

Decline and Fall of All Evil

The Most Important Discovery
of Our Times

Seymour Lessans
Compiled and edited by Janis Rafael

Safeworld Publishing Company
www.declineandfallofallevil.org

Copyright © 2015 by Seymour Lessans. Compiled and edited by Janis Rafael. Cover design by Miriam Thorin. All rights reserved including the right of reproduction in whole or in part, in any form or order. This book contains material protected under International and Federal Copyright Laws and Treatise. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopy, fax transmission, recording, or any storage information and retrieval system, without the written permission of the publisher.

Summary: Many theories as to how world peace could be achieved have been proposed, yet war has once again taken its deadly toll in the 21st century. The dream of peace has remained an unattainable goal — until now. The following pages reveal a scientific discovery regarding a psychological law of man's nature never before understood. This finding was hidden so successfully behind layers and layers of dogma and misunderstanding that no one knew a deeper truth existed. Once this natural law becomes a permanent condition of the environment, it will allow mankind, for the very first time, to veer in a different direction — preventing the never-ending cycle of hurt and retaliation in human relations. Although this discovery was borne out of philosophical thought, it is factual, not theoretical, in nature.

Printed in the United States of America

Publisher's Cataloging-In-Publication Data
(Prepared by the Donohue Group, Inc.)

Lessans, Seymour

Decline and fall of all evil : the most important discovery of our times /Seymour Lessans; compiled and edited by Janis Rafael.

p. ; cm.

ISBN: 978-0-692-31827-0 (softcover)

ISBN: 978-0-578-15130-4 (e-book)

1. Philosophy--Free will and determinism. 2. Good and evil. 3. Peace-- Psychological aspects. 4. Interpersonal relations. 5. Psychology--Popular works. 6. Lessans, Seymour --Philosophy. I. Rafael, Janis. II. Title.

BJ1401 .L47 2015

170

2014955475

Safeworld Publishing Company
Owings Mills, Maryland 21117

TO ALL MANKIND

“To truth only a brief celebration is allowed between the two long periods during which it is condemned as paradoxical, or disparaged as trivial.

Arthur Schopenhauer

Interpretation: Many things we accept today as fact were ridiculed and opposed in the not so distant past; this goes to show that just because an idea is unpopular now doesn't mean it won't be unilaterally accepted in the future.

“All great truths begin as blasphemies.”

George Bernard Shaw

This is the most fantastic non-fiction book ever written because it will verify the prediction made in the introduction by producing unbelievable changes in human relations in the next 25 years. By discovering the invariable laws of the solar system we were able to predict an eclipse and land men on the moon. By discovering the invariable laws that inhere in the mankind system we are able, for the very first time, to predict and accomplish what was never before possible — our deliverance from evil.

Please understand that when the 20th century is mentioned, it is referring to the time period when this finding was first uncovered. The prediction that in 25 years man would be delivered from all evil was based on the conviction that a thorough investigation would have already taken place. Although it has been more than 50 years, there has been no such investigation and, to this day, this discovery has not been recognized for its contribution. Due to the time lapse since the book's last printing some recent examples have been added to show how these principles apply to our current world situation, but please be assured that the actual discovery has not been altered in any way and is explained in the author's own words. Although some of his references are dated, the knowledge itself couldn't be more timely. For purposes of consistency the personal pronoun 'he' has been used throughout the book. No discrimination was intended.

Note: Twelve years after the author's passing, his daughter, Janis Rafael, went on a mission to compile her father's seven books in the hope that this discovery will not be lost to future generations.

Some people may be offended that the word God is used throughout the book and conclude that this is a religious work. Perhaps the 'G' word even makes them want to shut down and disconnect from what is being said. This would be unfortunate. As you carefully read the text you will see that the word God (often referred to as 'He') is simply a symbol pointing to the laws that govern our universe.

Table of Contents

Preface.	i
Introduction.	1
Chapter One: The Hiding Place.	19
Chapter Two: The Two-Sided Equation.	59
Chapter Three: The End of Carelessness.	93
Chapter Four: Words, Not Reality.	111
Chapter Five: Premarital Relations.	135
Chapter Six: The New Economic World.	165
Chapter Seven: The Wisdom of Socrates.	289
Chapter Eight: Until Death Do They Part.	329
Chapter Nine: Parents and Children.	391
Chapter Ten: Our Posterity.	469
Chapter Eleven: The New Meaning of Education.	491
Review	551
Afterword.	567
Postscript.	

PREFACE

My dear friends, relations, and people throughout the earth, the purpose of this book is to clarify knowledge that must be brought to light as quickly as possible because it can prevent what nobody wants — a nuclear holocaust. With the world in turmoil and on the threshold of an atomic explosion which could be started accidentally and could very well destroy all civilization, I am announcing a scientific discovery that will make war an absolute impossibility and revolutionize the life of man entirely for his benefit. Due to a fantastic breakthrough, to the discovery of a natural, psychological law that was hermetically sealed behind a logical theory that 98% of mankind holds true, every bit of hurt that exists in human relations can be virtually wiped from the face of the earth by something so superior to punishment, as a deterrent, that people the world over will be prevented from committing those very acts of evil for which blame and punishment were previously necessary. Laugh if you will but your smile of incredulity will be wiped from your face once you begin to read the text chapter by chapter of which the first two are most fundamental.

It is important to know that this book does not contain a theory but an undeniable equation that can be scientifically proven. It has no biases, prejudices or ulterior motives — its only concern is in revealing facts about the nature of man never before understood. Furthermore, so as to prevent jumping to conclusions, this book has nothing whatever to do with communism, socialism, capitalism, government, or religion; only with the removal of inaccurate facts that have been passed along from generation to generation in the guise of genuine knowledge. There are those who may be blinded by this mathematical revelation as they come out of Plato's cave having lived so many years in the shadows that distorted their beliefs into a semblance of reality — and may deny what they do not understand or don't want to be true. Just bear in mind that any disagreement can be clarified in such a manner that they will be compelled to say, "Now

I understand and agree.” I am about to demonstrate, in a manner our world’s leading scientists will be unable to deny, not only that the mankind system is just as harmonious as the solar system despite all the evil and ignorance that ever existed, but that the inception of the Golden Age cannot commence until the knowledge pertaining to this law is accurately understood. What is about to be revealed is unprecedented. Soon enough everyone will know, without reservation, that mankind is on the threshold of a NEW WORLD prophesied in the Bible that must come to pass out of absolute necessity when this natural law is stamped by the exact sciences with the brevet of truth. In view of the fact that the first two chapters must be read thoroughly before any other reading is done, it is my hope that the table of contents will not tempt you to read in a desultory manner. Should you jump ahead and read other chapters this work could appear like a fairy tale otherwise the statement that truth is stranger than fiction will be amply verified by the scientific world, or by yourself, if you are able to follow the reasoning of mathematical relations. If you find the first two chapters difficult, don’t be discouraged because what follows will help you understand it much better the second time around. This book was written in a dialogue format to anticipate the questions the reader may have and to make these fairly difficult concepts as reader-friendly as possible. There is a certain amount of repetition for the purpose of reinforcing important points and extending the principles in a more cohesive fashion, but despite all efforts to make this work easier to understand it is still deep and will require that you go at a snail’s pace reading many things over and over again. When you have fully grasped the full significance and magnitude of this work, and further realize there has never been and will never be another like it because of what is undeniably achieved, you will cherish it throughout your entire life.

Well, would you like to see what happens when science, the perception and extension of undeniable observations, takes over the problems of human conflict as the result of a fantastic discovery? Would you like to see that the mankind system has been obeying an invariable law just as mathematically harmonious as that which inheres in the solar system; a law that allowed a prophesy to be made thousands of years ago and verified in the 20th century? Would you

like to learn, though this book has nothing whatever to do with religion or philosophy, that your faith in God will finally be rewarded with a virtual miracle, one that will shortly deliver us from all evil? If you are sincerely interested in seeing this fantastic transition to a new way of life which must come about the moment this discovery is thoroughly understood, all I ask is that you do not judge what you are about to read in terms of your present knowledge but do everything in your power to understand what is written by following the mathematical relations implicitly expressed throughout. Please remember that any truth revealed in a mathematical manner does not require your approval for its validity, although it does necessitate your understanding for recognition and development. And now my friends, if you care to come along, let us embark...the hour is getting late.

INTRODUCTION

Who, in his right mind or with knowledge of history would believe it possible that the 20th century will be the time when all war, crime, and every form of evil or hurt in human relations must come to a permanent end? [Note: This is a reminder that the author lived in the 20th century (1918-1991). Though we are well into the 21st century, this discovery has yet to be given a thorough investigation by our world's leading scientists]. When first hearing this prophesy, shortly after Hitler had slaughtered 6 million Jews, I laughed with contempt because nothing appeared more ridiculous than such a statement. But after 15 years (8 hours a day) of extensive reading and thinking, my dissatisfaction with a certain theory that had gotten a dogmatic hold on the mind compelled me to spend nine strenuous months in the deepest analysis and I made a finding that was so difficult to believe it took me two years to thoroughly understand its full significance for all mankind and three additional years to put it into the kind of language others could comprehend. It is the purpose of this book to reveal this finding — a scientific discovery about the nature of man whose life, as a direct consequence of this mathematical revelation, will be completely revolutionized in every way for his benefit bringing about a transition so utterly amazing that if I were to tell you of all the changes soon to unfold, without demonstrating the cause as to why these must come about, your skepticism would be aroused sufficiently to consider this a work of science fiction for who would believe it possible that all evil (every bit of hurt that exists in human relation) must decline and fall the very moment this discovery is thoroughly understood. This natural law, which reveals a fantastic mankind system, was hidden so successfully behind a camouflage of ostensible truths that it is no wonder the development of our present age was required to find it. By discovering this well concealed law and demonstrating its power a catalyst, so to speak, is introduced into human relations that compels a fantastic change in the direction our nature has been traveling performing what

will be called miracles though they do not transcend the laws of nature. The same nature that permits the most heinous crimes, and all the other evils of human relation, is going to veer so sharply in a different direction that all nations on this planet, once the leaders and their subordinates understand the principles involved, will unite in such a way that no more wars will ever again be possible. If this is difficult to conceive, does it mean you have a desire to dismiss what I have to say as nonsense? If it does, then you have done what I tried to prevent, that is, jumped to a premature conclusion. And the reason must be that you judged such a permanent solution as impossible and therefore not deserving of further consideration, which is a normal reaction, if anything, when my claims are analyzed and compared to our present understanding of human nature. War seems to be an inescapable feature of the human condition which can only be subdued, not eradicated. But we must insert a question mark between the empirical fact that a feature is characteristic of human life as we know it, and the empirical claim that this feature is a sociological inevitability. Another reason that war is viewed as an unfortunate and intractable aspect of human existence is due to suffering itself, which sadly robs its victims of the ability to dream or have the breadth of vision to even contemplate the possibility of peace. The evil in the world has so constricted man's imagination that his mind has become hardened, and he shows contempt for anyone who dares to offer a solution because such claims appear ludicrous and unfounded.

Down through history there has always been this skepticism before certain events were proven true. It is only natural to be skeptical, but this is never a sufficient reason to exclude the possibility of a scientific miracle. You may reason that many people have been positive that they were right but it turned out they were wrong, so couldn't I also be positive and wrong? There is a fallacious standard hidden in this reasoning. Because others were positive and wrong, I could be wrong because I am positive. The first astronomer who observed the mathematical laws inherent in the solar system that enabled him to predict an eclipse was positive and right, as well as the space scientist who foretold that one day man would land on the moon. Edison when he first discovered the electric bulb was positive and right. Einstein

when he revealed the potential of atomic energy was positive and right — and so were many other scientists — but they proved that they were right with an undeniable demonstration, which is what I am doing. If my demonstration doesn't prove me right, then and then only am I wrong. There is quite a difference between being positive or dogmatic over knowledge that is questionable and being positive over something that is undeniable such as two plus two equals four. Just bear in mind how many times in the course of history has the impossible (that which appeared to be) been made possible by scientific discoveries which should make you desire to contain your skepticism enough to investigate what this is all about.

If you recall, in the 19th century Gregor Mendel made a discovery in the field of heredity. He was unable to present his findings because there was an established theory already being taught as true. The professors he contacted had their own theories and they concluded that it was impossible for him to have discovered anything new since he was nothing in comparison to them. If these professors had taken the time to scientifically investigate his claims they would have found that he was correct and they were mistaken, but this would have made them the laughingstock of the entire student world. In the end it was Nageli, the leading authority of his time, whose pride refused to let him investigate Mendel whom he judged a semi-amateur because he regarded as impossible the very core of Mendel's discovery. He was wrong as history recorded and though Mendel was compelled to receive posthumous recognition for the law he discovered, he is now considered the father of modern genetics and Nageli, a footnote. History has recorded innumerable stories of a like nature, but is it necessary that the pattern continue? Isn't it obvious that if such a discovery exists, and it does, and you deny the possibility, you are setting yourselves up as infallible gods among men, just as our intellectual ancestors did when they prematurely rejected the discovery of Gregor Mendel? Can't you be the ones to confirm the discovery? Must it be others, long after we are dead?

People have often questioned, "Well assuming that you did make a fantastic discovery, why bring it to me? You should run to the nearest university so it can be acknowledged. Then you would be acclaimed a genius and become famous the world over."

“That’s exactly what I did but when one professor heard my claims he smiled and lost all interest. Another used a method for screening out the wrong applicants for such a discovery. He immediately questioned my educational background and wanted to know from what university I graduated, to which I replied, “I have no formal education because I never completed the 7th grade.” Then without giving me a chance to tell him that my informal education was far superior to his formal education he responded without giving much thought to what he was about to say, ‘And you dare to come in here with such outrageous claims about solving all the problems of human relation!’”

“I couldn’t believe my ears, and my blood was beginning to boil.”

“Well tell me,” I said, trying to control myself, “What is your formal education?”

“I graduated from Harvard with many honors and credentials.”

I then inquired, “With all your formal education, your honors, your degrees and diplomas, what discoveries have you made to solve the problems plaguing mankind?” There was no answer and he hung up.

After that I was completely frustrated. Did you ever hear of anything so insulting, as if a discovery could not be made unless someone graduates college first? Which of these universities taught Newton, Edison, or Einstein, or did they perceive relations their professors were unable to understand until explained to them? Instead of being centers of investigation where new knowledge can be thoroughly analyzed, the professors use what they have been taught as a standard of truth from which vantage point they survey the landscape of divergent views for the sole purpose of criticism and disagreement. Isn’t this a perfect example of putting the proverbial cart before the horse, which should be a lesson to all professors that they should never become so dogmatic about their theories or opinions that they won’t take the time to investigate anything that might lead to the truth.

Unbeknownst to the highest ranking scholars, the universities have been handing along from generation to generation conceptions, not verified knowledge, that will be exploded once certain undeniable relations are perceived and pointed out to man’s common sense. Now let me make something very clear. To teach that $2 + 2 = 4$ doesn’t

depend for its truth on who is doing the teaching because the one being taught can perceive this undeniable relation. But when the relation revealing any truth is not obvious or difficult to grasp, or fallaciously logical, or logically inaccurate, then its acceptance depends more on who is doing the teaching and the long tenure of its existence rather than on what is being taught. For example, if students, who cannot perceive undeniable relations, are taught by their professor that 3 is to 6 as 4 is to 9 because he also cannot perceive this is false, they will be compelled to reject your explanation of it being 8 because they compare the rank of the teacher and the long tenure of what is taught with your upstart disagreement. Who are you to disagree with these distinguished professors? Everywhere you look people are using fallacious standards to judge the truth. To further illustrate this I recently gave a math problem to a student of mathematics. I asked this person if it was possible to arrange 105 alphabetical squares divided equally between A and O into groups of 3 so that each of the 15 different letters on a line and in all 35 groups would never be twice with any other letter. Since he assumed that I did not know the answer, he worked on the problem to find out if he thought it could be solved. After two weeks and feeling inadequate to the task, he responded, "My own personal opinion is that it cannot be done, however, I'm not an expert but my professor is. I'll give it to him." "By the way," he inquired (using the same fallacious standard as the Harvard graduate), "did you ever study higher mathematics in one of the universities, and if you didn't, how far did you go in school?" Once again I replied, "Only to the 7th grade." He then took the problem to his professor with this knowledge of the 7th grade and after another two weeks told me very positively that his professor said it could not be done, which is absolutely false.

In order for this discovery to be adequately understood the reader must not apply himself and his ideas as a standard of what is true and false, but understand the difference between a mathematical relation and an opinion, belief, or theory. The mind of man is so utterly confused with words that it will require painstaking clarification to clear away the logical cobwebs of ignorance that have accumulated through the years. For purposes of clarification please note that the words 'scientific' and 'mathematical' only mean 'undeniable', and are

interchanged throughout the text. The reasoning in this work is not a form of logic, nor is it my opinion of the answer; it is mathematical, scientific, and undeniable, and it is not necessary to deal in what has been termed the 'exact sciences' in order to be exact and scientific. Consequently, it is imperative to know that this demonstration will be like a game of chess in which every one of your moves will be forced and checkmate inevitable but only if you don't make up your own rules as to what is true and false which will only delay the very life you want for yourself. The laws of this universe, which include those of our nature, are the rules of the game and the only thing required to win, to bring about this Golden Age that will benefit everyone... is to stick to the rules. But if you decide to move the king like the queen because it does not satisfy you to see a pet belief slipping away or because it irritates your pride to be proven wrong or checkmated then it is obvious that you are not sincerely concerned with learning the truth, but only with retaining your doctrines at all cost. However, when it is scientifically revealed that the very things religion, government, education and all others want, which include the means as well as the end, are prevented from becoming a reality only because we have not penetrated deeply enough into a thorough understanding of our ultimate nature, are we given a choice as to the direction we are compelled to travel even though this means the relinquishing of ideas that have been part of our thinking since time immemorial? This discovery will be presented in a step by step fashion that brooks no opposition and your awareness of this matter will preclude the possibility of someone adducing his rank, title, affiliation, or the long tenure of an accepted belief as a standard from which he thinks he qualifies to disagree with knowledge that contains within itself undeniable proof of its veracity. In other words, your background, the color of your skin, your religion, the number of years you went to school, how many titles you hold, your I.Q., your country, what you do for a living, your being some kind of expert like Nageli (or anything else you care to throw in) has no relation whatsoever to the undeniable knowledge that 3 is to 6 what 4 is to 8. So please don't be too hasty in using what you have been taught as a standard to judge what has not even been revealed to you yet. If you should decide to give me the benefit of the doubt — deny it — and two other

discoveries to be revealed, if you can.

In his book “Alternative Science, Challenging the Myths of the Scientific Establishment” Richard Milton writes: “We are living in a time of rising academic intolerance in which important new discoveries in physics, medicine, and biology are being ridiculed and rejected for reasons that are not scientific. Something precious and irreplaceable is under attack. Our academic liberty — our freedom of thought — is being threatened by an establishment that chooses to turn aside new knowledge unless it comes from their own scientific circles. Some academics appoint themselves vigilantes to guard the gates of science against troublemakers with new ideas. Yet science has a two thousand year record of success not because it has been guarded by an Inquisition, but because it is self-regulating. It has succeeded because bad science is driven out by good; an ounce of open-minded experiment is worth any amount of authoritative opinion by self-styled scientific rationalists. The scientific fundamentalism of which these are disturbing signs is found today not merely in remote provincial pockets of conservatism but at the very top of the mainstream management of science on both sides of the Atlantic. Human progress has been powered by the paradigm-shattering inventions of many brilliant iconoclasts, yet just as the scientific community dismissed Edison’s lamp, Roentgen’s X-rays, and even the Wrights’ airplane, today’s “Paradigm Police” do a better job of preserving an outdated mode of thought than of nurturing invention and discovery. One way of explaining this odd reluctance to come to terms with the new, even when there is plenty of concrete evidence available, is to appeal to the natural human tendency not to believe things that sound impossible unless we see them with our own eyes — a healthy skepticism. But there is a good deal more to this phenomenon than a healthy skepticism. It is a refusal even to open our eyes to examine the evidence that is plainly in view. And it is a phenomenon that occurs so regularly in the history of science and technology as to be almost an integral part of the process. It seems that there are some individuals, including very distinguished scientists, who are willing to risk the censure and ridicule of their colleagues by stepping over that mark. This book is about those scientists. But, more importantly,

it is about the curious social and intellectual forces that seek to prohibit such research; those areas of scientific research that are taboo subjects; about subjects whose discussion is forbidden under pain of ridicule and ostracism. Often those who cry taboo do so from the best of motives: a desire to ensure that our hard-won scientific enlightenment is not corrupted by the credulous acceptance of crank ideas and that the community does not slide back into what Sir Karl Popper graphically called the 'tyranny of opinion.' Yet in setting out to guard the frontiers of knowledge, some scientific purists are adopting a brand of skepticism that is indistinguishable from the tyranny they seek to resist. These modern skeptics are sometimes the most unreflecting of individuals yet their devotion to the cause of science impels them to appoint themselves guardians of spirit of truth. And this raises the important question of just how we can tell a real crank from a real innovator — a Faraday from a false prophet. Merely to dismiss a carefully prepared body of evidence — however barmy it may appear — is to make the same mistake as the crank. In many ways cold fusion is the perfect paradigm of scientific taboo in action. The high priests of hot fusion were quick to ostracize and ridicule those whom they saw as profaning the sacred wisdom. And empirical fact counted for nothing in the face of their concerted derision.

