

PART V

*IMPLICATIONS FOR THE INDIVIDUAL AND
SOCIETY*

SECTION 28

The Philosophic Principles of Rational Being and Return to the Original Thesis: Love

Many pages ago, at the beginning of this work, the overall thesis and objective were set forth and the intended path of logic and development to that thesis and objective were laid out. That path and thesis can be briefly summarized as follows.

(1) Supersede the "god hypothesis" with a new, purely natural explanation and origin of the universe. (The preceding Part II - On the Origin of the Universe.)

(2) Validate that by demonstrating that it fully leads to and accounts for the universe of today; that it explains 20th Century science, resolves its problems and contradictions, and produces new scientific understanding. (The preceding Part III - On the Mechanics of the Universe.)

(3) Demonstrate that even intelligence, understanding, emotions and creativity are a natural evolution of the natural universe. (The preceding Part IV - On the Mechanism of Intelligence and its Origin.)

(4) On the basis of this new understanding of the reality in which man and society are embedded and exist derive the consequent mode of behavior essential to the existence of rational life and its survival and progress: the social community in and of the "golden rule", in all ways treat others as you yourself would wish to be treated.

It is the task of this Part V to accomplish that final objective: the demonstration and derivation of the natural essentiality of universal humane and loving social behavior and the method for progressing to it. But first, in order to best do so it is necessary to examine the fundamentals of existence and living -- the philosophic principles of rational being.

The Philosophic Principles of Rational Being

From the earliest persons to address the problem of the philosophic basis of being and life, the ancient Greek philosophers Plato and Aristotle, through the many following centuries in which that original work was reviewed and further

developed by philosophers such as Augustine, Boethius, and Aquinas, to the many further subsequent philosophers such as Kant, and their analyses during the 19th and 20th centuries, a general [but not unanimous] agreement on the fundamentals of reality and living life has developed. That set of concepts is reviewed and summarized [with some editing and additions] as follows.

Reality

Reality is that which exists. It includes material reality [matter and energy in their various manifestations] and non-material reality [ideas, concepts, feelings, events, *etc.*].

There are skeptics who attempt to contend contrary to this conception, as follows.

- Some contend that there is no reality, that all is an illusion. With them there is no point to further discussion because it will resolve nothing nor produce any useful results. Their contention cannot be absolutely proved nor absolutely refuted; rather, it is a termination of investigation and learning.
- There is the skeptic who contends that all is unknowable and that there is no such thing as truth. He refutes himself for if his statement of skepticism is deemed true then it refutes itself and if it is deemed not true then it denies his skepticism.
- That skeptic could then contend that his statement that all is unknowable and that there is no such thing as truth applies to all except to that very statement. With him there is no point to further discussion because it will resolve nothing nor produce any useful results. The construct of his contention is inconsistent.

Therefore, reality is as presented above or else all discussion, philosophy, and learning are pointless and cease. Common sense, then, dictates reality.

Reality is objective. There can be no subjective reality. The skeptical objections and their refutation are as follows.

- The skeptic who contends that there are different realities for different persons or different situations is misinterpreting errors in perception or errors in judgment. Objective reality is independent of perception and judgment. It exists in itself.

Different persons may experience different personal realities because each experiences a personal sub-set of the comprehensive totality of reality. Reality is "a whole"; what a person experiences is "a part".

- Some skeptics acknowledge the independent objective existence of material reality but contend that all ideas and concepts exist only by virtue of minds thinking of them and have no independent objective existence. That contention is in error as follows.

If all minds ceased and subsequently new minds arose, those new minds would develop some of the same ideas and concepts that were in the earlier, now ceased, minds *e.g.*: truth, goodness, right and wrong, beauty, *etc.* If that ceasing of existing minds and the subsequent arising of new minds were to occur many times over, some of the same fundamental ideas and concepts would reappear in each new set of minds. Such ideas and concepts exist in themselves independently of

minds to think of them. They have the same objective existence as does material reality. Some of them are, for example: truth, goodness, justice, right and wrong, love, beauty.

Truth

Truth is that which is in agreement with reality. That is objective truth. That is absolute truth. A judgment is a conclusion as to the truth or falsity of a specific statement; that is, a judgment is a conclusion that a specific statement is in agreement with reality [is true] or is not in agreement with reality [is false].

- There can be no subjective truth. Apparent subjective truth results from errors in perception of reality or from errors in judgment as to the agreement with reality, or both. There is only one reality.
- There can be doubt, questions, or issues with regard to specific truths, the doubt arising from insufficient information or from concern as to the validity of the reasoning to reach the judgement. Those problems do not affect objective reality nor objective truth. They only affect our ability to know the specific truths, an effect that can be reduced or removed with better information or better reasoning or both.
- A judgment is conclusively certain if it is impossible for new evidence to change it and its reasoning is beyond criticism. [For example, it is conclusively certain that the sum of the interior angles of a plane triangle is a straight line].
- Otherwise the judgment is in doubt to the degree that those two conditions are not met. The possible states of doubt range from "nearly" or "practically" certain through certain "so far" or "at this time" or "per a preponderance of the evidence" on to the genuinely doubtful. But, such doubt does not change objective reality nor objective truth -- it only describes the limits of our knowledge of the truth.

Goodness [The Good]

Beings capable of making choices have both needs and "wants" [things that they want]. Needs are those things that are essential to the existence and functioning of the being. Wants are things that are desired by the being but that are not needs. [It is possible for beings capable of making choices to want things that are harmful to their existence or their functioning, and to do so through choice or through error in perception or judgment. Such things are generally referred to as "bad"].

The ancient philosophers, and even those up to the present, have identified goodness, or the good, with those things that humans desire. Because humans are fallible and can behave irrationally that definition is adjusted to "good is that which a rational human would, or ought to, desire". "Ought" is an awkward philosophical concept, however; and the definition based on desire is actually a guide to identifying good [and not infallibly], not a definition of good.

The better definition of good is: "Good is those things that satisfy a being's needs or that satisfy those wants of a being that are not harmful to the being's existence or functioning [are not bad per the definition of bad just, above]". Goodness resides in those things that are good; they are objectively good. It is not that they are good because they happen to be desired; they are

good because of the needs and wants that they satisfy. If they happen to be desired it is because of their having that inherent goodness. [Also, see conditional good, below].

Justice

For most beings there is not sufficient good to satisfy their needs. That is because if their needs are satisfied they tend to increase their numbers which increases the amount of good needed to satisfy their needs. The result is the natural world's competition for survival.

Sufficiently rational beings develop the concept of civilization, a societal organization of a community with shared tasks and shared contribution toward the production of goods and shared benefit in receiving distribution of the resulting goods. Because of its efficiencies civilization results in the generation of sufficient goods to meet the needs of all of its society, normally produces goods in excess of that level so that some wants can also be satisfied, and tends somewhat to restrain excessive increase in the number of its members so that the demand for goods necessary to merely satisfy needs does not get out of hand.

