broadest sense, because objects are inhumane, people are now capable of tracking, controlling, and dominating the human brain,

including determining the type of knowledge that a person can access or be denied. The countries and individuals who won the Second World War believe that it is their responsibility to establish a broader and permanent system of general security, as they have designated themselves as custodians for this purpose. People from wealthy and powerful countries believe it is their responsibility to identify improvements that will help others live free from fear and want. Those people should be working on engineering how the new world order that human ingenuity created can accommodate both the real humans and the artificial beings. We cannot know what specific work plan has been developed by those who believe it is their responsibility to ensure that people live free from fear and want. We know that any effective work plan must include specific processes.

Governance is about how resources are acquired, managed, and distributed. The selection of individuals to collaborate in achieving a way of life that prevents reliance on labor-based production methods in favor of machine-based manufacturing allows people to dedicate more time to self-awareness and understanding their existence. Only knowledge could quench this thirst, and access to material things could indulge this desire.

Indeed, in developed countries, citizens now find themselves needing to carefully consider what they can manage without and what they cannot, in relation to meeting their survival needs and fulfilling their earthly desires. In developed countries, the survival needs of citizens have increasingly become disconnected from the natural reality, as modernization leads many to rely more on automation rather than their own physical and mental abilities to meet these needs. Residents of developed countries have replaced their necessary interaction with the natural system for sustaining survival needs with a relationship where an individual's wealth and power are determined by the level of modernization and scientific contributions. However, since this power/wealth relationship is based on a for-profit approach, the social inequality should be deepening much faster in developed countries after WWII because the variable that now gets an individual to move from one social class to the next is the kind of scientific contribution that a person makes, which could make a person move up and down the social stratification ladder.

In other words, the people of Saudi Arabia who previously benefited from the wealth of their resources are now facing a future where industrial plants will be operated through automation. In the future, the

shift toward automated industrial plants will change how these facilities operate. The partner would sell the technology needed to replace the old, worn-out equipment, thereby taking control of the decision-making process instead of the Saudis. The Saudis would need to create technology or replace old equipment to have a say in resource decisions, but they lack the scientific blueprints to do so. Let us not forget that whoever sells the Saudis the technology they need would not tell them how to service it, and a good example of that would be their military arsenal. The Saudis have modern jet fighters, but they don't know how to repair them, let alone service them.

The challenge for countries like Saudi Arabia, which did not use their wealth to educate their people on how to disassemble jet fighters and build new prototypes, will also apply to other nations. They would not have been allowed by the countries and people who had won WW2 to disassemble and build a new jet. At least the future wouldn't be as difficult for a country like Saudi Arabia; however, people cannot meet their survival needs through agricultural work due to the challenges posed by the environment.

Surely, the picture that we painted for how the future might look for a country like Saudi Arabia is not that it would be any different for the people of the United States as more and more automation continues to displace humans over there, too.

Currently, developed countries have yet to feel the effects of automation distancing and displacing their citizens to the point of returning to alien subjugation, domination, and exploitation—conditions of their own making—because the world is being rearranged.

In the days before the end of colonization, the excessive subjection of people to alien subjugation, domination, and exploitation was what helped the colonists to maintain their power, authority, and the rule of law. Capitalism thrives when the rule of law is strong. It is evident that for capitalism to thrive, simply having a global interconnection is insufficient. This process should be accompanied by overhauling the cultural traditions and values of less economically developed countries, not necessarily because those social parameters are

outdated. Rather, it is necessary to sustain the survival needs of people whose societies have been transformed by technology and automation into unproductive actors rather than productive ones.

So, since developed countries' citizens create the scientific advancements used, more people distance themselves from nature. In the broadest sense, people in developed countries could be focused on teaching their youth to write computer code and ensuring the rule of law is upheld, both of which are rational actions.

Human ingenuity can create computer programs and machines for planting and harvesting food, but the actual production of the food that people eat comes from the natural world, not from humans. Until World War II, society was divided into two groups: one group produced the technology used for planting and harvesting food, while the other group maintained and operated the machinery.

After World War II, the victorious countries and their people changed the purpose of the human body from one intended to interact with the natural world to one aimed at adapting social policies that entitle individuals to fully develop their human personality. A person cannot do two things at the same time. The entire human family is currently focused on recognizing their existence, with a collective desire to create computer code that allows the machines people build to handle the planting and harvesting of food.

The citizens in developed countries have not yet felt the impact of the challenge posed by the entire human family working on detecting their existence. This is because the economic rearrangement occurring in poorer countries is allowing the economies of developed countries to continue functioning. This phenomenon of economic rearrangement enables developed countries to send machines that distance people in poorer countries from one another, encouraging them to adopt a lifestyle similar to that of developed nations.

Evidently, the reorganization that is taking place in the countries whose people are swapping their labor-based mode of survival for becoming more machine-based is to compare it to a human's well-known method used in the demolition industry.

In the controlled demolition industry, building implosion refers to the strategic placement of explosive materials and the precise timing of their detonation, ensuring that a structure collapses inwardly within seconds, thereby minimizing physical damage to its immediate surroundings. Therefore, more countries and governments collapse on themselves, as the technology that the developed countries are feeding is reorganizing their people. The crises we see in some countries are turning their citizens into stateless people. This self-destruction method is very effective and very result-oriented because it uses its own citizens as explosives, thus minimizing the physical damage to neighboring countries other than dealing with the humanitarian crises of refugees until the end of hostility so those who survive return.

The benefit of the people who are self-destructing themselves to swap their own interaction with the natural world so it becomes like the one people in rich countries enjoy is that the loss of life that the nations that are being re-organized sustain contributes to neutralizing the people, thus giving them a quick transition to swap the tyranny and oppression they believe their own leaders were making them live and denying them in favor of living free from fear and want in the same way people in rich nations are doing (i.e., being surveilled). Moreover, since it is normally the poor who are seeking to be free in those nations, they are the ones who are being reorganized because they have the most interests. It makes it much easier to tap into the resources of those stateless nations when the rule of law has vanished in them. The gap or the void the lack of state authority creates makes it much easier to dominate the annexed people (mentally and physically). Let us say the resources here are not physical, which the rich nations want, but are human. The instability allows those people to sell goods directly without intermediaries, thanks to advancements in technology.

The insecurity from the ongoing global rearrangement prevents the economy in developed countries from shrinking. This is what is giving the people in the developed countries a lifeline to have purchasing power. Let us not forget that the purchasing power of people in developed countries diminishes at any moment. Such a scenario would put pressure on the system to transfer more of the people whose interaction with objects is uncontrolled to the controlled environment

(i.e., incarceration). Therefore, it is imperative that governments in developed countries continuously balance the purchasing power-to-mass ratio for citizens who are not incarcerated, as these individuals have largely replaced their essential interactions for survival with reliance on machines. In other words, most of the citizens in those developed countries generate their purchasing power from technology. Hence, their economy transitioned into becoming machine-based rather than manual labor-based. The only area where citizens can actively participate is in producing scientific achievements and providing related services. To strengthen the rule of law equally, the judiciary is the only field that can absorb the manpower that technology displaces or frees.

The insecurity in certain nations, caused by citizens' dissatisfaction with their governments' failure to ensure their freedom while others profit and enjoy life, is unsustainable. The insecurity that those nations are undergoing cannot go on forever. Let's consider the worst-case scenario: the people currently embroiled in a civil war may not cease until they have completely obliterated all their progress, necessitating a fresh start. The victor(s) would face two choices: either build a wall around their nation, severing relations with the rest of the world and isolating themselves, or continue to remain interconnected with the global community. In other words, their reconstruction choices would be either to impound their resources and their future or to reinvent the wheel. Even if they desired to isolate themselves and reinvent the wheel, capitalism would prevent them from doing so.

Let us base it on how, till now, the world events are favoring those nations whose desire is that all people in the world live free from fear and want, but for unknown reasons, free trade, globalization, and networked communication are helping them so far more than other nations to make their own people detect their existence better. Consider that they are going to join the United Nations, particularly since this is the only option ahead. The alternative is to live on earth according to the Bible's teachings, without the knowledge of good and evil. However, as we said before, technology and this credo that exists in the Bible prevent a person from distinguishing between good and evil, and therefore, they are one and the same. Membership is free to all peace-loving people who want to join the United Nations. Their

ambition would be to be like the rest of the nations, with whom they would be united, working on making sure that their people are not left behind.

Evidently, they will ensure that their children not only become literate but also receive training from an early age in various fields that facilitate their interaction with the world beyond their physical bodies. In effect, people living in rich nations are placing most of the tasks required for their daily responsibilities in the hands of technology. In other words, it is not real humans who are interacting with the objects or shapes those people use to sustain their survival needs and satiate their earthly desires, but rather machinery that is doing the majority of the work. The good news is that more and more of those people who fought and overturned their government so they could live free from fear and want are going to become dependent on automation that the rich nations provide and control. More and more afterwards, their interaction is going to become destined to distance their human bodies from continuing to interact with the natural world in favor of letting machinery do the bulk of the work. More and more they would be depending on machinery for their survival needs and seeking to become like the people who live in rich countries, depending on artificial beings (i.e., technology) for their survival. They would create fewer objects using their ingenuity.

In the broadest sense, we can say that as more and more countries are dismantled and reorganized using their citizens as tools to collapse their governments, the social significance of religious creeds, practices, and institutions diminishes. As this new way of thinking, which allows modernization and globalization to change and revamp cultural values, traditions, and methods of doing things, takes shape, its impact becomes more significant. Members of the human family will benefit more as they live united under the new world order envisioned by the leaders of the countries and the victors of WW2. The more this new world order shifted from being a vision to becoming a reality, the more the old order crumbled. The previous statement illustrates the desires of the victors of World War II to ensure that all members of the human family work towards achieving a comprehensive and lawful world order, an attainable goal based on the evidence we have presented. It is possible for modernization and

globalization to dismantle and reorganize governments when people are collaborating in the economic field. In fact, we believe that the rapid advances in modernization and globalization will not only dismantle and reorganize governments and religious institutions but also challenge the role that God played in shaping human life. Modernization and globalization would also weaken the ideals and practices of the global council (i.e., the United Nations) set up by the rich and powerful nations that won WW2. We believe that modernization and globalization will reorganize the global council to fulfill its original purpose. Let's see what that is in the next section.

People criticize the common program and principles that the international organization named the United Nations exercises due to how slow this council has been in fulfilling its mandate. The failure of the international community to manage to repair the social and economic structure of the states that are on the route to undergoing dismantling and reorganization or the ones that have undergone this transition already to give room to modernization and globalization is a result of the powerlessness of the global council to entitle every person to the realization of the full development of his human personality. The people who detected their existence need technology, progress, and access to resources, which this council doesn't hand out. The international technical assistance that the different global council programs and agencies can offer is basic. The solutions that the different global council programs and agencies propose are intended to make people go and do things in primitive ways when the staffs of this council and the poor who are helping have access to the same World Wide Web and are even holding in their hands the same cellular phone. Not to mention how the local market where the poor people do their shopping is flooded with products that are dominated by foreign products and industrial and machine-based manufacturing.

The purpose of the United Nations was to make people, after WWII, detect their existence. The people of the world do know now that modernization exists. The technical assistance that the different agencies and programs are providing in the different sectors is nothing but interventions that the nations that finance those ongoing interventions are doing. Those projects seek geopolitical outcomes for eventual future economic gains. There are the interventions that the council undertakes due to natural disasters. But this is just another

intervention that the Red Cross easily plays. We are not including the interventions that the different United Nations agencies are providing to help governments to rebuild in areas like education, infrastructure, food distribution, health, agriculture, and so forth. The dismantling of those sectors in the countries that are undergoing civil wars or are stateless already occurred due to modernization. The United Nations programs cannot modernize those countries; it is the private sector that does.

As more and more countries get dismantled and reorganized using citizens as explosives to collapse mounted states, modernization and globalization annex more and more nations. The role of government in the countries that become modernized would be limited to maintaining the rule of law. This is because modernization and automation pertain to a hierarchical system of power. It is the owners of this hierarchical system of power who are the state's partners and act as the lifeblood of decisions involving the governance of that nation. Moreover, it wouldn't be possible for modernization to produce and sell products and goods without dismantling and reorganizing the existing administrative structure of the nation that has not been modernized yet. This will continue to go on. Evidently, if a country wants to avoid this aforementioned dismantling and reorganization exercise, its people would have to get rid of their values and traditions in favor of modernization. A country that refuses to modernize and decides to maintain domination and oppression over citizens would be a country that cannot help but become insecure and later stateless.

In fact, force dismantles and reorganizes the countries and their people. The citizens in those countries didn't comprehend that all the conflicts and wars that people have known were exhibited to find ways for those people who settled their disputes through such a form of aggression to wield power and to replace what they see as an outdated thought process with one more modernized, including how the things from which people survive are produced, sold, and bought. The objective of conflicts and wars is to enable people to put their hands on the resources, mental and physical, that the aggressors need. The people who are engulfed in civil wars—their leaders didn't take the time to explain to the citizens that, in addition to joining the United Nations to work on converting the world into becoming a better place,

membership entailed agreeing to let the market of the joining member be flooded with the products of the rest of the other nations. This was one of the conditions to join the global council. In other words, any country, rich or poor, that wanted to contribute to converting the world into becoming a better place, the joining country was going to be fully disposed to agree to fully collaborate in all economic fields. Evidently, the leaders who could have refused to join are the countries and people who had access to weapons of mass destruction, and they were sure that when they launched their weapons, their missiles would not be shot down over their heads. Given that in the new world, all members were working to set up the main source from where any nation was going to draw strength to have any form of power, this was going to be coming from how advanced its own people's scientific supremacy or information technology had gotten.

Those governments that are now facing civil wars or are being dismantled, their leaders were busy policing citizens instead of explaining to their citizens that humans have financialized the world, and in the real market, you either win or lose unless you are developing weapons of mass destruction to become a member of the security council. The absence of long-term policies or vision is what prevented those countries and people from comprehending that the natural properties that humans use to survive, people had converted those natural properties into a commodity before Jesus Christ was born and the Declaration of Human Rights was drafted.

We predict that more nations will collapse if their people refuse to swap their values for the financialization of the world. Nations that wish to compete with modernization and globalization must be prepared to accept losses just as readily as they accept gains. Civil wars are caused by the standoff between modernization and globalization and tradition and values. Another reason is that the leaders of those governments believed that while they were making significant progress in transitioning their economy from manual labor to machine-based manufacturing, they could challenge the very people who granted them independence. Those nations didn't take into account that it is not people, money, or military equipment that wins during a world war; the decisive factor is technological supremacy. Those nations who challenged the nations who granted them

independence—all that they have done is speed up their dismantling and reorganization that we are saying is part of an ongoing elimination method. Those leaders who challenged in recent years the rich and powerful countries didn't want to believe that the people in those countries were able to control the bodies and minds of people as of 1948.

The elimination method works by dismantling the weakest nations first. The collapse of the Western European Empire or the Soviet bloc from being united is not related to the lack of access to technology by certain nations in these power blocs. Rather, the gradual dismantling happened because it is not possible to distribute matter on equal rights when matter is continually changing. As more and more people were entitling themselves to what the Declaration of Human Rights facilitates (i.e., the realization of the full development of their personalities), soon thereafter this phenomenon triggered or sparked the collapse. Russia's strength after the collapse of the Soviet bloc comes from its strong scientific and industrial progress, which includes access to weapons of mass destruction.

People could suppose that the ongoing instability that exists in the world is because the rich and powerful countries are unable to use their hierarchical system of power to maintain peace and stability. The founding members of the United Nations created this global council to create a new world order that would unite people under one world everywhere and anywhere. This endeavor is a process done by people and is for people. The reorganization process to achieve this new world order involves helping people recognize their own existence. In other words, the process is based on letting human awareness know that every person is entitled to the right to the realization of the full development of his personality. Reaching this goal of making every member of the human family subscribe to this new world order is a process. The insecurity that people are experiencing results from an increasing number of individuals becoming aware of their own existence. Those same people are thinking that this power or awareness gives them rights to intervene and decide on how the governance of the world is decided upon and how the earth's resources are to be acquired, managed, and distributed. Those people who are creating the insecurity are not taking into account the future

implications of their actions. Technology, not human reasoning, will dictate what people can access. Those people who are creating the insecurity are not taking into account the coming of all the people to create a new world order that would unite people under one world; its theme is how to make humans convert into instruments for production, exchange, distribution, and so forth, thus becoming like any financial leverage input. The financialization of the world is one path to ensure an equitable distribution of material things among people due to the limited amount that can be produced based on how matter regenerates or the environment rejuvenates, which is insufficient for people who aspire to live life to the fullest or to be motivated by happiness.

The scenario that we shared was about how people could continue to dismantle and rearrange themselves to become united under one world order. As we showed, this method allows the world population to grow without requiring people to practice birth control measures, regulate material accumulation, or stop modernization while a country transitions to being ruled by both people and machines. The dismantling and reorganization method that we described sorts out how to convert a state into being stateless by using a country's own people as explosives. When automation starts to govern nations, how the earth's resources are acquired, managed, and distributed gets sorted out easily next. This is because CCTV cameras now take care of this weakness of a person not being able to be in two places at the same time to ensure that how the earth's resources are acquired, managed, and distributed is not being challenged.