The taboo reaction in science takes many distinct forms. At its simplest and most direct, tabooism is manifested as derision and rejection by scientists (and non-scientists) of those new discoveries that cannot be fitted into the existing framework of knowledge. The reaction is not merely a negative dismissal or refusal to believe; it is strong enough to cause positive actions to be taken by leading skeptics to compel a more widespread adoption in the community of the rejection and disbelief, the shipping up of opposition, and the putting down of anyone unwise enough to step out of line by publicly embracing taboo ideas. The taboo reaction in such simple cases is eventually dispelled because the facts — and the value of the discoveries concerned — prove to be stronger than the taboo belief; but there remains the worrying possibility that many such taboos prove stronger (or more valuable) than the discoveries to which they are applied. In its more subtle form, the taboo reaction draws a circle

around a subject and places it 'out of bounds' to any form of rational analysis or investigation. In doing so, science often puts up what appears to be a well-considered, fundamental objection, which on closer analysis turns out to be no more than the unreflecting prejudices of a maiden aunt who feels uncomfortable with the idea of mixed bathing. The penalty associated with this form of tabooism is that whole areas of scientific investigation, some of which may well hold important discoveries, remain permanently fenced off and any benefits they may contain are denied us. Subtler still is the taboo whereby scientists in certain fields erect a general prohibition against speaking or writing on the subjects which they consider their own property and where any reference, especially by an outsider, will draw a rapid hostile response. Sometimes, scientists who declare a taboo will insist that only they are qualified to discuss and reach conclusions on the matters that they have made their own property; that only they are privy to the immense body of knowledge and subtlety of argument necessary fully to understand the complexities of the subject and to reach the 'right' conclusion. Outsiders, on the other hand, (especially non-scientists) are ill-informed, unable to think rationally or analytically, prone to mystical or crank ideas and are not privy to subtleties of analysis and inflections of argument that insiders have devoted long painful years to acquiring. Once again, the cost of such tabooism is measured in lost opportunities for discovery. Any contribution to knowledge in terms of rational analysis, or resulting from the different perspective of those outside the field in question, is lost to the community. In its most extreme form scientific tabooism closely resembles the behavior of a priestly caste that is perceived to be the holy guardians of the sacred creed, the beliefs that are the object of the community's worship. Such guardians feel themselves justified by their religious calling and long training in adopting any measures to repel and to discredit any member of the community who profanes the sacred places, words or rituals regarded as untouchable. Perhaps the most worrying aspect of the taboo reaction is that it tends to have a cumulative and permanent discriminatory effect: any idea that is ideologically suspect or counter to the current paradigm is permanently dismissed, and the very fact of its rejection forms the basis of its rejection on all future occasions.

It is a little like the court of appeal rejecting the convicted man's plea of innocence on the grounds that he must be guilty or why else is he in jail? And why else did the police arrest him in the first place? This 'erring on the side of caution' means that in the long term the intellectual Devil's Island where convicted concepts are sent becomes more and more crowded with taboo ideas, all denied to us, and with no possibility of reprieve. We will never know how many tens or hundreds or thousands of important discoveries were thrown in the scrap heap merely because of intolerance and misplaced skepticism."

The taboo reaction is due, in part, to the pride of those people who consider themselves highly educated scholars at the very top echelon of thought and knowledge. They are more interested in who you are than what you have to say. Before this group will even consent to listen you must qualify not by what you are prepared to prove in a mathematical manner, but by your educational rank. Do you see what a problem I have? I can't convince these people to give me the time even though I have made discoveries that will benefit all mankind. This pride is the first half of the primary problem; that the very people who have the intellectual capacity to understand the knowledge in this book refuse to investigate what must reveal, if proven true, how unconsciously ignorant they have always been. Is it any wonder they don't want to check it out? And even if they do, could they be objective enough when their reputation for wisdom and knowledge is at stake? Have you noticed the parallels between the Catholic Church in the middle ages with its dogmatism (that it cannot be what must not be — the clergymen even refused to simply look through Galileo's telescope and see for themselves, because they were so arrogantly convinced that they held the absolute truth in hands and thus needed no verification), and today's self-righteous "church" of "scientificity" with its dogmas? Therefore before I begin I would like to ask a question of every reader but especially of philosophers, professors and theologians. Is there the slightest possibility that the knowledge you possess does not contain as much truth as you would like to believe? Would you gamble your life or the lives of those you love that you really know, or is there just the remotest chance that you only think you know? What is the standard

by which you judge the veracity of your knowledge and wisdom; the fact that it was taught in college? Is your determination of truth based on the fact that it was written by a noted author, composed from your own analysis and understanding, or revealed through heavenly inspiration? What makes you so certain, so positive, so dogmatic? Because this book dares to oppose the three forces that control the thinking of mankind; government, religion, and education; the most dangerous thinking of all; the kind that really doesn't know the truth as Socrates observed but because of some fallacious standard presumes to know, I have found it necessary to resort to this manner of introducing my work in the fervent hope that I can break through this sound barrier of learned ignorance and reach those who will be able to extract the pure, unadulterated relations involved before another century passes by or an atomic explosion destroys millions of lives. Now be honest with yourselves; do you really know, or only think you know? If you will admit there is just the slightest possibility that you have not been endowed with the wisdom of God; that you may be wrong regarding many things despite the high opinion you and others hold of yourselves; that the expression the blind leading the blind could even pertain to you; I know this is difficult for you to conceive; I say, if there is the slightest possibility you could be mistaken and you are willing to admit this to yourselves, then I cordially welcome your company aboard, otherwise, you had better not read this book for my words are not meant for your ears. But should you decide to accompany me on this voyage I would like to remind you, once again, that this book is not a religious or philosophical tract attempting some ulterior form of indoctrination; it is purely scientific as you will see, and should the word 'God' seem incongruous kindly remember Spinoza and you will understand immediately that it is not. While God is proven to be a mathematical reality as a consequence of becoming conscious of the truth, war and crime are compelled to take leave of the earth.

It is true that many men before me, including socialists, communists, even capitalists also thought they had discovered the cause of, and solution to, the various problems of human relation, and their enthusiasm was no doubt just as positive and sincere as my own. However, there is this difference between us. I have absolute proof

that cannot be denied by any reader; they did not. Mine can be adequately communicated; theirs was never disentangled from the illusion of reality borne out of abstract thought and imagination. Mine is purely scientific; theirs an expression of dogmatic belief. In view of the serious nature of this discovery, the effects of which will beneficently ramify into every conceivable direction causing religious minds to consider this the return of the expected Messiah, and since it also contravenes a belief held true by nearly all of mankind, I am once again asking the indulgence of every reader to please refrain from jumping to any premature conclusions, to put aside if only for the time being the unverified knowledge gathered from books and teachers and heed only the truth reflected in my words. "But what is truth?" you might ask. "Let us say it is that which cannot be denied by anyone anywhere." "But," you might reply, "that's just common sense; everyone knows that." Well it is just this common sense; that sense common to us all that I am making the very foundation of this book. It is for this reason that what I write will be understood not only by those who can read the English language, but by the entire literate world. There will be no sleight of hand revelation as is dreamed up in philosophical circles by epistemologists; only a clear undeniable explanation about facts of man's nature never before understood. Knowledge in this context is to truly know ourselves. If you are coming along on this journey you will need to put on your thinking caps and try to understand the mathematical relations soon to be revealed which permit you to see this miracle.

There is an ironic twist here for if all evils of our world no longer exist, how happy would certain professions be to know that their services will no longer be needed. Shouldn't this news make those individuals very happy, who have been trying to correct the evil in the world? If the cry of the clergy is 'Faith in God,' isn't it obvious that the priesthood would rather see an end to all sin than to preach against it and shrive the sinners in the confessional. They should be simply thrilled at the miracle God is about to perform, even though it means putting them out of work. Isn't it true that politicians, statesman, the leaders of the world in general would much rather see an end to all war and crime than to retaliate an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth? If the Communist and Capitalist governments are

truly interested in the welfare of their people, then just imagine how excited they will be to learn that the most perfect relations between all men will soon be a reality even though it makes their services unnecessary. If a writer is just about ready to submit his book to the public for the purpose of revealing knowledge on how to raise children or live together in greater harmony as man and wife, he will be absolutely in ecstasy to learn that God is going to bring about such perfect harmony in a short time that all books purporting to do this very thing won't have any more value. Just imagine how happy the profession of psychiatry will be to learn that all of its patients will be healed overnight by this miracle, making this service obsolete. There is a good deal of irony to this Great Transition for it reveals how completely dishonest we were compelled to be with ourselves and others. A salesman is happy to make a sale when he works on commission, and if he found out that another salesman beat him to the punch he would be disappointed. The only difference between a salesman selling books and a doctor, theologian, etc., is that the former must convince only his prospects while the latter must also convince themselves. A salesman is not interested if anyone uses his product, just so he is paid a commission. Doctors and theologians and those in the helping professions are compelled to justify that they know what they are advising and treating, otherwise, they could never accept a fee, gratuity, or income for their service. Someone who struggles to earn a living such as a salesman where the risk of injury is virtually nonexistent doesn't need the same kind of justification, and will even steal with a clear conscience.

Though we would all like to see an end to evil, there are two issues that need to be considered. No one could be pleased if their source of income was taken away as well as the very thing that gives meaning to their lives. Doctors are sincerely interested in making their patients well, but they want to be the ones to do it. Religion would like to see us delivered from evil, but in some manner that confirms what has been looked for — Judgment Day. The Chinese government would like to see an end to all evil, but in terms of communism. Is it possible for the supporters of socialism and communism to relinquish the thought that they are right, when they think they are not wrong? Politicians would like to see an end to all evil, but they want to find

the solution. Would it be possible for the leaders of capitalism to willingly resign their jobs when they think their services are no longer required? How is it humanly possible for the organizations that fight for peace, for health, for security; those that wage a war against the evils of humanity to be sincerely happy about the very removal of the things they need for their ultimate satisfaction? Everybody would like to see a great change; “I have a dream” said Dr. Martin Luther King, “this view from the mountain top, but no one desires any intruders or interlopers.” These individuals, who at present control the thinking of mankind, set up a fallacious standard for the conscious purpose of protecting themselves against others and will react with hostility towards anything that shows they may be wrong unless it is presented in such a mathematical manner that it is impossible to disagree without revealing a still greater ignorance. If this book was not a mathematical revelation — which scientists will soon confirm — what do you think the clergy, the government, the medical and teaching professions, and many others would do if they thought for one moment this work was someone’s opinion that threatened their security, power, and leadership position in world affairs? They would tear this book to shreds. This discovery has incurred the wrath of the establishment because it upsets the apple cart and threatens the status quo. No one wants to willingly admit they don’t have the answer. The fact remains that these individuals are actually trying to solve problems that are very much over their heads and what is being revealed to them is only a method to accomplish the very things they have been attempting to do, without success. Unfortunately, those endeavoring to correct our ills appear to be cutting off the heads of a diseased hydra — the more psychiatrists we graduate, the greater becomes our mental illness; the more policemen and moralists we have, the greater and more prevalent become our crimes; the more diplomats, statesmen, generals and armies we have, the greater and more destructive become our wars. And as an expedient to the situation we find ourselves being taxed to death while our cost of living steadily rises. Wouldn’t you like to see an end to all this? Therefore before I begin I would like to ask you the following questions. Do you prefer war or peace, unhappiness or happiness, insecurity or security, sickness or health? Do you prefer losing the

one you have fallen in love with, or winning and living happily ever after? Since I know that happiness is preferable to unhappiness, health to sickness, I shall now begin a revelation of knowledge which no one will be able to deny providing the relations are understood. While the moral code, the Ten Commandments, our standards of right and wrong will be completely extirpated, all premarital relations, adultery and divorce will be a thing of the past changing the entire landscape of family relationships. Where did you ever hear anything so fantastic or paradoxical? And aren't you jumping to a conclusion that this is against all human nature? If all the people in the world who get displaced because their services are no longer needed were to know as a matter of undeniable knowledge that the income necessary to sustain their standard of living, whatever the cost, would never be stopped as long as they live, would they have any reason to complain about someone showing them a better way — the only way to accomplish that for which they are getting paid? Although they and others will be dissatisfied to learn the truth when it deprives them of personal fulfillment, they are compelled to be silent because to utter any words of protest would only reveal their ignorance, which will give them no satisfaction. I shall now set sail on a voyage which will perform this virtual miracle by igniting a chain reaction of thought that will explode across the planet and destroy with its fallout every conceivable kind of hurt that exists among human relations, never to return. It is now within our power to reach that mountaintop — the Golden Age of man — that we have all hoped and dreamed would one day become a reality.

THE FOUNDATION AND SCIENTIFIC
DEVELOPMENT
OF MY FIRST DISCOVERY

CHAPTER ONE — THE HIDING PLACE
CHAPTER TWO — THE TWO-SIDED EQUATION

CHAPTER ONE

THE HIDING PLACE

Long ago man formed a theory that the earth was flat because he could not conceive of it as a ball suspended in space. It became a dogma, such a fixed idea that when the first astronomer, in attempting to explain the reason why darkness came over the sun in the middle of the day, was denied an opportunity to present his findings because his discovery called into question this sacred belief. Let us imagine the first astronomer being granted an interview by the leading authorities of his time to explain the cause of a solar eclipse.

“Dear gentlemen, I have come to you to explain my findings about the shape of the earth. In order for you to understand the cause of the darkness coming over the sun, it is first necessary to understand that the earth is not flat.”

“What’s that? Did we hear you correctly? Are you trying to tell us that the earth is round which means it is floating in space?”

“That is true, and my discovery lies locked behind the door marked the earth is round.”

“This is absurd! Who are you to come in here and tell us that we are wrong? We are not interested in your theory because we say the earth is flat [and since we are wiser than you, more learned than you, more educated than you, you must be wrong], so why discuss this matter further? Besides, our chief medicine man chanted the incantation that caused the darkness to vanish. Thank you very much for coming out to give us your explanation but we are not interested in discussing this matter further because we know, beyond a shadow of doubt, that the earth is flat.”

This is the second half of the primary problem. The fact that a theory such as the belief that the earth is flat can hermetically seal

knowledge that prevents our discovering the invariable laws of the solar system which, in turn, prevents the knowledge necessary to land men on the moon. Children were taught this by their parents who had received this knowledge from their parents who were instructed by the medicine man who was considered the wisest man of his time. Since there was no way the knowledge of the medicine man could be proven false because no one knew any different, and since he was considered the wisest man of his time, his conclusion that the earth was flat brooked no opposition. Consequently, when those who were judged inferior in wisdom or knowledge disagreed with the medicine man, they were rejected. When an upstart scientist came along who concluded that the earth was round after making certain observations, how was it possible to get others to agree with him when they couldn't follow his reasoning which compelled them to compare him, not his knowledge, to the medicine man, to the professors and teachers whose wisdom and knowledge could not be impugned. To help you see how easy it is for a dogmatic theory to prevent scientific investigation let us once again return, in imagination, to the time when man knew nothing about the solar system, and listen to a conversation.

“Say, Joshua; do you believe the earth is flat or do you go along with my theory that it is round?”

“Even though most of mankind agrees that it is flat, what difference does it really make what I think?” said our philosophical friend. “The shape of the earth is certainly not going to be affected or changed no matter what my opinion is, right?”

“That is true enough, but if the earth is really round isn't it obvious that just as long as we think otherwise we are prevented from discovering those things that depend on this knowledge for their discovery, consequently, it does make a difference. How much so we are not in the position to know just yet but thousands of years hence, perhaps in the twentieth century, there may be all kinds of scientific achievements attributed directly to knowing the true shape of the earth, such as landing men on the moon which may never be possible without first knowing the true shape of the earth.”

You may look back and smile at the unconscious ignorance of our

ancestors but pay close attention to what happened to me as I draw up a perfect comparison with which you can identify. Because my discovery was purely scientific, my attention was drawn to an article by Eric Johnson, now deceased, who was once among other things the President of the Motion Pictures Association. It appeared in the November 6, 1960 issue of This Week Magazine of The Baltimore Sun.

“If there is one word which characterizes our world in this exciting last half of the twentieth century, the word is change. Change in political life; change in economic life; change in social life; change in personal life; change in the hallmark of our times. It’s not gradual, comfortable change. It is sudden; rapid; often violent. It touches and often disrupts whole cultures and hundreds of millions of people. Behind it all lies an explosive growth in scientific knowledge and accomplishment. Some 90% of all the scientists who ever lived are living today, and the total accumulation of scientific knowledge is doubling every ten years. But this is reality. If we remember that, then we will never flinch at change. We will adjust to it, welcome it, meet it as a friend, and know it is God’s will.” Since my discovery would bring about the greatest change in all of history, it appeared that this man would be willing to let me explain my findings. By convincing him on the phone that it was now possible to put a permanent end to all war as a result of my discovery, he agreed to meet me on a Sunday afternoon in Washington, D.C. Our conversation went as follows:

“I’m really not a scientist, Mr. Lessans, and in all probability you should be talking to someone else. Your claims are absolutely fantastic, but I want you to know that even though I wrote an article about science, I am not a scientist. Besides, after you hung up I became more skeptical of claims such as yours because they not only sound impossible but somewhat ridiculous in view of man’s nature. Frankly, I don’t believe your claims are possible, but I am willing to listen if it doesn’t take too long and if I can see some truth to your explanation; I do have another engagement but I can devote at least one hour. Would you get right on with it?” I then told him the story

about the earth being flat and he smiled at this, and then told him that a theory exists regarding man's nature that is accepted as true by 98% of mankind, and I pointed out that this theory is actually preventing the decline and fall of all evil because it has closed a door to a vast storehouse of genuine knowledge.

"I will be as brief as possible, Mr. Johnson, but in order for me to reveal my discovery it is absolutely necessary that I first show you its hiding place because they are related to each other."

"What is this theory?" he asked.

"You see, Mr. Johnson, most people believe consciously or unconsciously that man's will is free."

"What's that? Did I hear you correctly? Are you trying to tell me that man's will is not free?"

"That is absolutely right, Mr. Johnson. I don't believe it; I know this for a mathematical fact. My discovery lies locked behind the door marked 'Man's Will is Not Free,' just like the invariable laws of the solar system were concealed behind the door marked 'The Earth is Round' — until some upstart scientist opened it for a thorough investigation."

"I have always believed it to be free, but what difference does it make what I think; the will of man is certainly not going to be affected by my opinion, right?"

"That part is true enough (do you recall the comparison), but if the will of man is definitely not free isn't it obvious that just as long as we think otherwise we will be prevented from discovering those things that depend on this knowledge for their discovery, consequently, it does make a difference. The opinion of our ancestors that the earth was flat could never change its actual shape, but just as long as the door marked 'The Earth Is Round' was never opened thoroughly for an investigation by scientists capable of perceiving the undeniable but involved relations hidden there, how were we ever to discover the laws that allow us now to land men on the moon?"

"Your door was opened many times through the years by some of the most profound thinkers and never did they come up with any discoveries to change the world."

"It is true that determinism was investigated by people who were

presumed profound thinkers, but in spite of their profoundness none of them had the capacity to perceive the law that was hidden there. Most people do not even know it is a theory since it is preached by religion, government, even education as if it is an absolute fact.”

“Mr. Lessans, I don’t know what it is you think you have discovered but whatever it is, as far as I personally am concerned, it cannot be valid because I am convinced that man’s will is free. Thank you very much for coming out but I’m not interested in discussing this matter any further.” And he would not let me continue.

Now stop to think about this for one moment. A discovery has been made that will go down in history as that which will change the entire world of human relations for the better, yet because it challenges a theory which is held by many world religions there is a hostile reaction when it is questioned. This is a perfect example of how this preemptive authority of false knowledge which is passed along from generation to generation by theology, by government, and by various other sources does not even allow a person to open his mind to hear the explanation. The theologians I contacted, though they admit they pray to God for deliverance from evil also believe it is impossible for man to accomplish this apparent miracle. In a sense they are right because the law that was discovered is equivalent to the law that inheres in the solar system, over which we have no control. Any system of established dogma which shackles man’s mind and prevents scientific investigation needs to be exposed, so that the truth can be revealed. This is much easier said than done because the knowledge of what it means that man’s will is not free was buried deeper than atomic energy, and presents problems that are almost insurmountable. Convincing a few people of this truth is one thing; convincing the entire world is something else. Supposing the very people whose understanding it is necessary to reach refuse to examine the facts on the grounds that the discovery could not be valid because it starts out with the premise that man’s will is not free. To show you how confused are those who have been guiding us, a rabbi was told that the author of the book “Decline and Fall of All Evil” has the permanent solution to every problem of human relation, and he replied, “How do we know that God wants us to remove all evil?”

Now you tell me, if he is doubtful of this why do all theologians ask God in the Lord's Prayer to deliver us from evil? Another rabbi criticized me for not attending the synagogue to which I replied, "Isn't the reason you go to the Temple due to your faith in God, your belief that one day He will reveal Himself to all mankind?" "That is true," he answered. "Well you see, Rabbi, the reason I don't go to the synagogue is because I know for a fact that God is real. I don't have faith or believe this; I know that $2 + 2 = 4$; I don't have faith or believe that this is true." Still hoping that I could convince a member of the clergy to hear what I had to say, I phoned a Catholic priest for an appointment and our conversation went as follows:

"What do you want to see me about?"

"Father, when you utter the words of the Lord's Prayer I take for granted that you are sincere and would like to see us delivered from evil, isn't that true?"

"Certainly, what kind of question is that?"

"Well the reason I had to ask is because I have just made a scientific discovery that will bring about the actual fulfillment of this prayer, this deliverance from evil."

"What's that you say? Deliver mankind from evil? Absolutely impossible, it cannot be done."

"But how can you know without first finding out what it is I have discovered? Isn't this your fervent wish, that God perform such a miracle?"

"It is."

"Well then, why don't you let me come out and show you exactly how all evil must decline and fall as a direct consequence?"

"It's impossible, that's why I'm not interested. The only time such a world will become a reality is on Judgment Day."

"But that's just the point; this Judgment Day when interpreted properly has actually arrived because it conforms to the basic principle."

"This still doesn't convince me that I should devote my precious time to what sounds ridiculous."

"Sounds can be deceiving, Father. Who believed the first

astronomer when he predicted an eclipse, or Einstein when he revealed the potential of atomic energy? If I told you without adequate proof that this discovery will bring about the inception of the Golden Age your skepticism would not be an unwarranted reaction, but the actual proof is explicit and undeniable. It is only natural for you to be skeptical, Father, but this is never a sufficient reason to exclude the possibility of a scientific miracle.”

“I’m afraid that I will have to end this conversation. My advice is to take what you have to one of the secular universities. I’m sorry I couldn’t be more helpful but thanks for calling anyway.”

Later on, I tried to engage a pastor in a discussion about free will and he responded to me by asking, “If man’s will is not free, then you can’t blame or punish anything he does, is that correct?” And when I answered, “Right,” he actually got up and walked out of the room. You see, this learned ignorance presents quite a problem, and only by getting the world to understand what it means that man’s will is not free can I hope to break through this barrier. This law of our nature is not a premise, not an assumption, not a theory, but when 98% of the world believes otherwise, they might just close the windows of their mind to any scientific investigation which requires rejecting a theory that has dogmatically controlled man’s thinking since time immemorial. How is it possible to explain the solution when nobody wishes to listen because they think they know there isn’t any? Where is there one iota of difference between this attitude and that of our ancestors regarding the shape of the earth? To show how confused is the thinking of the average person who is not accustomed to perceiving mathematical relations of this nature, when I told someone that his answer was incorrect, he replied with a tone of resentment, “That’s your opinion, but I believe it is possible,” as if the answer could be one or the other. The earth cannot be round and flat, it has to be one or the other and your opinion can never change what is. Remember, I am going to bring about an unprecedented change in human conduct, but I can only do this if you understand what I am about to reveal. If you can’t follow my reasoning as to why the earth is round, you will be compelled to believe that it is flat for it gives you satisfaction not to be wrong. In other words, if I were going to offer an opinion as to why man’s will is not free then your educational

rank, your scholarly background could assert itself as a condition more valid to deny my claim, but when I declare that I am not going to reveal a theory but will give a scientific, undeniable, demonstration, then regardless of who you are you must wait to see the proof before rejecting the claim. Therefore, it is imperative that you know, well in advance, that my reasoning will be completely mathematical, scientific and undeniable, so if you find yourself in disagreement you had better reread that which you disagree, otherwise, your stubborn resistance, your inability to perceive these relations will only delay the very life you want for yourself. Many philosophers consider the discussion of whether man's will is or is not free equivalent to the discussion as to what came first — the chicken or the egg. To them, what difference does it really make? But if this knowledge can put an end to all war, crime, and evil in general, it makes a very big difference and it is imperative that the world listen so that this evil in our lives can come to a permanent end.

