

Lorenzo Calabi - Daniel C. Dennett
Andre Glucksmann - Jorge Wagensberg

Coordinator Josep Maria Colomer

CHALLENGES OF THE XXI CENTURY

AN ESSAY REGARDING GENOMIC
EQUALITY IN THE HUMAN SPECIES

Catalunya
Fundació Privada

AWARD

Convened in 2007

DIVULGARE LIBRARY

Edition for free circulation
January 2009

All rights reserved by Catalunya Fundació Privada
Rambla Nova 106-bis 7º 4ª - 43001 Tarragona

No part of this publication may be reproduced without the
permission of the copyright owner.

Cataloguing Publication Data: T-2202-2008

LITERARY ESSAY AWARD
SEPTEMBER 2007

SPONSORS

Catalunya Fundació Privada

FUNDACIO.CAT@telefonica.net

Fondazione Etruria

fondetruria@gmail.com

Many thanks to the members of the jury that
conceded this award for their disinterested
collaboration.

Mr Marcel Banús. Professor of Philology, URV
Mr Josep M^a Busquets. Engineer
Mr Luca Giorgi. Literary consultant

CONTENTS

FIRST PART

TO KNOW-TO BELIEVE

Ages of matter - The fundamental, the natural,
the cultural and the civilized - Exclusively by Jorge Wagensberg
Pages 10-41

1-What Darwin omitted	2-10
2-From dangerous ideas to empirical realities	41-45
3-The struggle for existence and natural selection	45-48
4-Individual and collective abilities	48-52
5-Professionalized politics omnipresence	52-56
6-Globalization	56-64
7-Post-Darwinism	64-66
8-God or Darwin?	66-68
9-God and Darwin?	68-70

SECOND PART THE CHALLENGERS AND THE CHALLENGED

Immediate challenges to world government.- Exclusively by André
Glucksmann Pages. 72-88

10-To Live - To Think	71-71
11- The challenge of Islam	88-100
12- The challenge of Judaism and to Judaism	101-105
13- The challenge to Christianity	105-109
14- The Russian challenge and the challenge to Russia	109-118
15- The Eastern challenge and the challenge to the East	118-137
16- The challenge to the West	137-185
17- The challenge to the Earth	185-192

THIRD PART

FACING THE CHALLENGES

Evolution and the spirit of an age- Exclusively by Lorenzo Calabi
Pages 210-236

18.-Investigating the causes	193-209
19.-Flexibility and practise	237-242
20.-From aristocracy to partitocracy	243-250
21.-Renovation	250-256
22.-Territory and Nation	256-265
23.-The human dream - Kant	266-276

FOURTH PART

STABILITY

In Darwin's wake- Exclusively by Daniel C-Dennet
Pages. 279-293

24-Darwinian Synthesis	277-279
25-Biological Synthesis	293-303
Corollary	303-304
Bibliography	305-316
Synopsis	1-11

Index

<u>Ref.</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Pages</u>
1	Darwin	(2)(6)(42)(43)(49)(276)
2	Knowledge	(3)(195)
3	Evolution	(4)(8)(94)
4	Bacon - Hume	(5)(50)
5	Religion	(6)(52) (66)(105)(128)(277)
6	Mendel - Maltus	(43)(44)(187)(295)
7	Natural selection	(45)
8	Abilities	(48)(174)(278)
9	Syncretisms	(49)
10	Politics	(53)(56)(62)(169)(196)
11	Globalization	(56)
12	Neo-darwinism	(64)
13	Islam	(89)(95)
14	Judaism	(101)(104)
15	Russia	(109)(113)
16	Democracy	(117)(247)
17	East	(118)(128)(132)(136)
18	Language	(122)(144)
19	West	(126)(137)(151)(155)(159)(177)(179)
20	Demography	(160)(177)(298)
21	USA	(172)(176)(203)
22	Ecology	(185)(189)
23	System	(55)(162)(261)
24	Nature	(237)
25	Government	(240)(251)(257)(264)(299)(302)
26	Peoples	(242)
27	Pollutions	(61)
28	Fears	(133)(149)(179)(190)
29	Particracy	(54)(243)
30	Decadence	(171)
31	Oil	(98)(188)(189)(207)
32	Education	(157)(195)(200)(205)
33	Races	(59)(123)

FIRST PART

TO KNOW-TO BELIEVE

1.-What Darwin omitted

(1) We will probably never know if in the content of “The origin of species” by Darwin, and the rest of his works that follow that same train of thought, the author had complete awareness of the challenge that this work would imply for all religious beliefs, particularly for the three monotheistic ones that have evolved from the Bible. Finding this out is important, but what can be said today is that from the evolutionary process in general, and of the human beings specifically, described in his complete works, it is impossible for us to assume that Darwin wasn't aware of the existing radical contradiction between his ideas and the biblical contents. Darwin's observation of the diversity of certain organs in one same species, consequence of developments conditioned by different climatic environments, -although retaining that which is essential to the species, the faculty of mating and procreation-, shows the reality of life creation by earthly causes-effects. And on the other hand his profound knowledge of the Genesis as a future priest, provoked his renunciation of the priesthood, and at the same time the decision of studying nature from then on, from which dedication the basic idea of his theory of evolution was born. And so a dichotomy impossible to disguise was produced. His intellectual and physical activity was to discover all “things” -realities.

His idea of evolution, evidently rational, authentic biological discovery, has only been rational theory until recently Joan Oró discovered indications showing that inorganic matters, under certain conditions have the faculty of becoming organic matters, thus transforming the darwinian theory in a near empirical reality. We can practically consider that it is. The exhaustive “naturalistic” study carried out by Darwin contributed ideas that, although aren't definitive in the verification of life creation through evolution, they do deny the veracity of biblical creation. The updating of the darwinian theory as opposed to the Genesis -or even to the Intelligent Project, a present-day invention that attempts to rationalize the naivety of divine creation by a being in the image of human beings—, destroys the God or evolution dichotomy, in an evident manner. Darwin must have known, but he must also have seen the consequences of what was a challenge to the churches. Now all we have to do is to discover the process of essential change from inorganic to organic changes, in order to (following the furrows opened up by Oró) transform the darwinian theory -already neo-darwinian- in a scientific reality.

Excluding the issue that metaphysics has only raised, why, what for, and how life has been created in the universe, relying on

science to obtain knowledge in relation to this fundamental issue, what is important regarding the development of our evolution, is that we consider its rationality. The process of life creation through evolution is driven by natural selection -an idea of Darwin as transcendental as evolution itself-, and that selection is produced through the consciousness of pleasure and pain. The feeling of pleasure produces in turn the desire of BEING and REMAINING. In the evolution of this process the unique conscience emerges, that of human beings, in their thinking-feeling complexities, the human soul, neither good nor bad. Selfish. And that is why the struggle for existence appears, a struggle that brings about selection. Biochemistry, genetics, neurology, biology and science in general are replacing metaphysics, and by logic, the understanding of this evolutionary process, that allows us to hope that the issues that have been marginalised will, in a more or less distant future, be equally understood just as we now understand our origin.

An understanding that, apparently, Darwin also did not grasp, since in his written works he didn't touch this essential subject. Whether or not the omission was due to a lack of knowledge, attributing it to the dominant closed and dark atmosphere of his time. An environment in which he lived uncomfortably in spite of his efforts to compromise readily all he could in order to avoid personal clashes. Now, darwinians make life uncomfortable to their opposite creatives. The first book of the Bible, the Genesis, has been nullified.

Human knowledge can only sense the infinity or the vastness of the Universe; sense its creation through the Big Bang or sense its existence from the beginning of time; sense its limited future or infinite time; and sense the transcendence of the reality of its own existence, by being or not being unique and limited existing conscience in the Universe. It's the path of total knowledge, opened up by evolution that does not cease, or by its extinction together with the Earth's extinction, in the process of continuous universal transformation. In this cosmic perspective, sensing and knowing with the maximum rationality have an open future. Knowing more. Believing, diminishes the possibilities of increasing knowledge, and instead of predicting, it assures the extinction of current beliefs, as extinct as all the predecessors in the continuous deistic syncretism of religion have turned out to be.

(2) The current lack of anthropological knowledge is a reflection of the even bigger lack of basic or empirical knowledge of the creative process that was before the existence of animal species. This lack of basic knowledge referred to how we were created, doesn't deprive us of considering that more than being preferable it is compulsory to possess little knowledge rather than to have many beliefs, especially when that which is believed because we lack the

knowledge is known to be impossible. According to the reasoning supported on the analytical systems that have positioned palaeoanthropology on the level of empirical knowledge to determine the age of fossils, we can be sure that there was nothing truthful about all the Genesis designed by human beings. What is least important is the so called historical details of the characters that allegedly featured in the stories told in them. And even less important are all the imagined stories of savage tribes, some of them having a poetic background, badly expressed but more beautiful than the anthropocentric genesis of monotheistic religions. The primitiveness of the inventors of such imaginations, and the imaginations themselves, discard completely their verisimilitude.

(3) The idea of the evolution of species, and that everything that exists on Earth is the result of an evolution -and often, also the result of a regression-, is accepted today by all those that pursue reality through rational thinking. The theory enunciated by Darwin is currently understood and accepted, if not by all, by most of the scientific community and the well read and reflective humanity. This evolutionism clashes with beliefs, since numerous and powerful nuclei that deny the darwinian theory, with time more active, continue to exist, defending against all evidence the world creationist idea, ignoring the world itself and its belonging to the universe, not even imagined. And it is also true that not all the self-proclaimed evolutionists have fully understood the revolution provoked by Darwin's idea, and the enormous implications it has in our vision of the world, including many aspects that affect its governing and its future.

The idea of creative evolution is recent. It came after Darwin's essential contribution, now a century and a half old, that restricted itself to explaining evolution, not the creation of species, even though his main book was called "The Origin of Species". This idea has been complemented and in certain aspects modified by neodarwinism, in parallel and above all by the studies about genetic legacy discovered by Mendel, and has acquired its current form thanks to the inevitable connection between the contributions of both discoverers, in relation to the causes of the existence of life, and its development. So it is understood that before these two discoverers we could not talk about the existence of non-believers, in spite of the existence of pre-evolutionists like Lamarck. Divine creation was practically the only way human beings could explain the existence of the world and for this millions of years had to go by for both naturalists to appear.

Each of the natural communities built a divine explanation, fitting in with the world they knew, and according to their level of cultural development. In some cases, these natural worlds were really small. Others were more vast and more complex. But the gods

were always omnipresent in the religions that later on became mythology, as they were in the creativist religions prior to monotheist religions, and specially in the latter. The existence of an incomprehensible and wonderful world led them to generate the existence of a creative God, or different gods. And the existence of these gods led to generate a privileged and different corporation, one that is in direct contact with the divinity and looks after the maintenance of these beliefs: the different clergies that have existed during human presence on Earth, are (as they continue to exist) the most permanent corporation -together with politicians- in the history of humanity.

It is a paradox of our XXI century, and at the same time one of its biggest challenges, that in spite of the existence of the Theory of Evolution that has been formulated rationally, and partially supported by important empirical knowledge, wide sectors of the world population continue to be marginalised, or have an attitude that is against this theory. They are primarily the sectors that consider themselves believers, monopolising a word that they should share, for one can also be a believer of other ideas, non-religious ideas. Different clergies and believers of the creationist religions, being convinced of the fact that the divinity is the creator of the whole universe -when we don't even have an idea of its size- and denying the creative power of evolution, confront rationality and try to impose their principles -not their values. ¿Are there many of these believers? Probably less than those that claim to be so, if we take into consideration, for example, children's incorporation to churches, with ceremonies like baptism. That is why we can consider that the number of official believers of churches exceeds the real believers that actually have these beliefs. But the opposite phenomenon is also true. That of the people that join the believers' community later in life, and that they do it then with the added fervour of the convert.

(4) Until Darwin, rationalism and empiricism that had initiated their development in Europe, did not clash openly with creationism. Important and profound thinkers like Bacon, having laid the foundations of empiricism, restrained themselves in the issue of the creationist ideas, which were dominant and nearly unique in their time. Later on Locke, and Hume mainly, defined empiricism, dedicating their meditation to creativism, considering it negatively. In Hume's case, he even suffered imprisonment because of his ideas rigidly rooted in empiricism, which would even lead him to confront with rationalism, to which he attributed a dangerous intuitive background that distorted realities empirically established. And neither did the central european thinkers, always with one foot in metaphysics, even when they finally started to consider darwinian ideas, want to confront directly with creationism. They didn't think that evolutionism and creationism clashed from the root, and they

tried walking on a tight rope, with the background of Plato's and Aristotle's classical philosophy, embedded to this day in the mind of important thinkers, inclined towards these two philosophical icons of classicism, more because of their brilliant style which marked the age, than because of the content of their philosophy which was marked by the lack of knowledge to formulate it rationally.

(1) On the other hand, this is not odd, since Darwin himself avoided inasmuch as he could this confrontation and wanted to circumscribe his revolutionary idea of human thought, to an evolutionary process of the species focusing almost at its end, and therefore without touching its most radically revolutionary aspect, that of the capacity of life creation through evolution, in spite of his discoveries of creation of certain organs in subspecies within the species he studied. This could be a prudence which, in his case, might have had the name of a woman: his wife, Emma, faithful believer and one whom Darwin would not have wished to upset. This hypothesis seems probable, given the fact that in private conversations that have been reflected by his interlocutors' comments he stated that he gave up becoming a priest because of the discoveries he obtained in his philosophical-naturalistic dedication. It could be that the reaction of the intellectual community of his time against the announcement of these discoveries led him to introduce in a successive edition of the "Origin...", the possibility that the evolutionary system by natural selection could only have been a continuation of a creative action -of the Universe and not only of the species. An action that would have been necessarily carried out by a Creator, as each theology emphasizes.

(5) In such a hypothesis, it's incomprehensible that, facing the creativists' poor argumentation, it has not been used to deduce that this Creator -of necessary omnipotent power in order to create the Universe- did not intentionally create the species with a perfect design at the moment of their creation, and also designed human beings as beautiful, intelligent, good and happy specimens. And that the divine delight generated by the creation of the Universe and human beings in this corner of a galaxy named Earth, led him to wish that human beings could have at their disposal the same source of delight in the re-creation of themselves in following stages through evolution by selection, endowing them with the appropriate genome to do so.

Any other reason as the proposed is not a valid argument, if it entails the disappearance of teleology -since beginning and end would be already established, although theology could persist- because in all cases of creation the irrationality of the Bible would be made clear, since evolution has taken place over millions of years, a fact of no controversy according to the paleontological traces that

have been appearing -besides malthusian and darwinian theories-, certified by analysis of absolute reliability.

¿What would be left of the monotheistic religions, that are still the belligerent ones, without the biblical fundamentals?

Rationalising religions implies an absolute abandonment of these fundamentals. And focusing the future on the basis of a rational vision of the future, not a teleological one nor the outcome of a creation made by a being in our own image, but strictly on the basis of our ignorance of the past, and concrete desire of the future.

Since Saint Peter, centuries after Aristarchus, and the following Popes that have been unable to ignore him, until the appearance of naturalists, astronomers and philosophers, among them many priests some of which were sacrificed by their own churches, they coexisted with Copernicus (1473)– Bruno (1544)– Bacon (1561)– Galileo(1564)– Kepler (1577)– Locke (1632– Newton (1648) –Hume (1711)– Lamarck (1744)– Malthus (1766) and Darwin (1804). Up until now, religions have fought against the root of the issue these thinkers have developed on a rational or empirical basis depending on the case, without any religion making any argumentative contribution against it that would be acceptable without insulting the intelligence of human beings in each time period. ¿Could it be a favourable sign of positive rectification, given the pronounced interest of the Vatican, expressed through significant voices showing the desire to combine creed and knowledge? Or just as happens in politics with the electorate, the parishioners can deprive, not the combination of creed and knowledge, but the desirable rectification of the idea of creation of live species on Earth supported on their biblical stories? If the interest for update, overcoming all the difficulties -that are a lot, and very difficult to surmount- could produce this rectification, the churches that would do it would lose little, in all senses, since the reality is already known by nearly all human beings that have a criteria to express themselves. And these churches would preserve their existence.

This is one of the challenges. An important challenge. So important that, if a great rectification in the churches took place, the christian ones to start with, the aim of having all Constitutions turning religions (in plural) into the suggested reference for catholicism as a civilizing factor would be justified.

Having reached the XX century and at the beginning of the XXI, we face the paradoxical situation that we mentioned before. Science and reason accept unanimously the darwinian evolutionist principles. And there is also an awareness of the profound practical, and even political, consequences of this acceptance. At the same time, there is a wide number of people in real society that cannot avoid believing. They maintain creationist convictions, that collide with

science and rationalism. And the problem is that this confrontation does not only take place in the domain of intimate beliefs. From these beliefs, attitudes towards the social body are generated. Attempts to impose moral principles, attempts to turn faith into civil law, religious sins into penal crimes. Religion-based creationism - understood as cosmogony, but also as the source of certainties that want to be imposed in politics, morals or education- is enormously strong in the United States. The north-american evangelical churches have gone very far, and with more virulence than catholicism, in their defense of a creationism that goes against all empiricist and rationalist philosophical movements. They have taken the active defenders of darwinism to court, wanting to portray them as followers of a scientological superstition, in any case no more valuable than their own faith. Fortunately, the independent juridical state -nearly everything in the United States- has always put God and Caesar in their place.

But today the true human and economical impulse of creationism and the main battle against darwinism is carried out by Islam. The islamic world allocates a lot of energy and resources to the propagation of creationism, and it is in this battle where part of the luck of continuity of evolution on the XXI Century in the entire world is at stake. It's not only a philosophical or epistemological debate, even though it is in its origin. If reason be placed in the centre of public life, if we rely on science to get to know and transform the world, this implies certain conceptions related to the governing of human affairs, a respect of the individual's values, and the separation of churches from states. On the other hand, if we place faith in the creative divinity at the centre of public life, and the scrupulous respect for the assumed sacred word turned into civil law, we move towards other political realities. Towards new totalitarianisms that have already been experimented in some parts of the world, and that would take us back to the old totalitarianisms that have also affected the Western world.

(3)

Even someone that is acquainted with Darwin's work could think that the question is: where do the species come from? What is their true origin? Depending on what our answer is, we find two opposite conceptions of the world, that affect people's everyday life and the way they govern it. If our answer is guided by rationalism and empiricism, we can go towards societies which have more freedom, ruled by the light of science and reason. If we answer that a God, any of the gods imagined by humans of little or no knowledge at all, denying the rational proof of evolutionary creation, we will move towards theocratic ruled by clergies that interpret the divine word, that monopolize and impose their version. The feeling is that, on a practical level, whether it's by conviction, by pragmatism, by

ignorance or by opportunism, a big part of the world and above all a very important part of its leaders, behave with evident contradiction between their general political positioning and the submissiveness they have showed in their relationship with the Vatican. The convinced creationists have sent their message to the masses of the world, that are nearly always lacking the education to separate imagination from reality. But what is even worse is that, frightened to confront with the believers, there are political and intellectual leaders that proclaim themselves believers. The consequences of great depth that these attitudes produce are that the real assumption of evolutionism has not yet happened with enough broadness and depth. In a certain way, we are facing a common believers' front, the sincere and the feigned, in order to block their way, instead of ideas, we need a basic understanding of human evolution.

In this closed point to the assumption of the deep and positive consequences of darwinism, there exists a kind of implicit pact that even affects many convinced darwinists. It is an idea that hasn't been rightly defined that revolves around what Darwin exposed, as a continuation of what God made. This is because there hasn't been a new Darwin that has exposed thoroughly the neodarwinian idea entering rational ideas. It has been neodarwinism with the intervention of many thinkers that has fulfilled the completion through evident deduction: that the apparition of fossiles of any species, cannot indicate a coincidence between the age of the latter and the moment of their creation. To reach any evolutionary state indicated by fossiles, there is an "ante" more or less distant, which could range from one million to tens of millions of years. And also that the fossiles of these former evolutionary states, could very well not be discovered, supposing that they exist in sufficient quantity and meaning. The earliest would be common to many species, and common in all of them when these were subatomic particles, inorganic matter.

The answer cannot be given through empirical knowledge, nor to Hume's satisfaction. Only reason, and therefore rationalism, can give the answer. The Earth has never had the power to create specimens evolved to the level of the fossiles that have been discovered until now. To suppose this would be a deism much more fundamental and fundamentalist than all the creativist religions that have existed. The Earth would be God. And that would be ridiculous considering the inmensity of the universe.

But from an evolutionist perspective, having sensed -and through rational deduction, having comprehended- all the former process to the one established empirically by Darwin, thanks to his observations, the practical outcome for human beings is now the liberation of supposed metaphysicians to try to reconcile the irreconcilable: creativism and evolutionism.

Genetics and evolution allow us to enter the essential questions of the human species with a new perspective: the stress between that which is strictly individual and that which is collective. Genetics have become, for human beings, a tool to behave according to their own individuality; since evolution has turned our species into a cooperating, and therefore social, species where the individual by himself cannot achieve goals and horizons that he can reach if he cooperates with others. The family, the kinship, the group, the community, the ethnic group, are spaces of cooperation, spaces of relationship and spaces of shared feelings-ideas.

Also genetics and evolution jointly force us to consider the relationship between that which is social and that which is biological, in such a way that not only metaphysics have become obsolete. Also the philosophy mainly speculative based on intuition, is an intellectual discipline on the way to being extinct.

Human beings as individuals, but also societies as groups of individuals, cannot be understood leaving Biology aside. Civilization and society are intertwined to the point of drawing out the complexities of the present time, that has in every case a deep biological stratum. Studying their relationship can help us focus the challenges of the future. At the outset, to translate the ideas of evolution through the struggle for existence from the literary darwinian text - which is definitely not all of Darwin's thinking - to the resulting explicit text of the application of which is now more than just a theory, a sufficient knowledge to make rational deductions about what our evolution can produce to establish realities.

The fundamental, the natural, the cultural and the civilized

Summary

1. The Four Great Ages of Matter
2. The generalisation of the concept of Selection and the idea of Persisting
3. Inert Matter
4. Live Matter
5. Cultured Matter
6. Civilized Matter

1. The Four Great Ages of Matter

Science has an aim which is a priority: to understand reality. Why? In order to anticipate uncertainty, the best strategy to remain alive in an uncertain world. Because of it, it's not strange that its first working hypothesis is written more or less as follows: ***reality exists and is intelligible***. What is reality? Why does that which exists exist and not something else? Why do the things that happen occur and not something else? How do we reach reality? How do we cease to

pertain to reality? To state that reality can be understood is no triviality. It could have perfectly been some other way. The following remark is often attributed to Einstein: ***The most incomprehensible thing about the world is that it is comprehensible.*** However, if we admit that understanding in science consists of searching and finding that which is common among diversity, then we can state positively that, in the domain of that which is simply possible, there are many more intelligible worlds than incomprehensible ones. For the time being, let's illustrate the idea with a metaphor. In an unintelligible world, nothing would have anything to do with anything else, no pair of branches could originate in a first common branch. A non-understandable reality would correspond to a forest in which there are more tree trunks than tree branches.

Reality is made up of two types of elements, objects and phenomena. Objects are distributions of matter, energy and information that occupy space. Phenomena are the changes that objects experience and that, therefore, occupy time. Let's start by considering the history of reality. The things we see, we see them directly, and the things we do not see directly, we see through the scientific knowledge that has been accumulated up until now. In the beginning (in the beginning of reality) all matter was a kind of homogeneous soup of quarks and, today, some 13.700 million years later, we have real objects that can be grouped, as we wish, in order to understand. For example, we can focus our attention on the magnificent diversity of living creatures that are observable in the present and on the no less magnificent diversity that can be seen in the fossil registration. We could, for instance, be interested in outstanding individuals like Shakespeare, Mozart or Einstein. We could, for example, raise questions relating to concepts that are not so closely linked with matter (but are linked with energy and information), like feelings, feelings as real as love passion or vengeance. And, for instance, we could very well be sensitive to the issues of coexistence and living together between human communities. We can try and understand how human society works and try to find out why sometimes (on few occasions) peace and harmony prevails and why most of the times it is hate, violence and discord that prevails. If, how we mentioned earlier, to understand means discovering (searching and finding) that which is common among diversity, then is there a sensible way to group everything that exists and has existed since the beginning of existence? Such a feat can only be started modestly: having a look at all the known history of matter, hoping we will be able to find a clue that will orientate us. If we do this paying attention we will notice that, since the birth of reality, mainly four truly transcendent episodes have taken place:

- 1) The birth of reality itself
- 2) The emergence of the first living being
- 3) The emergence of the first being with a language capable of understanding reality
- 4) And the first time two of such beings managed to make a joint decision through conversation

This reflection divides the history of matter, the most beautiful history of the Cosmos, in four great Ages that we will name as follows:

The Age of Inert Matter
The Age of Live Matter
The Age of Cultured Matter and
The Age of Civilized Matter

What does a truly trascendental episode mean here? It is an episode that brings an innovation in the way of remaining in reality, that is, a way of persisting in the world in which *just before* such episode differs a lot from *just after* (it is the concept of discontinuity in maths). Before deepening in the knowledge of these ages we shall enunciate and describe them briefly.

First ephemeris, the beginning of the history of matter. The Big-Bang signifies the kick off to the evolution of reality. It's the Inert Matter. It happened some thirteen thousand seven hundred million years ago.

Second ephemeris, the emergence of the first living being. It might have been a prokaryote cell not very different from a germ. It is the Live Matter. The oldest evidence is some three thousand eight hundred million years old.

Third ephemeris, the emergence of abstract intelligence capable of understanding reality. It must have been something very similar to a Homo sapiens, maybe even a Homo neanderthalensis. It is the Cultured Matter. And it is present since only a few hundred thousand years ago.

Fourth ephemeris, the emergence of politics, that is a cultured system (not genetic) to make collective decisions. It is Civilized Matter. And it probably accessed reality only about a few tens of thousands of years.

What we have then, is four great ephemerides that define four great Ages of the history of reality that, in their turn, correspond with four

fundamental ways of appearing and remaining in reality. In the year 2000, I was interested in reflecting on the second of these Ages, starting from the Theory of Irreversible Processes and of Mathematics and Information, practically without thinking about the existence of a fourth [01]. In the year 2004 I extended the outline to the first and third Age [03]. This essay tries to build a conceptual general sketch of reality including the fourth Age, that of civilized matter, in case it could shed some new light on that which is characteristic of our time, that which we perhaps understand worse and undoubtedly has made us suffer most. I am referring, of course, to the way in which human beings organize our living together: politics. We will go into detail in the essence of these four states of matter paying attention to how persistence in reality is achieved in each one of them. Our hope is that it might be a plan to understand reality because what we could very well call the *degree of reality* of an episode (object or phenomenon, stone, bacteria, human or nation) depends on two things: its probability to access this world and its probability to remain in it (and therefore also to its way of disappearing). As we will see, each state of matter has its peculiar way of persevering and in the way of persevering lies the key to understanding the complexity of the world, because the secret of the change is, precisely, in the part of the change that does not change. The importance of the concept of *persisting* lies in its close relationship with another two concepts of great scientific solvency, the concept of *selection* and the concept of *individuality*. They're also concepts for the conceptual sketch.

We can say: everything that exists is the result of a selection (especially, when something happens *necessarily* there is only one option and the selection is unique). What else can be said of the selection that opens up the way to an object or a phenomenon for it to access or remain in reality? Naturally that it remains in reality. In other words, from what gains access to reality that which has capacity to remain is continuously (re)selected. The obviousness of this issue is nearly insulting and can be illustrated correctly with the following metaphor: the probability of appearing in the photograph of reality depends on its capacity to remain in it.

2.-The generalization of the concept of Selection and the idea of Persisting

The concept of *persisting* is crucial in order to understand reality and, as we already pointed out, remaining or persevering in an idea that adopts different meanings in each of the four types of matter that we mentioned. We shall begin with the most fundamental reality, that of elemental particles, the “bricks” of matter and the realities of the levels directly above it, atoms and molecules. In these cases, for example, the capacity to *persist* is equal to

stability. However, we intend to follow a route that, although starts from that which is most simple, reaches situations as complex as the relations that are established between different human communities. To begin with focusing on the reflection on the key of our outline, the idea of persisting.

I think there has been at least one great thinker that has had this strong intuition and that, especially, anticipated *avant la lettre* what we today call natural selection or Darwin's. Let's stop for a moment in his own words and let's pay attention to the propositions 6 and 7 of the third part of the *Ethica ordine geométrico demonstrata* by Baruch Spinoza [02]. The sixth proposition is so famous that it even has a name, the *conatus*. The sentence, because it is a sentence, concentrates what I propose here as a Fundamental Principle of Reality in the World. I also add the seventh proposition. It is also interesting in the following discussion because it is a tribute to the idea of what understanding means.

Proposition 6. Everything, in so far as it is in itself, endeavours to persist in its own being.

Proposition 7. The endeavour, wherewith everything endeavours to persist in its own being, is nothing else but the actual essence of the thing in question.

The demonstration of the first, always in Spinoza's words:

Proof.--Individual things are modes whereby the attributes of God are expressed in a given determinate manner; that is, they are things which express in a given determinate manner the power of God, whereby God is and acts; now no thing contains in itself anything whereby it can be destroyed, or which can take away its existence; but contrariwise it is opposed to all that could take away its existence. Therefore, in so far as it can, and in so far as it is in itself, it endeavours to persist in its own being.

Impeccable. Only a few details need to be touched to read Spinoza again in our context. The first detail is the notion of God. Science, precisely, aims at understanding reality without the help of God. We only have to substitute (and I don't think Spinoza would complain at all because of it) the notion of God for the compound of Reality itself, where Reality is the group of all its objects, phenomena and principles and laws with which they must be compatible. Any presumed innovation in reality has to fight with the pre-existing reality prior to such innovation. Therefore, the pre-existing reality always contributes to select everything that wants to access and remain in it. It is part of what we can rightly call the *subject of selection*.

The second detail refers to the essence of things. Spinoza uses expressions that would make any modern physics theoretician flee. For example: *the thing in so far as it is in itself* or *the singular thing*. It is the expression Spinoza uses so as not to refer to anything. Not everything in reality has a being in which to persevere. Spinoza's maxim is restricted to single things, to things in so far as they are in themselves. In our vocabulary we must translate that concept, that is why we have called it individuality. We have taken care to prepare the concept. The individuality that defines a particular reality: the particle, the atom, the molecule, the gene, the cell, the organism, the mind, the herd, society. Natural selection does not perform on anything. It performs on an individuality capable of persevering. The thing that has being, an essence to persevere and a certain identity, with a certain degree of independence in regard to the uncertainty of the rest of reality, it perseveres. [01] and [03].

In any of the four matters, what is susceptible of being selected, the object of selection, is a class of individuality and the selecting agent, the subject of selection, has to do with the homologous individualities that populate the Rest of Reality. The concepts of selection and individuality (as those of identity and independence) are strongly united by double mutual relations. Selection does not perform on any piece of matter, but on pieces of a certain individuality, of certain identity, of certain independence in regard to the whims of the rest of reality. Or said another way. Individuality is that piece of matter with the necessary identity to remain, with the necessary independence to persevere.

Nothing of what reaches reality contains in itself nothing that is contradictory with the reality in which it has landed. Put in cultured words of the XVIII century, today it might sound strange to talk about an object that strives to achieve a goal. But it is a metaphor compatible with the idea of selection. The thing with a being that does not persevere in its being is not a real thing. It's not an object of selection. On the other hand, reality is reached through compatibility with the rest of the existing reality. And it is reality, with its combinations of external individualities and its own combinations of laws and chance, who selects. It is the selecting subject. Any later fluctuation of the object's environment is a challenge to remain in reality or to go back and wait in the queue of that which is only feasible (in the domain of what is logically possible). One would say that Spinoza, when talking about the *thing*, is thinking about the soul. But he could have said soul and instead he said thing. However, he does not refer to anything whatsoever, but a thing that identifies with an aspect or part of itself. And it is within it, in its being, where it tends to persist.

Again we stumble upon the shadow of a circularity, and from it, paradoxically, the strength of the maxim can arise. Kant was

engaged in this particular issue and we will deal with him in the following paragraphs, briefly, to comment on the epistemological weight a fundamental principle, like the one we are about to use, can have. The being of a thing is that aspect of the thing that has a better chance of remaining in reality. The being is, the essence of the thing, is that by which the thing that exists continues existing. There aren't two trees that are exactly the same, even when the seeds come from the same tree. Both objects could do without what they have different (shades), but they could never do without what they have in common (essence). What they have in common is the being, precisely that which allows them to continue living in the forest, their identity. The concept of tree persists more than a specific tree, a species of trees persist more than a particular tree of a species (individuality more than the individual). This is a crucial idea because in it lies the possibility of a leap in the concept of the individual from one hierarchical level to another (the individuals that join, losing some identity, to form a new collective individuality). Indeed, I think that to talk about the altruism of ants, for example, is an unforgivable abuse of language, in the boundary itself of a metaphor. If part of the workers of a colony commit suicide in order to serve as an improvised brick or bridge for the rest of the colony, it is not because of altruism among individuals. It is serving a major cause, the super-organism, the other-new individuality. It is not another worker ant, who benefits from the worker victim, it is the anthill (refrain from making human analogies and hurried political extrapolations). The ant is, of course, another type of individuality, it is even a part of the individuality, but any part of an individuality is not another individuality. An ant's leg, for instance, is not. And neither are a couple of workers. In certain normal conditions in the earth's surface, hydrogen and oxygen are individualities when they form molecules of two atoms, but any grouping of hydrogen and oxygen atoms is not another individuality, it is not a stable molecule. A molecule of water formed by two atoms of hydrogen and an atom of oxygen, for instance, is a stable molecule... In a certain reality a quartz monocrystal or a pebble would be another individuality... Let's now pay attention to the proof of proposition 7:

Proof of prop. 7 --From the given essence of any thing certain consequences necessarily follow, nor have things any power save such as necessarily follows from their nature as determined; wherefore the power of any given thing, or the endeavour whereby, either alone or with other things, it acts, or endeavours to act, that is, the power or endeavour, wherewith it endeavours to persist in its own being, is nothing else but the given or actual essence of the thing in question.

The idea is something like the essence of the essence. If the being is the essence that is made concrete in the thing, the being's tendency to continue being is nothing other than the being's essence. For many things in this world, the being would be its most probable state, and the essence of the being would be its guarantee of permanence in reality: its stability, in the wider sense of the term. A volume of water, for instance, is a thing whose being, in certain conditions of the environment, is an object with the shape of its container, whose free surface is horizontal in the surface of the planet and whose temperature follows, with greater or lesser inertia, the temperature of the immediate environment. For certain fluctuations of the environmental conditions the thing always ends up returning to its being. The volume of water follows environmental uncertainty but it has a stable state. Its being acquiring stability is its final destiny, the center to which the fluctuations return. But stability is not guaranteed in a limitless domain. Each stability has a region of validity (in Spinoza's words, as long as it does not abandon the thing itself). If the object leaves this domain, the fluctuations might not return and the object can be dragged far away until it finds (or might not) new stabilities. If the fluctuations of temperature, for example, go too far out and enter negative values, the thing could cease to persevere in its being. Water's solid state corresponds to another family of things with another being. Any transition of phase, in physics, equals a change of being. An egg can withstand certain temperature variations without changing its being, without losing its capacity to engender a new animal. But if the fluctuations are too wide, the irreversibility could be tragic. A boiled egg will not recover its gelatinous viscosity even if the environment turns cold again. And even less will it be capable of engendering one day a new living being. In any case a family of things exist that resist environmental uncertainty, and persevere in their being in spite of them not being able to avoid yielding to the caprices of uncertainty. These things follow meekly the fluctuations of environmental uncertainty, but their being is such that it can resist them. We have already mentioned these type of things. They're the inert objects. What is the being of an inert object? The spinozian being of inert object is in principle the state selected by fundamental selection. In our language it is the most flexible state. Fundamental selection provides resistance against uncertainty. That's what physical stability is based on. And it represents the first version of the rebellion of real objects facing the threat of ceasing to be it. Let's have a look at some examples.

Not everything in this inert world resists with the same persistence the uncertainty of the rest of the world. Let's think of an object that can reach two different states. A chair standing on its four legs is a thing as inert as another chair that is only standing on one of its four legs. Both situations are compatible with the

constitution of reality that chance has given them. In actual fact, both states are states of equilibrium allowed by the fundamental laws of mechanics. Both situations fulfill the conditions of mechanical balance: the resulting force of all the forces that act on the centre of mass is zero and zero is the sum of the bending moments of all the forces with regard to that same point. This guarantees that the chair, in any of these two states, does not turn on itself, nor does it move. Both states are equivalent if the occurring uncertainty is constant and perfectly equals zero. In any other case the equivalence breaks because the two states (the two beings) do not resist the caprices of uncertainty with the same success. Their stability is different. The support on four legs corresponds to a situation of stable equilibrium, the support on one leg implies a situation of unstable equilibrium. The first case has a domain of reasonable range in which the object can recover after the attack of uncertainty. The chair would have to be shifted far from its vertical position for it to begin a spontaneous movement with no possible return. The other case, the support on one only leg, on the other hand, has infinite fragility. From such a position it does not resist the slightest uncertainty. The chair standing on four legs rebels against uncertainty defeating all the fluctuations surrounding its being. Within the domain of its stability, the being is immune to uncertainty. The chair standing on four legs is more stable (it tends to persevere in its being more) than the chair standing on one leg. That is why its presence in reality is much more frequent than the chair balancing on one of its legs.

Let's imagine, to squeeze the last drop out of that example, that we suddenly enter a room that contains two hundred chairs. We will most probably find the room with all its chairs standing on all four legs. Is it impossible to find the two hundred chairs leaning on one leg? The truth is it isn't impossible, but it is very unlikely. If it should happen we would be flabbergasted or we would suffer a fit. We would immediately think there is a trick behind it. There are no logical or physical contradictions for such an experience. The situation is imaginable. However it does not respond to the proposition III.6 from Spinoza's Ethics we have just quoted. It does not resist uncertainty, it cannot remain in reality, even if in the most unlikely case it reaches it. A juggler's trade is based precisely on creating improbabilities. Improbability is precisely what excites the spectator, improbability is the basis of acrobats and illusionism. The excitement is obtained precisely from an improbability. Think about the renowned act of the dishes revolving around vertical rods. The conservation of the kinetic moment, while the dish maintains a certain turning speed, allows the dish to stay on the rod. A good juggler can maintain more than ten dishes, running like mad from one dish to another in order to give them the energy they lose

through friction. But not even the best juggler in the world could maintain two hundred chairs standing on only one of their legs. It's like those chemical elements we still haven't discovered because of their radical and intrinsic instability. They're so improbable that they never appear in the photograph of reality. That's why they do not appear in the great catalogue. They are things that are outside their being.

The type of selection that we call here *cultural selection* is also implicit in the conatus, and we don't have to make too much of an effort to relate Spinoza's work with this idea. The philosopher dedicates an explicit proposition whose proof and note we only have to translate mentally. Let's begin the job because with it we shall complete the spinozian support to our conceptual scheme and, for the same price, the spinozian notion of *desire* that we left hanging over earlier on. Now, it's time for proposition 9:

Proposition. The mind, both in so far as it has clear and distinct ideas, and also in so far as it has confused ideas, endeavours to persist in its being for an indefinite period, and of this endeavour it is conscious.

Proof.--The essence of the mind is constituted by adequate and inadequate ideas, therefore, both in so far as it possesses the former, and in so far as it possesses the latter, it endeavours to persist in its own being, and that for an indefinite time. Now as the mind is necessarily conscious of itself through the ideas of the modifications of the body, the mind is therefore conscious of its own endeavour.

Note.--This endeavour, when referred solely to the mind, is called will, when referred to the mind and body in conjunction it is called appetite; it is, in fact, nothing else but man's essence, from the nature of which necessarily follow all those results which tend to its preservation; and which man has thus been determined to perform. Further, between appetite and desire there is no difference, except that the term desire is generally applied to men, in so far as they are conscious of their appetite, and may accordingly be thus defined: Desire is appetite with consciousness thereof. It is thus plain from what has been said, that in no case do we strive for, wish for, long for, or desire anything, because we deem it to be good, but on the other hand we deem a thing to be good, because we strive for it, wish for it, long for it, or desire it.

Thank you Baruj Spinoza. The four classes of selection of our scheme fit into the propositions. Cultural selection doesn't differ from natural selection nor from fundamental selection, nor from political

selection, in regard to the conatus. Selection is a rebellion of an existing reality against a change that makes it possible to persevere in what is essential. Reality in this world, simply, is made like this. The first function of cultured selection, and therefore of culture and any sort of knowledge, is not in its supposed achievements, it's in knowledge itself, in its building process, the elaborating of representations, the thinking process, the mental delight of continuing to think. Anticipating uncertainty is, with no doubt, a present associated to what in the beginning must only have been mental delight. Or put another way, intellectual delight is the stimulus that ensures the acquisition of knowledge when confronted with another universal law of matter: having to choose between doing and not doing, it's better not to do, it's better not to waste energy or put ourselves in a risky situation. Let's now advance a compact assertion that relates all four types (or states) of matter with their corresponding ways of persisting. It is the framework of the mentioned conceptual scheme. As we mentioned, some years ago [03] the scheme only contemplated three states of matter. The innovation here is to re-discuss all of it, including the fourth state of matter, civilization. The compact sentence of the insistence of the real to continue being as such, sounds like this:

The inert is and tends to persist being, the living lives and tends to persist living, the cultured knows and tends to persist knowing, the civilized coexists and tends to persist coexisting.

There are many possible partitions of reality and this is one, the base of our conceptual scheme: that which is real deconstructed in that which is inert, that which is alive, that which is cultured and that which is civilized. Any object or phenomenon admits this first and relevant classification, a relevance that stems from four classes of selection that we can perfectly name as fundamental selection (specific of the inert), natural selection (specific of living matter), cultural selection (specific of cultured matter) and political selection (specific of civilized matter). From this particular partition will proceed the intelligibility of the world we are searching for. In each type of matter that which is selected to persevere perseveres. Each type of matter has its own strategy to persevere, but we cannot forget that each state of matter follows the preceding one, furthermore, it's an achievement of the preceding one. Natural selection is an achievement of fundamental selection, cultural selection is a delight of natural selection and political selection is an achievement of cultural selection. Life is a rebellion that can help to keep us alive and coexistence, in principle, is a rebellion that helps us to continue knowing. We will deal with that later on.

What we must do, having reached this point, is go deep into an assertion as general as Spinoza's conatus elevated to the rank of what we could rightly call the Universal Principle of Change, a principle from which the behaviour of the *selection* concept in the midst of inert, live, cultured and civilized matter. The next question is: having formulated the General Principle of Change how,

Everything tends to persist in its own essence

What is its epistemological weight? What is its rank as a generator of the understanding of reality? If we admit, on the one hand that to *understand* in science is that which is common among that which is diverse, the essence among the shades, the minimum expression of the maximum shared and, on the other hand, that this is all the more consistent the higher the rank of individuality that the piece of reality we are referring to has, then the so called Universal Principle of Change admits an audacious expression:

All real individuality tends to persevere in its (own) maximum intelligibility

And reality's intelligibility has two ways of growing: reducing common essence (capacity to anticipate) or increasing that which is shared (domain of validity, degree of universality). With this spirit we can analyze in each case the meaning of the *selection* concept in each of the four proposed *matters*.

However, for the moment we can appeal to another giant of knowledge: Kant. What would be the kantian valuation of the Universal Principle of Change? We will now dedicate some lines to it since the exercise is well worth it. It is all about speculating which would be the category according to Kant of the idea borrowed from Spinoza...

According to Kant [04] an *analytic* proposition is that whose predicate is part of the subject: "a grasshopper is an insect". A *synthetic* proposition is that whose predicate is not included in the subject: "a bird can swim under the water". An "a priori" judgement is a judgement that is independent from experience (although it is inspired by it): "the perimeter of the circumference is 2π times its radius". No experiment can deny that. An "a posteriori" judgement is a judgement that depends on experience: "a material expands under heat".

All analytic judgements are "a priori". Trivially: no analytic a posteriori judgement exists. They do not contribute with anything new to knowledge, but they are valuable to clarify concepts, to suggest good definitions and to travel safely from one to the other. Synthetic "a posteriori" judgements also exist. They are fragile and

dubious but useful. Knowledge can progress with them. Do synthetic “a priori” judgements exist? That’s not so clear. It is Kant’s great question mark [04]. The controversy started before this philosopher and it still goes on [05], [06], [07]. Such a judgement would encompass the solidity of that which is “a priori” and the utility of that which is synthetic. In the limit it equals an eternal non-trivial truth, a truth that doesn’t depend on reality, but makes it intelligible, a necessary and universal truth that is inspired by sensitive experience, but that is not born from it. Kant suggests that the structure itself of physics is based on statements of this type. The fundamental laws of physics or, put in the language we are using here, the fundamental laws of the Constitution of a Reality cannot be “a priori” judgements because if such were the case they could never be denied through observation or experience. To speak as Popper does: they would not be falsable. That is, the fundamental laws of science would not be scientific (they would fall outside the region of what we accept to be science). What does Kant refer to when he demands synthetic “a priori” judgements in order to set the foundations of science? Is he referring only to mathematical propositions (of the following type: on a plane, the shortest distance between two points is on a straight line)? The issue of Kant’s categories, the issue of the relevance of synthetic a priori judgements and the issue of their relevance at the time of the erection the building of science have not yet been dealt with. I would like to think that the convenience of synthetic judgements in science refer to pre or meta-scientific principles, that is, principles previous or that go beyond nature’s fundamental laws. They would be very general principles of the constitution of any reality, principles that are valid in any of their levels of observation, in any of their backbones. We may be talking about something that has more to do with the method to know reality than with the knowledge of reality itself. Kant might have made a mistake believing that the laws of nature, as the fundamentals of mechanics, those of quantum physics, etc. could have this synthetic “a priori” judgements status, but in his time Newton’s laws, for example, seemed necessary, inevitable, and completely universal. Science had not covered enough ground in order to glimpse the core of its structure and perceive that laws so apparently authoritarian in fact come from principles and theories that are more general (quantum physics, special and general relativity, variational principles...). However, there are concepts, so strong and apparently trivial and semicircular like the concept of darwinian selection itself that fit in perfectly with Kant’s powerful intuition. Natural selection is the best thing we have to understand how life has evolved on Earth and I dare to propose such idea (probably the most brilliant and greatest idea of the history of science) as a synthetic “a priori” judgements. I think

that any biologist after Darwin has asked himself this question: What a simple and at the same time powerful and clear idea! Why did I not have it myself??

However, what is interesting about a good conceptual scheme is that it provides a new perspective and allows extending knowledge through pure symmetry. In it, Darwin's natural selection isn't a fortunate singularity but the expression of the general Principle of Change projected onto one of the four matters, the Live Matter. I would say that the principle itself (and its four applications in particular) has the rank of a synthetic "a priori" judgements.

Let's summarize. Our conceptual scheme to understand reality consists of two things. On the one hand we have the partition of real individualities into four great types (the inert, the alive, the cultural and the civilized). This partition comes directly from observing reality or if one prefers, from exploring the history of reality. Infinite partitions of reality can be made, some more relevant than others. But only one of them, based on the four great ephemeris chosen earlier on, is the one we take hoping to understand reality. On the other hand, we have a Universal Principle that, although is inspired by reality, it doesn't necessarily come from it (as it could happen with any mathematical idea or theorem). It is a principle anticipated by Spinoza in his *conatus*, that finds a less general but deep, and above all very wide, projection in Darwin's praised *natural selection* and that, I believe, reaches an outstanding epistemological weight according to Kant's idea of an "*a priori*" *synthetic judgements*. From such a principle we hope to obtain the meaning of the idea of *persisting* in each of the four possible ways of doing it in nature depending on whether the inert matter, the live matter or the cultured matter (defined in the first part of the conceptual scheme) prevails. The conceptual scheme is erected crossing all the possibilities of its concepts and the hope is that from a coherent scheme new understandings will emerge. In a good conceptual scheme the voids are filled and boundaries are illuminated. Hence, the intention is to begin with the inert, live, and cultural matter and see what such an exercise can produce with regard to the civilized matter and the political system. The intention is to explore new routes in order to understand the political fact and, particularly and for instance, as Hannah Arendt expressed time after time, to try and understand innovations as recent and as terrible as Totalitarianism, that is, to try and understand the incomprehensible. Let's begin with the Inert Matter.

03. Inert Matter

The first big thing that happened was the shift from nothing to something. In current cosmological terms it is Big Bang. We cannot talk about before because before there wasn't even any time, but we

can a fraction of a second after. In our scheme we have agreed that an episode of history is transcendent when a little earlier is very different from a little after. This criteria is impossible to overcome in this case since a little before doesn't even exist and a little after does exist. Could we think of a bigger distance than the one between the existing and the non-existing? In terms of matter, there is a shift from non-existence to the existence of no less than two and a half million of trillions of quadrilion kilograms (the current visible mass of the universe). But not all types of inert matter remain the same depending on the rest of the matter surrounding it. Our current knowledge of matter allows us a minimum analysis.

Some particles as the so called hadrons are very stable. The same does not happen with many other particles. Particles are created and are wiped out according to the laws of the forces that rule this level, electromagnetic forces. The truth is that in reality, on the surface of the Earth (with its gravity, temperature, atmospheric pressure, etc.) there are few particles that can wander about without suffering dramatic changes. In such conditions, protons and electrons (which have mass) and fotons and gravitones (which do not) are all stable. In a specific experiment in which a thousand million quadrillion protons and electrons intervened and that spanned over a time period of ten million seconds no change was noticed in these particles [08]. The age of the universe is less than twenty thousand million years (the latest estimates, progressively more precise, give a figure of approximately thirteen thousand five hundred). Only an estimated ten trillion protons have disintegrated within that time period. The proton's formidable stability is equal to a fundamental law in nature: the maintenance of the baryon number. If the reality of the universe is the way we observe it today is thanks to the tremendous energy needed for the desintegration of protons. This stability guarantees its frequency (abundance) in the real world. Our discussion could extend with the examination of stability and the corresponding abundances of atoms and molecules in different realities (in the universe, in the surface of the Earth, in its interior, etc.). In each level of reality different fundamental laws and different probabilities of interaction (of reaction with other atoms) intervene. They are the backbone of different realities. The atomic nucleus, formed by protons and neutrons, are ruled by a bunch of fundamental laws that correspond to the so-called *strong interactions*. The nucleus receiving charged particles, electrons, and the result is regulated by the laws of *electromagnetic forces*.

Atoms, for instance, are not equiprobable within the cosmos. Their abundance is not equally distributed. Hydrogen (atomic number $Z=1$) is by far the most plentiful with 920.461 atoms for every million;

followed by Helium ($Z=2$) with a relative abundance of 78.344, then at a great distance, Oxygen ($Z=8$) with 608; Carbon ($Z=6$) with 305 and Nitrogen ($Z=7$) with 84. Uranium ($Z=92$) has a relative abundance of two millionth parts of an atom for every million and the atoms having atomic numbers higher than 110 are so unstable that they have not even been discovered yet. That is why they do not appear in the photograph of reality! Cosmic matter probably contains all the stable atoms and some of the nearly stable ones. The abundance of these objects called atoms is not the same in the universe, in the surface of the Earth or in a piece of live matter. But what is observed in each of these realities depends on its capacity to emerge and persist, that is, in a wide sense, its stability.

90% of the universe's matter is concentrated in stars, in the interior of which temperatures of hundreds of millions of degrees are reached. In this reality, the nuclear forces contribute to its Constitution more than any other force. The molecules inhabit a reality that is much colder, which is governed by electromagnetic forces. The queen of chemical compounds at a low temperature comes from the reaction of two elements which are abundant, Oxygen and Hydrogen, above all one of them: water. There is no doubt that this detail prepares reality for the emergence of other objects: the living individuals. Ammonia is not scarce either, just as hydrogen sulfide and methane which are compounds of frequent elements with the ubiquitous Hydrogen. They are volatile molecules, they might not be very stable but they are very active in order to intervene in a wide range of chemical reactions. Others are more stable but are not volatile, like the silicium, iron, aluminium, and magnesium oxides. In this level, the laws of chemical combinations rule (methane hardly dissolves in water, ammonia does,...). A specific molecular reality can contain all or several of the ninety chemical elements, what could lead to a baffling number of different molecules that depict an intricate landscape of eventual mutual reactions. The probability of a chemical reaction does not only depend on the chemical properties of the possible reactants (electronegativity, etc.) but also on the probability of their encounter, that is of their relative abundances and their previous stabilities.

Summarizing, in the first levels of reality, the objects that exist (particles, atoms and molecules, crystals, rocks,...stars), exist because they emerge easily -through a combination of what already is there- and because their permanence is compatible with the reality they have accessed. Let's begin filling in the conceptual scheme:

In fundamental selection the *object* of selection is an inert individuality, for example, an atom, a molecule, a crystal, a rock...

What or who selects? The *subject* of selection is the rest of the inert reality, that is, other atoms, other molecules, other crystals, other rocks, with their fundamental laws and, therefore, also with the rest of uncertainty that they liberate. *Persisting* here means, simply, to continue being. And the capacity to continue being is called *stability*. We can summarize the inert behaviour as follows:

The inert resists the uncertainty of its reality to persist in it. This capacity is stability and it is acquired by fundamental selection. This type of resistance is the first form of rebellion of an individuality against the uncertainty of its environment, the strategy to continue being.