The principal threats to that success of a civilized community are war, plague, pestilence, and natural disaster. War is one community's seeking to increase the good available to itself through appropriating by force some or all of the good of another community. Plague reduces a community's ability to supply its needs by reducing the number of its members able to participate in generating goods and by reducing their effectiveness. Pestilence is the destruction of goods needed for a community's survival by beings of another specie consuming them for their own survival. Natural disaster includes events that destroy production of goods or even destroy the entire community such as drought, flood, storm, earthquake and volcano.

Justice can only be present where there is sufficient good to supply the needs of all; that is, justice is only possible in a civilization.

In a civilization there will be persons who contribute to generating the supply of good in proportion to their ability to do so, and persons who are unable to do so [the sick, the disabled, the children and the elderly], and some persons whose conduct is adverse to the social generating of good or to the functioning of the society in general [criminals]. Justice is the allocation of sufficient good to each member of the society other than the criminal so that his needs are satisfied and the allocation of any remaining good among the members of the society in partial satisfaction of their wants in some proportion to their contribution to the social production of good for the society. The reasons for this are as follows.

- First, the society chooses to meet the needs of the contributors because they are necessary, they are the principal generator of goods; the needs of the sick and disabled because anyone in the community could next fall victim to that state [the policy is that of mutual insurance]; and the needs of the children and the elderly because the children are necessary to the future and to assure the care of the elderly, a state that all members of the society expect eventually to enter. The society may choose to meet some of the needs of those whose conduct is adverse [the criminals] to the extent its members see fit.
- Second, the nature of rational beings, they having evolved from competitive survival of the fittest to the level of civilization, is such that only by the distribution of satisfaction of wants in a fashion that

recognizes the relative value of recipients' contributions will society's members be motivated to maximize the generation of social goods and motivated to justly share goods rather than pursue their own good at the expense of others.

- Third, there can never be enough goods to satisfy all wants because as wants become satisfied beings develop new, additional wants. That is, wants are inherently unlimited whereas the means to satisfy wants are inherently limited.

Kinds of Good

- Absolute and Conditional Goods

Absolute goods are goods as defined above, those that satisfy a need or that satisfy a want that is not harmful. They are universally good; for example, happiness. Most goods are absolutely good.

Conditional goods are ones that satisfy a want and are good in spite of their being harmful to the being's existence or functioning. For example, death in general is not a good; but death is good for a terminally ill person who wants relief from extreme and otherwise unrelievable pain.

- Internal and External Goods

Goods can be analyzed and sub-divided in a number of different ways in addition to the divisions already presented, that of goods that satisfy needs and those that satisfy wants that are not bad, and that of absolute versus conditional goods. The next major distinction is between goods that are external to the being and those that are internal.

External goods are called possessions, they exist outside of the being who has them, *e.g.* food, clothing, money, but not all external goods can be "owned" as for example parents or children. While choice and effort enter into the acquiring of possessions, chance is still a major factor. The chance factors of where, when, into what family one was born have a major affect on one's acquisition of possessions.

Internal goods are called perfections and they exist within the being who has them, *e.g.* health, knowledge, skills, but by that is not meant that they are perfect. Something is perfect if it is as near to its best as is possible, but it can still be good even though less than perfect. While there can be an element of chance in the acquiring of perfections, choice is the dominant factor. One must choose to conduct oneself in a fashion that leads to better health, additional knowledge, new skills if one is to acquire those perfections.

Some external goods satisfy needs, for example food; others satisfy wants, for example entertainment. Some internal goods satisfy needs, for example health; others satisfy wants, for example a skill.

In general internal goods are superior to external goods. That is, perfections are part of the being, their acquisition is more under the control of the being and due to the choices of the being, and it is more difficult for the being to lose them or have them taken away. Possessions are lesser goods because they are not part of the being, their acquisition is less under the being's control, and they can be more easily lost or taken away.

Possessions tend to be things that are used up in the process of performing their function or that tend to wear out with use. Perfections, on the other hand, are neither consumed nor worn out; rather they are enhanced by use.

Possessions tend to distract beings from the pursuit of perfections. That is because possessions gratify immediately whereas perfections take time and involve extended personal effort to develop so as to provide gratification. It is possible to have too much of possessions but not of perfections. For example too much food or drink can be unpleasant or even dangerous, but it is not possible to have too much knowledge or health; they can be enjoyed without limit.

- *Means and Ends*

Another analysis of goods is into means and ends. Means are goods that one needs or wants because they facilitate or are necessary for the acquiring of other goods. A particular skill might be pursued as a means to acquiring money, the acquisition of money pursued as a means to acquiring food, the food itself being an end to satisfy the need for food. A good that is purely a means is of no value other than for the other goods it is the means to acquiring. For example, money is worthless other than for what it can purchase.

Ends are goods valued completely and simply for themselves. They have no role in acquiring other goods; they simply directly satisfy a need or a want. Many goods are means to some extent and at the same time ends in another sense. For example, having money would tend to relieve anxiety about survival [an end] while at the same time being only the means to acquiring that needed to actually survive.

Virtue

A rational being's conduct, or behavior, relates in two ways. One is solitary, what the being does relative to itself; how its conduct affects itself. The other is social, how its conduct affects other beings both individually and collectively, with whom it shares existence. The pursuit of happiness is the pursuit of those goods that satisfy one's needs and wants. Right conduct toward oneself is the pursuing, with justice, of one's own happiness to the extent that one is able to do so without harming others' just pursuit of their own happiness. Right conduct toward others is the pursuing, with justice, of their happiness to the extent that one is able without harming ones' just pursuit of one's own happiness.

Virtue is that right conduct. A good life is one that virtuously achieves a pleasing state of progress in the pursuit of happiness. Everyone can be virtuous; however, unfortunately, not everyone [perhaps even not very many] can have a good life; that is not everyone can achieve a pleasing state of progress in the pursuit of happiness. Chance, things beyond one's control, can be a large factor affecting one's seeking of a good life.

Lack of virtue, that is conduct contrary to right conduct as described above, that is conduct harmful to others' pursuit of their own happiness, that is conduct adverse to the social generating of good or to the just functioning of the society in generating and distributing good in general, is criminal.

But, why should one be virtuous? What is the motivation to not be criminal? That a rational being would wish to pursue its own happiness and would wish to avoid other beings' pursuit of their happiness from harming its own pursuit of happiness is self evident. The question is why should a rational

being be concerned about harming other beings' pursuit of their happiness or adding his effort to theirs ?

"Fairness", like "ought", is an awkward concept for purely philosophical purposes and cannot be relied on to support virtue. But, rational beings have a sense of fairness, a sense of good or bad, right or wrong ways to treat other beings. In other words they understand that if they treat others in a manner that they, themselves, would resent if so treated, then likely those others will resent receiving that treatment. That understanding by rational beings is the basis underlying the motivations to be virtuous. The motivations to be virtuous are as follows.