It is time to draw an infallible line of demarcation between what is true and what is false and you are going to be amazed at how much of what is false passed for what is true. However, everything was necessary. As we begin to understand the knowledge of our true nature, what is revealed is something amazing to behold for it not only gives ample proof that evil is no accident but that it was part of the harmonious operation called the mankind system and was compelled to come into existence by the very nature of life itself as part of our development. Once certain facts are understood it will also be no accident that every form of evil will be compelled to take leave of this earth. Humanity has been gravitating at a mathematical rate, and in an unconscious manner, toward this Golden Age when the seeds of hatred and the domination of man over man become relics of our collective past. It never dawned on the theologians and philosophers that man's choice of what he considered better for himself, even though it may have been evil when judged by others, came about in direct obedience to his nature or the will of God who had reasons we were not supposed to understand until now. Many prophets foresaw the coming of this new world but didn't know the exact time frame or from which direction peace would finally make its appearance, although they were confident that when it arrived it would

change our world as we know it. Now the prophecies, conjectures, and philosophies are no longer necessary, for this long awaited Golden Age that we have been looking forward to with prayers, hope, and great anticipation has arrived at last. This discovery I will soon make known to you reveals the infinite wisdom guiding this universe which is not only that long sought standard and touchstone of truth and reality, but also that elixir of alchemy for with it the baser mettles of human nature are going to be magically transmuted into the pure gold of genuine happiness for every individual on this planet and for all generations to come. Please be perfectly honest, who can object to relinquishing the belief in free will when the key to the decline and fall of all misery and unhappiness lies behind the door of determinism?

In the beginning of creation when man was in the early stages of development, he could have destroyed himself were there no forces to control his nature. Religion came to the rescue by helping explain the reason for such evil in the world. It gave those who had faith a sense of comfort, hope, and the fortitude to go on living. In spite of everything, it was a bright light in the story of civilization. However, in order to reach this stage of development so God could reveal Himself to all mankind by performing this deliverance from evil, it was absolutely necessary to get man to believe his will was free, and he believed in this theory consciously or unconsciously. It became a dogma, a dogmatic doctrine of all religion, was the cornerstone of all civilization, and the only reason man was able to develop. The belief in free will was compelled to come about as a corollary of evil for not only was it impossible to hold God responsible for man's deliberate crimes, but primarily because it was impossible for man to solve his problems without blame and punishment which required the justification of this belief in order to absolve his conscience. Therefore, it was assumed that man did not have to do what he did because he was endowed with a special faculty which allowed him to choose between good and evil. In other words, if you were called upon to pass judgment on someone by sentencing him to death, could you do it if you knew his will was not free? To punish him in any way you would have to believe that he was free to choose another alternative than the one for which he was being judged; that he was not compelled by laws over which he had no control. Man was given no choice but

to think this way and that is why our civilization developed the principle of 'an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth,' and why my discovery was never found. No one could ever get beyond this point because if man's will is not free it becomes absolutely impossible to hold him responsible for anything he does. Well, is it any wonder the solution was never found if it lies beyond this point? How is it possible not to blame people for committing murder, rape, for stealing and the wholesale slaughter of millions? Does this mean that we are supposed to condone these evils, and wouldn't man become even less responsible if there were no laws of punishment to control his nature? Doesn't our history show that if something is desired badly enough he will go to any lengths to satisfy himself, even pounce down on other nations with talons or tons of steel? What is it that prevents the poor from walking into stores and taking what they need if not the fear of punishment? The belief that will is not free strikes at the very heart of our present civilization. Right at this point lies the crux of a problem so difficult of solution that it has kept free will in power since time immemorial. Although it has had a very long reign in the history of civilization, it is now time to put it to rest, once and for all, by first demonstrating that this theory can never be proven true. A friend shared a story with me to show how difficult it is to get through this established dogma.

"The other day when I was in Temple a rabbi, during the course of his sermon, made it very clear that man has free will. Professors, doctors, lawyers, and just about everybody I know, agree that man's will is free. If this is a theory you would never know it by talking to them. Well, is it a theory, or is this established knowledge?"

"Of course it is a theory," I answered, "otherwise there would be no believers in determinism. Is it possible for a person to believe that the earth is flat now that we have mathematical proof of its circular shape? The only reason we still have opinions on both sides of this subject is because we don't know for a mathematical fact whether the will of man is, or is not, free."

"But these theologians don't agree with you; they say that man's will is definitely free. Look, here comes a rabbi; ask him if man's will is free just for the heck of it and you will see for yourself how

dogmatic he responds.”

“Rabbi, we have been discussing a subject and would appreciate your opinion. Is it true, false, or just a theory that man’s will is free?”

“It is absolutely true that man’s will is free because nothing compels an individual to choose evil instead of good; he prefers this only because he wants to partake of this evil, not because something is forcing him.”

“Do you mean, Rabbi, that every person has two or more alternatives when making a choice?”

“Absolutely; that bank robber last week didn’t have to rob the bank, he wanted to do it.”

“But assuming that what you say is true, how is it possible to prove that which cannot be proven? Let me illustrate what I mean.”

“Is it possible for me not to do what has already been done?”
“No, it is not possible for me not to do what has already been done because I have already done it.”

“This is a mathematical or undeniable relation and is equivalent to asking is it possible for anyone not to understand four as an answer to two plus two. Now if what has been done was the choosing of B instead of A, is it possible not to choose B which has already been chosen?”

“It is impossible, naturally.”

“Since it is absolutely impossible (this is the reasoning of mathematics, not logic, which gives rise to opinions) not to choose B instead of A once B has been selected, how is it possible to choose A in this comparison of possibilities when in order to make this choice you must not choose B, which has already been chosen?”

“Again I must admit it is something impossible to do.”

“Yet in order to prove free will true, it must do just that — the impossible. It must go back, reverse the order of time, undo what has already been done, and then show that A — with the conditions being exactly the same — could have been chosen instead of B. Since it is utterly impossible to reverse the order of time which is absolutely necessary for mathematical proof, free will must always remain a theory. The most you can say is that you believe the bank robber had a choice, but there is absolutely no way this can be proven.”

“I may be unable to prove that he was not compelled to rob that bank and kill the teller, but it is my opinion that he didn’t have to do what he did.”

“I’m not in the mood to argue that point but at least we have arrived at a bit of knowledge that is absolutely undeniable, for we have just learned that it is mathematically impossible for any person to prove, beyond a shadow of doubt, that the will of man is free yet a moment ago you made the dogmatic statement that man’s will is definitely free.”

“My apology, dear sir; what I meant to say was that it is the consensus of opinion that the will of man is free.”

“Now that we have established this fact, consider the following: If it is mathematically impossible to prove something true, whatever that something is, is it possible to prove the opposite of that something false?”

“Yes, it is possible.”

“No, Rabbi, it is not possible.”

“That my friend is your opinion, not mine.”

“Let me show you it is not an opinion. If you could prove that determinism is false, wouldn’t this prove free will, which is the opposite of determinism, true; and didn’t we just prove that it is mathematically impossible to prove free will true, which means that it is absolutely impossible to prove determinism false?”

“I see what you mean and again I apologize for thinking this was a matter of opinion.”

“This means that we have arrived at another bit of mathematical knowledge and that is — although we can never prove free will true or determinism false, there still exists a possibility of proving determinism true, or free will false. Now tell me, Rabbi, supposing your belief in free will absolutely prevents the discovery of knowledge that, when released, can remove the very things you would like to rid the world of, things you preach against such as war, crime, sin, hate, discrimination, etc., what would you say then?”

“If this is true and you can prove it, all I can say is that God’s ways are mysterious and surpass my understanding. I enjoyed talking with you, son, and perhaps I shall live to see the day when all evil will

be driven from our lives.”

“Even if you don’t live to see it, please rest assured the day is not far away and that it must come about the very moment certain facts pertaining to the nature of man are brought to light, because it is God’s will.”

“I must leave now but thank you for sharing your insights with me.”

After the rabbi left, our conversation continued...

“Boy, that was really something to see; you almost sound like old Socrates himself. Just imagine, you actually got the rabbi to admit that free will is nothing other than an opinion. But you weren’t serious about getting rid of all the evil in the world, were you?”

“I was never more serious in all my life.”

“Why do you predict war to end sooner than crime?”

“To end any particular evil (and you are in for so many surprises) requires that the people involved understand the principles that will be explained. When they do, they will be given no choice but to stop the evil, whatever it is they are engaged in. But whereas it is only necessary to get the leaders of the world to understand the principles to end all war, it takes all mankind to understand them to put a permanent end to crime.”

“But how is it possible for you, just with your reasoning, nothing else, to put an end to all war, crime, sin, hate, etc.? If I must say so, this sounds completely contrary to reason.”

“Are you asking if it is possible, or telling me that you know it is impossible?”

“After what you just demonstrated to the rabbi I certainly would never tell you it is impossible when I don’t know if it is, but it seems so incredible to hear someone say he is going to remove all evil from the entire earth, that I cannot help but be in disbelief. Well what is your first step? How do you go about making a start?”

“The first step is to prove conclusively, beyond a shadow of doubt, and regardless of any opinions to the contrary, that the will of man is not free.”

“But if you plan to use the knowledge that man’s will is not free as a point from which to start your chain of reasoning, couldn’t you

get the same results without demonstrating that man's will is not free, simply by showing what must follow as a consequence?"

"Yes I could, and that was a very sharp question, but my purpose in proving that man's will is not free is not so much to have a sound basis from which to reason, but to show exactly why the will of man is not free."

"I am still trying to understand your reasoning as to why free will cannot be proven true."

"Once again, let me show you why this is a mathematical impossibility by repeating the same question I asked the rabbi. Take your time with this."

"Is it possible not to do what has already been done?"

"Of course it's not possible for me not to do what has already been done...because I have already done it."

"Now if what has just been done was the choosing of B instead of A, is it possible not to choose B, which has already been chosen?"

"No, it is not possible."

"Since it is absolutely impossible not to choose B instead of A, once B has been selected, how is it possible to choose A in this comparison of possibilities when in order to make this choice you must not choose B, which has already been chosen? Yet in order to prove free will true, it must do just that — the impossible. It must go back, reverse the order of time, undo what has already been done and then show that A, with the conditions being exactly the same, could have been chosen instead of B. Such reasoning is not a form of logic, nor is it my opinion of the answer. Let me rephrase this in still another way.

"If it is mathematically impossible to prove something true, whatever it is, is it possible to prove this something true?"

"Obviously the answer is no."

"Now that we have established this fact, consider the following: If it is mathematically impossible to prove something true, whatever that something is, is it possible to prove the opposite of that something false? Obviously the answer must be no, it is not possible unless the person asked does not understand the question. In other words, if it is mathematically impossible to prove free will true, how

is it possible to prove the opposite of this, false? Isn't it obvious that if determinism (in this context the opposite of free will) was proven false, this would automatically prove free will true, and didn't we just demonstrate that this is impossible unless we can turn back the clock? How is it possible to prove free will true when this requires doing something that is mathematically impossible? We can never undo what has already been done. Therefore, whatever your reasons for believing free will true cannot be accurate because it is impossible to prove this theory since proof requires going back in time, so to speak, and demonstrating that man could have chosen otherwise. Since it is utterly impossible to reverse the order of time, which is absolutely necessary for mathematical proof, the most we can do is assume that he didn't have to do what he did."

To show you how confused the mind can get when mathematical relations are not perceived, Will Durant, a well-known philosopher of the 20th century, wrote on page 103 in the *Mansions of Philosophy*, "For even while we talked determinism we knew it was false; we are men, not machines." After opening the door to the vestibule of determinism, and taking a step inside, he turned back because he could not get past the implications. Now let us understand why the implications of believing that man's will is not free turned Durant and many others away. Remember, most people know nothing about the implications of this position; they just accept as true what has been taught to them by leading authorities. If determinism was true, he reasoned, then man doesn't have a free choice; consequently, he cannot be blamed for what he does. Faced with this apparent impasse he asked himself, "How can we not blame and punish people for hurting others? If someone hurts us, we must believe that he didn't have to, that his will was free, in order to blame and punish him for what he did. And how is it possible to turn the other cheek and not fight back from this intentional hurt to us?" He was trying to say in this sentence that philosophies of free will would never stop returning just as long as our nature commands us to fight back when hurt, an eye for an eye. This is undeniable and he was one hundred percent correct because this relation could be seen just as easily with direct perception as two plus two equals four, and there was no way that this

statement could be beaten down with formulas or reasoning, but this is not what he actually said. He, as well as many philosophers, helped the cause of free will by unconsciously using syllogistic reasoning which is logical, though completely fallacious. He accomplished this by setting up an understandable assumption for a major premise: "If there is an almost eternal recurrence of philosophies of freedom it is because direct perception can never be beaten down with formulas, or sensation with reasoning." Can you not see how mathematically impossible is his observation? This simple paraphrase will clarify a point: "If there is an almost eternal recurrence of" four equaling two plus two, "it is because" two equals one plus one, and one plus one plus one totals four. But when a person perceives certain undeniable relations is it necessary to make an equation out of four equaling two plus two, or out of the fact that once free will is proven untrue it can no longer exist and its philosophies of freedom return? Using this same syllogistic reasoning he tried to prove freedom of the will by demonstrating, in the same manner, that determinism could never prove it false.

Durant begins with the assumption that direct perception (which are words that symbolize what he cannot possibly understand) is superior to reasoning in understanding the truth which made a syllogistic equation necessary to prove the validity of an inaccurate perception. Thusly, he reasons in his minor premise: "Free will is not a matter of reasoning, like determinism, but is the result of direct perception, therefore..." and here is his fallacious conclusion, "since philosophies of free will employ direct perception which cannot be beaten down by the reasoning of determinism, the belief in free will must eternally recur." He knew that free will was a theory, but as long as proof was not necessary when it could be seen with the direct perception of our common sense that it was impossible to turn the other cheek (the corollary thrown up by determinism), he was compelled to write — "Let the determinist honestly envisage the implications of his philosophy." This indicates that all his reasoning in favor of free will was the result of inferences derived from the inability to accept the implications. Durant is anything but a scientist and an accurate thinker. Since it is absolutely impossible for free will to ever be proven true (I take for granted this is now understood),

nothing in this universe can prove determinism an unreality (and in this context it shall only mean the opposite of free will as death is the opposite of life), simply because this would automatically prove the truth of free will which has been shown to be an impossibility. Consequently, the belief in free will and all conceptions regarding it can only remain in existence as a plausible theory just as long as no undeniable evidence is produced in contravention. According to his reasoning he assumes that free will is true because, in his mind, determinism is false, and the reason he thinks determinism is false is because man is not a machine. Then, not realizing how mathematically impossible is his next statement he claims that philosophies of freedom (free will) eternally recur because reasoning and formulas cannot beat down the obvious truth of direct perception. Take a look at that last statement very carefully and see if you can't tell why it is mathematically impossible. If free will was finally proven to be that which is non-existent (and let's take for granted that you know this for a fact) and accepted as such by our scientific world at large, would it be possible according to Durant's statement for 'philosophies of freedom' to recur anymore? Isn't it obvious that the recurrence of the belief in free will is a mathematical impossibility once freedom of the will is proven to be a figment of the imagination, or to phrase it differently, a realistic mirage? Is it humanly possible for the belief that the world is flat to eternally recur when we have mathematical knowledge that it is round? Consequently, the continued return of the belief in free will can only be due to the fact that it is still a logical theory or plausible conception that has never been analyzed properly, allowing the belief and its philosophies to persist. But Durant states that philosophies of freedom eternally recur not because of the explanation I just gave, an explanation that cannot be denied by anyone anywhere, even by this philosopher himself providing it is understood, but because direct perception can never be beaten down with formulas, or sensation with reasoning. Isn't it apparent that such words have no relation to reality whatever? If Durant believed direct perception was considered superior to reasoning, is it any wonder he was so confused and his reasoning so fallacious since the word 'because' which denotes the perception of a relation, whether true or false, indicates that he is criticizing

reasoning while reasoning. This doesn't stop a person from saying, "I believe." "It is my opinion." "I was taught that man's will is free," but it would certainly stop him from trying to defend his position with an argument. One of the most profound insights ever expressed by Socrates was "Know Thyself," but though he had a suspicion of its significance it was only an intuitive feeling, not something he could put his finger on. These two words have never been adequately understood by mankind, including psychiatry and psychology, because this observation is the key that unlocks the first door to another door that requires its own key, and where the hiding place to this discovery was finally uncovered. What made it so obvious to Durant that man's will is free? And why do theologians treat this as if it is an undeniable reality? Durant is now deceased but over 20 years ago I phoned to tell him I had made a fantastic discovery that was hidden behind the fallacious theory that man's will is free. He replied, "You must be on the wrong tack, but take what you think you have to Johns Hopkins University for an analysis." I not only contacted that university but many others to no avail.

It is interesting to observe at this point that Durant was indirectly involved in my discovery. To give you a little background, it was November of 1959 when I received an amazing revelation that would change the course of my life. I happened to overhear on the radio a priest state very dogmatically that man has freedom of the will, and the hair stood up on my arms like a cat ready to fight. I didn't understand why that happened and didn't pay much attention to it at the time but felt that I was chilled for some reason. Up until that time I never gave much thought to the subject of free will, not rejecting or accepting it, but when this chill occurred every time the subject came up I began to see the connection. That night in a dream I kept hearing this phrase, "The solution to all the problems plaguing mankind lies hidden behind the fallacious belief that man's will is free." I still didn't understand where it was leading, but the next day I started to reread Durant's chapter on free will in his book *Mansions of Philosophy*. When I completed it I remarked, "He really doesn't know what he is talking about and Spinoza is right, man's will is not free." Then, after nine strenuous months I shouted, "Eureka, I have found it!" and I have had no rest ever since. After opening the door

of determinism and proving conclusively that man's will is not free, I saw another sign that read — 'Hidden behind this door you will discover the solution to the problem of evil — the long awaited Messiah.' I applied the key, opened the door, and after many months in the deepest analysis I made a finding that was so fantastic, it took me several years to understand its full significance for all mankind. I saw how this new world must become a reality in a very short time.

The reason theologians could never solve this problem of evil was because they never attempted to look behind the door marked 'Man's Will Is Not Free.' Why should they when they were convinced man's will was free? Plato, Christ, Spinoza, and many others came into the world and saw the truth but in a confused sort of way because the element of evil was always an unsolved factor. When Jesus Christ told the rabbis that God commanded man to turn the other cheek, they threw him out because the Bible told them that God said — "An eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth." When his enemies nailed him to the cross he was heard to say — "They know not what they do." "Turn the other cheek" he said. Because Christ exemplified in his behavior the principle of forgiveness, and because he saw such suffering in the world, he drew to himself those who needed help, and there were many. However, the legacy he left for Christianity was never reconciled. How was it possible to turn the other cheek in a world of such evil? Why was the mind of man so confused and in spite of every possible criticism how was religion able to convince the world to be patient and have faith? Where did these theologians receive their inspiration since there was no way science could reconcile good and evil with a God that caused everything. They solved this problem in a very simple manner by dividing good and evil in half and God was only responsible for the first. Then they reasoned that God endowed man with freedom of the will to choose good over evil. To theologians, God is the creator of all goodness and since man does many things considered evil they were given no choice but to endow him with freedom of the will so that God could be absolved of all responsibility for evil, which was assigned to Satan. This is also the reason why religion is so hostile towards any person who speaks against free will. Is it any wonder that Christ and Spinoza plus innumerable others pulled away from the synagogue? Is it any wonder

Spinoza became a heretic and was excommunicated? According to the thinkers of that time how could any intelligent person believe in Satan? Religion has never been able to reconcile the forces of good and evil with a caring and loving God, therefore Satan was destined to be born as the opposite of all good in the world.

Because Spinoza was dissatisfied with theology's explanation of good and evil, he opened the door of determinism and looked around quite a bit but did not know how to slay the fiery dragon (the great impasse of blame), so he pretended it wasn't even there. He stated, "We are men, not God. Evil is really not evil when seen in total perspective," and he rejected the principle of an eye for an eye. Will Durant, not at all satisfied with this aspect of Spinoza's philosophy, although he loved him dearly, could not understand how it was humanly possible to turn the other cheek in this kind of world. He also went in and looked around very thoroughly and, he too, saw the fiery dragon but unlike Spinoza he made no pretense of its non-existence. He just didn't know how to overcome the beast but refused to agree with what common sense told him to deny. The implications really need no further clarification as to why free will is in power. Nobody, including Spinoza and other philosophers, ever discovered what it meant that man's will is not free because they never unlocked the second door which leads to my discovery. The belief in free will was compelled to remain in power until the present time because no one had conclusive proof that determinism was true, nor could anyone slay the fiery dragon which seemed like an impossible feat. Is it any wonder that Johnson didn't want to get into this matter any further? Is it any wonder Durant never went beyond the vestibule? Are you beginning to recognize why it has been so difficult to get this knowledge thoroughly investigated? Since the modern world of science was playing havoc with religion it needed a boost and along came, just in the nick of time, a scientist who gave seven reasons why he believed in God. A. Cressy Morrison, who wrote his book, "Man Does Not Stand Alone," was almost convinced that God was a reality. He challenged Julian Huxley's conclusions written in his book, "Man Stands Alone." Both tried to answer the question, "Is there a Supreme Intelligence guiding this universe?" Who is right? Huxley said "no there isn't," but Morrison's arguments were

mathematically sound and he gave quite a boost to instilling faith again in those people who were really beginning to wonder. I can almost remember word for word how he tried to prove that nothing happens by chance, and he did prove it except for this element of evil. It went something like this:

“Chance seems erratic, unexpected and subject to no method of calculation, but though we are startled by its surprises, chance is subject to rigid and unbreakable law. The proverbial penny may turn up heads ten times in a row and the chance of an eleventh is not expected but is still one in two, but the chances of a run of ten heads coming up consecutively is very small. Supposing you have a bag containing one hundred marbles, ninety-nine black and one white. Shake the bag and let out one. The chance that the first marble out of the bag is the white one is exactly one in one hundred. Now put the marbles back and start again. The chance of the white coming out is still one in a hundred, but the chance of the white coming out first twice in succession is one in ten thousand (one hundred times one hundred).