The wave of insecurity that makes it seem like humans are less tolerant of peace and security may be due to the dismantling and reorganization we described to allow modernization. The degree of insecurity that we perceive is due to the resistance people's traditions, values, and religion are leveraging until the full transition to modernization takes place. The other cause of the insecurity is due to a shortage in social space to sustain the survival needs and to satiate the earthly desires of the large number of people who are all working on what the UN Declaration of Human Rights privileges and entitles them to: equal rights. Hopefully the experience that certain countries and people underwent could also serve as lessons learned for those nations that refuse to let the financialization of the world take over in their territory

to spare their citizens from the fate that would be awaiting them if they don't let modernization in.

In any way, as the world gets more modernized, more and more artificial beings get installed and become in control to regulate and even decide on the kind of interaction a person could have with objects or material things. As people's lives become more and more organized, human needs would become less and less demanding because it is the technological standardization that would be controlling how people live and how many pieces of equipment a person owns. In other words, if a robot does the washing of the plates, then rearrange them. A person cannot go ahead and continue to produce plates of all shapes and sizes because the robot at home who would be doing this work has to respect standards. Therefore, if certain people in certain nations desired to create a new social order that would unite people under one world as we described one to be, it is evident the wave of insecurity that people are knowing must take its toll until those rich and powerful countries that were victors after WW2 finish with putting their grip on people to continue to pursue the ideals that they decided on for them as war aims.

After all the peoples and countries get reorganized and become united under one world order, we predict modernization will manage to achieve. The global council will go back to fulfilling the role that it was created to serve. The General Assembly will go back to playing the role that it was created to fulfill as well as being the platform from which governments obtain instructions about the programs that they need to go back to their bases and implement. This is required because the artificial humans can only do the monitoring of the host country. The United Nations operations that are in the field would be shifting toward fulfilling more the intelligence roles rather than being development agents. This role is the one that the security council was created to fulfill as being a last resort to control the human behavior of the nations that possess weapons of mass destruction.

The history of the world has been full of different people testing different doctrines or ideals, minus the one humans began to practice after WWII. This new method involves utilizing scientific advancements and industrial progress to assist in global governance. In

other words, the goal is to help humanity emphasize the importance of scientific advancement over human reasoning.

The scenario we depicted illustrates a potential path for uniting people under the new world order that the human family has been seeking since 1948. Its principles are based on distancing the human body and human reason from being an intrinsic component of nature in favor of focusing the human purpose on becoming such that every person considers that his coming into life is to spot improvement and to seek the realization of the full development of his personality.

Everything people do is for the future. Humans don't know if the intelligent design that structured how humans look was an act that happened by chance or if it was intentional and people were intended to serve a purpose different from what they have been doing, like spotting improvements. Requiring people to subscribe to a common program of purposes and principles is one aspect of this issue. The ideals or beliefs that humans practice in this second life cycle of existence are fundamentally different.

When technology manages to produce satellites whose orbital speed matches the speed of the sub-satellite point on the Earth, the Londoners, New Yorkers, Greeks, and Yemenis wouldn't need so many cameras installed, monitoring the moves of their citizens. The satellite would zoom in on every citizen from a single lens. The question would boil down to one: Would the world continue to require so many people, and what would those people be doing? When the people who are now surveying CCTV cameras are out of a job, they will be wanting to detect their existence more due to what technology facilitated for them to be doing. Is continuing to distance the human body from continuing to be an intrinsic part of the natural world in favor of letting modernization and technology free the human ingenuity so this aptitude can detect its existence as a better path to base hope on, or is keeping the body engaged and tied up the better route?

Let us move into the last section in this work and review people's decision to distance the human body from being an intrinsic part of nature. This move may require people to continue reproducing at an accelerated rate, as they did after WWII. Most importantly, what are the consequences of allowing the human body to stop carrying out tasks, especially as technology reduces the number of tasks requiring human ingenuity? The key consideration is whether such a method would promote peace and security on Earth or if it would accelerate the end of this second life cycle of existence, paving the way for a third new life cycle.

Given the current conditions, it appears that people will need to choose between two options if they want the Earth to accommodate both real humans and the artificial beings they wish to coexist with, along with all other living and non-living entities. One technique could involve making matter regenerate at a rate equivalent to the rate at which people reproduce, while the other option would require people to organize around a new world order that reallocates resources to accommodate both real humans and artificial beings, allowing them to coexist as good neighbors.

We cannot predict whether people will be able to regenerate matter in the future at a rate that matches the current rate of human reproduction, which is necessary for real humans to detect their existence. The experience so far has been tilting toward supporting that whenever a business owner is picking and engaging an artificial being to carry out a job, everyone is swearing by the efficiency and, most importantly, the loyalty of those guests that humans invited to live on earth.

The people who switched and started using artificial beings to perform tasks express mixed feelings about how their interaction with such tools feels. What effect will the increased popularity of artificial beings have on the ongoing accelerated reproduction that the world has known after WWII, or will a marked change in population growth be noted? The devaluation of mysticism apparent in modern society and the weakening of the secular tradition that people relied on and used as a means to boost reproduction—the future of such motivators is not known. Demographers predict that the world population will continue

to rise and won't level off unless an epidemic, war, or unrest creates massive mortality.

The challenge would be how injecting new people at an accelerated rate could continue to have a role to play in a world that functions on making people detect their existence to consequently displace each other as they have been since time immemorial doing and without the new guests that humans invited standing in the way. Now, if more people continue to test and pick engaging artificial beings to do the work that real humans used to do and continue to swear by how efficient and how loyal those artificial beings are as compared to real humans. Moreover, if the world continues to treat real humans as instruments for production and plans on continuing to let their choices be motivated by the desire for happiness. We could start to see a drop in birth rates.

Maybe the drop in the birth rates would not be remarked on as much now due to planners and scientists circulating population estimates used to call attention to and to predict pollution and global warming levels, prepare for epidemics, and forecast worldwide economic trends (including consideration for food, transportation, infrastructure, etc.). However, as of the date people began to detect their existence, their principal challenge has been to agree on how the earth's resources can be acquired, managed, and distributed. If humans are going to prefer that their interactions with objects are focused on providing them with a perceptual experience of pleasure and satisfaction, then their relationship with these objects will change. In a world in which the worth of real humans becomes nothing but an instrument for production, exchange, distribution, and so forth, like any financial leverage input. Because of the elevated cost of living, we think people have no choice but to let the world's population stop growing as much. When the means to produce all the food required by people become centralized in the hands of a few individuals, the control or leverage that these individuals exert will determine the cost of living, which in turn will influence how many children a person can afford.

Let us recall that in the past, reproduction was required to address the limitations of the human body. The lack of research or improved patient care in the healthcare sector posed a problem as well. In the

earlier days, people were handing to their offspring bows, arrows, shovels, and axes, and so people needed so many newborns to give each one a tool. The breakthrough that technology facilitated has transformed how healthcare experts practice medicine. The breakthroughs that the medical field is registering to extend longevity have changed the reason why people reproduce.

In the future, people would most probably be reproducing for new reasons altogether. As technology improves every day, new developments continue to infiltrate our lives. The purpose of reproduction will no longer necessarily be required for family planning, preparing for epidemics, or forecasting worldwide economic trends. People would reproduce, not necessarily due to a manpower shortage as well. Reproduction would be required to continually inject new brains to keep transforming the existing technology into newer forms. In other words, the reason for reproduction would be to just keep on injecting new, fresh human innativities to modernize the existing progress. Only the human brain can do this part, and regrettably, not any human brain. This signifies that newborns would have nothing to contribute to the new thinking about the world. Those people would be doing nothing but detecting their existence. Those expandable people would be reduced to a financial instrument. People are already passing on remote controls, robots, pumps, electric saws, rifles, and so forth, and most of that equipment artificial beings already produce. There is definitely not going to be any need for so many real humans on earth, but only the right ones.

With conditions as they stand, it appears as if people are not going to slow down from continuing to let their creative and analytical intelligence, which allows them to imagine, invent, suppose, design, analyze, explain, judge, criticize, compare, and contrast, defy what God commanded all people stick to doing during their lives. People will continue to let their perception interpret or decide on what to respect and what to disregard in the guidance that God wanted people to pursue after birth.

Allowing every person to be entitled to the realization of the full development of his human personality in his area of interest will continue to expand human understanding in all areas of physical and

social science. The more scientific breakthroughs humans make, the more people's knowledge about nature and the nature of reality will broaden. The more people's knowledge broadens, the more this phenomenon will be transforming this connection that human awareness must be continually maintaining with the natural world, which is supposed to be done in a horizontal interface to take a vertical posture. After the human awareness takes a vertical posture and starts to distance itself from letting its survival needs be carried out by the efforts the human body would make, it charts this task to modernization. More human awareness would be engulfed in sustaining survival needs from this hierarchical decision-making process that decides on how the earth's resources are to be acquired, managed, and distributed. The only challenge is that until not too long ago, it was wealth and productivity that decided its limit. Now it is scientific achievements or modernization that sets the ceiling. Certainly, as more new people become among the living. The new scientific advancement that those newborns will spot would be making improvements in the world but on the back of destroying more jobs. Inviting disenchantment and reorganization not necessarily due to what the new advancement that was put forth facilitated. Rather, because there is no law that says that everyone everywhere will automatically benefit from the technological progress.

The challenge of new people continually spotting improvement in the world can be distilled into this simple question: Should humans continue to let capitalism and the financialization of the earth's resources and human ingenuity be the most appropriate credo for people to fix their hopes for a better future for the world on the basis of its principles: the credo God proposed people follow or the one the human ingenuity of people picked?

Eternal return is a concept in Indian philosophy that refers to a premise that supports that the universe has been recurring and will continue to recur. People have been letting this tradition of new people convert the earth into becoming an experimental theater for the sake of spotting improvement aimed at providing a perceptual experience of pleasure and satisfaction since the date people started to keep records. The cycle of existence that humans have been maintaining their relations with one another on its premise consists of letting security run into

becoming dynamic to consequently reach the point that it is important people work together to make peace and security dynamic. The conflicts, contradictions, divergence, and evil behavior that people are disenchanted with due to certain people amassing possessions or wealth or dominating by brutal strength and gaining and misusing power over others. Those actions that people exhibit are identical to what previous people who lived during different eras experienced as well. The decision the rich and powerful countries took to let WWII war aims every person be entitled to the realization of the full development of his human personality; all it has done so far is that it has extended this ongoing cycle of existence so it continues to repeat itself. Letting new people convert the earth into becoming an experimental theater to spot improvement makes more people want to detect their existence. This is the reason why we said earlier that the time that has elapsed since all members of the human family began to practice the common program of purposes and principles the leaders who were victorious at the end of WWII sketched is a minuscule interval in the history of the world to determine if their vision would really establish a permanent system of general security in the world so people could live free from fear and want.

As we said before, there are many ways to get from one point to another. We forecast that the common program of purposes and principles that the entire human family would experiment with would be getting the world more and more safe as more countries and people get dismantled and reorganized so modernization and globalization set foot. The reference the military leaders make to living in the most dangerous time ever is in reference to the weapon of mass destruction arsenal that the rich and powerful nations possess. The elimination method of the countries that possess weapons of mass destruction would be achieved most probably using mutiny, as this is the only way to spare the world from a catastrophe.

Assembling cavalry to ensure that human life is focused on achieving improvement is a milestone that has never been seen in the history of mankind on Earth. In fact, Franklin D. Roosevelt was not the only person during the Second World War who had hopes for a better future for the world and wanted to achieve historical recognition. Eleanor Roosevelt, the first lady of the United States, shared in her husband

Franklin D. Roosevelt's vision and hopes for the world during his four terms in office as president as well. Eleanor served as the United States delegate to the United Nations General Assembly from 1945 to 1952. Eleanor even served as the first chair of the UN Commission on Human Rights and oversaw the drafting of the Declaration of Universal Human Rights. Eleanor Roosevelt did indeed seek fulfillment in a public life, and her inspirational quote, "The future could belong to those who believe in the beauty of their dreams," will always be alive. These words that Eleanor Roosevelt suggested during the Second World War are indeed very inspirational to help free people from feeling helplessness and fear and get them to be spirited. Indeed, Eleanor achieved a milestone in the history of human rights that humans have not known before. However, there is a big difference between aspirations that are possible and aspirations that man doesn't have power over yet, like how to start to emphasize the importance of the mind over the relative unimportance of the human body. Humans have been trying to develop personal ethics since man appeared on earth, and till now only a few have managed to correct the distortions that skew one's analyses of benefits and costs.

There is no doubt the choice that the countries and people who won the Second World War made to free people is a milestone that is priceless. But the question is more complex than just freeing people. Since the date man appeared on earth, human reasoning has not managed to master the art of correcting the distortions that skew one's analyses of benefits and costs. Can modernization and automation, which are capable of controlling the human body and human mind, reach the goal? In fact, to put in a simpler form what we just said: Eleanor Roosevelt suggested that humans must learn to create unbreakable bonds between the sciences and the humanities. Eleanor Roosevelt died in 1962, much earlier than the year 1989, when the World Wide Web began to make people more and more detect their existence. Can modernization and humanities create unbreakable bonds when human reasoning fails to do it? This is because we don't think there is any difference between a person being chained and a person being surveyed all the time or riding in an elevator and being unable to get off at any floor that the person desires.

On 05 November 1958, ten years after Eleanor Roosevelt oversaw the drafting of the Declaration of Universal Human Rights, she was quoted as saying, "If the use of leisure time is confined to looking at TV for a few extra hours every day, we will deteriorate as people." On the same date, Eleanor also said, "If man is to be liberated to enjoy more leisure, he must also be prepared to enjoy this leisure fully and creatively."

We have no way of knowing how the countries and people who won the Second World War reached the conclusion that the purpose of human life is to spot improvement. In like manner, who designated the countries and people who won WW2 custodians to ensure that the social system or epistemology that, on its basis, people governed each other with up until when the Second World War was fought be modified to allow each person to reach the entitlement to realize the full development of his personality.

What appears, though, to be happening in some of the countries and people who were decolonized after WWII is that a good number give the impression that their citizens are not using the time that the countries and people who won the Second World War granted them to use to thank them for giving them breathing space. Definitely, a good number of the freed people are not using their freed time to watch television or to understand clearly that there never has been security and that what the countries and people who won the Second World War granted them is a lifetime chance that their fathers and forefathers never experienced.

People cannot be doing two things at the same time: watching television and instigating crises and conflicts. It appears as if the wave of insecurity that has engulfed the entire human family is the consequence of the countries and people who won the Second World War having underestimated or undermined the in-kind purchasing power that they gave to all members of the human family to let their creative and analytical intelligence, which allows them to imagine, invent, suppose, design, analyze, explain, judge, criticize, compare, and contrast, slow down their path to seeing their goal of putting their hands on the maintenance of the permanent system of the security of the world. Purchasing power can be in kind or in cash. The countries and people who won the Second World War appear to have underestimated or undermined the power of knowledge and how this parameter or aptitude can even weaken the maintenance of their own internal stability and strength, never mind their foreign policy concerns.

Would the world have stayed safer if the countries and people who won WW2 had continued all forms of domination and oppression instead of decolonizing countries and people, including the people who were their prize at the end of the second world war? If we were all to live as siblings, all members of the human family would stop wrestling over social space and how to amass material things on a cumulative basis. Would the world have stayed safer if the war aims of the countries and people who won the Second World War, set up to maintain their strength and stability, didn't include the promotion of world peace to give the decolonized countries and people, including the people whom they vanquished at the end of the Second World War, purchasing power?

There is a good chance that the instability currently present on Earth results from people forcing each other to exchange their modes of production, along with their traditions, values, and emotions, for a modernized approach that leads them to distance themselves from being an integral part of nature and instead become idle, allowing machinery to do the work. In other words, moving from maintaining a direct horizontal relationship with the natural world required to sustain the human body in favor of belonging or pertaining to those who want to use the objects that human ingenuity creates and who want to

sustain the human body by benefiting from what the social order allows them to do, and that is to make whatever their human ingenuity comes up with a commodity. This vertical relationship is a hierarchical one, as we said before, and the more a person depends on the tools or instruments that human ingenuity comes up with to sustain his physical body from when he is part of this band. The more the tools or instruments that human ingenuity produces distance the body from having know-how to sustain survival needs, the more it is engulfed in figuring out only how to maintain its sustainability or the sustainability of the human body in this hierarchical system of power. The only difference is that the mode of production in the hierarchical band is the human ingenuity of man who calls it "rules" because humans made it a commodity, and the horizontal one is for free. The horizontal one is the natural system that offers this mode of production. The natural system offers this service for free. The only disadvantage when using the free service of the natural world is that a person doesn't live the ideal life. This is because when the person is using this free service, his human awareness is, as we said, maintaining a horizontal relationship with the earth.

On the other hand, the more people make the switch from this horizontal relationship to pertain to or be part of this vertical, hierarchical one. The more people who made the switch, the more they need to rely on engineered solutions to allow them to sustain their survival needs. In this band, human ingenuity is the mode of production, and it prices the tools it makes for those who don't want to belong to the horizontal band. As more and more human ingenuity digs and comes up with tools to allow it to survive in this vertical band. The tools are designed solely to distance the human body from the know-how human ingenuity applies to sustain the body, favoring newer, more efficient ways to realize things.