- The desire for self respect, to be able to approve of oneself.
- The desire for the respect of others, to have the approval of others.
- Fear of the actions that others might take if they are resentful of the treatment that they receive, resentful of your anti-virtuous behavior.

Virtue and Societies

Societies, also, can be virtuous or criminal depending on whether they foster the pursuit of happiness of all of their members or of only a select few.

Socialism is virtuous because it generates and distributes good in a just manner. It supports everyone's pursuit of happiness. It contributes to everyone's pursuit of a good life.

Capitalism is criminal because it generates and distributes good in an unjust manner. It supports only the wealthy rulers' pursuit of possessions [which they think will produce their happiness] at the cost of harming the overall pursuit of happiness by everyone else. [So, also, are aristocracies and tyrannies.]

With regard to the possible motivations to be virtuous, criminal societies, or rather those beings who rule and control them, function as follows.

- Self respect is not a problem. They believe that they are special and superior to the masses so that they respect themselves and only themselves, for their exercise of rule and control.
- They are not concerned about having the respect of others. The only other beings whose respect they care about, if any at all, is their peers in the ruling clique and that as a matter of self preservation.
- However, they do fear the actions that resentful others might take. To deal with that problem they employ a combination of force and propaganda. The force is to instill fear and maintain disciplined control. As a roman emperor said, "Let them hate so long as they fear." The propaganda is to confuse, mislead, and distract the others so that they are unable to recognize the extent to which they have cause for major resentment and are therefore inhibited from acting to bring justice.

The Beautiful

Beauty, that is the beautiful, is a good that is absolute, not conditional; that is external, not internal; that is an end in itself, not a means to other ends; and that has the following special characteristics.

- Beauty communicates, puts forth or expresses feelings that are abstract rather than logical concepts, feelings that are not, or not as well expressible other than through beauty.
- Beauty is wanted, is valued solely for itself, not for any benefit other than that which results from contemplation of the communication expressed.
- That which beauty expresses is true. We instinctively, automatically recognize it as true, as unarguably valid. It is that about beauty that pleases us most.
- For an expression of feelings to express that trueness the quality of its composition must be superior. It must exhibit those characteristics that we recognize as measures of quality: order, theme and variation, form and rhythm and so forth as well as quality of craftsmanship. In other words, the closer the expression is to perfection the more beautiful it is. We unconsciously measure particular instances of beauty against our conceptions of perfection and are pleased by sensing approximations to that conception.
- In a world that appears to be filled with imperfection and disorder beauty offers the opposite.
- The expressed communication resides in a sensuous medium; that is, a medium that can communicate in a manner consistent with what is being expressed. The medium can be naturally occurring objects, events, or phenomena; or it can be specifically created or crafted objects, phenomena, or occurrences; or a combination of them. Occasionally the sensuous medium might be pure thought, pure idea or concept.
- The beautiful satisfies a need or want that we have. It is difficult to contend that beauty is a need, really essential to the functioning and survival of a rational being although some have felt so on occasion. On the other hand beauty certainly is wanted and it is a want that is not harmful to beings' functioning and survival.

The beautiful is always true; however, the true is not necessarily beautiful. There are ugly truths; some of reality, some of that which is, is ugly. One might propose that beauty is the highest form of truth just as compassion is the highest form of love and equity is the highest form of justice.

One can also observe that art is created beauty [if it is not beautiful it cannot be art] and an artist is one who creates beauty [if his creation lacks beauty he has failed as an artist].

Happiness

A good that is purely an end in itself and not at all a means is called a highest good, *summum bonum*, [as compared to lesser goods, those that are partially or totally means]. It is not the greatest good. There are many highest goods, many goods that are pure ends and not at all means.

The greatest good for a rational being would be its virtuously having the highest good of each of the satisfactions of all of its needs [to survive and function] and of all wanted perfections [that it chooses to pursue], and a personal comfortable amount of wanted possessions [neither so much nor so little as to

interfere with the pursuit of perfections]. Happiness is having that totality of good, that *greatest good*. Happiness can be pursued, but it can never be completely achieved; however, its pursuit with progress toward it can be a form, or partial enjoyment of pure happiness.

Love

Our objective is the demonstration and derivation of the natural essentiality of virtuous behavior and a virtuous society, universal humane and loving social behavior. But, what is "humane" ? What do we mean by the "golden rule" ? What is love ?

It is a curious thing, that love needs to be explained. We all want love and, seemingly, have a clear idea of what we mean by that. Yet, misconceptions of love abound, and, still more of a problem, most persons seem not to know how to give love, seem not to know what loving is.

Love is wishing good for the object of your love and acting to bestow that good. The feeling of love is the wishing. Being loving is the bestowing.

When a person says "I love candy" they do not mean that they wish well for the candy. They do not even care about the candy's welfare. What they mean is that they want to possess the candy, they want to satisfy and gratify themselves with the candy (in this case at the expense of the candy inasmuch as it becomes destroyed in being eaten).

More frequently than not when a lover says to his beloved, "I love you !" he does not mean that he wishes her welfare. No, he means that he wants to possess her, to continually experience the pleasure and gratification of her for himself.

Those are not love. None of us in wishing to be loved wishes to be owned, possessed, used in such a fashion. Then, where did the concept of what we really want come from ?

It came from childhood, from infancy. When we were very young we received true love from our parents. They wished and acted with regard to us only in the interest of our welfare. They fed, clothed, nurtured, caressed, and cared for us in every way. It felt very good.

While we do not wish to return to the helplessness and dependence of that past state we do wish to continue in being loved in that way. That is what love is. Giving that to others is loving. Receiving that is being loved. It is not a clinging, smothering, restricting thing. True loving seeks the fulfillment of the person loved.

Love does not require sacrificing oneself. One must be able to, and one must succeed at, loving oneself. If one cannot really love the person that they are closest to, themselves, then they certainly cannot validly love others.

Love and being loving are the condition and acts of sound, integrated persons. They are acting in their own welfare and, because love is something that can be, that is, infinite, that is without limit, they have abundant love remaining to give to others. They are able in abundance to wish the welfare of others and to reasonably act in that direction.

Social love is a society based on love -- based on each member wishing and behaving to implement the welfare of the others, of all. Social love is the virtuous society.

SECTION 29

THE INDIVIDUAL AND SOCIAL NATURE OF MAN AND HIS CREATION, SOCIETY

In order to understand the implications of reality for us individually, that is as individual persons, we need to understand our nature, "where we come from" and the factors that condition our behavior and expectations.

Likewise, since in the process of our development we have created a new type of entity, sophisticated and complex social organizations and what we refer to as civilization, we need to understand the affect our nature has had and continues to have on that societal environment we create.