Now try a third time and the chance of the white coming out three times in succession is one hundred times ten thousand or one in a million. Try another time or two and the figures become astronomical. The results of chance are as clearly bound by law as the fact that two plus two equals four.

In a game in which cards are shuffled and an ace of spades was dealt to one of the players, ace of hearts to the next, clubs to the third and diamonds to the dealer, followed by the deuces, the threes and so on, until each player had a complete set in numerical order, no one would believe the cards had not been arranged.

The chances are so great against such a happening that it probably never did happen in all the games played anywhere since cards was invented. But there are those who say it could happen, and I suppose the possibility does exist. Suppose a little child is asked by an expert chess player to beat him at chess in thirty-four moves and the child makes every move by pure chance exactly right to meet every twist and turn the expert attempts and does beat him in thirty-four moves. The expert would certainly think it was a dream or that he was out of his

mind. But there are those who think the possibility of this happening by chance does exist. And I agree, it could happen, however small the possibility. My purpose in this discussion of chance is to point out clearly and scientifically the narrow limits which any life can exist on earth and prove by real evidence that all the nearly exact requirements of life could not be brought about on one planet at one time by chance. The size of the earth, the distance from the sun, the thickness of the earth's crust, the quantity of water, the amount of carbon dioxide, the volume of nitrogen, the emergence of man and his survival all point to order out of chaos, to design and purpose, and to the fact that according to the inexorable laws of mathematics all these could not occur by chance simultaneously on one planet once in a billion times. It could so occur, but it did not so occur. When the facts are so overwhelming and when we recognize as we must the attributes of our minds which are not material, is it possible to flaunt the evidence and take the one chance in a billion that we and all else are the result of chance? We have found that there are 999,999,999 chances to one against a belief that all things happen by chance. Science will not deny the facts as stated; the mathematicians will agree that the figures are correct. Now we encounter the stubborn resistance of the human mind, which is reluctant to give up fixed ideas. The early Greeks knew the earth was a sphere but it took two thousand years to convince men that this fact is true.

New ideas encounter opposition, ridicule and abuse, but truth survives and is verified. The argument is closed; the case is submitted to you, the jury, and your verdict will be awaited with confidence."

Morrison never realized that all the mathematical arguments in the world could never reveal God until we were delivered from evil; consequently, he was compelled to join the ranks of those who had faith. Nobody has yet said he knows for a mathematical fact that God is real, otherwise, there would be no need for faith. I know that two plus two equals four, I don't have faith that it's true. Well, do you still believe there is no Supreme Intelligence guiding this universe through mathematical laws which include the relation of man with man, and that everything happens by chance? Do you believe that your faith in God has been in vain? You are in for the surprise of

your life.

This discussion on chance brings forcibly to the attention of the reader the fact that this world did not come about by chance. The purpose of this book is to prove undeniably that there is design to the universe. By delivering mankind from evil, the last vestige of doubt is removed. Through our deliverance, God is revealed to us; but the evil is not removed to prove that God is not a figment of the imagination, but only because it is evil. He becomes an epiphenomenon of this tremendous fire that will be built to burn away the evil, and the light that is shed reveals His presence as the cause of the evil that He is now removing through these discoveries which He also caused; and no person alive will be able to dispute these undeniable facts. There is tremendous misunderstanding about the meaning of determinism, therefore, it is necessary to first demonstrate why man's will is not free so the reader can follow the reasoning which leads to my discovery. The fact that man's will is not free is the gateway that allows the reader to come face to face with the fiery dragon himself. It really doesn't make any difference whether or not the proof of determinism is established beforehand because undeniable proof is established in the meaning; but for those who want proof before we attack the heart of the problem I shall demonstrate in an undeniable manner exactly why man's will is not free. Once it is proven mathematically — which takes into consideration the implications — there can be no more opinions or theories expressed on the subject, just as our ancestors stopped saying, "I believe the earth is flat" once they knew for a fact it was round. There is a great deal of irony here because the philosophers who did not know it was impossible to prove freedom of the will believed in this theory because they were under the impression their reasoning had demonstrated the falseness of determinism. The reason proof of determinism is absolutely necessary is to preclude someone quoting Durant and interjecting a remark about man not being a machine. Is there anything about my demonstration that would make the reader think he is now a machine? On page 87 in *Mansions of Philosophy* he writes, "If he committed crimes, society was to blame; if he was a fool, it was the fault of the machine, which had slipped a cog in generating him." In other words, he assumes that this kind of

knowledge, the knowledge that states man's will is not free, allows a person to shift his responsibility for what he does. One individual blames society for his crimes as he rots in prison while another blames the mechanical structure of the machine which slipped a cog and made him into a fool. You will soon see that not only Durant but all mankind are very much confused by the misleading logic of words that do not describe reality for what it is. This is why it is imperative that we proceed in an undeniable, not logical, manner otherwise someone may quote Durant, a priest, professor, lawyer, judge or politician as an authority for believing in freedom of the will. I recently had a conversation with a friend who was very sincere in his desire to understand the principles in my book. His questions were predictable coming from a superficial understanding of man's nature and represent the confusion many people feel when the issue of determinism comes up.

“Isn't it obvious that we must have standards of some kind so that a child can be taught the difference between right and wrong, good and evil? Supposing all individuals in a society are told that it is wrong to steal (I hope you're not going to tell me this is right), yet certain ones deliberately ignore this and take what belongs to someone else; isn't it obvious that we must blame them because they were warned in advance that if they should steal they will be punished? Are you trying to tell me there is no such thing as a standard of right and wrong?”

“If you know the difference between right and wrong, and you also know that a person cannot be blamed or punished for what he does because his will is not free, isn't it obvious that we are given only one alternative and that is to prevent the desire to do what is wrong from arising which then makes it unnecessary to blame and punish? Just as long as man has this safety valve of blame and punishment, he doesn't have to find the solution to this doing of what is wrong. Parents can be very careless and excuse themselves by blaming their children, and governments can be careless and excuse themselves by blaming their citizens while plunging the entire world into war.”

“But supposing they are not careless and they are doing everything in their power to prevent children and citizens from doing what is

wrong so that blame and punishment are not necessary, what then? Are we not supposed to blame and punish them for our own protection when they do something wrong?”

“That’s just the point. Once it is discovered through mathematical reasoning that man’s will is definitely not free, then it becomes impossible to blame an individual for what he is compelled to do; consequently, it is imperative that we discover a way to prevent his desire to do the very things for which blame and punishment were previously necessary, as the lesser of two evils.”

“This new world which looks good, sounds good, and seems theoretically possible in its blueprint form so far (since you haven’t shown me yet how to rid the world of war and crime — two most important items), it may be just another dream, and even if it isn’t, it took the Greeks two millennium to convince mankind that the earth was a sphere. Even today, there are still some people who don’t believe it, so how do you expect people to listen to something that not only sounds impossible, but is so far removed from contemporary thought?”

“This is the stumbling block I am faced with.”

“Are you telling me that this discovery, whatever it is, will prevent man from desiring to commit murder, rape, start a war, annihilate 6 million people, etc., is that right?”

“That’s correct. The corollary, Thou Shall Not Blame, when it is extended does not mean that we will be forced to condone what hurts us, but we will be shown how to prevent these evils by mathematically extending the corollary. And the amazing thing is that both sides of this equation are correct. Christ said, “Turn the other cheek” and Durant said, “This is impossible.” Just think about this for one moment. Would you believe that both principles are mathematically correct?”

“How is that possible?”

“God made the reconciliation of these two principles the time when He would reveal Himself to all mankind. But to get here you can see what had to be done first since the paths leading up to this understanding were camouflaged with layers upon layers of words that concealed the truth.”

“Is proving that man’s will is not free the key to open the door and your second discovery?”

“Of course not; I just told you that the fiery dragon must be killed to get the key. First, I must prove that man’s will is not free so we can come face to face with the fiery dragon (the great impasse of blame), and I will prove it in a mathematical, undeniable manner. Then I shall jab him in the right eye, then the left, then I shall cut out his tongue. I took fencing lessons for the job. And finally I shall pierce him in his heart. Then when I have made certain he is dead.”

“I thought you killed him already.”

“I did, but there was a dragon for each person, so instead of giving everybody a sword; steel is high these days, I shall slay him so the whole world can see he is dead.”

“Do you mean to tell me there is absolutely no way all evil can be removed from our lives without knowledge of your discovery?”

“That’s absolutely true.”

“Then your discovery must be the most fantastic thing ever discovered.”

“It truly is because God is showing us the way at last. However, before I show how it is possible to resolve the implications, it is necessary to repeat that I will proceed in a step by step manner. This dragon has been guarding an invisible key and door for many years, and this could never be made visible except for someone who saw these undeniable relations. If, therefore, you would like to learn that Man Does Not Stand Alone as Morrison understood from his scientific observations; that God, this Supreme Intelligence, is a mathematical reality of infinite wisdom, then what do you say we begin our voyage that will literally change the entire world. We are not interested in opinions and theories regardless of where they originate, just in the truth, so let’s proceed to the next step and prove conclusively, beyond a shadow of doubt, that what we do of our own free will (of our own desire because we want to) is done absolutely and positively not of our own free will. Remember, by proving that determinism, as the opposite of free will, is true, we also establish undeniable proof that free will is false.” So without any further ado, let us begin.

The dictionary states that free will is the power of self-determination regarded as a special faculty of choosing good and evil without compulsion or necessity. Made, done, or given of one's own free choice; voluntary. But this is only part of the definition since it is implied that man can be held responsible, blamed and punished for doing what is considered wrong or evil since it is believed he could have chosen otherwise. In other words, it is believed that man has the ability to do other than he does, if he wants to, and therefore can be held responsible for doing what he is not supposed to do. These very words reveal the fallacy of this belief to those who have mathematical perception. Man is held responsible not for doing what he desires to do or considers right, better or good for himself under his particular set of circumstances, but for doing what others judge to be wrong or evil, and they feel absolutely certain he could have acted otherwise had he wanted to. Isn't this the theme of free will? But take note. Supposing the alternative judged right for him by others is not desired by himself because of conditions known only to him, what then? Does this make his will free? It is obvious that a great part of our lives offers no choice, consequently, this is not my consideration. For example, free will does not hold any person responsible for what he does in an unconscious state like hypnosis, nor does it believe that man can be blamed for being born, growing, sleeping, eating, defecating, urinating, etc.; therefore, it is unnecessary to prove that these actions, which come under the normal compulsion of living, are beyond control.

Supposing a father is desperately in need of work to feed his family but cannot find a job. Let us assume he is living in the United States and for various reasons doesn't come under the consideration of unemployment compensation or relief and can't get any more credit for food, clothing, shelter, etc.; what is he supposed to do? If he steals a loaf of bread to feed his family the law can easily punish him by saying he didn't have to steal if he didn't want to, which is perfectly true. Others might say stealing is evil, that he could have chosen an option which was good. In this case almost any other alternative would have sufficed. But supposing this individual preferred stealing because he considered this act good for himself in comparison to the evil of asking for charity or further credit because

it appeared to him, at that moment, that this was the better choice of the three that were available to him — so does this make his will free? It is obvious that he did not have to steal if he didn't want to, but he wanted to, and it is also obvious that those in law enforcement did not have to punish him if they didn't want to, but both sides wanted to do what they did under the circumstances.

In reality, we are carried along on the wings of time or life during every moment of our existence and have no say in this matter whatsoever. We cannot stop ourselves from being born and are compelled to either live out our lives the best we can, or commit suicide. Is it possible to disagree with this? However, to prove that what we do of our own free will, of our own desire because we want to do it, is also beyond control, it is necessary to employ mathematical (undeniable) reasoning. Therefore, since it is absolutely impossible for man to be both dead and alive at the same time, and since it is absolutely impossible for a person to desire committing suicide unless dissatisfied with life (regardless of the reason), we are given the ability to demonstrate a revealing and undeniable relation.

Every motion, from the beating heart to the slightest reflex action, from all inner to outer movements of the body, indicates that life is never satisfied or content to remain in one position for always like an inanimate object, which position shall be termed 'death.' I shall now call the present moment of time or life here for the purpose of clarification, and the next moment coming up there. You are now standing on this present moment of time and space called here and you are given two alternatives, either live or kill yourself; either move to the next spot called there or remain where you are without moving a hair's breadth by committing suicide.

"I prefer..." Excuse the interruption, but the very fact that you started to answer me or didn't commit suicide at that moment makes it obvious that you were not satisfied to stay in one position, which is death or here and prefer moving off that spot to there, which motion is life. Consequently, the motion of life which is any motion from here to there is a movement away from that which dissatisfies, otherwise, had you been satisfied to remain here or where you are, you would never have moved to there. Since the motion of life constantly moves away from here to there, which is an expression of

dissatisfaction with the present position, it must obviously move constantly in the direction of greater satisfaction. It should be obvious that our desire to live, to move off the spot called here, is determined by a law over which we have no control because even if we should kill ourselves we are choosing what gives us greater satisfaction, otherwise we would not kill ourselves. The truth of the matter is that at any particular moment the motion of man is not free for all life obeys this invariable law. He is constantly compelled by his nature to make choices, decisions, and to prefer of whatever options are available during his lifetime that which he considers better for himself and his set of circumstances. For example, when he found that a discovery like the electric bulb was for his benefit in comparison to candlelight, he was compelled to prefer it for his motion, just being alive, has always been in the direction of greater satisfaction. Consequently, during every moment of man's progress he always did what he had to do because he had no choice. Although this demonstration proves that man's will is not free, your mind may not be accustomed to grasping these type relations, so I will elaborate.

Supposing you wanted very much of two alternatives A, which we shall designate something considered evil by society, instead of B, the humdrum of your regular routine; could you possibly pick B at that particular moment of time if A is preferred as a better alternative when nothing could dissuade you from your decision, not even the threat of the law? What if the clergy, given two alternatives, choose A, which shall now represent something considered good, instead of B, that which is judged evil; would it be possible for them to prefer the latter when the former is available as an alternative? If it is utterly impossible to choose B in this comparison are they not compelled, by their very nature, to prefer A; and how can they be free when the favorable difference between A and B is the compulsion of their choice and the motion of life in the direction of greater satisfaction? To be free, according to the definition of free will, man would be able to prefer of two alternatives, either the one he wants or the one he doesn't want, which is an absolute impossibility because selecting what he doesn't want when what he does want is available as an alternative is a motion in the direction of dissatisfaction.

To give you a more familiar example, if it were possible that B

could be selected even though A was the desirable choice, it would permit a woman to spend on a dress she doesn't prefer when a dress she does prefer is available, or to pick from a selection of dresses the one she finds the least desirable. Let us imagine for a moment that this woman is late for a business meeting and must quickly choose between two dresses. If both are undesirable, she is compelled to select the dress that is the least undesirable of the two; consequently, her choice in this comparison is the preferable alternative. Obviously she has other options; she could leave both dresses and wear something from home, continue to shop and call in late, etc. This is a hypothetical situation for the purpose of demonstrating that once she decides to buy a dress as a solution to her problem — and regardless of the factors that contribute to her final decision — she is compelled to prefer the dress that gives every indication of being the best possible choice under the circumstances. For example, if cost is an important consideration she may desire to buy the less expensive dress because it fits within her price range, and though she would find great satisfaction seeing herself in the more expensive dress, she finds greater satisfaction choosing the dress that appeals to her the least. This is where there may be some misunderstanding. Moving toward greater satisfaction does not mean we are always satisfied; it just means that we are compelled to prefer *what we believe to be* the best possible choice of the options that are available to us. [Note: This does not mean that we have considered all possible options; only those options that come to mind or have been brought to our attention at any given moment in time. Nor does it mean that our choices are unlimited for the availability of choices depends on a myriad of cultural, economic, and social factors]. After coming home she may have a change of heart and wish she had splurged on the more expensive dress. She may decide to go back to the store to make an exchange, or she may decide to just keep the dress because returning it involves too much time and effort making this the least favorable option. Each moment offers a new set of options but always in the direction of greater satisfaction.

“Is that it? You mean there is nothing else, and this is supposed to satisfy me? Let's assume for the sake of argument that other people are just as confused as me. Frankly, you could never prove by

me that man's will is not free simply because I can't follow your reasoning. Isn't there something else you can add to prove your equation, just as we can prove that two from six leaves four because four plus two equals six?"

To satisfy you I shall put this to a mathematical test for further proof and clarification. Imagine that you were taken prisoner in war time for espionage and condemned to death, but mercifully given a choice between two exits: A is the painless hemlock of Socrates, while B is death by having your head held under water. The letters A and B, representing small or large differences are compared. The comparison is absolutely necessary to know which is preferable. The difference which is considered favorable, regardless of the reason, is the compulsion of greater satisfaction desire is forced to take which makes one of them an impossible choice in this comparison simply because it gives less satisfaction under the circumstances. Consequently, since B is an impossible choice, man is not free to choose A. Is it humanly possible, providing no other conditions are introduced to affect your decision, to prefer exit B if A is offered as an alternative?

"Yes, if this meant that those I loved would not be harmed in any way."

"Well, if this was your preference under these conditions, could you prefer the other alternative?"

"No I couldn't, but this is ridiculous because you really haven't given me any choice."

You most certainly do have a choice, and if your will is free, you should be able to choose B just as well as A, or A just as well as B. In other words, if B is considered the greater evil in this comparison of alternatives, one is compelled, completely beyond control, to prefer A. It is impossible for B to be selected in this comparison (although it could be chosen to something still worse) as long as A is available as an alternative. Consequently, since B is an impossible choice you are not free to choose A, for your preference is a natural compulsion of the direction of life over which you have absolutely no control. Let me explain this in another way. Once it is understood that life is compelled to move in the direction of satisfaction, and if two such alternatives were presented to you as in the example above, what

choice would you possibly have but to accept the lesser of two evils? Since it is absolutely impossible to prefer something considered still worse in your opinion, regardless of what it is, are you not compelled, completely beyond your control in this set of circumstances, to prefer A; and since the definition of free will states that man can choose good over evil without compulsion or necessity, how is it possible for the will of man to be free when choice is under a tremendous amount of compulsion since B was evil, as the worse alternative, and could not be selected in this comparison of possibilities?

The word 'choice' itself indicates there are meaningful differences otherwise there would be no choice in the matter at all as with A and A. The reason you are confused is because the word choice is very misleading for it assumes that man has two or more possibilities, but in reality this is a delusion because the direction of life, always moving towards greater satisfaction, compels a person to prefer of differences what he, not someone else, considers better for himself, and when two or more alternatives are presented for his consideration he is compelled by his very nature to prefer not that one which he considers worse, but what gives every indication of being better or more satisfying for the particular set of circumstances involved. Choosing, or the comparison of differences, is an integral part of man's nature, but to reiterate this important point...he is compelled to prefer of alternatives that which he considers better for himself and though he chooses various things all through the course of his life, he is never given any choice at all. Although the definition of free will states that man can choose good or evil without compulsion or necessity, how is it possible for the will of man to be free when choice is under a tremendous amount of compulsion to choose the most preferable alternative each and every moment of time?

"I agree with all this, but how many times in your life have you remarked, 'You give me no choice' or 'it makes no difference?'"

Just because some differences are so obviously superior in value where you are concerned that no hesitation is required to decide which is preferable, while other differences need a more careful consideration, does not change the direction of life which moves always towards greater satisfaction than what the present position offers. You must bear in mind that what one person judges good or

bad for himself doesn't make it so for others especially when it is remembered that a juxtaposition of differences in each case present alternatives that affect choice.

"It seems to me that it is still possible to give an example of how man can be made to move in the direction of dissatisfaction. If I could do this, all your reasoning would be shot to hell."

"That's true, but I defy you or anyone else to give me an example of this. Go ahead and try."

"Let us imagine that of two apples, a red and a yellow, I prefer the yellow because I am extremely allergic to the red, consequently, my taste lies in the direction of the latter which gives me greater satisfaction. In fact, the very thought of eating the red apple makes me feel sick. Yet in spite of this I am going to eat it to demonstrate that even though I am dissatisfied — and prefer the yellow apple — I can definitely move in the direction of dissatisfaction."

In response to this demonstration, isn't it obvious that regardless of the reason you decided to eat the red apple, and even though it would be distasteful in comparison, this choice at that moment of time gave you greater satisfaction, otherwise, you would have definitely selected and eaten the yellow? The normal circumstances under which you frequently ate the yellow apple in preference were changed by your desire to prove a point, therefore it gave you greater satisfaction to eat what you did not normally eat in an effort to prove that life can be made to move in the direction of dissatisfaction. Consequently, since B (eating the yellow apple) was an impossible choice (because it gave you less satisfaction under the circumstances), you were not free to choose A.

Regardless of how many examples you experiment with, the results will always be the same because this is an immutable law. From moment to moment all through life man can never move in the direction of dissatisfaction, and that his every motion, conscious or unconscious, is a natural effort to get rid of some dissatisfaction or move to greater satisfaction, otherwise, as has been shown, not being dissatisfied, he could never move from here to there. Every motion of life expresses dissatisfaction with the present position. Scratching is the effort of life to remove the dissatisfaction of the itch — as urinating, defecating, sleeping, working, playing, mating, walking,

talking, and moving about in general are unsatisfied needs of life pushing man always in the direction of satisfaction. It is easy, in many cases, to recognize things that satisfy, such as money when funds are low, but it is extremely difficult at other times to comprehend the innumerable subconscious factors often responsible for the malaise of dissatisfaction. Your desire to take a bath arises from a feeling of unseemliness or a wish to be refreshed, which means that you are dissatisfied with the way you feel at that moment; and your desire to get out of the bathtub arises from a feeling of dissatisfaction with a position that has suddenly grown uncomfortable. This simple demonstration proves conclusively that man's will is not free because satisfaction is the only direction life can take, and it offers only one possibility at each moment of time.

The government holds each person responsible to obey the laws and then punishes those who do not while absolving itself of all responsibility; but how is it possible for someone to obey that which under certain conditions appears to him worse? It is quite obvious that a person does not have to steal if he doesn't want to, but under certain conditions he wants to, and it is also obvious that those who enforce the laws do not have to punish if they don't want to, but both sides want to do what they consider better for themselves under the circumstances. The Russians didn't have to start a communistic revolution against the tyranny that prevailed; they were not compelled to do this; they wanted to. The Japanese didn't have to attack us at Pearl Harbor; they wanted to. We didn't have to drop an atomic bomb among their people, we wanted to. It is an undeniable observation that man does not have to commit a crime or hurt another in any way, if he doesn't want to. The most severe tortures, even the threat of death, cannot compel or cause him to do what he makes up his mind not to do. Since this observation is mathematically undeniable, the expression 'free will,' which has come to signify this aspect, is absolutely true in this context because it symbolizes what the perception of this relation cannot deny, and here lies in part the unconscious source of all the dogmatism and confusion since MAN IS NOT CAUSED OR COMPELLED TO DO TO ANOTHER WHAT HE MAKES UP HIS MIND NOT TO DO — but that does not make his will free.