This situation is all fine and good except, as we said before, sustaining the human body requires payment when human ingenuity offers this service, whereas the natural system offers this service for free. Until the time of the two world wars, people had restricted the social space necessary for meeting their survival needs. After the two world wars were fought, the countries and people who were victors desired that all members of the human family start to be entitled to better lives. This

step that the countries and people who won the Second World War took is an unprecedented one in the history of the world.

There is one concern that no matter how much we try to reason an answer for it, we are not able to go anywhere. How are the countries and people who won the Second World War counting on maintaining their hierarchical system of power after they were gracious enough to allow the poor people to detect their existence? When the theme is to attract people to switch from the horizontal band to the hierarchical band, it is titled "Justice and a Shot at the Good Life," reflecting the teachings of the United Nations Human Rights Declaration, and aims to educate those who make the switch to ensure they adhere to these principles. Never mind freezing social space and accumulating material things that a person thinks will satisfy the full development of his human personality.

In other words, how are the countries and people who won the Second World War counting on maintaining their hierarchical system of power when the First Lady of the United States, whose husband freed the poor, told his own citizens the following? "If the use of leisure time is confined to looking at TV for a few extra hours every day, we will deteriorate as people." The question is that we are not able to reason to a logical answer no matter how much we try. This is how the countries and people who won the second world war are; if their first lady told them that if they use their leisure time to look at TV for a few extra hours every day, they will deteriorate as people, they will. How are the countries and people who won the second world war counting on not deteriorating when all the scientific advancements their human ingenuity is making them produce are nothing but tools and instruments that not only distance the human body from widening the gap from maintaining a horizontal relationship but also induce people to have more and more leisure time to look at TV for more than a few extra hours? How did the countries and people who won the Second World War reach that point as more and more of their citizens continue to spend the few extra hours that modernization freed? Will they not deteriorate as people? In like manner, how did the countries and people who won the Second World War reach that point? If they bring the entire human family to be united under one world order and to let the people of the world spend a few extra hours a day, In doing so, the

countries and people who won the Second World War are not deteriorating the entire world. In an earlier section, we already showed that the people in the countries continue to push their governments to allow them to have more leisure time to watch television. Is it possible to reach a state of organization around this new world order that the victors of the Second World War based their hopes on for a better future for the world? The question is simple and straightforward: Would the future be one that would make people live free from fear and want, as those countries and people who won the Second World War desired, or would it be when more and more people start to watch more television? Such an approach would usher in the end of the second life cycle of existence to give rise to a third and a new cycle.

Humans do know that the security of one person is the forgone security of the other due to the way nature regenerates, and human ingenuity is not the same as well. The countries and people who won the Second World War instead of rallying to ensure that countries and people remain colonized and the people who they fought with over who would have a say in the control of the governance of the world be decolonized as per how aggressors treated vanquished people throughout the history of the world. Likewise, rally for stringent population control; that is, if their objective is not to regulate how much social space or material things a person can amass. The victors of WW2 gathered to draft fresh new world orders and vote themselves as permanent members of the security of the world. The victor of WWII ignored the arguments that social theorists make on the social realm requiring a different epistemology, such as the same methods of investigation used in the case of the natural world using empiricism or the scientific method. The victor of WWII preferred, instead, that the poor who live in mud houses and use basic tools to plant their land and eat. This is what the people in developed countries rejected and swapped in favor of living a modernized lifestyle. The victor of WWII preferred that the impoverished abandon their lifestyle to pursue justice and access to a better life.

Entitling all members of the human family to live prosperous lives is, of course, a noble gesture on the part of the countries and people who won the Second World War. The only challenge is that to enable all members of the human family to live the beneficial life, this process involves employing giving, and people define “give and take” as two separate processes: one in which a person yields something to another and another in which a person seizes something. Religion developed

its cultural system of behaviors and practices based on the importance of yielding or sacrificing, despite the various forms of help that God provided, such as the angels and prophets he sent to Earth, including his son. Religion did not succeed in motivating human behavior through such sacrificial actions. Humans want to create a cultural system of behaviors and practices that directly opposes the thousands of years of conditioning by religion, which aimed to motivate acceptance through sacrifice; instead, the goal is to emphasize the importance of seizing rather than giving.

Indeed, the economic development and cultural system that people forged as of 1948 to alleviate poverty and improve living conditions is an interaction system that humans do not have experience with this kind of approach before to establish how people would adapt and integrate and to establish patterns for further evaluation. Humans have lots of experience with practicing and setting up religious values and institutions and, in equal measure, with how to make people yield objects. If the initiatives that people are pursuing and testing now allow the purpose of human life to be intended to seize, then when people seize more, they become able to distinguish between good or evil, thus converting humans into becoming more conscious and tolerant. Definitely, Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle would be pleased if they were alive to witness that humans have finally fully embraced their belief that ultimate wisdom comes from self-knowledge. If the more a person knows, the greater his ability to reason and make choices that will bring true happiness. If Plato were still alive, he would be the first to appreciate a world where people enjoy freedom from fear and want, and where the realm of ideas is considered more important than the deceptive world of the senses.

At this juncture, perhaps it is opportune to say that we cannot know if the countries and people who won the Second World War are pushing people to understand themselves, the world they live in, and the relations to the world and each other to see that the lives of people get enriched. Thus, putting the credo of Socrates and Plato in full practice or the countries and people who won the second world war and who desired that people detect their existence to realize the full development of their human personality to achieve something different when they reach their goal. This goal is to use the technological

breakthrough that rich and powerful countries developed and engineered to govern the world with such tools. This phenomenon is because the advanced technology that humans have managed to engineer can now control both the human body and the brain.

In other words, given how it is, the rich wield power and not the poor. The rich, to wield more power and reach to do what they want, regardless of the will of others, will use the scientific breakthrough to control, regulate, and even lock away from people access to knowledge, including controlling human movement. This is due to how this advanced form of knowledge has the ability to achieve this action. The dream of the rich to see an international universal order take shape in which their people could live free from fear and want may not have been their true intention.

This is because if the intentions of the rich were to see that all members of the human family reach a life free from fear and want, they should have garnered support to seek people to stop with the financialization of the world if really the barbarous acts which they have lived outrage their conscience. Those rich know very well that two people cannot realize the full development of their personality, because if this were possible. God would have initiated a mission to teach people how to give rather than how to take.

Could this defiance or disregard by the rich for this call of attention that many people are exhibiting by becoming less and less tolerant to peace and security have its source in the perception that the rich are supposed to be dismantling and reorganizing the world? This is to let automation in to control, regulate, and even lock away from people access to knowledge, including controlling human movement, which could allow them to reestablish the old power they enjoyed in past times. True, in past times, the rich used their financial and economic power to spread their imperialism. Could the rich be expecting that their technological supremacy will trace back to their imperial power? Could the rich have wanted all people to be united because they had reached using their scientific advancement to control the human body and brain before WW2, and was this the reason why they didn't care if people were decolonized? The rich made it their future project to govern the world using the advanced, higher form of intelligence they

were capable of producing to control humans. Surely, when the entire world becomes united under a single world order as desired by the wealthy, and all people come together to abandon the use of force in order to live safely, technology will be able to transform human behavior.

No law guarantees that everyone, everywhere, will automatically benefit from technological progress when all people unite under one world order. Especially after the rich and powerful countries finish interconnecting the world and restricting access to human knowledge.

Eleanor Roosevelt posed a straightforward question that we seek to answer. What do the rich gain after allowing the poor to watch TV for a few extra hours each day? Would such a gift from the rich to the poor lead to the collapse of the realization of the full development of the rich when the rich continue to let the world be inhabited by real humans and artificial beings, or will the modernization the rich are so wholeheartedly desiring the poor begin to benefit from contribute to transforming the full development of the rich to reach even higher grounds?

In other words, as more institutions modernize and more breakthroughs occur, the rich will benefit from the increased efficiency and safety that comes from fewer people needing to track human movement.s scenario means that as there are more and more breakthroughs, stops are made with requiring that a good number of people be busy with surveying one another because of how modernization can do the tracking automatically and take this job that real humans are now doing manually. As technology continues to advance, it takes on jobs that the rich count on to use to maintain their strength and stability.

The rich hoped for a world where everyone was safe, not one where they turned people against each other as machines detected human movement. Evidently, a phase of cyberwarfare would precede any military confrontation between the wealthy. The loser may seek to escalate the conflict and test military technology and equipment. The scenario we want to understand is when the victor of any military confrontation or method of elimination is determined without force.

How did the person or group of victors reason that the living people would support the hierarchical system and not revolt against it? If real humans do not create the hierarchical power system of that time, the rich—using either the natural world or artificial beings—could maintain the world's security with aliens without being defeated in their own game.

No one can predict how the broader and lasting system of global security might appear in the future. We don't know how the rich can influence the power system they want. The paradox is that the Bible states that humans have an evil inclination in their hearts from childhood. We already said we don't believe in that because the Bible claims that God said such a statement in his heart. Humans have not yet reached the point of managing to read what others think in their hearts. The wealthy do not want to acknowledge that the true threat arises from "real" humans, as they both serve as a mode of production and possess human ingenuity similar to that of artificial beings. After World War II, the wealthy allowed all people who had been oppressed before the war to be free. The question Eleanor Roosevelt posed places her in a category of her league. Eleanor seems to be an individual who belongs to a class of people whose ambition goes beyond that of God, Jesus Christ, Muhammad (SAW), Confucius, Buddha, Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, and many others. Eleanor suggested that humans must learn to create unbreakable bonds between the sciences and the humanities.

We have no way of knowing if, when man is liberated to enjoy more leisure, he could be trained or "prepared to enjoy this leisure fully and creatively," as Eleanor suggested man would be capable of doing when he learns to create unbreakable bonds between the sciences and the humanities. As we said before, Man has been practicing the common program of purposes and principles that her husband and other leaders suggested so that we could all base our hopes for a better future for the world on those leaders proposed.

In 1963, Eleanor Roosevelt said, "We must know what we think and speak out, even at the risk of unpopularity." In this work, we are going to just concentrate on sharing what we believe in, limiting our opinion reach as far as what Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle believed. We plan to show that for Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle, when "man is to be

liberated to enjoy more leisure, he must also be prepared to enjoy this leisure fully and creatively," as Eleanor suggested man do. Man could be accelerating the end of the second cycle of existence to usher in the beginning of a new third life cycle.

The new world order that the countries and people who were victors after WW2 wanted all members of the human family to practice, enabling every person anywhere on earth to observe human rights that recognize the equal and inalienable rights aimed to attain the full development of the human personality of the individual, is a very ambitious project. Enabling the perception that each person fixes translate into becoming an objective that any person can pursue to enhance his ability to achieve greater and more positive tasks in his life is certainly an invaluable ambition as well. Therefore, the contextual setting is that the rich are more and more taking control to use modernization as a means to replace traditions and values in favor of more modernized approaches to doing things. This new mode of interaction that the rich now are insisting on the poor using after both the poor and the rich became interconnected is not a venture that the poor would lose if this project were to end up later as a failure. It would be the rich. This is because it is the rich who want the poor to replace their traditions and values (i.e., religion) for a new way in which it would be the scientific advancement that would organize people's ethics.

Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle all believed that humans can eventually manage to emphasize the importance of the mind over the importance of the human body. In fact, Socrates spent his entire life exploring whether weakness of the will existed. Socrates reached that the development of personal ethics is a matter of letting human reason master what he called the "art of measurement." This method works by making human reason correct the distortions that skew one's analysis of benefits and costs. Socrates seemed to think that people only did wrong when, currently, the perceived benefits seemed to outweigh the costs.

As of 1969, humans are working to change their reliance on human reason by emphasizing the importance of ethics. Humans are working on letting human reason control and regulate the weakness of the will

so that the scientific advancement that people make can help to reach this degree of ethics. The people who agree with this school of thought, which Eleanor Roosevelt even suggested, must learn to create these unbreakable bonds between the sciences and the humanities. According to historians, at the time Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle lived, humans had not invented the World Wide Web, so people could not detect their existence as is the case now. The people in ancient Greece didn't have access to all the scientific advancements, industrial progress, and artificial intelligence as is the case now. It was only as of 1948 when people began to hold their tight grip on the custodianship of the security of the world from the hallway of the Security Council of the International Global Council, which the victors of WW2 created to govern the world using both their military and scientific supremacy. During the days when Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle lived, people maintained their supremacy on the battlefield, and the victor of WW2 knows this very well. The victor of WW2 knows that the conquests of Alexander the Great are undisputed and even that Aristotle was his mentor. Let us review if seeking to change the human cultural system so people reach ethics using scientific advancement is the way to go or if it is better to use human reason. This is because Alexander the Great, when he conquered half the world, was less than 33 years of age, and he was using knives and swords, according to historians. Those who are desiring to conquer the world using scientific advancement have been working at that for more than 80 years, and it looks like they are not going to be able to conquer staying in power if they happen to be in public office in their own country or hold off their national institutions' work to keep them safe. Most importantly, let us check if governments work best when ruled by individuals who have the greatest ability, knowledge, and virtue and possess a complete understanding of themselves, as Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle believed this would be the case or it would be setting up governments to make humans return to their state of nature, as Thomas Hobbes suggested, without a social contract established with "real" humans and not "alien" humans.

Socrates believed that governments worked best when ruled by individuals who had the greatest ability, knowledge, and virtue and possessed a complete understanding of themselves. Socrates believed that governments would work best when ruled by individuals who possess such backgrounds, because he believed that humans' choices were motivated by the desire for happiness. Little did he know, thanks to the countries and people who won the Second World War. Those victors decided to make every member of the human family on earth make his choices and become motivated by the desire for happiness. There are presently seven billion people who are all pursuing the same motivation. We have no idea what happiness each one of those seven billion people is seeking; we only know that the only happiness any person can be bestowed upon him is living longer. There is only one way to live longer, and that is to maintain the human body in good running condition—doing sports. The intelligent design arranged that humans work and take care of the earth to keep the body in good running conditions and arranged for all the therapeutic prescriptions to be free. Socrates wouldn't have known that people a couple of centuries later would be swapping maintaining their bodies in excellent running conditions using treadmill machines at home or in gyms instead of doing the same walk to the field to work the earth and to take care of it so that, in addition, the human body is kept in excellent running condition to sustain its survival needs.

We can't know if a person using a treadmill (which we think should only be for the sick and elderly) will get new calories from the natural system after sweating them out. But the question that is really worth asking is much more complex than what we just said. It is acceptable for 3.5 billion people to stand on the treadmill machine, thereby

placing the future of their ability to maintain good health in the hands of the person controlling the power switch. The question is getting to know what the objective of making the remaining 3.5 billion that are maintaining their bodies in excellent running condition from just taking care of the earth is, making them leave their lives behind to line up to exercise on the treadmill machine, thus making those too, like the rest, go nowhere. When all 7 billion people are standing on the treadmill, what happens to all of them when the person who has his hands on the switch that shuts the power to the machine pushes the off button? Where would all seven billion people find food? What provision would all the seven billion have? Most importantly, 3.5 billion people currently lack any knowledge on how to sustain the human body. What would the case be like when all seven billion lose the know-how to store potatoes, onions, wheat, etc.?

We can go on asking many questions of the type we just raised. However, the only question that we want to understand, or let's say depict for it, is a scenario of how it could end up. This question is related to understanding where those people who have already gotten on the treadmill machine could be heading, since this group is the one that, for now, decided to swap maintaining a horizontal alignment with the natural world to keep the body in good running condition for free in favor of riding on a treadmill machine. Based on our knowledge, people adjust the speed of the treadmill machine to different levels during their exercise sessions. If the speed of the treadmill machine is rapid, the person who is exercising cannot go on for a long time. If the speed is slow, a person can exercise for a much longer duration. Our question goes to the person who is controlling the speed on the treadmill machine. If this person arranges for the treadmill machine to go fast, would his clients manage to stay on it, or would they fall out?

If reaching the end faster has consequences, it implies that there must be something prepared; otherwise, a person will have nowhere to go from that point. Eleanor Roosevelt suggested that humans must learn to create unbreakable bonds between the sciences and the humanities; otherwise, those who are on the treadmills would not all fall. People can be kept on the treadmill machine in one of two ways when the operator increases the speed. One is to build the resilience of his

clients, and the second one is to alter the intelligent design of the human body.

Could it be that, after many years of failed attempts to help humans develop ethical resilience, human ingenuity now allows the senses to prevail over the realm of ideas (or human reason)? Human ingenuity has abandoned its pursuit of controlling the human body (and thus the world of the senses or mind) in order to achieve the peace of mind necessary to slow the aging process. This conclusion is because there is nothing that humans need that is more precious than this achievement.