THE PROBLEM OF OUR BIOLOGICAL HERITAGE

All biologically evolved life, that is all presently existing life, is various forms of competitors, combatants, fighters in a life and death, "no holds barred" struggle for survival. The battlefield is deep with the remains of the vanquished and the remorseless contest continues this very day and utterly without mercy.

This is not because of some heavenly, nor natural, mandate nor are the contestants, whether the vanquished or the victors, mean, evil or otherwise to be condemned for their behavior. They are merely natural. They are merely behaving naturally.

As discussed earlier in this work, change pervades nature and change constantly produces new variations, types of natural beings and objects with modified characteristics. In most cases the changes prove not to be advantageous and the individual having them fails to survive. But, sometimes a change appears that is a significant enough advantage that the individuals having that change are able to out-compete, to out-survive their fellows.

All life forms depend on a supply of certain sustaining conditions and materials from their environment: appropriate temperature, light, air, water, food or whatever, specific to the life form. If the supply of those necessities is abundant the life form increases in size or number until the supply becomes no longer sufficient to maintain that increased size or number. When the supply is not sufficient then those individuals most adept at securing enough to meet their needs survive. The others tend to fail, to be eliminated, to die out.

Life forms tend to reproduce their characteristics in their offspring. The types that better survive the competition for individual survival because of their

having more advantageous characteristics are more likely to populate the next generation than the types that cannot as successfully compete, that cannot obtain enough to maintain their own life let alone reproduce it. The next generation will, then, tend to have a greater proportion of individuals having those advantageous characteristics. Inevitably the process selects and improves the characteristics of those life forms that are most successful at acquiring from the environment that which they need and at reproducing in their offspring those same improved characteristics.

And we humans stand at the end of a very long chain of this process. We are refined and re-refined champion pursuers of our own self interest as we perceive it -- personal welfare and survival. We reproduce those same characteristics in our offspring.

The more advanced life forms, the higher animals, can learn from experience to some extent, but it apparently requires a mental level only reached by we humans (at least in our planet's environment) to reason abstractly and to apply that process to learning. Thus we humans have learned to benefit from the longer term effects of adhering to short term constraints. This has led to a decreased tendency to murder, steal, and so forth, acts which might produce immediate instantaneous increase in short term personal survival and material welfare but which bode poorly for the long term because of the danger, and even likelihood, of being victim rather than perpetrator.

There are two different potential modes of application by humans of their relatively new characteristic of intelligence. These are illustrated in the table below.

| <u>Natural</u> | <u>Rational</u> |
|--|---|
| Increased competition for limited resources. | Cooperation increasing the resources for everyone. |
| Less security because of preying on each other. | More security because of helping each other. |
| Exploitations: slavery autocracy, oligarchy. | Freedom and control over one's own life. |
| Relatively slow progress in environmental control and quality of life. | Enhanced development of control over the environment and the quality of life. |

Table 29-1

Because of our natural heritage we tend to take the left path above, that of greater competition. It is natural and instinctive to us. That path, largely with us to this day, can produce a high quality of life and survival for only a small group of the most successful competitors. It produces misery for the majority of society and it wastes resources and inhibits overall progress.

Yet, this is man, behaving according to his nature, his natural heritage. Why should we expect otherwise ?

THE ORIGIN AND ITS MEANING

Actually, many men throughout the ages of human existence have expected otherwise. Human history is replete with attempts to alter human nature, or at least to alter human behavior in spite of human nature.

Government is the greatest single instance. Long before the evolution of human intelligence our biological forebears learned the benefit of pack, herd, pride, tribal or whatever social organization to provide protection from predators and facilitate the gathering or hunting of food. Any organization like those involves leaders and rules. In sophisticated societies these are called government.

While government still functions primarily in terms of improving the supply of the material necessities and protection of the social organization and its members, it also pursues, and achieves to some extent, the altering of the natural behavior of the members of society. Excessive intra-societal competition is restrained by law and developed custom, both backed up by punishment for violations.

Government does not, nor does it seek to, move man from the competitive branch of progress to the cooperative one (of the above Table 29-1). In practice, the leaders in any society are the most successful competitors. They enjoy the high quality of life that their competitive success produces. They certainly do not want to change those "rules of the game". The modification of human behavior that government imposes is only to the extent and for the purpose of maintaining the government's structure and the position and quality of life of the leaders. That, quite naturally, is the leaders' primary interest.

Government does not really address man's nature, only his practical behavior. Religion, on the other hand, attempts to modify not only the behavior of man but also the nature of man. Religion attempts to overcome our inherited nature and overlay it with a "good" nature (to varying degrees in various religions). The tools that religion uses are generally the same as those of government: laws, education and punishment. In the case of religion the punishment (an unfavorable next life) is less tangible and less immediate than that of a government (unpleasant circumstances now, in this life). On the other hand, in religion the new feature of reward for good behavior (a favorable next life -- also not tangible or immediate) is used as an additional incentive.

For at least 6,000 years of human history the methods of government and of religion have been tried. One can observe that human behavior has probably improved a little as a result, but not much. Certainly we humans still remain trapped in the self-defeating and society-retarding competition branch of the above table.

In addition to government and religion, a third approach has been attempted to some extent to resolve this problem of man. That third approach is socialism and its idealization, communism. This approach to modifying man's behavior from the natural competitive to the advantageous cooperative has had less trial time than the attempts of government and religion.

Quite small communities: the earliest Christians, various communities of monks, and a few experimental utopian societies and communes have attempted socialist or communist community life. In the sense being discussed here this kind of community life is one of cooperation and sharing without competition

among the members of the community. In its ideal form each member contributes according to his ability and receives according to his needs (communism). In the more limited form each member contributes according to his abilities but is rewarded according to the quality and quantity of his contribution, although the society guarantees some minimum "floor" of quality of life under all of its members regardless of their condition or contribution (socialism).

Those various attempts failed in general because, even with a membership selected voluntarily for participation, human nature was too incompatible with the self-less sharing and cooperation required. Where the communities tended to survive was only in the cases of special controlled religious environments with a substantial element of coercion, that is, strong rule.

Another reason for the lack of success of socialist or communist experiments has been their inherent vulnerability to their competitive, survival-of-the-fittest, neighbors and environment. The most recent attempt to produce a successful socialist society was based on a new approach to dealing with that problem. The approach, termed Leninism, introduced the concept of "the dictatorship of the proletariat".

The concept of Leninism was that a leadership, itself already philosophically and practically dedicated to socialism and (ultimately) communism, should autocratically impose a socialist society on man. Then, by educating and modifying the citizenry via its autocratic control, it was expected that gradually a socialist / communist society could be evolved. The concept, perhaps "good on paper", fails because of the difficulty of truly modifying human nature and behavior and because the autocratic leadership (also hobbled by being of human nature) quickly becomes simply another exploiting group of "winners" in the age old competition. They give in to the temptation to operate the society for their own benefit.

