Decline and Fall of All Evil

The Most Important Discovery of Our Times

Seymour Lessans
Compiled and edited by Janis Rafael

Safeworld Publishing Company
ASafeWorld@aol.com
www.declineandfallofallevil.com

Order this book online at trafford.com
or email orders @trafford.com

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

Lessans, Seymour, 1918-1991
Decline and fall of all evil : the most important discovery of our times /Seymour Lessans; compiled and edited by Janis Rafael.

p. ; cm.

ISBN: 978-1-55395-330-2 (pbk.)

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

BJ1401 .L47 2002
170

Trafford Publishing
North America & International
toll-free 1 888 232 4444 (USA)
phone 250 383 6864 & fax 812 355 4082

Imprint: Safeworld Publishing Company

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 note 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 acknowledged for its contribution. Due to the time lapse since the book's last printing the editor has added some recent examples 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. For purposes of consistency the personal pronoun 'he' has been used throughout the book. No discrimination was intended.

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.

FOREWORD

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 studied thoroughly before any other reading is done, a table of contents has been omitted to preclude as much as possible someone reading 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. Though we are well into the 21st century, this discovery has yet to be given a thorough investigation by 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 20th 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 100% 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."

Skepticism is not the primary problem that is preventing this knowledge from coming to light, as everyone who hears of my discovery would be skeptical. The main problem is 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 "scientificality" 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, for which no one is to blame, 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 applecart 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

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 prophesies, 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."

"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 <u>why</u> 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 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 <u>good</u> 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.