04. Live matter

The second big thing that happened in the history of matter was undoubtedly the emergence of the first living being. The knowledge of things necessarily shortens. That's why the boundaries are sharper in the representation of reality than in reality itself. However there was a first living being ancestor of all the living creatures. It meant a radical novelty in the history of matter. The situation a little after it was very different from the situation a little earlier. A real being had emerged, an individuality with a certain identity for which to continue being was not enough. What had emerged was a new state of matter: live matter. And its way of persisting was not only to continue being but to *continue being alive*. Darwin's idea of *natural selection* lands very gently onto our conceptual scheme. To continue being alive is more than to continue being. The living being, in order to continue alive, does not only resist uncertainty (it is compatible with the caprices of uncertainty), it does something more: it *modifies* it. For example, if the temperature of the environment suffers fluctuations that are too wide (rises or falls too much), the living being does not only resist (as a stone would do), that is, it doesn't only maintain its identity even though it suffers great temperature variations. It is also capable of one or two things more: to maintain its own temperature or to control the threatening deviations of the external temperatures. To do so, it exchanges information with the environment, it detects the risky fluctuations, it interprets them and reacts in order to anticipate to drama. That is more than resisting, that is capacity to modify. From this point on we can talk about auto-organization without committing language abuse. The relation system versus environment has different alternatives. It is all about staying alive in an uncertain environment (with certain uncertainty: the only thing certain in an uncertain environment is that its future is uncertain). The aim is to stay alive when uncertainty comes into play and there are several ways of achieving this, there is not one single solution. The system can increase its

complexity, it can anticipate the performance of the environment, it can change of environment (mobility), it can change the environment without moving (technology), it can associate with other individualities sacrificing part of his identity, etc. The darwinian argument in this conceptual scheme escapes from circularity. It remains embedded as an important display (one of the possible four in our partition of reality) of the Universal Principle of Change. The arguments do not close the circle, they are incomplete. Natural selection probably acts on objects that we have named as individualities and that happens in several levels of live reality, from the genes, as Dawkins likes to insist (for many perhaps too much) [09], to the organism or populations of organisms. One of the classical discussions and still fresh in issues of evolution is focused precisely in this question (the anthill is more decisive with regard to the worker ant, than the herd of gnus is with regard to any one of its members). That's where the idea of individuality as an evolutionary unit comes from. The living world, the individuals, apart from resisting uncertainty, they modify it. Natural selection operates in favour of the idea that some type of individuality (gene, organism, population,...) stays alive. In the final result two new concepts appear that add to stability: **adaptability** that equals a capacity to **evolve**. Summarizing:

In natural selection the **object** of selection is a living individuality with certain identity and independence with regard to the environment, for example, a gene, a bacteria, an organism, a society... What or who selects? The **subject** of selection is the rest of the live reality, particularly, other genes, other organisms, other societies with their fundamental laws, devices for interaction and, therefore, also with the rest of uncertainty that all of this implies. Primarily a gene has to face other genes, an ant has to face other ants, an anthill has to face other anthills. **Persisting** means here, simply, staying alive. And the capacity to stay alive is called **stability**, this forces us, in the end, to consolidate innovations, that is, to evolve. We can even shorten it by saying:

The living resists the uncertainty of its reality to persist in it. This capacity is adaptability and it is acquired by natural selection. This type of resistance is the second form of rebellion of an individuality against the uncertainty of its environment, the strategy to continue alive.

We continue filling in the conceptual scheme. Next is the cultured matter.

05. Cultured Matter

The third biggest thing that happened in the history of reality was the emergence of a living being that possessing language and,

therefore, with it capable of dominating his thought to build intelligible knowledge. In other words, a live individuality emerges which is capable of understanding the reality to which it belongs. The leap between before and after the novelty was brutal because with the anticipation of reality through a project, intention had been inaugurated. The most remarkable difference between natural selection and cultured selection is that in natural selection first comes the solution and then comes the problem. Even further, an innovation can access reality without ever being useful to remain being or staying alive. On the other hand, a bit after the first cultured being the problem comes before the solution. The difference is so enormous that in the case of the individualities endowed with it, cultural selection eliminates the transcendence of natural selection. An individual cannot wait fifty thousand years to solve a climate change. If it hasn't previously superfluously (!!) stored a protective innovation (like the feather) it cannot wait alive, him and his descendents, for something equivalent to appear. On the other hand, an individual that possesses cultural selection begins having to deal with the problem of cold temperatures and humidity, and searches to find a favourable innovation through cultural selection. The ephemeris deserves to be one of the fourth because what is obtained through natural selection over a time period of hundreds of thousands or millions of years, cultural selection can achieve within minutes!!!

Only a tiny part of inert matter is live and only a tiny part of live matter is capable of understanding. That we know of, today only humans remain, *Homo sapiens*. The difference is not just a degree. A chimpanzee, one of our closest live relatives, is capable of many things, even capable of interpreting and combining symbols, but is unable to understand reality, as we refer to it here [10]. A chimpanzee cannot transcend space and time to compare two episodes of reality if it has not witnessed directly both of them, then he cannot search for common essences, therefore he cannot build intelligible knowledge. The extinct *Homo neanderthalensis* might have been able to do so, some other creature may achieve this in another place, in another flash of reality.

The amount of inert matter in the universe is an estimated two and a half billions of trillions of quadrillions kilograms ($2,5 \times 10^{54}$ Kg), from which (that we know of) only eighteen hundred billion kilograms ($1,8 \times 10^{15}$ Kg) form part of the live individuals, from which we are certain that only three tenths of a billion kilograms (3×10^{11} Kg) pertain to individuals capable of building intelligible knowledge. In our partition of matter in four types, the quantity decreases but the complexity increases. The time has come for us to talk about

something more than just simple mass. Complexity cannot be measured in kilograms. Having reached this point, thinking about complexity is already inevitable.

One gram of bacteria is more complex than one gram of common salt. Complexity can be measured by the number of different states accessible to each of these little pieces of matter or, if one prefers, by the quantity of information that is needed to build a whole entity up from the sum of its parts (measured for example in bytes, the number of binary decisions needed). A sodium chloride crystal has few different accessible states. The number of alternatives can be calculated based on the combinatorics of its microscopic configurations (based on atoms of chlorine and sodium) together with the free energy available for the different transformation procedures. To do the same calculation on a piece of live matter we also have to take into account all the alternatives accumulated during its history in the genetic information. To give an idea, a virus (a relatively simple structure in the frontier that separates the live from the inert) has the astounding and unpronounceable figure of a one followed by 36.000 zeros different states, that is, to build it from its most simple components a guide with instructions of 120.000 bytes is needed. A bacteria equals a one followed by a million three hundred thousand zeros, that is, a guide of 6.000.000 bytes. And a human being has a one followed by seventy-two million zeros of different states what equals a guide of 240 million bytes. To get an idea of what this crazy number means, $10^{72.000.000}$, let's remember that within the universe there are only 10^{80} atoms and that *only* 10^{120} different chess games can be played.

It is not easy to conceive an object more complex than the brain. It must be a goedelian limit. How is a system supposed to conceive another system more complex than itself? It weighs about one thousand four hundred gram and is the hero of the third rebellion. It is the abstract intelligence and main responsible of the *cultured matter*. If the inert matter resists uncertainty, the live matter modifies it, now we can say that cultured matter anticipates it! But anticipating here means something special. Anticipating here means paying attention specifically to uncertainty in order to reduce it; it is the most direct and less metaphoric sense of the term. In other words, an animal does not anticipate the fact of dying by inanition when it eats, nor does it anticipate the act of being knocked down when it flees in a rush. Neither do certain birds from mountainous regions that spend the summer collecting nuts and hiding them in order to find them during the harsh winter anticipate. (It has been proved that one single specimen had prepared more than a thousand hiding places). Nobody would complain if we used the word anticipate in these cases. That is why we need to polish the concept

to let it enter our conceptual scheme. These cases refer to a preprogrammed anticipation favoured by natural selection thanks to the fact that winter's uncertainty is periodical (and therefore not so uncertain). Let's say that it's a foreseeable uncertainty. In fact, in these cases, what anticipates is the past, as physicists often say when they want to tease economists. Actually, it is an adaptation by natural selection with the result of an apparent anticipation. Indeed, the same birds would probably continue hiding nuts for thousands of years, after a forced emigration to the tropic, whose winter does not require such a prevision. The meaning we give here to anticipation is a very new concept that we use when the individual, armed with his mind, confronts a new situation of his environment and does it through a project, an intention, a will, an objective. Nearly all animals have a brain, but only one elaborates intelligible knowledge. That is why, from now on, we will refer to it as mind (without having to tackle the difficult issue of the relation between mind and brain). Anticipation understood in such a way is the function that is specific of intelligible knowledge, its added value to surpass natural selection. Anticipation with this meaning opens the third and last type of selection, *cultural selection*. We will continue assembling the scheme, and so:

In cultural selection the *object* of selection is a cognitive individuality like a scientific theory, a work of art, a belief,...What or who selects? The *subject* of selection is the rest of cultural reality, other scientific theories, other works of art, other beliefs... but above all, and here is the big novelty, the great selector is the human *mind*, an individuality that is sharp and indivisible. It's neither half the mind nor mind and a half that does the thinking. It's that indivisible individuality that does the thinking, a unique identity called human mind. Besides, as in the other cases there is the rest of reality, here it is the *rest of the cultural reality*. A theory has to confront primarily with another theory, a work of art with another work of art...and all of it in their context of the uncertainty of the moment. *Persisting* means here, simply, to continue knowing. Natural selection has prepared things so that it is possible because to continue knowing is the function of what we could call *intellectual delight*, the pleasure that invades the mind every time it perceives something new. And the capacity to continue knowing is called *creativity*, maybe the property that is more specific of the human mind. The human being is, fundamentally, a creative being. In an even more condensed way, we say that:

The cultured, besides resisting and modifying the uncertainty of its environment is capable of foreseeing it. This capacity, that adds to stability, adaptability, and the capacity to evolve, is the capacity to

create intelligible knowledge, that is the capacity to understand, what is achieved through cultural selection. Knowledge represents the third form of rebellion against uncertainty. It is the strategy designed to increase independence against the fluctuations of the rest of reality. Knowledge feeds itself in order to continue knowing and it is the base of a universal innovation: humana creativity.

The cultural is transmitted by non-genetic means and the novelty is that cultural selection reacts with a colossally higher speed when facing the caprices of uncertainty. From this conceptual scheme arises already a criticism of all that knowledge that does not change, that cannot change, that is armored to any change in reality. And so we reach the last quarter of the conceptual scheme: the civilized matter. A good general conceptual scheme inspires its own extending and in this case the first three quarters (inert, live and cultured) [02] unfold the last quarter: *civilized matter*. Let's see what it can produce.

06. Civilized Matter

The fourth ephemeris in the history of the observable reality (that is the proposal) is the emergence of a society, but not any sort of society, but a society formed by individuals capable of building intelligible knowledge and of making decisions in the light of the understanding of the reality in which they are immersed, not in the light of fixed reactions attained by natural selection. We are referring to minds that discuss in order to make a decision relevant for the future of the group. The emergence of cultured matter and civilized matter could not have been very distant in time because of history's acceleration. With it we exclude, of course, the interesting societies of insects or other similar superorganisms (even mammals). It is something more than a simple aggregate of individuals, more than a herd, more than a family, more than many clans, we are talking about individualities that evolve through natural selection or, at the most, through cultural selection, but never through what we will call *political selection*. The first groups of hominids had to take joint decisions in the style of groups of primates, a dominant male decided for all. But politics does not begin until two minds can talk to each other and negotiate (even if it is imposing) a decision that affects both of them.

We have already mentioned that of all the individualities that have emerged in reality, the most individual, the most indivisible is the mind, that unit capable of understanding, and that understanding can only be carried out by a unit we call mind, not half a mind or mind and a half. Never before in history had the issue of two minds conversing to take a joint decision, not necessarily of mutual consent, not necessarily a decision that represents them both, but a

decision that affects their future and is understood by them. That already is politics. This is where the Age of history that characterises the current reality begins. It is an age that has its own ephemeris: the tribes and clans of the Palaeolithic age, the nomads of the Neolithic age, the cities of ancient Mesopotamia on the banks of the Tigris and the Euphrates, the cities of ancient Egypt and ancient Greece, the roman empire,...and the different systems to take joint decisions, that is the different political systems, autarchy, tyranny, despotism, dictatorship, theocracy, oligarchy, kleptocracy, anarchy, democracy, totalitarianism... If we call civilized individuality to the group of cultural individualities that have given themselves a political system, then Which is now the object and subject of selection? This moment is a delicate one and prone to easy confusion. However, the conceptual scheme guides us.

The object of political selection is not any group of cultural individualities that one might imagine. For a group of individualities to become, itself another individuality, the former have to share some kind of identity susceptible of reaching a certain level of independence with regard to uncertainty and the rest of civilized reality. It could be the case of two hunters that hunt together, of a family, a neighbours community, a city, a state-nation, or the entire mankind... Such are the units, the civilized individualities on which political selection acts, that is such are the units that strive to ***persist*** in their essence. In civilized matter the ***object of selection*** is the civilized individuality, the neighbours' community, the club, the city, the state-nation,... And if in the inert matter ***persisting*** means to continue being, if in the live matter persisting means to continue being alive and in the cultured matter persisting means to continue knowing, then what does ***persisting*** mean in the civilized matter? By symmetry, I believe the answer must be (gift of the rest of the conceptual scheme) something very similar to ***continue coexisting***. Any civilized individuality is characterised by an essence that is shared by its members, its cultural individualities (its minds) and that distinguishes it from, beware now, from other civilized individualities that populate the rest of civilized reality (other families, other clubs, other neighbour communities, other cities, other state-nations,...). But that does not impede there being differences between the minds of one same civilized individuality, of one same collective identity. In other words, there aren't two minds the same nor two civilized individualities the same and therefore coexistence has at least two clear meanings, one is internal coexistence (between minds of a same collective identification) and the other is external (between civilized individualities that populate the rest of civilized reality. Both are influential. Political selection shares with cultural selection the detail of the problem coming first

and the solution coming after it. However there is a radical novelty with regard to inert individualities (a molecule), live individualities (an organism) and cultured individualities (a mind): civilized individualities (a city, a nation, a religion,...) do not consist, as did the former, of let's say topological compact units. That is, that their interior and their exterior is such that sometimes one cannot move from one point of the interior to another without coming out to the exterior. The complication is remarkable and interesting because civilized individuality does not necessarily need to have a continuous spatial and temporal frontier. That is why in a civilized individuality, driven by what we have already termed as political selection, there are at least two reasons for its particular *persisting*, one is internal cohabitation between the minds that compose it and between its possible subgroupings and another external with the rest of civilized units that populate the rest of reality. In short, in civilized matter that which persists (subject of selection) is a civilized individuality, where *persisting means here to continue coexisting within and to continue coexisting without*. It's clear that the best strategy to achieve it, for example when uncertainty increases severely, is not so much stability as in the inert matter, nor adaptability as in the live matter, nor creativity as in the cultured matter, but *negotiability*, that is the capacity to reach joint decisions within and without. We are an element short of completing the scheme. What or who selects? Who is the selecting *subject* in the civilized matter? By symmetry, in the conceptual scheme the selecting element is the system designed to project a determinate number of cultural individualities in one only decision that affects the whole cultural identity of which they are a part. It's the political system including the case of the absence of political system (anarchy, autocracy, theocracy, democracy,...).

The civilized, a part from resisting, modifying and foreseeing uncertainty, is capable of managing it. This capacity, that is added to stability, adaptability and creativity is the capacity to negotiate changes in the rules of coexistence, negotiability, that which is achieved through political selection. Politics represent the fourth form of rebellion against uncertainty. The tendency now does not consist only of foreseeing uncertainty (as occurs in cultural selection) but in subjecting it, determining it. It is the strategy designed for the persistence of civilized individualities in spite of their internal and external differences.

In short, to continue coexisting within and without of a civilized individuality is the basis of this fourth innovation in the history of reality and it is called negotiability.

Let's summarize in order to close the conceptual scheme {Chart I}:

REALITY BY SELECTION	OBJECT OF SELECTION	SUBJECT OF SELECTION	PERSEVERE MEANS	CAPACITY FOR PERSEVERENCE
FUNDAMENTAL SELECTION	INERT INDIVIDUALITY Atom, molecule, crystal, rock,...	THE REST OF INERT REALITY Fundamental, principle laws other atoms, other molecules,...	CONTINUE TO BE	STABILITY
NATURAL SELECTION	LIVE INDIVIDUALITY Gene, Organism, Population,...	THE REST OF LIVE REALITY Laws, principles, mechanisms, manners, biological structures,.... Other genes, other organisms, other populations, ..	CONTINUE LIVING	ADAPTABILITY
CULTURAL SELECTION	CULTURAL INDIVIDUALITY Work of art, scientific theory, ideological, philosophical essay	THE MIND Rest of Cultural Reality: Other Works of art, other theories, other ideologies, ..	CONTINUE LEARNING	CREATIVITY
SOCIAL SELECTION	SOCIAL INDIVIDUALITY Group of minds with something in common (ideology, family, neighbourhood, city, nation, political party,....	POLITICAL POWER Autarchy, Theocracy, Anarchy, Democracy,.... Rest of Political Reality: Other cities, other nations, other ideologies	CONTINUE LIVING TOGETHER	NEGOTIABILITY

Let's now see what this conceptual scheme can produce when the time comes for us to understand the political reality. If we concede an ascending direction (only for the sake of arranging it although that is also the order in which things happen in the history of reality) from inert matter to civilized matter, through live and cultured, one of the things that can happen is that *the selection of an inferior level occurs in a matter of superior level*. The result allows us to talk about concepts such as the *natural selection of ideas* or the *cultural selection in the organization of public life*. They are, I believe, two factories of monsters, but can be understood and differentiated within the conceptual scheme we have built. What can happen is that the subject of selection of a matter of inferior level seizes the role of a superior subject of selection or, also that the subject and object of selection of a same level, simply, exchange their roles. These are two frequent distortions. Why should we call them distortions if they truly happen in reality? Well, there is a reason:

because it implies a regression of the object of selection, that is, a reduction of the independence on the individuality with regard to the environment where he belongs.

Let's look at a simple example. Mammals resist environmental temperature changes maintaining their temperature constant regardless of the fluctuations of exterior temperature. The selection of the inferior level, fundamental selection, would make a mammal have the same temperature as his environment. That is, in fact, what happens to reptiles. Natural selection has endowed mammals with a device for *progress*, if by progress we understand the following: gaining independence in regard to the uncertainty of the environment. A mammal that loses its faculty of thermal regulation becomes live matter that returns to inert matter, a bit like what the animals that hibernate do: they die temporarily, they travel to their own future without living it. It's a vital return. Natural selection here yields terrain to fundamental selection. There are progressive lines and there are regressive lines, both are possible. There doesn't even have to be a progressive or a regressive line. Thousands of millions of planets must exist where environmental uncertainty has never left the slightest opportunity for one single progressive line to emerge. But when progressive lines exist, now we can recognise them. We insist on the two ways of provoking an easy return, two alternatives with a clear political interest.

The first one occurs when a mode of selection substitutes a superior mode of selection, then the regression occurs (let's say for example that natural or fundamental selection substitutes political selection). That is when an appeal to darwinian selection is made, to eliminate or simply to leave part of civilization to disappear. Sometimes, even great thinkers like Hannah Arendt, refer to it as a

sinister influence of scientific knowledge. Here is the first fruit of our conceptual scheme. It is undoubtedly a sinister use of scientific knowledge, but it is not scientific knowledge!! In science, understanding reality is as important as understanding which is the domain of validity of such knowledge. And natural selection is a pre-cultural and pre-political selection. We can appeal to it in order to understand matter which is simply live.

The second way of easy regression occurs when the subject and object of selection exchange their roles (let's say for example when that which persists isn't the selected but is the selector). Let's leave aside, because it's evident but not less clear nor transcendent, the case of political corruption. Corruption is simply that, the voluntary confusion between selector and selected. But nobody that is corrupt refers to any natural law in order to justify himself, he simply practices corruption. The word is well chosen because everything ends up rotting around a corrupt political class. There probably isn't any greater disgrace or crime in political selection. In many other cases both regressive distortions are mixed. The idea of cultural selection of ideas is a concept much more delicate than what it seems to be and, probably the same could be said about the slippery *meme* concept, coined and promoted (but not invented by him) by Richard Dawkins [08]. Indeed, when an idea is successful through natural selection, the subject of selection is no longer primarily the human individual mind that has created it, nor any other individual mind that, by means of a new creation refutes it, but rather (as in the two inferior levels of inert matter and live matter) the rest of cultural reality, other works, other theories, etc. That is, the object of selection switches its role with the subject of selection. Ideas compete among each other without the intervention of one or several human minds. Natural selection nullifies cultural selection. The criteria is no longer to continue knowing, nor anticipating or understanding reality, nor is creativity its best strategy. Ideas, once created behave as genes and as such they are selected. And, also in this case, they are a sign of regression. A case that might be slightly wicked is when a human mind learns from natural selection and puts itself at its disposal, to benefit natural selection, although it does it in its own interest. It is, for example, the *design best seller* concept, in its wider and more general sense. A *design best seller* is no more than a pack of cultural stimuli well prepared and focused for them to be successful through natural selection. The cognitive process has three clearly distinct phases: the phase of stimulus, the phase of conversation and the phase of understanding. A piece of knowledge that has to succeed by natural selection does not need to generate conversation (especially reflection that is the conversation with oneself) nor does it lead to any new understanding

or intuition. It is easy for any citizen to detect the scam because any new understanding and any new intuition bring with it an unmistakable symptom. It is intellectual delight [10]. One can have doubts on whether he has understood or hasn't understood, but will always know whether he has enjoyed it or not. To achieve success with a *design best seller* on the commercial arena with other pieces of knowledge competing, it's enough with a package that is void of everything, but full of stimulus. They are stimulus that in normal conditions lead to conversation and to understanding, but that here do not lead to anything. It's a scam. It's like fishing with bait. Fishing with bait is cheating the fish. The fish that is caught with bait never really gets to enjoy the worm. The *best seller* might be commercial progress, but it is definitely cultural regression. Another distortion of the scheme happens when the being to persist is more the author of the work than the work of the author. Nothing against the memory of the great creators, but it just so happens that those that persist are the ones that created thinking more in the persistence of their work than in their own persistence.

But let's return to civilized matter and to the idea itself of political selection. Here, the regressive aberration is no less evident. To begin with, let's say that in everyday life of modern democracies we can see how the gestures and statements of politicians can be better understood from the viewpoint of their own permanence in office than through the content of their words, that is, with regard to the permanence of internal external coexistence in a collective identification. Again a confusion between the subject and object of selection. We have already mentioned that in the built conceptual scheme, the *object of selection* is a piece of society with a collective identity, a family, a neighbours' community, a club, a city, a nation,... and that the subject of selection is power, that is, a political system, a system to make collective decisions. Regression occurs, here also, when the roles switch or when a selection of inferior level acts on a superior one. Because progress means here that social structure (internal and external) becomes more independent from the caprices of uncertainty. Each time the uncertainty of the environment changes (and the most certain thing in the world is that the world is uncertain) the structures have to move. These are Tocqueville's words in his most famous, but not that much read, work "Democracy in America" where he states: *A new world requires a new political science*. Well, it so happens that the world is new everyday. And what has to persist is internal and external cohabitation. Cohabiting means to live pluralism. Confusing the terms here means that persistence is primarily for the subject of selection (or for the collective identification to which it belongs), not for the object. In very few words, when perpetuating in power is the only thing that counts. In general, perpetuating in power as a priority

is the concept that explains the history of human infamy from one end to the other. There isn't much more than that. Here also the inferior selection, that is, the cultural selection of the individual human mind usurpates political selection, that which corresponds to civilized matter. There are many different ways of attaining such a thing. The most general is impeding cultured individuals of being able to understand reality to negotiate in the rhythm of the changes of uncertainty coherently with their collective identification. Another solution is forcing one single collective identity subduing or, simply, reducing the rest. In any of these cases human individuality, the element that constitutes civilized individuality, is eliminated as subject of cultural selection. Under this light everything can be examined, theocracy, the different types of autocracies, aristocracy, anarchy, bureaucracy, imperialism,...etc.

The most brutal case in history has been undoubtedly totalitarianism. Hannah Arendt's thinking and her intention to *understand* this horrific phenomenon is touching. A phenomenon that, in her opinion, emerged for the first time in the history of civilized matter in the XX century. It's the case of national-socialism in Germany and soviet stalinism. The term terrific can be used here in its literal sense [11]. One of the many differences between totalitarianism and other forms of domination is that the variations of the latter are based on *fear*, but only totalitarianism is based on *terror*, on the "anything is possible", in the possibility of radical elimination of any individual or collective identification, no matter how big or ubiquitous it may be. Elimination in totalitarianism reaches such a degree that it erases any alien individuality. It even tries to erase its own memory, as if it had never existed. Here are a few words of Hannah Arendt that meet the understanding of our scheme:

*Isolation is that dead end alley to which men are pushed when the political sphere is destroyed from their lives, where they act together in search of a common interest... only when the most elementary form of **human creativity** (the bold letters are mine) that is the capacity to add something original to the common world, does isolation immediately become unbearable...*

What is relevant about the totalitarian phenomenon is that it emerges during the twenties and thirties of the XX Century as a radical innovation. It cannot be understood as a heritage or variation of anything before it. Although it has certain similarities with despotism, tyranny, dictatorship, totalitarianism cannot be understood in the framework of traditional political and ethical thinking. Totalitarian leaders did not see themselves as executors of an absolute power in which the benefit of the governor was above

any combination of the governed. The distortion is not a degree but an abrupt leap because they considered themselves servants of superhuman laws that determine ineffably any destiny of the cosmos. In this case it's fundamental selection, besides the darwinian, the one that leaps over cultural selection to usurpate political selection. The racial laws in the case of nazism and the law of the struggle of classes in the bolshevik belief are fundamental laws that will rule until the end of history and they explain the goal of conquering the entire world. Totalitarianism has its own fundamental and natural laws and they could never be considered a result of human creativity. The two totalitarian movements that made the XX Century turn pale have been wiped out (thanks in this case to natural selection of ideas), but it is clear that they entailed a tremendous regression for civilized matter. Hannah Arendt's intention to understand cannot be more necessary and more honest. Understanding is the only thing that can give us a clue to avoid it happening again. In fact symptoms that indicate it could erupt again already exist.

But a good scheme must be useful to understand all corners of reality, the political reality in this case. Democracy is the most harmonic system with the scheme, but the latter is also useful to detect its feeble points or to indicate a route of possible progress. There are many different models of democracy and it is curious that today there are very few nations, three or four, that are admittedly non-democratic. The scheme also indicates the deficiencies of for example representative democracy. That's better than nothing, the rulers are elected, but once the tendency of power is chosen also tends to perpetuate itself even if it's within certain limits. Participating democracy seems utopian to many thinkers, it's more expensive, more complicated, less agile, slower...but there is something the conceptual scheme suggests that no political party has yet proposed: the priority of citizens' intelligible knowledge. Knowing before eating would be the motto (only slightly exaggerated). Everything else is leaping over cultured matter before reaching the political matter: a shortcut. Everything else creates dependence among individuals and between collective identities. Populism is democracy's mortal enemy and propaganda is its deadly weapon. Anything that means not knowing, not understanding, not talking, not negotiating, escapes from the conceptual scheme built on the base of the symmetry that is deduced from the history of matter and is, basically, a mock of the idea of continuing to coexist.

What we have previously mentioned is also useful to analyze the much used expression: *the human being is a political animal*. Such an assertion could not have been less consistent within our conceptual scheme. A molecule doesn't have vocation for live matter

(although live matter is composed of molecules and although many of its properties can be explained molecularly). A molecule doesn't contain everything that is essential from live matter, nor does a bacteria contain the essence of cultured matter (even if some day we receive proof that a neuron is a modified bacteria, even if there is no culture without a living support). Neither are politics a property that is inherent to the human mind, but rather a property that springs from the strong interaction between different human minds that are grouped according to different collective identities. Because of this same reason, we cannot hope to find in the structure of a brick the deep understanding of a building like the Alhambra, no matter how big the attention with which we observe it is. The assertion our conceptual scheme offers us is much more reliable: ***the human being is a creative being***. Again we are facing a transgression of the four levels of matter. I believe this affirmation allows us to understand, for sure, problems or pathologies that seriously affect the welfare or self-esteem of human individuals, in my opinion they affect more than sexuality, the instinct of death or the inferiority complex. However, it is not useful to understand human biology (live matter) nor to understand the traumas and catastrophes of coexistence (civilized matter). The comment is not a trivial one because it suggests that the essence of political phenomena is not to be found in the depths of the human condition, that is, it's not to be found in the intelligibility of the human being, that which human beings share. It must be found in the intelligibility of collective identities, in its internal and external gradings. The refuting of the human being as a ***political animal*** has been seriously considered at least by a great thinker of political philosophy (although she would, I know, deny such a condition): Hannah Arendt [12] (again Hannah Arendt). Our everyday collective life is full of episodes that fit in with the portrait of the human being as a being that is individually intelligent and collectively nonsensical. The connection between human individualities (the minds) and any collective identity of the previously mentioned (ideologies, religions, cities, nations,...) is in how the essence of the collective harmonizes with the essence of the individual. The history of human infamy is also written in this key. The political systems that have emerged throughout the history of reality have seldom been supported on the individual understanding of reality the citizens might have had, except maybe during revolutions. In the context of our conceptual scheme, the great revolutions seem to play the role of progressive leaps that in a way compensate the continuous regressive tendency of the more frequent political systems. Revolutions, for example, centrifuge the collective identities that strive to persist by selecting themselves: expelling the divinities embodied in political leaders (Moses), putting divinities aside as direct or indirect subjects of political selection

(Renaissance?), expelling aristocracy as subject of political selection (american and french revolutions), expelling the middle-class as subject of political selection (marxism)...

The temptation of applying the conceptual scheme to the current moment is big. Mankind might be facing today the biggest of all its young history. Information flies at an incredible speed between the different collective identifications; the economic interests of supranational structures come into play with more weight and time-space influence, human activity has transformed an infinite planet into a finite one, sensitive to our internal and external interactions; democracy makes progress (???) in the democratic countries and in those that still aren't democratic (it's more a question than an affirmation); today the consequences of any local activity are global and everyday it becomes clearer that the planet is sick and tired, maybe even exhausted; the different parts of human society are in an increasing interaction; their differences are so big today that we would need seven or eight planets, if the five sixths parts of humanity wanted to live like the remaining sixth part that lives better; certain collective identities show clear symptoms of walking towards a totalitarian structure; nearly all the current economic theories are based in the concept of growth in a moment in which physicists, geologists, chemists and biologists know that even with seven planets like ours there is space for growth (growing uniformly of course, all at once)... This analysis should be tackled in another essay, but the last line of our conceptual scheme implies some suggestions: a democracy that still has to mature in the direction of increasing participation instead of representation where the object to persist is the cohabitation of social and political pluralism, a plural society whose health depends above all on the creativity of its citizens (individual minds) and of the priority that these give to the progress of the understanding of reality. In short, what we do know is how we have to begin: giving prestige to the intelligible understanding of reality.

2- From dangerous ideas to empirical realities

(What we know and do not know about human nature, is a process undoubtedly based on coincidence. It begins with the chromosomatic recombination, and continues with the vital development of each specimen. All without exception are conditioned by factors that are external to their own being, and are so many as the factors that stem from its own will and intention. The communities composed by groups of individuals, accuse the coincidental base of their members, and also the interference of other groups, but its development is primarily determined by the intention and will of its members. Hence, they are dependent primarily on their affinities, and on the stubbornness to develop any project, regardless of its good or bad intentions, or it being good or bad for the community itself. Mankind, the biggest community on Earth, does not have the capacity for action springing from its will. The struggle for existence has deprived it from achieving it. There is not enough awareness yet, of the fact that the will of the family group must extend

itself encompassing the whole of mankind, especially in the First World, in order to create the necessary affinity to normalize a globalization that, until this point, has evolved with no collective intention whatsoever.

Everything that has been considered to this point is a consequence of this reality –where the greater capacity of the communities in comparison to that of individuals has not been exploited– that we will now comment in detail. In principle and primarily to display the transcendence of the darwinian theory as the trigger to overcome the author’s algorithm, in order to create an intentional future line according to the knowledge that has been acquired until this point to overcome the algorithm, and transform it into a rational project).

(1) If everything that has happened on Earth and that humanity has been through has an explanation and a justification, even the great mistakes like the creation of gods, numerous as was the case of the Hellenics headed by Zeus, or the three -each one “unique”- created by Abraham’s lie or confusionism, Darwin’s idea which appeared in our world after many million years of human existence, is a model of positive syncretism in the line of evolution of our conscience.

Darwin is, even today, an uncomfortable figure in certain academic and religious circles. To begin with, his work surpasses the threshold of some scientific disciplines like ethology and anthropology, besides because it lays the foundations for a rational sociobiology capable of explaining what has happened and what happens on planet Earth and to its inhabitants, forces religions to be regarded for what they have been and are no longer. All of this, has not only been rationally exposed, but empirically demonstrated thanks to the contributions of palaeoanthropology that has determined accurately the age of fossils.

An enormous quantity of books and studies on Darwin have been published, reaching the emergence of rationalist ideas about the existence of life, and the conscience acquired by human beings. But, as happened from the moment Darwin published his work, there are still authors, activists, and organizations dedicated to denying its validity. There are many economic and cultural interests that would like to eliminate the idea of evolution. Islam spends energy and great quantities of money, coinciding conceptually with the creeds of the rest of monotheist religions, to everything that has to do with the origin of life. But the rationalist contributions with the support of a wide range of scientists, have turned neodarwinism into a reference for human beings of the third millenium of our era.

Today, as always, following Saint John’s footsteps there are many prophets who are pessimistic about the future of the Earth and humanity. There is a continuous competition to find a catchy name, a fortunate sentence that predicts an apocalyptic end to the world: the end of history, the clash of civilizations, the ecological catastrophe. We have to ask ourselves if in this jumble of ideas, there is any sense in vindicating darwinian evolution, or if it would be anachronistic. Our aim is not to paraphrase Darwin, nor to

vindicate his theories. We only aim to remember those people with big responsibilities in small chapters of evolution, undoubtedly and perceivably existing, the need to take up again seriously the darwinian theories, and adapt them to the level of current knowledge, precisely at this time when the catholic church is trying to take them on, even if it's only in those aspects that they believe can help to rationalize believing in God, the God father of the God Christ that makes the catholic attempt impossible.

(6) The big problems of the world are understood, and they have been partly because the reality of the process of evolution has opened paths to solve them. Following the idea by which all of the living beings are the result of processes that have taken hundreds of millions of years to evolve, and linking it with another idea: that the evolution of living beings by "natural selection through the struggle for existence" shifts the responsibility of their experiences to the human beings themselves. The struggle has always existed, it has lasted until the present time and will last indefinitely. But Darwin's idea has opened a path of exploration to learn how to coexist, with the support of another dangerous idea enlightened by Mendel, one of his contemporaries. In his search of crossbreeding of vegetable species, peas in his case, he discovered the genetic system of hereditary transference of physical features handed down through succeeding generations, and also mental characteristics in the human species. The development of genetics, without the supports needed for palaeanthropology—as happens in the case of the Theory of Evolution—, because it is a creator itself of anthropological knowledge of unpredictable transcendence. Although the genetic system is very sophisticated, from the beginning of its exploration carried out by Mendel until the current and scarce understanding of genomes, a process has been established, a process that generates a revolution in the field of biology and that clarifies concepts that were unsurmountable up until now relating to basic issues in biochemistry, neurology and genetics itself.

(1) The evolution of living beings that Charles Darwin observed in elemental species, irrational plants and animals, has been generated by the same factors that have later fostered the biological evolution of the human species -an issue that Darwin hardly studied, possibly because of the strong reactions he suffered against his discoveries in his time-, these factors that produce the differentiated evolution of living beings, especially in the human species, are based on the chromosomatic recombinations, and the mutations of the DNA structure of every individual produce its diversity, which combined with the selfishness of all generates the struggle for existence between individuals. And this struggle generates the consequent natural selection. Through the action of genes and the interaction of the environment, physical and human, different phenotypes in

continuous evolution in the morphology of individuals and naturally differences within the same genetic system and also in the central nervous system. If we shift the personal individualities to society, this produces the evolution of groups, that is usually called cultural or civilizing process, and it is the result of the continued process and constant evolution of the individuals, to a great degree caused by the genetic legacy received.

(6) Darwin could not grasp this process. Only its effects, and because he had no idea of its causes -discovered by Mendel the monk-, he could not oppose argumentation to the attacks of the creativist theoreticians in defending the ideas that affected essentially the terribly naive inventions of creation according to the particular Bible of every monotheistic religious belief. Mendel's idea went by unnoticed, an idea that was much more dangerous for religions because through its development the establishment of the genomic maps of many species has been partly reached, including that of the human species. The cause that Darwin had ignored, is accepted today even by creativists: the evolution of all the organs of the human body, especially the genetic system and the central nervous system, that we transmit through generations. And this entails a continuous re-creation of life that has placed us in the darwinian algorithm as we have done since the unknown beginning of the evolutionary process until what we now are. In that beginning, there surely weren't any human traces, neither morphological nor psychic.

The ideas of both these discoverers that ignored each other in spite of being contemporaneous are no longer dangerous anymore, without suspecting that the parallel furrows that their ideas opened up for future investigations that having converged in present-day biology, have become more than dangerous, even lethal for biblical beliefs, in marvellous realities that are building the foundations for the solution of problems of global range, caused by beliefs that because of a lack of knowledge are mistaken, and have deviated the general evolution that has generated such an amount of catastrophic literature.

The evolutionary process by which human beings were created has evolved over tens –or hundreds– of millions of years. But the awareness of this evolution is very recent, hardly a hundred and fifty years old. That is why the evolutionary character of humanity towards the conquest and exercise of freedom, with the natural and inalienable right to be oneself, an identity, still has many enemies. One of them was the rousseauian theory of the “good savage”, according to which human beings would have enjoyed a primitive state, pre-civilized, of pacific and equalitarian coexistence, and that would have to be recovered through a new path. Evolution shows the

opposite. That the conquest of freedom, both for men and especially for women, corresponds to the highest stage of their positive development. Freedom exists when individuality, the identity of each member within the general diversity, is assumed consciously. Against this vision of individual freedom also appears a sinister idea of the “identitarian” that emerges when creationist ideas confront evolutionary ideas. The old age of the idea of the identities, whether individual or collective, is the great defect underscored by the detractors of the identitarian. On the other hand, thanks to the empirical experience allowed by the modern analytical tools, the individuality that is produced by the union of two germinal cells during the act of copulation, is a widely accepted reality. And this biological idea is as old as mankind itself. Because of the knowledge about chromosomatic recombination the complete individuality of characters is accepted, even by the anti-identitarianists and the creativist believers. This implies to accept the biological aspect of transmission through inheritance of the character of human beings, and denying the effect through phenotype in communities, more transcendental than individual identities. The flagrant physical differences between races, ethnic groups, peoples and even families, destroy the anti-identitarian argument. The sophism is evident. Its acceptance implies elevating a gratuitous dialectical argument high above a biological reality that has always existed: the individuality of all things, including humans and their groups.

3-The struggle for existence and natural selection

(7)

The transcendence of Darwin’s work does not only derive from his discovery of evolutionary processes, but because of his rational idea of the struggle for existence and natural selection. The biological and cultural changes of the different human beings take place because in order to survive and breed, they have to act to satisfy their feeding needs, find a partner, face adverse climates and the attacks of other living beings, including their relatives. To achieve these goals they are endowed with basic vital stimulus that aren’t exclusive of human beings: hunger and sexual desire. And it’s the action generated by these stimulus, interacting with the environment and other individuals, that which provokes the evolutionary changes through the struggle that natural selection generates. And wherever the environment is most adverse and, therefore the struggle for existence is more intense, is where the most evolved human individuals have been shaped, a consequence of being obliged to force the organic function in face of the difficulties.

The darwinian idea of the struggle for existence could have progressed, and could have been formulated in a more complete way if Charles Darwin had communicated with Gregor Mendel. And the mendelian idea could have been enriched since its discovery,

associating the ideas of evolution and transmission of characters, equally applicable to peas or human beings. That did not happen, because Darwin suffered the reaction of the church, for his message was implicit regarding the non-divine creation of life, while Mendel was a religious man respectful with the Holy See. He did not link his discovery, as has been done later on, to the idea of creation of life through the evolution of all sorts of chemical and organic elements. The catholic church couldn't grasp the "dangerousness" of his message -of his idea- either.

Already in the same age the universe had been partially understood. Copernicus and Galileo, with not much intention the former and very purposely the latter, had started the process of secularization of the vision of the world within the universe. But the linking of evolution and the individuality of everything that exists in the civilizing process, in cultural and political aspects, was not established clearly until the XX Century.

The evolution of the human species shows itself through its very awareness. For millions of years, humans never defined their individual or group identities. They made history, but they were not aware of forming a unit with other groups, nor of the existence of history. Initially, they weren't that much different from the most evolved beasts, they lived in roving tribes or in small nuclei of population that were stable and autonomous, formed by families and clans. Unlike beasts, human beings have known how to form political communities by joining together in different groups, that is, sets of groups of people with no blood ties within a territory, with specific rules of behaviour and living under a more or less authoritarian guideline. In the beginning of this associative process, territory was no obstacle. The earthly space was mostly uninhabited. The problems have been unfolding as this space proved not to be enough. Because among other causes human beings have extended their living time, and they are more demanding with their quality of life.

When at the same time we are engaged in the middle of an evolutionary process by other means different from the barbarian warriors, the notion of ignoring history as a whole means not knowing anything is obsolete; when the world is fueled by science, is moved by humans that we could consider as being "not very humanist"; and when religious and philosophical passions become technological addictions that alarm a part of the current intellectuals so much, especially the ones that produce literature, it is important to appreciate the legacy left by the the greek-roman classics, that rookie humanities students clearly and totally surpass nowadays in their universal perceptions. And even more in those of mankind, because of the knowledge of cause of the identities of each race, of each ethnic group, of each People-nation, through direct contact

with them, or through the current communication and information media.

The small world which was unknown and could only be imagined by the platonics, did not favour thinking in terms of collective identities, but it did favour thinking in their own identities as in the rest of their contemporaries. The community of slaves, centuries before Binet's polygenism, was no exception, "because they did not count, they were subhuman". Also in that moment rather than studying history, they made history. The fights between groups had little or no social aim whatsoever. They were still barbarian and personal fights. But they were making sociology by creating empires. That urged knowing the world. And because they had no knowledge whatsoever of biology, especially regarding neuronal and genetic biology, they created their empires based on the personalization of the military leaders, who could make or break those empires at their free will. The masses that participated in war, if we exclude predation, ignored their leader's intentions, and they related them to each warrior's own in simplicities like possessing goods and women, and hoping to obtain recognition at the end of their military career. In such a situation –of which traces can still be found in the current world–, a great quantity of peoples were involved. Evolving in different directions depending on their size and conditioning geographical situations, the process has nearly ended, and we can observe how the swiss because of their position in high mountains, or the scandinavian because of their peripheral position, the final result is a positive one; and on the other hand, the peoples of celtic and anglo-saxon ethnic groups that searched for hunting and ways of living in the great european plain, lived the process of imperialization provoked by Rome. That is where the shift of the evolutionary centre core from the Ancient East to Europe took place. In the last phase starting on the XX Century, the disappearance of all the empires that had been created as a reflection of the previous decayed empires took place. And in this destructive phase, People-nations that resisted the voracity of wars emerged. Those that having preserved their own language and identity, have provoked the final death rattle of barbarity that has marked the space of time in our Era, the Middle Ages and the Renaissance included. Today the struggle for existence on a collective level is only carried out by People-nations, confronting State-nations, the reminiscence of the disappeared empires.

Every person, because of their nature, during the entire civilizing process, starting from a state that isn't even imaginable in its earlier phases, and reaching the current state, has lived conditioned by the legacy received, and in a very important part as a consequence of their own experiences. Some have been imposed by the climatic and human environment in which they have developed. Others have been caused by their own will driving the organic

function forcedly. It's the phenotypical character established by the mixture of the genetic legacy, and the direct influence of their vital circumstances. Environmental, geophysical and human circumstances. In this process and in the cohabitation between family members and between groups over large periods of time, human beings have created a great capacity for symbiosis. The construction of their languages, and even minimum vital aspects of feeding and behaviour in general, lacking any project or intention have created the People-nations and the ethnic groups. A process that has been repeated in all the space of the Earth. The same process that during earlier, more primitive times the environment exclusively created races. And each race, inevitably, has developed through generations of individuals. Peoples, ethnic groups and races possess the same genome. The intensity of function of each system and each organ has determined the different capacities to perform in each of the vital, physical and mental aspects. It's in the customary living of human beings -apparently petty but really transcendental-how the evolution of the species is produced.

The desire of delight, and the instinct to run away from pain, have conditioned the existence of all the animal beings. And among all these contributing factors, diverse characters have been created, and that is what identifies them and, above all it's what makes them more or less fit to develop culture and Civilization.

4-Individual and collective abilities

(8)

In any situation and level of development of people, they individually suffer or benefit from capacities that render discomfort or welfare, caused by their capacity to adapt, and depending on the external circumstances. It's their minimum history that goes by unnoticed in the majority of cases. The opposite happens when the sum of results of personal welfare or discomfort is transferred, from the family group, to collective groups. Some progress, or they live seasonally, and others suffer regression until they become extinct, parallel to individual death. Identifying some communities or others is not a laborious attempt. Historically the examples are plentiful, and they have been magnified by impressive literary works that have mobilized all sorts of human actions. The leaders of any past time have encouraged these principles to exalt their persona and their group: whether it was religious, imperial, national, and even reaching today's widely operating partisanship. It is true that in all senses the failure of systems based on privileged identities has been and is clamorous, and in spite of the string of failures -as in the case of the alliance of Abraham and God- the idea persists. And wanting to ignore the natural base of people's and their groups' abilities, the disrepute of the idea of identity has been provoked. Reaching the

extreme of stigmatizing the abilities that produce welfare or discomfort as undesirable, when they're nature is a biological and perceivable one: the capacity, the different capacity, in each person and in each group to produce the opposite feelings of delight or pain, in different proportions.

Given that the ideas of Darwin and Mendel, have been spread to all the human fields by neodarwinism and by the genetists, now only the will to "not wanting to know" deprives believers of all sorts of possessing the capacities to evolve rationally and positively. Evolution explains the device by which we have distinguished ourselves from other living beings, and genetics shows us the result of having inherited all sorts of capacities, and above all acquiring them enriching ourselves both culturally and economically, through the effort carried out by each person, by each family, by each race, reaching as far as mankind itself.

Denying the difference of cultural level, of existing civility between these humans and their groups is to deny the evident. Systems such as the IQ (intelligence quotient) aren't needed in order to affirm this difference when comparing the rich countries with the poor ones. The evidence is generally accepted, specially by those who are in a poorer situation and that demand solutions adapted to the convenience of their groups. And the differences between the better positioned, that can be discussed in diverse appreciations, the IQ substitute to be used, is the examination of the practical results which are evident according to the synopsis at the end of this book. They are because of their respective evolutions, and not because of abstruse ideas pertaining to all the thinkers that have existed. Nor because of "aryan syncretism":

(9) (*"aryan syncretism": the process of successions initiated and continued, among many others, by wizards – chiefs – kings – emperors – aristocrats – prophets – saints – classical and ignorant philosophers – national socialists – national catholics –national fascists and among other privileged ones reaching as far as the current democratic rulers all of whom are professional politicians*). They are according to what the indexes of productivity indicate, and they are because of the intentionality of the subjects involved, which are free of all esoterism, that persist as the base for programs that intend, and partly achieve, to affect hundreds of millions of human beings.

(1)Did Darwin sense the origin of species from a global viewpoint? Was he frightened from the familiar atmosphere and intellectual circles of his time, in order to limit himself to considering speciation as something subsequent and disconnected from the creation of life? Did he think about the possible socio-biological consequences -that have occurred- when considering that the evolutionary process is, according to its own nature, constant and perennial?

Answering these questions is impossible, knowing the answers is not necessary. Darwin and Mendel, just like any other renovator that has existed, established some theories, which later on became realities. They will have destroyed the existing before them, in this case all the clearly esoteric proposals of creativism. After hundreds of years of unawareness of being, because they didn't think; and later on, for thousands of years absorbed by the thought of creative divinity, the void of ideas regarding this fundamental issue, now human beings are driven not only by wanting to understand better or worse the civilizing process, but first of all to sense what could be more convenient and more rationally possible, future. And then, in order to obtain the best results through an ability to create an evolutionary project, that ceases to be algorithmic, and becomes rational, and therefore foreseeable and susceptible to being programmed.

We often find in the development of evolutionary thinking and through their many followers, apparent contradictions between the ideas of Darwin himself and that of his successors, reaching as far as neodarwinism. And also the realities that are produced sociologically during the entire process, which has become cleansed precisely by the reaction facing the obstinate creativist obsession that has been fed by religions. All as a consequence of evolution essentially being a natural system based on chain reaction syncretisms. It might be convenient, bearing in mind that in any renovation a more or less important sediment of preceding ideas is conserved that inevitably produce the invincible conservative attitude on clever minds that are fit to grasp current realities in any moment of time. It is like a kind of brake that operates to avoid the derailment of the process caused by having acquired an uncontrollable speed. The postures of renovation and conservation have always existed -and continue to exist. Outstanding thinkers that naturally perceive partial aspects of the general evolutionary process. Conservatives are generally erudites, and although erudition is not incompatible with the possibility of acquiring the capacity to possess creative thinking, reading and the process of assimilating the avalanche of philosophy created in all ages, it reduces the precious thinking time, dedicated to collecting the ideas of philosophers that in many cases have been absolutely surpassed. Such is the case of Plato and Aristotle, model of this non-phenomenical factor of the always operating syncretism, that is on the other hand the creator of the symbiotic character of human beings, and at the same time a factor of obstructing evolution.

(4) In spite of its inherent selfishness produced by the struggle for existence, depending on people and their groups, pragmatism allows overcoming all difficulties to find coincidences, agreements with mutual cessions. That's what happens between small groups.

Shifting this ability from all groups to mankind is just a matter of gaining ability to do so. We can also add that most of the anchor-ideas that brake renovation, are generally previous to Darwin and Mendel. But among them, and already opposed to the creativists, english philosophers liberated themselves from this persisting millenial inertia, the most outstanding being the creators of empiricism. Bacon in his work *Novum Organum* (1620), a kind of summary of his thinking directed not only against beliefs, but also against the persisting and omnipresent european platonism-aristotelism. Bacon set the basis of empiricism, an authentic philosophical revolution. Locke, theoretician of the english revolution (1688), giving method to the empiricist system, still keeping remnants of a religious mark -that he personally did not assume. And Hume crowning the empiricist system, exuberant in all his statements which, as happened to Bacon, led to his incarceration, by logic in such a cultural level that clashed directly with his character and radical thinking, which would not even accept the shy rationalism of his time. A movement that was diversely methodized, now more than ever, it is the support for a new renovating political system, and that unlike Hume, follows its empiricism without looking down on the intuition always a small step forward of empiricist knowledge. In this case, useful to exit from the algorithm that Darwin established philosophically, and therefore introduce itself in a programmed evolution, following Locke in that sense. The three fathers of empiricism were the creators of the philosophical saga that, parallel to Renaissance, survives in our days, in spite of the existence of anti-rationalists that think and act rationally. It's not a play on words. It's inevitable reality. Its confusionism is only apparent within the colossal syncretism, eternally present in human life. The paradigm of this confusion, is the disdain for politics, personalizing it in the professional politicians, when in reality we all are political agents. This reality, slowly changes, as is usual in any evolutionary process, the pattern of life shifts all intellectual and vital activities in general, with those that remain after they have become obsolete going down in history, as occurs with "aryan syncretism" in the present time. The failure to recognize this reality, has divorced professional politicians from the rest of political agents, with politicians unaware of their corporativism, more exaggerated than any that has existed in all sorts of activities and that has contributed to draw a border line, unsurmountable within the current political system- between the rulers and the governed. It's another paradigm of the confusionism created by the current syncretism between past and present, lived insensitively by the governed and dramatically by the rulers, that cannot avoid feeling unable, inept to confront the problems created precisely by this increasing separation between one side and the other, and also

because of the global range of these problems. The lack of space for so much population.

5-Professionalized political omnipresence

The discredit of professionalized politics, and therefore also of those who manage it, had *raison d'être*. It exists and the gap between the evolution of the world population and the evolution of its rulers is evident, with the latter anchored in models of government created in ancient ages, prior to the creation of the word and the concept of politics. Because with this name or without it, politics has acted since before its concept and name had been established. Because the organizers of team hunting were politicians, and politics is what most of the human beings do through their varied performances. Even when they are combatting or insulting politicians or politics. But the responsibility for the emergence of this situation lies in those that have means to change it. The ones that have chosen to become professionals in the political field.

The wizards, predecessors of the current shamans and seers, observers of the environmental and human nature, keeping the secret of the effects herbal treatment had on pains, have their equivalent today in the professional politicians that through deception surpass the wizards' deceit in many aspects. In the current scale of quality value, the summit is occupied by "aryan syncretism" -remember aryan means honourable man-, conferred with a divinity that is accepted by their subjects, at the same time they performed politics of domination, until their task was transferred to professional politicians. The highest position in the scale of values within the monarchic regimes were kings that actually ruled, and they absolutely did have *raison d'être*. They accomplished a crucial mission. Deified or only appointed by the grace of God. In certain parts of the Earth they have specific names, depending on the wake its governing action and delegate of God leave behind. As an example, king David who knew how to recruit wills through undeserved perks that created an immediately inferior class of "honourable men". Aristocracy, giving way to the appearance of corruption.