In other words, if someone were to say — “I didn’t really want to hurt that person but couldn’t help myself under the circumstances,” which demonstrates that though he believes in freedom of the will he admits he was not free to act otherwise; that he was forced by his environment to do what he really didn’t want to do, or should he make any effort to shift his responsibility for this hurt to heredity, God, his parents, the fact that his will is not free, or something else as the cause, he is obviously lying to others and being dishonest with himself because absolutely nothing is forcing him against his will to do what he doesn’t want to do, for over this, as was just shown, he has mathematical control.

“It’s amazing, all my life I have believed man’s will is free but for the first time I can actually see that his will is not free.”

Another friend commented, “You may be satisfied but I’m not. The definition of determinism is the philosophical and ethical doctrine that man’s choices, decisions and actions are decided by antecedent causes, inherited or environmental, acting upon his character. According to this definition we are not given a choice because we are being caused to do what we do by a previous event or circumstance. But I know for a fact that nothing can make me do what I make up my mind not to do — as you just mentioned a moment ago. If I don’t want to do something, nothing, not environment, heredity, or anything else you care to throw in can make me do it because over this I have absolute control. Since I can’t be made to do anything against my will, doesn’t this make my will free? And isn’t it a contradiction to say that man’s will is not free yet nothing can make him do what he doesn’t want to do?”

“How about that, he brought out something I never would have thought of.”

All he said was that you can lead a horse to water but you can’t make him drink, which is undeniable, however, though it is a mathematical law that nothing can compel man to do to another what he makes up his mind not to do — this is an extremely crucial point — he is nevertheless under a compulsion during every moment of his existence to do everything he does. This reveals, as your friend just pointed out, that man has absolute control over the former but absolutely none over the latter because he must constantly move in

the direction of greater satisfaction. It is true that nothing in the past can cause what occurs in the present, for all we ever have is the present; the past and future are only words that describe a deceptive relation. Consequently, determinism was faced with an almost impossible task because it assumed that heredity and environment caused man to choose evil, and the proponents of free will believed the opposite, that man was not caused or compelled, 'he did it of his own accord; he wanted to do it, he didn't have to.' The term 'free will' contains an assumption or fallacy for it implies that if man is not caused or compelled to do anything against his will, it must be preferred of his own free will. This is one of those logical, not mathematical conclusions. The expression, 'I did it of my own free will' is perfectly correct when it is understood to mean 'I did it because I wanted to; nothing compelled or caused me to do it since I could have acted otherwise had I desired.' This expression was necessarily misinterpreted because of the general ignorance that prevailed for although it is correct in the sense that a person did something because he wanted to, this in no way indicates that his will is free. In fact I shall use the expression 'of my own free will' frequently myself which only means 'of my own desire.' Are you beginning to see how words have deceived everyone?

Because of this misinterpretation of the expression 'man's will is free,' great confusion continues to exist in any discussion surrounding this issue, for although it is true man has to make choices he must always prefer that which he considers good not evil for himself when the former is offered as an alternative. The words cause and compel are the perception of an improper or fallacious relation because in order to be developed and have meaning it was absolutely necessary that the expression 'free will' be born as their opposite, as tall gives meaning to short. But these words do not describe reality unless interpreted properly. Nothing causes man to build cities, develop scientific achievements, write books, compose music, go to war, argue and fight, commit terrible crimes, pray to God, for these things are mankind already at a particular stage of his development, just as children were sacrificed at an earlier stage. These activities or motions are the natural entelechy of man who is always developing, correcting his mistakes, and moving in the direction of greater satisfaction by

better removing the dissatisfaction of the moment, which is a normal compulsion of his nature over which he has absolutely no control. Looking back in hindsight allows man to evaluate his progress and make corrections when necessary because he is always learning from previous experience. The fact that will is not free demonstrates that man, as part of nature or God, has been unconsciously developing at a mathematical rate and during every moment of his progress was doing what he had to do because he had no free choice. But this does not mean that he was caused to do anything against his will, for the word cause, like choice and past, is very misleading as it implies that something other than man himself is responsible for his actions. Four is not caused by two plus two, it is that already. As long as history has been recorded, these two opposing principles were never reconciled until now. The amazing thing is that this ignorance, this conflict of ideas, ideologies, and desires, theology's promulgation of free will, the millions that criticized determinism as fallacious, was exactly as it was supposed to be. It was impossible for man to have acted differently because the mankind system is obeying this invariable law of satisfaction which makes the motions of all life just as harmonious as the solar system; but these systems are not caused by, they are these laws.

“Can you clarify this a little bit more?”

“Certainly. In other words, no one is compelling a person to work at a job he doesn't like or remain in a country against his will. He actually wants to do the very things he dislikes simply because the alternative is considered worse and he must choose something to do among the various things in his environment, or else commit suicide. Was it humanly possible to make Gandhi and his followers do what they did not want to do when unafraid of death which was judged, according to their circumstances, the lesser of two evils? Therefore, when any person says he was compelled to do what he did against his will, that he didn't want to but had to — and innumerable of our expressions say this — he is obviously confused and unconsciously dishonest with himself and others because everything man does to another is done only because he wants to do it, done to be humorous, of his own free will, which only means that his preference gave him greater satisfaction at that moment of time, for one reason or

another.”

“His reasoning is perfect. I can’t find a flaw although I thought I did. I think I understand now. Just because I cannot be made to do something against my will does not mean my will is free because my desire not to do it appeared the better reason, which gave me no free choice since I got greater satisfaction. Nor does the expression, ‘I did it of my own free will, nobody made me do it,’ mean that I actually did it of my own free will — although I did it because I wanted to — because my desire to do it appeared the better reason which gave me no free choice since I got greater satisfaction.”

“He does understand.”

“Does this mean you are also in complete agreement so I can proceed?”

“Yes it does.”

Then let me summarize by taking careful note of this simple reasoning that proves conclusively (except for the implications already referred to) that will is not free. Man has two possibilities that are reduced to the common denominator of one. Either he does not have a choice because none is involved, as with aging, and then it is obvious that he is under the compulsion of living regardless of what his particular motion at any moment might be, or he has a choice and then is given two or more alternatives of which he is compelled by his nature to prefer the one that appears to offer the greatest satisfaction whether it is the lesser of two evils, the greater of two goods, or a good over an evil. Therefore, it is absolutely impossible for will to be free because man never has a free choice, though it must be remembered that the words good and evil are judgments of what others think is right and wrong, not symbols of reality. The truth of the matter is that the words *good and evil* can only have reference to what is a benefit or a hurt to oneself. Killing someone may be good in comparison to the evil of having that person kill me. The reason someone commits suicide is not because he is compelled to do this against his will, but only because the alternative of continuing to live under certain conditions is considered worse. He was not happy to take his own life but under the conditions he was compelled to prefer, by his very nature, the lesser of two evils which gave him greater satisfaction. Consequently, when he does not desire to take his own

life because he considers this the worse alternative as a solution to his problems, he is still faced with making a decision, whatever it is, which means that he is compelled to choose an alternative that is more satisfying. For example, in the morning when the alarm clock goes off he has three possibilities; commit suicide so he never has to get up, go back to sleep, or get up and face the day. Since suicide is out of the question under these conditions, he is left with two alternatives. Even though he doesn't like his job and hates the thought of going to work, he needs money, and since he can't stand having creditors on his back or being threatened with lawsuits, it is the lesser of two evils to get up and go to work. He is not happy or satisfied to do this when he doesn't like his job, but he finds greater satisfaction doing one thing than another. Dog food is good to a starving man when the other alternatives are horse manure or death, just as the prices on a menu may cause him to prefer eating something he likes less because the other alternative of paying too high a price for what he likes more is still considered worse under his particular circumstances. The law of self-preservation demands that he do what he believes will help him stay alive and make his life easier, and if he is hard-pressed to get what he needs to survive he may be willing to cheat, steal, kill and do any number of things which he considers good for himself in comparison to the evil of finding himself worse off if he doesn't do these things. All this simply proves is that man is compelled to move in the direction of satisfaction during every moment of his existence. It does not yet remove the implications. The expression 'I did it of my own free will' has been seriously misunderstood for although it is impossible to do anything of one's own free will, HE DOES EVERYTHING BECAUSE HE WANTS TO since absolutely nothing can make him do what he doesn't want to. Think about this once again. Was it humanly possible to make Gandhi and his followers do what they did not want to do when unafraid of death which was judged, according to their circumstances, the lesser of two evils? In their eyes, death was the better choice if the alternative was to lose their freedom. Many people are confused over this one point. Just because no one on this earth can make you do anything against your will does not mean your will is free. Gandhi wanted freedom for his people and it was against his will to stop his nonviolent movement

even though he constantly faced the possibility of death, but this doesn't mean his will was free; it just means that it gave him greater satisfaction to face death than to forego his fight for freedom. Consequently, when any person says he was compelled to do what he did against his will, that he really didn't want to but had to because he was being tortured, he is obviously confused and unconsciously dishonest with himself and others because he could die before being forced to do something against his will. What he actually means was that he didn't like being tortured because the pain was unbearable so rather than continue suffering this way he preferred, as the lesser of two evils, to tell his captors what they wanted to know, but he did this because he wanted to not because some external force made him do this against his will. If by talking he would know that someone he loved would be instantly killed, pain and death might have been judged the lesser of two evils. This is an extremely crucial point because though it is true that will is not free, **ABSOLUTELY NOTHING ON THIS EARTH CAN MAKE MAN DO ANYTHING AGAINST HIS WILL**. He might not like what he did — but he wanted to do it because the alternative gave him no free or better choice. It is extremely important that you clear this up in your mind before proceeding.

This knowledge was not available before now and what is revealed as each individual becomes conscious of his true nature is something fantastic to behold, for it not only gives ample proof that evil is no accident but it will also put an end to every conceivable kind of hurt that exists in human relations. There will take place a virtual miracle of transformation as each person consciously realizes **WHAT IT MEANS** that his will is not free, which has not yet been revealed. And now I shall demonstrate how these two undeniable laws or principles — that nothing can compel man to do anything against his will because over this his nature allows absolute control, and that his will is not free because his nature also compels him to prefer of available alternatives the one that offers greater satisfaction — will reveal a third invariable law — the discovery to which reference has been made.

CHAPTER TWO

THE TWO-SIDED EQUATION

Once it is established as an undeniable law that man's will is not free, as was just demonstrated, we cannot assume that it is free because philosophers like Durant could not get by the implications. Therefore, we must begin our reasoning where he left off which means that we are going to accept the magic elixir (call it what you will, corollary, slide rule or basic principle), THOU SHALL NOT BLAME, and transmute the baser mettles of human nature into the pure gold of the Golden Age even though it presents what appears to be an insurmountable problem, for how is it possible not to blame people who hurt us when we know they didn't have to do this if they didn't want to. The solution, however, only requires the perception and extension of relations which cannot be denied, and this mathematical corollary, that man is not to blame for anything at all, is a key to the infinite wisdom of God which will unlock a treasure so wonderful that you will be compelled to catch your breath in absolute amazement. This slide rule will adequately solve every problem we have not only without hurting a living soul but while benefiting everyone to an amazing degree. However, the problems that confront us at this moment are very complex which make it necessary to treat every aspect of our lives in a separate, yet related, manner. God, not me, is finally going to reveal the solution.

Since time immemorial the two opposing forces of good and evil compelled theologians to separate the world into two realms, with God responsible for all the good in the world and Satan responsible for the evil while endowing man with free will so that this separation could be reasonable. Giving birth to Satan or some other force of darkness as an explanation for the evil that existed illustrates how religion tried desperately to cling to the belief in a merciful God. But this dividing line between good and evil will no longer be necessary when the

corollary, Thou Shall Not Blame, demonstrates that once it becomes a permanent condition of the environment, all the evil (hurt) in human relations must come to a peaceful end. The absolute proof that man's will is not free is the undeniable fact that we are given no alternative but to move in this direction once it is understood that this law can control man's actions only by obeying this corollary for then everything that came into existence which caused us to blame and punish must, out of absolute necessity, take leave of this earth. Mankind will be given no choice; this has been taken out of our hands, as is the motion of the earth around the sun.

The first step is realizing that the solution requires that we work our problem backwards which means that every step of the way will be a forced move which will become a loose end and only when all these ends are drawn together will the blueprint be complete. It is only by extending our slide rule, Thou Shall Not Blame, which is the key, that we are given the means to unlock the solution. An example of working a problem backwards, follow this: If you were told that a woman with a pocketbook full of money went on a spending spree to ten stores, paid a dollar to get in every one, a dollar to get out, spent half of what she had in each and came out of the last place absolutely broke, it would be very easy to determine the amount of money she had to start because the dollar she paid to get out of the last store which broke her must represent one-half of the money spent there. Consequently, she had two dollars left after paying a dollar to get in, giving her three just before entering. Since she paid a dollar to get out of the penultimate store, this added to the three gives her four which represents one-half of the money spent there. Continuing this process eight more times it is absolutely undeniable that she must have begun her spending spree with \$3,069. As we can see from this example, when a key fact is available from which to reason it is then possible to solve a problem, but when it is not, we must form conjectures and express opinions with the aid of logic. At first glance it appears impossible not to blame an individual for murder, or any heinous crime, but when we extend this key fact it can be seen that these acts of evil are not condoned with the understanding that man's will is not free, but prevented. Regardless of someone's opinion as to the rightness or wrongness of the answer to the problem I just gave,

an opinion that would have to be based upon a logical conclusion as is that of our experts when considering the impossibility of removing all evil from our lives, we know the answer is correct because the reasoning that follows from this key fact is scientifically sound.

By a similar process of working our problem backwards we can officially launch the Golden Age which necessitates the removal of all forms of blame (the judgment of what is right for another) so that each person knows he is completely free to do what he wants to do. Although solving the problem of evil requires balancing an equation of such magnitude, it is not difficult when we have our infallible slide rule which God has given us as a guide. By now I hope you understand that the word God is a symbol for the source of everything that exists, whereas theology draws a line between good and evil using the word God only as a symbol for the former. Actually no one gave me this slide rule, that is, no one handed it to me, but the same force that gave birth to my body and brain compelled me to move in the direction of satisfaction and for me to be satisfied after reading Will Durant's analysis of free will it was necessary to disagree with what obviously was the reasoning of logic, not mathematics. I was not satisfied, which forced me to get rid of my dissatisfaction by proving that this philosopher did not know whereof he spoke. To say that God made me do this is equivalent to saying I was compelled, by my nature, to move in this direction of greater satisfaction, which is absolutely true. Definitions mean absolutely nothing where reality is concerned. Regardless of what words I use to describe the sun; regardless of how much there is I don't know about this ball of fire does not negate the fact that it is a part of the real world, and regardless of what words I employ to describe God does not change the fact that He is a reality. You may ask, "But isn't there quite a difference between seeing the sun and seeing God? I know that the description of the sun could be inaccurate, but I know it is a part of the real world. However, we cannot point to any particular thing and say this is God, therefore we must assume because of certain things that God is a reality, correct?"

We assumed energy was contained within the atom until a discovery was made that proved this, and we also assumed or believed that there was a design to this universe by the fact that the solar

system moves in such mathematical harmony. Did the sun, moon, earth, planets and stars just fall into perfect order, or is there some internal urgency pushing everything in a particular direction? Now that it has been discovered that man's will is not free and at the very moment this discovery is made a mathematical demonstration compels man to veer sharply in a new direction although still towards greater satisfaction, then it can be seen just as clearly as we see the sun that the mankind system has always been just as harmonious as the solar system only we never knew it because part of the harmony was this disharmony between man and man which is now being permanently removed. This discovery also reveals that God is a mathematical, undeniable reality. This means, to put it another way, that Man Does Not Stand Alone. Therefore, to say God is good is a true observation for nothing in this universe when seen in total perspective is evil since each individual must choose what is better for himself, even if that choice hurts another as a consequence.

Every human being is and has been obeying God's will — Spinoza, his sister, Nageli, Durant, Mendel, Christ and even those who nailed him to the cross; but God has a secret plan that is going to shock all mankind due to the revolutionary changes that must come about for his benefit. This new world is coming into existence not because of my will, not because I made a discovery (sooner or later it had to be found because the knowledge of what it means that man's will is not free is a definite part of reality), but only because we are compelled to obey the laws of our nature. Do you really think it was an accident the solar system came into existence; an accident that the sun is just the proper distance from the earth so we don't roast or freeze; an accident that the earth revolved just at the right speed to fulfill many exacting functions; an accident that our bodies and brains developed just that way; an accident that I made my discovery exactly when I did? To show you how fantastic is the infinite wisdom that controls every aspect of this universe through invariable laws that we are at last getting to understand, which includes the mankind as well as the solar system, just follow this: Here is versatile man — writer, composer, artist, inventor, scientist, philosopher, theologian, architect, mathematician, chess player, prostitute, murderer, thief, etc., whose will is absolutely and positively not free despite all the

learned opinions to the contrary, yet compelled by his very nature and lack of development to believe that it is since it was impossible not to blame and punish the terrible evils that came into existence out of necessity and then permitted to perceive the necessary relations as to why will is not free and what this means for the entire world which perception was utterly impossible without the development and absolutely necessary for the inception of our Golden Age. In all of history have you ever been confronted with anything more incredible?

In reality we are all the result of forces completely beyond our control. As we extend the corollary, Thou Shall Not Blame, we are able to see for the very first time how it is now within our power to prevent those things for which blame and punishment came into existence. Although Spinoza did not understand the full significance of this enigmatic corollary, he accepted it by rejecting the opposite principle of an eye for an eye by refusing to defend himself against his sister or blame her for cheating him out of his inheritance. Neither he nor his sister had a free choice because the one was willing to cheat to get what she wanted while he was willing to be cheated rather than hold her responsible. Spinoza made matters worse for himself financially, but at that moment of time he had no free choice because it gave him greater satisfaction to let her cheat him out of what he was entitled to by law. Both of them were moving in the direction of what gave them satisfaction. Spinoza's sister had no understanding of this knowledge nor did the world at that time, although Spinoza himself knew that man's will is not free. Consequently, he allowed others to hurt him with a first blow by turning the other cheek. He was excommunicated from the synagogue while being God-intoxicated, which seems to be a contradiction. You would think that a person would be thrown out for being an atheist but not for being a God-intoxicated man. The fact that I know God is a reality doesn't intoxicate me. I know that the sun is also a reality but when the heat gets unbearable, should I jump for joy? There is no comparison between Spinoza and myself. He was a gentle man, I am not. He refused to blame his sister for stealing what rightfully belonged to him because he was confused and believed she couldn't help herself. I, on the other hand, would never advocate turning the other cheek when someone can get the advantage by not turning it. He excused her

conduct, but if someone tried to take what belonged to me I'd fight him tooth and nail. Turning the other cheek under these conditions could lead to further harm, which is why most people reject the pacifist position. How is it humanly possible not to fight back when one is being hurt first, which goes back to the justification of an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth. I personally would get greater satisfaction defending myself or retaliating against those people who would do, or have done, things to hurt me and my family. I'm not a saint, but a scientist of human conduct. Most of mankind is compelled, for greater satisfaction, to move in this direction. Therefore, it should be clear that the corollary, Thou Shall Not Blame, does not mean that you should suddenly stop blaming because you have discovered that man's will is not free. It only means at this point that we are going to follow it, to extend it, to see exactly where it takes us, something that investigators like Durant have never done because the implications prevented them from opening the door beyond the vestibule. The fact that man's will is not free only means that he is compelled to move in the direction of greater satisfaction. If you sock me I might get greater satisfaction in socking you back. However, once man understands what it means that his will is not free, this desire to sock me is prevented by your realization that I will never blame you for hurting me. Until this knowledge is understood we will be compelled to continue living in the world of free will, otherwise, we would only make matters worse for ourselves.

To show you how confused is the understanding of someone who doesn't grasp these principles, a local columnist interested in my ideas, so he called them, made the statement that I believe that man should not be blamed for anything he does which is true only when man knows what it means that his will is not free. If he doesn't know, he is compelled to blame by his very nature. Christ also received incursions of thought from this same principle which compelled him to turn the other cheek and remark as he was being nailed to the cross, "They know not what they do," forgiving his enemies even in the moment of death. How was it possible for him to blame them when he knew that they were not responsible? But they knew what they were doing and he could not stop them even by turning the other cheek. Religion was compelled to believe that God was not responsible

for the evil in the world, whereas Spinoza and Christ believed correctly that there was no such thing as evil when seen in total perspective. But how was it possible, except for people like Christ and Spinoza, to forgive those who trespassed against them? And how was it possible for those who became victims of this necessary evil to look at it in total perspective? Is it any wonder man cried out to God for understanding? The time has arrived to clear up all the confusion and reconcile these two opposite principles, which requires that you keep an open mind and proceed with the investigation. Let me show you how this apparent impasse can be rephrased in terms of possibility.

If someone is not being hurt in any way, is it possible for him to retaliate or turn the other cheek? Isn't it obvious that in order to do either he must first be hurt? But if he is already being hurt and by turning the other cheek makes matters worse for himself, then he is given no choice but to retaliate because this is demanded by the laws of his nature. Here is the source of the confusion. Our basic principle or corollary, Thou Shall Not Blame, call it what you will, is not going to accomplish the impossible. It is not going to prevent man from desiring to hurt others when not to makes matters worse for himself, but it will prevent the desire to strike the very first blow. Once you have been hurt it is normal and natural to seek some form of retaliation for this is a source of satisfaction which is the direction life is compelled to take. Therefore this knowledge cannot possibly prevent the hate and blame which man has been compelled to live with all these years as a consequence of crimes committed and many other forms of hurt, yet God's mathematical law cannot be denied for man is truly not to blame for anything he does notwithstanding, so a still deeper analysis is required. Down through history no one has ever known what it means that man's will is not free and how it can benefit the world, but you will be shown the answer very shortly. There is absolutely no way this new world, a world without war, crime, and all forms of hurt to man by man can be stopped from coming into existence. When it will occur, however, depends on when this knowledge can be brought to light.