Humans meet their survival needs through resources provided by the natural world. Modernization distances human ingenuity from the knowledge that the human body was originally programmed to recognize. Those who have exchanged their horizontal relationships for vertical ones are enjoying the benefits of modernization aligning with their creative pursuits. A person can never be satiated with knowledge. Knowledge can take a person from one place to the next much better than the way imagination does it. However, those who are satisfying their human ingenuity with the opportunities presented by modernization are overlooking the fact that when the individuals operating the machines or apparatuses, from which human ingenuity is constructing its knowledge, choose to turn off the switch. People who are happy with their human ingenuity possess nothing tangible because knowledge duplicates the objects one reads about rather than merely reading about them. People impose their power or threaten each other using tangible tools and materials, rather than simply claiming to know what a knife looks like. A person who does not know how to produce a knife has nothing to impose his power on others.

Could human ingenuity reach the point that it is impossible for people to triumph over the weakness of their will? Therefore, human ingenuity has continually focused on identifying improvements, leading to a point where the human race is now beginning to test and allow scientific advancements to influence people's movements and ethical conduct. Human ingenuity is spotting this improvement by distancing the human body from any tangible object that poses risks to its sustainability. Let us explain:

A knife is a tool that people use to reduce any labor-intensive chore into a lightweight task. After people learned that a knife can become a weapon, people started to produce more and more knives to be used both as a utility tool and, most importantly, as a weapon. The sharper humans started making blades. The kill rate increased rapidly.

Humans do not protect the social space or the people; they freeze and protect the material things they accumulate with spoons, but not with knives. The need for human ingenuity to quickly find ways to feel secure against threats led to a continuous search for better methods to maintain its hierarchical power in a structure that ultimately extended to the production of weapons of mass destruction. All are actions that do nothing but distance the human body from being the animal that human ingenuity could instantly turn into when letting tools come to its defense or protection.

Earlier, in our work, we said we couldn't understand how the common program of purposes and principles of the countries and people who won the Second World War could manage to let the integrity of the hierarchical system of power be maintained while all people are freezing social space and accumulating material things on a cumulative basis or desire to pursue the full development of their human personality and not be concerned.

People have invented a program that they call Disarmament, Demobilization, and Reintegration (DDR), which peace promoters seek to use to disarm combatants to help roll out long-term development. The process works by collecting or removing from the combatant arms, ammunition, explosives, and heavy weapons (disarmament). The next step is to take the combatant out of military structures by discharging him from any armed forces, which includes a phase of assistance and training (demobilization). The final step is the process of letting the ex-combatant integrate into society as any person with a civilian status.

In the Bible, the credo that God proposed that humans follow in order for humans to reach and maintain peace and security on earth deals with distancing the human mind from distinguishing between good

and evil to distance the human body from letting knowledge tempt the latter to commit any evil act.

Could human ingenuity use the scientific advancement and industrial progress that the countries and people who won the second world war are flooding the world with to accomplish the same end result that God proposed that humans follow under his credo of treating good and evil the same? Human ingenuity is achieving this by implementing a program similar to the one developed to disarm, demobilize, and reintegrate combatants. Human ingenuity is gathering knowledge and skills from individuals about how to pose a threat in various forms, and then reintegrating new individuals into society who are free from such threats. In other words, human ingenuity removes the animalistic power that the human body can exhibit when it chooses to withdraw consent to surrender its freedom. In the DDR program, combatants are removed from military structures and provided with short-term assistance before being reintegrated into society. In the case of human ingenuity, this aptitude involves using knowledge to achieve the same goals as those that are being removed and collected.

This is because giving humans an artificial form of knowledge keeps people's minds preoccupied with thinking that they are developing knowledge. What this accomplishes is exactly the same end result that the credo that God commanded in the Bible for humans to practice. One method is based on distancing knowledge to distance the human body from becoming a threat (God's credo). The other method is based on preoccupying the human body with knowledge to distance the human body to become a threat (human credo). In other words, a person is reading about how a knife is produced, but the person is not producing a blade, which is what causes the real threat and not just reading about what a blade looks like, what it is made of, or what it does.

There is also another substantial contrast between the way God in the credo that appears in the Bible wants people not to distinguish between good and evil and the way human ingenuity suggests people do it. In the case of God's credo, the survival needs that humans continually need, it is the human body that is in charge of securing this source using what intelligent design put to work together: the human body

and mind. In the case of the credo that humans propose, the survival needs that humans continually need start to depend on other humans to secure through the machineries that human ingenuity produces. This is because in the case of God's credo, all humans are equal, and only the natural world has power over humans. In the case of the credo that humans propose, this credo depends on human ingenuity and the natural world. Human ingenuity is an aptitude that humans converted into a commodity, and this aptitude is not spread on an equal basis among humans. This signifies that people continue to distance the human body from relying on its own human ingenuity to learn how to sustain its survival needs. If humans let artificial beings take care of this part for real humans. Such actions could mean that humans are setting each other up to return to living under a new form of subjugation, domination, and exploitation. The entity that would be subjecting people to this form of new subjugation, domination, and exploitation wouldn't be real humans but the artificial being or modernization that humans preferred using to seek to arrive at political and ethical truths. During the colonization days, it was real humans who oversaw this action of subjugation; now it is modernization that does it under the control and on behalf of people. The only difference, once again, is that during the colonization days, people were not feeling free. Under modernization, people think that they are free.

Earlier we said the war aims of the countries and people who won the Second World War were different from the war aims that humans have seen before. In the broadest sense, we can say that indeed we do have two credos, and each one advocates a distinct approach on how humans should carry on with interacting with the objects that exist on the outside of their physical bodies. Both creeds, the one God proposed and the one human ingenuity wants people to pursue by practicing modernization or to start to live by its rule, are one and the same. Both creeds aim to distance human awareness from having access to knowledge. As we just said, one works on distancing human awareness from getting access to knowledge so the human body keeps on interacting with the natural world (God's credo). The other human credo is to work on providing human ingenuity to access knowledge, including controlling human body movement but without the human body detecting this knowledge in reality, due to the human body not altering any matter. The human body is an idly operating machine.

Only the senses are working, transmitting knowledge to human awareness. Evidently, in the case of God, it wouldn't matter if people multiply, because humans wouldn't be freezing social space and accumulating material things. The operation of human life is based on how humans propose it should be managed. People would be doing the opposite, continuing to freeze social space and to accumulate material things, thus continuing to put pressure on how the intelligent design or God desired humans to continue doing, and that is to multiply and replenish.

Could the countries and people who won the second world war be counting on securing the integrity of the hierarchical system of power they hope to maintain their grip on by relying on their advanced scientific breakthrough to fortify themselves, knowing how now they are able to control the human body and mind, including even winning a war without involving the human body in this process? This is also another reason why the countries and people who won the Second World War were not concerned with all people freezing social space and accumulating material things on a cumulative basis, including allowing any person to pursue the full development of their human personality.

As we said, we don't care if country A or B is responsible for global security. Likewise, we are not concerned at all with how the hierarchical system of power that the countries and people who won the Second World War mounted it.

We are interested in figuring out how human ingenuity reasoned and reached the conclusion that it manages to distance the human body and mind from the real knowledge that people use to threaten each other with. This process includes even controlling the movement of the human body to control and regulate the human ingenuity of the people whose aptitude is thought to be a threat. The integrity of human ingenuity, which in this case would benefit society (as exemplified by the countries and people who won the Second World War), would not be challenged.

Once again, as crazy as this idea may sound, it is worth considering. We think that the countries and people who won the Second World

War should have left colonized countries and people alone. We think the decision to decolonize people supports either human ingenuity lacking the ability to distinguish good from evil or God confusing their language so they will not understand each other when setting the war aims. In the same way, the Bible narrates God came down once on earth and confused the language of the people who he saw building themselves a city with a tower that reaches to the heavens.

Let us not ignore the other question that is equally important. How did the countries and people who won the Second World War conclude that human ingenuity is inherent in the human body, enabling individuals to fulfill their desires and achieve their goals? It may very well be that intelligent design or God have programmed human ingenuity in the human body to serve a function totally different from the one humans are using this aptitude to achieve. We are not talking about humans disobeying God. We are talking about how humans have reached that point of distancing the human body from becoming an intrinsic part of nature to preserve human security and may not be setting up this second life cycle into annihilation to start a third life cycle of existence. This is because it does not matter whether the intelligent design that created humans chose to remain invisible or if God decided to do so. The type of human reasoning that people employ is what makes the difference. Humans are, as of 1989, letting the purpose of human life be to entitle everyone to realize the full development of his personality. This principle could be good for capitalism but maybe very incompatible with the way the human body was intended to function as per the way the intelligent design programmed this "corpse" to function. Human ingenuity after it managed to control the human body through science. This attitude ousted religion and human reason to replace them with a modern way of submission. Instead of using God or religion as motivators for exhibiting ethics or human reason, people are encouraged to rely on science and technology. Human ingenuity wants people to achieve ethics based on how science or technology forces them to interact with the human body.

The more people are coming up with scientific advancements and are making industrial progress, which favors distancing the human body from relying on man-made means of production to sustain survival needs in favor of machine-based ones. The challenge is no longer humans going ahead and tying up social space that could be used by the accelerated population growth rates that emerged after WWII. Nor is the challenge any longer the objects humans engineer to later terrorize and dominate each other with and/or to obtain accessions with those apparatuses and tools.

Humans can protect the social space, people they want to freeze, and/or material things they accumulate with their bare hands or with a plutonium bomb; both methods are equally effective. There are two choices that people could pick to stabilize “the can of worms”: knowledge feeds it strength or power. Either people continue to practice the common program of purposes and principles that they embarked on after WWII to attempt to master, as Eleanor Roosevelt suggested, “the art of creating unbreakable bonds” between the sciences and the humanities or go back to practicing and mastering “the art of measurement” that Socrates proposed and which is based on using human reason to correct the distortions that skew one’s analyses of benefit and costs. That’s of course if people don’t want to go do the right thing and stop with spotting improvements that are intended to satiate earthly desire and instead go back to living as per the credo that in the Bible God calls on humans to do.

When the countries and people who won the Second World War started freeing people in 1948, industrialization was not automated. This race that people fall into its trap to continually look for improved ways to

spot improvement to protect the social space people freeze and/or material things they accumulate. made people consecrate their knowledge to engineer new tools and new approaches to maintain their hierarchical power. The more and more automation displaces real humans, the more and more the human body and mind become free. The more the freed human body and mind have nowhere to dissipate the energy other than watching television. According to Eleanor Roosevelt: "If the use of leisure time is confined to looking at TV for a few extra hours every day, we will deteriorate as people. " We have no way of knowing for how long people were watching TV in 1958. In 2016, we now have people watching TV for an entire day, as is the case in many countries, thanks to industrialization and automation. We have no way of knowing if people are deteriorating. What we know is that people were not expressing disenchantment in 1958 in the same way they are now doing in recent years across all social classes.

Certain people could have been mistaken and counted on modernization and, particularly, automation after WWII ended to recreate the same prosperity the people of Great Britain reached and benefited from during the British Victorian Era. There is a big difference between industrialization and automation because the latter distances the human body completely from establishing a direct interface with the natural world. The automation of industrialization, such as assembly lines, can jeopardize the legitimacy of requiring individuals to consent, either explicitly or tacitly, to relinquish some of their freedom and submit to the authority of a legal system or state power that controls the programmed ability to reason, given the nature of how automation performs this function. As time goes by and people continue to make scientific advancements, the implications of these changes become increasingly significant. The legitimacy of any state authority in ensuring the general welfare could split people into cops and robbers as automation increasingly takes on this role.

This phenomenon would be more and more manifested due to how in an automated society people have nothing all along to do but to talk to reach agreement on how the earth's resources can be acquired, managed, and distributed as per what the UN declaration entitles each one to. An automated society requires humans to continuously use the tools they engineer, which can threaten the welfare of other members

of the human family. The goal is to mitigate the negative impact that the increasing distance between the human body and its direct interface with the natural world will have on the preservation of actual human life. We are unaware of the current effects on the people in the victorious countries of the Second World War. If our work contains some element of truth, the countries and peoples that emerged victorious from the Second World War should focus on managing their internal hierarchical power rather than imposing it on the rest of the world.

In fact, there is a good chance that in the future, certain people may decide to lock away knowledge, which is something that modernization and artificial intelligence can do. Our suggestion is for nations to start to build enough jail cells before thinking of locking away the information that human ingenuity needs to build its own “artificial” know-how. As we said before, the threat comes from preventing others from accessing something else they need. The main issue is how those in power will act against others' wishes, which is what power is. This is because even if governments reach people's cell phones and cameras, they are in power “on” after people power them “off” to spy on the actions of their citizens. The threat is from the people who are doing nothing but exercising what they have a right to, and that is the rule of law. If the human body and human ingenuity were watching TV all day long. Can human ingenuity build any know-how other than making sure the rule of law is strong?

There is no fairer way to rule the world than letting surveillance cameras monitor every person's move. However, all the crises and conflicts people have experienced since WWII are due to machinery distancing humans from fulfilling the role that intelligent design intended for them—to be an intrinsic part of nature—rather than the human purpose of serving and seeking significance and immortality in achievements.

The issue is that, until not too long ago, people used to exercise control over other humans in two ways. People exercised control over others either by managing their food security, which is essential for survival, or by influencing their minds. Before the industrialization era, humans did not know how to control those who posed a threat to their interests

and relied on shackling the human body to tools to prevent human ingenuity from becoming a threat or leading to imprisonment. Religion was a tool to control the brain as well. After the birth of industrialization, people added a new mode to control each other. The method worked on controlling the resources people need to run the machinery used in any form of production. Another method that people relied on involved controlling and limiting the technical assistance needed to produce machinery for others or to generate energy. This changed completely after the scientific advancement and technological breakthrough that humans started making, leading to all the innovative technological advancements and automation that exist. People from the comfort of their office in real time can now press on a button and decide whom to open the gate to enter and whom not to. People are also able to drain the human brain of any knowledge, thus rendering the human body into a no threat at all. This is because distancing the human body from maintaining its direct interface with the natural world weakens the human ingenuity from knowing how to sustain its survival needs. In other words, if a person relies on a well as a main source for water consumption. If a person can, from a distance, turn the pump on and off, this person has the upper hand because he has the power to endanger human security with the push of a code. This brain drain and the ability of humans now to control people's movement and the knowledge that they can have access to are another challenge.

In past times, the growing complexity of human societies necessitated the stratification of individuals into social classes, which referred to their cultural backgrounds or social and economic situations. After the countries and people who won the Second World War decolonized poorer nations, the entire human family is now working to distance the human body from its direct interface with the natural world. The scientific and innovative technological breakthrough that is converting every tool that humans use into becoming automated is indeed rendering the human worth, both body and brain, into becoming a commodity that can be monitored and controlled in the same way people are now able to know where their shipment is located when it is en route to them. People are already testing how to begin to use driverless cars. There will be technicians who will assist the drivers

whose vehicles malfunction. A few people will have access to the code that controls driverless cars.

We cannot know what motivates people to engineer tools that help them finish their chores faster or to distance the human body from nature. A person can only depart this life naturally, or the objects that humans develop could motivate an early exit. There could be only two reasons why humans strive to create tools that distance the human body from its intrinsic connection to nature. This motivation is either to end each other's lives much earlier, contrary to what people think, or to contribute to slowing the aging process. The question arises about whether the natural system can withstand all the changes that humans are causing and whether humans understand how these changes affect the natural system's resilience.

People began to exhibit a low degree of tolerance toward peace and security after the countries and people who won the Second World War. This could be due to the world being reorganized in accordance with the common program of purposes and principles that the countries and people who won the second world war laid out to base their hopes for a better future for the world, or the more human ingenuity tricks people into devoting time to produce tools to distance the human body from maintaining being an intrinsic part with nature. This action contributes to more insecurity. This is due to all the knowledge that stirs human ingenuity to make people want to detect their existence.

After WWII, the victors chose to be mindful after their consciences were outraged. Despite this action being a milestone in the history of human rights, it aimed to create conditions of stability and well-being for all members of the human family, based on respect for equal rights and the principles outlined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. This attempt by the countries and people who won the Second World War is rational. There could be a good chance that this aspiration to promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom may be an epistemology that is not adaptable in the social realm due to how modernization or automation distances the human body from maintaining being an intrinsic part with nature,

according to the way the intelligent design intended for this species to function.

There is no harm in people continuing testing with modernization or automation to determine if humans would reach the point of dividing reality into two separate realms, the world of the senses and the world of ideas, and declaring that the latter is the important one. This is because, in the end, this is what could enable humans to seek to arrive at political and ethical truths. This is to manage to reach to make people live free from fear and want as the countries and people who won the second world war aspired to would be taking place when people begin to emphasize the importance of the mind over the relative unimportance of the human body.

There is one last task left for us to do in this work. This task is to examine how people's ongoing attempts to make every member of the human family be entitled to the right to enjoy freedom of speech and belief and freedom from fear and want "on respect for the principles of equal rights" could turn out when more people detect their existence. We will examine whether this action is ushering in a better world or if the wave of insecurity that began to rise after World War II is instead leading to the end of this second life cycle of existence, making way for a new, third life cycle. Evidently, the issue that people want to understand is whether people could manage to control and regulate the human body, both physical and mental, using technology and automation to stop this wave of insecurity. This challenge, as previously mentioned, involves finding ways for people to overcome their willpower weaknesses in a context where the tools they create, which serve as barriers between themselves and nature, are constantly evolving. People must reach a consensus on the acquisition, management, and distribution of both the resources and the tools that humans produce.