(5) The more or less famous religious prophets, like Abraham, made politics, a persuasive policy that convinced his distressed partners in the voluntary exodus from Ur to Canaan, that the route they were following was ordered by God, and that Abraham was only the messenger. It happened during the escape from the wars that his parents provoked. The parents that came from the same steppes from which they had also fled before them, as also other parents had done directly through the Ural Mountains giving birth to the scandinavian and german arians. And it was a fully sociological policy, that of the other fugitives who, without crossing the tribes of

Abraham, the greek tribes, that in the same age, two milleniums before our time, shifted their well defined gods towards Greece. Having become myths, with the clearly political base of Plato and Aristotle, were substituted by one of the three unique Gods of the same hebraic branch. The one that sent his son to the Earth, Christ, revolutionary man, still widely worshipped as God.

The ethnic syncretism parallel to the religious one continued. The emigrants with Abraham, believed in their God, born in the sandbanks of the Ancient East, Jehovah, the one that provided paths for his chosen allies on Earth, in this case the path of Canaan. That's where jewish monotheism began, split by the action of the big predecessor and maybe partly giving inspiration to Marx, creating together with the esenians the second God, with no other name. And finally several centuries later, through Mohammad the third unique and same god emerged, Allah. And so, the space of two milleniums and a half with varied exodus of jews, greeks, and warriors of Allah collecting different populations, ethnic groups and even races, three single gods and three monotheistic religions were created, burying the mythology taken to Greece by Helenus.

In that small space of the Earth and over an extended period of time, with the many biblical ephemeris of three differently propheticised religions, the religious syncretisms succeded one another, paradigmatic syncretisms, clearer than any other occurred with a socio-political nature. That is the root of religion: socio-political, opposed to the current socio-biology that Darwin unintentionally started. Indeed, it is clear example of syncretism, in this case religious, it is a copy of the ephemeris of King Sargon, that ruled four thousand three hundred years ago, he was a semite like Abraham, that was picked up from a basket floating on the river, just as Moses eleven hundred years later. Moses repeated Abraham's ephemeris, both of them convincing their frightened companions of their communication with God, to persuade them in their exodus to Canaan having departed from Egypt. All those epsiodes were simple political tricks of persuasion that have conditioned the development of civilization for milleniums.

(10) Politics, once the term had been established, were performed by the persian empire, the macedonian empire and also by the roman-byzantine empire.

“Aryan syncretism” has acted based on falseness, more or less deliberate, reaching as far as the more recent national socialism, or national catholicism. Or the communist of undoubted good faith, but just like the rest shamelessly imperialistic, exploiting lies. Lies that could have been believed by the propellants of the twin ideas of Engels and Marx, true admirers of Darwin, but just as ignorant as he was of the biological laws that Mendel's discovery, genetics, established: the reality of the legacy, of the identity inevitably

working on billions of billions of human beings that in such a way have evolved. Laws that inevitably force us to accept in the practicalities of life, that the communist idea -not rooted in the “community” but rooted in “that which is common”, what is equal- is contrary to human nature. That is why the only way to continue evolving is accepting, and even taking care of the learning process of living among diversity. Of people or groups. Pursuing similarity persistingly.

From the perspective of past and present it becomes clear that even those who despise politics, are performing politics. The divergence with professional politicians is justified because only the latter have the chance to change the system that keeps them kidnapped in the stage of demagogy.

It is not necessary to contemplate the evolutionary process of human beings, starting from the primitive like those of the groups manipulated by aryan syncretism, that now have derived in participacy. It is enough to compare between the current groups, and those subjected to the contemporary empires, the creation of religions that persist, all of them originating from lies, or confusion caused by the physical or intellectual fatigue of their creators. In the Roman Republic, the family that created the Roman Empire through the hand of a member of its “gent” juliana: Julius Caesar. And later, comparing the record of the politicians that have existed in any other party of parallel signs between those and the current ones. The process has suffered a regression. There was more empathy in the emperors that with their thumb sentenced the loser to death in the circus and the human herds responding deliriously, than the existing one today between a national leader and the current citizenship, more skeptical than gregarious, whose biggest concession to the decisions of their rulers is only to tolerate them, not because of firm belief, but because of the passivity that has been created and fostered carefully by the governing spheres.

(29) This consummation of divorce between the rulers and the governed has created blurry social classes. That’s how the politicians, that have appointed themselves with the exclusive privilege of performing politics, have turned out to be. These specialized conservative politicians are the ones who have made a profession out of the organizing task of citizens’ cohabitation, they have monopolized the direction of the decisive resources that have slowly culminated in “aryan syncretism” through political parties. They have created participacy that controls legislation and the act of government, justice and armed forces. They are the ones that, without links between them other than the State-nations, maintain near absolute precarious relations, since frequently it’s not just an absence of a link, but a more or less violent opposition between

States. But all, united in fact, when facing this reality established directly by the legacy of aristocracy, have placed the rest of the citizenship in a passive situation. An average of fifty per cent of the population, depending on countries, supports the system by voting in the elections, constituted by the still gregarious integrals of the Third World. Supported by the only partially gregarious that ignore deliberately the issues that affect local and general politics in the First World under process of globalization. Facing another fifty per cent of those who abstain from voting in the elections, and those who could incite the most and condition politics: the investigators of sociobiology, and scientists in general, coincide with those that make a passive opposition, with a null vote. This acceptance of the state of things created by professional politicians who were very satisfied with their own work –when they are the ones that most need some deep changes in the particratic system– has already delivered all it had to give.

(23) The result of this political system that worked well in its beginnings two milleniums ago in the Roman Republic, with the very scarce reforms, additions and suppressions, has been to create artificial groupings of more or less similar human beings, ignoring the communities already created before the system itself, through a long natural process, and therefore enduring, unlike the groupings created by professional politicians. These groups do not enjoy internal cohesion, and against what had been assumed up until now, they haven't provided the cohesion between these groupings that having been termed state-nations, and until recently Empires, in their desire to acquire greatness, have only achieved changing features because of the wars they have engaged in. Today, no Empire is regarded as having been great, nor is there a state-nation considered to be hegemonic.

Like everything else in this world, war techniques have evolved, reaching the point of atomic disintegration. The development of these weapons could now be producing miniatures. There are big advantages for the current powers that possess conventional atomic weapons, and can develop new modes of mass destruction. Big advantages and it's scary to think that through some of them with suicidal inclinations conspiring with groups that practice terrorist guerrillas, and with same goals, hegemonies ranging from personal ones within families, to religious, social or political ideas, could increase their potential by combining destructive means with human suicidal means. The aryan syncretism culminating in particracy does not guarantee a syncretism like the one their predecessors possessed, kings, emperors and oligarchs of all types.

(10)

The link between science and politics, only occurs when technology produces a device or system that is related to interests of states. That generally are not the same as the world's.

The distressed professional politicians, stressed by the domestic problems of their territory -and worried first about their personal situation, to remain active in their competition with their party partners, who are always potential rivals, and above all in the continuous attack and defense with the colleagues of the opposite party -, they cannot gage nor understand, the problems that affect all of the world, and therefore affect them. With the system of nation-states, the political activity of government is consumed nearly exclusively by paying attention to problems, insignificant problems on a world scale within its field. And even the politicians of the major powers, behave like disciples of Machiavelli, focusing on the pursuit of voters that will support them, remaining impassive regarding the problems of a global range.

Not working firmly in order to halt the proliferation of atomic weapons, the use of which -not only in hands of the guerrillas, but mainly under the power of irresponsible nation-states- is an unforgivable mistake. As is the permanence of the political system through these nation-states, each of which acts as if it were placed outside this world, that because of the proliferation of atomic weapons it is no exaggeration, is in a situation of global catastrophic risk, increased by the addition of challenges established during the beginning of this third millenium, some of them could ignite an atomic war. The peaceful coexistence of human beings requires politicians to incline towards an inevitably hard and costly recycling. And that implies previously having changed the system of human relations. A task that only the politicians themselves can force with thir allied voters. This organized jumble, more spontaneous than intentionally created, of a world like the existing one, certainly allows hopes of the evolutionary process having continuity in this millenium and in more to come. But we must not fool ourselves. To believe that the surprising evolution of our species in this tiny astral body called Earth is because of a destiny created by some force external to mankind, would be the same as believing in any of the imagined gods. It would also imply denying the algorithmic character of mankind, and abandoning the idea of surpassing it.

6-Globalization

(11)

Obtaining delight moves wills, with episodes that include crime and suicide. Its intellectualization, not since Romanticism but since the beginning of time, has translated the desire to obtain delight into the innate instinct to BE-REMAIN, of all living creatures, conscious in the

case of human beings. And it's interesting to check how in the current moment, the process of globalization of all things, ideas and systems being discussed, focus on this movement of welfare pursuit, directed towards economic issues and to the survival of the soul. Everything, even the homeland feelings, are inclined towards the encouragement of this process that establishes the priority to live - and to live well-, which is possible only if living in welfare is within the reach of everybody, even if this inevitably happens in different degrees.

The oppositions and protests against the forums where the economic issues of world range are discussed, indicate the lack of trust that the poor or less favoured, have in the people that deceitfully and pointlessly perform demagoguery on their behalf. And what causes this lack of trust is not the breach of agreements, nor the quantity of programmed aims. It is the certainty of this machiavellian political system that accepts lies as a political standard, now explicitly for the "politically correct", cannot solve problems that haven't even been looked at with concrete and real factors.

Polygenism, racism and all similar ideas, are a puff of smoke in the air. The reality of the common species prevails, and this implies the process of common lived experience in one single community. But also races, ethnic groups, villages, families, and people are realities with specific identities, and they fulfil a function according to what they are: civilized organisms, that together form the global community. A process based on the biological individuality of human beings.

The economic side of globalization, with the requirements of market economy, cannot deprive -and such an aim does not exist- globalization, with more or less parsimony, from entering all fields of the human experience. As happens in all revolutions, it entails episodes of violence. Eliminating them must be the primary aim. In broad terms, religions, particularly those that haven't evolved because the societies that practice them haven't evolved either, are the model of die hard conservatism. But we must bear in mind that religions, even the most ferociously proselytizing, if the circumstance of the appearance of miniature nuclear devices that we mentioned hadn't occurred, would have no chance of fighting with the slightest chance of success against the political establishment, old aged but able thanks to its rational roots -it does have them- to sprout and revive itself. This perspective is darkened by the difficulty that the fact of the politicians being as conservative as the religious figures entails. It's difficult for them to change following their own initiative. The role of civil society, with an enormous amount of outstanding people both intellectually and economically, an imposing bulk that in the First World surpasses fifty per cent -an important

portion of those that abstain from voting-, can influence in the discussion of a change of political system. In any case, what needs to be avoided is the appearance of violent episodes in the process of welfare generalisation.

Arguing with believers is a difficult task. Faith, whether it's real or fake, can only be overcome through the process of decomposition already in an advanced state in all religions, except in Islam, that within its heterogeneous doctrinal structure believers and professional politicians coexist, because its priests are both things at once. All revolutions have a spark that breaks away from the existing to impose renovation. The cracking of Islam will occur, no doubt. But not without unpredictable episodes, for which it is absolutely necessary to be prepared.

Civil society has a difficult task to become the violent spark that breaks away from what has become obsolete. It is not as if in the relative welfare that their more valuable members generally enjoy, or the ones in poorer situations, they have degenerated being useless for evolution. But they aren't a group, nor a group of groups, they're only a dispersed part even if they are a majority in the First World —which in the end are bound to act in the current situation—; another minor part in the Second World; and an absurd part in the Third World. And it is not only a lack of connection between these citizens what deprives them of playing the role of an igniting spark in the change of system process. It is the imposing corporative framework of the active political agents, including governments and opposition; the ecclesiastical hierarchies from their towering pedestals, built by great economic interests, the only ones that could cut the gordian knot of faith; and they are the more or less naive followers in the current political game that participate in the elections, giving a democratic tinge to the system. These groups are not totally disconnected. Their decisive force lies in the coincidence of interests, and even of feelings; in the possession of power; in the control of the juridical power; in the factor that has the most incidence, which is the educating driving force of youth; and in the inertia of everything that exists and has existed on the Earth. This last factor may be as important as the other factors all together.

Could the igniting spark that will change the system, and permit its renovation be caused by the evidence of a cataclysm being provoked by the eroded current system? In other words, could it be that the defense of personal interests of those who possess the power in the current system provoked them to convince themselves of the greater importance, even for themselves, of the global problems?

Describing them with no order whatsoever so that each person can put them in order according to their own criteria in reference to the urgency and priority within their group, is an exercise that could

be useful. All of them have been detected and studied in the media. But they have been studied separately by many specialists in each field in which these problems are occurring, catching the eye of the inclined voters, which are worried by concrete problems that in some way or another especially affect them personally.

There is no organism that can collect renovating suggestions. Nor is there a system to group people for sociobiological actions, other than political parties. All of them profoundly conservative, not with the current world situation, but with the system, their system, that discriminates all the scattered anti-system proposals, and firmly defends the established as being possible and operative. A *meme* of the instinctive and inevitable desire of persistence of all things, and especially of humans. These politicians are nearly happy engaged in local political manoeuvring, the only thing that generates votes in the elections, with their eye set on the pursuit of absolute majorities, or consoling in “decisive minorities”. Their electoral programs, especially when they tackle global problems, are only bold idle chatter that because of it being generalised, is not the object of mutual criticism. And that’s how the real problems of human beings continue being in limbo, mitigated and sometimes solved by the indirect action of science and technology. Not only by the mechanization of productivity. Discoveries like contraceptives, apparently of little transcendence, provoke radical changes in evolutionary orientation, not only in the sociological. Also in the biological. The provoked infertility is changing the sexuality of the two genders. With no specific intention. And in undefined directions.

Overcoming inertias and systems, must not be reached by making an inventory-type description of the problems. But it is necessary as an introduction to the second part of the book, in which we will contemplate the groups that can operate in a global scale without the need to change their structures. Nor substituting the politicians. Only capacitating them. We shall restrict our selection of priorities to consider to the following four spaces.

(33)

Economic and cultural differences between the three worlds established in this book’s synopsis.

It’s important to know the causes, but there are so many of them that a specific book on the subject would be needed. The situation of dependence of the Third World, and part of the Second World is caused, rudely summarized, to the lack of physical and mental activity during millions of years of those born in the warmer zones. The cause lies in the fact that in their habitat that which is indispensable to live has been offered to the reduced number of inhabitants, who had to make no other effort than to collect it. Together with the high birth rate which is a consequence of the low effort system of life -favoured by warm climates, in which the demographic path of high fertility was compensated by the natural

high death rate, and also provoked by the mothers themselves when the descendents of the couple surpassed the limit of the paternal capacity, but above all the maternal capacity to look after the children. And polygenism that inclined colonizers towards the destruction of the natives or to their use as working beasts, however introducing them to hygiene and health treatments that although were not enough from a First World viewpoint, they did reduce premature death. And although these changes of habits were very elementary, when combined with the action of the religious missions that has influenced in the elimination of the habit of sacrificing the surplus of newly born, it has produced an uncontrolled increase of world population. All of it together with other minor causes, has made it impossible for any sort of symbiosis between the colonizers and the colonized, the latter becoming the Third World, generating unequal cultural and economic levels continuously increasing instead of decreasing, bringing the levels of welfare between the inhabitants of the three established worlds further away from each other.

As a result, poverty in two thirds of the people of the Earth.

Causes: It is useless to blame the colonizers of all sorts that have acted until the present time. Those of each country, generally the ones that in every colonizing period could enjoy the means to colonize, were audacious, without any intellectual or social education, and the few evangelizers that accompanied them were unaware of the monogenism that is now well established, and besides, their main mission was to convince and force the natives to work for the colonizers. Pillage existed in the development of the colonization, but there was also compensation. In its development over the period of few centuries, the cultural level of the natives has evolved more than with ten milleniums of wild or semi-wild life. And although it wasn't enough, and with little or no intentionality whatsoever, it intiated them in the process of evolution that now acquires more possibilities to develop. The current state of the majority of the ex-colonies is half way between barbarism and civilization. There is no similiarity with the state of barbarism in the Northern hemisphere, that on the other hand has known how to adapt to the evolutionary process, even before Darwin, what has permitted them to learn how to coexist peacefully in a more or less violent way.

Demographic unbalance, with an explosion of the birth rate in the countries of the Third World, with an increase of fertility in many countries of the Second World, and provoked sterility in the countries of the First World. And in spite of the increase of the cultural level among the natives of the countries of the First World, the average

cultural level of the world's population is waning, because those that are born condemned to ignorance are a bigger figure.

The economic differential between the population of the First World and those of the Third World, also increases instead of decreasing. The aids, that are only a symbol of solidarity, are not enough. Even if the intention to finance the reduction of the economic differential between the existing levels in the world existed, there is no capacity to do so. The civilizing task carried out by the missionaries, and the hygienic task carried out by doctors have increased the average life expectancy of the poor in the world, increasing their productive age, and also the agonizing period of an old age that is even more miserable than life during their productive phase. Malthus clears himself after having confirmed that the population of the Earth has doubled itself in the short period of time of less than half the XX Century, of which there has been no perception in the Third World. There, without many vital stimulants, they have legitimized the calm masculine libido being practiced with feminine genital organ without clitoris, and women that are compliant to the authority of the male. And having abandoned, or at least nearly, the habit of strangling the newly born when the family is already a crowded one, through the effect the civilizing action of missionaries have on these growing populations, resulting in them being subject to territorial constriction.

(The demographical information of the world to be compared in the synopsis of the years 1993-1994 with 2003-2004)

(27)

Environmental pollution. Green house effect because of the lack of reservoirs of CO₂ liberated by the use of fuels and fossile combustibles.

This problem is susceptible of becoming The Problem. But at the same time it is the most controversial. The country that consumes the biggest quantities of fuels and fossile combustibles, the USA, who possess well-known considerable reserves, those of Alaska, does not position itself with regard to this problem. That's where the financing for the campaigns against the ecologists' allegations (now generalised allegations) comes from, directed towards the adulteration of their calculations on the effects of climate change. And even recently, casting a doubt over the effect of combustions and emanations of CO₂ as producers of the green house effect.

Playing with alternatives, speculating with an exhaustion of the non-exploited reserves of oil, preparing meanwhile a change of energetic sources, conserving oil fields for them to be exploited by applying them to other oil substitute products, would only be considered a machiavellian trick. But against all predictions, when oil becomes exhausted, even if it occurs over a period of two or three centuries -and it's absolutely certain that this will happen-, even if the rest of the world (as happened in KIOTO) launches projects

carrying them out, the advantage of the consumption of fossil combustibles over a large period of time in the future, would undoubtedly give an advantage to the competitiveness of the country that does not participate in the proposed agreements, promoted more by the ecologists than by the ecogians, and maintaining its fields in order to use them later as a raw matter.

Once the conflict of the cold war, with its episodes involving atomic weaponry, has been settled between the USA and the USSR, now there is a coincidence in the consumption interests of the former and the productive interests of the latter. In the case of a machavellian strategy like the one mentioned, Russia would lose again since it got rid of its oil reserves, unfortunately.

The final reflection about this problem is that all the systems of energy production based on combustion, even those that are atomic, within a relatively short time span, will certainly be exhausted. Facing this certain and, in no way hypothetical, perspective it is obligatory and prudent to do as much as we can to mobilize the energetic production by means other than the combustion of fossiles.

(10)

Many other problems are accumulative, they build on the mentioned problems. But nearly all of them are problems that if the demographic one should be solved, the ones originated by this main one could be dealt with effortlessly. The scarcity of water; the exhaustion of fertile lands; the extreme poverty in the Third World; the exhaustion of the oil reserves; a part of the population living in low deltas could be the victims of an increase in the water level of oceans; nuclear residue production, diseases caused by malnutrition and a long list of misfortunes, would decrease in so far as the world population ceased to increase, or even better that an important decrease of the world population occurred. Now this could be possible without big social traumas.

Given the moment we are now living, not any more conflicting than other past times considering the means available for human beings in each period, it's not reasonable to take care of urgent problems leaving future generations the task to solve the rest of them (some of them which by then will have become unsolvable). When other problems emerge, like the ones that appeared during the second half of the twentieth century, the capacity of response would be much less effective than the one available at the moment. Pretending not to understand the future is not a human attitude, because the sudden appearance of one of the problems we have considered, whether new or derived from these, can happen within a time span that can affect future generations, and maybe even affect the current generations.

To act by preventing certain situations based on rational ideas, born from observations made by intuitive thinkers is a must. Lamarck and Darwin were fought, especially the latter. Faith, with its ability to narcotize moral awareness conscience, reacted fiercely against his ideas about life creation and evolution, ideas that were impossible to verify empirically within the existing level of knowledge in the moment of its discovery. Their acceptance has suffered a big delay. The adoption of a policy that is consequent with this (unfortunately not unanimous) acceptance is now being dangerously delayed.

The muslim action over the former culturally advanced region of the Ancient East and even over the Indus and the Pacific Islands, paralyzed their evolution, if not definitely, for a millenary times, and will have caused incalculable social damage. The attitude of our predecessors during the course of our Era, has created the current problematic situation, where there is a global world in certain facets, without a system to rule it. The realities that are now evident, foreseen by the Malthus, the english priest, followed so closely by Darwin, is the most outstanding fact that indicates the effects that lack of foresight provokes the mental laziness of those that have the duty of valuing in each moment the ideas that are born in rational minds. Generally those of scientific and unbiased people. It seems as if we have just discovered an evidence that has always existed: the Earth has a dimension that we cannot change. Therefore, birth rate cannot only be controlled, but must be controlled more and this should be done through Galton's eugenesic ideas, another remarkable prudent man who was unaware of genetics. Not by trying to select progenitors (not yet). But by determining where it is necessary to increase birth rate and where it is necessary to reduce it. And more than attenuating the biblical "grow and multiply", we must neutralize it according to the malthusian premise.

The dysfunctions created by globalization only have one single cause: they aren't independent, they all have to be taken care of at once, that is, globally. By a global government. Impossible to constitute given the current system of representative democracy, based on the election of representatives that cannot represent the will of the voters. Because they are elected on a personal basis, and not depending on the programmes of compulsory fulfillment once the governments and oppositions have been established. And even if there was a change of system, in which the programmes were the real motive for the election, and they were programmes of compulsory fulfillment, the opposed dispositions due to the opposed needs caused by the existing chasm that separates the economic and cultural levels of current mankind, would nullify any programme. The proposals that would appeal to the poor and ignorant, the majority

of the current world, would inevitably be chosen. And they would not be the necessary ones, not even for the poor and ignorant themselves, and even less for the entire mankind. The current marginalization of those that do not wish to become part of the anti-system, is provoked by the fear of being considered conservative. And the system does not change. France has mobilized when two candidates for the presidency, very ambiguously and without enough depth, have hoisted the order of change. Many elections have been won with this motto. And all of them have failed because of the true conservatism, not latent but powerful, of those who, through opportunism and lack of concretion, cheat the voters. Could the current challenges provoke the change?

This perspective is a positive one. It could thwart the action of politicians that making use of the demagoguery that characterizes them nearly all, once again try and partially or totally achieve in cheating the electorate, without even making promises of specific changes. That is why the changes have to be explained thoroughly and in relation to each of the challenges.

Not only do the professional politicians that exercise government and also opposition have to intervene in the creation of a new political system that enables pacific coexistence and fast evolution. Also those who possess outstanding brains that besides their professional dedication choose to incorporate themselves to this project. And this requires to continue on the direction of the true muslim yihad. Personal struggle to improve oneself. Electors and candidates.

Switzerland has a long history of plebiscites for a wide range of issues. They are effective within their domain. In a world federation based in the union of States of sizes like that of Switzerland it would be possible to solve its specific state problems, without interfering in the federal policy. Could it become in the future, having gathered a longer experience, the path for People-nations to discuss global issues? In this hypothetical case it would have to be considered that these type of consultations could only render positive results when the cultural political level in the world were like the one Switzerland has currently. Because of these reasons, all the exits to the current situation only have one direction: the educational system, which can only be changed if we change the political system first.

7-Post Darwinism

(12)

After having remembered that which is essential from what has happened since Darwin's Origin of Species. And as a consequence of this work in relation to the evolutionary process that has placed us facing the challenges (apparently more risky than any of the former

challenges), now is the time to specify and value them, after having considered the capacities acquired by human beings, thanks to the neo-darwinian ideas. It's an exercise we must do, in order to justify a proposal that overcoming fears of naivety and pedantry, lays a reasonable base for a focused and realist discussion on these challenges.

The division between believers and unbelievers persists. Nevertheless we have created a perfect symbiosis between both social poles and the Earth. It seems to be a fantastic coincidence, or the result of an unknown universal order, and that only through its understanding will we be able to understand what our predecessors have been able to do in their corresponding cultural levels. The surpassed episodes since the last century and a half, have still been mediatized by the theogony. But it's no paradox that in the imagination of creative processes of the Universe and of human beings on the Earth, the inventors were rationalists. The lack of knowledge in their time, forced them to think reasonably that something superior than human ability had created every known thing -which wasn't much. Thinking of God was reasonable, rationalist, without them being aware of being rationalists.

That which we now know and that has been confirmed empirically in relation to the process creator of life on Earth, continues being little. It's what is known from a brief period we call historical, and in palaeontology what we have deduced from prehistory. Particularly, in the universal order, the knowledge is nearly insignificant. Undoubtedly the human beings of the tenth millenium will comment on the lack of knowledge of the current moment. Having overcome the religious beliefs through empirical knowledge, wherever this knowledge exists, now we continue to think rationally in the light of the knowledge of realities that have been discovered about the creation of all existing things. And specifically about an infinity of aspects regarding our own being, and more than about the unknown past, about the future. And we continue being rationalist and scarcely empiricist regarding these matters. And we will continue this way until we surpass ourselves in our knowledge, based on what we have reached so far.

Should we do as Hume did and do away with rationalism placing empiricist knowledge as the only source of evolution? Acting according to this premise, would mean being subordinated to accidental discoveries, which would be impossible to coordinate for these types of discoveries happen sporadically and in places of the Earth with no links between them. Intuition would die. But this hypothesis should not worry us. Intuition exists, and it functions precisely based on the empiricist knowledge we have reached in all fields of knowledge. An idea or a thousand ideas establish new realities, seldom discovered by inspiration.

Only rationally can one deny the principles of all religions. Those “realities” created in the beginning of conscientiousness, by ideas of undoubted rationality and according to the level of knowledge achieved, will never be confirmed. But will our successors in ten thousand years time -bearing in mind what our predecessors were in the past, and the acceleration of the evolutionary process-, have knowledge of the universal causes? That the name given to those past theogonic realities was God is not important. In any answer to the given question, the inventors of religions have now been recognised as being necessary in their time. If during the next ten milleniums we gain knowledge in responding to the why and what for questions of the Universe, and if evolution is understood by certain causes, the current darwinian algorithm would be equally considered useful and necessary to achieve our cultural level.

8 God or Darwin?

(5)

A dichotomy that still has validity. Miracle or algorithm is the alternative for the inhabitants of the Earth that try to imagine the future, partly because of their knowledge of the past. A past that no longer is an unknown beginning of the existence of the Earth and human beings.

In this dilemma, it is suitable to eliminate God, not because there exists something still unnamed that has created the Universe, but because it's evident that the idea of God or of the imagined gods has become completely nullified through fully rational knowledge and above all because of the part that has been empirically proved with absolute rotundity and realism. God is a simple word, devaluated by the defining eagerness of human beings when facing the incomprehensible. It is difficult if not impossible to assume that the knowledge within reach of the human neuronal system, with all its future evolution, will manage to defeat the ignorance of how the evolutionary process has unfolded from inorganic matter to organic matter. Even if this happened, the knowledge would be restrained to an episode on Earth. But it could be the start of a new search: its relationship with the Universe.

It's evident that all the projects of the future must be based on the empirical knowledge and reasonable ideas born from intuitions now enriched by the knowledge attained in many fields of human thinking. Leaving the absolute aside, logic must intervene, even if it is with the scepticism that it is only another support for rationality.

In this order of ideas, being similar or different to all the assumptions established by human beings, it's evident that any project of the future has to be shaped with the alternative of the deductions that the darwin based evolutionism allows us to use. Or

continue with the idea of the creating God, an idea that doesn't even further imaginations. Complete frustration. Another "God will provide". The darwinian philosophical algorithm, based on logic and on the observation of nature, has impeded the destruction of theogony without the creation of a substitution. Is the possibility to understand the empirical knowledge reached by the bulk of sciences created and developed the only positive thing that logic and rationality have? It's not, since intuition acts as an encouragement to search realities, an aspect verified through scientific investigations. Intuition and inspiration guided by rationality, avoid the search of any knowledge where there is not the chance of finding it. Scientific investigation is fed from brains like Hume's, but also and in a big proportion of brains that are especially intuitive.

Also the vital philosophy born in the East, before the religious creation, defining Good and Bad, in spite of it being the most ancient and the least uncertain, in practice it has also been invalidated by the interpretation through time that the humans have made and currently make of both concepts. In its origin, the woman embodied the concept of Bad. Only now do are they seriously trying to change it even if it's timidly, as a consequence of how (in different ways) religions have incorporated the same concept of woman and evil in their theological foundations. And they're an evil, but an evil far smaller than that of the poor uncultured masses of the Third World. Millions of years conceiving and breeding humans has certainly produced specific genetics that now we are trying to redirect. (In a similar way to how communism tried to solve social differences, now feminism tries to equal the differences between the two genders. Both attempts haven't considered the biological base of these differences. We can assume that in this second equalizing attempt another negative essay will be avoided, driving the intention towards the natural: learning to coexist with difference, a goal that has nearly been achieved. Within the religious syncretism produced, the incorporation of new concepts is a model of an inertial philosophical legacy which is clear and transparent. Transcendental and useful in a phase of development of the process, and maintained because of the lack of renovating capacity that all religions have without exception, until they have produced the absurd as their main feature. But this evidence that does not need any argumentative support of any kind, and that provokes the generalised disbelief, is not a factor to reinforce the darwinian algorithm.

Darwin started the destruction of the gods, as Nietzsche announced joyfully, he also opened the path for a rational meditation that destroys beliefs, but that doesn't create certainty in that which is substantial in reality and that we believe we know about the Earth and the Universe. Nor about the process of creation, development and perfectly visible end of mankind in this tiny sphere

placed in the apparently insignificant solar system. Nor in the also apparently insignificant Milky Way inside the enormous Universe.

God as an abstraction is possible. But the human beings of the third millennium cannot project themselves based on it. Only can they do that in the dual, although unique, rational and empirical system that creates knowledge: realities produced or discovered. And they can only be obtained through education, that created knowledge, and simultaneously increases the ability to sense things. In short: intuition through inspiration from each cultural level of the subject; objective knowledge through empiricism; and rationalism through the combination of both factors.

9-God and Darwin?

The Bible, with its five books, the most compromising being the Genesis, turned into a dogma accepted by the hebraic, christians and muslims. Written by Moses in the desert, three thousand years on it continues posing an unsurmountable barrier for any attempt to rationalize monotheistic theologies.

The amanuensis and successive writers -twenty eight just for the Old Testament which is common for the three monotheistic religions-, continued the mosaic writings completely dictated by Jehovah, between the years 1513 and 1474 a.C. Some like Joshua were still simple amanuensis of the God Jehovah. Others under the inspiration of the god himself.

After the fifth book, the Deuteronomy, Moses had a rest -one could see this book as being unnecessary, for as its name indicates (duplicate), it was a repetition of laws already written in other previous books, which doesn't praise it as an amanuensis of God. And the biblical theme which follows could have interpretations that allowed a complement being made, maybe a symbiosis, between the idea of a creating God, and an evolutionary process through the innate quality of the human species, designed divinely to think and to evolve. That is, God designs and Darwin discovers the design that no prophet had grasped.

In an explicit way, this hypothesis hasn't been used by any outstanding believer, even though currently some neo christians are trying to use it in a camouflaged way. The answer is in the book "Intelligent thought", written by thinkers gathered by John Brockman. One of the authors, Susskind, presents the idea of kindly compromising with the believers. But the most dogmatic believers do not accept compromise. In spite of their belief, they are intelligent enough to understand that behind Susskind's proposal lies the intention of both ignoring and pacifying them.

We have been evolving for hundreds of millions of years. And only during the short space of time of a century and a half, have we perceived the reality of the evolutionary process of human beings. At

the same time we have verified the extinction of innumerable species, without the world having suffered deterioration because of this cause. Even today, through the inertia of beliefs that have been treasured as a sign of the privilege of possessing faith, the reality of the evolutionary power of the human being is underrated by creativists, since it's impossible to deny. The evolutionary reality of the First World and part of the rest, is accepted by a great quantity of humans, not all of which are highly educated. Those that still live cultivating their faith, multiply various times this mass of current rationalists. Both vote in the elections. And the really educated chosen candidates must necessarily take into consideration the enormous faithful mass. A faith that has opposed signs, to the point where the paradigm of the incongruent increases, since the believers have to confront with rationalists on the one hand, and the believers of opposed creeds on the other. And frequently they even have to face those that are only slightly different to their own. The believers are more powerful than the rationalists on a world scale. Not because of their direct action, but because they mediatize the activity of professional politicians, ready to add more votes on their side even if they come from the devil's son.

It's a strange situation where small details of faith which are practically inapprehensive provoke oppositions that are settled with bombs, and where reflection is ignored because of the lack of knowledge. Small and even insignificant theological differences, impossible to grasp for the big faithful masses, that leave their mark on the ballot box, erecting barriers for evolution.

This system that produces incongruences such as we have mentioned, is called democracy, which means "power of the people". Definitive: it is not necessary nor is it convenient. But it would be if the people, the ones that are educated and the ones that are not; the rich and the poor; the civilized and the still uncivilized; the faithful and rationalists, and a thousand more opposites like these, the inabilities of the uneducated were mitigated gradually until they disappeared.

The global cultural evolution is occurring. How long will it take before the denial of the gods invented by humans does not provoke mental collapse among the believers?

The beginning of this process of rationalization, can happen in this crossroads between the first and second millenium. As a replica of the Renaissance of the mid second millenium, and now on a world scale, so that it can be considered as that of the definitive globalization. Not with the permit of the structures that impede it, pseudo-empires undermined by conservatism turned into state-nations, and all against all, but with its active collaboration through its adaptation to the current realities. The churches-parishioners framework, supporting itself in the still massive existence in the Third World could enable a change that in any case would have to be

radical, without destroying itself, choosing firmly an education of a scientific base, before an explanation is found to the hardly known functioning of the human mind and genomic system. The small part that is known of either systems is determining in order to invalidate the biblical versions of creation. The permanence of the faith is not a miracle. It's only the verification of the conservative strength through inertia, in this case paradigmatic, regarding the survival of faith. Four milleniums after the invention of a single God by Abraham, and after palaeoanthropology has denied biblical verisimilitude, only the hope of science being able to answer this question remains: could we establish a relationship between knowing and believing? Reborn christians and aggravated islamists; opposed mohammedans, violent and irreconcilable; interests that are also opposed and potentially elevated over their real value, compared to the challenges of the twentieth century; agnostics paralelos to the blank voters; belligerent atheists and creativist believers, agnostic or atheists, make it difficult to answer.

First: how and who are each and everyone of these commuities?

SECOND PART

THE CHALLENGERS AND THE CHALLENGED

10-To Live-To Think

The philosophical development firstly, and the socio-biological one in the present time, of the evolutionary idea through the struggle for existence that Darwin illuminated, is far from reaching a wide social meaning like the one allowed by the content of its thinking. Since Christ and all the way through Marx, the idea of “human family” is unfolding, and is now entering the issue of another dichotomy: liberalism-state control.

In the well-structured family, father and mother, each one with his specific family love, they intervene modulating the differences of the resulting chromosomathic recombination. They benefit the sons that are less favoured by randomness and the until now incontrollable function of chromosomes. And it is not only in relation to the economical patrimonial issue that they do so, but in a greater degree in the aspects of the characteristic of each descendent, and with a proper intuitive tendency driven so as not to clip the possibilities of development by those which are more favoured by the randomness of the genetic system.

The “human family”, rediscovered late by nearly all religions, is now emerging without violence but with tremendous vigour in the form of globalization, it lacks personal progenitors. There is no modulation. Establishing it is something that can only be done gradually. Step by step. People-nations; federated groups of them; kantian federation of the world.

The issue of the dichotomy that has been constituted between creativism and evolutionism, parallel to that of the struggle for existence with or without familiar moderation, represents one of the bigger challenges they have to face in the twenty first century. The parallelisms between creativism and evolutionism, and between liberalism and state-control in our age, is not an issue exclusively reserved for the academics and those used to thinking in some circumstances or others. It affects everybody, even those that ignore absolutely the existence of these issues being discussed. Challenges that affect global mankind are at stake. Taking positions or abstaining from doing so, realities are produced that spring from the passive or positive actions of each human being. Transcendentally. The challenges can appear to be sectional. Actually all challenges affect everybody, especially professional politicians.

IMMEDIATE CHALLENGES TO WORLD GOVERNMENT

THE CHALLENGES OF FREEDOM.

The end of the cold war has provoked a confusion in the contemporary minds that has been increasing since 1989. In the name of what? We ask everywhere, in the name of what should we fight, concentrate or live? There were two blocks, everyone was able to choose their own field or choose not to choose between three options, three conceptions of the world, that is: the East, the West, and since Bandung, the “neutralists” and the “non-aligned”. The fall of the Soviet empire has complicated things. What was expected was that the loss of ideological and moral references would be of short duration. Freed from the communist mortgage, the old continent must turn christian, according to what a charismatic spokesman, John Paul II, prophesied. Two decades of enormous gatherings and fervent pilgrimages did not paralyze a fulgurant de-christianization, and the Pope had to admit that europeans lived “as if God didn’t exist”.

We believed, not with less satisfaction, that once the iron curtain had been lifted a well-balanced socialism, which would be condescending and democratic, would unify “the european house”. In 1998, the majority of the governments of the European Union were in fact “pink”. Flash in the pan! Discord prevailed and everyone confirmed that the many european “socialisms” had no common strategy to face the difficulties of globalization and build a project for the future of the continent. Some ratified the “European Constitution”, others rejected it, this proved that the european citizen thinks as if “socialism” was no more than a void concept and an enchantment for municipal use.

Should we deduce from this double disenchantment that we have lost our references in the Earth and that the only thing left to do is to vituperate a “post-history”, where the consuming citizens wander like the deaf and blind in the ingravity of a “void of values”? This was the diagnosis proposed in the dawn of the twentieth century by Nietzsche or Hugo von Hofmannstahl; and now has become the same old tune of the post-philosophical thinking that announces with no cease the end of ideologies, the death of art, the disappearance of morality, the extinction of the man that questions himself and reflects, about the decline of western civilization.

I. TEN THESIS ABOUT FREEDOM

1. This famous “dissolution of the social link” -or “crisis of values”- which isn’t a phenomenon that happened today nor yesterday, is vituperated by the teachers of morals or by the candidates to the elections. In the ancient Athens, Socrates was sentenced to the capital punishment for the demoralization of the youth, even though all he had done was to express aloud the evidence that no manual of

good behaviour granted athenians any privilege whatsoever. The multiplicity of the ways to live and die, of educating the proletariat, of honouring the Gods or not doing so, determines the West's original pluralism. Several hundreds of "Supreme Goods" used to coexist in greco-roman antiquity and even when Europe became unanimously christian, it divided itself again between a greek church and a roman one, whose relations were all but amicable. Lashing out against the relativism of values, the way the highest moral, religious and academic authorities of our age do, simply manages to lament that the West is the West.

2. The unity of western civilization, far from wanting a community of ideals because of them being multiple, contradictory and versatile, is based on one single idea: freedom. It is the bet of bets that structures greek, european, western and world societies. The opening rupture that creates an abyss between Greece and Asia, and the victorious resistance to the persian invasion is lived and celebrated like the war of freedom against despotism. In the name of that freedom, the athenians sacrificed their fields, their homes and their wealth to win, while they were cornered on board their ships in Salamis. In the name of a similar will to obtain freedom, Leonidas and his spartans held their position until their death in the battle of Thermopylae. Aeschylus and Herodotus sanctified this act of birth of greek difference: a freedom that, above all, strives to be itself.

3. The West's self-definition through the desire to obtain freedom manifests itself in the ostentation of weapons, but even more in the clash of consciences. What difference is there between a hellenian and an asian? Plutarch asks. Answer: one word, one single word which is unknown to the persian, who underestimates its use. The word the greek knows how to say: NO. The free man discovers he is free by crying: no!! More than two milleniums before Descartes, the greek culture sets common beliefs asides, it distances from them, it practices generalised doubt. Agamemnon sacrifices Iphigeneia. Wherever traditional opinion honors the devotion of a chief that wants to obtain from the Gods the favourable winds for his ships, the greek eye asks the infanticide: in the name of what did the father get her daughter slain? While Agamemnon believes himself to be delegated for the mission and does not question his instincts, nor his dreams, nor the oracle's threats, Homer (and his readers, that is all of Greece) questions the freedom of Agamemnon that has the right to abandon himself to his thoughtless impulses or to refrain from doing so. The secret of the "knowledge of himself" that is sought by ancient literature and philosophy, is the return to his own choice which is obliged to a freedom that is discovered to be responsible and searches for itself.

4. I don't only know I am free, I also know that you are free. The greek City ("polis") answers the extraordinary requirement of organizing the coexistence of liberties that are recognised as such, that is they do not depend on a terrestrial or celestial power that can decide for them. To the persian prince's surprise, that looks for his image in the mirror, in Sparta or Athens nobody is his despotic alter ego. It's "nomos" (the law) who rules. The law received by all regulates the reciprocal relations of the free citizens, without anybody establishing themselves above such law, if they do not want to face the death penalty. Until the point where they advise the legislator, father of the law (Lycurgus, Solon), to eclipse himself after having codified it; he mustn't either benefit from a supra-legal status. In the case of an exceptional urgency, a dictator can be elected and legality can be suspended, but it is not the dictator who defines the urgency (unlike the totalitarian dictatorships theorized by C.Schmitt), on the contrary, it is the community (polis) who defines the urgency and delimits the necessity and time duration of a dictatorship. In a free city, that is autonomous, the western constitutional state frames the line of the free men, that share out the powers and serfdoms through a deal (and a new deal, and a new new deal) excluding submission and the imposition of one of them.

5. Freedom is not an ideal, a promise of future, it's not even a nostalgia that evokes a surpassed past time. Freedom is a beginning, a game that starts and rules with no cease, in the greek sense of the word "archê". It does not propose its kingdom for later on (as happens in the communism that Marx dreamed of), nor in the retrospection of an earlier stage (where man, according to Rousseau had been "born free" whereas now he finds himself "withheld"). Freedom rules here and now in the present time of a civilization that presents itself as a battle field, a "Kampfplatz", that's how Kant defines the soul. Freedom, the power of the opposites, capable of acting correctly or wrongly, is not, precisely because of this reason itself neither good nor bad, but instead freely one or the other. "A power of good and bad", and therefore also "a power for evil" as Schelling pointed out. From the beginning, Pericles, according to Thucydides, in his unforgettable Funeral Oration, declares how the glory of Athens shined in the "eternal memorials of our friendship and enmity" the great city has "everywhere planted" (II Book, XL4). Ready both for peace and for war, the West has never stopped worrying its neighbour nor itself.

6. Between traditional civilizations, ruled by a principle of global order, and the civilization of freedom bearer of a radical disorder, the breach is, to begin with, unavoidable. The book that founded western civilization, Homer's Iliad, expresses the irreversible

division. The greeks that besieged Troy were a gang of looters, that have left homes and traditional monarchies behind them; their field is devoted to the democracy of the warriors that claim their freedom brandishing the weapons with the prestige of the violent heroic feat in mind. At a first glance, the trojan wealth embodies the prosperity of a kingdom that is correctly arranged: in the highest position is the juridical and magical authority of a sovereign (Priam), in a lower rank are the defenders of the city (Hector the brave), in the third are the producers and the reproducers that fertilize the opulent community both economically and demographically (Paris, no sovereign, not much of a fighter, represents them). The greek intrusion makes the trojan tripartition explode, which as Dumézil has proved was canonical for all indo-european peoples from India to Scandinavia and Rome. The emancipation of the warrior, the claim of a sovereign liberty, the temporary and spiritual destruction of the old order. Through this triple stroke of lightning the West announces itself to the world.

7. Neither war, nor the killing of defenceless populations, nor slavery have been western inventions. The moment man seized the means and the opportunity, he penetrated his neighbour's forehead with his silex axe, and set fire to the huts of the small societies surrounding him. The freedom to kill caused havoc both in the Amazonia as in Ancient Greece, the difference is that in the latter the good mythological, religious and traditional motives that disguise a blind homicidal and suicidal relentless violence are questioned. Uncovered and asserted as such, the combatting freedom is voluntarily or against its will bearer of a feasible end of the world, that symbolizes Troy scored off from the map. The horizon of the final extermination, newly born babies included, introduces the first genocide (certainly literary) fulfilled not by the gods but by a purely human rage that is aware of itself. Such a threat of an apocalypse, grey, in no way redeemed by the return of reconciled harmony or the descent of a celestial Jerusalem, was the revelation, possibly the only one, that writers, historians and philosophers of Ancient Greece contributed with, commenting it endlessly. When Valéry exclaims, after having exited the First World War, "us civilizations" we are now sentenced to "consider ourselves mortal", the distinguished academic does not announce anything other than the very disturbing truth that our civilization acclaims from the beginning and often strives to forget. The prospect of the end of mankind caused by man under his own responsibility is asserted by the growing west. Nearly three milleniums after such a spiritual bomb had caused upheaval in the world, Hiroshima and Nagasaki confirmed what we already knew: "in each one of us, mankind discovers its possible death...each morning we will be in the eve of the end of time" (JP Sartre, 1945).

8. The experience of freedom is anguishing for those that still clutch on to eternal truths passed on by millenary traditions on their way to disappearing. It's no less tiring for us since in it we try to overturn the slope of endless violence. Because we are free, nothing of what is inhuman is strange to us. In the "Heart of Darkness", are we not forced to recognize with Joseph Conrad, as a human possibility and therefore also ours? The extraordinary cruelties that a good conscience not very considerate rejects as being pre-historical or exotic? A freedom for evil, for error, for horror and terror, harasses the most sublime creations and most tempting prosperities of western mankind which are on the way to becoming global.

9. The experience of freedom is not something that is decided for once and for all between progress and decline. It continues being capable and guilty, always in the crossroads, of this tragic fact. He who explores the pros and cons sheds light on "an immortal treasure" that is useful for the far future and illuminates the fulfilled past. Thucydides has claimed this merit and his "History of the Peloponnesian war" in fact talks about the inhabitants of the XX and XXI centuries. The three stages of the growth of a catastrophic belligerent rage (whether consecutive or fitted into each other like russian dolls) shed light both on recent history as on the ancient events. It all begins with an exterior rivalry, Athens vs. Sparta or France and Russia against Germany in the 14-18 period. Each field rebels against itself. Civil war in the greek cities, totalitarian revolutions and counter-revolutions that throw europeans against europeans, in the second world conflict. Finally, the war that was foreign, and civil, sets individual consciences on fire, making them lose references and taboos. It's a physical "plague" but above all it is mental, a moment of madness that Nietzsche designates for the "demolition of all values", nihilism. Is it not towards this abyss that makes signals to the terrorism without boundaries that is being happily globalized since the end of the division of the world in two blocks?

10. Is it then convenient to sacrifice some pessimistic fatalism? Absolutely not! The experience of freedom has by nature two sides. It places us in front the worst things we can commit and simultaneously it reveals us as being capable of resisting something worse that can only be explained through our voluntary serfdom. The reunification of Europe, so marvelously advanced all through the second half of the XX century, was designed in the name of freedom. "The word freedom, that seems to have lost its power, possesses an exceptional meaning for the person that recognizes the best of its value -the person that one day has lost it, declared the anticommunist mayor of Berlin in the beginning of the 50's, Ernst

Reuter, a repentant collaborator of Lenin. From the masons in the Stalinallee (Berlin 1953) to the ucranians of the Orange Revolution (Kiev 2005), the antitotalitarian distance gathers people both from the left and from the right, the religious and the agnostic, with the only will of fighting against communist despotism and their imperial stink. The fall of the Berlin Wall was their Salamis and their Marathon. The greek adventure of a struggle for freedom in the name of freedom still goes on. On the condition that we dare to think of man's freedom as the "the deepest of abysses and the highest of heavens" (Schelling).*

In the opinion of the optimistic experts, the dislocation of the soviet empire announced the "end of history", that is the end of bloody, destructive and tragic history. Indeed, the peoples emancipated themselves from the "blocks" of the cold war, but their new freedom could not stop being surprising. The prophets of a new world order, based on reason and engendering universal peace, had hurried to conceal the dark, irreducible part that goes with human freedom. They have harbored Havel and the democratization of the old "Popular Republics", and they had no eyes for the furious Milosevic installing, as never before since 1945, war, crime and ethnic purification in the heart of Europe. Even mistakingly, even blindly in the other continents: the end of the cold war "liberates" a long series of hot wars. Without waiting for the 11th of September of the year 2001, the year of the revelation, only three years after the fall of communism in 1994, the map of the world did not look good: war in Croatia and war in Bosnia, war in the Caucasus, Russia deploying their troops to Chechnia...last but not least in Rwanda, the Tutsis are the victims of the third or fourth genocide of the twentieth century. The nazi record has been broken: (new record: 3 months; number of dead: 800.000; means used: cutlasses).

II. THE CHALLENGE OF THE ALL ROUND LIBERATION

The western world fascinates and upsets traditional societies. In the entire planet, our contemporaries discover that ancestral customs, the beliefs of long ago, the established religions are all being subject to debate and that they are not in any way infallible. This situation was already described in the socratic dialogues, where adolescents of Athens strike their elders with multiple questions and they discover that the old aged cannot answer when they have never asked themselves. The West introduces agitation everywhere. The traditional societies live in eternity, without asking "why?". Certainly, the "why?" question mobilizes implicitly the myths of the origins; it brings dynamism to stories and legends, but it is not set forth as such. We do not ask ourselves: "Why am I forbidden to commit incest?" or "Why do we defend certain forms of violence?".

The West introduces the problem. It destroys, it baffles, it plunders traditional infallibilities. The communities that are manipulated in this way, uprooted, resist badly such a fundamental test. Such is the problem of the talibans in particular and of fundamentalists in general.

In traditional Afghanistan women wore the veil, but without it being absolutely compulsory. Some women got rid of it, especially in cities. Suddenly, the uniform was imposed unconditionally. In virtue of what? What is it that “students of theology” imagine concealed behind the burka that is absolutely necessary to disguise? Their fathers and grandfathers saw a mother, a woman, a daughter who were legitimate and who were kept with zeal as a father, husband or brother, exposed to strangers’ looks. On the other hand, the fever of the taleb reveals that the object taken care of is no longer this traditional being –sister, mother, wife–, but the woman. But, what woman? The one that ignored her original culture and that discovers in hindu films and in the posters of international stars. The theology student thinks and imagines the western woman, he has a cinemascope in his head and fights against his own ghosts. He is no longer the man from long ago, he is no longer the man of religion.

Through the law of the burka, he believes he can obstruct his own westernization. He is a westerner already, but a westerner that does not fulfil himself, that does not accept himself; a refuted westerner, extremely miserable, that hasn’t found any other solution than making others even more miserable, their sisters, their mothers, their wives. However, he pursues his own obsession, he flees from his shame until he reaches the denial of himself. At the end of his self-destruction, he becomes a human bomb. We are living the paradox of the westernization of the planet that destroys religions by politicizing them. The politicization of traditional religions marks the beginning of their end. The sexualization of the ancestral uses and customs announces its decomposition.

Believing that we are doing not so bad both with our minds as with our bodies, in a terrible twentieth century that accumulates two world wars, forty five years of cold war, and seventy years of totalitarian revolution, with a bonus of some genocides, seems feeble. To imagine that silencing the weapons is enough for the minds to calm down and for the good democratic sense to rule the world, this borders with the unthinkable! Our elites predict, they are always ready to bet that a Providence will eradicate terrorism with a touch of a magic wand. The immediate danger is to yield to panic, trying to conceal the tough reality of the post-nuclear challenge. First degenerative delirium: that of the anti-americans that learnedly explain that with the “Empire” being punished for its sins, the simple citizens have nothing to fear and that they are in no way involved.

A second delirium, anti-muslim on this occasion, stigmatizes a thirteen hundred million human beings in one go that have not benefited from the judaeo-christian revelations. As if muslim fundamentalism did not attack muslims in the first place: we only have to take a look at Afghanistan, Algeria, Iraq. Are we forgetting that Al-Quaeda mobilizes the strings of a wealthy family recruited in the most westernized layers of Arabia and Egypt? Bin Laden cheats. Oriana Fallaci and Samuel Huntington are mistaken when they evoke a conflict of civilizations or the war of religions. The fundamentalist terrorism is not an archaism inherited from an obsolete past, the exterminating angels emerge from the black, destructive and nauseating face of our hyper-modernity. The islamized “brother” that sacrifices others and himself is the twin of the bolshevik “man of steel”, the duplicate of the fascist “heroe” that swears “long live death!”.

Third delirium: that of the interventionist erradicators that breed the naivety of believing that terrorism continues to be a heritage that is exclusive of the irregulars that have no State. That is forgetting yesterday, our immediate past, the bloody XX Century. its devastating ideologies, its terrorist States; it is rejecting today’s reality: take a look once more at the record of the russian troops in Chechenia. That is forgetting that terrorism, far from restricting itself to maniac pulsions, puts into practice a political and rational tactic of seizure and preservation of power. Bin Laden aimed at leading Saudi Arabia and Pakistan. With or without Allah, he opens up the path to numerous post-modern princes that will believe they are more cunning than he is.