We have been growing and developing just like a child from infancy. There is no way a baby can go from birth to old age without passing through the necessary steps, and no way man could have

reached this tremendous turning point in his life without also going through the necessary stages of evil. Once it is established, beyond a shadow of doubt, that will is not free (and here is why my discovery was never found; no one could ever get beyond this impasse because of the implications), it becomes absolutely impossible to hold man responsible for anything he does. Is it any wonder the solution was never found if it lies hidden beyond this point? If you recall, Durant assumed that if man was allowed to believe his will is not free it would lessen his responsibility because this would enable him to blame other factors as the cause. If he committed crimes, society was to blame; if he was a fool, it was the fault of the machine which had slipped a cog in generating him. It is also true that if it had not been for the development of laws and a penal code, for the constant teaching of right and wrong, civilization could never have reached the outposts of this coming Golden Age. Yet despite the fact that we have been brought up to believe that man can be blamed and punished for doing what he was taught is wrong and evil (this is the cornerstone of all law and order up to now, although we are about to shed the last stage of the rocket that has given us our thrust up to this point); the force that has given us our brains, our bodies, the solar and the mankind systems; the force that makes us move in the direction of satisfaction, or this invariable law of God states explicitly, as we perceive these mathematical relations, that SINCE MAN'S WILL IS NOT FREE, THOU SHALL NOT BLAME ANYTHING HE DOES. This enigma is easily reconciled when it is understood that the mathematic corollary, God's commandment, does not apply to anything after it is done — only before.

“I don't understand why God's commandment applies to something before it is done, and not after. Does this mean you can blame after a crime has taken place? And doesn't this go back to the same problem man has been faced with since time immemorial; how to prevent the crime in the first place, which is the purpose of our penal code? How is it humanly possible not to judge, not to criticize, not to blame and punish those acts of crime when we know that man was not compelled to do them if he didn't want to? If someone killed my loved one how is it possible not to hate the individual responsible, not to judge this as an act of evil, not to desire some form of revenge?

I still don't understand how not blaming will prevent man from hurting his fellow man if this is his desire. Though this may be an undeniable corollary, how is it humanly possible not to hold someone responsible for murder, rape, the killing of six million people, etc.? Does this mean that we are supposed to condone these crimes or pretend they didn't happen? Besides, what will prevent someone from blaming and punishing despite the fact that will is not free — if it gives him greater satisfaction? Just because man's will is not free is certainly not a sufficient explanation as to why there should be no blame."

This has always been the greatest stumbling block which kept free will on the throne until the present time. It is a natural reaction to blame after you've been hurt. The reason God's commandment does not apply to anything after it is done, only before, is because it has the power to prevent those very acts of evil for which a penal code was previously necessary, as part of our development. At this juncture, I shall repeat a passage from Chapter One to remind the reader of important facts that must be understood before continuing.

To solve this problem of evil with the aid of our enigmatic corollary — Thou Shall Not Blame — (for this seems mathematically impossible since it appears that man will always desire something for which blame and punishment will be necessary), it is extremely important to go through a de-confusion process regarding words by employing the other scientific fact revealed to you earlier. Consequently, as was pointed out, and to reveal this relation, it is an absolutely undeniable observation that man does not have to commit a crime or do anything to hurt another unless he wants to. As history reveals, even the most severe tortures and the threat of death cannot make him do to others what he makes up his mind not to do. He is not caused or compelled against his will to hurt another by his environment and heredity but prefers this action because at that moment of time he derives greater satisfaction in his motion to there, which is a normal compulsion of his nature over which he has absolutely no control. Though it is a mathematical law that nothing can compel man to do to another that which he makes up his mind not to do (this is an extremely crucial point), he is nevertheless under a compulsion during every moment of his existence to do everything he does. This reveals that he has

mathematical control over the former (you can lead a horse to water but you can't make him drink) but none over the latter because he must move in the direction of greater satisfaction. In other words, no one is compelling a person to work at a job he doesn't like or remain in a country against his will. He actually wants to do the very things he dislikes simply because the alternative is considered worse in his opinion and he must choose something to do among the various things in his environment or else commit suicide. Was it possible to make Gandhi and his followers do what they did not want to do when unafraid of death, which was judged the lesser of two evils? They were compelled by their desire for freedom to prefer non-violence, turning the other cheek as a solution to their problem. Consequently, when any person says he was compelled to do what he did against his will because the alternative was considered worse, that he really didn't want to do it but had to (and numerous words and expressions say this), he is obviously confused and unconsciously dishonest with himself and others because everything man does to another is done only because he wants to do it which means that his preference gave him satisfaction at that moment of time, for one reason or another.

Let me repeat this crucial point because it is the source of so much confusion: Although man's will is not free there is absolutely nothing, not environment, heredity, God, or anything else that causes him to do what he doesn't want to do. The environment does not cause him to commit a crime, it just presents conditions under which his desire is aroused, consequently, he can't blame what is not responsible, but remember his particular environment is different because he himself is different otherwise everybody would desire to commit a crime. Once he chooses to act on his desire whether it is a minor or more serious crime he doesn't come right out and say, "I hurt that person not because I was compelled to do it against my will but only because I wanted to do it," because the standards of right and wrong prevent him from deriving any satisfaction out of such honesty when this will only evoke blame, criticism, and punishment of some sort for his desires. Therefore he is compelled to justify those actions considered wrong with excuses, extenuating circumstances, and the shifting of guilt to someone or something else as the cause, to absorb part if not all the responsibility which allowed him to absolve his

conscience in a world of judgment and to hurt others in many cases with impunity since he could demonstrate why he was compelled to do what he really didn't want to do. You see it happen all the time, even when a child says, "Look what you made me do" when you know you didn't make him do anything. Spilling a glass of milk because he was careless and not wishing to be blamed, the boy searches quickly for an excuse to shift the responsibility to something that does not include him. Why else would the boy blame his own carelessness on somebody or something else if not to avoid the criticism of his parents? It is also true that the boy's awareness that he would be blamed and punished for carelessness — which is exactly what took place — makes him think very carefully about all that he does to prevent the blame and punishment he doesn't want. A great confusion exists because it is assumed that if man does something to hurt another he could always excuse his actions by saying, "I couldn't help myself because my will is not free." This is another aspect of the implications which turned philosophers off from a thorough investigation. In the following dialogue, my friend asks for clarification regarding certain critical points.

"You read my mind. I really don't know how you plan to solve this enigmatic corollary but it seems to me that this knowledge would give man a perfect excuse for taking advantage of others without any fear of consequences. If the boy knows for a fact that his will is not free, why couldn't he use this as an excuse in an attempt to shift his responsibility?"

"This last question is a superficial perception of inaccurate reasoning. Because of this general confusion with words through which you have been compelled to see a distorted reality, it appears at first glance that the dethronement of free will would allow man to shift his responsibility all the more and take advantage of not being blamed to excuse or justify any desires heretofore kept under control by the fear of punishment and public opinion which judged his actions in accordance with standards of right and wrong, but this is inaccurate simply because it is mathematically impossible to shift your responsibility, to excuse or justify getting away with something, when you know that you will not be blamed for what you do. In other words, it is only possible to attempt a shift of your responsibility for

hurting someone or for doing what is judged improper when you are held responsible by a code of standards that criticizes you in advance for doing something considered wrong by others. The very act of justifying or excusing your behavior is an indication that the person or people to whom you are presenting this justification must judge the behavior unacceptable in some way, otherwise, there would be no need for it. They are interested to know why you could do such a thing which compels you for satisfaction to think up a reasonable excuse to extenuate the circumstances and mitigate their unfavorable opinion of your action. If you do what others judge to be right is it necessary to lie or offer excuses or say that your will is not free and you couldn't help yourself, when no one is saying you could help yourself? Let me elaborate for greater understanding.

If someone does what everybody considers right as opposed to wrong, that is, if this person acts in a manner that pleases everybody, is it possible to blame him for doing what society expects of him? This isn't a trick question, so don't look so puzzled. If your boss tells you that he wants something done a certain way and you never fail to do it that way, is it possible for him to blame you for doing what he wants you to do?"

"No, it is not possible. I agree."

"Consequently, if you can't be blamed for doing what is right, then it should be obvious that you can only be blamed for doing something judged wrong, is that right?"

"I agree with this."

"These people who are judging you for doing something wrong are interested to know why you could do such a thing, which compels you for satisfaction to lie or think up a reasonable excuse, to extenuate the circumstances and mitigate their unfavorable opinion of your action, otherwise, if they were not judging your conduct as wrong you would not have to do these things, right?"

"You are right again."

"Now if you know as a matter of positive knowledge that no one is going to blame you for what you did, wrong or right, that is, no one is going to question your conduct in any way because you know that they must excuse what you do since man's will is not free, is it possible

for you to blame someone or something else as the cause for what you know you have done, when you also know that no one is blaming you?”

“Why are you smiling?”

“You’re the greatest with your mathematical reasoning, and I agree that it is not possible.”

“This proves conclusively that the only time man can say, ‘I couldn’t help myself because my will is not free,’ or offer any other kind of excuse, is if someone said he could help himself or blamed him in any way so he could make this effort to shift his responsibility, right?”

“You are absolutely correct.”

Which means that only in the world of free will, in a world of judgment, can this statement, “I couldn’t help myself because my will is not free” be made, since it cannot be done when man knows he will not be blamed. Remember, it is only possible to attempt a shift of your responsibility for hurting someone, or for doing what is judged improper, when you are held responsible by a code of standards that criticizes you *in advance* for doing something considered wrong by others. But once it is realized, as a matter of positive knowledge, that man will not be held responsible for what he does since his will is not free (don’t jump to conclusions, just follow the reasoning — my problem is difficult enough as it is), it becomes mathematically impossible for you to blame someone or something else as the cause for what you know you have done simply because you know that no one is blaming you. Being constantly criticized by the standards that prevailed man was compelled, as a motion in the direction of satisfaction, to be dishonest with everyone, including himself, while refusing to accept that which was his responsibility. He blamed various factors or causes for the many things he desired to do that were considered wrong, because he didn’t like being in the wrong. But the very moment the dethronement of free will makes it known that no one henceforth will be held responsible for what he does since his will is not free, regardless of what is done, and there will be no more criticism or blame, regardless of his actions, man is also prevented from making someone else the scapegoat for what he does, prevented from excusing or justifying his own actions since he is not being given

an opportunity to do so which compels him completely beyond control, but of his own free will or desire, not only to assume full responsibility for everything he does, but to be absolutely honest with himself and others. How is it humanly possible for you to desire lying to me or to yourself when your actions are not being judged or blamed, in other words, when you are not being given an opportunity to lie; and how is it possible for you to make any effort to shift your responsibility when no one holds you responsible? In the world of free will man was able to absolve his conscience in a world of right and wrong and get away with murder in a figurative sense — the very things our new knowledge positively prevents.

It should be obvious that all your judgments of what is right and wrong in human conduct are based upon an ethical standard such as the Ten Commandments which came into existence out of God's will, as did everything else, and consequently you have come to believe through a fallacious association of symbols that these words which judge the actions of others are accurate. How was it possible for the Ten Commandments to come into existence unless religion believed in free will? But in reality when murder is committed it is neither wrong nor right, just what someone at a certain point in his life considered better for himself under circumstances which included the judgment of others and the risks involved; and when the government or personal revenge retaliates by taking this person's life, this too, was neither right nor wrong, just what gave greater satisfaction. Neither the government or the murderer are to blame for what each judged better under their particular set of circumstances; but whether they will decide to think and react as before will depend not on any moral values, not on habit, not on custom, not on any standards of right and wrong, but solely on whether the conditions under which they were previously motivated remain the same, and they do not remain as before because the knowledge that man's will is not free reveals facts never before understood. We can now see how the confusion of words and the inability to perceive certain type relations have compelled many thinkers who could not get beyond this impasse to assume, as Durant did, that if man knew his will was not free it would give him a perfect opportunity to take advantage of this knowledge.

“I am still not satisfied with the explanation. If it was not for the

laws that protect society, what is to prevent man from taking more easily what he wants when the risk of retaliation is no more a condition to be considered? Further, what is to stop him from satisfying his desires to his heart's content when he knows there will be no consequences or explanations necessary? In the previous example it is obvious that the boy who spilled the milk cannot desire to shift the blame when he knows his parents are not going to question what he did, but why should this prevent him from spilling the milk every day if it gives him a certain satisfaction to watch it seep into the rug? Besides, if the father just spent \$1000 for carpeting, how is it humanly possible for him to say absolutely nothing when the milk was not carelessly but deliberately spilled?"

"These are thoughtful questions but they are like asking if it is mathematically impossible for man to do something, what would you do if it is done? How is it possible for B (the father) to retaliate when it is impossible for B to be hurt? Contained in this question is an assumption that deliberate and careless hurt will continue. As we proceed with this investigation you will understand more clearly why the desire to hurt another will be entirely prevented by this natural law."

"Even though I cannot disagree with anything you said so far, I still don't understand how or why this should prevent man from stealing more easily what he wants when the risk of retaliation is no more a condition to be considered; and how is it humanly possible for those he steals from and hurts in other ways to excuse his conduct?"

"We are right back where we were before, the fiery dragon — but not for long. Now tell me, would you agree that if I did something to hurt you, you would be justified to retaliate?"

"I certainly would be justified."

"And we also have agreed that this is the principle of an eye for an eye, correct?"

"Correct."

"Which means that this principle, an eye for an eye, does not concern itself with preventing the first blow from being struck but only with justifying punishment or retaliation, is this also true?"

"Yes it is."

“And the principle of turning the other cheek, doesn’t this concern itself with preventing the second cheek from being struck, not the first cheek?”

“That is absolutely true.”

“Therefore, our only concern is in preventing the desire to strike this first blow, for then, if this can be accomplished, our problem is solved. If the first cheek is not struck, there is no need to retaliate or turn the other side of our face. Is this hard to understand?”

“It’s very easy, in fact. I am not a college graduate, and I can even see that relation.”

“Let us further understand that in order for you to strike this first blow of hurt, assuming that what is and what is not a hurt has already been established (don’t jump to conclusions), you would have to be taking a certain amount of risk, that is, you would be risking the possibility of retaliation or punishment, is that correct?”

“Not if I planned a perfect crime.”

“The most you can do with your plans is reduce the element of risk, but the fact that somebody was hurt by what you did does not take away his desire to strike a blow of retaliation. He doesn’t know who to blame but if he did, you could expect that he would desire to strike back. Consequently, his desire to retaliate an eye for an eye is an undeniable condition of our present world as is also your awareness that there is this element of risk involved, however small. This means that whenever you do anything at all that is risky you are prepared to pay a price for the satisfaction of certain desires. You may risk going to jail, getting hanged or electrocuted, shot, beaten up, losing your eye and tooth, being criticized, reprimanded, spanked, scolded, ostracized, or what have you, but this is the price you are willing to pay, if caught. Can you disagree with this?”

“I still say, supposing there is no risk; supposing I was able to plan a perfect crime and never get caught?”

“I am not denying the possibility but you can never know for certain, therefore the element of risk must exist when you do anything that hurts another.”

“Then I agree.”

“Now that we have a basic understanding as to why man’s will is

not free because it is his nature that he must always move in the direction of greater satisfaction, as well as the undeniable fact that nothing can make man do to another what he makes up his mind not to do — for over this he has absolute control — let us observe what miracle happens when these two laws are brought together to reveal a third law. Pay close attention because I am about to slay the fiery dragon with my trusty sword which will reveal my discovery, reconcile the two opposite principles ‘an eye for an eye’ and ‘turn the other cheek,’ and open the door to this new world.”

At the present moment of time you are standing on this spot called here, and are constantly in the process of moving to there. You know as a matter of positive knowledge that you would never move to there if you were not dissatisfied with here. You also know as a matter of undeniable knowledge that nothing has the power, that no one can cause or compel you to do anything against your will — unless you want to, because over this you have mathematical control. And I, who am standing on this spot called there to where you plan to move for satisfaction from here also know positively that you cannot be blamed anymore for your motion from here to there because the will of man is not free. This is a very unique two-sided equation which reveals that while you know you are completely responsible for everything you do since nothing has the power to make you do anything you don’t want to; and while it is mathematically impossible to shift your responsibility to some extraneous cause when no one holds you responsible, everybody else knows that you are not to blame for anything because you are compelled, by your very nature, to move in the direction of greater satisfaction during every moment of your existence. Now if you know beyond a shadow of doubt that not only I, who am the one to be hurt, but everyone on earth will never blame or punish you for hurting me in some way, never criticize or question your action, never desire to hurt you in return for doing what must now be considered a compulsion beyond your control since the will of man is not free, is it humanly possible (think very carefully about this because it is the most crucial point thus far — the scientific discovery referred to) for you to derive any satisfaction whatever from the contemplation of this hurt? Remember now, you haven’t hurt me

yet, and you know as a matter of undeniable knowledge that nothing, no one can compel you to hurt me unless you want to, for over this you have mathematical control, consequently, your motion from here to there, your decision as to what is better for yourself, is still a choice between two alternatives — to hurt me or not to hurt me. But the moment it fully dawns on you that this hurt to me, should you go ahead with it, will not be blamed in any way because no one wants to hurt you for doing what must now be considered a compulsion beyond your control, **ALTHOUGH YOU KNOW IT IS NOT BEYOND YOUR CONTROL AT THIS POINT SINCE NOTHING CAN FORCE YOU TO HURT ME AGAINST YOUR WILL — UNLESS YOU WANT TO** — you are compelled, completely of your own free will, so to speak, to relinquish this desire to hurt me because it can never satisfy you to do so under these changed conditions. Furthermore, if you know as a matter of positive knowledge that no one in the entire world is going to blame you or question your conduct, is it possible to hold others culpable, to extenuate the circumstances, to lie or to try and shift your responsibility in any way? As was just demonstrated, it is not possible, just as the same answer must apply to the question, is it possible to make two plus two equal five. This proves conclusively that the only time you can say, “I couldn’t help myself because my will is not free,” or offer any kind of excuse, is when you know you are being blamed for this allows you to make this effort to shift your responsibility. Let me explain this in still another way.

When you know you are not going to be blamed for what you do it also means that you must assume complete responsibility for what you do because you cannot shift it away from yourself under the changed conditions. We have become so confused by words in logical relation that while we preach this freedom of the will we say in the same breath that we could not help ourselves, and demonstrate our confusion still more by believing that the corollary, Thou Shall Not Blame, would lessen our responsibility when in actuality, responsibility is increased. Many philosophers have gotten confused over this one point because it was assumed that a world without blame would make matters worse, decreasing responsibility and giving man the perfect opportunity to take advantage of others without having to

worry about consequences. But this can only occur when man knows he will be blamed, which allows him to come up with reasonable excuses. Did you ever see anything more ironically humorous? The only time we can use the excuse that our will is not free is when the world believes it is free.

“But the question remains: Why is an excuse necessary? Why can’t he just satisfy his desires to his heart’s content when there are no consequences, without explaining to others his reasons for doing what he wants to do? Why can’t he just walk into a store, take what he wants since nobody will be stopping him, and then just go about his business?”

“You must constantly bear in mind that man is compelled to choose the alternative that gives him greater satisfaction, and for that reason his will is not free. Consequently, to solve our problem it is only necessary to show that when all blame and punishment are removed from the environment, the desire to hurt others in any way, shape or form is the worst possible choice.”

“I understand the principle of no blame but society does what it must do to protect itself. A person with scarlet fever is not blamed but is nevertheless quarantined.”

“If a person had something that was contagious, he would welcome this precautionary measure. The knowledge that he would not be blamed under any circumstances, even if he was responsible for spreading his illness to the entire region, would prevent him from desiring to take any chances that might cause further spread of the disease. This is similar to the question that was asked earlier: If it is mathematically impossible for man to do something, what would you do if it was done? How is it possible for B (society) to protect itself when it is impossible for B to be hurt? Once again, there is an assumption that deliberate and careless hurt will continue. When man knows there will be no blame or punishment no matter what he does, he can only go in one direction for greater satisfaction. He can hurt others with a first blow if he wants to, but he won’t want to. It is important to understand that if someone is being hurt first his reaction is no longer a first blow, but a retaliatory blow. Under these conditions he would have justification to strike back.”

In order to hurt another, either deliberately or carelessly, man

must be able to derive greater, not less, satisfaction which means that self-preservation demands and justifies this, that he was previously hurt in some way and finds it preferable to strike back an eye for an eye, which he can also justify, or else he knows absolutely and positively that he would be blamed by the person he hurt and others if they knew. Blame itself which is a condition of free will and a part of the present environment permits the consideration of hurt for it is the price man is willing to pay for the satisfaction of certain desires, but when blame is removed so that the advance knowledge that it no longer exists becomes a new condition of the environment, then the price he must consider to strike the first blow of hurt is completely out of reach because he cannot find satisfaction in hurting those who will refuse to blame him or retaliate in any way. To hurt someone under these conditions he would have to move in the direction of conscious dissatisfaction, which is mathematically impossible. If will was free we could not accomplish this because we would be able to choose what is worse for ourselves when something better is available. From a superficial standpoint it might still appear that man would take advantage of not being blamed and punished and risk hurting others as a solution to his problems, but this is a mathematical impossibility when he knows that blame and punishment are required for advanced justification. In other words, the challenge of the law absolves his conscience with threats of an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth, which is payment in full for the risks he takes. He may risk going to prison or be willing to pay the ultimate price with his life for the satisfaction of certain desires. An individual would not mind taking all kinds of chances involving others because he could always come up with a reasonable excuse to get off the hook, or he could pay a price, if caught. If he borrowed a thousand dollars and was unable to pay all of it back, he could easily say, "Sue me for the rest." If he tries to hold up a bank, however, and fails, the legal system does not allow him to excuse himself and he is sent to prison. Without the knowledge that he would be blamed and punished should he fail; without this advance justification which allowed him to risk hurting others, the price of this hurt is beyond his purchasing power. How could someone plan a crime knowing that no one — not even the ones to be hurt — would ever blame him or retaliate in any way —

even if they knew what he was about to do? Has it been forgotten already that we are compelled, by our very nature, to choose the alternative that gives us greater satisfaction, which is the reason our will is not free? Consequently, to solve this problem it is only necessary to demonstrate that when all blame and punishment are removed from the environment — and when the conditions are also removed that make it necessary for a person to hurt others as the lesser of two evils — the desire to hurt another with a first blow will be the worst possible choice. In the world of free will man blamed man and excused himself. In the new world man will be excused by man for everything he does and consequently will be compelled, of his own free will, to hold himself responsible without justification. In other words, once man knows that he is truly responsible for what others will be compelled to excuse and he would be unable to justify, he is given no choice but to forgo the contemplation of what he foresees can give him no satisfaction. It becomes an impenetrable deterrent because under these conditions no person alive is able to move in this direction for satisfaction, even if he wanted to. This natural law raises man's conscience to such a high degree because there is no price he can pay when all humanity, including the one to be hurt, must excuse him.

“I am still having a difficult time. Could you explain the two-sided equation again?”