The social ideal of communism in its ultimate form: from each member of society according to his ability and to each according to his needs, remains a valid ultimate objective. It is even a reasonable test of "how civilized" a society is. The concept is practiced in the nuclear family and has been so practiced for millennia. The concept of that family environment and social organization has never been criticized. Rather, even though the family is a case of essentially pure communism, it is held up and praised as the foundation of society.

Its practice in all of society, as a single big human and humane family, would be communist society.

MORE HUMAN NATURE -- THE PROBLEM OF OUR LAZINESS

By "laziness" is meant the natural inclination of we humans to do as little as possible to get or achieve what we want. We only put out significant effort if we believe that the benefits that we will receive will be in proportion to that effort or even better. If we are guaranteed minimum or adequate support and have little expectation of additional benefit resulting from any additional effort on our part then we are inclined to do as little as possible, just enough to "get by".

THE ORIGIN AND ITS MEANING

This, also, most likely is a natural characteristic evolved in us and in all life. The life competition for survival is always a struggle in the context of insufficient resources to meet the needs of all so that only the better competitors have their needs met sufficiently to enable them to populate the next generation. It takes energy to struggle, to compete; therefore energy is a valuable resource to be husbanded and preserved. The life form that can meet its needs with less energy expenditure is more likely to succeed. Energy conservation, "laziness", is bred in us.

That bodes ill for the success of communism ("from each according to his work -- to each according to his need"). It does not bode too well for socialism where, although reward is proportional to work, a guaranteed "floor" is provided for everyone. That is why communism can only be achieved when the problem of obtaining material abundance is first solved. With a society of material abundance there can be a reasonable level of laziness and full satisfaction of needs simultaneously.

THE PROBLEM OF OUR AFFECT ON THE INSTITUTIONS WE CREATE, POLITICAL ECONOMY

"Economics" is the contemporary word used for what has traditionally been termed "political economy". "Political economy" is the more accurate term in that most of 20th Century "economics" is involved with manipulating human nature and behavior (a political activity) to achieve intended social and economic results (economy) in spite of, sometimes in contravention of, the underlying "real economics" of the situation.

(It is unfortunate that so many quotation marks must be used to discuss these points. The reason is that the meanings of terminology have changed over the years. Frequently the change in meaning is an intended, caused action not mere language evolution. For example, ever since the "Great Depression" of the 1930's no government and no politician uses the word "depression" no matter how badly the economy is performing. The word "depression" carries too much negative political implication. Consequently, government and politicians have substituted "recession" which sounds less severe. The terminology change also clouds the citizenry's comprehension of what is really happening. From the point of view of most politicians that is a desirable result.)

"Real economics" is the study and implementation of the principles underlying the operation of an economy. Those principles are rather simple and few.

- Before the development of "tool making" intelligent species the economic activity of beings was simply the pursuit of material needs when and as needed -- gathering and hunting food and sustenance.
- Intelligence brought the concepts of planning and of investing in capital tools and equipment:
 - making provision for future needs now, rather than waiting until the need is immediately upon one (saving), and

- investing some effort now in making the later satisfaction of needs more effective, even if at the cost of less immediate satisfaction now (investment in making tools, research, education).
- Neither of those existed before intelligent beings started applying their intelligence to the situation. Therefore, any such developments (tools, capital) are the product solely of the labor of persons, both the physical and the intellectual labor of persons.
- The labor of persons is capable of some specific amount of productive result per time period. That is, in a society of humans, behaving according to their nature and consisting of the typical mix of competent and not, conscientious and not, and so forth, a certain amount of useful productive result can be obtained per year. (That might be called the Gross National Product today.)
- The amount of that productive result is increased by better tools and better planning and organization. But, better tools and planning and organization require that some of the current effort be diverted to those ends.
- Thus human society, with a certain amount of total useful productive potential at any particular time in any particular circumstances, must decide how much to allocate to current consumption, how much to allocate to improving future time periods' production, how much to allocate to supporting those who cannot care for themselves, how much to allocate to recreation, and so forth.

Economics is, then, really about making those decisions for the allocation of current resources between current needs and future improvement. If a society, such as we, spends more of its resources on current consumption then there will be less improvement in the resources available in future years. If we wish to improve our future conditions it will be at the unavoidable expense of deferring some enjoyment now. There is no way around this. It is simple reality.

(The economics just described is macro-economics, that of the society and its economy, its productive forces, overall. Once the macro-economic decisions are made numerous further economic evaluations, micro-economics remain. These are of the character more commonly referred to as engineering economics or investment economics. Their issue is: Among alternative ways to effect a particular activity, or among alternative such activities, what is the relative cost and which is the most cost effective, the most economic? For example: Should the river crossing be a bridge or a tunnel? Should an investment in elementary education go to improving teachers, facilities, materials or course content? Should more highways be built or more public transit developed? And so forth.)

"Economics" (that is macro-economics) as a real, societal, decision and management process almost never occurs overtly. Its implicit occurrence cannot be avoided. There is only so much "pie", so much total annual gross production,

THE ORIGIN AND ITS MEANING

and each allocation must come out of it. "Political economy" is the process of attempting to avoid, to get around, that problem by the manipulating of society.

"Political economy" is one of the principal on-going activities of government. It is so because government is the instrument of the "winners" in the human competition. It is the means that those at the top of the economic pyramid employ to maintain their position and to keep the essentially unstable situation that the inequitable pyramid embodies from upsetting their dominance and their enjoyment of it.

Man long ago evolved from his pre-human condition, where the competition for survival was one of direct, immediate competition for food, shelter, a mate, and so forth. The evolved man functioning in social organizations, continues the struggle for optimum survival on the new field of competition, the economy. The struggle is still conducted with strength, force and guile, but with the new weapons in the contest of "political economy" rather than "tooth and fang".

Take unemployment, for example. In the most economically advanced contemporary countries the percentage of the total available work force that is unemployed ranges from on the order of 5% to 15% or more. In a country with a work force of 100,000,000 persons that would represent from 5,000,000 to 15,000,000 persons wishing to participate productively in the economy and unable to do so.

All countries have many unfilled needs: repair and improvement of roads, water supplies, sewers, bridges, etc.; better hospitals and medical care; better schooling and teachers; better quality of life for the ill, infirm and elderly; relief of poverty and so forth. The contribution that could be made by those unemployed to resolving those problems is wasted by their unemployment. From 5% to 15% of all the useful results that the society could have is utterly wasted.

In spite of their unemployment those unemployed persons are, nevertheless, eating, wearing clothing, living in residences and in general otherwise similarly surviving. Why would a society elect to feed, clothe and house (albeit minimally) a significant part of its population free to those recipient persons and not permit them to contribute to productive output and the improvement of the society's condition ?

From the point of view of economics it is ridiculous. The economy should be planned and operated so that everyone who can contribute is enabled and encouraged to do so. That course of action would maximize total output and benefit everyone (if the society is being operated equitably, that is to benefit everyone).