Fourth delirium: the prejudice of invincible and irreversible development. The same argument is heard in the world economic forums and in the parallel meetings of the alter-globalisationists: the problem of 9/11 would not be a real problem, the real problem is poverty; whenever the misery of the world is reabsorbed, whether it is through the liberal means of Davos-New York, or whether it is through the moral and social means of Porto Alegre, there will be no further terrorism. While we wait for the long desired universal extinction of pauperism, if we do not block the nihilist terrorists with the more appropriate means, we shall all die! The moral and spiritual crisis we are living, could not be reduced to the effects of an economic infrastructure. The agitation is evidently social, cultural and political, and it brings democracy and tolerance under scrutiny, but also our refusal to face Evil head on.

We must not forget that half of mankind has applauded, more or less discreetly, Mohammed Atta’s deeds. Many have considered these acts as legitimate, giving them a taste of their own medicine. There are many candidates to follow on from Bin Laden. Given the modesty of the necessary means and the price of blades in all the stores of the world, the future remains unresolved. And *in waiting*.

The past moves away from us both in Bangkok as in Rome, the future is dubious as much in Paris as in New York, the planet becomes a whole. An unusual community of vertigo, unified by the anguish of a vertiginous responsibility, we can no longer share. This is called a civilization, a single and undividable one from Socrates to Bin Laden included. The challenge of the liberations has not been born from a barbarism whatsoever that would be strange to us, it hasn't been thrown by some extraterrestrial or infrahistoric creatures. Since Parmenides, Hamlet and Hiroshima, civilization awakes and reveals itself in the to be or not to be crossroads. And immediately after it becomes deaf so as not to feel uncomfortable.

III. THE CHALLENGE OF THE FREEDOM TO HARM

Towards the end of the XX Century, because of famine, the north-korean stalinism ends up killing several million people. The few humanitarians *in situ* offer an abandonment that reaches cannibalism. The criminal record of Sudan in Darfour is no secret for anybody. In regard to khomeinism, that continues to torment Iran with its will to crusade, with nuclear motive, does not cease to reiterate itself. Behind the powers that we rightly call "rogue States", we can discover other States, tempted to sponsor world rabble: Russia, for instance, that protects North Korea, develops its nuclear commerce with Iran while China sponsors Sudan. It has been confirmed that the relations of power that decide the future of the planet have changed radically; the nature itself of what we understand by "force" has mutated. The relations of power have become relations of harmfulness.

In the classical Europe that emerged from the Treaty of Westphalia in 1648, the great States decided sovereignly their mode of life. Their survival was seldom under scrutiny; they would enter wars to obtain provinces and prestige. The vocation to build prevailed over the capacity to destroy. Second phase: the world wars and totalitarianisms have developed formidably the art of annihilation. Nevertheless, the blocks and the empires still claimed the responsibility about the future, the faculty of promoting the productive forces. Hitler would boast, the same as Stalin did, about how he had solved the problems of capitalism, of going beyond the crisis, of eliminating unemployment, etc. Totalitarianisms declared an industrial, social, and economic project. The powers that faced each other had the capacity to build a world (that some considered to be the best and others thought it was hellish), a capacity that was equal to the one they had to squash their opponent. It was correlated: the big powers added their strength to do to their strength to undo. Nowadays, the power to undo prevails over the power to do. Example type: Russia's adhesion to the G7. It is not its

economic prosperity what convinced the Seven to accept Russia, it is rather its destructive power. Not only the fact that Russia possesses the second largest nuclear arsenal in the world, but also that it is the second or third weapons smuggler of the world and it is capable of increasing world chaos to an outrageous extent. Even if the Moscow stock market is less important than Singapore's, it is the power to devastate what defines the status of a great power.

What is true for Russia is also true for more reduced sizes. Any State, organization or group, measures its power according to its capacity to harm. In order to maintain the biggest army of the world at bay, it has been enough for the general Aïdid-father and the general Aïdid-son to occupy a neighbourhood in Mogadiscio. The eradication of these gangsters would have had a high price in men; the americans have decided not to intervene given the price of the operation.

In order to maintain the balance of terror that moderated the cold war, the "big ones" had doubled their nuclear capacity. They possessed a "first attack" susceptible of being very painful, even being able to wipe out their potential opponent from the map, keeping in reserve a "second attack" that would sanctified them: if the alter ego in front dared to attack first, the victim, having been annihilated, would seek revenge posthumously punishing the aggressor with a second attack, equally deadly. The reciprocity of the apocalyptic threats ensured in this way a fragile disuasive peace, but a peace after all.

The post-nuclear challenge of big-scale terrorism modifies the situation. By de-nuclearizing, the capacity for the first attack has been "democratized" and has decreased. The mass extermination does no longer depend on the monopoly of the big and super-big nuclear powers. On the other hand, sanctification still requires, and it always will, the capacity for a second attack. If it aims at playing in the major league minimizing its risks, a rogue State can choose between two strategies. Or else it entrusts itself to a godfather who is sanctified by an absolute weapon. Or else it can become autonomous by discreetly acquiring a terrific arsenal (A.B.C.) capable of escaping the interventions, surgical or not, of an anti-terrorist coalition.

With the post-nuclear challenge, the connection of a terrorist will without faith nor law and a panoply of exterminating weapons maintained out of reach permits us to consider the unthinkable. What did Milosevic lack in order to perpetuate his ethnic purifications, or what was Saddam short of in order to finally assimilate Kuwait? The capacity of a second strike, a nuclear or bacteriological umbrella under whose shelter a nihilist can authorize any transgression whatsoever. This is the problem posed today by the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction in the hands of fanatical states or pirate groups that protect them. This is the problem that a

new Bin Laden could generate, sheltered in some hellish silo, rather than in the anachronistic caves of Tora Bora. A threatening and feasible sanctification from the rogues does not re-establish the dissuasive status quo, it substitutes the balance of terror with the world unbalance of terrorism.

IV. THE NIHILISTIC CHALLENGE

Our concept of “terrorism” must be reconsidered deeply in the light of 9-11- The rubble from Ground Zero have been removed, but the moral and mental consequences of the biggest terrorist attack in history corrode us.

Before, any irregular combatant, any “partisan” without uniform could be catalogued, or even stigmatized, as a terrorist. The fall of the World Trade Center’s twin towers implies the specific and unsurmountable threat of a radically devastating terrorism, the nihilistic hybris. It has absolutely nothing to do with an ideological invention, diffused by frightening falcons established in the White House; it is an immediate perception broadcasted throughout the planet by the printing of the images in the crash of the collapse. Afterwards, we dedicate ourselves to “staying calm”, often that is to reflect, to make disappear. However, in that moment, we perceive in the media a destructive delirium with which we will have to live and, insofar as it is possible, survive.

Why did they use the term “Ground Zero”? It contains a *déjà vu* feeling. It was instantly baptised, no journalist has claimed the authorship rights. Between the name and the thing, the unusual adaptation became clear. Let’s study this evidence that hasn’t been recognised by anybody: originally “Ground Zero” indicates the center of the nuclear explosion that took place on the July 16th of 1945, at 5 h 29, in some part of New Mexico -the last experiment scientifically controlled before launching the Bomb in Japan. Prior to any interpretation, theorization or manipulation, the memory 9-11 fires the blood both for the ones that suffered it as for those who contemplated it -the entire Earth-, in the horizon of a new Hiroshima. The indeleble intuition of a terrorism of nuclear importance at the disposal of any buyer of blades.

Manhattan displays the possibility of a new Hiroshima where the annihilating power is radically democratized. The absolute weapon does not only rest prudentially in silos that are supposedly controlled by powers which are supposedly controllable. From here on, our neighbour might elaborate meticulously an unpredictable suicide operation that would surprise us as much as the students in Hamburg, when they discovered that one of their colleagues had deliberately crashed against the WTC. Such planetary insecurity is unprecedented. A short sentence by George Bush underscored the

reach in this famous speech about the state of the Union in which he vituperated the “axis of Evil”. Having passed unnoticed for both critics and adulators, some words confess that which no president of the United States ever dared to say or even conceive: “Time is not on our side”. Until now, americans progressed through History “with God on our side”, as Bob Dylan (ironically) sang. It’s over now. Even if the children in schools sing “God bless America” and the dollar pursues its reverence and reverence for the supreme Being, it’s useless: divine, technological or financial Providence does not guarantee the march towards the happiness of America and the entire world.

Overnight, a capacity of mass devastation, that had until then only been the privilege of the great powers, is available for all hands, many purses and millions of overexcited heads, manipulated or slightly unbalanced. Only a tireless optimist can imagine the hyper-sensitive and dangerous locations definitely sheltered. Are oil reserves or nuclear power plants more invulnerable today than what the WTC towers were yesterday? The human bombs proliferate here and there, how could we outrule a deliberate Chernobyl? Each day we shall be living the eve of the end of time.

In Manhattan, anybody can be killed. Anybody that is within a defined perimeter. The perimeter can be defined in one single person: an executioner does as he pleases with the body of his victim. This can be extrapolated to a specific city: Guernica, Manhattan or Grozny. The nihilistic terrorism is not a guerrilla since this term refers to an army. We must not confuse an irregular violence that resists against weapons by using weapons - characteristic of all revolutionary, separatist and anticolonialist strategies— and a violence at all levels that uses terror against the unarmed population. The russian terrorist from the XX Century that stopped his arm, without throwing his bomb, forgiving the archduke so as not to kill his wife and son, constitutes unfortunately, an exception in the history of contemporary insurrections. Any violence uses the threat, but only nihilistic violence abandons itself to indiscriminate murder. Manhattan does not illustrate the prejudices of violence in general; Manhattan embodies the assumption of a very specific violence, that of nihilistic terrorism.

It was not at all something exclusive of the islamists. When in Algeria, the GIA were targeting intellectuals and women, and massacring the farmers in mass, in Europe, the democratic path (see Vaclav Havel) was obstructed by the terrorism of ethnic purification (see Milosevic). Those that were cutting off arms and heads in Liberia and Sierra Leona were having a wonderful time, when the genocide of a million tutsis was revealed by a black plague in Congo, where the civilian death toll was even higher. Saddam Hussein’s wars and massacres, the bloody tricks of khomeinism, the killings in Timor, the atrocities of the Tamil Tigers, the ruins of Grozny and the slaughters

in Darfour show how the end of the blocks liberated the democrats, but also the homicidal and genocidal instincts, with the approval of diverse religious, nationalist and racist ideologies.

V. THE DEMOCRATIC CHALLENGE

Two centuries ago, A. de Tocqueville pointed out in which way a democratic country was not fit for warlike conflicts: “How does it happen, then, that the American Union, with all the relative perfection of its laws, is not dissolved by the occurrence of a great war? It is because it has no great wars to fear” (*De la démocratie en Amérique, chap.VIII*). The great hope of 1989, that of entering an age of perpetual peace and not having any more “big wars to fear” is the original ghost, continuously dissatisfied, of any democratic regime.

Regular and irregular soldiers, whether they are dressed as civilians or in uniform, wearing kamis or a three-piece suit, the fanatical warriors of the post-cold war are eager to get themselves a place in the sun, conquering, through the use of iron and fire, houses, perks, women, stripes or absolute power. The flag has little importance as long as it justifies the faculty to kill unobstructedly. Baghdad becomes the new “Chicago”, an ethnic-theological version of a gang war, with mafias taking over territories through ethnic purification.

The bright citizens and democrats must prepare themselves to face, not an enemy supposedly absolute, but a frightful and multiform enemy that is no less implacable. I call it, like Dostoevsky, “nihilism”. Hitler is dead, Stalin is buried, the block of the East has been dismantled, however an exterminating nihilism creates havoc under different flags. Ground Zero in Manhattan, *tabula rasa* in Grozny, political famine in North Korea and Zambia: handcrafted or institutional terror imposes itself both in Asia and in Africa.

Before 9-11, the prevailing thesis stipulated that since the fall of the Berlin wall we “were” out of danger. It seemed as if the big ones in this world were no longer subject to the fragility of their life on Earth; the rich countries and those that were well-off lived under shelter. We were not worried by the neighbouring conflicts, termed by the strategists as “conflicts of low intensity”, being so painful for those who suffered it. An ephemeral feeling of definitive immunity, of eternal extraterritoriality, that inspired the thesis of “the end of History”, that ridiculous prophecy of the disappearance of danger. It is necessary to learn again that History is tragical and that we have not ceased to exist on the edge of the abyss.

When Milosevic announced his operations in 1991, all the powers of western Europe thought that the promise of conceding loans and

economical aid, would soon make the man adopt a pacific and conformist attitude: better to have peace and money than the war of destruction? Milosevic thought otherwise. The hope that prescribes the wait, that time plays in favour of democracy, that there is a Providence that guarantees the future in the name of God, the Market or social Progress, is unfounded. The hope leads us to accept, without complaining, all the misfortunes of the world, and it leads us to believe they have no importance; the destiny of the afghan women has no importance; the suffering of the chechen people has no importance; the fact that 5,000 soldiers are enough to interrupt the genocide of a million tutsis in Rwanda has no importance; the death, hardly mentioned by the newspapers, of two to three million people in north-east Congo has no importance; the 20,000 persons murdered in the center of Europe ten years ago have no importance. Insignificant trivialities, with the exception of Kosovo, whose population that had been cruelly expelled outside their frontiers threatened to invade our neighbourhoods and disrupt our municipal balance. Hence, it was necessary to intervene. Was it because of moral reasons, as it has been suggested? I doubt it. When Putin martyrs Chechnya but shuts in the refugees in their country, the issue of a european intervention, whether it is a simple verbal protest or diplomatic pressure, is not raised.

9-11 will continue being a moment of truth, since it forces us to take into account the principle of reality. The globalization of crime; the terror in Kabul concerns the fate of New York. The conclusion we can extract is that paying no attention to three quarters of mankind can be expensive. Let's interpret Talleyrand when he says that forgetting Afghanistan yesterday and Chechnya today, is worse than a crime, it is a fault. Worse than a moral crime, it is a paralysis of the brain. Or is allowing the degradation of incendiary situations of which Afghanistan is a role model a realistic approach? The russians have invaded the country for ten years, destroying the moral and social structures of the population, exterminating probably a million people (of which it is said 80,000 were intellectuals), converting the population into illiterates, and spreading ruins in a place where they soon settled as masters –blind americans and with the aid of the pakistanis– the biggest bandits, the biggest villains, the most fanatical of them all: the talebans. We know what happened afterwards. After Manhattan, the West gave the russians, once again pyromaniac firemen, *carte blanche*. Beware of the fatal consequences!

The attack on the World Trade Center cannot be forgotten. The horror of 9-11 is still present in hearts and minds. A growing number of americans (79%) and of europeans (66%) consider international terrorism as a “very important threat” (according to a survey of the

German Marshall Fund and the Italian Company of Sao Paolo). The world wobbled in 2001, until this date and since the end of the cold war, mankind believed it was living in the horizon of global peace. Now, the naive idyll of the “end of history” free of major threats cannot be sustained any longer.

Such a radical change in public opinion leaves the politicians disoriented. The same survey shows the Europeans are more and more distrustful with the United States. However, the pacifist ideology does not unify the old continent. With regard to Iran, 54% of Americans, but above all 53% of the French population, approve military intervention, if diplomacy should fail in its intention to stop Tehran. Everyday life exhales a similar ambiguity. The uneasiness is general, however, after a slight fluctuation, the economy has recovered as if nothing had happened. Even the more vulnerable sectors –air travel, world tourism– show triumphal rates of growth. Fear in the stomach, yes; but no panic. Everyone in their family and private life admits that the danger increases, but hopes to dodge it.

The unrest is universal. In 2006, the media commemoration of the fifth anniversary of the attack on New York and Washington often turned into sessions of exorcism, with the American President as the perfect scapegoat. If the attacks and the major threats accumulate, it is his fault. If the terrorist movements recruit, both here and in the antipodes, murderers without any scruples, his sad record becomes evident. If a religious war is planned in Iraq, if the Muslims exterminate Muslims in Morocco, in Algeria, in Afghanistan or Indonesia, if Iran develops a nuclear program, do not search for any culprits, the culprit is Bush, always Bush. He has triggered the war in Lebanon, he is the promoter of the conflict between Israelis and Palestinians and when Putin sets the Caucasus on fire or makes the Ukrainians and Georgians sing, with the help of gas, the Kremlin is only responding to the “provocations” of Washington. It is clear, isn't it? The three thousand martyrs of 9-11 were immolated by the American “arrogance”, five years later the victim becomes the executioner.

In the olden days, pins used to be nailed into a doll in order to invoke the bad omen and kill the evil spirits at a distance. Nowadays, we rebuke the alleged Master of the world, reproaching him for how he uses his “hyperpower”. He is the source of all our evils. His disappearance would re-establish universal concord. This magic behaviour wins on both sides of the playing field. Our index finger points towards the cause of world chaos, our angelical smile ensures that once the evil power has disappeared, everything will go well, the dove and the snake, the lion and the lamb will all coexist in

harmony. We only have eyes for the abominable Bush, crazy America and we relegate the bloody instigators of the massacre to oblivion. Reaching the point where these sad beings try desperately to call our attention by insisting that they are still present. They claim authorship rights, that have been stripped from them, for their heroic deeds in London, Madrid and Baghdad. Having lost pity, the good minds deduce that the White House maintains them in apnea. Let's be serious now. No matter what his errors are like, Bush has not invented the planetary extension of a terrorism that existed long before he did and that will go on no matter who his successor is. The mental sin of the western military was for a long time to put all their energy into the conflicts of the day with a delayed war. This apathy reaches the major pacifist states that perplex themselves with the pseudo lessons of the past reproaching the Pentagon for drowning in a "new Vietnam". There is nothing more naive: Zarkhaoui wasn't Ho Chi Minh. Let's open our eyes and make a few sums: each month 3,000 iraqi die by coincidence, victims of the terrorists. The same figure, 3,000 are the american soldiers that have died, in four years time. This proves that in Iraq the murderers are leading a war against the civilians, not an independence war against the foreign occupation and their native military support. We Have gone to another planet, Vietnam is far away from here. Those that miss Woodstock, understandable nostalgia, want to forget that the world has changed in forty years time.

The threat that hovers over the iraqi society is not a vietnamization, but a "somalization". Remember, under the auspices of the UN, an international army landed in Mogadishu with the americans at its head (Operation "Restore Hope", 1993). They had to ensure the survival of a hungry population that had been annihilated by rival clans. Having lost 19 men in a deadly trap, the GI's embarked again. What followed is well known, a wary Clinton promised "never again" and refused to intervene in Rwanda one year later (april 1994) – where 5,000 blue berets were enough to interrupt the genocide that wiped out a million tutsis in three months.

The small-scale somalian example is spreading around the planet. Having been taken as hostages, terrified, sacrificed, populations become the war loots of the local leaders, that obey neither faith nor law. With the pretext of volatile banners –religion, ethnic group, cheap racist or nationalist ideology, falsified duties of memory– the commandoes contest for power, fighting with kalachnikovs. They fight less among themselves than against civilians, who represent 95% of the victims, women and children in the first place. Terrorism, defined as the deliberate attack of civilians, is not only exclusively carried out by islamists. It is worth noting that the procedure has been and still is being used by a regular army (blessed by othodox priests) and militia following the Kremlin's orders in Chechnya, where the killed children can be

counted in tens of thousands. When the murderers entrust themselves to the Qur'an, those that agonize continue to be the unarmed muslim pedestrians. Yesterday it was Somalia, today it is Darfour, the real time laboratories of the abominations among abominations: the war against civilians.

Once the ghost of an allmighty America and a satanic Bush has been evacuated, what should we think? We must return to the principle of reality, watching how the world advances, fragile, chaotic, populated by individuals and communities, prisoners of a dramatic void. They can no longer refer to the millenarian rules that their ancestors complied with obediently; the violence of modern times has uprooted any traditional references. They cannot integrate, as we can to a greater or lesser degree, into constitutional states which do not exist (yet, say the optimists) in their case. In this void, the terrorists of all kinds proclaim "we will win because you love life, and we do not fear death". The fall of the WTC towers illustrates their challenge. Who will win? Will it be the multiple nihilistic fighters that spread homicide and suicide? Or a majority of honest people that try to live in a civilized way, whether it is in the shabby districts or in the elegant neighbourhoods? To accept or not to accept the law of the human bombs, I fear this will be the question among questions of the child of the century: to live freely among men or to die.

11-The challenge of Islam

During nearly the entire time of existence of the human species, the mould where mankind has been shaped has been religion, until the appearance of the Renaissance half way through the second millenium of our Era. Among all the syncretisms that have existed, countless, that of religion is the most identifiable of them all. It is a phenomenon that as a reflection of the genetic legacy, has been transmitted through generations, apparently being indestructible, although currently this immutable persistence can only be noticed in Islam. In the rest of religions the tendency is the opposite. They strive to link beliefs and rationality, -it is a vain attempt if there is no courage in the desire to exit from the creativism-evolution dichotomy. With courage and intelligence it may be possible. It would be the last of religious syncretisms. The two last catholic popes have carried out attempts in this sense. But breaking religious syncretism means much more than persecuting ecumenism, and also more than giving up proselytism. It necessarily implies abandoning theological postulates, even the most modern of monotheisms, breaking religious syncretism in order to adopt rational thinking, to a certain degree parallel to empirical, scientific, and socio-biological knowledge. If this change is not deeply carried out, religion will be

put aside from human experiences, as happened to mythology, in which case the enormous values of transcendent humanism –personal to the priests, economical, and above all having intellectual vocation and support for the neighbour– would be lost, and only the monuments of remembrance like those of the Ancient East, will be left. There the sand covered them, and they have only been partially unburied. It is easy to imagine what will become of the current temples and cathedrals in the society of the year ten thousand. Museums or nothing.

(13)

The islamist culmination, apparently inexplicable, is understandable if we consider –even if it is in a very superficial way–, the circumstances in which it has evolved, and that still continue to be active.

The islamists, and also a big part of the arabists, display the level of civilization reached by Islam between its act of foundation in Arabia, carried out by Mohammed, and the Middle Ages. In certain moments, we could accept that Islam created a culture that was parallel to the process of civilizing syncretism that was initiated in Egypt and Mesopotamia that has culminated in Western Civilization. But this process, that having been polished by the greek and roman civilizations led to the lack of direct war between Islam and the actors of the process of civilizing symbiosis of the mediterranean with the continental europeans, was very fruitless in the hands of Islam. The rise of their cultural level, is essentially displayed by assuming the culture that was created before in Greece, especially the platonic-aristotelian. And fatally, these circumstances set the base of this conservatism, unique and extreme, that has characterised and continues to be present in Islam.

No religion has ever been a specific civilization. All religions have been episodes within levels of civilization that have followed one another. Jesuschrist and Mohammed, both of them illiterates, left behind a fertile legacy which has been useful for the socio-biological evolution of humans that has taken place from the Renaissance on. But they were only two revolutions that stirred their ankylosed contemporaries in the stage of myths. And Jesuschrist also destroyed the Sanhedrin, whose components controlled the hebrew fate, and interfering with the roman imperial process. And Mohammed, six hundred years later, mobilizing his no less ankylosed contemporaries, still in the complete and belligerent polytheism, and through his borrowing from the hebrew and christian religions, and also trying to erase polytheism, bringing the faith to that same judaic God with a new name, in order to recruit the followers of the opposite belligerent creeds in Arabia. It is perfectly logical that the character of the doctrines stemming from both these prophets, have provoked schisms. Doctrines that were designed by two extraordinary men, but who were nonetheless only men, that because of the

invincible differences between the diversified peoples, collected for their ideas by penetrating in their ignorant masses, at the time nearly the entire population of the Earth, that have diverged producing continuing schisms within monotheistic religions. Unlike judaism which was developed within one single race. Christ and Mohammed are not to blame for the inability of their succesors to evolve with the pace of the knowledge that has gradually been acquired, until the XXI Century. The blame falls on their “fallible” succesors, who were also nonetheless only men, that now cannot avoid the confrontation with Islam, which is really not only between the followers of the latter religion and those of others. The most violent is between the islamists themselves, but above all between Islam and the group of the First World, which is hated by the islamists because it is wealthy and it has evolved, indeed a bad example for the faithful mohammedans.

All theories about religiosity are based on ideas of theological meaning or pertaining to another nature, because these do exist, like the one that explains the society’s shift from the agriculture based economy to the industrial that took place in the dawning of the Renaissance, and that the islamists could not join, explains the culturally and economically retarded situation of the islamic world. This socio-economic change was not produced neither in the beginning of nor during the Renaissance. The ferociously conservative character of the islamist priests no matter what the tendency is within this religion, and the submission of the mahommedan masses, started in a much more distant past.

The big difference between arabs and persians, and also between these two and the much different greeks and romans, certainly has a socio-biological explanation. It is that of the characteristical formation of the peoples of the south coast of the Mediterranean Sea, and that of Arabia reaching the North of Syria. Mainly population occupying territories whose geography is dominated by deserts. This circumstance created –and it persists–, the specific nature of nomadic/sedentary shepherds. All of them were idle, with a peculiar activity that does not combine meditation and action. Contrarily, in the fertile islands, big like Mesopotamia and the basin of the Nile, or if different magnitudes like that of Old Canaan, embedded in the vast region of the Ancient East, produced similar human beings to the inhabitants of the region that is now occupied by Iran and Turkey. In these spaces, for centuries agriculture was the primary economic source, and it developed technologies like the domestication of animals, the production of tools for cultivation, the use of irrigation, hydraulic constructions, etc., but they have lacked their own Renaissance because of the influence of the mohammedan power, the breeder of conservatism.

The parallelism between the Shia schism in Islam and the protestant schism in catholicism exists. In both, it responds to two forms of natures that are radically different: the hard-working character of some (they have always been from the North, and not just by chance, but because the North is cold and it entices physical activity), and the idle character of those that because of varied climatic and environmental causes in the South, have been inclined towards laziness and inaction.

The differences and dissidences between Sunni and Shia muslims, with their multiple derivations, of which the most important are wahabism, sufism and neosufism, all of them still current, are the result of the experiences in a territorial diversity as big as the one Islam occupies in the map of the current world. And they are also the cause of the almost permanent fights that take place within these religious communities.

The ethnic mark is noticeable in all vital aspects of human beings. And given that the religious mark nearly all of them has received has been so important, it is perfectly natural that both of them coexist, mutually interfering one another, making their features characteristic. Having seen that ethnic groups have not produced religions, nor viceversa, but that the ethnic groups have differentiated religions within their own spaces. Such a thing happens in Europe. Christianity prevails in its territory, it has a speculative character of a philosophical kind in the mediterranean countries. Bythantism did not only happen in Bythantium, though that is where it was created and it is its model. In the center and north of Europe the speculation is focused in coordinating the transcendental meditation of religion, keeping nominally the content of the Old Testament. In practice, the Bible is forgotten to a certain extent in the aspects referring to personal experiences, however the doctrinal aspects that are derived from them are cultivated. And wisely the belief is linked to justification of the activity in secular life, in which its clergy takes part in many aspects, the most important of them being the family. These dissidents of catholicism, have thus avoided the problem of the tendency towards homosexuality, and especially, paedophilia that is so harmful for the catholic church. Procreation is the paradigm of production.

We have seen the differentiation produced in the muslim religion by the environment, so deep and widely diversified in geographical zones like that of its cradle, Arabia. The deserts and mountainous zones, with their difficult communication and access routes; and the agricultural producing orchards to the scarce irrigated valleys. This differentiation has been kept all the way through the process of settlement of islamism in its current locations. At a point when deep into the period of evolution we have still not completely left behind –the Renaissance, linked with the Modern age– in the XVII century, diversity increased until it became

disgregation. Then, the islamic characters continued to respond to that of its great communities, they were or wanted to be Empires. And the ones pertaining to the mongol community were clearly perceptive, professing the mohammedan creed originated from the Qur'an, tending towards an ideology specific to the East, with a character that was more philosophical than thological, establishing an islamism that was not very proselytizing depending on the regions. Their influence encompassed a wide region including India, where until the decolonization put the hindu and islamic religions face to face, the followers of both religions coexisted peacefully. It is notorius that the clash which is apparently exclusive in religions is influenced by other causes. One of them, the eternally forgotten and not taken into account: the ethnic cause. The ethnic puzzle of the asian subcontinent is one of the most litigious regions of the planet. In Kashmir the descendents of the central asian more directly corssbred by theses settled, because it is the path taken by the followers of the brahmins in their voluntary exodus towards the south. There, crossbreeding was generalizado. In the south, crossbreeding was produced almost exclusively by the shudras (servants, semi-slaves to the aryan inmigrants) and the native black people. The lack of human resources favoured this fact, leading to the discrimination of classes that still exists. There are recognized descendents of the brahmins, and descendents of the crossbred aryan shudras with the natives. The indian huts reflect the strong hierarchy of the central asian society. Within India's territorial space, religious diversification, even within each of the two major religions, forms a manifold mosaic in regions that are practically adjacent. India's ethnic diversity, as in any other place, produces religious diversity, especially in countries from the great south-asian region, located in the insular adjacent zones, nearer or further, where Islam has settled. It is a reflection of a certain fact, that within India's territorial space, some twenty languages and a dozen literate people exist.

The original mohammedan doctrine, the Sharia (The path), petrified in the Sunna (treaty of religious customs and of life in general) closed the doors for any kind of flexibilization. The past —of complete perfection considering the level reached in the territorial order, and by comparison to what for Islam was the definitive decadence of greek-roman civilization —which was actually the beginning of western civilization—, was a fixed model. The supreme perfection of the Prophet has deprived any renovation concerning content and above all form. In a certain way, Mohammed was a social totalitarian, an involuntary creator of totalitarianism.

Tha ottoman's adoption of Islam, brought the arab world and islamism back to life, in spite of the religious practice being different

between ottomans and arabs. Even in the favourable moment for the sunni complex, nothing seemed to predict the distancing of the Ottoman Empire that has led to current Turkey, with the ambivalent inclination towards the West -including Israel-, and the upkeep of a society that is marked by an islamism of its own mould. Unlike the rest of Islam, somewhat slowly it is developing its own Renaissance. The connection between the agricultural economy and the industrial is another syncretism, deeply operative in the West, and now culminating in Turkey.

Oil fields are developed instead of crop fields in Islam at the moment, with brutal syncretism, without there being any continuity with any other social or religious revolution, besides the mohammedan.

In spite of the religious difference between Sunni and Shia that corresponds to Turkey and Iran, both countries have created two different ethnic groups because of their geology and geography, but they share a similarity, when compared to that of the arab countries. Both countries have serious inter-ethnic problems facing communities that have never been assimilated. They share the kurdish problem. But Iran also maintains conflicts with the people that are differentiated from a precarious persian majority, and an also precarious balance through religion, what indicates possible instabilities caused by the existence of minorities such as the kurd, baluchi, arab, turcoman, and the biggest of all, azeri, which together represent forty percent of the total population. In the two countries that have most similar cultural roots to those of the developed countries of the West, bearing in mind their small size compared to that of Russia, an equal or superior disgregation than the suffered by the ex-USSR could take place. They are ethnically more vulnerable than the arab countries. An economical hecatomb, depending on the evolution of the resources and the use of oil throughout the world, would discover the lack of true cohesion in the people that live in current Iran.

In addition to the arab-sunni and ottoman-sunni communities, there is the third islamic group, the shia, the most wayward and restless of them all. The change of system promoted by Khomeini reduced the shy compromise with the evolved world that could have been the hope to establish a reaction to the islamic conservatism, that could have provoked a turning point in this movement that now is challenging the world that experiences renovation. There is no doubt that at the end of the process in the twentieth century, the oil politics played a decisive role in distancing Iran from the West.

The idiosyncrasy of the communities, or rather the ethnic identity, suffers traumatic changes and to a greater extent gradual evolutions. These evolutions are important, characterised by their slow pace development, they end up being indeleble. The power of the habits is enormous. The one produced by the enclosed

environments of the deserts, has proved to be decisive in the ethnic education of the arab islamists. Through centuries since Mohammed (570-632) and during a millenium, the desert's mark has gravitated over the arab world.

Returning to the "source", to the past, it has been and still is the main motivation in the vital perspective of arabism, and part of islamism. The result of the many attempts –especially in the shia branch– made to separate lay activities from the religious world, has been to retreat, defeated more or less violently, to the domains of daydreaming imagined glories. And that is how Islam continues to behave in general. Another paradigm of this religious stubbornness is the fact that in the cradle of the shia –Persia-Iran– thanks to Khomeini a return to the most radical conservatism has occurred. With it, any vestige of a renovating evolution is eliminated, with the destruction of the ancient and distilled shia system of avoiding political intervention from the religious spheres. This system gave control to the rulers to avoid deviations from the dogma set by the Qur'an. The change has meant regressing to the original arab-mohammedan political-religious symbiosis, with Khomeini arguing that it is lawful to take extraordinary measures when facing situations that are equally extraordinary. That is how a crack was mended, a crack through which within shia multiple attempts to allow a laicism of their own had appeared. It could have turned out a different way, having a parallel result to the laicism of the West that, not because of a rejection of christian churches, but because of the consensmate fact that in society –and many repented priests, or frustrated ones like Darwin– coexist with religion, without there being any violent conflict. That is why the attitude of individuals that have the ability to assimilate scientific disciplines of a high level, like some of the suicide terrorists that attacked the WTC in New York, who in spite of having studied carreers in european universities and being acquainted with the West, cannot abandon their ethnic root when it is conditioned by totalitarian beliefs is not surprising. They act in absolute coherence with them. Exceptional specimens are those that when in a new human environment are inclined to a re-evaluation of their system of life through their own reflection and that of the learning process –which is scarce on the other hand when the immigrants of the western countries that give them shelter come from islamic countries, not financed to perform in the guerrilla. The small minority that integrates, does not change the generalized fact that immigration only becomes embedded, maintaining the religion and customs of their countries of origin.

(3)

The evolution of human communities, in the image of the evolution of its individuals, whether they are families, villages, nations or empires, need the bulk of all its components to be able to discuss,

continue or oppose the ideas or projects of their most outstanding characters, which exist in every environment. The comparison between one community and the next, can be better made considering as a factor the result of the actions of the group, than the performance of their leaders. More now than in the past, since with few exceptions communities have evolved more and better than their rulers. Islam could be one of such exceptions. The faithful mass which follows their guides and prophets continues to be immersed within its own enclosed atmosphere. Not even the most modern communication and information media can change this situation.

In Islam, together with the byzantine debate between sunni and shia, the personalized struggle continues to be at the foreground. This struggle which is present all over the world, inevitable and necessary struggle as the idea of natural selection shows through the will to exist and to be, in a big part of the world it is diminished by the acceptance of the differentiation in all individual and collective levels. And as a result, the need to learn to coexist among unequals. The existing delay, also in the rest of the world, of this compromising process, within Islam, and of Islam against the world, is evident. The rest of religions enter debates they cannot really resolve, generally clinching the dogmas established by the human childishness of its creators, trying and achieving to a certain degree to separate religion from the enormous intellectual effort that living rationally, within environments enclosed by dogmas, implies. And in Islam, there is no effort in this direction, to the contrary, it proposes to transform the entire world into faithful of the mohammedan dogma, neither more childish nor less childish in the human scale, than all the created religious dogmas.

The parallelism the dissidence between sunni and shia, with the dissidences between christians, is relative. The christian dissidences have given different results depending to the degree of rationalization of life in different environments, and in general, consisting in living “believing”, but placing cultural and economic realities in front, that slowly have transformed their beliefs into a mere label, and frequently in the formal or factual abandonment of these same beliefs. In Islam, particularly in the shia, valuable rationalists have appeared. They have all been wiped out by the clergy, with the complacency of the mass of believers. It is the parallel version of some western thinkers touched by the conservative attitude that “lets others invent”.

(13)

The Persian and Ottoman Empire’s important and transcendent adhesions to Islam were historically decisive. But the ethnic root of current turks and iranians is evident. Although the Sah Pahlevi was defeated by Khomeini —and the ulema landowners supported on the mass of believers that exists, which is enormous. And although Ataturk did not manage to renovate Turkey in order to make its

European part pre-eminent, here by opposition to the mass of believers in spite of the existence of this sharp shock character, the two countries with if not opposed creeds, at least divergent, they have options for a change of orientation in the future. Not only because of the influence of rationalist leaders, but because of its ethnic composition which has many affinities with the West, what could make both countries overcome the esoteric background of Islam. Turkey, through a bilateral agreement with the European Union, of which it intends to become a part of. And Iran because of it being the best candidate to achieve a successful effect in the transformation of the use of oil so that instead of it being a fuel, it can become the raw matter for the production of mechanical and chemical elements, as Sah Pahlevi proposed.

The Iranian people, the majority of which are adhered to Shia, with an active genetic root caused by the crossbreeding of the natives with the central European Aryans who were constantly penetrating, in mass in the years 1500 A.C., completely crossbred, and creating their own Indo-Iranian languages, have a morphology that is similar to that of Europeans. Their history is not a dramatic one, like that of the Hebrews, but it is the most dynamic of the Ancient East. Their geographic location between the West and the East, and above all because of the ethnic diversity, Medes, Persians, Afghans, and the rest of differentiated races like the ones above mentioned, has produced a collective mix within a same space, which is not free of cultural and biological crossbreeding. The mutual Greek and Persian influences were deep. And the most decisive in order to deprive the current Iran—along with Turkey and Russia—being an extension of the West, it is the easiness to penetrate that Islam had, during the period when Europe really was shaped, caused by the dramatical and labourious Mediterranean-continental symbiosis. Anachronisms usually render poor results, but in this specific case it seems reasonable to make one considering what Europe would be, if it had faced the Islamic conquests in the vast region of the Ancient East, from Constantinople to Iran.

We shall do this exercise as an example, of another error committed by Abraham, with his lies giving birth to four millennia of monotheism.

a) The big scale ethnic configuration does not respond to Eurasia's division between Europe (West) and the rest of the continent (East). What Europe has ended up being—only a peninsula of the Eurasian continent, having in this case an evident geographic continuity—, if the West had been territorially conformed with a bounded by the Atlantic Ocean to the West; the Mediterranean and the Persian Gulf to the South; Iran, the Caspian Sea, and the Ural mountains to the East; and the Arctic Glacial Ocean to the North. And if the population of the territories within these limits had coexisted with the ones that

in Europe –for milleniums very backward with regard to those of the Ancient East–, moved by their eternal enemies, the greeks, they would (as these have done) have engaged in a symbiosis with the continental europeans.

b) The climate and environmental conditions of the now impossible semi-continent are similar. The symbiosis would certainly have occurred.

c) In this entire territorial plain, its population has been the result of the crossing of natives of each zone, more or less deeply crossbred with the natives of Central Asia, in continuous and voluntary migration, during at least ten milleniums, and possibly twenty. All along the period of glaciations in Europe.

d) The morphology of the population of this impossible semi-continent, after the numerous crossbreeding processes took place, responds to the one established in the european peninsula: white in the north, tanned in the south. With a marked existence of shades of colour caused by the crossbreeding that occurred, even with the population of the southern coast of the Mediterranean.

e) The typical cultural differentiation among europeans –indo europeans–, and iranians, iraqis and the surrounding zones –indo iranians–, has been given because of the circumstance that their wars against Greece, Egypt, and the “desert nomads” creators of many belligerent peoples which are still present in the zone, had been carried out with civilizing goals. But above all, because of the action of Islam which taking advantage of the inhibition of those recently arrived europeans, fought and won through a then modern religious creed, overthrowing empires and collecting ethnic groups like the ottoman. The europeans fought efficiently to defend the small peninsular territory, which was apt for an easy coexistence, much easier than it could have been in the vastness of the entire Eurasian continent. The fall of Constantinople caused by the ottoman thrust, over a period of centuries, has determined the evolution of the inhabitants of the East of Europe. The ottomans –unlike the mongols who came from upper Asia–, starting from re-grouped tribes, converted to Islam through the opportunism of his “ilkans”, succeeded in settling in Europe, later taking control of the cradle of the East Roman Empire, Constantinople, and the small adjacent territory for good.

Now Turkey has a chance to westernize itself thanks to its geographical connection with Europe, and only its lukewarm sunni religion which is widely accepted by the people, but scarcely by the more cultured class, indicates a path that can be taken, if it is adopted by other arab neighbouring countries. And together with Iran because of the existence of a part of the population that compares the results of islamic conservatism, with those of judaism –which in spite of the holocaust, with its dispersion and millenarian exodus outside the Ancient East, it has progressed just the same, and in

many cases even more, than the natives of the countries that sheltered them—, could make it possible to shake its religious foundations. A new “bábism” in times of scientific preponderance is not impossible.

(The founder of bábismo, Sayyid Ali Muhammad, was apparently only a display of prophetism when he tried to be the door (báb) leading to the exit of the hidden Imam, for he preached he was its re-incarnation. But his political discourse which was assumed by prominent personalities, including some Ulemas, had a content that could have been perfectly accepted by the most demanding lay rationalism. Its action had begun by the mid-XIX century, its guide book “the Bayan” that can be considered the most rational and liberal Bible ever written, it left furrows which had been opened up by the Báb, —which was known by this name—, on issues such as the treatment of women, valuing work, and a long string of subjects which are being debated today, and was summarized by the declaration that the only world to be considered was the earthly one. Although he was executed, his wake was collected by followers like Mirza Husain Ali Nuri, who abandoning politics, in such times proclaimed western values which were not always accepted (some continue to be) by the West itself. Iran is a paradigmatic case of cultural regression. And the “báb” is the paradigm of the lost opportunity for evolution)

(31)

The prospect of the exhaustion of oil fuels, has not been enough to shake the situation and create new energetic resources. It could be that although the national governments have not done anything in that direction, the oil companies might have well-kept studies to develop them, before the we reach the collapse caused by the lack of fuels. It will be caused by the rise of oil prices on the one hand, and the fiscal pressure of the administrations with regard to the spillage of CO₂ in the atmosphere, and the direct pressure on the consumption of oil products, and on the other hand because of the not futile protests of scientists and ecologists, which will make oil companies shift towards the development of alternative energetic sources.

Whenever this shift in the business guidelines occurs by offering new products with prices equivalent to those of the oil products, each time easier to rise the price of the barrel, Islam now being maintained by the two big suppliers, sunni in Arabia and Shia in the iranian environment, could be the correct moment to provoke a change in the attitude of the exporting countries to reach a pacific coexistence with the rest of the world. Then the feeling of religions could be calibrated. This circumstance can be provoke and accelerated through the First World’s economic power.

The oil reserves now brutally devoured to produce energy, could become the last reserves when the also inevitable exhaustion of minerals for the metallic and especially chemical productions occurs. The economic and human capital needed to carry out this technical revolution, is not within reach of any oil exporting country,

besides Russia, the latter only being able to do so supported by the more technological advanced countries.

Many of the problems Islam has, and that cannot be solved with its own means, could be approached if they reevaluate their reserves to use them in sectors of greater added value than the one provided by selling their products as fuels. A project for the transformation of the economies, and the necessary long period to carry it out, would permit negotiating without the pressure of the prospect of lack of supplies provoked by the unilateral action of the oil producing companies, whether it is provoked to raise prices, or if it is caused by lack of production, or by an increasing consumption caused by the mechanization of the Second and Third World.

Provoking the energetic change through a decision of the consumers, besides decreasing the ecological dangers for the planet and for human beings, would also lead to agreements being reached. With no pressures of any kind, the negotiations between bilateral powers, in which religions would have no place, the issues that would be discussed could be wide enough for them to force the abandonment of the mutual complex of fear and arrogance on both sides. The arab, muslim and Third World demographic pressure cannot continue much longer. Neither can north-american politics, and the most prudent non-intervention, cowardly because it is easy-going, of Europe. The First World, not only the West, is obliged to understand that the religions that induce terrorism cannot be fought by using bigger bombs in the yankee style, than those available to the suicidal terrorist, or by compromising, in the european style. And the muslims, headed by Iran and Saudi Arabia, must be forced to meditated about the sure advantages to be gained through a reasonable agreement, in which all parts may obtain benefits. The machiavellian approach cannot prevail in the century of computation and communication that makes its negative consequences evident. The problems must be tackled with real factors. And this is certainly not a problem of civilizations nor religions. It is a problem of the system. It is not only Islam that must change. The First World must also change. It is not enough to say that we all must change. It is enough if those that have created a class that occupies the positions that used to be occupied -and in a certain way enjoyed- by emperors, kings, and aristocrats: the professional politicians, who in spite of all the appreciations, do not enjoy but suffer occupying positions for which they are not fit, because of their scarce professional education. Their "happiness" enjoying undeserved perks is only apparent. A great majority of them, outside politics, have no other options, and this only reinforces their affection to what has become their profession.

Islam is more than a challenge to the world. It is a danger that could ignite a provoked confrontation, indicating that the islamists assume

that the West, as a whole, is incapable of coordinating itself to carry out global action —as Europe was when Islam defeated the East Roman Empire—, and even further, that this inability is extended to the unfaithful world in general.

The parallelism is evident between the situation of Europe facing the ottomans' islamism when their thrust led them to the core of the continent, finally resulting in the islamization of the Balkans thanks to the bridgehead of Constantinople, and the current situation of the islamic countries brought back to life by the oil exportations; an unsustainable demographic growth caused by the silent invasion of the West; and the maintainance of the belligerent faith against rationality and science. The history that does not repeat itself because there is always a circumstantial diversity that avoids it, but the same consequences could happen again. The discord in Europe, whose leading role was played by the christian Rome-Constantinople schism in times when religion ruled, is also parallel to the lack of understanding in the current West. It happened because of bythantine causes of personal oppositions that provoked the rupture of the joint cultural process of the Ancient East and Europe. And now the discord in the West provoked by Europe without consistent causes.

The symbiosis of content exists in the West. But the division in the political action also exists. The religion cause has disappeared, in spite of the signs of persistence in the USA. The cause of the current ineffectiveness of the West, is no longer religion, it is economy and the struggle for what we call welfare, and also the personalized causes, clearly displayed opposed positioning of europeans and americans, (unfortunately not only among their respective governments, also in part of their respective populations), without justified causes for their divorce —perhaps only announced—, between the two parts of the West. Both need to complement each other. If they do not do it, their internal problems will increase.

Given the possibility of the result of war in Iraq ending with a defeat of the USA, such a hypothetical defeat would mean the defeat of the West. It would be an incentive for the radical iranians, that would give them preponderance over the few arab countries that are now prone to engage with the developed world. And it could generate the same result as the fall of Constantinople to the mohammedans did. It was the price paid to enable the symbiosis of mediterraneans and continentals. Now for nothing. The main culprit, in that previous confrontation, was Rome. Now, the culprit would not be the USA. It would be Europe, that would suffer the consequences more than anyone. Could the West repeat the mistakes Europe made previously?

12-The challenge of judaism and to judaism

(14)

The cloistered hebrews in Canaan, were already a historically punished race by the imperial scuffles of the Ancient East. A passing point for the armies of Egypt and those of the North, assyrians, medes, persians, and many more. A significant community with regard to its territorial dimensions in the original and unpopulated Palestine, not because of its population, that was already forced to pay taxes if not to one Empire to another in order to survive. Only under the rule of David did it reach the category of Empire, taking over a territory that stretched from the Mediterranean to the Euphrates, but their development in the region was all but pacific and calm. Its geographic situation –repeated many times in other passing points, and because of it committed and oscillating between various directions–, was the cradle of people whose fate has not been to live like the chosen by God, but rather as the undesirable, the mocked, the combatant and finally the victim of the holocaust. But in all the adventures of its exodus, it has collected multiple cultural aspects. Already during its exile in Babylon, it acquired a cultural level it would never have been able to reach in its enclosed and scarcely populated Canaan. A learning process that was fast and that shows the acquired abilities in their random existence. It embedded without integrating in the babylonians, forming a kind of colony that evolved faster than its captors did. Instead of being a punishment, it was a return home: they left Ur with Abraham and returned to Babylon with Nebuchadrezzar II. In the end both came from the same ethnic nature. The characteristic hebrew conformation responds to multiple cultural crossbreedings, nearly none of them being biological. It is the paradigmatic result of living continuously surmounting in a hostile environment, but generally within a cultured, creative and vigorous character.

The most distinguished hebrew prophet when the expulsion to Babylon took place was Ezekiel, who was considered to be a passionate babylonian, and who remained voluntarily in Babylon with the majority of his fellow countrymen, once Canaan was given back to the jews. A parallelism of the current settlement in the West, in which the majority of jews and also those holding a better economic and cultural position, have not emigrated to Israel.

The roots of the jews, are the same as in all the other peoples of the Ancient East, besides the arabs. Their return to Israel, has not been used to undertake a great reflection by their declared islamic enemies. They have the same God, with different names but with the same meaning. They have the same ancestors as the islamists form the North of the Ancient East, from Persia-Iran, to the adjacent deserts of Syria. And even their primitive Canaan, was an enclave within the mediterranean strip and the Red Sea, formed by the territories that pertain to current Lebanon, Israel, Egypt, Saudi

Arabia and Yemen, differentiated from the interior of the Arab Peninsula, mostly deserts unlike the fertile regions of Canaan. Their populations in similar contrast, are also differentiated. The differentiation has continued, displayed by their abilities in economy and science on behalf of the Jews, and the lack of abilities of the Arabs to integrate into general evolution, being unable to overcome the legacy received from their prophet Mohammed.

And this community internationally located in a position of privilege, not only because of their economic capacity, but also their artistic, and above all scientific, is the paradigm of the demonstration of the certainty of the Darwinian theory of natural selection, and the Mendelian theory of the genetic inter-generational transmission. It has suffered and fought intensely, resisting in all territorial and human environments. And until their current struggle with Arabs and Islamists is not defined, we cannot say that they have finally won in their persistence to BE. If Zionism manages to validate the unilateral English decision of giving them back their territorial property lost since multi-millennarian times through Balfour's initiative, it would be the paradigm with regard to the result of the instinct to remain of a human community, for the loss of their territory can be considered to have come into effect since their expulsion from Judea by Hadrian in the year 135. It has never occurred, not even in their wildest dreams, to Zionists to claim responsibility to Italy for that first forced exodus, with the prolegomenon of a carnage that was equivalent to that of the Holocaust. The Hebrew paradigm of their capacity to remain, is opposed by the abandonment of positions of the colonizing countries caused by fatigue. England in this particular case, appointing itself the right to decide the destiny of the Palestine and Jewish peoples. Not because of a feeling of responsibility or justice understood through their criteria, but because of evading the duty of ordering the retreat from the occupied territories with goals that are purely strategic, becoming a conflict through the Zionist action and the lack of symbiosis spirit and scarce sense of reality of the Palestinians. And therefore handing over to Europe a poisoned problem for which it is not responsible. There have been replicas in the Sahara, Cyprus, Kurdistan, Soviet republics, and a string of abandonments in oriental territories that have adhered the inexistent "world community", which is not represented by the inefficient UN. And generally, with the USA assuming military and therefore economic responsibility. Not because of altruism, but because its comfortable prosperity has a greater vision of the future. And fighting spirit, which will be put to the test in their solitary interventions in Afghanistan, Iraq and Palestine; what remains to be seen is if they can bend their international interventionism.

The compared history of the peoples of the Ancient East, show truthful information regarding the process of natural selection in communities through the phenotypical effects that as happens with individuals surpasses the genetic, determining and transforming them. Wars, epidemics, exodus, migrations, and above all religions until the advent of the Renaissance, have created collective characters oriented towards the conservation or renovation. The jewish religion that created monotheism, has been the hebrews' insignia. In their exodus, it has been useful in order to maintain their collective identity, although among their countrymen, born and created all over the world, currently millions of descendents of converted or liberated from religion must exist, many of them ignoring their hebrew origin. Perhaps Mallorca is the clearest example of the maintainance of the hebrew identity in a group, partly forced by their current native fellow countrymen.

In other regions of the Earth like Holland, of a more open nature, and with a human environment more liberal than the hispanic –big inquisitive promoter–, it is possible that the jewish dissidents outnumber the followers of judaism. Identitarian and with a crossbreeding of low intensity, either ignoring or not their origin, through natural selection they have reached prosperity in spite of the enormous difficulties opposed to their personal struggles. Particularly those that have maintained publicly their identity through the banner of their religion. The only thing that would be left to know is how many of these actually profess it and feel it internally. And how many agnostics and atheists have been created within the hebrew family through the milleniums, from Babylon (587 a.C) to the Holocaust.

The repeated jewish exodus were all painful and they all produced opposed characters. The most famous, and probably the most cruel, ignited by Ferdinand and Isabella from Spain, led to a repression that was much more barbaric than the previous ones. The inquisition acted thoroughly, and the half-saint couple developed actions against jews that today would be considered to be a genocide. And as it has always happened whenever an attempt has been made to reduce a religious movement, it created an uprooted class with serious psychic consequences. There were many so-called "marranos" (sephardic jews), which having to face pressure and continuous expulsions, traveled to Portugal first, and from there to the rest of Europe, primarily to Holland. In the course of few generations a movement of religious liberation had established, and few true turncoats to the repressing religions. Bacon's timid empiricism, did not assume an atheist shape until a relatively far future, that with Hume in the eighteenth century finally took off, before Darwin started spreading his ideas that could be used by the jews in their psychic restlessness. Nevertheless, without having any empiricist or rational philosophy, Spinoza, a jew of portugese origin,

gave a personal formula that prior to empiricism, satisfied the lust for life sheltered by a vital idea, his was clearly atheistic, that liberated him from the confusion the religious rootlessness produced in the jews that were not converts nor followers of the original faith. This occurred with a certain parallelism to the scandinavian protestants which had voluntarily broken away from the Catholic Church, with who they coexisted. Pragmatism.

The jews that had remained voluntarily or forced in the ghettos, maintained their (not homogeneous) beliefs. Adding to the fears and suspicions that are characteristic of a new exodus, a confusion within believing circles of christian sign, and only a small part of jews would reach an attitude that could only be personal, similar to Spinoza's. A similar situation evolved in the East of Europe, particularly in Poland. The scene of part of the most cruel act. The holocaust, certain and unquestionable, which has been zionism's big argument, favouring their territorial claims.