The more a person gets to know, the greater his ability to reason and to make choices that will help to achieve practical results for the greater well-being of society is, but it is not something that humans have real desire to practice. This is irrespective of the fact that even if people were to try. It is not possible for humans to triumph over the weakness of the will because of how the permanent ongoing changes that both the natural world and human ingenuity are undergoing are continually fabricating new desires. In addition, humans want to trap themselves in letting the detection of existence pass through science. This action is like adding more fire to the flame. The scientific advancement that people develop takes away from in front of the human body the role this aptitude was supposed to serve for human ingenuity. The scientific advancement that people are happy with seeing around them renders the action of the detection of existence, which the intelligent design intended to be real, into becoming an artificial detection. The human body stops short of sending to human awareness what the true know-how looks like to allow this aptitude to find itself in the multitude of arrays of things it can do. When science guides human awareness, the knowledge it detects becomes artificial.

There is nothing wrong with allowing human awareness to skip steps in order to detect existence. In other words, stop letting human awareness discover its existence on its own and, in the process, let the happiness that a person draws come from this experience rather than letting machinery motivate this process. Indeed, no person can claim that he reached a complete understanding of reality in the short lifetime that we all have. The power of human ingenuity to enable, through science, a person to broaden his knowledge without even leaving the comfort of his home, as per what the internet facilitated in

the form of reading material, is indeed a breakthrough. Even if a person doesn't get to live the reality and this action remains an artificial one, at least he knows that there exists something that our forefathers may not have known about in the same way we now do.

Let us say that there is no single correct answer to how each person perceives or defines reality. However, one thing is certain. If people organized their lives around the credo that the Bible states God suggested prioritizing practical results for the greater well-being of society, they would be more likely to pursue the good life. A person who has never experienced reality cannot develop the ability to distinguish between good and evil. A person thinks that he did.

Moreover, the world is currently inhabited by two types of entities. Those two bodies are real people and the artificial beings that humans produce or give birth to. Both real and artificial beings interact with living and nonliving things that exist, and both are ruling the world. People monitor these two bodies to ensure they produce outcomes aligned with the ideals established by human ingenuity for maintaining security in the world. Let us examine how the world may evolve if people continue to allow both real individuals and artificial beings to inhabit and govern it simultaneously.

In the broadest sense, the goal of the credo (or plan) presented in the creation story of the Old Testament is to motivate people to abstain from committing wicked or evil acts, without distinguishing between good and evil in how they conduct their lives. The plan developed by the victor of World War II to maintain world peace and encourage the entire human family to practice for the improvement of the general welfare of every citizen on earth is not different in its intentions when compared to the one suggested by God in the Bible. The only divergence that exists is embedded in the mechanism or machinery to be used to get there in each plan, as we said. In the plan proposed by the Bible, individuals would strive to attain ethical truths through the act of yielding objects. Humans believe that the path to achieving ethical truth involves seizing objects. This contrast that exists between how humans and how God consider the path to form noble character to pass through is not limited to this only divergence. In the case of God's plan, the Bible states that humans do it through lessening barriers,

dropping regulations, and encouraging people to yield material possessions to maintain a direct interface with the elements from which humans sustain their survival needs and satiate their earthly desires. Human plans to motivate ethical behavior and prevent evil are the same as God's plan. Humans want to reduce barriers and regulations to allow machinery to directly interact with the elements that provide for their survival needs and fulfill their earthly desires, rather than having the human body perform this role. Additionally, encourage people to pursue material possessions so that the human body can establish a direct interface with the machines and devices created by humans, rather than relying on the human body to interact with the natural world. In summary, the primary distinction lies in the methods by which the human body meets survival needs and fulfills earthly desires. One plan involves freeing the body from the responsibility of meeting survival needs by allowing machinery to perform this role (*credo science*), while the other plan focuses on allowing the human body to discover these experiences for itself (*credo God*).

There is also another question that equally applies. Humans are uncertain whether they should see themselves as just another part of nature, like other species, or as intended custodians, a role they adopted to subjugate and dominate each other in the name of improving the world.

The strangest thing is that, unlike any other living creature, only humans are unhappy with how intelligent design programmed them and are working to improve their conditions. Similarly, lions, mice, birds, fish, elephants, giraffes, and monkeys are not organizing global councils to stop preying on each other or to appoint themselves permanent members of the animal kingdom's security. People could continue to want to be organized to play the custodianship role over each other instead of letting the experience of being among the living be a pleasant one for everyone. This decision to convert the world into becoming a better place is human ingenuity, and only human ingenuity will decide it.

Many people lived as of when Heraclitus (c. 540 BCE–c. 480 BCE) was stressing the need for people to live together in social harmony

and when, on 11 May 1943, Eleanor Roosevelt said, "One of the best ways of enslaving a people is to keep them from education... The second way of enslaving a people is to suppress the sources of information, not only by burning books but also by controlling all the other ways in which ideas are transmitted." People living between the dates of the two survivors rejected Heraclitus's idea that people prefer a dreamy, false view of the world rather than understanding the universal principle connecting all things and events.

Protagoras (c. 490–c. 420) was the most effective at emphasizing that absolute truth is determined by what individuals perceive as true when he stated, "Man is the measure of all things." Humans were likely programmed to create change, like all living and lifeless things, rather than using the natural system to pursue a good life through hegemony, claiming to improve the world and promote peace, despite no one being officially assigned this task.

Heraclitus suggested that good and evil define each other. Could the conclusion that people reached be to use human ingenuity to achieve with this aptitude what human reasoning has been putting this programmed tool to accomplish? The goal is to give this aptitude the functional role that human own reasoning wants it to play in the life of any person, but this may very well not be exactly what the intelligent design intended this aptitude to function as. This incompatibility is what is making humans unable to reach agreement in peace. For example, producing a spoon is beneficial for human reasons, but the spoon is harmful for the natural world. The natural world and the human body are both made of matter, and thus they are one in one.

This underlying connection between opposites that humans perceive is the consequence of humans having clustered the superior pre-programmed aptitude to reason that all humans are programmed with one on the basis of two opposing forces, because in this way they could classify the changes that don't suit them, as we said before. This notion also signifies that the inclination of the human heart is not maybe evil as religion tries to articulate that every person's heart would become as such when a person reaches the childhood age.

Humans' decision to distance themselves from continuing to want to be an intrinsic part of nature and their decision to structure their interaction on the basis of the custodianship role that they started to play over the objects they engineer led people to perceive that they are going ahead and working toward addressing how to reduce hunger, poverty, desperation, and chaos in the world or seek significance and immortality in their achievements. This empowerment was achieved by people after they recognized the capabilities of human ingenuity. Human ingenuity created objects whose benefits could be perceived by human reasoning as reflected in their own lives. This is because of how the senses were communicating to the human reasoning how the objects that human ingenuity was producing were transforming the lives of the people who were using them, thus making them appear that they were living a richer life. This perception is what encourages people to lose sight of reality in pursuing ever higher degrees of scientific excellence. In turn, this perception of putting human ingenuity to crank out scientific advancement and industrial progress was distancing the human body from interacting with the natural world. The more human ingenuity distances the human body from interacting with the natural world. The more human reasoning thinks that this distancing has made the purpose of human life less worthwhile.

This perception, which humans' reasoning invented right when this aptitude supposed that when human ingenuity is put to use, distances the "human body" from fulfilling the role the intelligent design programmed the "human body" to achieve for "the natural world." This reorientation aims to utilize human ingenuity to enhance scientific advancement, thereby enabling the "human body" to extend its lifespan in alignment with the interests of human ingenuity and reasoning. This perception may have led humans to believe that their purpose is to seek significance and immortality through the achievements of their own ingenuity. The love of life motivated human reasoning to take such actions and form these perceptions. This act by human reason to alleviate hunger, poverty, desperation, and chaos stems from this aptitude's feeling that life is short and impermanent, which disempowers it.

Evidently, the unwillingness of human reasoning to succumb to the conditions imposed by religion affects how it chooses to spend its days on earth. In other words, abstain from interacting with matter to produce progress so wickedness will cease. Human reason invented good and evil in order to blame this disobedience on the existence of such evil perceptions and not to blame the human reasoning. The classification of the changes that human reasoning exhibits in the matter under two opposing forces to serve its own interests worked until the year 1945, or until WWII ended. As of 1945 science, which is a tool that humans invented to control each other with, is showing humans that evil is not the real problem, so humans reach a life in peace. It is more the human ingenuity of certain people who have conniving ideas, like the one Eleanor Roosevelt in 1943 suggested knowledge be used to serve: a knife with two blades.

The world has been through many changes before. Indeed, the initiatives that people developed to understand themselves, the world they live in, and their relationships with one another have enriched lives and helped humanity figure out how many things work.

Throughout history, people have employed various methods to enslave one another. After 1945 people began to enslave each other using knowledge as a weapon. People are now working on collecting and controlling all the ways in which ideas are transmitted, not necessarily to produce knives or guns but to store potatoes, make cheese, plow the earth, and so forth.

We assume that the process of controlling all methods of transmitting ideas and consolidating them into a single source is ongoing. People are aware that access to knowledge and progress led many to agree that the universe changes very little. In fact, Heraclitus wrote the world order is an "ever-living fire kindling in measures and being extinguished in measures." It appears as if Heraclitus is right. Eleanor Roosevelt was also right when, in 1963, she said, "There has never been any security." At this juncture, we could only say that, indeed, a large number of people are willing to endorse a god-created man. Those who do not believe in God's creation of the universe are willing to endorse the idea that it could have taken millions of years for the universe to form and that humans are descendants of apes on the tree

of life. Nonetheless, there is one truth that seems to repeat itself no matter which choice a person's own belief on how the universe was created happens to fall on. The universe seems to be so organized that there are two scenarios that this could be due to: either God created the universe or it was so organized by chance.

Eleanor Roosevelt, in 1963, said that we should "face the future fortified with the lessons we have learned from the past." Today, we must create the world of the future. The path forward will involve either returning to human reasoning to establish necessary ethics with the support of religion or allowing science to assist in this task. Eleanor Roosevelt was indeed a well-educated first lady. Let us continue to check, as Ibn Khaldun suggested, when we need to seek experience. Let us evaluate the historical material to determine whether distancing people from their intrinsic connection to nature contributes to widening social inequality, which some believe is increasing the gap between the rich and poor. Alternatively, if such a method ushers in a better world and doesn't prepare the second life cycle of existence for a speedy end.

People take actions for different reasons. There are people who reach to nourish potentials; they feel comfortable with them much more than others to make a positive difference, and there are others who don't. Indeed, humans do not have any idea about the purpose of human life and where life on earth is heading. This doesn't mean that because it was concealed away from man, knowing if the actions that all the living and non-living things impact in reality could be impacting negatively or positively the endurance of the earth.

Humans can perceive that their actions are contributing to improvements in the world. There would always be two types of improvements. The improvements are related to how the natural order functions, and there are the changes that involve how to change substances or constituents within. Erecting a high rise is nothing but grains of sand that human ingenuity collected and made come together to stop remaining as a skeleton and take shape. Whether real humans or artificial beings erect a high rise, they are one and the same. The human body and the artificial beings are nothing but substances (material of terrestrial origin) that have a form. The only difference is that one possesses a spirit and the other doesn't. Although the improvements that man and his new guests have spotted have not changed how the natural order functions, this change is still imminent. There are two types of changes: explosive and digested.

The puzzle that challenges ingenuity for an explanation is the underlying connection between the natural order (physical) and the human soul along with its constituents: human ingenuity, human reasoning, and human imagination. All those properties are immaterial (non-physical).

"Realm" is an aspect that different people explain according to each one's own perception. This domain is the measure of what each individual deems to represent absolute truths.

People have the power to understand the universal principle that explains how all things are interrelated and how natural events occur. All the aforementioned aspects exist within the physical realm. In other words, people are able to see water, air, and fire and solid, liquid, and gas. Each one of those aforementioned constituents represents a realm that is interrelated, which causes natural events to occur. Humans cannot see the natural realm of the soul, whose three main constituents are human ingenuity, human reasoning, and human imagination.

People have until now focused on managing how to structure the realm of the natural world (i.e., how to acquire, manage, and distribute the earth's resources). People tend to overlook the need to structure the realm of the soul in a similar manner. Hence, it is the realm of the soul that is causing all the instability that the world is learning from man.

Man can continue to ignore that hot and cold, day and night, health and disease, birth and death, fresh water and salt water, and so forth are all opposites whose underlying connection is the natural world that unites all those things. There is no underlying connection between the natural world, which unites all those things, and the realm over which the soul has dominion. This conclusion is because, until proven otherwise, the soul is not made of matter.

People could continue to use the constituents of their soul to impose changes on the divergent nature of the world, under the assumption that all opposing connections are coherent and that a change in one direction is ultimately balanced by a corresponding change in another. There is a good chance that the hidden connection, which balances the divergent nature of the world's endurance, is something that will remain unchallenged. The mystery that challenges ingenuity for an explanation is that everything said in the different religious books remains unrefuted. The Bible says that for as long as the earth endures,

seedtime and harvest, cold and heat, summer and winter, day and night will never cease (Genesis 8:22).

We can't know if the hidden link that balances the world's divergence will collapse. In other words, the endurance of the natural world depends on whether its self-ordered or chaotic changes will lead to collapse, or if the changes created by humans are contributing to its cohesion or disintegration. For example, the intelligent design could have arranged the changes the air exhibits in keeping together the hidden connection moved at the speed that the human body exerts such displacement and not at the rate of the changes a vehicle exhibits. There is also the question of the hidden connection that humans perpetuate in this coherent system and that is the focus of this book. We are trying to understand whether the realm of the soul controls its hidden connection or has power over it. If its constituents could work together to maintain an orderly balance in the world, similar to how the constituents of the natural world maintain balance with one another, this would hold true regardless of how the changes taking place appear to the senses.

We want to understand this connection because, as we said, there are many ways to get from one point to another. If humans cannot prevail over the weakness of their will, there is little point in building a global council to encourage cooperation, since humans cannot achieve this while distancing themselves from being an intrinsic part of nature. This is because, as we said, knowledge is a knife with two blades.

So, as we said, power is the ability to do what one wants, regardless of others' will. One option could be to impose a limit on reproduction until individuals can determine how to separate the social realm into two distinct worlds. The world of ideas and the world of senses, and reach to declare the former as the only important one. This is because there is no reason to make people suffer unnecessarily if humans are not able to separate the realm into two worlds anatomically, as we showed, and, on top of that, want to make the purpose of human life to be to entitle each individual to reach the development of his own personality. If it weren't for the artificial scarcity that humans created, there wouldn't be an economic problem in the world nor a need to have a global council to agree on the maintenance of the security of

the world. Science has now shown that we can rely on God on all ethical matters to win eternal life, and this reward is now a personal choice. In other words, a person decides for himself and on his own whether he wants to go back to doing what the credo of the Bible God claims a human being must do to avoid death and win eternal life.

However, as we said earlier, human reasoning wouldn't want that reproduction be slowed down only because its newer human ingenuity can arrange for human imagination the wish of slowing down the aging process. One thing we know. The Bible claims that God acted after his first two creations disobeyed him. God installed a flaming sword flashing back and forth to guard the way to the Tree of Life (Genesis 3:24). Let us review if people can manage to triumph over the hidden connection that is keeping them until now unable to triumph over the weakness of their will as per the way Socrates suggested people do, which is a prerequisite to attempting to dare to see if human ingenuity can find a way to overtake the flaming sword. In other words, evaluate whether it is better to continue distancing humans from being an intrinsic part of nature in favor of creating unbreakable bonds between the sciences and the humanities, as suggested by Eleanor Roosevelt, or to return to mastering the bonds that Socrates recommended. The goal is to develop personal ethics just on the basis of human reasoning and not without the help of science.

Indeed, God's proposition about how he wanted humans to live is not ambitious. The social order that humans picked is not a system that could be compared with the one that God suggested. However, if we take into account all that we know already about how the state of human life has been like from the date people invented writing up to when people decided to create the global council that human reasoning suggested could help to convert the world into becoming a better place. Moreover, if we pile up on this entire period, how the state of peace and security in the world has been like after people began to pursue their projects so no person can live in fear and want. We cannot but relate how life on earth was like when Christianity was spreading and the efforts that the victor of WWII agreed to and proposed took place on earth. Under either approach, it was humans who were spreading each respective ideology.

When Christianity emerged, people were more and more converting and adopting this religion as representative of their beliefs. The companions of Christ and the converts managed to spread Christianity by showing how salvation, forgiveness, and other adherents can make people build a strong distinction between good and evil and see the difference between them. The group of people that started to believe in God, Christ, resurrection, salvation, and so forth began to employ missionaries to spread this religion. When those missionaries were spreading Christianity, what those missionaries were preaching to people was nothing but how Jesus came to make the Laws of Moses become fulfilled plus how when a person fulfills them, he would be saved from hell and resurrected. The means to reach salvation was through a person living a life of compassion.

Relatively speaking, there isn't a significant difference between the type of cooperation that the United Nations advocates and the goals that Christ and his disciples aimed to achieve regarding the protection of human dignity and worth. Strangely, Christ's preaching aims to achieve the same objectives, but it emphasizes adhering to teachings that follow a path similar to the one his father preached, rather than the approach people adopted after WWII.