At this present moment of time or life you are standing on this spot called here, and are constantly in the process of moving to there. You know as a matter of positive knowledge that nothing, no one can cause or compel you to do anything to another you don't want to do, and this other who is standing on this spot called there to which you plan to move from here, also knows positively that you cannot be blamed for your motion from here to there, regardless of what is done. Now if you know as a matter of positive knowledge that not only I but everyone on the planet will never blame or punish you for hurting me in some way, because you know that we are compelled to completely excuse what is beyond your control, is it mathematically possible (think about this carefully) for you to derive any satisfaction whatever from the contemplation of this hurt when you know beyond a shadow of doubt that no one, including myself, will ever hold you responsible,

ever criticize your action, ever desire to hurt you in return for doing what is completely beyond your control? But remember, you haven't hurt me yet, and you know (this is the other side of the equation) that you do not have to hurt me unless you want to, consequently your motion from here to there is still within your control. Therefore the moment it fully dawns on you that this hurt, should you go ahead with it, will not be blamed, criticized or judged in any way because no one wants to hurt you for doing what must be considered a compulsion beyond your control (once it is established that man's will is not free), you are compelled, completely of your own free will, to relinquish this desire to hurt me because it can never give you any satisfaction under these conditions, which proves that A — everybody on the planet — has the power to control B — everybody else — by letting B know, as is being done with this book, that no one will ever be blamed for anything that is done. In other words, the knowledge that there will be no consequences presents consequences that are still worse making it impossible to consider this as a preferable alternative for how is it possible to derive satisfaction knowing there will be no consequences for the pain you willfully choose to inflict on others? The reaction of no blame would be worse than any type of punishment society could offer. It is important to remember that punishment and retaliation are natural reactions of a free will environment that permit the consideration of striking a first blow because it is the price man is willing to risk or pay for the satisfaction of certain desires. But when they are removed so the knowledge that they no longer exist becomes a condition of the environment, then the price he must consider to strike the first blow of hurt — all others are justified — is completely out of his reach because to do so he must move in the direction of conscious dissatisfaction, which is mathematically impossible. If will was free we could not accomplish this simply because we would be able to choose what is worse for ourselves when something better is available, but this law of our nature will give us no alternative when we are forced to obey it in order to derive greater satisfaction.

The solution to this impasse which removes the implications is now very obvious because the advance knowledge that man will not be blamed for the hurt he does to others (this is the solution worked

backwards) mathematically prevents those very acts of evil for which blame and punishment were previously necessary. Instead of being able to absolve one's conscience by justifying an act of crime or some other form of hurt because of the knowledge that he will be blamed and punished (which permitted efforts to shift his responsibility while encouraging what had to be criticized and condemned), he is prevented from deriving any satisfaction from the contemplation of this hurt by the realization that he will never be blamed, criticized, punished or judged for doing what he knows everyone must condone, while being denied a satisfactory reason with which to excuse his contemplated conduct. I will rephrase this in a slightly different way: Instead of being able to absolve one's conscience by being given the opportunity to justify an act of crime or some other form of hurt which permitted the shifting of one's responsibility while at the same time encouraging the crime, the knowledge that will is not free and what this means actually prevents an individual from deriving any satisfaction from the contemplation of this hurt to another by the realization that he will not be blamed, criticized, judged, or punished for this act. The difference between this principle and the principle Christ preached — "Turn the other cheek," is that the former prevents the first cheek from ever being struck whereas Gandhi, in his bid for freedom and his belief in nonviolence, was forced to turn the other cheek although the first cheek was struck over and over again which took an untold number of lives. Secondly, man must be willing to die in order for turning the other cheek to be effective, consequently innumerable abuses cannot be prevented which starts a chain reaction of retaliation. Besides, how is it possible not to strike back when your very being moves in this direction for satisfaction? Gandhi said, "Kill us all or give us our freedom; we will not resist anything you do to us," compelling those in power, after many were already slain, to find more satisfaction in leaving them alone. Many minorities, such as the Blacks, cannot apply this psychology because the situation does not call for such a sacrifice. How are these people to turn the other cheek when they are underpaid, overtaxed, and judged by Whites as one of the inferior races? It has been their effort to correct these abuses — not by turning the other cheek — that has brought these people this far. By turning the other cheek (which also

proves in a mathematical manner that man's will is not free), it absolutely prevents the second cheek from being struck because it is impossible, as the people of India demonstrated, to get satisfaction from continuing to hurt those who refuse to fight back, but as history has shown many were killed just by being struck on the first cheek. My imparting the knowledge that no one will again blame you in any way, judge your actions or tell you what to do will mathematically prevent your first cheek from being struck which is necessary in a world of atomic energy when an entire nation can be wiped out from being struck on the first cheek. Let us, once again, observe what the perception of undeniable relations tells us.

At this moment of time in our present world of free will you are trying to decide whether to hurt me in some way but you have had everything removed that could be used to justify this act. You simply see an opportunity to gain at my expense, but should you decide against it you will not be a loser. In other words, you are considering the first blow which means that you are planning to do something to me that I do not want done to myself. You realize that there is a certain risk involved, if caught, because you must face the consequences. If the crime, misdemeanor or offense is not that serious, although you know you will be questioned and blamed, you may be able to get away with it by offering all kinds of reasonable excuses as to why you had no choice. But if no excuse is acceptable as in a court of law after you have been found guilty, or when your parents, boss or others know you are obviously at fault, you could be sent to prison, electrocuted, hanged, gassed, whipped, severely punished in some other way, scolded, reprimanded, ostracized, criticized, discharged, beat up or any number of things. You don't want this to happen if it can be avoided, but if you can't satisfy your desire unless the risk is taken, you are prepared to pay a price for the crime of hurting me with a first blow. Under these conditions it is impossible for your conscience to exercise any control over your desires because you cannot feel any guilt just as long as you are prepared to suffer the consequences. Now let's imagine for a moment that you are living in the new world and are confronted with a choice of whether or not to hurt me.

As before you are trying to decide whether to hurt me in some way

but you have had everything removed from which you might have been able to justify your act. You simply see an opportunity to gain at my expense, but you will not be a loser if you decide against it. In other words, you are contemplating the first blow under changed conditions. You know as a matter of undeniable knowledge that nothing in this world has the power, that no one can compel you to do anything against your will, for over this you know you have absolute control (you can lead a horse to water but you can't make him drink). This means that you are completely responsible for your actions even though, due to circumstances, you may prefer hurting me. To make absolutely certain that you know this is an undeniable law, try to shift away from yourself what is your responsibility or to some extraneous factor when you know that no one in the world will ever hold you responsible. It cannot be done, which was already proven. This does not mean that other people are not often responsible for the hurt we do as part of a chain reaction as when an employer is forced to lay off his employees because the money to pay them has stopped coming in to him, but no one is blaming him for what is obviously not his responsibility and therefore it isn't necessary for him to offer excuses.

As you are contemplating hurting me in some way, I know as a matter of positive knowledge that you cannot be blamed anymore because it is an undeniable law that man's will is not free. This is a very unique two-sided equation for it reveals that while you know you are completely responsible for everything you do to hurt me, I know you are not responsible. For the very first time you fully realize that I must excuse you because it is now known that man must always select of available alternatives the one that offers greater satisfaction, and who am I to know what gives you greater satisfaction. Consequently, you are compelled to realize that should you desire to hurt me in any way whatsoever you must also take into consideration the knowledge that under no conditions will I strike you back because it can never satisfy me to hurt you for doing what I know you are compelled to do. This prevents you from thinking excuses in advance because you know you are already excused. You cannot say, "I couldn't help myself because my will is not free," because you know I already know this. You cannot apologize or ask for forgiveness because you are already forgiven and no one is blaming you. This

means that should you decide to hurt me with this first blow or be careless and take the risks that lead to a first blow, and I would have to choose between retaliating or turning the other cheek, you would know that I would be compelled by my nature to find greater satisfaction in turning the other cheek because of the undeniable fact that I would know you had no choice, since your will is not free. Remember, you haven't hurt me yet; consequently, this is still a choice under consideration. And when it fully dawns on you that this hurt to me will never be blamed, judged or questioned in any way because I don't want to hurt you in return for doing what must now be considered a compulsion beyond your control — **ALTHOUGH YOU KNOW IT IS NOT BEYOND YOUR CONTROL AT THIS POINT SINCE YOU HAVEN'T HURT ME YET** — you are compelled, completely of your own free will, so to speak, to relinquish this desire to hurt me because it can never give you greater satisfaction under the changed conditions. [Note: It must be understood that the expression 'of your own free will,' which is an expression I use throughout the book, only means 'of your own desire,' but this does not mean will is free. If you need further clarification, please reread pages 53-58]. In other words, when you know that others will never blame or punish you for what they are compelled to excuse, but also that the other factors truly responsible for the dissatisfaction which engendered the consideration of hurting others as a possible solution will be permanently removed as a consequence of following our slide rule in all of its ramifications, you will be given no opportunity to ever again strike another blow of hurt. It becomes the worst possible choice to hurt another when it is known there will be no blame because there is no advantage in hurting those whom you know are compelled to turn the other cheek for their satisfaction. Conscience, this guilty feeling over such an act, will not permit it because you will get less satisfaction, not more. If man's will was free we could not accomplish this because we would be able to choose what is less satisfying when something more satisfying is available.

The knowledge that man will no longer be blamed for striking a first blow since his will is not free — when he knows that nobody, absolutely nothing, can compel him to hurt another this way unless

he wants to for over this he knows he has absolute control — enters a condition or catalyst never before a permanent factor in human relations and mathematically prevents those very acts of hurt for which blame was previously necessary in a free will environment. Remember, it takes two to tango — each person and the rest of mankind — therefore this discovery which prevents man from desiring to hurt others is only effective when he knows in advance, as a matter of positive knowledge, that he will never be blamed or punished no matter what he does.

“Wait a second. Will you admit that if I strike you first you are perfectly justified in striking back?”

“Of course you are not justified in striking a person who is compelled to do what he does by the laws of his nature.”

“But you know that an individual doesn’t have to strike another if he doesn’t want to.”

“But if he wants to, isn’t it obvious that this desire is completely beyond his control because it is now known man’s will is not free?”

“Are you trying to tell me that if someone strikes me I must turn the other cheek because he couldn’t help himself?”

“That’s exactly right. How is it humanly possible to justify some form of retaliation when you know that the person who hurt you is moved by laws over which he has absolutely no control?”

“But I do have mathematical control over not hurting you, if I don’t want to.”

“I don’t know that, because it is impossible for me to judge what you can and cannot do since you are compelled to move in the direction of greater satisfaction, and I don’t know what gives you greater satisfaction. Consequently, you are compelled to realize that should you desire to hurt me in any way whatsoever, you must also take into consideration the knowledge that under no conditions will I strike you back because it can never satisfy me to hurt you for doing what I know you are compelled to do, since your will is not free.”

“Now I get it. Then when I fully realize that under no conditions will you ever strike back because you must excuse what you know I am compelled to do — when I know that I am not compelled to hurt you unless I want to for over this I have mathematical control — I am

given no alternative but to forgo the desire to hurt you simply because, under the new conditions, it is impossible for me to derive even the smallest amount of satisfaction.”

“Wonderful! If each reader would understand this basic principle, then he would be able to follow me as I extend the corollary into every part of our lives.” [Note: It may seem like a contradiction when in the previous dialogue I say we are not justified in striking back and at the end of this chapter I say we are. Please understand that I am extending the basic principle to show how this law of our nature can prevent the first cheek from ever being struck. If our cheek has not been struck, there is no need to strike back. If you find it confusing as to how the basic principle prevents the desire to hurt others as a preferable alternative, it is imperative that you reread this chapter in order to grasp the two-sided equation, which is the very foundation of this discovery. Until this natural law becomes a permanent condition of the environment, we will be unable to prevent the first blow from being struck which, in turn, gives justification to retaliate]. As we follow the corollary, Thou Shall Not Blame, which will act as an infallible slide rule and standard as to what is right and wrong while solving the many problems that lie ahead, we will be obeying the mathematical wisdom of this universe which gives us no choice when we see what is truly better for ourselves. By removing all forms of blame which include this judging in advance of what is right and wrong for others, we actually prevent the first blow of injustice from being struck. This corollary is not only effective by your realization that we (all mankind) will never blame you for any hurt done to us, but also by our realization that any advance blame, this judging of what is right for someone else strikes the first blow since it is impossible to prevent your desire to hurt us by telling you we will never blame this hurt when we blame the possibility by telling you in advance that it is wrong. In other words, by judging that it is wrong to do something, whatever it may be, we are blaming the possibility of it being done which only incites a desire to challenge the authority of this advance accusation that has already given justification. Therefore, in order to prevent the very things we do not want which hurt us, it is absolutely imperative that we never judge what is right for someone else. But remember, it is not the knowledge that man’s

will is not free that compels him to give up this judging in advance what is right for others, otherwise the government, the unions, the religions, all the writers who make a living expressing their opinions as to what is right and wrong with the world, with love, marriage, children, business, education, etc., would suddenly give up their manner of earning a living which is a mathematical impossibility. Do you think that the manufacturers of candles and other inferior forms of lighting wanted to give up what gave them a source of income when electricity was discovered? They were compelled to adjust because they couldn't find a market for their obsolete products except on a smaller scale. Do you think the adulterers want to give up their fun, the single males the pleasure of sexual intercourse before marriage? Do you think the people who are getting wealthy on the sweat, brawn, tears and insecurity of extremely low wages will give this up just because God thunders down from heaven — Thou Shall Not Blame? Do you think that religion will willingly give up its great power and influence when it is learned that the will of man is not free — which reveals that God is a mathematical reality? The truth of the matter is that everyone will be compelled of his own free will to give up anything that hurts another in any way simply because this hurt will be considered worse under the new conditions. This, my friends, is the great secret of God's infinite wisdom, which gives man no free choice as to the direction he must travel for greater satisfaction.

As we end this chapter, there is one vital point that needs clarification. If the knowledge that man's will is not free is supposed to prevent that for which blame and punishment were previously necessary, and if a person who saw his child deliberately kidnapped and killed would be compelled to desire revenge as a normal reaction in the direction of satisfaction, how can this knowledge prevent some form of retaliation? Just because you have learned that man's will is not free is not a sufficient explanation as to why you should not want to avenge this child's murder by tracking down the criminal and cutting his heart out with a knife, so once again we must understand what God means when He mathematically instructs us not to blame. When the knowledge in this book is released and understood, every person as always will be standing on this moment of time or life called here, so to speak, and preparing to move to the next spot called there.

As the principles set forth in this book become a permanent part of the environment, you will know that the person who kidnapped and killed your child or committed some other form of hurt which occurred prior to the release of this knowledge — regardless of how much you hate and despise what was done — will never blame in any way your desire for retribution, which means that he will never run and hide to avoid your act of revenge because this is a form of tacit blame; and when it fully dawns on you that he will never make any effort to fight back no matter what you do to him, never lift a hand to stop whatever you desire to do, it becomes impossible for you to derive any satisfaction from this act of retaliation especially when you know that he will never again be permitted by his conscience — because of the realization that he will not be blamed — to do to another what was originally done to you and your family. As a result, the chain of retaliation will be broken which will prevent any further criminal behavior.

Time and time again a person desiring personal revenge has been able to experience a certain amount of control over his desire, but never to the degree that will permit this Great Transition to get underway — with the help of our slide rule. When he fully realizes that the perpetrator whom he wishes to hurt in return will never desire to retaliate with further hurt, or desire to commit another crime to anyone anywhere, he is compelled to lose his desire for revenge because it is impossible to derive any satisfaction from the advance knowledge that he will be excused by the entire world. The full realization that he can no longer justify this act of personal revenge because no one will consider it wrong or tell him what to do (remember, no longer will anyone judge what is right for another); that he will be able to do what he wishes to this person without any form of justification because he knows in advance that he will not be blamed and that everyone, including the one to be retaliated upon, will be compelled of their own free will to completely excuse what is definitely not his responsibility — **ALTHOUGH HE KNOWS IT WOULD BE HIS RESPONSIBILITY** — makes him desire to forgo what he knows he doesn't have to do. He knows he is not under any compulsion to do what has not yet been done, and when he becomes aware that no one henceforth will judge his actions; that he

is completely free from the trammels of public opinion to do, without the slightest fear of criticism, whatever he thinks is better for himself; that he will not even be punished by the laws that were created for this purpose, it becomes mathematically impossible for him to desire hurting this other person under these conditions regardless of what was originally done to him. It would be equivalent to deriving satisfaction from continuing to beat up an individual who, though fully able to fight back, refuses to lift a hand in his own defense. This allows the Great Transition to get underway without any fear of harm. Let us observe why the perpetrator can no longer continue his crime spree under the changed conditions.

The potential kidnapper or criminal who is standing on this moment of time called here when this knowledge is released and before the act is done, is prevented from further contemplation of his crime by the realization that he will never be blamed, judged, criticized, or punished for this act (and by the removal of all forms of tacit blame which unconsciously gave him the motivation and justification), which compels him to get greater satisfaction in his motion to there by giving up what he was contemplating. Up until the present time there was nothing powerful enough to prevent man from risking his life to satisfy a desire regardless of who got hurt because the satisfaction of possible success outweighed the dissatisfaction of possible failure; but when he becomes conscious that a particular reaction of no blame will be the only response to his actions by the entire world regardless of what he is contemplating, he will be compelled, completely beyond his control, but of his own free will or desire, to refrain from what he now foresees can give him absolutely no satisfaction. How can he possibly find satisfaction in doing something that the world must excuse, but he can no longer justify? This natural law of man's nature gives him no alternative but to obey it in order to derive greater satisfaction, and will prevent the first blow from ever being struck. As we extend the corollary, Thou Shall Not Blame, and slowly unravel the causes of war, crime, and hatred — which are deep-rooted and interwoven — we will get a glimpse into the future and envision how life will be when all hurt in human relations comes to a peaceful end.

There will be many volumes extending this law into every area of

human interaction. The answer to the world's problems will satisfy Communism and Capitalism, the Blacks and the Whites, the Jews and the Christians, the Catholics and the Protestants, the rich and the poor, the cops and the robbers. However, it must be understood that in the world of free will innumerable wars, revolutions, and crimes were a reaction to various forms of hurt which did not allow any alternative but to retaliate. Consequently, man was compelled to blame, criticize and punish as the only possible alternative when judged by his undeveloped mind. When those about to fight back discover that they will no more be retaliated upon, it is also necessary for them to realize that the factors responsible for this consideration of war and crime, as the lesser of two evils, will also be removed; and are those responsible given any choice but to remove these factors when they know that those who they have been hurting will never blame them for this?

To fully understand the fact that conscience — our feeling of guilt — was never allowed to reach the enormous temperature necessary to melt our desire to even take the risk of striking a first blow, it is only necessary to observe what must follow when a crucible is constructed wherein this new law can effectively operate. It was impossible for any previous stage of our development to have understood the deeper factors involved which was necessary for an adequate solution, just as it was impossible for atomic energy to have been discovered at an earlier time because the deeper relations were not perceived at that stage of development; but at last we have been granted understanding which reveals a pattern of harmony in the mankind system equal in every way with the mathematical accuracy of the solar system, and we are in for the greatest series of beneficent changes of our entire existence which must come about as a matter of necessity the very moment this knowledge is understood. Although this book only scratches the surface, it lays the foundation for scientists to take over from here. The undeniable knowledge I am presenting is a blueprint of a new world that must come about once this discovery is recognized, and your awareness of this will preclude you from expressing that this work is oversimplified. Because it would take many encyclopedias combined to delineate all of the changes about to occur, it would have been much too long for a book that was written

for the express purpose of providing mankind with a general outline. It will be up to future scientists to extend these principles in much greater depth.

As we leave this chapter I hope I have made it clear that just as long as man is able to justify hurting others, he is not striking a first blow. Before I demonstrate how this justification is permanently removed by preventing the insecurities that have permeated our economic system and justify the act of self-preservation by whatever means necessary, I will allow you an opportunity to see exactly what happens in a human relation where this justification is already removed. In the next chapter, I shall reveal how all automobile accidents and carelessness must come to a permanent end. Before we move on, I must clarify a very important point. Christ and Spinoza turned the other cheek and paid the consequences because the justification to hurt them was never removed, but I am going to demonstrate how it is now possible to prevent the first cheek from being struck which renders obsolete the need to turn the other cheek or retaliate. Although Gandhi won freedom for his people and Reverend King won certain civil rights, they accomplished this at great expense. However, all was necessary because we are moving in the direction of greater satisfaction over which we have no control because this is God's law or will. At this point, I suggest that you study carefully, once again, Chapter Two and then discuss it to make certain you understand that if you find any flaw it exists only in your not understanding the principles, for they are undeniable.

CHAPTER THREE

THE END OF CARELESSNESS

Wouldn't it be wonderful if we never had to worry about people carelessly risking the lives of our loved ones, neighbors, and friends? Well, get ready for a miracle. I shall demonstrate, by applying this natural law, how it is now possible to change our environment and raise man's conscience to such a degree that all carelessness, including automobile accidents, will be virtually wiped from the face of the earth because people the world over will do everything in their power to avoid the carelessness and risks responsible. Right now there are more people killed in car accidents than we can fully comprehend. These collisions take place only because man operates on 75% of his potential power which is insufficient to prevent what nobody wants, even though he is doing everything in his power to prevent it. By understanding what it means that man's will is not free we plug in the extra 25%, and then have the power to prevent the unintentional tragedies that continue to plague our lives.

Carelessness, just as the word implies is an I do not care attitude. It arises from several factors. There are young boys and girls who want to make an impression on their friends and this requires that they demonstrate their ability to handle a car like a race car driver, but they never give much thought to the other person because man's first concern has always been for himself. The show-off wants to give his friends a thrill and demonstrate how to do what really takes guts. He doesn't care if he is a menace to other drivers who happen to cross his path. If he is willing to risk his own life — and happens to take others with him — that's their tough luck. For this reason you would often hear, 'Drive carefully; the life you save might be your own.' The drunks and dope addicts and people in a hurry cannot stand being behind a slow moving vehicle even if this means passing on a curve or hill. They either don't fully realize the danger or they don't care since

the risk is primarily to themselves with no thought of those who may be in the way.

There are other individuals who don't care because this requires great effort and they aren't willing to exert the kind of energy it takes to protect the lives of others. To apply brakes when the light changes yellow as an alternative to speeding up and making it so stopping isn't necessary is considered a nuisance. As a result, they often end up going through on the red and crashing into the driver who starts off before the light has changed to green. Then there is the mother who is so fed up with the struggle to take care of the house and her children, and now that she is no longer in love with her husband she just doesn't care. She leaves matches and other potentially dangerous items lying around and when the house catches on fire or they get hurt in some other way she always comes up with excuses. What has added to her carelessness is that she never understood the meaning of fatalism which is the doctrine that all things are subject to fate, or that they take place by inevitable necessity. Consequently, when this belief in fatalism was expressed to me by a mother who didn't seem to take much care in looking after her children, I asked her the following question:

“If you saw your infant getting ready to crawl in front of a truck, would you pick him up or let him go?”