The challenge of Islam to the world is perceivable and does not need any argument for its demonstration. The challenge of judaism to the world, remains overlapped, and with multiple challenges in sociological aspects, like that of Palestine-Israel for instance. But the main one is displayed by their alliance with a re-born christianism in North America, which is apparently circumstantial. And it is not. Alliances can have controversial signs, whether it is with the american democrats or republicans. The enormous economical power of the jews on a world scale, at the service of a centralized organization with goals of global domination, similar to Islam. And even less through their beliefs. The action of judaism continues to be defensive, and currently consists of maintaining the State of Israel. In order to achieve this goal, with the exception of the few anti-zionist jews that exist, nearly the entire rest support anything that could be useful to them. And this is their challenge. They do not need to create a combative Al-Qaeda, nor a monopolizing OPEP. It is enough with their bond, much more solid through their feelings, developed throughout the world—superimposed upon the one that had been created in its time in its original environments of the Ancient East—, that partly in its origins was caused by the religious coincidence of all the wandering jews. The cultured, which is the majority of them, show clear signs of discomfort when asked indiscreetly about the religious issue. They do not define themselves. But they do define themselves when they have to consider their community.

(14)

There are two mutual fears, those of Islamism and Judaism. Both are perfectly justified. And both constitute the biggest challenge for the world, only nominally because of religious sentiment, but in reality through the action of the West: Europe because of its uncontrolled

de-colonization; and North America because of the easy infiltration, the permeability of a civil society that was alien to world problems until the 11th of september, and always obsessed by its personal benefit and victory. A society from which the rulers emerge needing advisers in all aspects. And these are mainly jews or are at the service of jews.

An authentic challenge to the jews, is the need to accept the realities that their beliefs deny, and who in a way similar to that of Spinoza should practice genuine integration in the varied environments in which they live. Practically the same as countless "marrano" descendents, who in the style of Spinoza and the current anti-zionist jews, do not have to make an effort to carry out the symbiosis of religion and vital praxis.

13-The challenge to christianism

Neither through theological content, nor through a proselytist yearning, is there a challenge today that has violent content carried out by any christian church.

In Europe, the non-catholic christian churches, prudently observe the process of agnosticism and atheism, with numerous parishioners that are not very fervent. And the catholic church, now has the evidence of the near disappearance of priestly vocation among its natives and the decrease of believers in the entire christian environment where it continues to perform, with the fixed dogmas which are impossible to accept for part of its motley parish. Christianity in general, except for the one located in the countries of the Third World and particularly in Africa, has taken a defensive position, passively. As in any kind of fight, the exclusively defensive posture is an announcement of defeat.

Ecumenicalism is the last hope to re-unify the inertial force for a survival that will be, in any case, of reduced dimensions. The only ecumenical factor that could embody a long term resistance is islamism, precisely the community from which we cannot hope to find any alliances because of what christianism or any other belief means to them.

(5)

The impossibility of erasing the weight of the Bible, and the preceding common mosaic with judaism until the advent of Christ, has placed christianism in all its tendencies in the commitment of being useful to the human beings, to thy neighbour. The christian action in many aspects perfectly driven towards this commitment, has saved it from mummyfying. For milleniums. In the twenty first century, after five centuries of intellectual renaissance following the most brilliant predecessors ever recorded, those that started in the Ancient East actions that were truly transcendental besides religion; those that, lacking knowledge, tried to mock Delphos and proposed something different to the mythological gods; those that were

ignorant with regard to simple realities which are known today to those that have studied their first grade; and romans, but above all byzantines, that tried in their time, so near in terms of years but so far with regard to ideas, to achieve a symbiosis between knowledge and beliefs: from all this group, only the commitment remains, the commitment to continue being useful to society, in spite of this society becoming strange to them, because all sorts of beliefs also become strange to the current society.

The selection of seminarists, long ago and extendedly, used to be made from students that were all but stupid. On the contrary. Because of their own parents and because of the established clergy, it could be assured that the selection was made out of students that were outstanding.

It is useless to ask how entities such as the christian churches, which are rich in economic, cultural and human resources, have not been able to take advantage of this wealth to become enduring entities. The cause is not conservatism. It is the ignorance of realities in all times, until now, when they have placed themselves in a process similar to that of the disappearing empires on the last century –without their being an abdication of imperialism–, the churches are being diluted in a similar way, and the religious restlessness surfaces. But the empires have never been an economic and human body. They were simply a system. The Churches, particularly the christian ones, continue to be a physical body with intangible goods, but also with tangible ones, and that is the reason for them lasting.

Can the Christian Churches avoid their reprimand?

It seems that Pope Ratzinger is trying to do so. But the change that is needed in order to renovate this church, cannot be the work of one single man nor, above all, can it be achieved by increasing ecumenically the number of believers. Besides, each church attempts to increase these figures near their environment, which generally results in the increase of the distancing among believers.

The tree planted by Abraham ramified magnificently, but the fate of all trees is death. The only way to survive is by replanting its sprouts in time. The attempts made to sprout in the three monotheistic religions have been many and have all been failures. There has not been a significant “babism”. The inertial force in the shape of a brutal pruning has deprived the substitution of a tree for another tree. What remains to be seen is if the old roots can still sprout, and instead of pruning them they are looked after and nurtured in their transplant to produce a renovation capable of being fruitful again.

In this situation, a renovation like that of the north-americans with their re-born beliefs, popularized on a world scale for it being the banner of the re-born christians with a presidential name, is not

enough. For the rest of the world, the re-born in faith president is simply an ex-alcoholic, that having been born into a family with great links to an also re-born old religion, wahhabism, has managed to reach the summit of the country that determines the world's evolution. What the situation of christianism, and especially catholicism, needs is a reassessment of their real position in the current world. The attempts made to concentrate all the dogmas, irreconcilable, in Rome are nothing but an attempt to bring back to life a tree that has already fulfilled its vital cycle.

The preceding tree-shaped digression does not try to be illustrative in any aspect, and even less in a theological aspect. It only tries to show, not in a respectful way as is usually said in religious issues, but simply that in the cultural level of the developed world in the West and the East, churches need to find the way to recycle themselves. The world primarily needs educators. But within rationalism. The Church, or the churches, that begins an acceptance of today's existing realities will mark a route that could be millenarian, as they have been in the phase leading to the present time. And making themselves present in a world that already ignores them. It won't be Islam, which moved by factors outside religion, as decisive or even more decisive than religion, as for instance the decision to give back the Palestinian territories to the zionists or common israelis, which has been done following England's will, in a cowardly way, and because of their political and strategical interests, which have provoked the poverty of palestinians. More or less compensated for their forced diaspora. A poverty which is enhanced by the surpassed birth rate of the palestinians themselves. To these direct factors, we must add the indirect factor of the supposedly "moral" interests of the always real and opposed economic and religious interests of Iran and Saudi Arabia. Anti-americans and pro-americans respectively, which is surely the factor that causes the most misfortunes to the unfortunate palestinians. Because of this factual framework, that one day will be able to determinate to what extent each of these mentioned factors have intervned in the specific episodes, Islam is a self-confessed challenger. But the worst challenge it suffers, is itself, which as the individuals, everyone has to defeat them throug their own *yihad*, an efficient system in order to tackle its own challenges. The position of the arab palestinians, begins with a bad procedure carried out by England, and the West giving its support. But the continued mistakes of the palestinians have enhanced the effects of the West's mistaken performance during their de-colonizing phase. First it was the West, and now it is the USA, which have not been able to value the depth and size of the muslim faith in the places where it has settled. It is worth noting the existence of illiteracy in all these places, that affects, in many cases, more than half its population.

Judaism, as any religion today, is also moved by factors that are outside religion, and in a certain way are parallel to those of other monotheistic religions, but with the important difference of religion not occupying such an important place, or so generalized, as it has in Islam within the intimate thoughts and feelings of the hebrews.

Palestinians and israelis have to settle a confrontation that was created basically because of a territorial issue, with the sides of this problem mainly being soil and water. Even the intervention of islamic countries is propelled by interests that are heavier than religion, even if as is usual in islamist politics, religion is the banner exhibited by all the anti-zionist contenders.

The fortunate, for the israelis, intervention of the USA in the conflict, and parallel to it the also fortunate, for the palestinians, intervention of Europe, has taken the conflict to an international level, a conflict that would cease to exist if the USA and Europe someday achieved a convergence of interests, that more or less exists below the surface. The jews have strongly influenced the exterior policy of the USA, and have had no influence whatsoever in european politics. It is not as if the USA has become so under the influence of judaism. The US religion plays an important part in politics. But deep down it is an "amusement", even if this entertainment reaches nearly caricaturesque conflicts that have to be settled in court. A proof of this idea is the fact that the Vatican flirts brazenly with Islam, and looks down on judaism. Meanwhile in North America, it acts notoriously with consent between prominent jews and not so eminent re-born christians —considering their economic capacity and the achieved cultural level.

But there are other challenges. The most important for all religions is adapting to a world that is building a scientific base that is incompatible with the esoteric background which is common to all of them. It is hard to imagine that Judaism, a silent religion, will carry the banner of religious rationalization. This character is applied to their secular life. But because it is a silent religion, even if it did propose a rectification, it would not have globalized effects in the world. And this is also the case of the oriental religions and the new ones that have been moulded in the west, without even mentioning the remnants in peoples living in a semi-wild state.

The challenge of the rationalization of the churches, results in a challenge only to the christian churches. It is not as if the christian clergy in all its orientations ignores this reality. But the reaction when facing it is what they are unable to find. Even though it could be that they do have it but are lacking the courage needed to use it. It is nothing other than without any formal apologies, even without any bombastic statements declarations, but explicitly expressing the decision to become la laic, directing its actions throughout the

world, using all the means it has to collaborate in the enormous task of educating those parts of the world that had been forgotten by colonization, with the consent, it must be said, of the christian churches themselves, obsessively dedicated to proselytism. Now only in the Third World. If these churches, especially the catholic church, face this challenge, in a more or less long period of time, but while it is still suitable, the rest of religions would be affected, or maybe even forced to follow that same path of rationalization.

It could be that it is not only courage what the christian churches are lacking in order to reach a recycling process of the people and of the goals to be achieved. It could be that a decisive part of the clergy is not sufficiently qualified to accept the rejection of beliefs that have never been questioned, neither in the seminary nor in the activities that are developed later on by each priest.

The instinct of survival and of persistence is general in everything that exists. Each believing priest wants to remain being within the belief. The christian churches have enough means to auscultate its human content. The ageing of the clergy could obstruct an attempt to entirely renovate the church.

Does the permanence in the beliefs deprive the recycling process that would enable the permanence of the churches? We have seen how ants, tiny creatures, sacrifice themselves individually in great numbers, when it is necessary to ensure the permanence of the anthill. The christian clergy does not have this instinct.

During the immediate course of religious life, the lack of youth which is always open to renovation, would intensify itself, making it more difficult for a plan to save the enormous values of all types that churches have. Are those who fight against the grain trying uselessly to bring together belief and rationality aware of this?

If that is the case, they must be told that the intellectual sacrifice of the old-aged clergy, would not only save the permanence of churches. It would redeem them from the out-of-place resistance to remain in the biblical belief since long ago and unnecessarily. The believing parishioners would not be an obstacle for the ecclesiastical renovation. Their emotional sacrifice, more a sentimental character than an intellectual one, would be much lighter than those of the believing priests. And the non-believing parishioners would breathe happily as they would be able to give support to renovated churches, and according to the acceptance of the value of scientific and technological work, which is finally what can lead a mankind that lost long ago its religious guidance, creator of "morals", and that cannot find systems to substitute it.

14-The russian challenge and the challenge to Russia (15)

The tsarist empire, the communist empire, and the one yearned by the successive governments after the disintegration of the USSR, and

also by a considerable amount of citizens, who are the privileged ones because of their participation in the legacy left behind by the communist administration.

The process that created the identitarian feeling in Russia, has a class character reflected in the encyclopaedic register, and it has a greater social influence than in the countries which have not tried to eliminate social classes following the communist model or other similar ones. The territorial space, the biggest in the world pertaining to one single state, and the lack of population to occupy it, has decreased the competition and therefore also has decreased selection. That is why the social values differ from those of the rest of the world. Communism does not value the possession of goods to establish them. In Russia, in connection to the destroyed aristocracy –apparently destroyed, because what they destroyed was the aristocrats but not aristocracy–, a sentiment of pride has survived, pride of belonging to a country destined to be, if not the master of the world, the guide of mankind.

The feeling of defeat in the cold war against the USA, has been followed by a renaissance of this pride caused by the upkeep of their military power, enhanced by an imposing stock of nuclear weapons, and which now, through their economic power thanks to the exploitation of their oil and gas reserves, can be maintained, looked after, and increased.

The sentiment of personal freedom and the enjoyment or lack of welfare, essential values that are esteemed in the West, can thrive if the relations between Russia and the First World happen within a framework of pacific coexistence. And this does not depend on the will of its population. It depends, as always, on the will of the ruling aristocracy, who is strongly conditioned by the invincible tendency to place itself in a dominant position, and now also by the re-discovered opportunities to economically enrich itself during the shift from communism to a growing market economy.

Its attempts to expand in the West have always failed. The European empires first, and the state-nations afterwards, have possessed an economic and military thrust with which the successive Russian empires have been unable to compete. As a result and in spite of the ethnic affinity between both parts, a symbiosis has not occurred. There has been a lack of relations, even if confrontation has occurred (which it has), it has been a low-intensity confrontation. On the other hand, the Russian expansion to the East has been that of exploratory strolls and gratuitous occupation.

The established divergence between Europe and the Empire of the tsars, was not imposed by Europe as a winner –it was the winner– in the attempts to obtain hegemony made by the Russian Empire. It was the easiness of expanding towards the East, which was hardly populated, in the territories beyond the Urals. On the other

hand, the emigration from Central Asia, which was continuous until the end of the glaciations, to all the cardinal points and to Russia itself before it became a political entity, leaving that space practically empty, like an extension of the desertic siberian and arctic territories. Russia had an extreme easiness for its expansion towards its north-eastern space reaching as far as the arctic boundaries, which have never been explicitly claimed by China or Japan. The territorial expansion of the russian empires towards the East, did not render worthy values to the scarce inhabitants of those regions, nor to the russians that have always considered them a prison, rather than a territory to colonize. Until the discoveries of gas and oil, there was no compensation for living in such an exceptionally cold climate.

The imperialist tendencies of the tsars, transmitted to the distinguished communists in the Encyclopaedia, through their common nature created by a citizenship that has continued with the passivity of their wendo ancestors, they have become more moderate through the easiness for the creation of a territorial unity, the biggest in the world, that in a certain way has compensated their failure to expand towards the West.

Little influence has been exchanged between the european russians and the asian russians. The disintegration of the USSR has showed that the opposition to russian domination in the asian populations (considering Asia begins on the eastern side of the Ural mountains), has occurred apparently caused by social reasons, but that are actually ethnic reasons through the creation of characters formed by the scarce native inhabitants that currently live in the region, with an important mongolic factor that is very similar to the natural slavic character impregnated with finnish components.

(Never at the wrong time, we will now mark the irrefutable example of racial and ethnic differentiation. It is made evident by the existence of the sami and eskimo peoples. And it is another indication of the probability of the human species having been created in all regions of the Earth and not only in Africa. The morphology of these people, very different from those of the rest of the world, makes it difficult to explain the morphological change that it would entail not only because of the colour, but in the height, oblique eyes, and adiposity which in the case of the inhabitants of the Tierra del Fuego, the antarctic fuegians who are the southern equivalent of the eskimos from the Arctic, who were endowed by their icy climate with an adipose super defence to the extent of being able to live naked in those icy temperatures. An unequivocal indication of speciation derived from the climate effect, antithesis of the black africans who are specifically endowed with a colour that resists the exposure to the solar rays in the tropical-equator regions. When, in what conditions and in search of what did they emigrate from warm Africa to live in the climate conditions of both Poles? Even if it is with less morphological differentiation of africans and whites, these questions are also applicable to the inhabitants of the entire Northern hemisphere. But this tangential aspect, even if it is essential for the much discussed idea of equalizing human beings, is not what focuses our interest in the issue. The differences between human beings start or finish between races and individuals. There are differences in between. Sub-races

named ethnic groups. On a descending scale well differentiated peoples with the supreme sign of language. Ultimately people, who are absolutely individualized, with the impossibility of equalization in all the physical and mental aspects (until the chromosomatic recombination can be controlled: never?). The attempts made to equalize, whether christian or marxist, failed. The currency of equality in the French Revolution is needless. And it is useless to argue that there should be equality in the way we deal with people or communities. What is necessary is a different deal for those that are in a worse situation because of having lived in glacial territories for millions of years, and others in regions having a moderate or warm climate.

The chances for evolution cannot be the same. They must adjust to the nature of each race and each individual. Definitive: what is desirable, because it is possible, is the articulation of a coexistence between differences in each level, from the individual to the racial. And promoting the evolution of the backward, whether they are communities or individuals. Only in this case would racism be praiseworthy, and the "ism" would be in its place. The possibility of bringing happiness to the inhabitants of the tropic that had moved to Lapland or the Tierra del Fuego, if a mineral discovery made them necessary because of a lack of migration fitness of the inhabitants of the North hemisphere, is not small, it is null. And vice versa supposing the migration of the inhabitants of the Poles towards the tropics. The racial and ethnic marks of peoples are indeleble morphologically and genetically).

The ethnic conformation of Russia, especially in the Western Russia, is relatively similar to that of Europe. The natives having similar characteristics, if not identical to that of primitive europeans, mixed with the central asian peoples of the slavic tribes from beyond the Ural mountains, before or after the germanic tribes with Scandinavia. Their settlement to the North of the Carpatians and later distribution towards the four cardinal points, happened after or before a pretty intense crossing with the inhabitants of the Arctic, in such a way that the physical and character similarities with the finns, stem from this circumstance. The posterior crossbreeding process of the germanics that had settled in Scandinavia and the Baltic, would moderate the mongoloid features until they nearly disappeared in the slavic peoples relocated towards the South, and particularly in the wide corridor that stretches from the North to South of Russia, established by the baltic rush –central asians crossbred with the natives from the North of Europe– and founders of urban enclaves, cities at first, and principalities later on in Kiev and Mosco, that became the Russian Empire.

From the East of the Urals to the siberian planes and in Central Asia, in its expansion towards the Pacific, the russians found the ethnic groups of the central asians that did not emigrate to the South and West reaching the Mediterranean and the Atlantic. They are the famous oasis that were visited by the chinese adventurers and where the first contacts between the West and East took place. It is the region where the mongoloid characters appear again embedded by those that came from the Arctic and detoured from their natural expansion path which was that of China, and combining

with natives from Central Asia, who had a white physique in latitudes as southern as Kashmir, from which point mulattoes appear – malays– and black in the tropical and equatorial zones.

To the East and North of the region of the oasis, the plateaus of Central Siberia and the hills and arctic territories reaching the Bering Strait – in a considerably long corridor which is crossed by the transiberian railway, where the russian people have settled and have become a majority, since the adjacent regions are enormous uninhabited spaces or have a population density which is derisory. The number of ethnic groups in Russia has been reduced since the independence of ten countries occurred, after the last world war, diminishing the Federation's area to 4.525.643 km², and its population to 138.186 million people.

(15) Russia's tsarist empire first, and communist empire later, has ended up being the current aggregate of peoples theoretically federated, which in reality depend on the russians. Unitarily, it is the youngest country of Eurasia, in spite of the ageing of its population, especially in Europe. Its frontiers have suffered more changes than any other, having started its conformation as a country in the second millenium, when the Principality of Moscow was established in 1823. Even though the incorporations and segregations of territories have been frequent, the population has been dominated by the slavic ethnic group, which now have a greater possibility of cohesion. With the re-adjustments that have been triggered by the disappearance of the USSR, the non-russian or non-slavic peoples, represent minorities which are more or less docile and are located to the East of the Ural Mountains and of the Caspian Sea, and the southern end between this sea and the Black Sea. The population density has been decreased to about 8,46 people per sq.km. Given the development of its former satellites, we have another example of how the territorial and demographic concentration produces bad coexistence and poverty, and de-centralization favours coexistence and wealth. And on the other hand, it has shaken off a muslim population that amounts to fifty million people, leaving only some twenty million followers of Islam within the Federation. A source of conflicts for Russia.

This ethnic clarification has coincided with the rise in the prices of the oil products; the lack of existence of a church that is rooted in the population as a result of the atheistic indoctrination of communism; an erudite elite capable of assimilating the modern technologies; and a docile population, although not very dynamic, the future prospects, are now favourable for the Federation, whether it is a real or fictitious one. On a longer time span, with regard to the inevitable energetic change, Russia can also plan it with a greater efficiency than the oil exporting countries which have a population that is not technologically fit to industrialize itself. Not all the legacy left by communism is negative.

This bulk of circumstances allow Russia to enter the First World, and act according to its economic and cultural capacity, and more than its culture, because of the atomic arsenal they possess.

The problems caused by demography are the same as in Europe, although they are deeper. On the other hand, the resulting atmosphere of its short but troubled history, happens to be inappropriate for it to be attractive within the world that has the vocation and need to emigrate. This is a great advantage with regard to the migration system allowed in the West.

The countries of the Federation that have been naturally articulated, with an acceptance of the differences that stem from socio-biological structural realities, what would be rational and convenient would be not to put pressure on the West because of its territorial dimension and atomic military power, and choose to become an element associated to a program of true world unity. The signs given by their rulers, do not follow that path. And the Russian people, as always, does not give indications of resisting the intentions of their current aristocrats.

The administrative and governing distribution of Russia, could favour an association of Peoples that could at the same time function being managed, and in a certain way ruled, federally. They do not have to invent anything. Their Republics and autonomous regions, their autonomous "oblast" and "okrug", only have to actually become autonomous. Now that there is no single Party—which distorted the coexistence among unequals—which was the true government of the USSR, new possibilities arise. Accepting that the communist regime might have been convenient to make the shift from a ruling autocracy to another collective one, though still as indoctrinating, easier for the population; and lacking the deep European crossbreeding, the long awaited compatibility between the Soviet ethnic groups and peoples did not occur because of the failure of the unfortunate Marxist idea of producing equalization. Now, without rejecting its territoriality which is its great treasure and primary good inherited from the Tsarist empire, the independence of the republics and other divisions could be a complete reality. The conditions that make this possible already exist. But signs against this perspective also abound. The Russian character is impregnated with conformism, inherited from their Wendish predecessors. Farmers satisfied with their position, without the intention of dominion and the tendency to admit alien dominations for generations, combined with the opposite tendency of its elites who have a marked oligarchic and authoritarian character, from the authentic Tsarist providentialism to the camouflaged one of Communist comradeship. This conformist character is attributed to the crossbreeding of the Slavs with the Mongolians of the North. A crossbreeding which is deeper than the one between Sami and Finns. And Finland too, since

it has only used passive resistance versus its neighbours. The different result of this common feature would have to be found in the very much repeated reason of reduced communities are more compatible, have a pacific character, free hegemony, and easier ruling. Which does not prevent them from also being laborious. It is more than easily possible, especially when the environment forces to do so, and in Finland it is a cold climate in its entire territory. The communist regime does not create a competitive character, a fact that was proved in Eastern Germany during its period as a russian satellite. And the size of the territory and population of the former Russia and the extinct USSR, fed the expansionism which once begun could only be eliminated through defeats. What remains to be seen is if after having been extinguished, tsarism and communism, the combination of the conformism of the population and the providencialism of the elites lead to a new totalitarian regime that could be inclined towards the East, or a liberal one with an inclination towards the West. Or the creation of its own modern one, that would permit bipolar action favourable for all sides.

The abandonment of the liturgy which was much loved by the slavs, opposed to greek and roman theogony which opened theological speculation until the arrival of Bythantium, and from there to rationalism and the culture of knowledge; surpassing the worship to the past which has an oriental mark; the distancing of the cultivation of the german spiritual greatness; the rectification of erudite and rational antigalicism first, and now having overcome antiamericanism, all of this would be a good sign of acceptance by the russian intellectual community, of the abandonment of the yearning to become big, in the style of the european empires that have disappeared without much ado. And also to dilute that germanic spirituality, each day becoming more void by the knowledge of the complex thought and feeling –the soul which has been so much thought about by all religions and communism, something parallel to a religion–, that would permit establishing realities and destroying beliefs, is another indication of the tendency to be observed.

But it is sad to see that the communist disbelief is always made relative, and as a result of the certain parallelism between Christ and Marx, is now oriented by the opportunism to the cultivation of the light religiosity but always latent in the russian farmer. This, in the moment when the believers of all creeds, except those of Islam, are disappearing. Their intellectual community has been shaped under a european influence. Essentially with a german root. The german intellectual community, has differed from the latin and the germanic from Scandinavia and England and the centre of Europe. It has ended up accepting rationalism, especially in the change operated since the fall of nazism, but maintaining the root of the ideas of its philosophers of epic content which have not been

eliminated by the surpassing of national socialism, and that in times of the formation of the Russian intellectual community was at its peak. The national socialist movement was possible because of this philosophical base, not quarrelled with science, although it was strongly rooted in totalitarian ideas of superiority of the heroic life and in a certain way with similarities with the acceptance of the soul very badly conceived by the Aristotelian philosophy, adopted by the Christian Byzantines and the Roman Catholics, who were not as different from each other as is generally believed. More than the opposed interests of Russia and Europe, which are not many and that can become complementary, it is the opposition of their “souls” which could prevent the desired symbiosis that could extend itself towards the East. There is no excess of rationalism in Europe, but there is a substratum of widespread belief in Russia, that only apparently seemed to substitute religious beliefs, which were faint and similar to the oriental beliefs, full of liturgy and nearly void of theology. This makes a shift in the guidelines of the orientation of beliefs easier, without the need for retractions made by the hybrid that was created by Marxism and Christianity. In short, the future of Russia is more conditioned by its Aristotelian-Christian-Marxist “soul”, than by the values that govern the will of the West and, to a certain extent, the East. Should we hope that this factor will end up playing an important role in order to reach the convergence of Russia with the West –to which it belongs– through a change of the essence of its soul?

It is not only through the electoral process that the masses of voters influence their rulers. Even if the first need is being elected, they then want to become popular, be loved and respected. The new populism which has roots in the one created by the Roman Empire, is rising, not only in countries of the Second World, especially in South America. Also in its cradle, Europe, the will of the candidates to government is a victim of this desire. Not because of narcissism, but because it is an indication of their continuity in their expectations within government. The communist experience should empty the esoteric sense that its rural population has cultivated, entering definitely a westernization beyond technology and science, important aspects in the cultural moment mankind is now experiencing, but which do not represent that which is essential in the current crossroads of the shift from nationalism to the globalization of coexistence. The acceptance of the differences –that communism tried to achieve through an equalization of people and their communities instead of articulating a system to coexist within differences–, not only accepting them, but even encouraging them, would be typical of those who have served as a test bed for an idea only apparently rational –equalitarianism. Abandonment of the

platonian soul, adhering to the natural one –the thought-feeling complex–, that is a subject it still has to tackle.

The challenge for russians, and for the rest of the human beings, is not to return to attempts of equalization like the ones they have already experienced. Nor to be fearful of their morphological features –which are minimum and in certain spaces– from their mongolian ancestry, when they exist which is not very often. The finns and estonians who more frequently present these physical features, though they are very weakened, show how without losing their identity they are leaders in evolution. Finland through its positioning in the numerous indexes of modernity, on a world scale. And the same happens with Estonia on the scale of the countries liberated from communism. Like Slovenia.

Russia, because of its size, particularly its territory and energetical resources, does not need to make as much mimetism as the finns and estonians. Their calculated lack of definition, often badly calculated, can be a factor of challenge for the West, and with less chances, also for the East. But Russia, in its european part, a decisive part, belongs to the West. The difficulties it might create for Europe, in the end would be suffered by Russia itself when, almost inevitably, it becomes part of one of these two civilizations of the West and the East, or a connector between them both.

(16)

Democracy, the government of the people by the people, is not a system. It is a state of culture, of civility reaching a level which is enough to make it possible. The West doesn't possess it either, but the difference lies in the fact that they have a century of advantage over Russia in this determination, and even if it is following the wrong path, it continues to struggle to reach it.

The path taken by Russia is not one that will be able to make the process of cultural and socio-political approach towards the West or the East more dynamic. Indications of this exist. Among others, the revitalization of religiosity; its flirting with the Vatican; its attempts to recover coercitive military strength against the West; the replanting of the secret action of power, a kind of covert terror; the mistrust in the individual value; the temptation of using heavily the communist nostalgia of an important part of the population; the action taken against the media which are not addicted to the government and their executives; and in short, the return to totalitarian systems masked by displays of "democracy", a chorus that was already used by the soviet rulers of the USSR. All of this and more, makes a return to the past plausible, or at least a social, political, economical and political standstill that will disqualify Russia as a factor of evolution, facing the competitiveness of all the People-nations of the world.

This negative possibility could cease to be a problem for the slaviv communities, and at the same time a proof that its history is

that of conformity –in a certain way denied by the communist experiment and its defence against european fascism. The history of the slavs reminds their movements in the West, before and during the settlement of the germanic peoples, when having been named wends, the rest of aryan peoples like themselves, always thought it would be easy or at least feasible to dominate them according to convenience. Their expansion towards the East where the characteristic of the population is real and has been proved to be passive, and their persistence thanks to their resisting attitude –with Napoleon and Hitler in the last episode–, would lead to thinking that Russia, with all its enormous possibilities, must not be considered to promote the compatibility of human beings on a world scale. That the only thing we can hope for and try to obtain is its neutrality.

For the West, and also for the East, the fact that the russian attitude needs towed and has no traction is a problem. After the communist failure, Russia's participation against the evolution towards real democracy is not to be feared. Not even if they returned to a communist-style or extremely socialising regime, after a few years, the population would not accept a return to stalinism. But what the West and the East must strive for, is to add their support to a total globaization, for which there are symptoms that show both parts want it. Or at least to get Russia to accept this process, which would be a first step for a posterior adhesion. The decision must be made by Russia, but the West can influence for it to go one way or another.

15-The Eastern challenge and the challenge to the East (17)

The Yellow Danger is emerging. China, India and Japan, each one of those three countries independently, have enjoyed half a century of peace. An authentic peace in the exterior. In the interior, China and Japan have seen a revolution to overcome the opposed ideologies imported from the West, communism and fascism, and have dedicated all their economic and cultural resources to the construction of an order, which is not a new order, but a “meme” of western order. India, with the adaptation to their independence, that equally means their adhesion to that same order, has left behind its stage with the non-aligned. And precisely when this western order gives clear indications of having exhausted its evolutionary capacity. The indian “meme” is probably inevitable because of the long english colonial process. And in China and Japan it is desired, and because they are countries that are vocationally mimetic, a character that is decreasing as they reach a cultural and economical level high enough for their values to be recognized.

It is impossible to calibrate the old and renewed yellow danger, or rather the challenge added to the many that the West already has to bear, fortunately (for the West), to a great extent also involving the easterners. This circumstance is what forces a direct and profitable contact, as has never existed before between the West and the East. Challenges on a world level, parallel for all countries of the world, since the de-colonized countries which are now supposedly defying have a double challenge. First, the challenge of progressing in the pursue of an order of liberal economical and cultural evolution which have been developed by China, India and Japan to different degrees. Second, to participate in the obliged change of system in all countries, to make pacific coexistence possible and fruitful in the globalized world of the immediate future, already established to a certain extent.

The eastern problem has certain similarities with the european one, increased by the territorial or demographic size of the three countries above mentioned that could have a parallelism with the three europeans, Germany, England and France. It is the problem of adapting political liberalism to the ethnic diversity which is very marked in Europe, noticeable in China, weakened in Japan, and superior to all in India. The evolutionary cultural and economical state is also heterogeneous, with a big difference in the economy of China and Japan, and also with the emerging countries, South Korea and Taiwan.

In spite of this circumstance, we shall consider the East as a whole, with the addition of India, because the cultural evolution that has developed around China and Japan, and that of India, connected to the West through its colonized period, has rendered a result that is coherent with these influences. In the present time their positions in the world map predetermine a block which with its extensions towards southeast Asia –an added heterogeneity– we will have to wait to see its trajectory within the process of globalization which is favourable for them, in order to consider its structure as one single block, two or even more.

Our interest igniting the suggestion of actions that lead to overcoming the apparent evolutionary immobility –and real immobility in certain aspects– in our current world, the East is an important factor, Japan because of its economy, and China because of its demography. Therefore we are forced to establish the hypothesis with regard to how the population of this eurasian region can contribute to the movement that globalizes human relations, considering that the possible process of globalization will need to have a development extending across a long time period in which China, if it continues to progress with the rythm of the last half century, can leap from the second to the First World. Something similar happens in the case of India, in which leaps from the third to the Second World will also take place, and from the latter to the

First World, and that can become an important positive agent in the process of normalization of world coexistence.

South America, once it manages to overcome the measles of antiamericanism –which essentially depends on the political management of this big power–, the continent will enter a parallel problem to the one lived by Europe with the african continent. Panama Canal instead of Strait of Gibraltar. But with a much lighter problem in America, due to causes of the state which is incomparably much more evolved in the inhabitants of South America than those in Africa.

Both regions represent uncomfortable neighbours for the northern regions, respectively. And it will continue this way until new globalizing politics are performed, in which poverty and the lack of culture is tackled by the action of the First World.

The USA have the duty of transplanting its federal system in the southern semi-continent, which could be positive in order to turn the south-american continent into an interlocutor or associate, once populism has deteriorated. The progress of this movement would be a serious problem for the USA and for the rest of the world. The american experience of coexisting with many races and ethnic groups, can play a major role once a uniting process has been inaugurated by accelerating its realization.

Africa, excluding the arab North which is integrated into the internally fractured islamic block, is the region of the globe that can only be counted on to reach a feasible economical and cultural agreement, that will favour (in a longer time period) the certainty of the immense uncultured masses, most of which are also starving, not becoming the reservoir of rebels with terrorist tendencies. Helping them.

The Eastern civilizations which will soon become incorporated or associated to Southeast Asia, and India –the result of the ancient Indu civilization and the english colonization–, should be the spinal column of the global civilization we have on the horizon. The abortion of other civilizations, especially the amerindian, but also the african and those from the Pacific Islands, have become eloquent examples of the darwinian root of the human communities formed through selectiveness.

There is no other way of culminating the process of world coexistence, if the West and the East do not take part actively in a project to accomplish it. Logically this is only possible if they both previously achieve internal union: Europe-USA in the West. And in the East, with the absence of the indian sub-continent, forming each part of the block –or blocks–, according to the guidelines we are following.

The mediterraneans considered the centre-europeans were barbarians. China also considered all foreigners as barbarians, but discriminating pejoratively the nomads from the northern steppes, –their ethnic blending ancestors–, feeling confident to assimilate the peoples of the South –but failing to do so–, and keeping a univocal admiration for those of the West.

The process of economic globalization has accelerated, in the second half of the twentieth century, the relationship between the West and the East and in the end of this stage, the fact that these two civilizations have evolved ignoring each other, but have produced similar results has been surprising. And it has even been more surprising to discover in the East many aspects of their civilization in which they had been ahead of Europe. But neither the europeans nor the rest of the westerners, and even less the peoples of the East, take into consideration that towards the end of the mesolithic, in the East where there was no repercussion to the glaciations of the quaternary period, their evolution was continuous, not peacefully, but without the dramatic circumstances sustained by the europeans because of the glacial meteor.

The fact that Europe is the result of a concatenation of civilizations that were born from those from the Nile and Mesopotamia. The driving line through Greece, managed to connect with continental Europe only after the Renaissance, becoming the cultural process of the Western civilization. The chronological comparisons of the cultural levels of the two unique current civilizations that the West and the East have turned out to be, must be done considering the West as a single civilizing process. That is how the process begun in the Ancient East, continued reaching Europe, and adding America and the regions of northeast Russia to this block of countries, the Western Civilization has been attained.

China on the other hand, with its premature Renaissance, only intervened in the cultural development of the continental countries like Korea, Vietnam and Tibet, and only indirectly in Japan. Later also in other spaces of Southeast Asia, more intensely when they developed their sea transportation, but it is still a weak and belated influence, has led to around twelve million chinese living in the region, with an immense number of malays descending from them and the natives of each country.

If instead of comparing China and Europe in their cultural developments, the comparison is made between the East and the West, what becomes clear is the similarity between both civilizations, parallel and with a mutual ignorance which was almost complete in their developments.

The formation of the morphology and character of the current europeans, with few guarantees caused by the lack of palaeoanthropological information, but with enough indications for

logical deductions, is in the field of the plausible hypothesis, and which are considered in the chapter dedicated to The Challenge to the West. The formation of the malays stems from the chinese influence. In other words, that Europe is the result of multiple crossbreedings between the native inhabitants and the emigrated central asians. Just as the malays are the result of the natives of each region of Asia and the Pacific Islands crossed with the mongolian immigrants from the north, primarily chinese.

The chinese and japanese morphologies do not show indications that make us assume they are the result of crossbreedings with the central asians. On the other hand, the signs that indicate crossbreeding with the arctic, subarctic and mongol populations are clear. The northeastern arctic climate, without glaciations but with low temperatures all year round, has created a typical morphology and character, transferred through crossbreeding to the populations of the territories located in latitudes similar to the european. The morphological differentiation between westerners and easterners begins with the crossbreeding they have practiced throughout their development. With few possibilities of polishing decisive factors such as the disintegration of the Pangea and formation of continents, still in the Mesozoic Era which took place a hundred and fifty million years ago, a time when human beings already had predecessors that where probably impossible to classify, now or in the future.

Before the sinoization of the wide oriental space of chinese mark took place, there was a monogolization of the native peoples in the mentioned space, with those that emigrated from the Arctic. The crossbreeding between both ethnic groups ust have been difficult and violent. The troubled sino-mongolian relationship is already reflected historically, with the culmination of the Gengis Khan's mongol Yuan Empire, during the XIII century and half of the XIV century. The foldings of the big mountain ranges, particularly the Himalaya, must have provoked dramatical consequences unimaginable for the planet's fauna and flora, and also for the beings that have preceded in the formation of our species. Linguistics gives us a hope of tracking it, but it limits it extraordinarily with regart to the antiquity of the possible geological informations.

(18) The languages of the East, have their primitive bases in the agglutinating ural-altaic languages, among which are japanese and korean (and significantly, finnish, showing the distant relationship of the finns with the arctic peoples, supported by certain physiognomical features maintained weakly by finns, and even weaker in estonians and magyars a consequence of their more important crossbreedings). And on the other hand the monosyllabic languages, among which are the southern mongolic, chinese, northern, tibeto-burman and thai. Indications that confirm the sino-arctic-malay crossbreeding. And the expansion of this character and

morphology reaching the countries of the South, through the expansion of China in this direction, including the region of India which has approximately a hundred million inhabitants. These are hardly sinoized morphologically, since they are the most stressed negroid type in India, and also probably their better conserved natives, since the crossbreeding with the brahmanic central asians, creators of the Indus Civilization has been practically non-existing.

(33) From this approach to the yellow racial constitutive process, after the establishing (with bigger motives) of that of the white race, and in the end the very clear origin of the black race, the causes and origin of the three human races have been established. The rest of many other forms are in reality ethnic groups that differentiate deeply each one of these three races.

In any case the proposed hypothesis, to start with shows the logic of formation of races due to natural causes. Essentially climatic. Eurasia enjoyed a mild clima before all the glaciations. This fact is confirmed palaeontologically. The fact that antropoid fossiles have emerged which are only thirteen million years old, does not gives us any orientation with regard to the process of creation of our species. The morphological evolution of the sauria, which has been proven, indicates unequivocally that the Earth does not have and has never had the capacity to instantly create physically evolved specimens of any kind. The evolutionary process of the antropoids that were found belonging to thirteen million years ago, very short in size, follows that same logic. What remains an absolute hypothesis is the process between the state in which they existed so long ago, and that of the beginning of their speciation, of which nothing deprives us of thinking it could have taken place in the first stages of the Cenozoic, or during the Mesozoic, some two hundred million years ago. Vegetation appeared on the Earth as long ago as the Silurian period of the Palaeozoic era, some four hundred million years ago.

With this perspective of the past, it is difficult to accept that the oriental inhabitants of the Arctic region and their parents from the South, mongols and chinese, originally came from Africa. Not only in Eurasia, but also in America where the mongoloid traces appear in the amerindian ethnic groups. The supposedly amerindian racial base through malay immigration can spoil this theory. But the transfer of the mongoloid character through the eskimal emigration to the South of the continent is more logical. By natural logic, since the climatic cooling was more intense than in Europe, for the glaciations reached spaces located much more to the South. And it should be considered that neither patagonians nor fuegians have a mongoloid morphology. The patagonians which have a considerable size because of the carnivorous nutrition they have had, and so near to (but separated from) the fueguians who have had a fish-based nutrition, fat to the point of being able to live naked in their glacial climate and with scarce physical development. All of this indicates

that the origin of the species could have occurred in all terrestrial places and not only in Africa. On the other hand, the supposed dates of transfer of the africans to the Arctic, it is unimaginable that it could have occurred when the human beings were in a stage that was a bit more than embryonic, but was still absolutely primitive, before the disgregation of the Pangaea structured the Earth continentally. And nearly as unimaginable is the fact that they did so, when the climate had indicated genetically and indeleibly the black colour of african sub saharians. And with a goal which is opposite in this case, to the continuous tendency of all migrations: to pursue mild climates, and also lately favourable human atmospheres. From the confirmation that human beings have differentiated each other due to climatic causes, it implies that the nature of the Earth is the only single cause of such a differentiation. The palaeontological deductions of the mithochondrial Eve would be eliminated and also the continuous rectifications with regard to the process of evolution of the species. The knowledge of this process would be more decisive for human beings than all the theories that have been created about its origin strictly in Africa. The word race would become the designation of human differentiation due to natural and inevitable causes. The big beneficiary of this clarification, would not be palaeoanthropology, but sociology. And the word racism would designate what its "ism" really indicates, more than acceptance, esteem for that which is different. Everything.

Establishing a perspective of the East's past, is not driven by a desire to remember history, which is convenient but is not indispensable. The intention is to prove the indissoluble unity of the species. And it proves that its awareness represents the highest value achieved by all the living things on planet Earth. The development of this awareness carried out at the same time and independently in the two eurasian regions, the West and the East, with compatible results, and along hundreds of millions of years, clearly demonstrates that the communities, and mankind considered as one of them, have a common origin, and also have a common genome. And that the environment and the will born from its awareness produces that which is parallel to the individual phenotype transferred to the communities. That implies that speculative philosophy, becomes sociobiology, and in consequence any search for our origin and its causes is to be made in the field of scientific investigation. It is not a metaphysical issue, although to speculate whether or not other awarenesses exist in the Universe still is.

The opposed positions within the West, Europe-America; the also opposed positions between the believers and the non-believers; between the rich cultured and the poor uncultured, must be considered as the process of general awareness, which is nothing

other than entering the knowledge of structural realities of our nature. The way to develop this process, can continue dragging its heels like it has until the present moment relying on improvisation to face the problems that the globalizing forces provoke. Or more conveniently, based on the established realities and those that are still to be established, like for instance our origins and the development of speciation, to formulate specific projects with concrete future deadlines. If it is not the first and primary one, an essential project is that of recognizing ourselves as Westerners and Easterners, with all the appendages we have been mentioning, as communities with a decisive character through the recognition of similar values and an equal capacity to change the socio-political system we have described, which have not had a position in harmony with the average cultural level of their current inhabitants. The politicians, the priests and the judges are the ones that have to make it possible.

The western history, which is excessive, gives an idea of superlative creativity. Contrarily, oriental history, in spite of having obtained an equally positive result, through the continual reiteration of the anecdote, seems to confirm the opposed idea of their actors lacking creativity. That they are only mimetic. We must ask ourselves how long have they “only” been mimetic for. Leaving behind the hypothesis that go beyond the mesolithic era, and perhaps as we have been suggesting until the cenozoic period, a simple comparison of the neolithic period recorded in both eurasian spaces, not only indicates clearly enough the compatibility of the cultural level of eurasians in the twenty first century. They also indicate that through the activity carried out according to local and circumstances and the cultural development according to the racial characters acquired, these processes and their respective results do not differ much. The West and the East are compatible, and possibly have always been compatible.

There has been many orientalists in Europe (and there still is) who surprised by the slow –but persistent– cadence of chinese evolution, put special emphasis on indicating the development reached by the East in early times when compared to Europe. The euro-centric stance which is also common in europeans –no greater than the oriental-centrism that openly and with a widely accepted idea, assumes the belief that the world originated there–, does not value correctly the circumstances of the formation Europe during the neolithic, after the disturbed mesolithic hardly exiting the last glaciation phase. Europe prevails as a reference, and that makes them disregard the intermediate region of the Ancient East, and so it is a paradox that the europeans who were as barbarian as when the easterners cultivated agriculture eight milleniums B.C., now after ten milleniums, they have erected themselves, together with the northamericans, as the richest and most cultured of all, what would

belittle the East's evolutionary process. The European crossbreeding with the Central Asians is a factor that is underestimated, and also with the Aryans themselves, basic civilizing core of the world, through their expansion towards the West.

(19) If instead of comparing the evolutionary process of Europe with that of the East, we compare the East to the West, the latter including the civilization started in the Ancient East, that unlike the Chinese-Japanese space was influenced by the immigration of Central Asians, in no way Mongolized. Later continuing the same process in Greece, in similar circumstances. Arriving at Rome, in a gigantic process of syncretism and evolution, until it incorporated itself to Europe: seen this way we realize that the cultivation of land in Mesopotamia began at the same time as in China, or even earlier, about eight and a half millennia B.C. And this similarity can be seen in nearly all of the technological and cultural achievements occurred in Eurasia, world cradle of civilization.

The resulting equality of the evolutions of West and East, becomes clear when Japan, in the period of less than a century—and in many aspects in less than half a century—, places itself in a position which is really comparable to that of the most outstanding Western countries. To speculate about how long it will take for China to take a quality leap like Japan's leads us to many sociological considerations. The centralism disease in the East has been the first cause for their delayed and respective developments of China and Japan. Both with a history that is full of wars, revolutions and drastic changes of civilizing orientation through what has been the cause for evolution: the dynasties. Particularly in China, where because of its territorial size, the dynasties created and destroyed military, intellectual, administrative, and pseudo-religious castes, during many periods, there existed two dynasties. Not only because of the distance between the two basins of the Yellow and Blue rivers, main poles for the evolution of the country, but in provinces which are neighbouring, especially in the North. Manchu and Mongol peoples have intervened directly and decisively in the country's constituent process as a political unit. Even nowadays, threats of separatism exist within regions like Xingiang, the only Chinese region that has "Aryan" predecessors, Western neighbours that have been ignored for millennia. Japanese prehistory is even less known than the Chinese. Its inhabitants, because of the geographical nearness, must have differed little. In Japan the physiognomical features exempt of the oblique folding of the eyes abound, or at least greatly weakened as in the case of the Finns. In general they possess more heftiness than the Chinese. There are indications of crossbreeding considered Malay, that could be Sino-Japanese carried out during primitive periods. This would explain the supposed and least probable Malay Japanese crossbreeding process. But there is no doubt that on top of

the natives who were similar to the Chinese, there has been a factor of mongolization, which if we abandon the idea of it coming from the Malays it must be through Arctic immigrants, or through the Chinese. The language of different families –those of the Chinese and Japanese– would make us assume that in both regions their own languages specific to each of their countries has predominated, and that the crossbreeding with the Mongolic provoked the extinction of the languages of those who had immigrated. If that were the case, the difference would be explained through Japan's insularity. The differentiation caused by their languages belonging to different idiomatic families –the monosyllabic and the agglutinating ones– indicates the antiquity of the creation of languages, not only in the East, but in the whole world.

The explorations of the Arctic regions have practically been innocuous with regard to the discoveries of palaeoanthropological deposits. The descendants of the Arctic natives, Eskimos and Sami, because of their tiny numbers, have not been the target of a deep and special research. The most logical idea is that these very similar ethnic groups, that have been reduced to less than a hundred thousand individuals cornered in their original spaces, have not thrived neither in number nor in evolution, because of their confinement within an inhospitable atmosphere. And in spite of it and being subject to intense endogamy, they show capacities that can be considered extraordinary. The extreme climatic changes, in their periods of mildness must have allowed an important Arctic population. And in consequence, during harsh periods, the emigration to the South is explained through the attraction of milder climate from the Miocene onwards, a period during which the distribution of sea and land took place, and during which the climate stabilized itself, having suffered no great changes on a global level since then. The presence of midgets in Europe and in relatively recent though prehistoric times, detected and interpreted in a wide range of ways, can be explained through the resistance of the Sami who did not return to their natural habitat during the inter-glacial periods.

The system created in order to coexist in both countries is simple. The existing differences are explained through the bigger endogamy in Japan because of its insularity. The Japanese advance with regard to China is due to the demonstrated fact in the whole world: the geographical and especially demographical size conditions the development of countries. The Chinese dimensions, particularly the demographic, is the paradigm of excess. The great empires perished because they were big and difficult to rule. China has not perished, but the difficulty to govern it has made its evolution slower than Japan's, which is much more balanced geographically and demographically.

Until the last world war their isolation was only broken by Japanese initiatives in Chinese territory, that can only be considered incursions without any chances of success of the Japanese in the continent. And they show that in the attempt of the Japanese shogun Hideyoshi, towards the end of the XVI century, when they entered Korea they had no idea whatsoever of China's power and territorial size. The defeat was inevitable. What later became a military power –and as such destroyed by the USA–, was for centuries and milleniums a dislocated group of small local armies fighting for the feudal type lords, aspiring to overthrow the shogun of the day in order to substitute him. Through these battles is how the country slowly unified and the *tennō* prevailed over the entire territory. And through this internal warfare activity, the history of Japan unfolds, for unlike China, the Japanese evolutionary process is not produced by cultural processes which are parallel to the West. Not even the imported religions, the Chinese taoism or the Tibetan buddhism, have conditioned Japanese thinking. And the local shintoism –adoration of the gods mixed with the ancestors–, is mere liturgy, free of dogmas and codes of behaviour. The Japanese are neither believers nor skeptical. They ignore religion. The “*tennō*” –the most permanent dynastic emperor in the world ruling for milleniums–, can be God, the only one known tangibly, since the concept of divinity in Japan does not personifies the gods, but concepts which are derived from Nature. The dynasty rarely questioned throughout history, can be something equivalent to a theogonic concept specific to Japanese thinking. The famous Japanese pragmatism begins with this exceptional fact.

When it came into contact with the rest of the world, beyond China's western frontiers, necessarily with the West, it became indispensable for something to operate as a religion. The contacts with the West and even with the Vatican, made the Japanese see the real value of beliefs in the world they were discovering.

(17) This discovery in times of the Renaissance that in China occurred between the XI and XII century, well in advance of the European Renaissance, in the three religions means much more than a change in the artistic and literary aesthetics. As in the West, it is the awakening of the critical thought from the distant and near past. Given that this shift took place at the same time in Europe and Japan, the oriental country could not allow itself to compete with millenarian religions. There was no serious attempt to adopt one of the religions that had penetrated from China. The ambiguous relations, even with christianism, were acts of Japanese strategy to attract wills, though they always failed in the end.

(5) Francisco Javier reached Japan in 1549, and because of the Japanese nature, always enigmatic for the westerners, he received the impression that Japanese evangelization would be possible. In the

time of Nabunaga, Francisco Javier's successors obtained positive results. After the evangelist's short stay in the country, two years and three months, his successors reached a hundred thousand followers over a period of a quarter of a century. Within the same Era of the Internal Wars, in the age of the new shogun Hideyoshi, in an apparently unexpected way, Hideyoshi promulgated the law through which within a time limit of twenty days, all christian priests had to leave the country. Posterior attempts, always sheltered by laic circumstances, had ephemeral developments ending with the persecution and expulsion of the christian clergy. This clergy, without reaching the levels of corruption of buddhist monks, could not prevent the japanese from perceiving that the christian doctrine apparently more similar to their ideas—the thought and feeling of the never disappeared oriental dichotomy of the Ying and Yang, the Good and Evil—actually the theologically misunderstood christianism, tended towards the excluding practice; it inclined its believers to shirk in the payment of taxes, because they thought they had to keep a part for the Church; and that in spite of the displays of human solidarity, the christian clergy passively accepted, and even promoted, the slave trade for the spanish colonies in America, that could have had some influence in the mongolization of some small southamerican communities.

The delayed civilizing process, both in China and Japan, is a process that is exempt from the theogonic and even cosmogonic transcendentalism. The chinese Dynasties, and the japanese Eras and Ages, frame the development packed with fights personalized by rulers that were alien to the chinese pseudo-religious philosophies of Confucius, Lao-zi, and Zhuang-zi. Their ideas which are not overabounding, revolve around everyday life, and his particular life after he reached an outstanding social and economical position, always through the intervention of the Emperor of China or the shogun of the moment in Japan. The best opportunities were enjoyed by the military classes, giving place to a rotation of families, one of them being Hideyoshi's, promoted by the Nobunaga shogun, his predecessor in that position.

In both countries a big quantity of temples were erected, apart from the shintoists in Japan, by initiative of the priests or monks of the religions imported from China, and especially from the sino-tibetan. Certain parts of its history can lead to assuming this fact stems from a deep religious sentiment. And that is not the way it is. Even today there can be activity in some temples. But there are no faithful followers, there are attendants in litugic acts who do not participate in their esoteric essence any longer.