The story that appears in the New Testament is the one in which the young man asked Jesus Christ about what he should do to win eternal life. Christ answered this young man by saying to him, "Go sell all your possessions and give them to the poor." (Matthew 19:21)

There are two essential components involved in the creation of any material object. The two essential components in creating any material object are thought and workmanship. It makes no sense that when Christ asked this young man to give away the material possessions he had accumulated, this new person would then face the dilemma of how to achieve eternal life, especially since all people do is interact with material objects. Likewise, it is illogical for Jesus to ask the young man to give up only one of the resources required to create any material possession. This is because the body of knowledge that goes into producing a shape is immaterial, and this is the person's thought, which stays with him at all times, while on the other side, the object doesn't. Jesus' reply to this young man must imply "do not distinguish

between good and evil." In other words, he should not create or manipulate any object.

Indeed, the suggestion that Christ proposed to this young man was less ambitious than the aspirations that people began practicing after ratifying the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. People, when they ratified the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, affirmed the inalienable rights of all the human family, men and women, to better standards of life and even allowed that everyone is entitled to the protection of the moral and material interests that a person accumulates. That's not all; when it comes to the production of any scientific, literary, or artistic production under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, a person has the right to its protection as well whenever he is the author.

The United Nations, under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, is practicing a common program of purposes and principles that challenges ingenuity for an explanation because they either involve a paradox or an apparent contradiction. The United Nations wants people to interact with objects in a manner that is the total opposite of what Christ suggested to this young man to do. In the case of what Jesus Christ proposed, the rich guy was going to forgo being rich (i.e., having access to material things) to become poor (i.e., having no access to material things). Based on what Jesus Christ was asking this young rich man to do. It doesn't appear that Jesus was insinuating he wanted this young man to cooperate with the poor man on equal rights principles or the material things that he accumulated. Likewise, it doesn't appear that Jesus Christ was insinuating that this rich man would recognize the inalienable right of the poor man to better standards of life. What Jesus Christ appears to have insinuated to this young man to do if he wanted to win eternal life is to eject or oust from his life any desire for the pursuit of the full development of his personality. This argument is completely contrary to the goals that the United Nations is pursuing under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

To a great extent, when the victors of WW2 came together, they created the United Nations to work together so all human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights, as the Universal Declaration

claims. Those victors next agreed to foster improvements that support the inherent equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family to the good life. The individuals who convened were not undertaking any actions that differed from what Christ was requesting of the rich young man. The people who after WWII were victors and wanted to stop hunger, poverty, and desperation in the world were attempting to do something more noble than what Christ proposed. In the case of Jesus Christ, as we said, Christ didn't suggest that either the rich or the poor attempt to live according to the equal rights principles guaranteed by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The rich young man was going to become poor and stripped of everything he had when he gave all his possessions to the poor in return for winning eternal life.

We can only comprehend one detail of what the victor of WWII programmed as war aims, and that is the nearness of the concept that Christ wanted people to test with, as opposed to what people instead began to practice after WWII.

When the missionaries spread the message that anyone who chooses to live a life of compassion will be saved from hell and resurrected, they aimed to gain more Christian converts. The people who listened to the converters' preaching and subsequently converted became more receptive to their message. Indeed, the promise that those missionaries who were spreading that God sent his son as a sign to signal that he was no longer going to be judging people on consequent reward or punishment based on how people continued to adhere solely to the covenant laws helped them to find converts. Let us also say that the message that those missionaries who were spreading Christianity were also using to ascertain that it was no longer necessary to adhere to certain laws because Jesus coming was by itself a sign that they were fulfilled and served their meaning, which helped a lot as well, was that the message was that Jesus coming was by itself a sign that they were fulfilled and served their meaning, which helped a lot as well. However, without a doubt, the promise of resurrection from death for anyone who accepted a life of compassion was the primary reason the Christian religion spread so quickly.

Most importantly, the missionaries were spreading Christianity until it became accepted as a formal religion in an unorganized manner. Those missionaries were spreading Christianity not from an organized system but from the perspective of a movement. Initially, tensions rose between Jews and Christians as the Jews wanted to preserve Moses' laws. Pagans and rulers revolted against the missionaries. Those missionaries managed to get through their movement to make Christianity an accepted religion. Christians killed many pagans who refused to convert, even after Christianity became legal.

First and foremost, it may very well be that evil and wickedness were elevated during this age, and God and his son wanted to provide people a chance at winning eternal life, but we cannot ignore that when God and his son began mingling and looking after the interests and welfare of people, those two were fueling disenchantment. The followers of God and his son created havoc for the pagans who refused to convert when Christianity started to spread, and many were even persecuted.

From what we know, the group of nations who agreed and proposed that all the people of the world be united formed a global council after WW2 to end hunger and poverty in the world and help establish that no person lives in fear and want. We could say the global council that the victor of WWII set up is very similar to what the converts to Catholicism set up in Rome back in the 1st century. Their plan is not any different from when Peter, one of Jesus's disciples, traveled to Rome and formed an early Christian community of believers over there. In the case of Peter and the Christian believers that joined with him, he set up an ecclesiastical administration that grew into becoming an ecclesiology operation responsible for the governance of all Christians all over the world. We don't know if Peter and the people with whom he set up his ecclesiastical community in the 1st century created a security council. What we know is that from the 1st century up to now, this ecclesiastical community has split into many denominations, and that if God and his son don't make a miracle very soon, all the scientific advancements that people are making are going to shut the Holy See out of business. Could we expect in the future to see the United Nations Security Council split in the same way the Christian Church split?

The state of despair that most religions are finding themselves in these days is dealing with as a result of how scientific advancement and industrial progress are competing with the values that the church spent thousands of years investing in to keep people away from having to return to their state of nature. The collapse of the Christian church was due to the people who created those institutions agreeing that perhaps no man can rule over another man. The question we aim to explore in this work is the following: Can humanity create unbreakable bonds between the sciences and the humanities, as Eleanor Roosevelt suggested, or are we setting ourselves up to be ruled by science? Indeed, organizing human ethics based on the rationalization that science facilitates is a far better concept than spending time mastering the art that Socrates suggested we pursue to correct the distortions that skew analyses of benefit and cost. But what we want to understand is more paradoxical: when God chose to be invisible, humans could not agree on how to govern each other, and God did not create any tool to separate humans from nature. How did human ingenuity reach that if it controls the ingenuity of other people, and that involves even reaching up to controlling all the ways in which ideas are transmitted, which is, as Eleanor Roosevelt rightly said, "one of the best ways of enslaving people"? Human ingenuity could enable others to develop ethical principles that prioritize peace and security over intellectual pursuits in order to achieve this goal (which is very reasonable).

In other words, let us go ahead and take the worst-case scenario and assume that the purpose of science is to achieve, as per what Eleanor Roosevelt said in 1943, "one of the best ways of enslaving people." How did human ingenuity reason and reach that if it lets the artificial intelligence that the same human ingenuity invented help with the maintenance of peace and security in the world (something which is very reasonable)? Science (or artificial beings, robots, modernization, automation, and so forth), which people are intending on depending on to make people exhibit more ethics (very reasonable), wouldn't be the instrument or the motivator to split people apart in the same way secularization (or science) made headway on religiosity and is dismantling and disintegrating this behavioral motivator.

In this case, it would be human reason that would resist the transformation that science is emphasizing, which is ethics (very rational). The disenchantment would be as a result of people's powerlessness to be ethical. This phenomenon is not because humans don't like to be ethical, but it is because even if they were to try, they can't. If power is the outcome of people practicing immoral acts, it is because humans cannot declare the world of ideas as more important than the world of the senses. How can humans be by nature not able to divide reality into two worlds, the world of ideas and the world of the senses, and declare the former the only important one? How can people continue to do immoral acts if science is exact? Either the common program of purposes and principles that the victor of WWII laid out are intended to make humans begin to resolve a new paradox or they are an apparent contradiction. As crazy as what we have to say next may sound. If the rich want to prosper. It is in the best interest of capitalism to keep people away from anything that is exact, which is what science is all about. In other words, distancing people from close identifications with religious values and institutions works against capitalism based on what we are showing. The injection of science into the hands of all members of the human family does nothing but make people become more exact. The injection of science in the hands of people could make the security council of the global council split in the same way Christianity split; thus, the more humans use science to produce tools, the more they distance the human body from being an intrinsic part of nature. The more this phenomenon splits people apart to form blocs, the more it brings humans back to the dark ages. This means throwing away thousands of years until man reached the draft of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which is the most precious milestone Eleanor Roosevelt managed to achieve in the history of not only human rights but also the history of man.

At this juncture, there are two crossroads that people could take to move away from the difficult times that humans are experiencing. One choice is for the people to reform their global council so it promotes a social order that prevents humans from distinguishing between good and evil, as the Bible's ideology suggests. This is to, once and for all, build on what Eleanor Roosevelt built to fix the new common program of purposes and principles that seeks to truly make all members of the human family reach a life free from fear and want. Alternatively, we

could allow new technologies (such as artificial intelligence, computers, modernization, robots, microwaves, driverless cars, electric toothbrushes, and others) to further distance people from their intrinsic connection to nature in favor of prioritizing detection and existence. In particular, continue to let those guests help humans emphasize the unimportance of the world of the senses over the importance of the world of ethics.

We have no way of knowing if there would be countries and people who believe that they could rule the world with their scientific supremacy from the comfort of their couches or from the skyscraper that they are watching down from instead of doing it in the same way the people of Shibam and Alexander the Great were doing it with sticks and knives in the streets.

As we mentioned earlier, the period during which humans have practiced a common program of purposes and principles is minuscule in the context of world history, making it difficult to assess their promptness, as Ibn Khaldun suggested when evaluating the need for experiential understanding. In conclusion, let us review how peace and security evolved as of 1945 and as of when people began to practice the war aims that, on their principles, people based new hopes for the world on. The small interval we will analyze may help us determine whether people's low tolerance for peace and security is caused by knowledge creating this gridlock or if intervening by either increasing or limiting access to knowledge would have no effect. On the contrary, this study aims to highlight a different perspective. Any intervention aimed at identifying improvement, whether by injecting more knowledge or by ceasing the dissemination of knowledge, will yield the same outcome. Both would be preparing the way for the end of this second cycle of existence to give rise to a third cycle. The only improvement that people can achieve from this point forward is to build upon the milestones established by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Any improvement beyond this goal would only accelerate the peace and security gridlock, hastening the end of this second life cycle and giving rise to a third.

Before and after the two world wars were fought, the people of the world were disorganizing. Each member of the human family possessed a distinct nationality and had either explicitly or tacitly surrendered some of his freedoms and submitted part of them to the authority of a distinct form of sovereignty or form of government. After WWII all the countries in the world came together and became a member of the United Nations in order to be more organized. The people accepted the obligations contained in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights or the United Nations Charter not by force, as the missionaries needed to resort to getting Christianity to become an accepted religion through a rebellious movement, but by conviction.

We could say that the laws, treaties, and conventions that the governments pledged themselves to achieve in cooperation with the United Nations are based on the obligations set forth in the charter of the United Nations. Earlier we said that the objectives that people are pursuing under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights are more ambitious than what religions have spread. We also said there is not too much deviation between what people began experimenting with in 1945 and what God and later Jesus Christ, who claimed to be his son, wanted humans to reach. Both methods speak of reaching the same goal, except the deviation rests with the path each proposes be taken to get there.

Judging from the degree of insecurity that exists in many countries around the world today, the people of those nations believe they are not free and have gone to the extent of toppling their governments because they are requesting recognition of their rights to be free. Additionally, the wave of migration makes it unclear whether

individuals are fleeing their home countries due to existing insecurity or seeking a better life. In the deteriorated state of countries dealing with civil wars, we cannot say that the policies used by their leaders caused the social breakdown that people are fleeing from.

We have no way of knowing whether membership in the United Nations has changed over the years or not. The United Nations publishes a portal on how a country can become a member of this global council. The global council web page states, "Membership in the Organization, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, is open to all peace-loving states that accept the obligations contained in the United Nations Charter and, in the judgment of the Organization, are able to carry out these obligations. " The General Assembly admits states to membership in the United Nations based on the Security Council's recommendation.

The growth in United Nations membership, from 1945 to the present, has changed as follows: in 1945, there were 51 original members. There are 193 member states at the United Nations. The introduction of the World Wide Web in 1989 marked a significant milestone, bringing the total number of members to 159. From the year 1990 until now, the 34 nations that joined are not countries that resulted from the expansion of the land surface of the earth but rather from the split of people from those 159 nations in favor of self-determination. Let's consider the number of nations that emerged when man first set foot on the moon on 20 July 1969. By then, there were 126 members in the world. During the 20 years from 1969 to 1989, 33 nations emerged.

Moreover, the Global Council portal on the World Wide Web describes how a state or government obtains recognition by the United Nations. The portal states the following: "The recognition of a new state or government is an act that only other states and governments may grant or withhold. It generally implies readiness to assume diplomatic relations."

The reported procedures are as follows:

1. The State submits an application to the Secretary-General and a letter formally stating that it accepts the obligations under the Charter.

2. The Security Council considers the application.

3. If the Council recommends admission, the recommendation is presented to the General Assembly for consideration.

4. Membership becomes effective the date the resolution for admission is adopted.

We have no way of knowing if the 142 countries that were admitted to become members of the global council were vetted and found capable of carrying the obligations contained in the United Nations Charter and if, in the judgment of the Security Council, there was enough evidence to consider their application.

Let us consider two cases to analyze how people and security evolved after the countries and people of WWII transferred power to dependent peoples to exercise peacefully and freely their political status. Let us take the case of the people of Europe and that of Syria and Lebanon.

The author was born in the Beqaa Valley in Lebanon. The author lived through part of the civil war that engulfed his country of birth. Now, Syria, the country where the author's parents and his ancestors lived and died, is now engulfed in a civil war. Let us recall the Beqaa Valley, which is part of modern Lebanon. This region was part of Syria until 1943, when the French widened the geographical territory of Lebanon to include this land.

We have no way of knowing if the leaders of Syria (1945) and Lebanon (1943), when they requested to be granted independence, concealed the truth about their readiness to accept the obligations called for in the charter of the United Nations, thus misleading the UN Security Council to admit the people of those two countries into the global council. The author believes the leaders in Lebanon were not qualified and capable during the years he lived in this country. The author cannot speak about the leaders in Syria because he never lived under the rules of the Syrian government to assess the performance of this government.

Let us go along and consider that the civil war that the people of Lebanon have known and the civil war that Syria is now knowing are a result of the political, economic, social, and educational unpreparedness of the leaders who ruled those two countries from when they were each granted independence till now. Let us go along and consider that it was the same inadequacy that led the political machinery in those countries to decide to deviate from carrying out the obligations set forth in the charter of this organization, which is a prerequisite for being admitted to the United Nations according to the membership rules, as we said.

The following puzzle challenges our ingenuity for an explanation. From the time humans invented writing until 1945, the world was governed by individuals who imposed their rule through various forms of government, including monarchies, oligarchies, fascism, military regimes, dictatorships, and others. Despite all the exploitation, domination, and subjugation, people tolerated their leaders rather than revolting, showing less defiance than people seem to exhibit in modern times.

Let us take the case of the Europeans. What we know is that the second half of the 20th century was geared by the victors of WWII to begin to promote geopolitical interventions in Europe consistent with the maintenance of the strength and stability of their national security. There is no doubt that the plan developed by the powerful nations that emerged victorious after WWII was forward-looking.

We can't know how the WWII victors' geopolitical interventions in Europe in the late 20th century affected their national security. In particular, we need to consider how the hierarchical power dynamics between the victors of WWII and their partners are evolving. During the second half of the 20th century, European countries significantly benefited from economic and financial aid provided by the victors of WWII to help them recover and rebuild after the war. We have no way of knowing if the policies, indoctrination, religion, movements, schools, tools, machinery, and so forth that the victors of WW2 injected in Europe to help the Europeans start to act toward one another in a spirit of brotherhood resulted in outcomes that are consistent with the objectives set by the countries and people who

rushed to their aid to help them reconstruct. The citizens of those nations seem to show loyalty to their rescuers, unlike their leaders. It seems that those in power demonstrate this allegiance primarily to maintain their positions. The citizens of Europe do not seem to have developed a conscious knowledge of good and evil.

In like manner, we have no way of knowing if an alliance is one in which a country receives economic and financial aid to resuscitate and revive as was the case with a number of countries in Europe after WW2. As soon as the countries that received the economic and financial aid that the victors of WWII facilitated manage to resuscitate, revive, and modernize industrial and business practices. Right when the economy of the countries that were resuscitated surpasses a threshold development level and/or right when their economy begins to enjoy growth and prosperity. Those countries that received the economic and financial aid to resuscitate and revive form a bloc and benefit from the removal of trade barriers to set up institutions to coordinate their own economy, including offering financial and technical aid to stimulate the total political reconstruction of the economies of other people and at other continent levels. This move is to let the European countries that were resuscitated and revived form a bloc offering financial and technical aid to stimulate the total political reconstruction of the economies of other people and at other continent levels. Unless the countries and people who won WW2 are counting on their relationships keeping them fulfilled in the custodian role of the security of the world at the global council. This move means that either the victors of WWII and the European countries that were resuscitated are one and the same or the programmed aptitude to reason that humans are programmed with is an aptitude that doesn't know how to distinguish between good and evil. This behaviour is because a father splits his fortune among his own children. The children's productivity forces them to begin to compete against one another and against their will.