But, societies today are not being operated to benefit everyone. They are operated to benefit the top of the economic pyramid at the expense of the rest. That is the current operation of the age-old survival competition. Therefore, from the point of view of political economy, the tool of the ruling wealthy in their operation of society for their benefit, the unemployment makes good sense.

The on-going existence of a substantial number of unemployed persons puts pressure on the rest of the population that lies beneath the economic

pyramid's peak. It helps keep them and the economic imbalance under control to maintain the wealthy rulers in power.

- It holds wages down and increases the wealthy's profits.
- It reduces the likelihood that social resentment might turn into protest action because those who are employed do not wish to risk becoming unemployed.
- It pits one part of the population against another tending to prevent their uniting in opposition to their oppressors, deflecting just resentment that should be directed against those oppressors into resentment against their fellow victims.

And who bears this social cost (both the cost of the lost productive output and the cost of allocating part of what productive output remains to feeding, clothing and housing those unfortunate unemployed)? The wealthy rulers? Of course not. The cost comes out of part of the national product that might otherwise go to the general populace' benefit. That is highly effective political economy in operation.

That state of affairs is totally foreign to rationality. A rational society, a society populated by intelligent beings functioning cooperatively and creatively instead of competitively and destructively, would insure that all of its citizens can be productively active according to their abilities and state in life. The objective of such a society would be the maximizing of the quality of life for all of the citizenry. Such would be the function and objective of societal planning and administration.

But, whatever rationality we have is not used to operate our society to the optimization of benefit for all. It is used to pursue, as we see it, our own individual benefit. We just as surely are caught in constant competition and struggle in our supposedly civilized societies as our primitive forbears were in their wild and barbaric environments.

The most favorite response of the beneficiaries of this unfortunate state of affairs to criticism of it as the above is, "Well, do you of know anything better?" This curious response is popular, also, with some of the victims of the system who, nevertheless, think of themselves as beneficiaries. (Usually this is because they have some other groups of people to "look down on". They consequently can use that to think of themselves as being at least a little "on top".)

The response "do you know of anything better?" is actually a direct agreement that the above presentation of the state of affairs is correct because it acknowledges, by failure to present opposing arguments, that there are none. There can be no argument against it, no contention in logic and rationality in favor of "political economy" and opposed to "economics". But, that "do you know of anything better?" response is intended as an effective destruction of all criticism of "political economy" and, curiously, most people accept that response as valid and, therefore, they accept the manipulation of their life by "political economy" as the best that they can do.

THE PROBLEM OF CIVILIZATION

What is civilization ? Civilization is the state of condition of persons living and functioning together, jointly, cooperatively so that they produce and experience the benefits of so living and functioning jointly and cooperatively. The word "civilization" derives from the Roman word for "city". It implies a society involving cities, and cities involve people living and acting together, jointly, cooperatively, interactively.

That as counter-posed to people living singly or in very small units, on their own, individually, independently.

Thus civilization involves social cooperation, the opposite of individualism's "rugged independence" and its competitive survival of the fittest. Civilization involves joint survival via joint action. Only civilization is capable of providing improved quality of life: security, material abundance, the arts, culture, the possibility of individual fulfillment and of happiness.

Individualism pursues return to the original state, the opposite of civilization, the consequent survival competition, the state of the animals unable to function in any mode other than the competition for survival.

The future of mankind is civilization. Civilization builds on our only real biological advantage -- intelligence and rationality. Civilization implies, means, requires: society, communal action, social sharing, "socialism" and, ultimately, communism, the full cooperative sharing with our fellow persons. Human society must, and it therefore will, so become or we will regress to the animals from which we came.

To support the development of civilization is to be a civilized person. To oppose it is to be primitive, barbarian, essentially an animal.

But, what is the purpose of civilization ? What is the purpose of the social structure that we create ? Certainly the structure is not an end in itself.

To we humans what matters is our personal and individual security, fulfillment and happiness. Therefore, the purpose of civilization must be to promote and achieve that goal.

- The society exists for its individual members --
not the individual members existing for the society.
- The economy exists for society's individual members --
not the members existing for the economy.
- The government exists for the members of society --
not the members existing for the government.

The societal structures are our creation. They are tools which we have made to achieve our objectives. It is we who must use and control them, not they us.

But, the natural characteristics that we humans bring to the problem of managing our life and our society are largely self-defeating:

- Dominant self-interest and competition to obtain as much as possible for ourselves rather than the cooperation and team work that can produce more for everyone including ourselves, and
- Natural laziness that seeks to let the other person put out the effort and do the work.

In consequence we are saddled with a society operated for the benefit of a few at the expense of the many, a society in which the populace exists for the economy rather than the economy serving the populace, a society in which people are economic units deemed only as workers or as consumers, their only role being to function economically.

But, of course we "know of something better", and it is high time that we got on with it.

SECTION 30

The Evolution to Civilization

Love, the humane society of social love, true civilization -- that is the "something better" that we know of. But, can it be? Is it really possible? How?

WHY THE SOCIETY OF SOCIAL LOVE IS ESSENTIAL

It was stated earlier in this work (the third paragraph of section 21 - *The Probable End*) as an inevitable conclusion from the development:

"Truth is that which conforms to and describes reality. Reality is that which is, not only matter and energy in their various forms but also: feelings and emotions, ideas and cultures, languages and arts, and so forth. Whether we can know, sense, measure or understand some aspect of reality or not it still, nevertheless, is."

Why is this so important? Because, the most significant characteristic of the 20th Century, other than its explosion of technology, was its adoption of the diametrically opposite attitude toward truth and reality -- that truth is different for each person and each case, that it is what each individual perceives it to be -- that there is no objective reality, only the subjective reality as perceived by each individual -- that all is relative.

Aside from the damage that such thinking has done to scientific progress, its most severe damage is the license that it gives. It gives license to create, choose, decide upon one's own "reality" and then act accordingly. "If truth is only my truth then I can have whatever truth I like. If there is no objective reality then I may do as I wish without regard for the effect on others." Such thinking ultimately gives us war, rapine, holocausts.

But, if there is an objective reality, objective truth, then, even if we are not able to completely know and understand it we are still subject to it, still measured and judged by it, and we feel compelled to behave accordingly.

Thus objective reality and objective truth, which indeed are, are also desirable, beneficial to society. If we must have a god, a standard and judge of behavior, then objective truth and reality are that.

Two fundamental social or societal conclusions that can be drawn from reality, drawn from experience, follow. They are so obvious that their proof is in their statement.

First

The only way for one to receive humane treatment is for another person to give it. But, we all are "another person" to other persons.

Therefore, the only way for us all to consistently receive humane treatment is for us all to consistently give humane treatment.

Second

In a society functioning on competition for wealth, power, and control there will always be a pyramid of success having a small number of winners at the top and the rest of the people below.