In China, the communist episode destroyed belief, which at first had pretty high participation, without the intensity existing in the christian field of the West. In Japan, which was even more orphan than China with regard to metaphysical preoccupations, the

final and nearly absolute resolution of the esoterical, has occurred in the twentieth century, and if it is not the entire population, the enormous majority of Japanese, who have a cultural level much more equal than in China and even in the West, aware of the beliefs that survive in countries like the USA, the possibility of there being something real in these beliefs does not concern them. They do not take them into consideration. What had been a need for an emotional and transcendent life focused on family and the ancestors, and also in a certain way on the great adhesion to the deified Emperor, with known millenary ancestors, was the most influential factor for the weak dissemination of the strictly religious beliefs. That lack of a sentiment of transcendence, with very simple criteria of the personal value, has been covered by science without sacrificing anything tangible or intangible. And that is how one can explain that after the journey on the path of a slow evolution, undoubtedly lacking ideas –it would be more correct to say esoteric imagination–, with in half a century, besides positioning itself in a very good place in the field of scientific investigation, the young generations have overcome the superiority complex that led their country to atomic disaster. And to the defeat that only the old people and some recalcitrant authoritarians continue regretting, for this defeat paved the way for a big shift in the course, which was profitable and unimaginable by the grace of the most transcendental act of the Dynasty: to impose their own rendition against the USA. The economy has profited under this circumstance, and it continues increasing its working rhythm, unlike the situation in the West.

The very noticeable synchrony of the Western and Eastern civilizations, which have currently achieved a degree of compatibility that can lead to a combined action in the future, will be a chance fact. But since this fact has so much transcendence, and given that through selective action, darwinian, after millions of years the species has been reduced to two compatible civilizations, the situation suggests that we should search for causes and not just accept its coincidence. The independence of the two civilizing processes during nearly the entire period in which they have spanned, motivates more than anything else –without resulting in new centre-anthropological esoterisms–, the elimination of euro-centrism and asian-centrism. In other words, without forgetting how tiny the Earth is compared to the Universe; that within the Earth, while recognizing the human civilization as the most outstanding fact in it; and that the evident relationship between the Earth and the Universe. In other words, without forgetting how tiny the Earth is compared to the rest of the Universe; that within the Earth, while recognizing human civilization as its most outstanding fact; and that the evident relation of the Earth with the Universe, which are the

factors that have to be considered for any speculation referred to the creation of existential consciousness, the West and the East, are only two anecdotes. And given the experience of western religions, the sensible thing is to avoid repeating other ill-fated imaginations as those of the West have been with their theogony. The East can surely influence to act only through rational thinking. The two parts can contribute with values.

Since human beings have reached a degree of evolution such as the current one, they cannot accept the developed process. We must think where the level of knowledge could be, if in the West, with the same intellectual effort carried out by such an immense quantity of thinkers only since Democritus; including Copernicus and Newton, and maybe Einstein; and another in Darwin and Mendel and a great number of geneticists, from DeVries and Correns to Watson and Cricks; and between them an infinity of scientists, if the intellectual effort that was applied to deism, just as if the East had dedicated itself to the innocuous —though not a mutilator of wills—, adoration of ancestors. And that since Plato and Aristotle, thinkers had not suffered the inertia of the trinitarian “soul” created by them and transferred to Bythantium; if in its place, as Confucius, they had only created rules for coexistence; and following the path opened by the pre-socratic from Elea, progressed in the field of logic meditation —which is rationality— of Good and Evil, and the mechanicist meditation of Democritus, which is parallel to the evolution of Darwin.

Given the evolutionary process of the East, it is worth pointing out that the result of the compatibility with the western process in spite of the mistake made by europeans behaving in the East as if it were an uncivilized region of the planet —as the populations of America and Africa and the Islands of the Pacific really were, and to a certain extent, still are—, a fact that promoted mutual antipathy. The eastern character unlike the West, has dampened the effects of the offenses received, and with their differences persisting, contrarily to what happens with Islam, there is no bitterness on behalf of the easterners towards the West that obstructs joint actions. The initial antipathy is becoming mutual understanding. Thought prevails over emotion.

The oriental beliefs have not had nor currently have a decisive influence, in a way that they do not coincide with Islam in considering the West as being excessively attached to a rationalism that puts the “logos” in front of the value of the “soul” of a platonic-aristotelian nature; without relinquishing its specific habit of thinking and feeling, in a similar way to russians, that is, pacifying themselves liturgically much more than theogonically, has not created hate nor repulse towards the West. This allows us to adopt the scientific logic for the development of technologies and

production of goods –that no God has ever condemned–, even less the blunt gods from the East who have no edges.

The “soul” that engendered the kamikazes, the heirs of the samurais, has been diluted but has not been eliminated. There are still remnants that have to be considered. Through the memory of the Japanese defeat in the last war, and the failure of the Chinese communist trial, the cruelty that is inherent to passional action or bitterness could happen again. And wherever the western pragmatism fails to act, caused by the saturation of problems the First World faces, led by the USA (who are absolutely satisfied to do so) and Europe reluctantly, can be compensated by the supposed pragmatism of the East based on its mimetism, which is certain and not supposed.

Both China and Japan, have been historically cruel with themselves. The great chinese exodus surpass those of the hebrew and palestinian peoples. They have not provoked the maintenance of cruelty as Islam has done. There are no known causes by which we would have to fear a clash between the West and the East, which would be the only possible clash of civilizations. But the East is unpredictable. The fact that maturing dilutes cruelty is mostly true in people. But not so much when talking about communities, and the oriental community in its last civilizing stage, has been inclined towards the passional. This is the danger that has to be considered.

In this historical moment, the West has advantages in relation to the East. It is opportune to exploit them. The behaviour of the East if it places itself in a position equal or superior to the West, enters the field where all the hypothesis can be valid. The rhythm of current development, for the benefit of both parts but especially for the West, recommends immediate action. Not accepting the prospect of having to do so towed by the East within fifty or a hundred years time.

(17)

The history of the East has evolved endogamically, and only in the last centuries has it had mutual influences with the West. The only country which is now overbearing and has the power to develop an empire has been China, but besides discontinuous and circumstantial episodes of expansion to the South of the asian semicontinent, its imperialist action has been circumscribed to the space the country currently occupies, and unnecessary annexes, Tibet, Xingkiang and Taiwan.

Japan through its territorial limitations, and consequently demographically, taking advantage of the China’s lack of international political projection, tried to apply the Monroe doctrine translating it as “Asia for the asians”, already in the beginning of the twentieth century. The actions of the USA defending what they considered to be legitimate interests in any place of that colonized

world, was deprived by believing it could obtain benefits in that immense Chinese territory and market, desired by Japan. Theodor Roosevelt did not need to intervene directly in the Russian-japanese war, and only participated in the final negotiation, depriving Japan of developing a policy of hegemony in Asia, an obsession maintained until the end of the world war. Half way through the twentieth century, Japan was inspired by some military men which had been influenced by european fascism, and insisted on the same monroenian idea. And failed yet again because of the action of the same country under the leadership of another Roosevelt –not without the latter having to use disguising subterfuges of his interventionism which produced few or no electors at all in the USA.

The double japanese failure to erect an empire in Asia, not surprisingly, has generated the rapprochement of the two great oriental countries to the USA. It could be that this rapprochement is highly positive for all the parts that intervene in this process and contrary to the interests of Europe, and also probably opposed to the interests of the world. In the second attempt as a result of the totalitarian movement that ignited the war against the USA, which had declared and really were against territorial and cultural imperialism practiced by the Europeans, deviated north-american politics. From the japanese blending process with europeans and northamericans, new policies have emerged in both sides, policies that are not defined internally, neither by both countries, nor by their rulers nor by the opposition of the moment. In the United States, the two predominant political parties coincide in their lack of territorial ambitions, and they differ with regard to cultural and religious intentions. And above all, both political powers always pursue the benefit of the economy of their country, which produces votes.

(28) There are no geostrategical issues for territorial domination with stable settlements –besides military circumstances. Nor intentions of cultural or political domination that can determine american poltics. Nor is there a democratizing intention behind the current attempt to neutralize Iraq. Nor do they, essentially, act driven by the fear of that country's destabilization. What does exist is a precaution against the fear that was fueled by the attack on the WTC; the prospect of Iran and terrorist organizations becoming nuclear powers, in spite of it being precarious; the loss of the also unstable balance within the entire region of the Middle East, a fear that was already felt against Saddam's Iraq, of which there was no certainty of them possessing weapons of mass destruction; fear of another gasifying and political "OPEC" thriving, as the oil issue is becoming; fear of global Islam and the impossible adhesion to the politics performed by these theocratic regimes on behalf of the always unpredictable Russia; and fear of a bunch of these circumstances dragging China, at this point still too innocuous to

carry out international violent actions by itself. And all of this, with the prospect of remaining alone on this process (which is not impossible) of destabilization, because of the attitude of the “old Europe” in these moments (and perhaps forever?) more indecisive than it has ever been in all the international political aspects, and even in their attempts to constitute itself one way or another.

All these fears, justified, do not depend on what Islam, Russia and Europe do. They exclusively depend on what China decides. In other words, what the East does. And this explains the American tendency of looking at the Pacific and Atlantic oceans with ambivalence.

The fact that after millions of years of human evolution, because of a mistake as there has always been, the possibility of a bigger regression than the one fascism and communism could have produced, depends on the East is more than worrying. But only if the destabilizing currents acted immediately or very soon. If on the other hand, the West with an American initiative and at least the abstention of the neutralizing Europe, brakes any movement that can provoke the situation of oriental refereeing in world politics, the perspective clears up. Time that runs in benefit of the West and the world, can make China define itself as pragmatic, and together with Japan (which has already defined itself as such), the East could make a good outcome of positive evolution continued on a world level.

This proposed alternative can become a reality in any future time, negatively in the sense that an agreement is produced excluding the West, or Europe. Contrarily if the positive political process of understanding between the West and the East is produced, in which case a longer period of time is needed to achieve it.

Although currently and because of the technologies that evolve rapidly, and the political events that occur with the same speed, we have to consider that in the rapprochement of the West and the East, the crucial moments were the two mentioned: the beginning of the twentieth century, and the middle part of the same century, when Japan and the West are re-aligned. The third, would be the previous step, China's complete deviation from communism. That is when the difficult and always delayed negotiations with the easterners could begin. And another period of at least fifty years would be needed, or perhaps a century to reach a symbiosis similar to the one existing in the West, despite all its internal confrontations produced by a system which is out of date and which is kept through force by its supposed beneficiaries, the professional politicians. Also an entire century has gone by to reach the current situation of peace, which is not precarious just now, between the two authentic civilizations which have developed in the world. The oriental and all the rest, besides those aborted, have culminated in the West through syncretisms that have operated in the East within its own territorial

space. And paying attention to the reality of syncretisms in India, that with the influence of the deteminating civilization of the Indus, and the english colonization, has resulted in a culture of a level in between the two only independent civilizations, that now continue and are the only existing ones. All the rest considered, either do not really exist, or have been and are being absorbed by the West and the East.

The system of government, the result of the one established by Greece and Rome through the imperial vicissitudes, inherited by the State-nations that continue exploiting it to its possible limit, is exhausted. It is not useful to take steps towards real democracy. And a new system that inevitably must emerge, will need a long and difficult process. The EU demonstrates this.

The previous understanding of Japan, India and China, would also be through a long and difficult process. Both processes in such a dangerously long period, can have unthinkable and unpredictable episodes. Impossible to control only through scientific and technological progress, the only current factor of modernization and renovation. And with the proliferation of nuclear weapons, it would be difficult to avoid them being used.

The repeated oriental mimetism has this challenge: to look towards North-America and/or Europe. There are clear indications that show they are trying. The main factor of modernization, the USA, with the necessary changes in its system which it should be able to achieve; and next, Europe with drastical changes in its system, that in any case are much easier to accomplish than the ones needed by the three big countries of the East, that is the desirable path for the West to reach complete recognition as a renovating agent of the political system in a global world. Because they are in fact the decisive power, probably the only one, to provoke a modernization of a human conventional system at this point in time. If a symbiosis between the heirs of the civilizations of the Indus and the Yellow River occurred, at the same time as the reconstruction of the West, a situation would exist that would allow us not to talk about a clash anymore, but to talk about an alliance of civilizations. Also the only one possible. There are no more civilizations alive.

The other civilizations of the eastern field, like the khmer which had a personality of its own, just as the primitive ones like the etruscan in Europe, and the modern ones of Greece and Rome (and even considering the aborted amerindian in America, and the Nok and Ife in Africa) all of them melted in the colossal syncretism that created a great East-West Axis, would produce a situation of creativity that, without being free of problems, would hopefully generate an authentic climate of unalterable world peace.

(17)

Who in the world deals or thinks of these challenges? With the current western system of governance, in the best of cases an incipient and limited democracy, without many chances of evolving rapidly towards a real and widespread democracy, no power can emerge that has the capacity for action to lead a new way of making politics. And what about in the East?

India and Japan, each one of the eastern powers driven by different causes, coincide in assuming the challenge of economic globalization of the current world, which is parallel to the action developed by the West facing this same challenge. With democracies which are even less developed than those of the West, and the malfunctions of the system it supports, they still have more difficulties in India and Japan. The latter despite having rejected the “monroenian” imperialistic idea, because it has within its geographical field countries that force it to spend growing amounts in defence within the spacious Pacific Ocean—especially China which multiplies by five the 500 aeroplanes and the 150 war ships of the Japanese—, and on the other hand the need to digest, as the West, the inevitable competition of the countries of Southeast Asia in the world markets. India, blending the East and the West, has not left behind extreme poverty. These are not the suitable conditions to design a long-term world future. In the two centralized administrations, with a noticeable ethnic disgregation, especially in India, governing is equally or more saturated than the democracies of the western world. They have to govern the country, the parties and the people of the administration; satisfying the orders of their respective clients, and as a proof of the reliability of each person and each party, they must grow, and essentially grow economically.

China is a different matter. Still aligned with the communist politics of the ex-USSR, it shifted with regard to the projection of the future according to quinquennial plans in Russia, long-term planning in China. Its history is full of episodes with mobilizations of human masses. Entire peoples including all the social categories, that having been expelled from their own territories under all the empires and regimes, have allowed settlements of new protected communities; social mobilizations in other territories; gigantic hydraulic engineering works to be used after decades of construction, as examples, it has the appropriate character for a long-term project as a result of the analysis of the behaviour of its insulted and admired West. The difficulties added to the ones of the West that India and Japan have, do not exist in the case of China. Under empires that were not as lasting as Japan’s, but tirelessly substituted, or under the invention of capitalist communism, the Chinese population, leaving aside regional disturbances often caused by hunger, has become overcrowded and has maintained a low economic level

compared to Japan, and a low cultural level compared to the West. Because of this and because of their industrious nature forced by a scarcely fertile land, intensely populated in the more fertile basins of its two big rivers, the population has discreet ways and is easy to manipulate. The leaders since the advent of communism have the appropriate atmosphere for deep meditations about their future and the world's fate. In no other place, not even in Islam, is there a favourable situation as in China, that can produce the emergence of an imperial attempt that has a sign of possible violent or peaceful ways. In any case it would be necessary to achieve a cultural state, equivalent to the current West. This hypothesis could only be admitted as convenient, if both civilizations participated in the project.

It is difficult to imagine Europe in what will be the end of the century. It is not so difficult to imagine what an understanding of the two peoples that are now distanced economically and technologically, but both of them hardworking, the USA and China would render. The understanding of China with the USA, would surely have troubled episodes, more numerous, and with a content superior than the difficulties to beat the mutual mistrust in the two parts that make up the West, North America and Europe. The persistence to produce a shift in their mutual relations is a decision of both of these parts. It is not very probable that the Americans will lose their productive capacities on a short-term or medium-term, despite the existence of signs that indicate this tendency in their youth. And in spite of it being difficult for this youth that will rule Europe within twenty five or thirty years time, being redirected for them to accept that pleasure would not exist without the antagonistic pain, the latter surely less intense everyday, but part of the interference between both feelings, a visible indication of the struggle for existence, to remain indefinitely. Through rationality, the challenge of the educators in Europe and in the world, must be to achieve a complete turn in the educational system. The only way to recover the evolutionary rhythm of the West, and to stamp it onto the world.

16-The challenge to the West (19)

This challenge does not stem from Islam, nor from terrorism, whatever its sign is. On a long-term these movements have an inevitable and predicted end: they will be surpassed. The effort needed to overcome them now, is made by the USA. In spite of their government being carried out by people and a party with an equally fundamentalist content to Islam. And despite the fact that the opposition party lacks strong personalities that promise a substantial change of politics that goes much further than taking care of the

wealth of their citizens, North America now facing terrorism, continues to be the hope for peace in the West, and in the world.

The western civilization, direct heir of the greek-roman civilization surpassed by the decline of the Roman Empire against Islam, as the last episode of the many that knocked it down, could lead us to believe that history repeats itself, and that Islam can defeat the West. This is not possible because Islam is supported on a myth, and all myths sooner or later are discovered, –now all the religious ones have been discovered. Repeating exhaustively: if the West reaches an entente, avoiding the announced divorce provoked by the french attitude in the bet of Iraq and Iran. A situation that is not parallel to the one that existed between Rome and Bythantium facing the ottomans in their challenge of Constantinople. But with many similarities. In both circumstances, divided christians in the first case and equally divided westerners in the second case, it is the most outstanding similarity between both situations. The romans were not aware in Constantinople, and above all in Rome, of the transcendence of their fight for survival between the two concepts defended by the parts that met. Rome and Constantinople focused the conflict from the religious point of view, which it had. But it was also a challenge of Islam to a West that was not aware of the transcendence of the mohammedan challenge, although it is true that the ottomans then did not fight to impose Islam. Their goal was more political than religious. But there is now a conscience in the West of what Islam means through the terrorist activities it develops. And also that not only will it not provoke a great riot in the evolution of the First and Second World if, even if it is minimally, these succeed in understanding each other, but that, because of it being anachronistic, their violent challenge to the non-believing and wealthy world will produce their own neutralization.

The biggest challenge to the West, is the one provoked by itself. The laws of Nature undoubtedly exist. The Merry Earth could be nothing of what has been imagined under this term. But it has been the Earth and nothing else, who has created the diversity of life on it. The laws it imposes on its inhabitants have a geophysical character. None of the human adventures and misfortunes (or of any other species) are provoked by the Earth, which is impassive and absolutely unaware –at least by a conscience that is compatible with ours.

We are far from knowing the causes of the emergence of organic matter in the Earth. The discovery made by Joan Oró indicates a path for investigation to get closer to possessing this knowledge. That is why it is not completely ineffective to speculate in this sense. Now, it is already the moment to progress towards this knowledge leaving metaphysics aside, based solely on empiricism. Once again science

applied to biochemical investigation permits us to hopefully obtain results. Not random results like the ones reached by Oró, despite him setting the path to continue in the search of the creative ability of the Earth to create organic matter. In spite of the instability provoked by the Earth, it is more generous than all the invented gods. Even if it is unintentionally, for by nature it lacks intention, it has allowed our life with no other condition than that of not destroying it. The human beings, with conscious acts and unconscious ones, the former increasingly correct, insofar as the evolutionary level gains height, they provoke progress, but also standstills and regressions. And if we do not have to fear punishments or vengeance from the Earth, which is not our interlocutor, we can neither hope one of its laws to free us from mistakes. Therefore, since there is no law that will guarantee the continuity of human evolution, we must accept that we exclusively depend on ourselves.

It is not only history, but also pre-history and palaeoanthropology gives us knowledge of what our predecessors did, and even knowledge of mistakes that were committed and goals that were achieved, more the nearer they took place in the past. It was a mistake of Abraham's to deceive his companions in exodus by arguing his alliance with God. Something so insignificant in appearance, created the line of syncretisms developed around Moses and Judaism; indirectly Plato and Aristotle; in direct lines the esenians with Christ as a symbol; Islamism with Mohammed as a symbol; and with countless branches, like Bin Laden and the reborn Christians at the end.

It is not enough to know what our predecessors have done or have not done. What is most important is to know why they did one thing or another. The causes are always produced by human nature. Only biology first, and sociology after, can teach us what this nature is like. Synthesizing and leaving exceptions aside, we can say that it is evolutionary because it is genetical, and it is evolutionary or regressive through the collective phenotype applied to it, that is sociobiology. Thus, we cannot escape from socio-biological meditation. Metaphysics are dead. And this has been in a certain way due to the election between knowing and believing.

There is no possible system that can teach us how genetics have performed on each individual or collective action. Nor is there knowledge of the evolution of the human genome to adapt itself to the evolution of the neuronal system and the rest of organic systems. And the knowledge of the evolution of the main systems, the neuronal and the genetic, is very scarce. Contrarily, there is often exhaustive knowledge of the effect that the phenotype has acting on sociology. In other words, we must necessarily act only according to what history, pre-history and palaeoanthropology teaches us. But we must know with certainty that what we do, whether it is right or

wrong, is reflected on the genetics of each individual, and that following the installation of each new characteristic feature in each of its characters, that is of the genetical system specific to each individual, we are different to what we were before.

Mistakes that undermine us or successful achievements that enhance us. Also naturally with the inevitable transfer of the new individual characteristic features to the collective features of belonging.

What have the inhabitants of the West, and more specifically those of its cradle, Europe, done? How have they evolved?

The European Union is not a united community nor is it a unified community, even though its States which have bigger geographical and demographical size, want it to be unified. They probably not only see the impossibility of continuing in the attempt of hegemony repeatedly tried through bloody wars that have occupied the period of the second millennium. And they also understand that not even through those means —apparently rejected definitely in Europe—, nor through other more civilized means will it be possible to unify the diversity of peoples that compose it. The ethnic diversity in a relatively small space within the world, deprives this unification. Because of this, the hegemonic temptation has ceased to be the goal of the States as a collective national or state intention. But the intentions to create a directorate constituted by two or more States, for an indefinite period of time, are evident. It would be in order to preserve the identity and situation created in each one of them, after having abandoned the ideas of recreating the decayed empires, of which the elites of different classes feel nostalgia. The Union with two gears, the Paris-Berlin, London-Berlin axis; the Europe of the regions; the interest of England and the recently incorporated Poland to limit the authority of the EU, are the signs that indicate the tendencies to obstruct or deprive the creation of an idea-sentiment, a European “soul”, necessary for a true Union.

Perhaps the patriotic feeling in the States that have become nations, whether it is the latest display of reality that should never have occurred: that of considering legitimate the construction of States by using weapons, with the intention of unifying diverse populations with the insignias of unity and greatness, under the veil of dynasties circumstantially supported on communities that ended up believing they were superior, nearly always because they were composed by a greater number of people. They are the State patriotes, not the national patriotes.

The European Union now suffers the consequences of the centripetal process started with the disappearance of empires and the construction of hybrid States of colonialism and imperialism. The evidence of the greater evolutionary rhythm that is produced in the

countries that have also become nations, but that are constituted by one single community -and therefore always having a reduced and more suitable size for a efficient government- to overcome the patriotic sentiment that allows the persistence of ideas related to legitimate and indefinite prevalence, when it has been like everything else in politics something that is only temporary, is not enough. And so, the fact that it is not only feasible, but also necessary, to establish a system that favours the union is not considered. Rejecting unification, which if it has not been possible for half a millenium since the Renaissance, with a citizenship that was less aware of politics then, cannot be feasible now with the reality of a complex society, progressively individualized and civilizingly interconnected on a global scale, with new means for action that are opposed to war: science and technology, through which knowledge and welfare can be reached, constantly increasing despite the obstacles of the political system that, just like everything else in the Earth, wants to persist.

The reality of the inevitable dilemma between unifying through some system of domination, or of unifying Europe through another system, will need to enable undoubtedly on a shorter or longer term, will evolve towards a different one –that the average political cultural level allows– that will allow the Union, which already has this appropriate name.

It is necessary to look into the causes that explain why this project for a Constitution of the EU does not pursue this union. Below the surface we find that the europeans' patriotism is one of them. And patriotism has always been fueled by the mistrust towards the stranger, towards that which is foreign. The dampened but real state patriotism that does not sound too good and that has brought us constitutional patriotism, is not on its own a dissociating factor of the European Union's character. Other more specific mistrustful attitudes must be added to the generic mistrust towards that which is foreign. The States that have a small size, which as has been mentioned are the ones that in the second half of the twentieth century, under the shelter of scientific and technological rise have taken the lead ahead of the bigger-size States, mistrust the latter from the moment when they see in them the nostalgia of their decayed empires, and through this cause having the intention to create one of different features, that could be a european empire according to the napoleonic model, in which the small States would be the colonized, especially in a cultural sense. And the big States, mistrust the capacity of the small ones, insofar as they can be useful subjects to rule the Union. And all of them together, and against their intimate desires, have mistrusted the union process through the State-nations. The big States through the experience they have had due to the many secessions that overthrew the Empires. And the small ones due to the fear of losing their character, which favours

them and because of it they love. Sensing all of them and not desiring that a true union will dilute their current structures, if a decentralization is accepted that will on a medium or long-term erase the sentiment of state or constitutional patriotisms.

Is the patriotic sentiment so big, so as to deprive Europe of actually uniting, firstly to establish an internal order that will allow the creation of a good coexistence in the diversity that conforms it, but also and primarily, for it to be in fact a community with the capacity for international action? It is not. It is necessary to deny this patriotism as the only essential cause of the difficulties to create a European Union, and in addition the union of the West. The pragmatism of the people and the communities is increasing, and although in different proportions, it penetrates in the behaviour of all the existing communities. Besides patriotism which does not always exist, there are the interests of the State-nations, and particularly of the people that benefit personally from a situation which they intend to be definitive. And that is why they are positioning themselves outside world realities.

Europe has really aged before becoming a human community. It is not only the mutual offenses between franks and germans; nor other nostalgic feelings of colonial greatness; nor religious antagonisms. It is the history in principle, unique on Earth, occurred in a continuous millenary struggle. Firstly due to the crossbreeding imposed by the ubiquitous central asian immigrants, and secondly because of the imposition of a domination in the colonies spread throughout the planet. Two circumstances that have exhausted its vital reserves as result of the effort carried out. It has obtained the results that are never scarce after actions that possess a dose of constructive values. And these doses were important in comparison to the existing cultural level in each one of the moments of the european creation. There are no punishments for committed errors. There is nothing above human beings in the Earth that can impose anything over them. In this sense it must be said that the problem of the West is not solved basically because of the inability of the westerners themselves. We still haven't reached an irreversible situation of decedence. North America cannot afford the decline of Europe. If an adequate relationship was established between USA and Europe, even stronger than the one kept with the United Kingdom, we could consider the West as the main actor in the globalizing world process that is now open, and that is developing with no guide or control. The question marks on the rest of the communities we have mentioned, would continue existing establishing them and specifying them with more detail, although with regard to Europe it could be with a clearer prospect of a positive result.

Regarding its size, Europe brings together the most heterogeneous population in the world. And at the same time, it is

also the population that has practised crossbreeding to a greater extent. The causes are the glaciations of the pleistocenic period.

Insisting on the idea of the creation of human life through the evolution of the primary elements, and later on the idea of the evolution of the species throughout the entire Planet, in periods that until now it has been impossible to determine. Let's assume as true the existence of hominids who were our ancestors since periods before the cenozoic period, inhabiting the eurasian peninsula that has ended up calling itself Europe.

We shall equally assume that, in the phase of the hominids there was no chance of migrating towards longer distances. Their world in that evolutionary phase was derisively small. It was the world within their boundaries, known through the necessity to hunt in territorial spaces that were similar to the ones that today are being lost by the inferior species due to the predatory action of human beings.

Speciation, which was already differentiated according to climates in each region, would have been carried out simultaneously in the entire terrestrial space. The genomic system would have acted to specialize the genes of our genetics and enable the development of human life in any environment of the Planet. The location and identification of the genes will be key in order to confirm or deny this hypothesis, although for the issue we are considering with regard to the ethnic diversity of europeans, it is enough to consider the existence of human beings in Europe at the beginning of the first glaciation, six hundred thousand years ago. An insignificant period of time, compared to the millions of years of evolution of the species in Europe and in the world, confirmed by palaeoanthropology.

Meanwhile in the entire surface of the Earth, human beings evolved within their own habitats, or within relatively short distances, in Europe as in an important part of the Northern hemisphere, and spanning six hundred thousand years, three glaciations occurred and four interglacial periods, the fourth of which is the one we have been living for the past ten thousand years. The three former periods had a duration of sixty thousand years (the first), a hundred thousand years (the second), and sixty thousand years (the third). The surface that was affected was Europe and North America, following a line from South to North from the parallels 45° N in America and 53° N in Europe, in a West-East diagonal line, reaching to the North the height of the 65° West meridian. The territories located to the East of the Urals, and nearly the entire territory of what has become the Russian Federation escaped from it. This circumstance provoked ice currents to flow from the northern polar cap towards the South, kilometers thick, it had an erosive effect, contributing with morrenic strata that erased

any sign of life that could allow a palaeoanthropological study, not even an approximate one.

The slow progress and retreat of the glaciers allowed the migrations of the humans that were located in these territories, but the effects on their evolutionary process was decisive, insofar as it extended the nutrition system by itinerant hunting for a period of half a million years more than in the temperate and warmer regions where there were no glaciations. That is why one can insist on Europe's youth. And also in the evolutionary capacity of human beings in general terms, depending on the causes of the delays they suffer. The delay of the Europeans due to glaciations (six hundred thousand years of duration in Europe) is not the same as the ones produced by climates (millions of years throughout the world) which generated racial differentiation.

As the negative effect of the glaciations occurred, there was another positive effect of biological nature: the intense crossbreeding produced by the displacements from north to south and vice versa. And even more decisive, the immigration of populations from the East of the Urals, which not having suffered the effects of glaciations, in a time when they were neither correctly nor wrongly established –totally ignored–, emigrated towards the West, leaving some territories of extreme continental climate voids of mankind. Small groups remained isolated, as for instance the well-known from Kashmir, and the unknown by many from the current Chinese Xinkiang, where natural mummies that are undoubtedly from a white race have been found.

(18) The central Asian emigrants moving towards the south and the west, brought with them the matrix of all the inflected languages which have been identified (on no grounds whatsoever) as Indo-Iranians or Indo-Europeans. Their linguistic structure carried to the West, has molded the ten Latin languages; the nine Germanic ones; the twelve Baltic Slavs; the three Celtic ones; the seven Hamito-Semitic ones, together with those established in Iran and India; and Greek and Latin as the first nucleus for the evolution of Sanskrit. And that from India and the west of the Urals towards the West, covering the Arabic Peninsula and the north of Africa, and crossing the Atlantic Ocean to America, are currently the vehicles of communication of more than half the world population.

As linguistic diversity evolved, another disintegrating factor has occurred: the ethnic diversity that can become disintegrating instead of being unionist through suitable politics, if inter-ethnic and relations are not directed among the People-nations that shape Europe.

The crossbreeding of the European natives among themselves, caused by the migrations forced by the glaciations, and the one produced by

the asian immigrants from beyond the Ural Mountains, has no historiography. It is one of the mysteries that will probably never be solved, since palaeoanthropology cannot find signs of continuity not even with leaps, in territories destroyed and rebuilt three times in the last six hundred thousand years due to glaciations. The diversity of human types in Europe found in fossils outside the space occupied by the glaciations, startles the anthropological interpretation, not only in europeans, but in the species in general. With signs of cannibalism in sites millions of years old in zones that were not affected by glaciations, Atapuerca and Dnamisi, both having a similar geographical altitude.

Now approaching this anthropological issue. But already underscoring the signs, impossible to forget because they are the only reliable ones, of a common origin in all the european inflected languages derived from sanskrit –all, except the finougrian, finnish, estonian and magyar. And that through pre-historic deductions and historical knowledge we know that they cannot come from the north of Europe that should have driven them to the Indus, a hypothesis that is impossible to consider. And contrarily, completely logical to assume that its origin is Central Asia, from there it expanded towards the south and west, until it reached the Indian and Atlantic oceans, through migrations –maybe pursuing the Sun–, of the inhabitants of the vast eurasian region located between the Ural mountains and the high siberian plains.

This rational idea, rather than hypothesis, is confirmed by the fact that apart from the celts whose known movement has a west-east direction –that is explained by the obstacle posed by the ocean, the rest of the immigrant peoples of Europe, have their oldest temporary stays registered in the west side of the Ural mountains. The finns are usually placed to the north of the stretch of the Volga river, from its fountainhead and in a west-east direction, to a latitude equal to Finland's. The slavs are located in principle in the region located northwest of the Carpathian Mountains, first important barrier in an east-west direction –Urals-Carpathians–, from where they were scattered to the west reaching the Vistula and the Elba; to the East in the entire space which is now occupied by Belarus, Ukraine, and Russia. And towards the south, occupying the slavic territories of the Balkans. Only the germanic peoples, the most numerous, are located directly in Scandinavia. But their ethnic group, marked by their sanskrit-based linguistics, poses only one mystery that remains unsolved: when they first settled in that region, from where they departed to the south, clashing with the celts and the slavs, each one of the ethnic groups settling in their current locations.

Considering that the last interglacial period developed over a period of sixty thousand years, and that the last glaciation spanned over a period of a hundred and fifteen thousand years, both adding a

hundred and seventy five thousand years, the assumption of the celts and the germanic peoples being the first immigrants from central Asia during the second last interglacial period (considering the current period as the last) is not to be rejected. And also the fact that during that period the first crossbreeding occurred between them and the native europeans, with a greater or lesser destruction of the latter, which had a weaker build. The celts would be located in the atlantic coast side, and the germanics in Scandinavia. And all of them would participate in the exodus towards the South, first, and a return to the North later on, driven by the last glaciation, and the interglacial period we are now living. A pure hypothesis that supports the fact that the fossiles of the european hominids to the South of the glaciations' borderline, have a wide variety of sizes, that indicates a great anthropological disparity. They range from gigantic dimensions to almost dwarf-size, the latter being the most ancient.

Following this order of ideas, migrations can be assumed even during the second-last interglacial period, which finished two hundred and thirty thousand years ago, and that spanned over a hundred and ninety thousand years. Stressing this further, we could even assume that the migrations from central Asia could have occurred over the entire course of the interglacial periods of the pleistocenic era, occupying the last six hundred thousand years before the holocenic era.

The discovery of the fossile in Hostalets de Pierola, which is thirteen million years old, and even disregarding this one, those of the sites at Atapuerca and Dnamisi with fossiles which are millions of years old show the presence of native europeans in periods that are old enough, to assume that the celts, or perhaps other asians which have not yet been classified, reached the shores of the Atlantic Ocean, producing through crossbreeding with europeans who were our ancestors, contributing with the first inflected linguistic roots which are common to the nearly all of the peoples that shape current Europe.

The existing difficulty to decipher the signs of iberian writing, does not prevent speculating with the ideas of the existence of natives more or less crossbred, before the great central-asian migrations to the north of Europe took place, probably through the Ural mountains, and the posterior ones following the iranian route reaching Greece, and at a more modern time Rome.

In short, a colossal crossbreeding process which is unique in the Earth due to its scale. In all cases, it is evident that the mountains of ice flowing in a north-south direction, would destroy all traces of former life in each glaciation. And that the human exodus forced by these phenomena —we must not discard they could repeat within an indefinite period of time counted in tens of thousands of years, or if the ocean currents that moderate the climate in Europe

change— produced a deep crossbreeding process between the european ancestors of the people discovered by Rome in its expansion towards the north of the european peninsula within the Eurasian continent. And also the consolidation of its ethnic groups and Peoples.

The deep and widespread biological crossbreeding of europeans, that occurred in early stages, was complemented by the cultural crossbreeding process that occurred all along the Middle Ages. Not only through the action of the Roman Empire, but also through the action of the so-called barbarians in their sackings reaching the Mediterranean and Black seas, which gradually became settlements, first called federated and later reaching stable positions, that allowed them to undermine the Roman Empire.

Through the roman influence with regard to the organizational and legislating aspects, the primitive itinerant hordes, that departed from sedentary settlements which were considerably operative —the famous archaeological remains discovered by Himmler's scientific forced supporters, actually miserable small villages compared to the imposing monumentality of the architectural remains of the Ancient East—, later they evolved playing a role in making and breaking empires, nations, and finally carrying out the construction of mono-ethnic nation-states, and federations of the same kind like the current swiss, austrian and german. These countries, after the entire process that has culminated nowadays, with their knowledge of science and technology adapted to each age, have positioned themselves in leadership over the mediterranean countries, formerly the masters of the reduced world that represented the world they knew, together with the Ancient East and the part they had discovered of Africa, before the Renaissance.

The relay in the summit of the evolutionary process of human beings migrating, from the East to the West —Civilizations of Mesopotamia, Egypt, Greco-Roman and Western Civilization— was another factor for the crossbreeding process, producing new european types, until it has reached modernity, which despite the globalizing movement in all socio-biological orders, through the inertia of millions of years have produced characters which are typical of the european human diversity, identified through well established ethnic groups: the albanian, armenian, baltic, celtic, slavic, germanic, greek, latin, and basque —which have a root termed as indo european—; and ugru, finnish and turkish —which have a uralo-altaic root— and the caucasian and basque, which are very similar, having no classification.

This ethnic diversity, increases its complexity if it is considered that the State-nations have been built out of the scrappings of the empires that came after the roman one, all of which had absorbed quantities more or less considerable of peoples,

and even different ethnic groups, primarily because of fights and dynastic alliances. Although the differentiated morphology and character among ethnic groups appear as being more emphasized, especially with regard to physical appearance, the differentiation between communities is as stressed or more than the ethnical differentiation. The character is shaped in the less numerous groups, family and community, which is demonstrated by the fact that no languages specific to any ethnic group exist, not even the basic one, sanskrit –or its predecessors which must surely have existed–, because the central asians never actually built a civilization or an ethnic group: they were peoples, though very similar between them, in their eternally itinerant existence until they settled in the Ancient East and in Europe. Language, which is the reflection of multiple transcendental characters for the development of the evolutionary process, is typical of peoples, in the entire planetary expanse. Sanskrit, from its earliest stages, had emphasized varieties that differentiated the european languages. A variety that demonstrates the differentiation of the immigrant central asian communities, that unlike the East they gave priority o their own languages against the languages of the natives.

The gigantic flow of human beings in Europe, partially produced by the specific factors of climate and environment, with the tremendous dramatic synergies of those who experienced it –glaciations and the immigration of central asians, some of which were still cannibalistic–, has produced european anthropological diversity. A diversity unmatched in the rest of the world in small circumscribed spaces such as the european, considering only the northern hemisphere inhabited by the white and brown races, the latter including the yellow easterners.

The Homeland has created deep and romantic sentiments, but just like the rest of romanticism it is about to become extinct. Including the emotional feeling between genders that has been and still is the primary factor of vital delight, that has diluted its strength due to its clash with rationalism, and is dying because of the intercession of women's liberation –main factor of romanticism– that do not accept to continue sitting in an uncomfortable altar, demanding to be only human, but equal to man and no less than him. Men and women, all human beings, learn to difference the real from the imaginary. They learn to discard beliefs and acquire knowledge. The concept of love is not exclusively specific of theogony, sex, or the homeland. Self-esteem and familiar love deprives more and is more permanent.

Under the veil of patriotism and banners are hidden thoughts, interests, ideas and even ideals that are more or less epic or naive. Instinctive acts and conscious and intentioned acts, are being examined by their actors, and are objectively interpreted by those of

psychiatry and neurology on the one hand, and on the other by professional psychologists, and writers that fill up infinite niches of human characters, the result of the actions that are specific of each one of them and of all of those with which they interact. Without exception, thoughts and feelings and their combinations, are explained and understood as a preparation for new chained acts that structure the character of each individual, always searching for delight and the elimination of pain. Selfishness understood this way, happens to be the common feature of human beings. Other sweetening adjectives are used, but in the end the meaning is the same: all human actions are selfish, even those that are disguised and/or are altruistic.

This reality destroys any kind of romanticism, does not prevent that the individual should learn to associate depending on the ability it possesses to inter-communicate both mentally and emotionally, in order to achieve bi-personal or multi-personal association, until it becomes global.

Europe, having a prolonged experience in associations of all kinds, due to environmental and crossbreeding circumstances, has inserted it in each of its inhabitants, though because of the romantic decline and the rational boom, in the end has produced incredulous beings, not heroic or epic ones. And facing competitors that maintain all or a part of the gullibility in religious, political or personal concepts it resembles an old-aged, even decrepit, community. And it can become one if, as a consequence of the persistence within the community of an important quantity of believers, therefore romantic people, a real state of the European population is not established, differentiating majorities from minorities in the opposed signs of romanticism and rationalism, encouraging the latter.

The current lack of definition in front of the well defined characters of other human communities, has created the impression in the world, and in Europe itself, that within its space there are no positive human values. It is, or it could become, the space of total fear.

(28) Fear in the nations that have been liberated from communism, that leads them to imitate the western part of Europe, which lacking the epic of any kind tends to become poorer in terms of culture –the meaning of culture today: scientific and technological knowledge, and economic power– due to a lack productivity, in comparison with North America and the East.

Fear in the socialist countries, to proclaim themselves as liberals, in spite of the failure of soviet socialism, seen by all.

Fear in the liberal countries, small countries governed correctly, of being left outside the European Union, –a magnificent idea wrongly developed.

Fear of the right wing that clutches on to extreme patriotism and conservatism, and on the other hand, of the demagogic slogans of socialism.

The in the governors of the many citizen rebellions, even if they are now hardly dangerous due to their lack of institutional links that will make them operative.

Fear in the state nationalists, against the resisting nationalists; fear of the atheists and agnostics; of the rationalists that think and act ignoring the slogans from the left and right wings; and of the silent electors that abstain and are gathering followers to complain about the incompetence of their rulers.

Fear of the decrepit churches that are not willing to accept their disappearance or recycling in order to become useful; and an even bigger fear of the islamic religion, with the aggravating factor of fear being provoked by the ones that follow this religion even if they lack terrorist activity or vocation.

Fear of war, also abominating the defensive war, and encouraging the suicidal attacking warriors.

Fear of the emerging countries driven by the multinational companies that combine the working capacity of the natives with the advanced technologies of the West..

...deep fears which are not unjustified. But they are ineffective fears because they are not useful in order to mobilize wills that more than provoking a resistance, should produce brave reactions.

In this Europe of fear, in this Europe without heroics or ideals to take its place, without even any proposed ideas for governing it through the States, a Constitution that is a paradigm of fear is proposed: the European Union becomes a true union and, as a result, the States-nation, multiethnic or formed by distinct peoples, disappear. In spite of the fact that this means creating a collective that would be operative in the process of globalisation - which, on the other hand, Europe cannot avoid following and also promoting - the feelings that have been overcome by an important part of society, in contrast with its government leaders, leads them to establish a different Europe without consulting the population. All of this just to continue feeding those feelings that were justified when patriotism was the factor that brought people together and peoples into States nation that succeeded the Empires. And so impeding the Union, contrary to what its name means, from being more than a meeting of States that discusses united actions to deal with its own fears. Now especially, that of terrorism known as religious fundamentalism, Islam. Contradictorily, fear to the defensive reaction of the USA with this terrorism. And finally, fear towards the rise in productivity in the Orient - and not surprisingly - of the notable economic success

obtained through their own human means, in part ceded and not without cost by Europe, by means of immigrants who are little or not at all willing to integrate in the communities where they live.

The history that Europeans know about themselves is impregnated with heroics that haven't taken in that of the Europeans who became autochthonous through the mixed breeding that took place when the glaciers melted. They are the real or virtual epic histories of Mesopotamia, such as those of the Flood, Gilgamesh, and the Biblical stories begun by Abraham, those from Greece, Homeric, the Roman ones, such as Aeneid and the Empire. All of them fall into the fundamentals of European thinking, competing finally and definitively between Greco-Roman and Judeo-Christian philosophies, and producing new epic histories that are completely European: the French Revolution, the Napoleonic Empire, the colonial empires, until arriving at the Marxist revolution and the national socialist revolution, which has only been tested, both monumental failures. So much history without any repose or exchange of ideas has left the epic history of present-day Europe exhausted, which could be a positive circumstance if an adequate substitute comes along that establishes the action to realign the rhythm of global evolution, and letting go of the epic history.

(19) Ever since the Renaissance, rationality and science have gone about demystifying what is epic. The last epic acts of the twentieth century have created post-epic Europeans, but excessively comfortable, conservative and even apathetic. And because of this, Europe is called old. And it is becoming old in the most real sense of the word: extreme apathy has produced infertility and this is mortgaging generational renovation by means of excess youth in the Third World. Cultural discord, which means non-integrated immigration, is insidiously establishing itself in the ghettos that Europe creates for Muslims, an important contingent of immigrants. In this way, the European collective that as such does not have to age, given that the generational renovation can avoid it, is passing from an epic red to the most decrepit black. And this is only the beginning of the process, that if there is no reaction, reality will be the announced European decadence. The graft of the Islamic youth cannot create a hybrid which improves the European original; although perhaps a hybrid will take place that is sufficiently broad that it can influence the original Islamic epic history. If this were the intention, it could be argued, but there is no such intention. There is only a lack of action produced by a conservatism that masks itself with apparent modernism that supposes the elevation of an aesthetic to substitute the culture produced by the habit of working. An unnecessary elevation that shows a lack of creativity.

The disease of Europe is not just the lack of epic history. It is the lack of a project for the future and even for the present. And

that is because in the globalisation movement, there are many actors, among whom the European Union interprets a role that is less than secondary, behind the USA, the Orient and the south of Asia. And this is worse than looking at the past. In reality, it lives as it did in the past. A closed past. That of the States Nation. But without the epic history that has been the soul of these States-nation as it was during the Empires and the rest of epic movements, all of them finally displaced by the constant renovation of values. Present-day Europe tries to appear in line with modern thought because now is the time to bury what is epic and develop rationality in the cultural aspect and pragmatism in the economic. And this is how it could be or might be. But signs show that things are going in the opposite direction. Culture which moves in various directions - the reason why the nonsense of cultural plurality has been invented - has reached a point in which the essential is not based on the knowledge - or the pursuit of knowledge - of the causes that produce realities. One cannot dispense with history or consider it essential either, although it is primordial in the first phase of education. Present-day culture essentially is the knowledge of realities established in each moment. And this is the culture that is ignored in the curricula - more in the Europe of large States-nation than in the Ethnic Groups-nation that are in line with the USA and those that are emerging in the Orient - that from their universities and governments, dictate the educational programmes with a tendency to defend the culture of memory, of history, of icons created in other cultural phases and in the obsessive study of the thought of ancestors who are far and near in time. One looks to Finland for whom there are compliments, but it is not taken as a model in many of the aspects in which it stands out, particularly its educational system. And the economy that is practised in Europe is anything but pragmatic. The demagogy that provokes assistance gives positive results, but without a practical sense and essentially without a sense of many realities. Quite simply, a few electoral promises that lack a true renovating intention are kept.

All of the political and economic revolutions that has developed in Europe have been useful, even those that have had dramatic results, such as the French and the Marxist. But the bad thing about these experiences is that they have not been taken into account in order to rectify the political cultural direction, nor the economic practice of world rebalancing. The cultural descriptive phase inaugurated in Greece continues to be esteemed when there was so much to describe and economic policy is more in line with the theogony of Christian, Islamic and particularly Catholic charities, ignoring the reality of individualisation increased by technology, particularly computer, but weakened by a lack of educational projects. There is

only an individualisation that tends towards hedonism with a negative result in productivity.

Breaking the imperialistic epic history and forging a European Union - in spite of it being little more than a meeting of States - couldn't help but be a success because what was prior to this meeting was not only a crazy idea, but an authentic political crime. But the sign of European decadence is manifested in the incapacity to align itself with the cultural process begun in the USA when at the same time as the first French Convention; they knew how to provide a federal system to articulate the co-existence between people and between different collectives. And simultaneously, not intentionally, but due to the nature of the people who created the federal system, leave classical culture and economy in the second or third position it came from when the cultural action of believing in the future is applied - the American dream - and by practicing a productive economy, has placed itself in front of all the existing human collectives. With the exception of the small Ethnic Groups-nation that, due to the current political system, have no chance of decisively intervening in the political globalisation process.

The counterpart of the cultural and economic development of the USA is the persistence of religious beliefs derived from the Reformation on the part of Protestants; in the beginning favourable to initiatives of an economic nature and an internal order in line with current times, such as the non-imposition of celibacy within its clergy.

Starting from zero, after four centuries, from the beginning of what is called the colonisation of North America - in spite of the fact that it was just the occupation of some infra-populated and infra-exploited territories by a small, but bellicose Indian population - passes Europe in terms of productivity. Natives and immigrants, without any idea of what the productivity of the American dream is, while immigrants converted this dream into a reality through work and struggle and, at the same time, evolved culturally, placing culture as a new concept which complements this dream.

Now there is only one competitor that overshadows them: Japan...and the other imposing shadow of China.

The quantities of patents that produce large economic income are the indicator of the level reached by each of the established *de facto* human blocks in the world. The USA has cornered the market on the largest quantity produced. The circumstances at the end of the eighteenth century were very different from the current ones on both sides of the Atlantic. The ones in Europe were tremendously more favourable because they were in a privileged moment due to colonial exploitation, although they squandered their wealth in the dispute to set themselves up as hegemonic States.

Due to insufficient information, it was impossible to establish comparisons between the constitution that was being developed as

the French Convention at the same time as the American constitution was being written.

If the Revolution in France signalled a necessary change in direction by increasing the level of democratisation and transferring a good part of real power from the black of the clergy to the red of weapons and later to the burgeoning bourgeoisie which substituted the aristocracy, on the other hand and just the opposite of France, in America, where none of the settlers - or very few - belonged to the elite castes and they did what has placed them in their current position: work. And upon prospering, they have not ceased to do it, the same as Europeans who have not ceased to philosophically speculate, discovering few practical and useful realities. Just the opposite, creating vacillation in ideas and indecision when it comes to taking action. And so it continues, with the incapacity to establish a comparison of results between centralised government and federal government being the most palpable demonstration, difficult two centuries ago and obligatory in the twenty-first century.

The differential in established well-being between the two main parts of the West, America and Europe, with everything and being so enormous, is not decisive for the future, nor is it unsalvageable. What is truly important isn't the differential that exists now. It is the differential that will come about at an increased rate in the immediate future, in the medium term or in one century. Not only as regards the USA. Also as regards the emerging countries in the Far East and Southeast Asia. (pg.11 Synopsis). The current decreasing productivity does not have to mislead the West. That which took place in two hundred years in America can take place in the current environment in half a century or less, starting now in the Orient. The yellow danger or the American challenge, now re-edited and acting without respite, situate Europe in a more than uncomfortable position. On the path to decadency and lack of well-being.

The lack of coordination between the evolution of civil societies - and its governments has been pointed out insistently - not only in Europe, but also in America. If the civil societies in the West and in Europe in particular have to take well-ordered initiatives, thanks to an elevation in the general cultural level - that, on the other hand, produces more able governments - the process will overcome in time the term that it has to continue holding the greatest economic, scientific, cultural, and even military power in a world where the other rapid process of globalization is developing. To take advantage of the cultural level reached by this western civilization - that should become a bridge among all the civilizations and the immediate future of knowledge, it is obligatory to adopt and energise these processes, but by giving them a well intentioned project that allows

them to overcome the Darwinian algorithmic phase through another that is intentional and programmed.

The merit has a measure of valour in and of itself, though these are the values that matter for all types of evolution. It's necessary to add symbiosis and syncretism to the selfish character of human beings. Their capacity to establish symbiosis among the distinct characters of individuals and their collectives is evident and the capacity to add positive or negative capacities in their development through evolutionary levels in constant elevation throughout time.

Finding the causes of each person or each Ethnic Group-nation as to the factors of their evolution, takes away everything or almost everything, the merit of the most evolved. But this absence of merit doesn't change the values of a more or less dynamic evolution. Present-day Europe, old and tired, acts like that. Now it should opt between continuing to age or creating values to break the cycle that has placed it in its present state that is still not the decrepitude of the dying.

A lack of merits wasn't the cause that kept any of the previous civilisations from avoiding their own decadence. What must be considered in any case is that the value of a possible renovation is what must break what seems like a spell: the evolutionary cycle of all civilisations, carrying them to their decadence. Not due to any natural and inevitable law, but because of selection in the fight for existence functioning on the scale of collectives. Global communication establishes competition between the uneducated but vigorous youth of the Third World and the educated, but vice-ridden youth of the First World. An anthropological phenomenon that is insufficient when considered in its multiple facets.

Without trying to be triumphant or catastrophic, and with the support of acquired knowledge, the most synthesized analysis possible of the current situation in the world requires supposing and acting based on the following realities that affect each living person and the whole of them:

(19)

Human beings don't know why they exist as part of the Universe and also why and for what purpose the Universe, the Earth and Humanity exist. All metaphysics is incapable of overcoming this situation. Without finding it, humans evolve by means of scientific knowledge of earthly realities. That this knowledge gives other universal knowledge will be important for those who follow us. If the Universe is immense, so is the research to be done. At any level. At the current level, it is as exciting as any of the levels to be reached in the future.

The sensation of comfort increases with the absence of pain and the presence of generic and individual pleasure. Culture creates personal and collective comfort. Doses of happiness that are reached

through the effort of each one of them, accompanied by the generally possible circumstance of modifying tendencies through individual will. The means to use: work, especially mental, and in a degree that grows as knowledge increases. This will does not exist in the so-called well-off societies. In these societies, parents who are occupied in having more personal comfort stop producing what is most valuable: direct successors. And those that are produced, which are insufficient, are not educated in the discipline of work.

To know the origins of each individual and each collective is an important support, especially for leaving behind beliefs of all kind and forcing oneself to know all that is accessible, also for each individual. But the indispensable knowledge is that of existing realities in a global world and in the personal micro world.