In effect, the abnormal defiance of peace and security exhibited by the people of certain nations is not limited to just a few specific countries. The citizens of the countries that had won the Second World War similarly emphasized the importance of the mind over the relative unimportance of the human body. If it weren't for the rule of law

holding a very tight grip to force citizens to consent to many rights. The prison population would be housing more people than those who are living free.

After two back-to-back world wars, which were considered the deadliest in the history of the world, only a half-century has elapsed. There could be only two reasons that have motivated this form of defiance to peace and security. Either people have begun to experience short memories or something has empowered their human reasoning to exhibit this low tendency toward tolerating peace and security—to seek justice.

However, what is very incomprehensible is the way people in modern times are reacting to the idea of living a life of compassion as compared to the reaction that people took when the missionaries were proposing such principles, which is precarious and unclear. When the missionaries urged people to adopt a life of compassion, both the pagans and the rulers showed their discontent by resisting this idea until Christianity was eventually accepted. When the United Nations offered to help people live a life of compassion, both the people and the leaders accepted joining and subscribing unconditionally to such an aspiration or project.

We don't know what Jesus' companions were spreading when they were converting people, but one of his most important sermons is the Sermon on the Mount (Matthew 5:7). This sermon is considered by many to encapsulate the essence of Jesus's teachings. In this sermon, Jesus did not teach any doctrine, not even religion or theology. It was just commandments in which he was encouraging people to follow the principle he is bringing to people's attention. Those who would could win eternal life. Jesus, from what we know, was not asking people to convert their religion, to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, to establish conditions under which justice and respect for the obligations arising from treaties and other sources of international law can be maintained, or to employ machinery for the promotion of the economic and social advancement of all people. Nor do we find evidence in what we read or interpret in the words he used in this sermon on the Mount that he made. Jesus was preaching democracy, governance, knowledge networking, and/or sharing good practices.

Logically, people should revolt against those who would be proposing to them principles that preach access to justice, human rights, democracy, and so forth because they are all concepts that involve promoting participation and accountability. But, as we said, instead of revolting, the people were told to be accountable and accept democratic, participatory concepts. Those who were told, "Blessed are the merciful, for they will be shown mercy," would not lose anything or have to give anything in return if they practiced this command and chose to rebel.

Jesus Christ preached little compared to the abundance people experience when they practice the common program of purposes and principles, which they all become a member of at the Global Council to see materialize. After close to 80 years of people practicing the principles that are enshrined in the obligation of the United Nations, we should see a difference. This is not the case at all. After all the people of the world became united, interlinked, and networked, all of them started to collaborate in the economic field, including employing machinery for the promotion of peace and security in the world. Instead of peace and security improving, it seems to be in further decline.

Let us take the case of the people of Syria, who, until only four to five years ago, lived with much better standards, no matter how drastic the political and social conditions were like. The civil war is tearing this country apart, engulfing its people.

In the last few years, instead of the people of Syria taking advantage of modernization and globalization to be more interlinked and networked, a large number became disenchanted and engulfed the country in a civil war to attack the unreadiness of their elected government officials to practice justice, human rights, democracy, participation, accountability, and so forth.

What is very incomprehensible is the action that the disenchanted people in Syria took against the performance of their government and/or the readiness of the respective institutions to practice justice, human rights, democracy, participation, accountability, and so forth has no place.

First, the Syrian Arab Republic is one of the 51 original founding members of the United Nations. We have no way of knowing if the security council reviewed the credentials of this specific member state, including its ability to assume diplomatic relations, which is a prerequisite to be granted membership in this global council. The United Nations worldwide web portal lists the Syrian Arab Republic under a category that is called "51 original members."

Second, the obligations that the elected government is implementing are the common program of purposes and principles that Syria signed up for as far back as in 1945 when the leaders of this country "founded" this global council to work together with the rest of the member states to ensure that the permanent maintenance of the security of the world is reached.

If the specific group of Syrian citizens became disenchanted with the performance of the government in speeding its readiness to practice justice, human rights, democracy, participation, accountability, and so on. This disenchantment should be pointed at the policies or common program of purposes and principles that were agreed upon when the global council was created. The government of Syria is only a facilitator for the implementation of the obligations contained in the United Nations Charter.

It is very difficult to understand what exactly the individuals currently waging a civil war in Syria are disenchanted with. There are only two possible motives for their disenchantment. One motive could be the government's adherence to a common program of purposes and principles established in 1945, or it could be related to the performance of the elected government.

There is no way to determine which specific motive caused citizens to become disenchanted with their leaders' performance in Lebanon, leading them to support a civil war that began in 1975 and has since driven this country, where I was born, from terrible to worse. I also cannot determine which specific motive caused the people of Syria to become disenchanted with their leaders' performance, prompting them to engage in the recently started civil war.

I know one thing:

I know that the common program of purposes and principles that my mother and father began practicing are inscribed in the United Nations' Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which they subscribed to in 1948.

I know that the disenchantment that my mother and father had with their leaders was a result of their leaders not practicing the common program of purposes and principles inscribed in the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which the government subscribed to in 1948.

I also know that the Christian missionaries were spreading Christianity during this time. The missionaries were preaching that if the pagans fulfilled certain responsibilities, they would achieve resurrection. The pagans' new knowledge would help them win in the next life. What the missionaries were preaching was “giving” to win something afterward. A Christian had to live an entire life of “giving” and compassion to be spared from hell and be resurrected or win.

The United Nations (the nations) and all the organizations that offer international technical assistance are preaching responsibilities that people pursue. They will benefit from them in this lifetime. The knowledge that people are gaining from the teachings of the United Nations (the nations) and all organizations offering international technical assistance since 1945 helps them achieve success in this lifetime rather than in the afterlife. In other words, what the United Nations (nations) and all the organizations that offer international technical assistance are preaching is knowledge that a person “takes now” in order to win something in that person’s lifetime. A person gains knowledge from the teachings of the United Nations (the nations) and all organizations offering international technical assistance about how to achieve the full development of their personality during their lifetime.

The difference between the plan that Jesus Christ proposed and the one that the United Nations (nations) proposes is that in one of them a

person doesn't have to alter matter as compared to what the other calls on people to do more of. In other words, the missionaries were preaching to people to give up matter (or altering less matter) so people would alter less matter. The United Nations is encouraging people to alter more matter in order to acquire more possessions. The two plans offer different knowledge.

The difference between what a person can win in this lifetime as compared to waiting an entire lifetime to win after death is something we doubt in heaven humans are also doing much of, and that is access to alter matter. The benefits that a person receives from the offerings of the United Nations are significantly better and more ambitious, as they enable individuals to live life to the fullest.

Given the current conditions, Eleanor Roosevelt's suggestion for humans to establish unbreakable bonds between the sciences and the humanities appears to be a challenging task based on our findings. Life is full of hard choices, and the bigger they are and the more options we have, the harder they get. We think that if humans do make real efforts to practise Socrates' proposal of mastering what he called "the art of measurement" to correct the distortions that skew one's analyses of benefit and cost. This route could be a much healthier way of going if people want to live a life of compassion with one another. The Socratic method works on just using human reason and not science. When a person goes at the speed of human reason, his imagination moves at the speed of his knowledge. If we place the same person in a driverless car, their experience would differ significantly. The car manufacturer would be happy seeing how much his earnings are going to grow. However, our work has shown that this is not the case. When the people are letting the driverless car take them from one place to the next. The discussion would be about how the earth's resources should be acquired, managed, and distributed. This is because nothing is more precious than having all the nations of the world united, allowing every member of the human family to recognise their equal and inalienable rights to freedom, justice, and peace, once everyone everywhere is entitled to the full development of their human personality based on the principles of equal rights.

If our work contains any elements of truth, the challenge that will require creative solutions is determining whether schools should focus on educating about ignorance or on teaching social sciences and natural sciences. The answer is because anytime a person uses their human reason, this induces access to knowledge. The more

knowledgeable people become, the more this phenomenon prepares them to practice justice, human rights, democracy, participation, accountability, and so forth. The more people are kept away from knowledge, the more this phenomenon pushes them to practice justice, human rights, democracy, participation, accountability, and so forth.

In 1963 Eleanor Roosevelt said, "There never has been any security." It seems that humans desire a sense of security; the only way to achieve this is by striking a deal between practising the principles attributed to God in the Bible and those suggested by Jesus Christ, who claimed to be the son of God.

We have no way of knowing if, at the time when the missionaries were spreading Christianity, the means they were using for their transport included spreading this faith using cellular phones, cars, skis, or dropping from parachutes so the converts could take advantage of what would be awaiting them when they converted. If these circumstances weren't the case, we could not think of another motive that could be making people feel disenchanting for any reason other than when people began, as of 1945, to emphasise the importance of detecting existence.

The crises engulf the states. Their disenchantment stems not from limited access to knowledge, but from their governments' disempowerment to provide sufficient opportunities for them to achieve the development they believe they are entitled to, as promised by their leaders after joining the United Nations. Their right is to have a say on how the earth's resources should be acquired, managed, and distributed on the basis of what the United Nations Universal Declaration and the United Nations Charter empower them with, and that is to practise justice, human rights, democracy, participation, accountability, and so forth on equal rights principles.

The more people become aware of their existence, the more they demand the maintenance of the rule of law. If humans are able to let the world of the senses prevail over the world of ideas. The world would have been safer since Adam and Eve lived. Nothing has changed on earth after WW2 except that more people started acknowledging their existence. The ongoing insecurity that the world

is experiencing may be a result of the modernisation and globalisation efforts embraced by rich and powerful nations, which aim to change the cultural values and traditions of decolonised countries and their people in order to liberate everyone from religion and the fear of need and want.

The puzzle that challenges ingenuity for an explanation is how the countries and people who won the Second World War and whose own human ingenuity invited modernisation and artificial beings reached the conclusion that capitalism and financialisation will not contaminate their citizens and dismantle the role they voted for themselves to start playing as custodians and permanent members at the global council over the maintenance of the security of the world. The rich and powerful countries seem unconcerned that knowledge could undermine their institutions or hinder progress, despite the growing disenchantment that distances people from their intrinsic connection to nature.

If the countries and people who won WW2 are counting on their relationships with the rest of the member states at the global council to keep them fulfilled in the custodian role of the security of the world at the global council, they enjoy playing it. For example, consider the efforts to eliminate hunger, poverty, desperation, and chaos in Europe, as well as to restore normal economic health to the nations that were devastated during WWII. We cannot determine whether the political, economic, social, and educational aid provided resulted in political stability. It appears as if the decision by the countries and people who won the Second World War to implement policies aimed at marginalising people's interaction with and establishing direct contact with the natural world invites a different kind of stability. The economic reconstruction policies of the countries and people who won the Second World War seem to invite political stability only when people quickly detect their existence, which is necessary for maintaining the strength of the politicians' own power, rather than that of the people who resuscitated them. The only change that the people of Europe experienced after the despair they faced at the end of WWII was gaining access to scientific advances and industrial progress, which helped their economic recovery exceed pre-war levels. In

November 2016, the countries of the European Union agreed to a plan to boost defence and security.

If the countries and people who won WWII are relying on their advances in technology, science, and social organisation to triumph over human ingenuity, they believe this will allow them to continue fulfilling their role as custodians of global security at the international council. How did the countries and people who won WW2 reach the conclusion that capitalism and financialisation dismantle and reorganise countries and people to replace the governance of those states with modernisation and globalisation? The citizens who live in those rich and powerful nations would tolerate modernisation and automation and wouldn't revolt against them. Let us say the above differently. If the project of the countries and people who won WW2 to organise all members of the human family around this global council continues to evolve or if the countries and people who won WW2 abandon this plan. How did the countries and people who won World War II come to the conclusion that, when modernisation and globalisation became more and more installed in their homes, capitalism and financialisation wouldn't dismantle their social fabric in the same way they did in other states? In other words, how did they reach that as more and more automation distances the human body and human ingenuity of their citizens from being organised according to the credo that exists in the Bible, that this action would enchant their citizens and push them to support their hierarchical power by exhibiting transparency in those areas contained in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights or the obligations contained in the United Nations Charter? In other words, citizens may become disenchanted with the inability of their own governmental institutions or hierarchical power to practice justice, uphold human rights, promote democracy, ensure participation, and maintain accountability.

What has maintained the stability and strength of the countries and people who won the Second World War until now has been their coming together to decolonise the countries and people to give them the right to self-determination and to give them purchasing power to be able to collaborate with them economically. The apparatuses and machinery produced by people today create a barrier between the human body and its interaction with the natural world. How the

countries and people who won the Second World War subject the countries and people to alien subjugation, domination, and exploitation to maintain their own hierarchical power is through the apparatuses and machineries that those rich and powerful countries would be suppressing with them, the poor, distancing the human body from interacting with the natural world. If the countries and people who won the Second World War do not collaborate with the countries and people whom they decolonised, to keep their assembly lines up and running to maintain their strength and stability. The countries and people who won the second world war intend to maintain their stability and strength within their sovereign territory. This situation is because the countries and people who won the Second World War are planning on this method of keeping on destructing outside their national territory to keep their hierarchical power intact within their own territorial boundaries. The apparatuses and machinery that they are producing are distancing the human body from interacting with the natural world. We just observed that the leaders in Syria, Lebanon, Libya, and other countries distanced their citizens from being an intrinsic part of nature. Civil war engulfed those countries. In other words, there are only two choices waiting ahead of the entire family if the leaders do not agree to draft a second milestone document in the history of human rights similar to the one that was drafted in 1943. The choices are (1) people would continue to be disenchanted and reorganise until they come together to complete the task of coming together of all the people of the world under this new one-world order; (2) people would dismantle the global council and stop collaborating economically, and each one would build a wall around the perimeter of his national territorial boundary. If the leaders do not agree to draft a second milestone document in the history of human rights similar to the one created in 1943, there will be no way for the people of the world to return to a state of unity under this new one-world order.

As we said before, the period since people began to practice the common program of purposes and principles that are in vigour is minuscule in the history of the world, so evaluating their promptness is difficult. The closest thing that we think from an illustrative perspective that we could think of to describe what would be awaiting the entire human family in the future if the rich do not agree to draft a 2nd milestone document in the history of human rights similar to the

one that was drafted in 1943 is the social conditions that are depicted in the American horror drama television TV series titled "The Walking Dead", which is a post-apocalypse event. In this case, the events that plague this horror drama after the post-apocalypse are what the people could be setting themselves up to experience if they refuse to draft a second human rights document.

On the other hand, we could also conclude that the Bible states God believes all human hearts are evil from the moment a newborn becomes a child. Let us assume Jesus Christ is not innocent (even though the author believes that Jesus Christ is the son of God, and let us remember he was crucified for the credo he came up with). Let us assume that Jesus Christ had a hidden agenda to make people alter less matter so he could alter himself and his disciple more to allow him to progress more than others. The aforesaid statement is only so we don't appear that we are in this work pointing fingers or trying to allude to any country having the intention of using science as a tool to enslave people. The aforesaid statement is only because there are people who are not born yet who might believe that they could use their scientific supremacy to destabilise the world to allow them to maintain their own stability and strength.

Science (artificial intelligence, computers, modernisation, robots, microwaves, driverless cars, electric toothbrushes, and so forth) makes people alter less matter, and so, as we said before, there is not a whole lot of a big difference between the way Jesus Christ was preaching and what science forces.

When the pagans were converting to Christianity and giving away their possessions and having less to alter matter, they didn't revolt against the missionaries. When the United Nations began to collaborate economically, it allowed people to interact less with matter, resulting in a better quality of life. The people in the nations converting to have less are already revolting against their governments and engaging in civil wars with one another. Those who dislike their leaders can't act this way because they oppose the new world order that aims to improve living standards.

People acquire knowledge from the changes the natural system is continually undergoing and the different concepts that imagination constructs or perceives. If everything is relative. The people who lived during the time when the missionaries were spreading Christianity were evidently working from a set of knowledge. Since knowledge is fluid, people continuously acquire this aptitude unless it is restricted. When the missionaries were spreading Christianity, the degree of knowledge in the hands of the people was low. It was, therefore, necessary for people to maintain close relationships with the natural world to understand how it works. Human ingenuity was tying up the human body in all the investigation that the hands were doing on behalf of the brain, or human reasoning. The knowledge that people have now developed has distanced the human body from requiring the maintenance of this close relationship with the natural world, which was serving to keep human reasoning tied up.

As we mentioned, the issue with knowledge (science) is that it can never fully satisfy a person. The more science deepens, the more people start to make use of its benefits. The only problem is that science is an exact field, whereas humans are not. Science becomes inexact only if humans start interfering. In other words, when a policeman crosses a red light, the CCTV camera cannot distinguish whether the car is a police car or not unless the man overrides the CCTV camera.