Therefore the chance of being a winner is quite small.

In the material competition the vast majority of us are *losers* not *winners*. That is in the very nature of the competitive mode. The competition can produce only a very small number of *winners*; there has to be a very large number of *losers* to support the economic / social imbalance, for the pyramid arrangement to function.

Furthermore, that arrangement inherently requires a tremendous waste of resources and dissipation of otherwise attainable progress that could benefit all of us, all of society. Those resources and that potential progress and improved quality of life, rather than going to our benefit, are taken from us by our masters, our conquerors the *winners*, in the cost of their maintaining their position and the repression of us.

There is only one solution, only one reasonable course of action for we *losers* to take. We must stop playing that game; we must change the rules.

- Would we like to be on top, the *winners* in that competition ?

Yes, of course we would.

- Have we any hope of that ?

No, no way.

- Well then, in that case, do we then want "good", "right" and "fair" to rule ?

Of course we do. It is the only way that we can at least be partial *winners*, the only way that we can avoid being total *losers*.

WHY THE SOCIETY OF SOCIAL LOVE IS POSSIBLE

It is not easy to so change the rules.

Our behavior throughout our lives is a constant struggle between: on the one hand the motivations of our material nature to survive, to hunt, gather and eat, competing to what ever extent necessary to accomplish those goals and "devil take the hindmost"; and on the other hand the motivations of our rationality, our sense and our conscience, which keep speaking to us about "good" and "bad", "right" and "wrong", "love", "justice" and "fairness".

THE ORIGIN AND ITS MEANING

As our intelligence has gradually developed we have, nevertheless, been dominated by the material origin of our nature. It is so ingrained in us that we cannot easily act contrary to it. Yet, we have arrived at the point where our experience shows us that our capitulation to our material side is self-defeating.

History and experience demonstrate absolutely that so long as our society functions according to its material "survival of the fittest", competitive mode, that long will it be the pyramid of a very small number of dominating *winner*s at the top and a vast mass of deprived, repressed humanity, the *losers*, underneath, supporting those few *winner*s.

But, we are all victims of "the prisoner's dilemma". The dilemma, which can be presented in various forms, is as follows. Two persons are captured by authorities as suspects of having committed a crime, are held prisoner and are kept and interrogated separately. Each is told, "If you will cooperate and implicate the other then you will be treated leniently."

The problem of each of the prisoners is that if the authorities had sufficient proof they would not need the sought confessions nor the implicating of the partner prisoner. Therefore if both prisoners are silent they will go free. But, if either prisoner accepts the authorities' "deal" the other prisoner will suffer the full penalty.

Should the prisoner being questioned accept the partial benefit of leniency assuming that he cannot rely upon his partner's loyalty, or should he go for total freedom counting on his partner's doing the same, but at the risk of the full penalty because of his partner having testified against him to obtain leniency ?

In society, if we all behave humanely (both prisoners refuse to confess) we all benefit. But if some persons pursue wealth, power and control (our partner prisoner implicates us) while the rest of us assume that everyone is cooperating (while we were loyal to him), then that rest of us become the base of the pyramid supporting the aggressive few (he gets off and we get the full penalty).

If we cannot count on our fellow citizens' abstaining from power and exploitation (if we are not sure our partner prisoner will stay loyal), are we not better off taking "half a cake rather than none" by pursuing whatever small wealth, power and control we can (implicating our partner to obtain leniency) ?

Clearly, the prisoners dilemma situation favors those who have captured the prisoners and hold them incommunicado. Likewise, in society the situation favors those who are the aggressive pursuers of wealth, power and control and operates against the majority of the citizenry who would like a humane environment but find it difficult to progress toward it.

At every moment our material nature and self-deluding perceived opportunities to win tempt us back to the old ways. Only fixing our gaze on the irrevocable fact, we cannot be winners so let's be cooperators, can save us.

The solution to the dilemma is to implement the desired social policy not by radical change but by progressive development of social thinking. Individuals can only be counted on to behave at a level of social responsibility and

humaneness that corresponds to the more or less social norm of their time and environment. It is hopeless to count on heroic, altruistic or even citizen-like motivation to improve society.

The change in attitude toward social behavior, the improved concept of what is socially criminal must evolve. It must come from the people and become part of what the people are. It must come about not as an overtly or formally agreed upon rule but, rather, as the gradually developed innate ethic, the fundamental *moré* that we live by.

We must come to feel about struggling to climb to the top on the backs of our fellow persons as we now feel about neglecting our children, murdering our parents, hypocrisy, stealing and lying.

It is easy to say such things, to advocate such goals and behavior; the history of mankind is replete with such advocacy. But, how do we actually move toward the goal? How do words become actions?

Curiously, the method is quite simple and has already long existed and operated. That is why we have made the small progress that has been obtained so far in progressing toward true civilization. Throughout our history we have, in fact, been following the method, not consciously but nevertheless inevitably. We need now merely recognize it, consciously adopt and pursue it, and hone the method to maximum effectiveness by working to accelerate its operation. The method operates as follows.

Because, apparently, we are basically well-intentioned beings when not in too dire straits, and because we are rather weak in ambition, self control, and self discipline, the standards that we proclaim are always significantly higher than our actual performance relative to those standards. Prodded by our inner conscience, we are always contending levels of social and personal moral and ethical behavior that are significantly above the levels at which we actually perform. That behavior has so characterized human behavior and the human experience over so many millennia that one is forced to conclude that it is inherent in us.

(That conclusion is not unreasonable. Our standards would tend to be based on our desires for ourselves, how we would wish to be treated. Our external behavior must in addition deal with our laziness and our inherent competitiveness in the struggle for survival.)

That very fact, that very characteristic of us as sentient beings, has produced the moral and ethical progress we have so far achieved. And, while we see a long path of needed progress ahead of us; nevertheless, we have already progressed by a significant distance from our animal origins.

- Because the level of our intentions is higher than that of our performance there is continuous pressure tending to produce some consequent progress in the raising of our performance.
- As our performance improves our standards of behavior, our intentions, also tend to rise.

THE ORIGIN AND ITS MEANING

- This process iterates generation by generation and yields the extremely slow but inexorable progress that we have made and are making.

This does not really require that individuals change as individuals. Rather, the advance is by generations. The point to which society has arrived by virtue of the progress that the prior generation made is simply to the next generation the way things always were, the usual, normal, taken for granted status of society. It is their starting point.

Societally we tend to perform, on the average, at the average level of our standards. That average includes all of the range from high noble standards at one end of the range to the worst aspects of current society at the other. As a result there is some pressure to eliminate or ameliorate those worst aspects. And the result of that elimination or relief of the worst aspects is a new, somewhat higher average level of the standard because it is now an average over the same range of values except that it omits the eliminated worst aspects.