Getting into the philosophical question of personal happiness - the most important among all of them - and continuing with the analysis of the European reality, one must look again to the synopsis. The production per person with the value of 35,294 dollars a year in the USA is the result of the work of all of them following their independence. Apart from the episodic circumstances in beliefs, customs and characters that identify them, it is the result, without any appreciation of merit and only of values of the physical and mental work done. The production of the common European market of twenty-five is 22,928 dollars a year and person and of 8,714 dollars a year for the non-common European market, with an average of 19,595 dollars a year for the whole of Europe and is the result of little more than two centuries of work and war on the part of Europeans.

If one keeps in mind that in the West of the end of the eighteenth century, Europe started off with an enormous advantage over the USA in all fields of human activity, the result of a non-declared, but real war that was cultural and economic in nature between the old European colony and its metropolis, the victory of points from the combat in favour of what were the colonies is overwhelming.

The USA, in spite of large existing personal fortunes, is the country with the closest approximation between the theoretical GNP per capita and the real one, also that which corresponds among its different States, and only behind three Scandinavian countries and the special tax havens that exist in the world. And Europe oscillates between the 48,900 of Luxembourg and the 1,100 of Moldavia, the 29,300 of Ireland and the 8,400-8,900 y 9,700 of Lithuania, Lithonia and Poland and, among other notable differences, the 13,300 of Greece and the 25,500 of the United Kingdom. There are no statistics for the disparity among social classes, but the comparison of the poor in America and the poor in Europe is sufficiently clear so as to give a good hypothesis as to the distribution of wealth. It is more level in

America than in any other place in the world, except in part of the countries of Northern Europe.

The price of one hour of work in America is very uneven. The quality of work is considerable. And consequently job mobility is intense in the search for better salaries. Spontaneous Darwinian selection.

(32)

The transfer of values from economically evolved countries to those that are delayed in the First World has considerable merit. But there are appreciable negative values. The German motor of the European economy, once it was rid of the weight of military expense following its defeat in the second world war, has remained not only neutral, but has been an object of regression in comparison because of what East Germany has meant for Federal Germany. Its contribution to the solidarity of the EU has deprived Europe as a whole and Germany in particular of more closely following the progressions of the USA and the Orient. If now or in the near future, Europe has to drain the resources of the wealthier countries to transfer them to the poorer - an obligatory act - and especially those that are poorer still in the world. The effect could be much more negative than the German example, suffered by transferring them to countries in the south and to the incorporated East Germany. All action to level the Ethnic Groups-nation requires study, thought and a new system to avoid delays and evolutionary paralysation in the countries that have to finance the process. And, above all, the largest contingent of aid must be oriented to rationalise demographics, international action and especially the educational system that can create a greater productive capacity, which is necessary.

If the economy is the result of education and vice-versa, examining the ratios of the synopsis, one can verify the total figure of dollars applied to education in North America is 591,973,299,000 dollars for a population of 322,549,667 inhabitants, which is 1,835 dollars per inhabitant-year. And Europe sets aside 613,480,198,000 dollars for a total common market and non-common market population of 594,408,626 or 1,032 dollars per inhabitant-year. The disparities in Europe between common market members as far as expense for culture and among these and non-common market members, without being so accused as in productivity, still shows notable differences between the maximum Danish contribution of 8.20% of GNP and the Greek 3.80% and the Romanian 3.5%. And moreover, the notable difference - in spite of the important and non-residual, although habit-driven practise of religion and various esoteric beliefs in North America - is based on the main subjects studied in science, technology and humanities, among them European and North American, the clear tendency is in favour of science and technology in the USA. Esotericism will be displaced in America just like in all parts of the world, though it is undeniable

that what exists now is highly dangerous in all the States where it predominates.

The real war, though undeclared, within the West between Americans and Europeans, bloodless since the disappearance of the American colonies, has been marked by singular combats of all types. Attributing the American victories to specific innate human qualities on the part of its citizens and their corresponding governments in any of them would be erroneous. But it isn't to attribute them to its population, not innate, but acquired in only one aspect. Work. From cavemen to present-day human beings, personally and collectively, physical and mental activity has determined their characters and the practical result of them. It can't be any other way: the means are the same for everyone. They are the means that are part of the species, more or less developed through organic function. One can extrapolate this statement and apply it to the world in general, but here and now, we will limit ourselves to using the idea with two main objectives in mind: arguing the necessity of creating an atmosphere in Europe in the sense that the best donation to the poor is to give them means to educate themselves and by means of work; and in the USA create it for the acceptance that its best situation is the fruit of work done and not superior innate humanistic qualities. Everyone is different, but everyone has the same biological means. Willpower is what counts. Both westerners have to accept the evidence of mistakes, the greatest of all supposing that the rest of the world has to be at the disposition of its will and convenience. The equality of the genome, supposes the equality of possibilities of genetic development in each individual and collective that the individual belongs to. But these possibilities must be exploited through forced organic functioning. The means that are available in the twenty-first century permit fostering the habit of work in all climates. Doing so is the most decisive contribution to make the states of evolution compatible in all the countries of the world.

Perhaps the combined power of Islam and petroleum (OPEC) is anecdotal. And perhaps the work capacity of China and the technological capacity acquired through the Japanese mimicry shared by China are fundamental, combining both capacities and acting independently of the West.

For the world, it is not indifferent if the civilisation that succeeds Western civilisation is a continuation of that civilisation, led by the same American and European actors or a civilisation from the Orient because the latter would mean a lengthening of the process. And for westerners, this is essential. In this respect, they should reflect on the reality of the aptitudes they acquire and that are not exclusive to any race or ethnic group. The Japanese tendency towards the

transfer of mental activity from mimicry fed by a high analytical capacity to a capacity of inventiveness demonstrated in robotics must be taken into consideration.

It may be that in the long, very long term, there are no protagonists and only actors who use the same measuring stick in the evolutionary process of human beings. Before this can be made possible, it is necessary to eliminate the existing abysmal cultural differences. Until there is a more level cultural situation, there will be people and collectives who continue to mark the guidelines where the levelling process should go. It has always been so with natural reason given that it is not conceivable for a collective that is not culturally gifted to be the leader of a social movement. Experience in this sense forces one to accept this reality.

The advantage of the European Union participating in a project to channel human beings towards a harmonic co-existence based on their genome equality, the final goal for a complete and fruitful peace, responds to the interests of Europeans themselves. Civilisations that were defined prior to the current one and subsequent and successively overcome until reaching Western civilisation, show a process of change in which the people who were the protagonists of each civilisation suffered a paralysation in their particular evolution, a slowing down, and even a direct regression. We could examine the particular circumstance of each group of people that has come down in the world by the succession of protagonists of the process of human evolution and we would find very different and even contradictory cases. With this, we want to point out two aspects that should be kept in mind. First: when under whatever circumstances - in general, the effect of extreme apathy - an Ethnic Group loses evolutionary rhythm; it sinks into mediocrity or reacts in time to recover the evolutionary capacity, but without recovering its privileged position. Simply following the line imposed by other ethnic groups. The new situation may not be the cause of unhappiness or even of greater happiness if its character has been or has become able to accommodate. And secondly: for humanity, it is intranscendental if a determined collective, Ethnic Group or "nation" is in a position of leadership in the evolutionary process. In all cases, what is important is the result of the action of each one of the civilisations that has been, for valuing the favourable or negative factors in order to continue evolving.

(19) The question to elucidate is not a consequence that can be derived for Europe by the act of abandoning its position, which is still important on the current world political map. The really important question to be considered is if it is advantageous or not to use the European capacity for leadership based on its economic and cultural productivity, inventiveness and renovation of sociological concepts for the whole of humanity. And it won't be Europe that decides this question. It will be other powers. Possibly the USA, China and/or

Japan or a union of the three. What Europe can decide is if it is advantageous or necessary for her to recover these abilities, now evidently diminished in relation to her inevitable competitors of American and the Orient or, since she is getting old due to a lack of familial regeneration, she would prefer to retire.

The possibilities of analysis in the present can allow for a debate with positive results as regards how Europe can maintain its current position and even improve it by means of a joint action oriented to the attainment of a process of global levelling of humanity in economics and culture. The construction of the European Union, although at an excessively slow rate, was possible while the structure was being built through multilateral agreements due to the beneficial inertia of men like Jean Monnet, Adenauer and De Gasperi. The introduction of the assembly system that requires a referendum regarding the first Constitutional project has broken the continuity of the process. The assemblies can be valid only in small collectives. Contrarily, they are tumultuous and lack the value of orienting as in the referendum consultation of the European Constitution where votes were mobilised by issues that had nothing to do with the consultation.

The experience of the failure of this Constitution, conceived with centralising ideas such as those that have functioned in the European States nation born of the destruction of all the Empires that have been on the European Peninsula, brings to light other realities that need to be considered. Fundamental issues tied to the challenges of world character, all of them influencing the voting decisions of those consulted, make it possible to extract the result of an idea of what they really think about the Constitution of the Europeans - that are also other things apart from Europeans: citizens of diverse nationalities, from the right or left, believers or rationalists and an unending etcetera. And if the consultation is only weakened in Europe, remember that there would be another consultation at the world level. Representation is indispensable. What's needed is to perfect it. And this is possible in Europe now, when it continues without rules and regulations or character that is neither old nor modern, nor is there a continuous or non-continuous dialogue directed at establishing it. Because dialogue is only possible between a limited number of people; therefore, a representative delegation is obligatory. The system of representation works, but it works badly because the election of representatives takes place by means of an old system born of a precarious situation or no political formation on the part of the electorate but, above all, because people are elected and not programmes of action.

(20)

The European Union is possible if it becomes federal. With an intense decentralisation. More profound than all the existing up to now to

construct others that, using the model of this first union, give rise to the creation of a reduced number of interlocutors that constitute a forum that is more for consulting, though not executive, that makes it possible to have levels of government in line with the composition of the human collective in the entire area of the Planet.

It is obligatory to pull out the following aspects from the current world political reality, linked to the European in particular, that in basic schematic terms, to exhaustively enlarge, must be considered:

The lengthening of life in all regions of the Planet and the relative improvement in the cultural level of each one of them as regards healthcare, that has produced an increase in the population in the Third World. There has not been a repeated explosion of the birth rate. Quite simply they have learned to accept the existing, all the while not regulating the population by means of infanticide that was practiced before in primitive societies, generally by the parturients themselves and supported by the premature destruction of human beings due to wars, pandemics and ignorance of mental and physical hygiene. Everything in an algebraic sum is the cause of the increase in the world's population and of the cultural and economic distancing among different countries.

Europe, because it continues to insist on continuous and constant growth that is typical of countries that are small in terms of territory and demographics, also doesn't resist the saturation of settlers due to the fact that in the course of thirty years, the proportion of immigrants and descendents that have not assimilated or integrated in relation to native Europeans give a changed social political map that will change even more and for the worse in aspects such as the composition of the electorate, the relationship between workers and management, social security, the demands on teaching, the permanence of religious practice that has almost been overcome, the unoccupied mass of native Europeans due to a reduction in the possibility of the exportation of industrial products, a process that has already begun, and very possibly, the certain lack of occupation of immigrants and their descendents, so that keeping in mind the aging of the native population, pensions will have to count on four workers for every retiree, when in reality, it is possible that there won't even be a proportion of three for each of them.

All of this and more, regardless of whether the European population wants to or can assimilate a strange human mass with a volume of so many million immigrants, just for the dysfunction that the refusal of native Europeans to carry out work of a low professional nature entails, that only robots can resolve.

The action of multinationals buffers the collapse of the European population while the dislocation of industrial businesses increases the production in regions that are also overpopulated in

Asia and provokes a drop in European exports and an increase in imports.

As traumatic as it may be for the West, this inversion of exchange factors of industrial products could perhaps be the way to avoid a collapse in the population. But the largest immigrant mass comes from Arab countries, where they receive little - or practically no - industrial localisation on the part of multinationals. The more than permissive process that has been encouraged of an average of four children/woman is that of an ungoverned world in which poor countries appear, particularly Muslim, with annual growth rates of 2% (Maghreb), of 1.15% (Turkey). This after having nearly 10 percent of its total population immigrate to Europe in the second half of the past century. This massive entrance of immigrants to Europe, between 2000 and 2004 has meant that three quarters of the births within the Union have been from resident immigrants in the EU.

Nothing strange considering that in the Maghreb, the birth rate is 4 children for each woman and the average of three in the other large emitting countries of Muslim emigrants, Turkey, India and Pakistan and that to summarise: we have a super populated Europe with an unemployment rate that is approximately the same quantity as that of immigrants.

A Muslim world with an annual population growth rate of two percent will give rise to three hundred million Mohammedan Arabs becoming four hundred and fifty to five hundred million in the year 2025. And the increase of a minimum of one hundred and fifty million born in their countries of origin and within the EU would certainly change the European cultural evolution because no immigration policy is valid when it comes to achieving the integration of the Islamists in the modern world, not in a term of twenty years and certainly not in one of half a century.

(23)

These aspects, which we can consider negative factors for establishing a federation, are only an example for many others to study before making a detailed base project in order to give a change in direction to the political policy that is being practiced now in order to make it rational. It can be said that the current policy doesn't have a project or any hope of having one without first having radically changed the millenary and obsolete political system. For a new system, in good part followed in different parts in federated countries. It's not necessary to invent a lot, though it can be advantageous and even necessary to delve deeper into rules and regulations that without current computer systems were very difficult to apply before. The system would be representative and with a very schematic model such as:

Levels of government: municipal, country, state, federal
Large cities would have to establish parts by districts.

More competence at the municipal and county levels, cutting back those at the State and Federal levels.

Election to office by universal voting in the municipalities - or municipal districts.

County chambers made up of representatives from the municipalities based on the number of votes obtained by each party in the municipal elections. Among many ample competencies, limiting those of the higher level chambers, they would have that of naming the county representatives to the State Chambers.

State Chambers, made up using the same process as the County Chambers through the representatives named by these.

Federal Chamber, also using the same process as in the two previous levels of Chambers, through the representatives named by the State Chambers. In both levels losing competencies ceded to the lower level chambers and gaining the next higher level with the result that the Federal Chamber is a non-legislative organism and an arbitrator for all situations of conflict among all the levels of government and within these levels. And essentially in order to determine the policy that the organisms of a global nature will follow, by representatives named by the same Federal Chamber.

Only one vote every five years. Obligation to present government Programme that must be completed. Definition previous to elections of regrouping around the winning party or the second most voted party.

Free decision to construct a joint government from all the parties that participated in the voting; or a government constituted by the winning party and those who have previously manifested their willingness to share governing duties in their electoral programme; obligatory coalition around the second place party winner without acting in opposition to the programme of the winner and, on the contrary, control that the winning party or coalition completes their proposed electoral programme.

All the coalition agreements that are coherent with their respective pre-election programmes and with the participation of the government according to the number of votes obtained by each political party of the winning coalition.

Closed candidacies with the order of the position that each candidate occupies in them prevailing. The first position would be pre-named as President of each level of government. The second position, of pre-naming of the representative to the chamber of the next highest government level. Both offices would be occupied by members of the winning party. The rest of the offices will be decided by simple majority within the winning party or the coalition of winning parties.

Naming of a representative of each level of government to act in the chamber of the next highest level, obligated to follow the guidelines put out by the government of its own level and being a faithful representative of those it represents and of the Party programme in each one of the levels of action, among which there must be a coherent programme in the preparatory phase prior to the election on the part of political parties. Decisions in the four levels of government by simple majority.

Following the County Chamber, the existence of only two parties. The winner and the second winner. The possibility of understanding between both parties. If government and opposition are established, the opposition carries out the role of making sure that the programme that was proposed in the elections is faithfully carried out. Counting of votes obtained by predetermined coalitions in the municipal election and in the subsequent voting within the higher levels.

Within the common framework of undeniable enlargement into a project of a far-reaching sociological scope, all the necessary diversity that would make a cordial acceptance of a European federation on the part of all the Ethnic Groups-nation possible and even easy must have a place. And in the same way, once the Federation is constituted, establish rules, regulations and priorities that identify it with a new policy that is the opposite of the Machiavellianism that is now more rampant than ever. As an example:

The basic concept of the recollection of taxes centred in each State. It would mean an internal cash box of solidarity for the Union and external for the world of poverty, administered at the federal level with a quantitative programme of contributory percentages based on the GNP of each region - countries, even municipalities and not States that have poor regions that are rich within the whole or rich regions that are also poor within the whole. A programme with terms of application for aid, renewable. In this way, no State would enjoy or suffer gratitude or ingratitude. The wealth or poverty of each region - county or other equivalent territorial divisions - would already be after the municipalities, determined by the personal GNP of each collective that is grouped at each level of government. The right to receive aid would also go hand in hand with the duty to administer it with justice and the intention to suppress it once the objective of interregional compatibility has been reached.

It would be essential to have an increase in executive power correlative to the four levels of government, parallel to the lessening

of competencies and auxiliary organs of administration and government, as well as the creation of federal unions to privately exploit public goods: the environment, water, railways, transportation, communication, by means of temporary concessions to private businesses.

To simplify: it is possible to summarise the European objective by saying that it is necessary to create seventy Ethnic Groups-nation among one and fifteen million settlers, each one willing to achieve the social, economic and cultural level that Scandinavia, Ireland, Denmark, Switzerland and Austria have or to be on the path to achieving it, such as Slovenia. This would be the first step in initiating an era of social reconstruction by means of an achieved competitiveness through work that is carried out with joy. The exact opposite of the hidden programme of Christianity which, at its core, consists of hedonism and a lack of prestige in work, which is considered inappropriate for the human category. Activity is function. What has allowed us to transform ourselves into what we are, so different from our almost beast-like ancestors and that causes the unmercifulness of the retarded next to that which has allowed us to become something better than the bestiality of our human beginnings, very different from what was imagined by the biblical creators of Eden, recreated by Rousseau, and re-edited by Marx in the Stalinist version that was tested in Russia.

The relative impoverishment of Europe and its sad role on the world scene do not produce feelings of commiseration among the peoples of the world. They are the unmerciful next to Europe, which represents the unconnected mass, but of a formidable dimension: four thousand, three hundred million as compared to one thousand, three hundred million in the First World and seven hundred million in the Second World.

Not all the poor are believers, but the thousand, five hundred million Muslims and the rest of believers scattered within the three worlds are potential enemies of rationalism that can be mobilised. The logical idea of believers would be to consider that the wealth and comfort of the West show the goodness of its system of life. But it is easier for them, though not more advantageous, to think that they are poor because the West has deprived them of becoming rich by taking their natural resources, maintaining them in their ignorance. They miss the mark by thinking that in this situation, it is easy to justify their lack of development due to causes that, in the beginning, they couldn't overcome, but that now each individual and each collective creates themselves and that their struggle shouldn't be for weapons, but for study and work, what is correct is to blame oneself, without giving up aid for development and offering peace.

If the reflection of the West continues to be that its power and force have to always be enough to face the rebellion of the poor,

then it deserves the consequences of this lack of realism. The idiosyncrasy of the samurai/kamikaze, believer/suicide are being studied and their ways are becoming obvious. And it should be logically feared that it consists only and exclusively of changing the idiosyncrasy of suicides: making amen live.

One will say that this reflection is of a flagrant naïveté. “Real politics” are in the opposite and irreconcilable position, as contrary as the challengers and the challenged. And it should be added: and more because of the attitude of professional politicians. And the latter is a real problem.

Changing the ideas and feeling of the large human masses of believers and nonbelievers is only possible through appropriate education applied during two or three generations. Changing the mentality and sensibility of professional politicians is even more difficult, but trying to makes the correction in case of a positive response. What could be done with the same instantaneousness as what produced the separation of the Czech Republic and Slovakia? And with the same bloodlessness.

Does this disquisition with the idea of constructing a federated Europe, apt for becoming a model for other federation in the entire world have something to do with it? Yes, and very much so.

A world federation - perhaps only possible in a future originated by the visit of “Martians”? - requires a system of correct representation. The one that we are proposing, to be tested continuously, and with a concrete and coherent intention, with the final objective being to make all the peoples of the world compatible for peaceful co-existence, demands two premises.

First. The world government should not be directed by a collective elected by all its settlers or by representatives chosen through the Parliamentary Chambers of two hundred countries (pg. 13S). But by representatives of a maximum of ten large federations in the image proposed by Europe, with touches of the largest current existing federation, the USA. And also from the smallest, but of equal or superior effectiveness, the Swiss federation.

Second. No country, Ethnic Group-nation would remain outside the framework designed and maintained by a small collective of intellectuals in constant rotation, entering and exiting the world organ of order as many times as is necessary according to the issues to be debated. Their conclusions would not only be informative, nor executive. They would be the base of discussion in all the State Parliamentary Chambers that would approve or reject the proposals by the majority of countries and settlers. Diverse organs would exist simultaneously for diverse issues.

The federated European Union should really mean the disappearance of multiethnic and multinational states and give rise

to free and voluntary federated Ethnic Groups-nation. The reflection for the patriots of the multinational States is one of total simplicity: they will continue to disappear in any case, with agonising slowness and avoidable fights or their disappearance can be instantaneous and peaceful as in Czechoslovakia. Perhaps the dominant citizens will have a more difficult present. But due to the level of consciousness reached in present-day societies, rest assured that the additional effort which all human beings must make to regulate globalisation and reach peaceful evolution will be increased the longer the current situation is prolonged. And on the other hand, they don't have to be deprived of the romantic, patriotic sentiment by decree. Groups of Ethnic Groups-nation (by then converted into federal States) of free constitution and recognised by the EU would be able to develop and establish a common policy within these groups. Although in order to avoid their exclusion from the European Union, each one of those in federated States should complete the Common Framework established in the EU, that even though their rights to negotiate as a group with the Union are recognised, in terms of international relations and in terms of issues that are outside the Common Framework, each group of federated States would only have the right to establish pacts among themselves in order to support specific policies. Established pacts among all the components and transferred directly by each one of them to the Federal Government of the EU. The Common Framework simultaneously negotiated with the Constitution of the EU and with the intention of minimal federal intervention so as not to impede the free development of each federated State and, on the contrary, with the tendency that all, even those that are opposites in more or fewer aspects feel comfortable within the Union.

The evolutions of the federated States will have to take place based on their own merits through work and supported by the better situated States within the EU. With an alternative, individual possibility for: to personally decide to belong to these better situated States for which there should be appropriate rules and regulations within the Union. The dislocation of people is added to the dislocation of businesses, strictly for those belonging to the European Union. Work mobility encourages mixed breeding and we're still waiting for benefits there.

The fortunate failure of the Constitution of the Giscard Convention can give rise to different and successive tries to reach the maintenance of the States nation in Europe. None will provide any possibilities of creating the European Union. They will be a waste of time and opportunities because, currently, no-one fools anyone. The hegemony of a state or more than one that is associated no longer has any chance of establishing itself.

It seemed that the simultaneousness of the Constitution and the enlargement with ten new countries, could give rise to a successful plan of the existing Paris-Berlin tandem when the consultation turned out to be negative. The failure of the attempt can't be attributed to the pressure of the States that would have mortgaged their future, but to the incongruity of a conservation project made of outdated political structures that had people who were opposed to it in all the social sectors. The practical impossibility of changing the constitutional text at the request of one or more countries for an intentionally confusing text, the Ethnic Groups-nation would have become satellites of France and Germany, depriving them of changes in direction at opportune moments. The incongruity becomes obvious when the first stage of the project is not accomplished. The transparency of the intentions of the proposed Constitution is equally in the attitude of the French and Dutch voters: the far right due to their disagreement with the lessened loss of State sovereignty and the rejection of immigration policy; the left, due to their disagreement with the announced economic policies that showed a glimpse that was considered more dangerous than a programme of reconstruction to deal with the liberalisation of international markets with a prevision of terms and clear objectives and a quantity of important independents. The growing divorce between European governments and their citizens could foresee the possibility of a fiasco that was so large that one could know its importance and depth only through direct consultations with the ballot box and, for this reason, it is feared that this well done consultation will never take place.

The civil society has played an important role in the result of the consultation that took place and has shown that the heterogeneous majority that has rejected the proposal has understood the incongruity of the attempt to tie up advantages for the present and future that are definitive for a minority that is as self-loving as it is select in a moment that is not possible anymore. And, from what can be seen, without knowing how to appreciate the realities of the current best positioned in the world, of the USA and its causes: work and productivity and also the rhythm at which the Orient advances, due to the same causes.

Using large brush strokes, one can consider that at the halfway mark of the twentieth century, European government leaders, marked by their recent tragedy provoked by National Socialism and the most ancient communism, were conscious of what it meant to really unite Europe. In this way, Monnet expressed his federalising idea with a Kantian backdrop, but definitely modulating the forever reigning centralism in France. Once fifty years had passed, the citizens at all levels of culture have advanced notably. Meanwhile the people who are professional politicians in the public

administration and who govern directly, comfortable in a situation of well being created precisely by the timid advances of the economic union during the half century, do not go any further than controlling the inert process created in a moment of fear of defeat by totalitarianisms, limit themselves to defending, not principally, but exclusively, the quotas of power within the Union. And what is more negative, the largest possible part of the very ample manna of the subventions established by the organisation, still to those countries that enjoy privileged positions in the world, and that by their own means can resolve the economic imbalance of certain productive sectors through state solidarity.

(10) There are no European government leaders who are bent on demonstrating the necessity of organizing a true co-existence among the European peoples, after governing them and leading them to the assumption of collective responsibility through work. In order for the present-day Europe to produce the level that now only a few Nordic countries have reached, a change in attitude on the part of those who govern and those who are governed is absolutely necessary. It will be possible to lead or, better yet, co-lead along with the rest of the First World after achieving this objective or just being firmly on the path towards it and, in this way, globalisation will advance at its own pace or that of the politically irresponsible multinationals.

Prolonging the current situation increases the absenteeism of the civil society in the management of the public thing. It is a negative synergy from the error of monopolising power on the part of professional politicians and is clearly manifested in the abstention or negative response in the consultations regarding the European Constitution. It is argued that the negative is due to a certain amount of discontent in the interior of each country. There is also an emphasis that the negative votes are from a set of groups or people without any nexus or affinity. This is also true. What is not considered is that both realities are the worst symptom of the divorce between citizens and their governments. And so no-one takes any initiatives to break the nationalist inertia of the large States nation.

An important sector of citizens has become impregnated with exclusive patriotism and this makes it difficult for any truly integral decentralising proposal to prosper. The vast majority are disoriented or incapable of changing the direction of Europe's decadence through the States-nation that make it up; of the social degradation due to uncontrolled immigration; of the impotence of the educational system to avoid the malformation of generations that will have taken over from the current ones; of the shirking of responsibilities on the part of the family that categorically fails in directing its offspring towards a system that, at least, maintains the line of natural authority followed by previous generations; of a generalised fear of the effects of globalisation without a project that threatens the

acquired level of comfort without anyone who is responsible daring to say that the relocation of activities can only be avoided by working more, much more at all cultural and social levels; not doing what is necessary to decrease the birth rate in the Third World to make it possible for the population to remain fixed in its countries of origin; and above these needs, the lack of capacity to convince people that work does not continue to be a divine punishment dictated in paradise, but a means or remediating problems that appear evident to the very government leaders, but acting as though they didn't have any responsibility in the matter.

The time that is available is very limited if we want to avoid converting Europe - and with it, perhaps the West - into simple satellites of countries that work intensely, such as China, a country that has demonstrated that its ability to copy productive systems and technologies yields impressive results. One must consider what would happen if its citizens were to become financially capitalistic and elevate their professional formation. It is foreseeable that in time, the mimicry that is now applied to the production system will be applied to the systems of government and co-existence, but the European system won't be chosen, rather that system which is considered more positive. The federal system, which creates levels of government that are adequate to human abilities in the XXI century, would be an example for the Orient, where India and China, together or separately, have to decide their political structure. The inertia of a ferociously centralist past in both countries can be conquered if mimicry is also applied to socio-biology. Globalisation, which on the one hand is necessary in order to avoid an explosion of the current conventional system, would obligate the Orient to evolve in order to socially homologate itself with the West.

The European Union, as a profoundly organic Federation, distributing responsibilities to all levels of government, with rational criteria of existing realities that are barely if at all recognized, and always with the option to rectify them, can overcome the test that it must now endure on the part of blocks that have guessed the weakness of the European collective. It still has some large advantages when it comes to securing a hold in the changing world and to be well situated in the concert of emerging Ethnic Groups-nation and others that are better oriented because they are small or federated, that see in globalisation the cure and not the cause of their ills. This path involves attending to the ethnic groups of the Ethnic Groups-nation, creating rivalries and destroying enmity and hatred. Respecting ways of being, although they may not be the most advantageous and waiting for things to change for the better, through personal or close experience, for the creation of stimuli through the result of different political systems, postponing

territorial disputes and attending to a sense of humanity in order to definitively get past feelings of predominance by some countries.

Human cruelty runs parallel to the degree of maturity reached by each one of the existing collectives. Old Europe is not as cruel as other regions of the Earth and now it is less so with itself than it was in the past when its maturity had not reached the current level. It is necessary to elucidate if the process of decadence is avoidable or not, taking into account this process of maturity which has taken place. Individuals die. Not necessarily so their collectives. Each People and each existing block, or block that is in the phase of forming, is the result of evolution from childhood to maturity, from irresponsible cruelty to rationality that diminishes it. It is easy to verify that the current state of comfort in Europe responds to the action of its ancestors. And though it is uncomfortable, we must think that one can't live eternally on the inheritance of work realised by others. Successive generations enjoy the inheritance through transfer, which is the natural law that comes from the genetic system, but it is also natural that they must be willing to maintain that inheritance and increase it. Wasting instead of producing is accepting that the future, not distant, but immediate, will be one of becoming resentful victims as opposed to other human beings far from Europe that now watch her and work to equal or surpass her. The first step in this process is about to be consummated and is clearly perceptible in the divergence between Europe and the USA following the American independence. The creation of small, independent states when in Europe, France was debating the formula to convert human beings into equals who were happy is the cause of this divergence. For lay people, arrogance is their sin. There are no nations that are chosen by any God. All are what they have made of themselves. Circumstances influence, but they are not decisive in the way that attitude and the behaviour of each individual and their collectives is. Europe's sin was arrogance. Now it could be the USA's. And we won't have to wait centuries for the result and the examination of that result. We are already receiving signs that the process of decomposition in the West has begun. Without a doubt, it is possible to change direction now. It might not be in the near future if the process of decadence speeds up. In order to avoid it, one cannot call on Mohamed or Machiavelli either. All over the world, including Africa, knowledge asserts itself. Small minorities are enough to extend them in all areas. Thinking the opposite would be another act of arrogance, of political blindness.

(30) In large brushstrokes, it is easy to explain why Europeans or any other collective has been made up ethnically. Now we must explain how and why the Ethnic Groups-nation and especially the States-nation are going through a transition from an aging state towards a new, undefined state that is not ethnic in character. In the West, of a social nature due to: the disappearance of religious content,

precocious discovery of sexual pleasure and an accepted irresponsibility of singlehood, parents who are inhibited when faced with the laziness of their children and who are inclined to become independent from the family in order to avoid the unpleasantness that children have always given and give to their parents, and these become protesting parents = Family that is rarely well structured.

The generalised prolongation of schooling; there is not only violent rebellion to a life that is submitted to the fight for existence, but open mocking of everything that is transcendental; the liberation of repressive customs for women; sex without maternal and paternal responsibility; rupture of the generational scale; no tax deduction for voluntary sterilisation = Parallel to a lengthening of the lifespan, biological aging of the native European population.

Modernism understood as the abandonment of duties; sexuality represented in it hedonistic aspect; the discovery of personal pleasure multiplied by the media; the feminine resistance to the role of motherhood = Appearance of biological changes that are not only genetic, but also physiological, particularly neuronal.

The example of parents and also the example of educators as regards the cultivation of hedonism; the exaltation of corporal beauty, particularly that of women; the assumption of economic comfort without the least amount of effort to obtain it; not just the acceptance of the feminine corporal donation, but now there is the provocation on her part, which provokes changes in the libido of both sexes with unpredictable consequences. = Weakening of the evolutionary factor and the instinct of belonging before BEING

And one factor that is just as important as all the factors in the European decline right now and not exhaustively pointed out, the main one: the diminished productivity of the native population.

From the synopsis that closes this book, one can infer the following table that establishes the difference in the creative capacity between old Europe and the new America in US \$.

(21)

REGION	KM2	Population	Dens.	GNP	GNP7 inhab.
USA	9,629,091	290,342,554	30,15	10,450,000,000	36,300
Canada	9,984,670	32,207,113	3,23	934,100,000	29,300
USA+Canada	19,613,761	322,549,667	16,45	11,384,100,000	35,300

REGION	KM2	Population	Dens.	GNPx1000	GNP7 inhab.
EU25	3,976,346	455,021,454	114,43	10,432,730,000	23,000
Norway	324,220	4,546,123	14,02	149,100,000	33,000
Russia	17,075,200	144,526,278	8,46	1,409,000,000	9,700
Europe	21,375,766	604,093,946	28,26	11,990,830,000	20,000

We point out what these data tell us, combined with the processes of colonisation and decolonisation:

In 1496, in full era of discovery, Spain establishes Santo Domingo.

North America begins to be explored in Canada in 1534 and until 1605; France doesn't establish the first colonial settlement in Acadia.

Two years later, the English do the same in Virginia in 1607.

The processes of independence begin in the USA in 1783. In South America, decolonisation begins in Haiti in 1804 and finishes in Cuba in 1898.

The colonial period in North America: 178 years. The post-colonial period: 224 years.

The colonial period in Central and South America: 402 years. The post-colonial period: 209 years.

We also wish to point out that in North America, the colonisation was carried out by immigrants that fought and worked simultaneously. In Central and South America, colonisation was carried out by troops and clergy and the work was done by the natives.

In the period of 4 centuries, the region of North America with diversified immigration has produced a fairly well balanced population, with the exception of the descendents of slaves and with a territory that is almost equal to that of Europe - including Russia - its productive capacity in only 6.27% less than that of the EU25 + Russia. And the population of the planetary region lacks little to double that of North America. The corresponding personal GNP reflects this important difference: \$35,288.93 for North America and \$19,635.32 for EU25 + Russia.

The big difference between Europe and America is in the countries that border the Arctic. A biologically aged Russia with a territorial dimension that can be compared to the territories of Europe and North America, including Canada, barely makes it into the First World and greatly reduces the economic qualification of Europe. The explanation of this large difference in results is none other than the culture of work in area of the English immigrants, of a largely medium-low social and economic level in the North American region. On the contrary, the cultivation of gentlemanliness on the part of immigrants in the South American region causes its low productivity (The climate in the regions, the same as in the colonised countries, is an added factor. But this does nothing more than to confirm the enormous influence of climate in the conformation of races and ethnic groups).

It has not been possible for Europeans that have transplanted to America and to those who have remained in Europe to unload the inert weight of monotheistic religions, of roots from the Ancient Orient and ancient past of four millennia. Nor have the South

Americans, in the course of four centuries, been able to unload the habit of cultivating leisure - very Christian - that has been more than maintained, elevated as a sign of superior culture.

All of this can be considered biologically normal and consequently not only justifies the not-very-productive character of the settlers of the south of the two continents, but once more serves to confirm the theory of survival among specimens and species. What enters into the terrain of collective phenotypes and, therefore, that of sociology. It is the persistence of the North Americans in their productive capacity and the evident decrease in these capacities on the part of their relatives who have remained in Europe, in spite of them being northerners, but like all Europeans, inclined to the cultivation of leisure. The loss of aptitudes on the part of Europeans for work does not only manifest itself in the final results of their respective economies throughout a relatively short period. It is also evident in the cultural aspect. It is necessary to do one more comparison: the number of Nobel prizes awarded to Americans and Europeans and the number of patents that enriched North America - with the exception of the Nobel Prize for literature, a European specialty.

(8) The explanation of this loss of aptitudes has a sociological origin. The great European mixed breeding that we considered before happened when North Europeans immigrated to America. The difference with those from the South has to do with the fact that the English emigrants and successive diversified Europeans couldn't establish themselves without working and fighting intensely. Those that remained behind in Europe lived a prosperity that the colonies made possible. And we can't attribute it to biological intra-European mixed breeding. Following the Renaissance in Europe, they haven't existed, though there has been cultural mixed breeding. The socio-biological phenotype of the collectives, apart from climate, also stems from factors introduced by human beings themselves, particularly their government leaders.

Central European metaphysics have acted and Mediterranean theogony, exported to the continent by means of the Reformation. There is not a law that condemns civilisations to stagnate, to evolve little, and finally, to weaken and be replaced like the Greco-Roman. The European Western civilisation, with a lot more consciousness on the part of an important sector of its citizenry than what was in Constantinople and Rome, shows processes of decadence with clear signs of exhaustion and a lack of evolutionary ability. As happens in family generations, it is wasting what its ancestors earned.

Thinkers, media, and even European governments, when faced with episodes such as the North American reaction to the challenges of the believers, try to, and do achieve to a certain extent, present a frightened attitude next to this true challenge as a

show of maturity - a challenge that is not only to the USA, but to the entire world and especially to the West. The response of France to the qualification of "old Europe" is an ingenious play on words, but nothing more when they say, "old, but sensible and with experience". Only isolated voices in the USA have answered "perhaps so", but certainly afraid". Comfort makes human beings frightened. Avoiding the struggle for existence is turning your back on challenges. (We will take this question up again in more detail and specifically in the part where we will try to demonstrate the impossibility of facing all the challenges contemplated, maintaining the current established system of co-existence without any projection and without any future perspective). Humanity has become the owner of the Earth, it has the monopoly. There has never existed a competitive species that could force it to perfect its organs. The Darwinian algorithm has not worked for this reason and has delegated the administration of this property in social collectives, some created spontaneously and that are usually the most positive and others that are forcibly imposed by the work of people or groups of people, almost always declaring their intention of providing happiness to human beings. In general, they have been overcome by the pretty happy human beings that right or wrong have rejected these proposals and their proponents. Because they were demagogic.

As a final phase in the process of social decomposition, with an average of happiness that has grown compared with each previous phase, Europe, biologically aged, sustained by resentful immigrants, governed without the necessary aptitudes to set behavioural guidelines for the immediate future, the base of any political project. A reversible situation if this diagnosis is only accepted and the educational system is changed and the relationship of the human couple. Europe has limped along for too long until recently, when it has been avoided. Not totally in Central Europe. Very much so in the South and only in the very North have they been on the path. It's the battle between two genres. It has been, in general, the most pleasurable. But the premonitions of Malthus, of Darwin and of the inevitable Galton, have to be reconsidered. With exquisite care on the part of social thinkers in order to avoid the challenge of the sexes, the feminine becomes a factor which diminishes pleasure in spite of everything the couple has. The subject needs the attention of specialised biologists. This will give rise to many studies related to education and that in a not-so-distant future will concern women more than men. It is the sign of fear that they will end up hurt by a freedom that they have taken and begin to doubt if it improves or damages their expectations in life.

If equality among humans, though biologically impossible, isn't to occupy their thoughts, equality between the two sexes has to be combated to the benefit of both, especially women. The reasons

for the rebelliousness of women when leaving the altar where Western romanticism placed them exist. In the distribution of pleasure and pain, she has got the worst part. Black people are black to protect them from sunburn. Women have got the worst part because in the couple one of the two parts has had to be the deposit for continuing life. Neither blackness nor femininity in and of themselves deprives one of happiness. It is the circumstances that stem from these realities that have provoked unhappiness. Relatively, in spite of the distribution of pleasure, the masculine sexual pleasure as an example has corrections and it would be necessary to measure pleasure and pain in all the facets of life in men and women in order to establish a balance. Just as it would also be necessary in all the facets lived by whites and blacks.

The morphological characteristics of all these collectives can be perennial. Not the consequences. The differences between women of Scandinavian ethnic groups and women of Latino ethnic groups and even more so, between North American women and their European sisters, clearly show how circumstances change the effects of human character, making what for one is an illness, for others is a factor of health.

(21) The history of the American continent that, in general, is the history of its settlers, now wants to establish that the illness of the USA is terminal. The history of the Americans, in terms of their ethnic conformation, is the historical transfer of emigrants; in the beginning, European, to the continuation and with less intensity of the numerous fugitives from misery and now the audacious well-placed that aspire to be even more so. What came before this process is pure hypothesis. The melting of the glaciers that penetrated towards the South more so than in Europe invalidated all the scarce paleoanthropological signs for another little sought after part. The episodic history of the Americans is the very recent process of conformation of a collective that without having the solidity of the small Ethnic Groups-nation that we have repeatedly cited brings together the different conditions better than others because of the circumstance experienced by women. The exodus of Central Asia to Europe, creating a type of specific femininity that millennia later accented their difference through the emigration to America. A new multiracial ethnic group has not been created nor can it be pursued. Only a diverse human map that, thanks to the political system, has assimilated the immigrants well - with the exception of those that come from slavery. In this aspect, it is possible that Europe will pay as dearly as the USA and support for their respective economic development and infrastructures, for the use of forced immigrant labour in the USA through slavery and voluntary labour on the part of immigrants and also on the part of the receiving European countries. The mistake of the plantation owners of the South of the USA has

allowed Americans to turn the process around and today continues to integrate immigrants. But they are people who contribute superior economic and cultural values to those that immigrants bring to Europe.

(19) We have said that humanly speaking Europe is not old, more than what the average life span represents, furthering the low birth rate that has produced a biologically aging society. Collectively humans are immunised from total biodegradation and, what's more, add capabilities through genetic transmission so that their whole is as long lasting as the Gaia Land as long as it remains alive. And there is no justification for its premature retirement. So that this is not so and action is taken to avoid it, it is necessary to find the manner to make the generational change eugenically correct and not the base for young individuals among the innumerable extras that the Third World produces. This is a mortgage of the negative result. Strengthened as well by the sale - almost a free session - of part of the best specimens created in their own European space and transferred to other countries, mostly to the USA that, within the West, is outside the demographic dysfunctions, but that thanks to immigration, as in France, saves the generational process as described in the following table:

(20)

Country	Year	Km ²	Inhabitants	Density	Fertility Woman/year	Vegetative Evolution
GERMANY	1993/4	357,021	81,912,000	229'50	1'37	-1.30
	2003/4	357,021	82,398,320	230'79		-1.74
FRANCE	1993/4	547,030	58,172,000	107'00	1'85	3.30
	2003/4	547,030	60,280,529	110'20		3.49
SPAIN	1993/4	504,782	39,652,752	78,55	1,26	0.70
	2003/4	504,782	40,217,413	79,67		0.60
ITALY	1993/4	301,230	57,282,824	190,16	1,26	-0.20
	2003/4	301,230	57,998,353	192,54		-0.94
UNITED KINGDOM	1993/4	244,820	58,586,000	239,30	1,66	1.80
	2003/4	244,820	60,094,648	245,46		0.78
EU-25	1993/4	3,976,346	448,310,818	112'74	1'51	0.81
	2003/4	3,976,346	455,021,545	114'43		0.38
USA	1993/4	9,629,091	260,711,000	27'07	2'07	6.9
	2003/4	9,629,091	290,342,554	30'15		5.7

Not so much because of numerical data as for consideration of equal or greater transcendence that the numbers themselves, the behaviour of the American population remains precarious in line with the necessities of countries that opt for maintaining their identity or

improving it. Although the result is tight, it should also be noted that in this aspect, Europe is in a clearly unfavourable position.

The following can be deduced from the statistics in the table:

(1) Lack of regenerative capacity of the demographically more important European countries, with the exception of France, which has made some not very significant advances that encourage the high fertility rate among immigrants, mostly Arab Muslims.

(2) General loss of regenerative capacity within the EU, in spite of the contribution of the immigrant population and of countries with a higher birth rate that form a part of the Union.

(3) General loss of regenerative capacity in the USA, although maintaining itself in terms of the birth rate, fertility rates in women and a vegetative growth in the population to a level that is closely correct.

(4) Negative vegetative evolution in Germany, Italy, Spain and in the whole of the EU to a level that provokes aging within the native population that will produce vegetative growth by means of the immigrant population and a generational change in the space of twenty years with the ensuing cultural bipolarity within its respective native and immigrant populations. The Third World in one's house and a new and worse system of colonization that, on the other hand, provokes a loss of evolutionary capacity for the countries that export labour to the First World.

The information in the immediate future indicates the realisation on the part of European governments that the tendency of immigration isn't to integrate. But even with integration, the fact that the average cultural level would be reduced wouldn't change. The percentage of immigrants from the Muslim world and, in general, from the Third World, is disproportionate in relation to the total population of the EU, but especially in relation to the countries that are the largest receptors of foreign labour, that are those that are listed in the preceding table. On the contrary, without any sign of government concern in the USA, a movement has spontaneously arisen without being structured by any governmental programme or by the civil society that, more than a tendency, shows an evident behavioural realignment. In the country of the "neos," young people are known as neo-Victorian. It is an important part of the youth that belongs to economically and culturally well situated families, who in an ostentatious manner have abandoned the "beat" movement of the fifties, creating an authentic new way of life that is more similar to the Victorian era than to the post-modern era. A parallel reaction to that which took place in Scandinavia, where the bored youth of the sexual liberation movement of the women who created single parent families - mother and a child - has given rise to families with a larger

number of children and the same sign. The influence of the new minority in the USA - without viable statistics from diverse sources indicates that a large increase in the vegetative population exists in certain States in the East - that may not be decisive for producing a new “baby boom,” which isn’t desirable either. But it can make a mark that provokes a eugenicist selection that, in fact, already exists and could increase. The practical result, if it is possible, could create a eugenics project on a larger scale, not only increase the birth rate in the First World and reduce it in the Third. A process that if we contemplate the practises, on the one hand, in Scandinavia, that within a movement of liberation of feminine customs, maternity with paternal plurality would become normal and even normalised through day care centres and the educational system.

Among the multiple revolutions produced successively in the western world, the current one of globalisation, promoted in the first place by the very North Americans, is leading this population to follow a path begun by Europeans, in the sense of going off course into a life of ancient hedonism, sexual, but now obsessively for getting started at a premature age.

The new conservatives in the USA, Christians and allied Jews, do not help to lessen the hedonistic current that doesn’t affect just youth. On a scale, it affects an important part of mature ages. And what is more serious: an important part of adolescents, if not children. And so on different paths, Americans and Europeans can coincide at a point that can lead to impoverishment or to renovation at the joint ethnic crossroads that, up to now, with big highs and lows, has been the motor of the civilisation of knowledge.

(28) Some circumstantial errors on the part of human beings who are even more circumstantial do not have to be possible by breaking a millenary journey of identified evolution from Mesopotamia to the West, that also seems broken, but that enjoys a statistical table that is unique in the world.

(19)

REGION	KM2	Population	Dens.	GNPx1000	GNP/ inhab.
USA+Canada	19,613,761	322,549,667	16.45	11,384,100,000	35,300
EU25+Russia	21,051,546	599,547,823	28.48	11,841,730,000	19,750
Norway	8,279,750	28,229,414	3.41	753,000,000	26,700
Australia					
New Z,					
West	48,945,057	950,326,904	19.42	23,978,830,000	25,300
Rest of World	81,568,326	5,289,517,526	64.85	22,842,292,600	4,300
Total World	130,513,383	6,239,844,430	47.81	46,821,122,600	7,500

Now that a new revolution has begun, different, but perhaps more transcendental than that of the Renaissance, the process of relations at a world level. From computer sciences to large Chain Stores and all the commercial activities, it hasn't been the Europeans or the Orientals who have mainly led this revolution, but the Americans. What the Europeans are about to lose - the capacity of work done well - the Americans can lose, as well. This when it has been shown that comfort is more important than work that is well done, that in all other factors, keeping in mind not so much the depth of pleasure as its extension throughout lives that are getting close to a hundred years, the fourth and last part of which is with physical and intellectual capacities reinforced by acquired experience. For this reason, it is difficult to believe that such a large and undeniable advance produced in the West might not be used to all its advantages, not due to banalities, because they are, but due to trivialising pleasure.

The issues that impact global problems don't end in the conditions outlined here, although these are the basic ones to be considered. It is also necessary to consider those that are derived synergetically, which are noticeably ample and deep:

First -

Both parts of the West, the USA and Europe present extraordinarily different conditions for their respective development.

Europe has already collapsed from the density of its population. The ecological deterioration of its interior sea, the Mediterranean is proof, among other similar things. Growing in these conditions will require inverting the possession of the best and largest technology, now in the hands of the USA. Apart from the changing episodes of valuation of their respective currencies and in spite of the debt in the USA, they change all the expectations. They aren't at all optimistic for the West as a whole. The euro has revitalised the European economy. The frontal defence of the challenge of terrorism forces the USA to endanger its economic independence. And just as it has always been, only economic power assures the hegemonies that have existed throughout history and now more than ever because hegemony should exist all over the world.

Europe needs a plan to lose weight. Deconstruct. No activity that involves an increase in productive growth makes rational sense. The only exception is the growth of quality. That which currently allows for science and technology. Fast change is only possible in small countries. Globally, the EU can't realign its production in the way that Finland does because it is a country of reduced dimensions or India, which is in a moment that is good for exploiting the low cost of production in order to be competitive, a situation that can prolong itself until well into the current century. Neither country produces imbalances in the market which is in a phase of globalisation. In the

future, the crisis that developed countries are now going through due to the competition of developing countries, will transfer a bearable rhythm to these like the one that the countries who now suffer business relocations must deal with. The USA needs to continue growing because it needs to free itself of debt; its creditors are the most probable competitors due to hegemony: the Orient and Muslim oil-producing countries. In this way, the interests of the West can end up being complementary: what Europe loses in growth, the USA gains. To stop growing doesn't cause unhappiness.

Second.

Eurasia, the cradle of two final resulting civilisations of all those that have been, East and West, if one leaves out Russia, will be the demographically poorly structured collective. This makes real understanding necessary among all its parts. Within the Kantian federal idea, Russia has at hand the valorisation of its territorial extension and its oil reserves. But not even the vast continent will escape from being overpopulated, bearing in mind that the Russian Northern territories present the same difficulties that the Alaskan territories do for the USA, with the difference that these are proportionally smaller. The USA has territory, vital space to continue growing, keeping in mind the possible cultural evolution of the American continent on the one hand and, on the other, acquired experience from its foundation to assimilate diversified immigration. Diversified and massive from the beginning. Currently of Hispanics from the same Continent. An immigrant population that wants to and can integrate from the first generation. For all of these reasons, the USA has many possibilities to keep growing. If the obsession for growth on the part of Europeans inclines them to plant the idea of competition in this factor, they have a lot to lose.

From the perspective of the territorial limitation of the Planet and the infinite human capacity to reproduce, Eurasia and particularly Europe can't compete with the American continent or with the African one either, which could grow if given the necessary structures.

Third.

The assimilation of the late developing settlers in the process of evolution on the three important continents, Eurasia, America and Africa and in the oceanic space of the Pacific is indispensable in order to project global policies. It's necessary that we reach a genomic equality in humans that becomes not so much a socio-biological equality as an acquired level of compatibility among them for all the systems imaginable. For those that deal with the integration of migrations, as well as for mutual relations.

Europe receives the immigration of Sub-Saharanans, mainly Muslim Arabs. The first are in the lowest evolutionary level of all emigrating countries. The latter immigrate with the decided intention of not integrating. Religion advises it to both immigrant

contingents. The large proliferation of oratories, miserable mosques inserted in marginal neighbourhoods confirms it. “Respect” for beliefs confused with their existence, invented for the native European religions, is the reason why all beliefs enjoy the same respect. The co-existence of passive beliefs and in a slow phase of extinction with the active and proselytising of Islam, instead of promoting mutual understanding, produces a real clash between communities. Not so much for theological reasons and more due to distinct habits and social behaviour. The largest incentive for the violence that culminates in international terrorism takes place among Muslim believers that have immigrated to the First World. It’s not a trivial question, nor one that simply occurs from time to time. It runs parallel to the “yellow danger”. This has been overcome. Not by the action of countries that are on the receiving end of migrations, but by the wise action of reducing the birth rate in the country that was the largest producer of unskilled labour. China.

The migratory policies of Europe only have one direction. Acting in the territories with a vocation for immigrating, spurred on by the media. This is perfectly compatible with the situation of low density population (Africa 28.64 inhabitants per square kilometre, with the existing saturation in Europe, 114.43 inhabitants per square kilometre in the EU25 and 71.14 in non-common market Europe with an average of 92.78 inhabitants per square kilometre). Not the migratory policy that doesn’t exist in Europe, where it is more necessary, but this lack of policy make imperialism, which is attributed to the USA, a practice in Europe with the rationalisation slope of world demographics: exploit the poverty of the Third World. Buying cheap work. This is the basic question which needs to be considered for all action that tends to normalise globalisation. The attenuated terrorist actions in Spain, England and France, following the Twin Towers, haven’t been enough to make the EU mobilise to resolve the demographic problem that is the cause of almost all the world problem.

The situation in the USA as regards the migratory question is also favourable to them. The American Hispanic region is the main producer of migration. Its cultural level is high in relation to what exists in Africa. But the positive factors revolve around, first, the wiliness to integrate on the part of the immigrant “Hispanics”. And later, due to the fact that the country as a consequence of having been created by immigrants almost in its totality, following the episode of the Twin Towers, doesn’t have to do anything else but adapt the migratory legislation to the new situation. However, as concerns the Islamic impact on security, the situation is also dangerous. The percentage of Muslims within the American population is 1.95%. In the EU, it is 2.26%, but with the integration of all the non-common market countries, it will increase to 14.44% due

to the contribution of Turkey. If the confrontation were one of religions and one of the two religions were Islam, it could be considered non-advantageous to incorporate Turkey into the EU. But the real Islam-West confrontation has to also be added to that of the First-Third World, conquering the indefiniteness of all the collectives that should intervene in order to deal with a hypothetical combined action of the Third World and Islam that would reunite two human masses that, for now, have no nexus, that would multiply by almost four the number of its components in relation to the First World-West.