We have no way of knowing if in the future humans are going to be able to defend why they crossed a red light if the CCTV camera that humans are installing to allow them to practise justice, human rights, democracy, participation, accountability, and so forth are not able to behave in this way based on how the intelligent design programmed them to be. What we know is that science forces the human body to stop and alter matter, given how machines do the bulk of the work. Let us say we begin to have users and producers. The users are the "real humans", and the producers are "artificial beings".

At this point in time, real humans return to living in an identical state to how people were during the Stone Age, without any knowledge. People would have many machines around them doing many things,

but without their human ingenuity, it becomes idle. People's choices would be motivated by the desire for happiness.

We have no way of knowing whether ultimate happiness comes from watching television, reading, or sitting in driverless cars. We do know ultimate wisdom comes from knowing oneself. The more a person knows, the greater his or her ability to reason and make choices that will bring true happiness increases. The only way happiness translates into politics, with the best form of government being neither a tyranny nor a democracy, is if the people manage to divide reality into two separate realms. The world, the intelligent design that created humans wants them to function like it, and the world that artificial intelligence expects them to live in. At least Eleanor Roosevelt agrees with our views on this issue.

Let us say we have two realms. One realm would be the world of intelligent design, which programmed humans to function in one way. This method prevents people from understanding how to dominate the world of the senses because humans gain their knowledge from the ongoing changes in the natural system and the various concepts that their imagination constructs or perceives through the realm of science. The other realm would be the world of science and its creations, which include artificial beings, robots, electric toothbrushes, and more. Those guests, whom the real human invited, know how to prevail over the senses because the changes that the natural system is continually undergoing don't influence them. Those guests don't possess the imagination to construe or perceive and, in particular, have no senses.

However, the more the landscape of the natural system changes, the more science advances or progresses, and the more real people want new knowledge, the more they learn. The more real people become knowledgeable and learn, the more they will be motivated by the desire for happiness. The more society distances the human body from interacting with the natural world in favour of alien beings, robots, and machines performing this work, the deeper this separation becomes.

The real people who in the future would be living would be fighting and displacing no longer real people like them with flesh but artificial beings (machines and so forth) in the same way humans do it now. The

only difference is that artificial beings are much mightier than real humans. In addition, science knows how to distinguish between good and evil, and real humans don't.

Since humans' hearts cannot but become evil as soon as a newborn reaches the childhood age and begins to alter matter on his own. As science advances, a small group of individuals gains greater control and regulation over its progress. The more power those handful of people would gain. If our work has any elements of truth, the more the tensions between the real people and the handful of people who are playing the "cops and robbers" game will grow. The "cops" refer to the small group of individuals who control scientific advancement, as well as those hired to enforce rules and operate the artificial beings.

The more the artificial beings enslave and suppress people by rationalising their access to the food they need to sustain their survival needs. The more the tensions between the real people who artificial beings are controlling and the real people who are operating those artificial beings grow, the more dangerous the situation becomes. The more the artificial beings sideline themselves on the side of the handful of people who control the codes that run those artificial beings, the less power they have. The more the artificial beings side with the few who control their codes, the more destruction there will be.

There could be several scenarios that could end the 2nd life cycle of existence to usher in a 3rd cycle. We predict that real humans will prevail over artificial beings because they do not possess the ability to exhibit wicked behaviour. However, this doesn't exclude those three scenarios from occurring as well.

(1) When the superior preprogrammed aptitude of the real human triumphs over the artificial beings. The progress would be destroyed. Man would find himself in the Stone Age, forced to start anew because artificial beings have separated humans from interacting with natural systems. Humans would have to learn to recreate knowledge from the beginning.

(2) When the superior preprogrammed aptitude of the real humans who are producing the artificial beings feels defeated. Those people who are holding onto power would let their weapons of mass destruction end the second life cycle.

(3) The real humans and the artificial beings cannot predict how the endurance of the natural system behaves, and this phenomenon would trigger an end to the second life cycle.

An apocalypse event may be natural (climatic or epidemic) or man-made (nuclear warfare or imaginative). There are people who speak about alien invasions, zombie invasions, and others. In this work, we tried to depict a manmade invasion to create an apocalypse using science. We showed that science can produce an invasion by alien beings to create an apocalypse if people try to control each other using science (i.e., use science to control the ways in which ideas or knowledge are transmitted).

Our work tried to attempt to show what people could attempt to do to prevent the apocalyptic event that we depicted from taking place if people continue to distance themselves from remaining an intrinsic part of nature.

The work was an attempt to show that humans could consider maintaining the human race alive and together as one. As we said before, there are many ways to get from one point to another. Indeed, lots of pre-apocalyptic stories were written and made. Some of those stories take place in a non-technological future world or a world where only a scattered element of society and technology remain. In this work, we tried to show something that goes much beyond the themes that other authors depict in post-apocalyptic stories. Our objective in this work is to try to call attention to the need to stop taking lightly the arguments that the social theorists make on the importance of using methods of investigation to control and regulate the social realm that are different from the one used in the scientific method.

Jesus did not preach anything that contradicts what the Bible in the story of the creation claims God commanded Adam and Eve to do or the Law of Moses. When Jesus told a young man that he should sell all

his possessions and donate to the poor in order to win eternal life, he was conveying a specific message. We don't think Jesus wanted this young man to be poor in vain. Later, Mohammad (S.A.W.) was not speaking anything that contradicts Christ or the Adam and Eve story that exists in the story of the creation of the Old Testament. God and his son proposed that people refrain from distinguishing between good and evil, each one in a different manner. Maybe people during the age of God and his son lacked the rationality to understand the implications of their actions in distinguishing good from evil. One would imagine that, as people were building more rational explanations, they would have by now been able to recognise that scientific advancement and social organization intensify people's incongruity in distinguishing between good and evil.

Could this low abnormal pattern that people began to exhibit toward being more tolerant toward peace and security be knowledge that fuelled such conduct? We have no way of knowing. Could the decision that the superior programmed aptitude to reason took to distance the body from exhibiting change in matter create crises and conflicts because this aptitude has forced the human body to be idle or to slow down its interaction? We also don't know the answer to this question. Could the more superior programmed aptitude to reason distances the human body from exhibiting change in matter, the more this phenomenon etches a notch in human life toward the end of this second life cycle? The answer is because the more the superior programmed aptitude to reason produces knowledge, the less this act lessens the need for the superior programmed aptitude to think and to rely on its own ingenuity or body to do things. We also have no answer to provide to this question.

Science is unaware of any reason the human body cannot stay mobile. We know that the more people produce knowledge, the more their desire for it grows. As people learn, they are keen to learn more, too. The disenchantment of people with their lack of access to knowledge makes them opt for crises, not necessarily because humans are conflictive by nature but rather because they have access to neither the knowledge to reproduce the object they desire nor the required resources.

If humans held an iota of faith in this God, who figures in the Bible, and all the missionaries he shuttled to caution people on the implications of knowing good or evil, perhaps people would have developed the rationality to make them see that distinguishing between good and evil would make a person die, as He suggested. To make matters worse, after resorting to two world wars, people merely served their own state of mind for what they thought was right, regardless of empirical evidence or factual certainty. People reached the end of two world wars, and they needed to be doing the total opposite of what God suggested humans stay away from doing, and that is to make more humans distinguish between good and evil. There must be a reason why the more people produce knowledge, the more the desire of the people for more knowledge grows. Thus spawning that people become more interested in distancing themselves even more from the credo that Moses, Jesus, and, most importantly, Mohammad (S.A.W.) were preaching.

People, instead of building endurance to reject emphasising importance on the basis of distinguishing between good or evil and emphasising what Mohammad (S.A.W.) preached, put themselves to doing given his claim of being the last person God would speak to until the endurance of the earth crashes. People chose to prioritise human knowledge and reasoning.

Indeed, the more inventions people make, the more a good number will continue to be distancing people from distinguishing between good and evil on the basis of their natural abilities, preferring to let artificial means guide them.

Surely, the more artificial beings are embedded among humans, the more ethical values that real humans preach to make humans prevail over the weakness of the will, the less demand there will be for them. In the future, there would be fewer and fewer humans seeking to ensure that real people develop the ability to distinguish between good and evil. This also would signify that people have found a way to reduce unethical things. Most importantly, such a scenario would also mean that people succumbed to their will instead of applying a solution that alters how the intelligent design rated humans to function, thereby avoiding the claim that they managed to find significance and

immortality in their own achievement—the reason why, in the first place, humans disobeyed God. The solution people found works by overriding how the intelligent design intended humans to function. The solution humans came up with is not how the intelligent intended humans to function.

One possible motive for replacing real humans with artificial beings could be the pursuit of the good life, which would have driven the superior pre-programmed aptitude for reasoning to eliminate individuals exhibiting two opposing ethical attitudes. However, this approach is not in line, as we speculated, with the way God or the intelligent design that guides and overrules humans and the world desired people to spend their lives working, eating from the sweat of their brow, multiplying, and interacting with natural bodies, both living and inanimate. The mechanisms people are proposing are ones that invite a person to detect their existence. The two intentions are entirely different. Let us continue to review what might be motivating humans to interact with objects outside their physical bodies, based on their superior preprogrammed reasoning abilities rather than following the guidelines suggested by the Bible.

Since assuming the responsibility to govern the world in their own way and establish their own identity, people have made significant progress. The project that people launched after WWII aimed to ensure that every person could live free from fear and want, and it is a very ambitious initiative, regardless of how long it takes to achieve such a vision. Indeed, if people had listened to what Moses, Jesus, and later Mohammad (S.A.W.) suggested on how humans should spend their lives on earth doing, chances are that people wouldn't have known the degree of progress that we see around us, which is a prerequisite to not living in fear and want. On the other hand, the appeal that God and the messengers that he shuttled to earth to stop humans from specifically centering the interaction that they must continuously naturally exhibit in matter to be targeted at advancing knowledge cannot be overlooked.

It is evident that on its basis people are voyaging to codify how they live, work, etc. Much of its principle is characterized by how machineries can aid in elevating humans to live an enriched life and to reach the wisdom that they are aspiring for so they can prevail over the weakness of their will. The manner that people are pursuing to detect their existence embodies a total changeover in terms of methods and motivating ideology when contrasted to what is reported in the story of the Fall of Man in the Old Testament of the Bible. The awareness that on its basis people reorganized the purpose of human life and on its premise created the unified order that exists has succeeded so far in maintaining the pattern that new people continually have to adapt to and integrate into after birth. However, if we consider that till now the movement that people set in motion to give direction through it to the patterned series of interrelationships that humans have conceptualized on its basis is the purpose of human life. We can say that the

accomplishment that people have reached has not been capable of persuading any course of action that would support that when people reach the point of distinguishing between good or evil, they wouldn't die as reported in the story of the fall of man. Likewise, when people's ability to distinguish between good or evil is stripped, humans do not return to their state of nature. Therefore, if humans picked that the social order or movement that characterizes how they interact with objects spins around machineries that assist man with the superior programmed aptitude to reason that all humans are programmed with, they should behave when interacting with objects rather than developing machineries that would distance the superior programmed aptitude to reason from having to deal with having to make a choice. This cultural system that the superior programmed aptitude to reason managed to navigate itself through and created both science and religion to attain the degree of progress that exists or the degree of personal ethics that people managed to little master is something that this aptitude couldn't have been putting up with to just reach that whenever new people detect their existence and they proceed to pose speculative philosophical questions about the nature of reality, existence, knowledge, and so forth. Their actions retrogress the progress that this aptitude has made in life.

The only thing that is worth living after birth for, and it is the reason why all people would want to distinguish between good and evil, is prolonging their longevity so death doesn't cut short their projects.

Let us divide people's fixation on digging to find the blueprint to the universe into two time intervals. Let one interval be all that people accomplished to reach this goal until now. The second interval will encompass what people are expected to achieve in the future to reach this goal.

We don't know if people will manage to stop the aging process. The scope of our work covers only up to the point in time when people reach the slow aging process. If and when people reach the goal of slowing the aging process, this transformation will be exhibited in the human body directly and not in the physical world. At that point in time, the human physical body would stop depending on the physical world, and the two would exist hand in hand next to each other.

Whether God exists or not in the universe, this would become irrelevant. Most importantly, it would no longer matter if people could prevail over their will or not to make people eligible for their inalienable rights to sustain their survival needs and to satiate their earthly desires. This is because people reach a point where they stop being dependent on the natural system (and/or live longer). People would have no reason to have any dispute over how the earth's resources become acquired, managed, and distributed. The people would still have to figure out a way to govern each other. This wouldn't be required to address human inability to prevail over the weakness of their will, but rather because human imagination cannot be controlled or regulated.

We could say that we have two choices up until people reach the slow aging process. One is to continue to let the world be phased between periods of wars and periods of peace, as we have been doing. Alternatively, to return to living according to the credo that the Bible prescribes.

What will need to change on earth if people do decide to live by the guidance that God fixated on? It would be to abolish the underlying institutional and political dimensions that people build networks and partnerships around and are innovating, experimenting, bringing fresh ideas and perspectives, and promoting and to return to living, setting up values, traditions, and institutions that make humans return to living like an intrinsic part of nature.

However, if people prefer not to live by the guidance of God and/or to stop to make progress that is aimed at taking advantage of others to live the good life. It makes a big difference whether a person departs this life at the age of ten or ninety. Whoever lives longer, his long life span would allow him to take more advantage to impose unnatural changes in matter until scientists figure out how to stop the aging process as compared to the person who died at a younger age.

This also means that scientists manage to find a way to slow the aging process. It would be the pre-programmed aptitude to reason along with the scientific advancement that people developed, which would have helped humans to produce this drug that would slow the aging process.

In this event, it is the tool or the drugs that this person discovered that are going to change the intelligent design on whose basis the human body functions. The hands and the thought were tools that crafted the main tool, or the drugs, that were going to stop the aging process of the body. Therefore, we can say that the hands and the thought were means like the raw material from which the tool or the drug was produced. In other words, the human body or thought wouldn't have been able to change the intelligent design on their own if it weren't for the material of terrestrial origin that exists around them and which they borrowed to produce the tool or cure.

Given that until now, the superior preprogrammed aptitude has not managed to find the cure that would stop the aging process. It is the new people who are taking over who are ensuring the continuity of this project. We could then say that this tradition that people hand from one generation to the next to invite newborns to detect themselves or to know good from evil is a tradition that has introduced no difference in human life so far other than to produce the tools that cause this life to depart this life unnaturally.

Earlier we said that people depart this life from natural and unnatural causes. We also said that the unnatural causes that cause people to depart this life sooner or ahead of their time are the objects that people produce that induce such unnatural death. If people were to stop producing the shape that makes people depart this life from unnatural causes, people would be departing from natural causes only. However, it is impossible to assume that God wanted people to replenish and multiply without counting on people coming up with tools if he made humans be possessed with an intelligent system that cannot function on staying idle. Therefore, tools cannot be the cause of the crises and conflicts that people experience.

Tools or progress reduces the degree of interaction of the body with matter as the objects that humans craft convert the body into becoming a beneficiary of the objects that get crafted. The more progress people register, the more the human body reduces its interaction with matter. This also means that the laws that people on their basis have been enacting about how people should interact with matter are no longer going to be required as much in the future as they are today, as we said

earlier, because people would have switched the physical body from being a tool to craft objects to being idle during this entire process.

People have failed to let their superior reasoning prevail over their will. What has been making people deal with all the crises that the world has known has been the pre-programmed aptitude to reason and insistence on the purpose of human life being to produce tools. If progress is continually changing, that means that people's senses and desires are always changing as well. People's decision to make the purpose of human life to produce tools signifies that people can never cease to have crises because those tools are what are influencing their senses and desires to be always changing. This signifies that there could be two reasons that are not making people prevail over the weakness of their will. Either the superior programmed aptitude to reason doesn't know how to distinguish between good or evil, unlike what people think, or people were not created to operate tools, and humans are trying to convert themselves into something that their intelligent design was not created to serve.

The superior programmed aptitude to reason cannot be an aptitude that doesn't know how to distinguish between good and evil, because when it comes to how to deal with family members, it is able to prevail over the weakness of its will. It is when it comes to dealing with strangers that people are not able to exhibit the same attitude. Fear could be one factor that would make the superior programmed aptitude to reason to make this distinction, but not to protect others but rather for its own protection. However, its own protection can only be preserved with the preservation of the human body because the aptitude is not made of matter. There is only one way to reach this: if the superior pre-programmed aptitude manages to survive in an artificial being or to make, as we said, the human body become immortal. The process could also include transferring organs.

We have no way of knowing if the superior programmed aptitude to reason will succeed in reaching either approach that would allow it to become immortal and live forever. This requirement is because to pass through to this stage, people must be able to reach a degree of knowledge that would make them either reach the natural system that exists on the outside of their human body, whose impact doesn't alter

the changes that the human body continuously undergoes, or the intelligent design on whose basis the human body functions, which becomes genetically modifiable. The ability of humans to stop a person's system from shutting down requires many processes to come together. The most important process is to prevent biological death, which occurs when brain cells start to die due to a lack of oxygen. The Bible claims that humans will never attain the ability to achieve immortality. The Bible claims that God installed a flaming sword to guard the way to the Tree of Life after his first two creations disobeyed him. (Genesis 3:24). Good luck!