We even tend to further elevate our most noble standards at the high end of the range because the elimination of our current worst aspects of society and the consequent rise in our average standards tend to make new higher standards seem to be more possible. They become reasonable when before they had seemed to be hopelessly unrealistic.

Thus we see that the evolution to a humane society, to true civilization, is possible. That evolution is going on now; it has been going on and it will continue to do so. Its action has been and is innate, inherent, a natural aspect of human society .

But the progress is slow, agonizingly and sufferingly slow.

HOW THE SOCIETY OF SOCIAL LOVE CAN BE ACHIEVED

Then, how can we further this action, contribute to this progress, hone the method to greater effectiveness ? By doing these three things.

- Recognize that this process occurs and is the means to ultimate humane, rational civilization and, therefore, work personally to raise standards and eliminate worst aspects of society.
- Enlist, inform and educate fellow men, society, in that recognition, that work, and that contribution to progress.
- Persist. Work hard at the project and persist in patience.

The goal cannot be achieved by coercion. It cannot be achieved by some special elite. It cannot be achieved by asking for heroic or even merely special sacrifice by people. All of those methods have been tried by religions, governments and revolutionaries with their supposed elites of clergy or statesmen or party leaders. In spite of its initial self-sacrificing dedication the leadership eventually always gives in to the temptation to use its dominant position to further its own selfish interests and to abandon the pursuit of the people's overall individual and collective social interests.

A truly humane and rationally ordered society can only come from the people, can only be achieved by the gradual evolution of society over the generations, over generations of reducing and eliminating bad and raising standards of good. The humane society can only be achieved by generations of evolving the innate standards of all mankind to the level that social love is reasonable and natural.

But, the need for patience, the fact of slow progress, or the multi-generational length of the task must never excuse failure to diligently strive for the goal. Every individual is either part of the solution or part of the problem. He is either a contributor to the betterment of mankind or in actual effect, and therefore in fact, a supporter of the continuing of the so damaging, so wasteful, competitive jungle of human society. There is no "neutral ground" no non-involvement.

CONCLUSION

The import, the message of this entire work, is as follows.

There is no God, no divine justice, no "fairness" at all. The universe is, itself, a non-sentient, non-"feeling", material existence. It does not "care". It simply functions according to its natural nature, according to essentially simple modes of behavior set by its nature. It is, and it "behaves" in a manner that is neither "good" nor "bad" in the ethical or moral sense. "Good", "bad", and "fair" are values that arise out of intelligence out of reasoning applied to experience.

We (and presumably other) rational beings who have arisen through the operation of that universe are a special "hybrid" a combination of:

- all of the natural consequences of a material universe operating according to its nature, the competition for survival, and*
- the judgmental concepts that rationality gives rise to: "right" and "wrong", "good" and "bad", "love", "justice" and "fairness".*

These two aspects of our nature arose from the natural universe and are part of its nature; but, there is, nevertheless, no universal or cosmic enforcement of those judgmental values that arise from intelligence.

Their implementation is up to us, to us "on our own", alone.

If we persist in our pursuit of self-interested personal welfare, personal satisfaction and gain, with poor regard for our neighbor, then we shall be victims condemned by ourselves as the inevitable consequence of our own actions to being and living in such a society.

If we face up to these truths and participate rationally in society and humanely in our lives and day to day existence with each other, then we shall, to that extent, enjoy the benefits of such a society.

And,

If we teach others these truths and if we are each a humane example then we will bring the civilization of social love into being.

This is not a matter of morals or some objective rule imposed from outside our society. Rather, it is the only way to our ultimate successful functioning as a society of rational beings.

The task is, then, to create true civilization, a society of truth, love and justice. The method is to shift society gradually but persistently ever more and more in the direction of disapproval and non-acceptance of social injustice and of personal selfish, aggressive, self-centered behavior.

We must become the environment in which we wish to be. That "becoming" is the final stage of our evolution.

Re-phrasing the comment Beethoven placed in the score of his last string quartet:

"Kann es sein ?" [Can it be ?]

"Es muss sein."

It must be.

Postlogue

To those of far future generations to whom all expressed here should be obvious, simple, and a natural and inherent part of your understanding of yourselves and of the reality in which you exist:

For we, who dragged ourselves a small distance farther up the beach from the primordial sea that was the biological origin of us all, whatever progress we achieved was at the cost of very hard work, struggle and suffering, suffering most likely unbearable to you and, somehow, barely bearable to us. Not only that: the new level achieved, whether ours or yours, is always fragile.

Civilization, rationality, and love are only realized and only maintained by constant effort, close attention, intense dedication; they can be lost far more easily than they are gained.

EPILOGUE 1

*So, now, here we have reality,
a natural universe that came from nothing
and, eventually, will so disperse itself
as to return to, essentially, nothing.*

*And which, during its brief, but glorious
transit from nothing ... to nothing,
evolves rational Life.*

*Life, magnificent in potential and capability,
dreadfully fettered by its natural origin;
what will become of it ?*

*Will the society of social love evolve
and crown natural reality
with its beauty and magnificence ?*

*Perhaps.
One can dream.*

The path is understanding:

*understanding our origin,
understanding our natural nature,
using the unavoidable facts that so fetter us
-- the now innate personal survival
and dominant self interest --
to construct, even from these,
the civilization of mankind,
of Life.*

*But, is there no objective standard of good and bad,
of right and wrong ?*

It would seem not ... yet ...

There are, and have always been

*Truth and Beauty,
Love and Compassion,
Justice and Equity,
Rationality, Culture and Humanism.*

*But they exist not in realization
but only as ideals.*

*They have always existed
because they are universal.
Their existence does not depend upon implementation.
They exist in and of themselves as natural principles.*

*They are the only permanent reality,
the only infinite reality.*

They ... they are God.

*They cause ?
Yes, they cause events, behavior.*

*They judge ?
They are the judge of all that we do.*

*They think ?
Yes, but not in our searching, learning sense. Rather,
they know.*

*They create, not imperatively but by urging.
They tend-urge all to form to their model.*

*Do they have power ?
They have more power than anything else,
They have supreme power.*

*Do they love ?
They Are love.*

*Can we communicate with God ?
Yes, by our thought, intent, behavior.*

*Can we participate in God ?
Yes, to the extent that we, also, become:*

*Truth and Beauty,
Love and Compassion,
Justice and Equity,
Rationality, Culture, and Humanism.*

EPILOGUE 2

*The greatest good
is love,
and the greatest bad, death.*

*Love is giving, sharing, being.
Death is taking, denying -- termination.*

*It is not life and death which are opposites
but love and death.
One can be "alive" but dead;
but, one cannot have loved and be dead
even though "dead".
Love surpasses even the end of life.*

*The end of life is assured all of us,
but of love none is assured.*

*But love is within our power;
we can create it,
bring it into being,
give and share it
at will.*

*Likewise death, but -- living should be love.
We opt for that and,
in so doing
create life
and survive even beyond death.*