“Naturally, I would grab him.”

“Why would you grab him, if you believe in fate?”

“I can see that danger,” she replied.

“In other words,” I responded, “once you have done everything in your power to prevent an accident and then it occurs, you can say it was fate.”

Carelessness has allowed airplanes to crash into each other or to explode because the mechanics failed in their duty. It has allowed ships to ram each other, hotels, night clubs, houses, etc. to burst into flames and people to perish. It has allowed tires to blow out and brakes to fail; even buildings to collapse. There is no telling how many lives have been lost or mutilated (blinded, crippled or what have you) all because of someone's carelessness. And liability insurance came into existence out of absolute necessity to help prevent the

aftereffects of an accident, otherwise we would have more killing.

My friend remarked, "I don't know about you but if it had not been for my ability to drive defensively, I would have been killed or hospitalized at least a dozen times. I agree that defensive driving is extremely important in this world, that is. I don't know about the new world, but not everybody has this coordination and skill to drive defensively, just as they don't have other talents and skills."

"You're right, however everybody does have the ability to apply the rules of good driving." Now observe how God compels this to come about.

When a car accident occurs in our present environment the people involved are very dissatisfied because their car was just damaged, but what do they do for satisfaction? If there were no witnesses they hurl accusations at each other until the police arrive. The person who did not have the right-of-way could possibly, in a courtroom with a clever lawyer, make the innocent party appear guilty, in order to get his insurance company to pay for damages. If the one who had the right-of-way was under the influence of liquor, even though the accident was not his fault in any way, he is already judged guilty as this offers a perfect reason for making the guilty party appear innocent. But when an extremely serious accident occurs where, let us say, two children and their mother were instantly killed, while the father and the other driver were thrown clear, to assume responsibility for this is too horrible to bear which compels them to think up a million and one excuses as to why it was the other person's fault. If there were witnesses, and both drivers know it was not the father's responsibility, the guilty party would welcome whatever punishment could be dished out so that he could pay dearly for what he did; and the liability insurance he carries just in case, helps him, in a small way to pay part of the price. If it was the father's fault, he might not be able to stand this terrible feeling of guilt and might be forced to find some reason as to why this accident was unavoidable otherwise he could kill himself. However, to make it possible for him to continue living, just in case he can't come up with a convincing reason for the accident, the law will charge him with manslaughter and he will have to serve a prison sentence, which he welcomes, because this also helps him to pay for what he did. How many times, true or false, will the

ability to use just these words make someone feel so much better — “I couldn’t help myself.” “It was not my fault.” “It was unavoidable.” “I’m terribly sorry.” And how many times in the course of history have the innocent been compelled to pay the price of the guilty, just because man was able to shift his responsibility?

To understand why all automobile accidents must come to an end, out of absolute necessity, watch what happens when we apply our basic principle to show you exactly what takes place in our present environment before and after a collision, and then let you see the same accident under changed conditions. Most people are concerned with their own safety, but under the changed conditions they become more concerned that they are not responsible for hurting others as that alternative which gives them greater satisfaction. Remember, however, the new world is not yet here so we are going to imagine the same accident which will not occur, just so we can see why it will not. Actually, the only reason we are willing to drive carelessly and take risks in our present environment is because when we do have an accident, which means that when we have made a careless mistake resulting in a hurt to others, it is possible to gain satisfaction by paying the price or shifting responsibility. When it becomes impossible to do either, we must do everything in our power to prevent the accident as that alternative which is better for ourselves.

Not so long ago a truck was heading west inside the city limits, doing 50 miles an hour in a 35 mile zone. It was past midnight, and very few cars were on the street. The driver was anxious to get home because he hadn’t seen his family for a week. He had driven this same route many times and knew it was safe to go this speed at that time of the morning. His only concern was to keep an eye out for a patrol car so he wouldn’t get a ticket. Up ahead, four blocks away, he saw that a traffic signal was green when about a half block away he knew that it would soon be joined with the yellow light and followed in a few seconds by the red, indicating that he would have to stop. Because he felt this was a nuisance since the amber light had not yet gone on, and since the darkness enabled him to see that no headlights were coming from other directions, he felt safe to increase his speed to 65 miles an hour.

Heading north was a car carrying five people — a father, mother, and their three children. They had just attended a wedding and were on their way home. The father had been drinking rather heavily and completely forgot to put on his headlights. He was also traveling along at 50 miles an hour when he slowed down to 35 so he wouldn't have to stop for the red light up ahead, but when he saw the yellow light go on for the other direction, and knowing that the light would be green before he entered the intersection even if he resumed his 50 miles an hour, he did not hesitate to do just that. Now just before the truck got to the crossing the light changed, which meant that the driver would have to go through on the red. At that very moment he saw the car without any headlights on enter the intersection a fraction of a second ahead of him, but it was too late to avoid the collision. The father saw the truck at that instant too. They both jammed on their brakes and turned their wheels instinctively, but the truck ploughed head on at a slight angle into the rear right side of the car. The parents were somehow only injured slightly; the truck driver was not hurt at all, but the three children were killed instantly. Standing on the corner was someone who noticed that the car's lights were not on. Now let us analyze this.

If the truck driver had any inkling that such an accident would have resulted from his trying to beat the light he certainly would never have considered it, but he chose to do what he did because it gave him greater satisfaction at that moment. However, we are not concerned now with what he should or should not have done but what he must do for greater satisfaction following the accident. It is obvious that he feels absolutely terrible over what he knows was his fault, yet he does not want to be blamed for the death of these children. There is certainly no satisfaction in feeling the weight of this responsibility; consequently, he is going to do everything in his power to shift it away from himself. The police arrive and learn that the father was driving without headlights on and that he was highly intoxicated. The truck driver kept saying over and over again — “It was not my fault. That man went right through the red light and didn't even have his lights on. The death of those children is horrible, but it was not my fault!” Before long he was absolutely convinced that the accident would never have occurred had the headlights been on, and he was right because

what made him speed up to beat the yellow light was his certainty that no car was coming. However, he could not tell the police the truth, that the right-of-way still belonged to the father even though intoxicated and without lights — although it made him feel as if it was not his responsibility.

In court the father was found guilty of manslaughter even though he was innocent, which infuriated him. But because the deaths of his children were considered punishment enough, his sentence was suspended and he was placed on probation. His wife, however, was not satisfied with the decision since she believed him guilty of killing their children (she had warned him time and again about his drinking at parties), and filed for divorce. The truck driver was awarded quite a bit of money in damages because he discovered that he was not physically the same after such a traumatic experience. Had the conditions been slightly different making it impossible for the truck driver to shift his responsibility, the only avenue open for greater satisfaction would have been for him to pay a heavy price for what he did. His insurance would have compensated the parents to a degree for their tragic loss and they would have been satisfied to know that he was sent to prison. When released he would feel that he paid his debt to society and the family, and his conscience would be cleared. If he felt the least bit guilty for killing these children he could always confess this sin to a priest or psychiatrist, or atone for it in various ways. The father, on the other hand, who was found guilty although he was completely innocent has built up a tremendous hate for the entire system of justice and may desire to kill the truck driver in retaliation if he thinks he can get away with it. His life has been ruined and he wants to hurt somebody in the worst way for what was done to him. Had this accident not taken anyone's life, the driver of the truck might have volunteered that it was his fault so his insurance company could reimburse them for property damage. This could help compensate in some small way for what happened. Now pay close attention to the same accident under changed conditions so you can see why the truck driver when faced with the choice of speeding up or slowing down is compelled to prefer the latter — which avoids the tragedy.

The truck driver feels absolutely horrible over what he knows was

his responsibility because he went through the red light, but he also knows that no one in the entire world will ever blame him for what was done. People standing around are shocked over the sight. The father and mother are weeping bitterly over the loss of their children but they will not say to the truck driver — “Look at what you just did!” The police are not going to smell his breath or give him other tests, because there are no more police (they will be displaced on a gradual basis, which will be explained shortly). There are no prosecutors who are going to try and prove his guilt in a court of law. An ambulance arrives to carry off the dead, and tow trucks to clean up the debris. How do you think he feels? Wouldn't it be wonderful if he was punished or could pay in some way for what he did? He would like to be blamed, criticized, condemned, punished, beat up by the father and hated but he knows these things will never take place because nobody alive holds him responsible. He would like to write a check to compensate for what he did, but nobody is suing him or blaming him in any way, which compels him to hold himself responsible. Since he is unable to shift what is his responsibility or find any satisfaction whatsoever, he finds himself in an unbearable situation and will be compelled to go through life with the death of these children, the sorrow of the parents, and the destruction of their property, on his conscience. Let's examine this from another point of view.

What if the father didn't see the truck at all and was not certain of what happened? What if it really was the father's fault? Well, is anybody blaming the driver of the other car, so how would it be possible for him to say, “It was not my fault but his?” No matter how unbearable it was for the truck driver to feel this responsibility, just imagine how the father must feel to know that he was, or might have been, responsible for the death of his loved ones, although this difference could hardly pass through the eye of a needle.

“I am not sure I understand. What do you mean when you say ‘this difference could hardly pass through the eye of a needle?’”

If the father was even the slightest bit uncertain of what actually happened, as long as he knows it might have been his fault, he will suffer just as much as if he was certain because there is no way he can find out when no one blames him. He might actually believe that his

drinking was responsible, that maybe it was the fact that he didn't put on his lights or that he went through the red light because he just didn't see it. How do you think he feels knowing that his carelessness might have caused the death of his own children? How will he ever know that he was not responsible unless he is fully aware at all times of what he is doing?

This means that the very thought of hurting others through carelessness is so terrifying when there will be no blame, punishment, or a price to be paid for what we know is, or might have been, our responsibility, that when we are confronted with a similar situation as the truck driver we could never find greater satisfaction in speeding up, while the father knowing that drinking might cause him to get in an accident figures out a way to solve his problem so he can still drink without taking on the responsibility of driving. If he has no one to drive his car but himself, and he feels that drinking might cause an accident for which he knows well in advance there will be no blame, he cannot afford the risk of placing himself in a position from which his conscience will torture him the rest of his life. People know they are not compelled to drink and drive, not compelled to pass on a curve or hill, not compelled to recklessly show off and race unless they want to, for over this they have mathematical control, and when it fully dawns on them that should they hurt others with their carelessness they will not be blamed or punished because everyone knows they were compelled to do what they did — WHEN THEY KNOW THEY WERE NOT COMPELLED — they are given no alternative but to do everything in their power to prevent a situation from arising that gives them absolutely no satisfaction.

The only reason that accidents resulting from carelessness were able to take place was because people could blame something else as the cause, thereby shifting what was their responsibility; and liability insurance didn't help because those with ample coverage felt they were prepared to pay for their negligence. In the new world the parties involved in any kind of accident will assume the cost of the damage done to them, which means that when someone holds himself responsible for hurting others he must also hold himself responsible for hurting the victims of his carelessness all the more since the money they will have to spend on a new or repaired car could have

been used either by themselves or the insurance company, for other things. If a person doesn't have this [no fault] insurance or sufficient cash reserve to cover his share of the damage, then we, all the people, will pay the cost because we know this person couldn't help himself, that he was compelled to neglect taking out this insurance, or else he couldn't afford it. But when he will be guaranteed his standard of living (which will be explained in the economic chapter), then he will desire to carry this protection for fear that he will hurt others by making them pay for damages that he should be sharing. If a driver was to blame for a bad accident there would be no choice, as we have just witnessed, but to live out his entire life with this horrible feeling of guilt, having no way to relieve it. This explains why the ability to confess our sins allows the confessional to be a place where we can find the justification necessary to absolve our conscience. But when it becomes mathematically impossible to shift the responsibility for our negligence away from ourselves — when we are not being blamed — there is no way carelessness can be justified. If for any reason an accident should occur and it was not our fault, there would be no reason to feel remorse, but if we were not sure whether our actions contributed in some way we would have to live with this uncertainty knowing that we might have been partly or completely responsible. Consequently, the only way a person would know for sure that he was not responsible is to be aware at all times of what he is doing.

The right-of-way system in the new world becomes a mathematical standard by which each motor vehicle operator is forced to judge only himself. The truck driver knows he did not have the right-of-way; consequently, he was aware he struck the first blow when the collision took place. If he had gotten to the red light and no cars were coming, he would not have been striking a first blow had he decided to cross the intersection. By the same reasoning, his speed is no longer controlled by a patrol car being present or absent but by what he considers safe enough so that he will never have to encroach on another driver's right-of-way. He cannot afford to drive with bad tires or brakes because if the one should blow out and the other fail forcing him to collide with other cars by entering their territory, he will know that he struck the first blow. If the tires were new but the mechanic failed to tighten the bolts on one wheel which fell off at high speed

causing the accident, his conscience would be clear since this was something that happened to him as a part of a chain reaction. This applies to all types of transportation where there is a chain of responsibility. For example, when a plane crashes it is the responsibility of all those who have anything to do with it — building, repairing, maintaining, piloting it, etc. — consequently when these individuals know that they will never be blamed for taking thousands of lives or putting those lives in jeopardy, they will never allow a plane to go up unless they are absolutely certain that no one will be hurt. Everybody will be compelled to assume the responsibility of hurting others in these plane crashes because the others will never blame them for this hurt. The changed conditions will force all mechanics to be extremely careful so that they are never responsible for accidents due to their carelessness. Right now the mechanics, engineers, etc. are justified in being careless because they know that somebody is going to blame somebody else right down the line of command, but when they know that nobody will ever blame anybody, they will all feel the weight of a tremendous responsibility which compels them to ground a plane unless they can feel absolutely certain they are not sending a group of people to their death. There will be no reason for airplanes to crash as we begin to understand the factors that make skilled pilots, controllers, and mechanics vulnerable to human error, and find better methods of defusing those errors before an accident occurs. Furthermore, now that cockpit instruments can provide the pilot with information regarding altitude, speed and direction — along with other technological advancements that can detect potential problems long before take-off — airline travel will be safer than ever before. All engineers and mechanics who design, maintain, and repair aircraft systems will have no choice but to make safety a number one priority.

In the private sector driving a car, motorcycle, or any other type vehicle that operates on public roads will be considered a serious undertaking. For example, before desiring to drive a car in the new world we will want to know everything that could possibly make us responsible for hurting others in an accident which will then, never occur. It will also prevent us from delaying other drivers from getting to their destination. If by not using directional signals when required (which excludes having to use signals when we are alone on the street

or in a lane that only goes to the right or left), or by not moving over far enough when making a turn we see that we are holding up traffic for which we will not be blamed by the honking of horns, we will soon find greater satisfaction in not doing those things that interfere with the flow of traffic. By blowing horns in blame, and by calling people names, we not only find justification to repeat that for which we are prepared to pay for in terms of going to court, getting a ticket, etc., but we get a certain satisfaction in irritating those whom we know will criticize this annoying habit. When it becomes impossible to pay a price for hurting or annoying others because there are no consequences, in other words, when all justification for tying up traffic has been removed, we are given no choice but to change our ways.

“I’m beginning to see the effect of this even in smaller accidents, because the person who caused it is made to realize how much inconvenience and trouble he puts people through who refuse to blame him in any way for doing what he knows they must excuse, and he, for the very first time, cannot justify.”

As a consequence of knowing what it means that man’s will is not free, all carelessness is automatically removed because to hurt someone who will not blame you for doing what you know could have been prevented had you not been careless, gives you no choice. Driving a car under these new conditions, unless you know what you are doing, is equivalent to playing with a loaded gun; and if you can get any satisfaction out of standing around while the parents weep over the death of their child just killed by you who will not be blamed or punished in any way, then, my friends, you will be able to do the impossible. Consequently, a great responsibility is placed upon the shoulders of anyone who has anything whatever to do with cars, and instead of being anxious to drive each person will be more anxious to make certain that he really knows how first. The miracle about to unfold is that once all mankind are taught what it means that man’s will is not free, and certain other changes are made which I will soon discuss, people are permitted to see, well in advance, a situation that is too horrible to contemplate, consequently, the only avenue open for needed satisfaction is to prevent it from arising because there is no way they can do anything afterwards under the changed conditions. This means that whatever the other driver did that caused the accident

would be listed among the DON'TS OF GOOD DRIVING and no one would desire to go against these. People in a hurry to beat a traffic signal will do just the opposite, never try to beat it, and never be in a position where they are forced to go through a red light, or screech their brakes. If, however, there is no traffic coming and the light is red, there is no reason to stay because its purpose is to stop the other traffic so they can go.

As for whether we need permission from the government to drive? In our present environment we need a license and before this is granted we are given certain tests to see if we qualify which means that part of our responsibility has already been shifted. In other words, people who are really not qualified to sit behind a wheel are made to think that they are by receiving permission, and should someone make the comment, "You shouldn't be allowed to drive," the response would be, "The government thinks so or I wouldn't have been given a license." In the new world there will be no such thing as a license to drive because man has become of age and can now assume responsibility for himself, therefore, the only person to tell you that you are sufficiently trained and ready will be you yourself. No driver henceforth will ever again be issued a license by a government agency to determine his qualifications. This means that the division of the Department of Motor Vehicles which determines the eligibility of a new driver by administering a passing or a failing grade will be permanently displaced. The fact that certain inadequate standards were set up for others to determine our qualifications allowed many unqualified people to assume they were qualified because they passed the required exam. We will never again have to prove to anyone but ourselves that we are qualified to drive and our vehicle is in good condition. We can see very clearly why our responsibility must increase to the maximum degree since this is the only way we can prevent what we don't want. Where before we couldn't wait to pass the test so we could finally go wherever we wanted, we will not be that anxious to sit behind the wheel until we know for sure we can drive without causing collisions or delays. Even driving instructors will never tell us when they think we are ready because they would not want to assume this responsibility. Their job will be to teach us all the causes of accidents and delays, and show us how to handle a car

properly. They will have a thorough course of training which will include all the causes of accidents through carelessness, but it will be up to us to determine whether we are capable of driving without hurting anyone by comparing our ability with the tough driving standards set up by the driving schools. There will be no need for statutory speed limits that try and force compliance because nobody will desire to drive at a speed that endangers others. The speed limit will serve as a general guideline to indicate the maximum reasonable and safe speed to travel, as well as to alert the driver of dangerous road and weather conditions. Today we say — “Obey the laws or else you will be punished.” Tomorrow we say — “Don’t obey the laws of good driving if you don’t want to, but if someone gets hurt as a consequence it will be impossible to blame anybody but ourselves.” Therefore, every suggestion to guide the new driver in the right direction will be willingly heeded because of this fear that someone, other than ourselves (this is the least consideration in the new world), could be seriously hurt. Driving a car becomes a very hazardous profession because the very thought that someone might get hurt for which there would be no blame or punishment, and no questions would be asked as to whose fault it was, compels everyone to become an extremely skillful driver before undertaking what could very easily lead to the kind of accident just described, and there is no more unbearable form of punishment than to know that you are responsible for someone’s death or serious injury. However, to launch this new world and create the environment necessary to prevent crime, war, hate, and all the other evils plaguing our lives we must remove every form of hurt to us that could justify retaliation, which is a separate problem that will be solved very shortly.

“Although I agree with everything you have demonstrated so far, reluctantly, and think it is absolutely marvelous, I can’t see how you can satisfy the whole human race and that’s what you must do with your equation which includes communism as well as capitalism.”

You keep forgetting one thing. I am not the one who will solve this problem. The astronomer who first observed the invariable laws between the planets, moon and sun didn’t cause the eclipse; he perceived certain relations that made him aware it would occur at a certain time. And just because I have observed the invariable laws

inherent in the mankind system which allowed me to see the end of all war and crime because of what it means that man's will is not free, does not mean that I am causing this to come about. The most I am able to do is reveal God's laws, which gives me no choice but to move in a certain direction for satisfaction because we are all a part of His laws. At this juncture, let me recapitulate certain salient points.

Man is compelled by his nature to move constantly in the direction of greater satisfaction and when he is blamed for hurting others through carelessness he is permitted to find satisfaction in one of three ways. He can apologize, shift his responsibility to something or someone else as the cause for what he knows he has done, or if there is no way he can shift his responsibility he can pay a price for the hurt he knows he caused. However, when he knows, well in advance, that all mankind are compelled to excuse everything he does because it is now known that his will is not free — while he knows that he doesn't have to hurt anybody unless he wants to (for over this he knows he has mathematical control) — he is given no choice but to do everything in his power to prevent a situation from which he cannot find any satisfaction. How is it possible for him to find satisfaction in carelessly hurting others when he is denied an opportunity to apologize, to shift his responsibility, or to pay a price of atonement for what he did? Since this will eat at his conscience, and since he knows this well in advance, he is given no choice but to prefer the alternative that offers greater satisfaction and in this case the only avenue open is for him to prevent such a situation from arising. I realize that there is quite a difference between hurt that results from carelessness which is something a person really doesn't want... and deliberate hurt. There is also a vast difference between the blame that follows a hurt and blame that is in advance which is a judgment of what is right for someone else. This latter blame is discussed thoroughly in the chapter on marriage, where it is also demonstrated how such advance blame or judgment of others must come to an end out of mathematical necessity. This is the kind of blame that tells you how to wear your hair, how to dress, how you should live. It is the bully in various forms. These things are your business only as long as nobody is hurt by what you do. You will understand this much better as we proceed.

The belief in free will and the concomitant blame are equivalent to the thrust of a rocket in getting a satellite into space, for without it we could never have reached the outposts of this Golden Age. But just as the astronauts shed their excess baggage when their rocket has expended its energy in reaching orbit, so likewise will we shed this theory and all the blame that helped us reach this tremendous turning point in our lives. Well, is it any wonder this discovery was never found because the solution actually lies beyond the framework of modern thought since it cannot be understood in terms of our present knowledge? As I said, there are no precedents. I realize how difficult it must be for you to conceive a world without liability insurance and the Department of Motor Vehicles, but you will learn soon enough that millions of people are going to be permanently displaced from their manner of earning a living but they will not be hurt in any way, so don't jump to any conclusions; just be patient. If you are slightly less skeptical and more willing to continue the investigation, you will see how effective are these laws as God puts an end to all war, crime, adultery and divorce. But first, I shall reveal my second discovery which will play a vital role in the new world.

PART TWO

MY SECOND DISCOVERY

CHAPTER FOUR — WORDS, NOT REALITY

CHAPTER FIVE — PREMARITAL RELATIONS

CHAPTER SIX — THE NEW ECONOMIC WORLD