It is necessary for the entire world that no nexus be established between the Third World and Islam because in addition to the sum of the two human masses, it is possible to add potential desperation on the part of both due to the economic disposition of Islamic petroleum.

Fourth.

Mineral reserves - apart from solid, liquid and gas fuel whose use will be changed - are not located in quantity and diversity in Europe.

The American Continent has a great diversity of them. Africa, similarly, which could be a compensation for Europe if it decides to influence in a world action to get the Africans out of the well of poverty in which they find themselves. The USA, in direct comparison with Europe, enjoys this advantage, which is won't stop using.

Considering these four points of comparison, it is evident that Europe has to negotiate from a position that is dependent on the USA. However, in the current position of all the operating forces that they use in their speeches and lawsuits, they show, without a doubt, that the best option is to make alliances within not only the First World, but the world in general.

The West, due to nature, to an intertwined history, and to shared ethnicity within a complex mixed European-Central Asian heritage, factors that are immensely more important than territory, only needs political willpower in order to develop a change in the system that is working with visible success in countries within its own area.

The Great Alliance, the Kantian world federation can only be forged with the two current civilisations: East-West. Any proposal to initiate a process oriented against this idea distorts and leaves out the operative forces that continue having more positive factors than negative.

Something as out of place in the XXI century as religion and, in particular, Islam, is a difficult burden to drag around, but they exist. To continue arguing today as Darwin did with his colleague Fitzroy in his trip to Tierra del Fuego about Biblical questions such as the Great Flood and the capacity of Noah's Ark to shelter pairs of all

the existing species in sight of the palaeontological discoveries in the territories explored on his sea journey is simply grotesque. It is logical to consider that even the grotesque influences in conserving the current system; how much additional difficulty exists when it comes to smoothing differences about real interests, especially economic, but also conceptual between East and West, among any of the Three established Worlds, among the States-nation, among active forces such as Russia next to the protagonists of present-day evolution, undoubtedly between East and West, and among other less important religions among all the distinct religions. These real differences, that after the episode of the Twin Towers have provoked the slide towards violence that culminates in Palestine and Iraq, mean that apparently this is a base factor for the clash between Islam and the rest of the world.

Between the grotesque and drama of this situation, the apocalyptic proclamations don't help and neither is there any place for the optimistic attitude generated by the idea that in spite of everything, humanity progresses and will definitely prevail in all the existing challenges. Because it is possible that humanity will prevail over them. But by specifying them and knowing how to do it. And also because it isn't true that in this precise moment, humanity is progressing if we consider that humanity is everyone and the majority of everyone lives worse now than in the era of submission to colonialism and even worse than in the era of pre-colonialism.

The selection of the best brains in the world could establish a plan or programme to break the vicious cycle created by the opposing conservative-renovating souls. What they couldn't do is develop it. It is necessary for government leaders and politicians in general to shake off their ignorance, but cultural generalisation is all earthly area is even more necessary. And this can only be achieved by constructing a wide educational base in an atmosphere of collectives with affinities of any sign. European indecision to write a Constitution can be very positive. The existence of Ethnic Groups-nation in Europe, in the western area and also in the eastern, are an example of a model of human and territorial organisation that can level the state of evolution in a truly united West through ideally sized collectives that exist in the USA and in some parts of Europe.

The strength of the USA and European weakness are not equally true. Particularly American strength. There have always been hegemonic States. And all of them have ceased to be so as a consequence of economic impoverishment when faced with a new competitor. Not now, but possibly soon, China could be a new competitor. The world wouldn't gain anything with such a substitution. This is a perspective that the West must contemplate. Essentially the governments of the USA and Europe must: when they

want to do so, they may not have any options with which to act. Can they do it now? The answer could be yes. If both parts have government leaders who are sure that what is at stake is the future in this situation of multiple challenges. The economic dependency of the USA, due to the large foreign deficit, is aggravated by the necessary effort to face these challenges. This dependence is especially strong with China - a military power susceptible to disproportionate growth - and of the Muslim oil-producing countries and others of the Second and Third Worlds, all of them friendly with the West, a tight situation for those that up to now have led the evolution of the species. Each challenge demands great economic potential.

17.- The challenge to the Earth (22)

Simplifying the issue of the warming of the Planet only within the economic component, which is what the government leaders of the USA do, could be considered within the possibility of a “trust” of well-informed brains having reached deductions to obtain gigantic and unilateral benefits. It would be the use of foreign oil reserves until they are totally used up, at prices that until now have been lower than other energy sources. And maintaining their own reserves to be used for industrial transformation after the collapse of energy produced by fossil fuels for industrial transformations and diverse types of construction elements.

Elucidating in this sense does not seem logical. Whatever the reality of this issue, wanting to ignore ecologists that announce catastrophic results for human beings if they don't take expensive and efficient measures would be irresponsible. It would be even more so if the rest of the world adopted the same attitude as the United States. And it would be so because global warming is a problematic issue in many more important aspects or, at least as important as the economic aspect.

Without a productive economy at any level, from individual people to large collectives, we know that it is not possible to evolve. But neither is it without acquiring more and higher educational levels. We must accept then that just like almost everything in our world and more so in global political decisions, there are fewer bipolar alternatives than situations to decide among a range of options. It is the search for balance among all the possibilities and after evaluating them, determining which is the most adequate combination of options.

This situation can be defined by saying that if all the attempts on the part of oil-producing countries to increase the price per barrel to an extreme limit were successful, the world would have to mobilise itself and not just in the search for producing ecological energy but, with still more decision, to economise it. This field

hasn't been exploited enough and it can dramatically change the lifestyle of human beings, with benefits that are as important as the economic ones. This is a problem that needs initiatives from the EU as much as from the USA. The needs of the Earth are many. Land for crops and forests, water, clean air, living space and, above all, the main one: a guaranteed balance of air and marine currents.

The advances in audiovisual communication could lessen by two thirds, the consumption of fuel in air transport. And a logistical management on a world scale, another two thirds of fuel for land transportation of travellers and goods. It's only an example, among many of the consumption of energy that could be saved.

In the longer term, not only are their possibilities of saving energy through rational, practical systems. There is the possibility of avoiding an increase in the population and the incorporation of the Third World and part of the second - China in the first place - to the habits of the First World, provoking the predicted energy collapse. Only controlled demographics to stabilise the world population first and, afterwards, establishing it according to what the Earth can resist without forcing it to produce more than what it is capable of producing.

The Earth is not defiant. The Earth doesn't protest, not even due to the challenges that human beings bring up. The Earth behaves according to conditions established on a universal scale, well known by many of them, gravity in the first place and which are essentially the ones to be considered. There are other conditions that are not entirely known empirically and that can only be used as an inferred guide. And they can be decisive.

Warming and melting of the Earth have taken place in the past. Of all the wide range of cataclysms on the Earth that we now enjoy, only volcanic and seismic activities remain in the form of earthquakes and tsunamis, the pluvial metre and wind with a cyclonic culmination, the climate changes that have certainly taken place, even though we don't really know what caused them. In our overpopulated world, keeping in mind its physical capacity, considering not only the meteorites of known frequency such as the tides, but also all the others that are known and unpredictable, needn't cause any type of apocalyptic fear due to the behaviour of the planet and its atmosphere. This one which occupies up to two thousand kilometres of height from sea level to interplanetary space, doesn't have any known reactions due to affectations in inferior levels: the troposphere with a thickness of only 7 kilometres at the poles and an average of 13 in temperate territories and up to 16 kilometres in equatorial regions. And the successive stratospheric and mesospheric layers, until reaching the exosphere in interplanetary space. Each one with its own and/or shared physical and chemical compositions of gigantic dimensions that explain why

the Earth has overcome its cataclysmic conformation starting from a ball of fire in its beginning up to the Gaia Earth that we enjoy. All of this inclines one to believe that the gases that we, as human beings, produce, all together are a pale replica of the active volcanoes that have existed intermittently; they can't negatively go over and change their nature in a definitive manner. The Universe would remain impassive if human beings disappeared from the Earth, which is the maximum existing danger if the consequences of the challenge that the Earth receives on the part of defiant human beings are not foreseen. If human beings' decision only had to contemplate the economic aspect of this important and complex issue, they could calculate the profitability of different energy policies. If the balance were favourable, burn all the oil reserves, trusting that the effects of climate change would be overcome in a new state of alternative energy production or a set of proposed alternatives; they are tested and then can be put into action. All of this thinking that the means that future generations will have at their disposal can mitigate the adverse consequences and without economic cost to them because of the scientific and technological evolution that will hypothetically take place. In this way, the challenges of the Earth that are real will have a reason for existing. We would save large economic means and also intellectual ones for the following generations and our current one.

The question isn't so simple and is of a complexity and dimension which escapes objective vision. It can only be presented in all its extension and contrary to what one might suppose, when the problem becomes global, the issue becomes simpler.

(6) It's known that the current population, doubled in forty years - a similar period of time to what Malthus calculated at the time in which the world population barely missed 1,000 million in the year 1800 and that in the year 1900 still hadn't doubled - it would establish itself in 1,650 million - can't grow at a similar rate, not now and not in the time that the English clergyman predicted the doubling of inhabitants in the space of thirty-five years and that needed more than one hundred. In this same time period, 1900 - 2000, the population of the Earth has multiplied by four.

The discredit of Malthus doesn't affect these mathematical errors, which have been magnified to support the desire for growth in all socio-political-economic areas. Possibly with current accounting means, they would have been closer. But the discrediting of his idea has been produced by its very base: it is the productive capacity of human beings that would become insufficient for feeding a population in constant growth. And the population is better fed than in his time. There are excesses of food that force the establishment of subventions to limit the production of nutrients (another issue is that of the lousy distribution system). At the time of Malthus, in a world without smoke and moved by renewable energy - then enough

- it was impossible, if not difficult to foresee that the food shortage would take place because of the inability of the Earth to produce more than what its nature allowed.

We shouldn't underrate Malthus. It is a primitive Malthusian idea without the renovation that almost always exists in basic ideas such as that of Darwin's evolution by means of the struggle for existence. And here are the reasons for considering global warming from perspectives other than economic.

In spite of what we know, the population cannot grow indefinitely on the Earth; the premise of all the governments of the world is growth, setting objectives for growth in all areas, including birth or even in the number of settlers for each piece of Land. Empires such as the "Nazi Arian" have been proposed or of all the proletarians united in the world, fortunately avoided; the States nation with nostalgia for greatness generally promoted through colonial exploitations, join in the idea of growing indefinitely demographically and economically, and on a decreasing scale up to municipalities and rundown villages anxious to recruit well-off citizens with weekend homes follow the same current. It is this way in spite of knowing that the Earth's population, as Malthus said, can't grow indefinitely. All over the world, it is necessary to insert this idea that growth in and of itself does not generate well-being. What we have said for Europe is the same for all parts where there is a lack of conditions for growth - water, land, human elements, etc. - maintaining the status quo is what we need. Growth along, and also everywhere, can only be pursued in order to grow in well-being. And wherever possible, install it where it doesn't exist.

Malthus was reasonable for the simple reason that the Earth can't become larger and now we are seeing difficulties for taking in and feeding the current population. It suffers fatigue due to the pressure to produce more than it can. Even supposing that science and technology obtain synthetic nutrients, it has been demonstrated that all advances in productive systems demand superior energy consumption. Considering current realities that can't be omitted without catastrophic pessimism, they have to be considered as a whole. The main ones are:

(31)

Petroleum that is produced naturally in processes throughout very long periods and the most important reserves are in deserts where there were marine zones, is the most economic product for combustion and fuel. The known reserves are large. The reserves to be discovered could be even more so, though in the measure that their placement is deeper and in the marine area, the increased expense is important. Foreseeing the drying up of petroleum in a space within the current century - or even in a few centuries - is what is reasonable. Sooner or later globalised humanity will have to

act in order to avoid an energy collapse that questions the continuity of the evolution of the species. We know little or almost nothing of the beginning of our existence on the Earth. And even less about the end of the species. It could be due to the drying up of energy sources. Only the absolute dominion of demography can guarantee that the end of the species will not be due to a lack of any kind, among them, sources of energy. Along with the Malthusian theory, there can also perfectly well be a recovered Galtonian theory, also like that of Malthus. It would be the eugenics of the Third Millennium. No, now at least in order to select human couples. Only in order to update the original idea of Galton that now should be when and where the birth rate is encouraged and where it is diminishes or suppresses.

On the other hand, petroleum is a mineral that contributes raw material that, in many cases, each day more, substitutes metals. With higher benefits than are produced when it is used as fuel.

(22)

Global warming is an indisputable fact. As much or more so than statistics, everyone that has lived more than eighty years in the country definitely accepts this change. Eighty or seventy years ago, permanent freezing in places where there was enough rainwater appeared at the end of November or the beginning of December and stayed until February or March. In these same places and conditions it has disappeared and when it does appear, it is only for a few days. Warming then is not a temporary phenomenon. It is the almost secular certainty with an undeniable intensification within the current period. Even accepting that warming due to the greenhouse effect is not the cause of climate change, the gasses of fossil fuel directly or indirectly provoke serious diseases in human beings.

(31)

The benefit of petroleum is not determined by the labour of the natives in oil-producing countries. Its presence in one place or another is random, but being that the sites are located in territories that before were marine and now are deserts, its inhabitants, due to Mohammedan inertia and environmental conditioning don't use this benefit to encourage cultural and economic evolution. On the contrary, the benefit is used scandalously to multiply and with arrogance defy the rest of the world. Their growth is only in terms of the birth rate.

Give the extraordinary transcendence of fossil fuel, with or without Global warming due to this cause, it is incomprehensible that ecology combats the installation of hydroelectric centres for the reason of protecting fish wildlife of a value that is limited only to the sport of fishing; the same opposition to the installation of wind farms and solar energy for the reason of maintaining the countryside. It is a flagrant contradiction. What is necessary is to regulate the fluvial

currents, no matter how small, and store the largest quantity of water reserves. And get used to the presence of wind farms and fields of solar panels. They don't cause any harm.

(28)

Given this panorama related to energy sources, we see that oil-consuming countries have no interest in reducing their fossil fuel consumption or in constituting an anti-OPEC with economic height at its disposal. Obsessed by constant growth and afraid of the difficulties that a change in energy would entail because of: a) change only possible with the cooperation of all the countries of the First world; b) process of long duration and gradually developed over a period of at least half a century; c) negotiating with oil-producing countries in the long term, with prices that devalue and re-evaluate according to the efficiency achieved in the production of alternative energy and forcing as much as possible with pre-established minimum and maximum prices; d) parallel agreements to develop petrochemical industries in oil-producing countries, linking these agreements to the establishment in other countries of a controlled birth rate with incentives for women who do not surpass - at the moment - two children; e) budget changes that must be complied with in all the anti-OPEC countries, incentives for having children and parallel to this, the search for a sustainable energy producing method and its production; f) an agreement to regulate immigration with the rule to establish the age of the immigrants between twenty and twenty-five years old, only accepting temporary contracts with a maximum of five years and the possibility of remaining another five years in the case that there is a certain and total integration, marriage included.

The earthly inability to produce in a constant and indefinite progression forces the establishment of productive priorities, situating them near consumption with logistical savings of an enormous dimension.

All of the problems that have been outlined here not only advise, but sooner or later force the establishment of an imposed system that adjusts to the demands that the acceptance of the reality of the Earth is not infinite in every aspect and that its inhabitants must adapt to this reality. To have children or not to have them. Produce or consume. Distribute dividends or reinvest. Speculate or initiate and develop economic methodologies with a social content. Change the production of the current mono crops and diversify agriculture pursuing a less costly logistic, given that the current level of population - and not in what is announced for the term of the present century - life is very uncomfortable, said in gentle terms, for everyone, rich and poor, educated and ignorant. Discomfort of a different intensity according to which category you belong to. And this is supposing that in spite of the increase in

educational level and civility, there is no equivalent war or struggle, as in the past, in order to obtain what is lacking. Especially enough vital space if the division in small pieces of Land for each collective continues, water and other necessary elements for the comfort of a large number of inhabitants and mainly energy.

All of the challenges that we have contemplated in different ways, in political or sociological content, no matter how difficult they are to control, enter into an area of enormous dimensions. Those that only require that a collective modify certain behaviour can be overcome easily and rapidly. The birth rate, for example. The word takes on a defining value that is enough to set criteria regarding this subject, even in people and collectives of limited education. Just reading press publications and listening to the radio and watching television is enough to obtain a criterion as regards this complex issue. There are illiterate people who are truly intelligent.

The challenges that can only be overcome by changing the nature of people or collectives, even though they are enlightened, when change is not possible, it is much more difficult and not always sure that there will not be a return to the neurons and genes that they had assimilated throughout time. Pedagogy and biology that are used thoroughly can change this aspect in human living. While it is not so, only the intelligent illiterate, also the enlightened, but deformed by one or another cause, must be pressured until obtaining neuronal and genetic changes. Many of the challenges to present-day humanity are truly susceptible to causing disasters, not only temporary, but definitive. There is nothing in the Universe that guarantees that human beings won't suffer them. But there is also nothing that keeps us from avoiding them. Each component of our world is interrelated with all the others in the same way that each physiological system of our being is with the rest of the system. Both interrelations are absolutely necessary for life in human beings; they are conscious of their existence, but not of the other components. Only one exception: the mind, which does not only encompass the brain. Its prolongations are situated in the central nervous system which makes us sensitive to pleasure and pain. The interrelation of the mind and the central nervous system, without the two systems being aware of the other's existence, we can say is the soul. No soul - the only source of consciousness in the world - has the capacity to warn us of a cataclysm when it draws near. Only when it is present. Presence and intuition can be the same thing and they may possibly evolve. Until that is so, only the mind can deduce and construct hypotheses for the future. The uncertainty of all hypotheses needn't force us to work until we are exhausted, but nor should it cause us to fall into fatalism.

In the present-day world, one would say that the firm purpose of catastrophic announcements may have an intuitive component.

At any rate, premonitions must be examined, accepted as hypotheses and acted on based on the search for positive effects. The alternative actions when faced with challenges - often more than an alternative, a choice among many combined options - has positive corrections. A subject for the third part.

THIRD PART

FACING THE CHALLENGES

18.- Investigating the causes

The desire to live is shared by all existing beings. The phrase of Paul Valéry, simplified and leaving out the conditional, would be: “I think and therefore I am” can be multiplied by all the number of verbs. Valéry’s phrase is good for a thinker. For a government leader, it would be: “I have power; afterwards I exist.” But more literally and for everyone “I love; afterwards I exist”. And plants that neither think nor speak have their own desire to live, which is parallel to that of humans. Their struggle for existence is to grow and keep other plants from shadowing them and lessening their ability for photosynthesis. All the sentences of human beings describing their vital sense can be inverted: Valéry’s would be “I live and therefore I think”. Photosynthesis literally gives life without words. Omnivore humans and even exclusively carnivore species exist due to the process of vegetable photosynthesis. In the “system” of “protein” and organic life, the order is: inorganic material, live vegetable material, and live animal material.

Inferior beings without consciousness, such as tress, live and function perfectly based on very complex processes such as photosynthesis until reaching the maximum complexity of human beings with multiple systems and physiological processes. Their forced function to remain and in the search of pleasure and the suppression of pain have made us evolutionary. Now the impression exists that we don’t know how to use our physical medium and any other function. And that is because to live, to exist, and to be for humans is not enough. The combination of the rest of verbs, including to kill, forms a unique way of being in each person. In this way there are lovers and rapists. The range of combinations to differentiate ourselves individually is infinite. This infinity worried Socrates who, ignorant of the genetic function, when the music was far from being methodised, marvelled at the infinity of harmony and melody that the seven tones and five semitones - that already existed although they hadn’t been methodised - could produce. Because of this, he associated music with the identity of the human species. A mystery opened by Mendel when he discovered genetics. Now the mystery is why we exist, if we exist for something on a universal scale. If we are something more than a complex reality of genes - that are neither selfish nor altruistic, they only exist - the conscious taking root in the whole of the physiological systems of the

human being that makes it possible on a personal level, as far as wanting to be, that there is no mystery.

Upon introspection, it is relatively easy for each individual to know for what purpose he exists and why he wishes to exist. And better defined what he wants to be. And here is where the biological realities of the affirmation of conscious identity and the physiological structure that, more than allow for, imposes the infinity of morphologies and moods of human beings, coincide.

Each human being is born and lives from the union of the two germinating cells and their chromosomal recombination in a much more complex manner than vegetable photosynthesis. Establishing parallels among the infinity of combinations among the twelve musical tones and semitones and the same infinity with the combination of forty-six chromosomes of each component that the parent pair contributes to recombine the forty-six that the new being will have.

Human beings, apart from being, think and, because of this, want something more concrete, based on the fact that they exist due to their personal genetic nature. Only now, after the Christian failures, imperial, Marxist and "Arian syncretism", among a great number of doctrines and systems for obtaining happiness on Earth, in Heaven or in metempsychosis, a movement of cordial acceptance of the individuality of people and of their natural collectives begins. And after that, it becomes manifest that only affinity can work - just as music tonality works - as an element of cohesion for levelling with relativity the evolution of the human collective.

Affinity is produced spontaneously in the family, and in a more diluted form in the collectives known as people and on an ascending scale, ethnic groups and races. By innate and genetic nature created by the struggle for existence in each step from the individual to the collective of humanity, no one wants to be subject to remaining in the shadows. Even among components of a family. This is part of human nature.

The challenges outlined beforehand have global components in which there is no authority or referee to mitigate the hardness of the natural law of fighting for existence. The inevitable division of the Earth and its inhabitants, produced by an absolute mutual ignorance of the existing collectives at the beginning of life and continuing on a downward slope until the present day, can't help to create affinities, which exist deep down among all human beings. The Sovereign States, so loved by conservatism, in reality have not been appropriate elements for creating affinities. Just as their predecessors weren't, all the Empires that have been. Human law, contrary to natural law, has given everyone the same genome, has served to teach people to love what is theirs and, unfortunately, also

to hate what is strange. With a logical translation abroad, often only for the difficulty and adapting to non-essential differences represents.

The existence of individuals that have tried by all means to achieve a manner of being human with a sufficient affinity in order to fight for an existence that is bloodless, have left permanent furrows. Christ and Marx aren't the best examples. Darwin's furrows and Mendel's, due to being the result of correct intuition and consciously made, methodically and with a scientific base, are those that have planted the seeds that have shown that only knowledge moves the evolution of the species. Good intentions are not enough.

(2) As an absolute and generic challenge for all human beings, we have that of obtaining knowledge. It's the most important and decisive for breaking the inert behaviour that has the West mired in a sea of doubt and non-functioning. And as a paradigm of this dramatic situation, covered up by the well-being that has been achieved thanks to scientific knowledge applied to diverse technologies, We have a cowardly Europe, aging and injected with strange bodies that aren't new sap. They are micro-organisms that are infecting the evolutionary process. They are starting immigrants, ignorant, backwards and resentful that refuse to integrate as we have seen in previous comments. And with their arrogance fed by an economic power that has not been created by personal effort, but by the circumstance of having the energy source of the mechanised world, petroleum, through religious intercession, they challenge a stunned world and not only the West. Violent challenge that does not accept dialogue. That looks for suicidal confrontation and that doesn't find an answer other than the defensive attitude of cowards. And we are referring to the guerrilla warfare defensive, source of all defeats, although also opera. We are referring to the defensiveness of an exhausted political system of no use in the global world that discovers itself as a new challenge when it should be and, in part is, an invitation, almost an imposition of a change of system of co-existence.

(32) Without pretending to be original, it is necessary to repeat over and over again, that the most profitable for everyone and for all collectives is to take care with education. Behind every challenge, it is possible to find ignorance of someone or something as a cause. This moves one to think of those who are called to direct the confrontation of each one of the challenges that are detected or just under the surface; they can be motivated by poorly focused selfishness, gratuitous arrogance or a criminal instinct. Any of these causes or others that are similar in nature, stem from a lack of knowledge. The most elemental, the lack of self knowledge, of our species and, afterwards, always the lack of complete knowledge of the causes of each challenge. Of each problem.

(10) If current problems were those that we have considered up to now, we would need to make the effort to study them in more detail, one by one. But we would repeat ourselves constantly because a large amount of them have common causes. The main one, as we have repeatedly said, is the lack of general knowledge and also, in particular, the lack of knowledge necessary in the people who have to resolve those problems. For this reason, education and the lack of adequate education for our times is a motive and constant reference in world problems.

In order to determine the education which should be imparted due to the importance of these global problems, the factors to be considered take in practically all of the existing problems: a job that is impossible to do individually, even being a person of extraordinary knowledge - not very frequent among politicians - due to how much the preceding factors and those that are specifically derived from each collective and each person must be considered. The only thing one can do is search for affinities to decide on the educational methods appropriate to each collective. The smaller, the better.

Political parties are an adequate medium if the members are there for reasons of affinity. The current political parties don't work for this objective. They have been and continue to be apparatus for producing leaders capable of convincing voters. This, which is internal corruption of the very apparatus was already present in its beginnings, diffusely in Greece and clearly implanted in Rome. In both cases of civility, the slave was a natural part of humanity. Like a disease. And the church certified it. The genome, which existed as it does now, was ignored. And although now it has been discovered biologically, it continues to be ignored for political action.

In science and technology, without need of norms and systems for renovation, with its objective being to establish realities, renovation takes place spontaneously. Structural realities, those that don't change, are constructing a base to support all the wisdom reached in each moment. Those "realities" that are established by intuition and without passing through the sieve of empirical knowledge are incorporated into this base which is susceptible of growing indefinitely and at the opportune moment. Or they are simply displaced from this base if they are found to be erroneous and replaced by other empirically established realities.

Politics, always non-scientific, doesn't have to develop or evolve. For this reason, the political system has become immutable. The techniques that are introduced in the system are directed at increasing the efficiency for capturing votes. The consequences of the professional political exercise are of the highest transcendence for the whole of world society and for each existing partial society. It's ironic that politics separated from the rest of activities and contrary to them remains independent since it was practiced by

terribly ignorant warlocks - but less than their contemporaries - even current government leaders. And that its independence is shamelessly used for corporate advantage, if not personal. That votes in the democracy that has been achieved up to now, have the same value for a totally ignorant person as of a wise sociologist or political analyst, is a fraud with great transcendence.

The causes of this situation stem from all the challenges that we have commented as exponents of a general conflict among human beings. Consequently the basic challenge, fundamental, is giving the system that is immutable because of the will of those who manage it and don't develop it, politicians, definitive legitimacy through the creation of voters who are wise in politics. But if even those who are wise in science can be and frequently are little enlightened in politics, the idea appears of a humanity eternally condemned to be directed by a corporation of politicians, judges and even religious leaders, extremely jealous of maintaining this situation that, on the other hand, can only change, not with their acquiescence, but through the decided will to change it. A change that is only possible by means of the education system, now managed by the politicians it is dependent on.

With the vigour of educational plans, mediated not only by Islam but all over the world by teaching of an esoteric base and only positively effective for imparting scientific and technological knowledge; it isn't viable for trying to rationalise education. The autonomous Universities or the autonomy of the professorship do not represent a hope for rationalisation. The number of suffering professors must be uncountable when faced with the impotency to change the state of the educational system. Even with some governments on the scale of States-nation and large federations of one and another type dependent on the Federal Power, circumstantially accepting a modernisation of curricula in the subjects of humanities, the result is very poor. The efforts carried out on a personal level are useless. The problem is global, but not general. There are profound differences. With Islam representing more than twenty percent of the world population, scattered around the entire world. With churches that have no other objective and future than to uselessly resist a silent disappearance - and embarrassing is one keeps in mind the cultural influenced that they contributed in their moment. And the interests of the conservatives incrustated at all levels of present-day society, don't allow for a university action that could be the road to reaching an educational change, that alone and in the space of a few generations, would solve the root of the current global problem.

This imposing reality forces the intellectuals of the most economically evolved countries to mobilise in order to cut the Gordian knot that represents an impassable barrier for political

evolution precisely because the professional political class is their own barrier. Generally built from ignorance.

The persistence of collectives that bring together a large number of people also bring together all the problems that the challenges represent. The attempts to modernise any aspect that they do, suffers the resistance originated by the reality of societies with great needs, the main one being a lack of renovators and the bother that conservatives cause. The inability to act on a world level on the part of professional politicians is what keeps the system in place. There are politicians who are honest at their core, but none can free himself from lying. They can remain free of corruption for personal interests, but not for the interests of the party. Their struggle for existence is the struggle to maintain themselves active. The examples of colleagues that have overstepped the discipline of the party are clear warnings to contain oneself in all activities. Including that of thinking. The balance between what is personally advantageous and what is professionally advantageous is filigree that is not necessary in any other activity. This alone deprives people of much more value than those that choose the professional political line, given that they do not try to promote themselves in this field. And there are a lot of those who with authentic vocation stop trying when they perceive the intellectual servitude that the profession expects before the interests of the party. Interests created by leaders and by those who maintain it: the voters who are incapable of choosing well.

Every normal rational person knows that the conceptual differences in any subject and situation require communication above all. Within and among States-nation, there is no possibility of generalised and conclusive dialogue. What is desired or advantageous for one State is totally unacceptable for another. And dialogue doesn't work that way. Politicians contemporise, which is to say they lie as regards intentions. And if you add the same politicians who lie when faced with unsalvageable difficulties in their own countries to this situation, they have to do it on an international scale to deal with challenges that are global, their versatility is even more understandable.

The system is the same as in the Roman Republic, but the problems have increased in dimension. Nothing and no-one has been able to standardise human beings. And dictatorships can no longer prevail due to the cultural level reached by distinct societies of the First World. Contemporising, lying in political work, increase transcendence in the measure with which collectives of one dimension or another act.

There can't be any dialogue between Russia and the satellite countries around her in Eastern Europe; and just like there can't be any there, there can't be any among the rival States-nation that are

not declared, but are, in effect, rivals, such as the founding nucleus of the EU, nor among them and the Ethnic Groups-nation, with or without a State. On the contrary, dialogue is perfectly possible among these Ethnic Groups-nation. It isn't practised for lack of channels and only signs of admiration exist with the success of many of these Ethnic Groups-nation. The cases of Finland and Estonia are recurring. The first and most notable among them that in spite of having been a satellite the largest part of its history and that now appears in all the global classification as an economically and socially forward country. And Estonia, the most successful along with Slovenia among those liberated after the last world war, converted in a showcase for the rest of those who have had the same luck. And without being able to avoid it, Estonia is the most hated by its former dominators, an example of the impossibility of establishing dialogues between countries with a forced post-imperial structure (in this case, Russia) and naturally formed countries.

The divergence between the Finnish and Russian educational systems is neither casual nor due to circumstances. Rather, it responds to their different characters and arises from the social-phenotypical system, and therefore is possible to re-direct. Naturally, not by inverting the Finish orientation; rather, the Slav.

The nearly six decades that have been completely lost by Russia since the mid twentieth century and, to a certain extent, by Europe as well would have been more than enough to develop a federal system. And the result of competition among Ethnic Groups-Nations, dialoguing as equals, would have also been adequate. And without any negative consequences for Finland. Quite the opposite. The struggle for existence would have benefited Finland as well. Her Autonomous Villages, like the Cantons in Switzerland, are the turning point of development. Rivalry does not equal enmity; not even hatred or plain dislike. These sentiments are generated by an imposition of foreign customs on the part of Nation-States with illusions of grandeur on Ethnic Group-Nations who resist this imposition. Not only in the Balkans, but in many European spheres where hot spots of violence - that are not between sides fighting for existence - cause human and economic loss, not just for those who resist being dominated. These losses are also felt by those in power, losses that are difficult to calculate, but which on this scale are always important.

Given the cultural and political level of the twentieth century and, even more so, the twenty-first, it is unthinkable that a rivalry between California-New York, Quebec-Ontario, or Baviera-Baden Württemberg could give rise to violent fighting. A large number of violent outbreaks happen between Nation-States that, even though they are not rivals, they consider themselves to be historical

enemies. In general they share a common border and have been at war before.

(32) The result of different educational systems, due to the different sociological formation within each Ethnic Group-Nation, would be akin to the educational system that exists in federal countries now, visible and comparable in relatively short terms of application. This would be the best form of dialogue. A dialogue which does not exist and which is impossible between Nation-States, given that internally they must deal with the characteristic disparities among their forced components and even with those people who have accepted their absorption into the system. The merit belongs to the Ethnic Groups-Nations and, in general, arises from a much calmer character than that which is typical of Nation-States, which tend to be violent and arrogant.

Within politics in general, the disagreements between collectives that are grouped together by a brutal system of weapons and certain number of combatants, dialogue is impossible. In spite of the fact that the topics which separate them are, for the most part, not very significant to citizens who are not professional politicians, except for those that refer to mutual relations. The educational issue, which directly affects thinking and, above all, the feeling of parents, increases exponentially with the degree of difficulty as regards dialogue. Though the general educational system should have a common framework, this cannot be created by bringing together hundreds of millions of people. It would be convenient if religious believers didn't exist as such. But they exist. To a greater or lesser extent, educating everyone as a non-believer is possible now and will be for many generations, when a global system for recognizing degrees exists and until the results collated from different education systems show their respective outcomes.

This difficulty will lessen greatly and even disappear when the collective is reduced. But in any case, what is truly important is that for any issue, such as the aforementioned one, where there is a small collective of people with a great deal in common such as Ethnic Groups-Nations, dialogue is always possible. The difficulty of finding, such as in Finland, an acceptable formula for everyone, makes one consider that educational problems that affect all human beings in general, but especially those who are further along in the evolutionary process, are those which will open the door to radical change, and these can only succeed through political intentions. And this is possible because it does not mean a collective suicide of current politicians. On top of it, it's also not a problem for their successors. They will be free of the party servitude that damages the image of politicians, justly taking into account the negative result of the system.

There are quite a few components in an education project which allows future generations to establish an electorate that obligates those elected to accept a new political system in accordance with the educational levels reached but, above all, to reach this point by means of an appropriate educational system whose level is estimated at this time.

To summarize, consider the realities of this issue:

The overly spoiled and loved children in the more cultured world who, as spoiled children that they are, continue in their youth - a state which they maintain well into adulthood - and when they become adults, raised by permissive parents, and in many cases having lost the vocation of parenthood, transfer basic aspects of formation to the school that are only possible within the family through the example set by elders.

Unwanted children in a poor and ignorant world, brought up in a violent atmosphere in which they are even sold, hidden under a ton of political and social subterfuge. For example, Palestine.

Educators overwhelmed by an educational system that is imposed on them by the omnipresent political professionals.

Self-satisfied government leaders within a system that they don't want to change more than not being able to change it.

Media with an economic character and management style, obliged to co-exist with government leaders or aspiring leaders. An invitation to consumerism, to laziness and irresponsibility.

Labour unions obsessed with getting their share, who forget about productivity. The destruction of the work ethic.

Acceptance of crime and delinquency in general. Social deviations at a young age, due to drugs, alcohol and premature sex.

Everything is acceptable in an affluent society and the same goes for the Third World due to deviations in the civilising process of the species. We only have to go back to Leucippus: "everything which exists has its cause". What is lacking is to find those causes. The casual circumstance that all personal identity comes from a genetic system - pure chance - in the chromosomal recombination, transferred to collectives, increases the difficulty of establishing systems to overcome "chance" and to act rationally. It's useless to even try to eliminate chance from the current state of human knowledge in a rational way. Only continued analysis of practical results will give guidelines for opportune rectifications. The greater

the collective that needs operating, the greater the difficulty in applying the system.

At this crossroads, created by Eurocentric decadence, a cause of premature biological aging, with uncertainty as far as its capacity to renovate, the actual unstable situation in the West, especially in Europe, has been created.

The permanence of the dual system in China, another “Arian syncretism” without Arians: dominant classes and masses that are docile toward governments that have been endogmatically formed in a mixed breeding with large doses of Mongoloidism.

The chain of succession from kings to almost democrats, converted in gods, to eternal emperors in Japan, delegating in the shogun, authentic dictators barely reined in by the Emperor.

In the sub-world of the Ex Jewels of the Crown, India, with a population that is nearing that of the Far East with the same population density and half the NGP per person; with ethnic diversity, with notable language and alphabet systems and religions juxtaposed against an aggressive Islam. All of this subtly distinguished by influences from the Indus civilisation, as well as the West, by way of England, but together in the same challenge towards humanity and, above all, to the Earth to which is attributed the overcome “yellow danger”, and current destabilising Hindu demographic increase.

A mass that has been left out by Western and Eastern civilisations, a little more than halfway between a wild, barbarous state and civilisation, populating Africa, the Pacific Islands, the Amazon and surrounding regions, and enormous spaces immobilised by Islam.

The permanency of deities, weakened by a lack of priestly vocations in the West due to the growing Civilisation of Knowledge and of the self knowledge obtained by “civil societies”, politically unconnected and inoperative (but still capable of positively influencing a process of cultural interconnection, barely begun now, for a change in the system of government). And the immutability of the political system only remedied by democracy, forming a panorama that not even when contemplated as a whole on the part of governing politicians or by the political opposition.

This summary of difficulties in establishing an adequate educational system for the situation of the state of human development can be looked at in more detail, but as we have said when considering the general problems of challenges, doing so would be to repeat ourselves constantly. And that is because the same political dysfunction, and in this case, educational, is the source of many negative or positive synergies.

The more or less distant perspective in the future, of a repetition of an excessive birth rate, would be automatically explosive although it was half the rate of the previous century.

(21)

The challenges of the 21st century arise from known causes. According to periodic circumstances, some become more important than others. Following the last world war, the most repeated was a lack of capacity for cultural management, of civilization, of a society that up to then was evolving according to the Darwinian algorithm, that in all areas of development has seen a decrease in the capacity of its leaders to manage and a lack of executive and legislative guides, capable of converting the algorithm into a rational process, projecting the idea that humanity is the most real collective of all that exist and adapting themselves according to evolution to the complexity of the common genome, though up to here with insufficient knowledge to intervene, but acting in human living.

Government leaders, the same as now, as soon as they have had an electorate capable of discerning their problems that had emerged from global problems, could act as they do have done for thousands of years. Opportunistically. But what would be desirable and perfectly possible, would be to count on some politically conscious populations to change systems and for the opportunity to be created and not randomly taken advantage of. Is it possible to do so with the current state of the Earth and of human beings? It's possible, if they want to.

The system is not everything, but it is the most important. And it's not necessary to invent it. It is carried out with varying degrees of success in different places on Earth, with the degree of success depending on the intrinsic goodness of that place. And it goes without saying that this quality, without exception, derives from certain concrete qualities of those who apply them. It makes no difference that these qualities have no merit for those who possess them. What is important is that the value of these qualities determines the outcome. The circumstances which lead those who populate continents or islands or simply small, barren islands, that can serve as an example in the search for affinities, that more than persuade, practically obligate them to act a certain way, do not exist by chance. These circumstances come about as a consequence of the omnipresent syncretism in human behaviour. There is no present without a past.

The Constitution of the USA, unique in its briefness and with amendments to maintain it alive, was not a work inspired by poorly educated settlers. It was created by the best educated English immigrants, religious believers, but without an affinity for the religious turn brought about by the libido of a king who had few if any religious beliefs, that emigrated to a land at the right time - that

wasn't a country given that its population was insignificant - where they could maintain their faith. This is the origin of the persistence of the North American believers. The immense labour required has robbed them of their ability to think, and the education received has shown itself to be successful. All the time invested in thriving has made it possible to maintain religious beliefs.

At the same time - with an extreme proximity, two centuries - there were two Conventions for the constituents. The one from the USA and the one from France. There are many antecedents to consider here. In the first place, the Angles, Saxons and Jutes predominated the formation of present-day English people and marked a difference with the Normans, Ligurians and, especially, the Celts that form the base for the present-day French from the northern and central parts of the country. Still, the inevitable mixed breeding that takes place when there are invasions, which is the case of the south of the English island, the north of France and even intervening Jutland as a thrower towards England, with everyone interfering in the rule of both countries, the ethnic characters as we know them today were established. France with its constant attempts to enter the South of the hexagon, due to the same causes of ethnic modification present in the era of the Revolution, was already a country obviously inclined towards theorising. Its revolutionary Convention in search of happiness for the French, was in some episodes, the peak political act in search of affinities. On the other hand, the English in North America, put forth all their pragmatic character, maintained to this day, and being aware of realities that were not easy to perceive, opted for a simple Constitution, but one that was open, so that very different groups that were forming due to shared affinities could enjoy the freedom to govern themselves according to their own character, so that happiness was something that they could themselves achieve, both individually and collectively. Over time, the difference has played itself out. The Civil War, slavery, religions and customs have produced communities in the North, the South, the East and the West, each with its own character, without any problems. On the contrary. The federal system that was adopted has created a real and better co-existence in all the States where, due to the hegemony of one of its parts, they have been forced to unite and, in general, failed in the attempt. The original factors of affinity, forgotten and even unknown by a sizeable part of the current population of the USA, have given rise simply due to acquired habits that are respected and even cordially accepted. And there is a big difference between the governments of each of the States, in climatic areas that the territorial dimension of the USA has produced. There is a certain community of spirit that bonds much better than that which the European Nation-States have.

One can consider or ignore the causes of behavioural disparity between these two Constitutions. The most important was caused by the effect of getting rid of or moderating the dynasties and aristocracies in Europe, a tremendous hindrance for the French convention attendees, which only increases the merit of their work. However merits are erased based on the final results of one's work, which is what counts in the end. The French Convention marked a positive feat: the decadence of "Arian syncretism". And another negative: Jacobean centralism.

The Nation-State is, in and of itself, hegemonic and/or homogenising. They are disintegrating precisely because they have not realised in time that union can only come about by creating affinities. And with an absolute respect for their identities. To this end, education is necessary and the ability to achieve an adequate level of culture so that citizens can acquire the aptitudes necessary to act in accordance with the cultural state of the collectives that make up the whole and not by use of military force or its dimensions. It is clear that this challenge cannot be met without changing the system. The educational project must be specific to each Ethnic Group-Nation, though with everyone pursuing the same objective: to determine stable realities. The convergence of many, or possibly of everyone, can only come about through the comparison of the results of each one of them that, thanks to current computer science, can have the guarantee of being adjustable and can serve as an indicator of personal will, without any type of imposition creating rebelliousness, not uniformity, but rather compatibility that is established at all levels of co-existence among Ethnic Groups-Nations of the entire world, that have this aptitude given that they have not placed it on the altar of excellence as the Nation-States have done with patriotism.

(32) The Finish educational project, with an undoubtedly positive result in the relatively short period of time of half a century, is not possible, even in homogenised China. And much less in diversified Europe. The Latinos from any of the Mediterranean states have nothing to add either to mobilize the wills of the Scandinavians. And these, despite being a positive example in the area of education, can do little to avoid the dysfunctions of the systems in the south of Europe, impregnated by history and religion. On the other hand, the obligatory interrelationships, convenient in other aspects such as the economic one, and regulated that is establishing itself not only in Europe, but in the world; acting in an international sphere; common objectives in concrete struggles of terrorism and delinquency: of the harmonization of Codes; the monetary system, and in general, the technical aspects that society needs, always with the exception that each Ethnic Group-Nation may want to introduce nuances or change

in each of these aspects, would give rise to mutual contacts that could produce agreements due to created affinities or affinities yet to be created. And more important still, direct, certain knowledge of the results of each implanted system in all its governmental variants, noting differences to be considered by all.

A process of this type, different but with common and similar objectives than those followed in the creation of the USA, demands perseverance and time, particularly in the educational aspect. Without the need to erase or change naturally created characters, that more than advisable, it is necessary to maintain, if all the other different ones are accepted.

The most effective revolutions have been those without history, whose effects have been noted long after they happened. The attempts to develop Europe in the style of the United States are aberrant. This affirmation is not gratuitous. One only has to observe those politicians who occupy a distinguished place in their States and act according to the rules of the current system and when they are comfortably ensconced in the UE, fall into a decline or become obsolete where the internal struggle is concerned - a custom that indicates favourable preferences between the love of local politics rather than a place in the larger European sphere - shows the two faces of the untamed conservative human politician. That of the one who thinks, but knows and decides not to think or know in order to accommodate himself to what a poorly formed electorate demands. The typical example is Romano Prodi. In an unusual circumstance, he formed a part of the UE and then returned to the Italian government. He made a public manifestation of his era of European activity that it wasn't possible to create it with international credibility if he had to continue in the conditions of going through the Nation-States. But in his earlier stage and latter political activity in the UE, he was quiet in Italy as a European and behaved like all politicians. The system makes one do this and accepts and promotes the lie more than each specific politician. What fails is that the system accepts and promotes the lie or at least hides certain well-established convictions of all government leaders. And they are, in the end, selfish beings, apparently lacking in vision and fraternal human feelings. What one can definitely deduce is that in reality what is essentially lacking are not only the components of the individually political corporation - though, that too - but in the end, it is the electorate that fails because they are incapable of determining who is right for each election. Politicians fail individually when they are incapable of changing the system.

Words, almost all of them polysemous, create enough confusion as regards systems of co-existence. Now we have arrived at

a definition of the state of the Earth as a possible clash of civilizations, based on the idea that religion, and more concretely Islam, is one of two opposite poles in this clash. In the contest of great ideas that have an impact, the idea of an alliance of civilizations has appeared. Which ones? East and West? There is no clash of civilisations; rather a clash between human collectives. There aren't many of them and they essentially are due to the issues collected in the Synopsis. Religion and native lands are only a negative synergy of the outcome of the path that human beings have followed, according to somewhat environmental circumstances where these have developed. This could be the appropriate moment to think about the instability that the cultural, economic and demographic imbalance creates among human beings, considering all of them, so that the Islam collective - does not drag a sufficient part of the rest of human beings to a confrontation that for now is limited to Islam and the First World, including the East, to turn it into a confrontation between the First World and the totality of existing collectives.

(31)

Maintaining the price of a barrel of petroleum at a level between \$1.20 and \$1.80 for seventy years in the past century, due to the Machiavellian politics of the First World oil companies and now when the use of combustion and fuel is questioned and, though timidly, a search for alternative energy sources has begun, coinciding with the alarm as regards global warming due to a lack of CO2 reserves, the manipulation of forced prices and oscillations that can multiply the price of a product in the span of half a century by one hundred, oscillations that are allowed by circumstances that are favourable to manufacturers or consumers, speak of a change contrary to the one provoked by OPEC. We would return to the situation at the beginning of the sixties in the last century when, due to a set of circumstances now predictable in the short term, the drastic drop in the consumption of petroleum would ruin the petroleum producing countries.

In the First World, we are seeing that the consequences of these economic policies can be dealt with. It wouldn't be the same in all the petroleum producing countries that are, for the most part, Muslim. Westerners and Asians that now play this game, can't argue that OPEC's pragmatism must also be responded to pragmatically, taking advantage of favourable circumstances to progress towards a greater rhythm of energy at low cost.

But this isn't pragmatism. It's a mistake. It's Machiavellian. And Machiavelli was right when he advised the prince according to the circumstances that one and the other experienced. It was when there was no project for the future because there couldn't be one. And now there isn't either, but there could be one. In the current circumstances, the project for the future isn't just to have peace in

the world. It is to make the evolutionary process more stable and dynamic, getting past the Darwinian algorithm, looking for a plan precisely to get rid of Machiavellianism.

The monopolistic alternative provided by the producers and consumers of petroleum, must come from an understanding of the parts. The West is in a position to provoke that. Establishing a plan without lowering productivity, the energy savings as a prioritized objective, and keeping in mind that saving depends, more than any other factor, on putting the brakes on an increase in world population and, as much as possible, which it is to a large extent - slowly decreasing it.

Calculations are made as to the necessities of all the essential elements for the well-being of the world's population, when China moves from the Second World to the First, there will be an addition of one thousand, five hundred million Chinese. The calculation of the necessities of the world population is necessary given the prevision that there will be four thousand, five hundred million people added to the First World. For a global calculation of general consumption - and particularly energy consumption - it is not important to define a space of years so that these predictions are met. It makes no difference if it is a century or less or two centuries. The big problem is not one of simple proportions of factors only determined by the number of current and future consumers. There is the unknown factor of the consumption of each one of them, of an energy consuming consumer society, to the point that the economy of consumption will possibly end up being more decisive than the means of production.

A worn out political system cannot consider possible decisions for this type of issues. And they certainly cannot be made by multinational companies that are subject to the peremptory market laws, which are to obtain immediate benefits. The solution is not the elimination of the market system. In the case of petroleum, it is not easy to obtain positive results without destroying it. It's also inevitable given that, if not now, without waiting another seventy years, it is possible that before this term runs out, due to the increase in expected consumerism, and to the scarcity of deposits for economic exploitation, the situation will be forced when there is no possibility of exchanging technology for peace between the world in general and the petroleum producing countries that are run according to the Koran. The drop to a greater misery in the Arab and Islamic world would be catastrophic for the whole world. Providing incentives to change energy sources is surely a worthwhile investment in the not-too-long term. Japan is a country that is making a major effort towards this objective and West has yet to get organized to be at the necessary level to revolutionise the world economy the way it revolutionised petroleum in the twentieth

century, not substituting it and working intensely to confirm the good perspectives of alternative energy sources, although this may demand a large economic investment for research and testing on a large scale. Not by announcing it, but with the initiation of a world plan to reconvert energy - more possible than star wars at the time this was addressed - would be another cold war with a guarantee of victory for the entire world and not just for some parts.

One final reflection: supposing that the total reserves of liquid and gas fuel were, at the beginning of the twentieth century, five times what they are now - which is to suppose a lot - at the actual rate of consumption and supposing what that rate will be in the current century, it is evident that the necessity to look for alternative fuel sources in order to avoid wars due to a lack of vital space in the twentieth century, in the twenty-first century, this will happen due to a lack of energy, an essential factor today in the evolutionary process.

The oft-repeated idea that in the twenty-first century, there will be a revolution by means of the exploitation of silicon in computer sciences stems from a hypothesis that raises some serious doubts. It isn't that computer sciences and the attached technical areas of calculating and research have already completed this path. Artificial intelligence is still in the developing stages. But equipping these areas, even taking them to the four corners of the Earth, will not produce even a gram of material. Development and well-being demand raw materials, real or substituted, and nutrients. And also elements of transformation - silicon is of great use here in achieving economies of this type.

The need to resolve the petroleum problem is one of the very few that is easy to resolve through direct action and, what's more, to obtain positive results for other related problems, such as various aspects of ecology. But not even as such can the solution, inevitable in the long or short term, be applied strictly through oil companies that have prospered since 1970 and now belong to a large range of countries. These countries have their own interests and different and opposing points of view as concerns the problem in general, as we have seen in the war in Iraq. The multinational companies that have their own particular challenge in coordinating their shares without giving up benefits in the order of a volume which is similar to the present volume need an objective of a higher human interest. They can have one. By anticipating the certain change in energy production. By allowing for that change instead of placing obstacles in its way.

EVOLUTION AND THE SPIRIT OF AN AGE

The historical philosopher knows that Minerva's bat takes flight when the sun sets and when Philosophy turns grey upon grey, then a life figure ages and, with grey upon grey, does not allow itself to become younger, only wiser. And knowing in conformity with knowledge. But the historical philosopher knows that his task also consists in, with an apparent contradiction, learning about time in thought. This, at least, according to an important and noble voice in Western philosophy.

Naturally when Hegel taught this way in his *Philosophy of Right*, he thought in terms of the totality, whose determinations today we are apt to conceive of according to a lot of different aspects and, at the same time, separated. One of these aspects is the ideal global horizon of an epoch. I began a systematic study of Darwin's thinking some years ago, motivated by the persuasion that, contrary to the simplistic representations of the "end of ideologies", and moreover of *La fine della storia* and the plausibility of an inclination towards a thought that was only "weak", the figure and work of Darwin would have achieved a growing importance, to the point of occupying a central position with respect to the ideal of our time. Transversally regarding many disciplinary subdivisions and the simple opposition between mundane knowledge and religion. An important part of contemporary scientific, historical, philosophical and theological production, I believe, confirms the centrality of which I had become convinced. That is, of the centrality recovered by the author of that "considerable revolution" in the act of Western thought that Sigmund Freud has characterised as the second greatest contribution to the humiliation of human narcissism¹.

Of the whole of Darwinian renaissance in the last decades of the twentieth century and of the first years of the twenty-first, it is probably impossible to establish a precise *thematic periodisation*.

One of the important themes of this renaissance appears to be represented in this statement by Jürgen Habermas: "The volatile cocktail of Darwinism and liberalism that had spread between the 19th and 20th centuries, under the protection of *pax Britannica*, seems today to be reborn under the sign of globalised liberalism."²

From this representation - if we had to consider it an exhaustive one - I would not consider it decisive to flatten all of contemporary Darwinism in favour of a more or less classic social

1) 2) page 306

Darwinism from the end of the 19th century or beginning of the 20th. Such a flattening can be against the existence of a contemporary Darwinism that is reflected in man as a moral subject and the existence of authors who find the reasons for liberal thought, laity and social responsibility in the works of Darwin. This is what I have objected to in my works of 2002 and 2004³. In the latter work in particular (and this time in agreement with Habermas), I have taken on the principle of genetic chance as a principle of symmetry in the “lack of availability” of people and, as a result, as a guarantee of freedom.

However, I will say that while in recent years the ideal confrontation has been referred to above all in its moral aspect, be it in the strict sense or in the more or less human sense, (parallel to morality as a science of human nature in general) afterwards, a different nuance has prevailed. It is important to note that the category of chance has acquired a growing excellence and contrary to this, the idea of a theologically reflected nature, based at the same time, on a vision of right dictated by religion. *Darwinism, theology, natural right*. I will deal with this aspect in the following pages.

1.) While envy of physics is a neurosis that can be found among disciplines dubbed as bland - Richard Rorty recently wrote in an article in *MicroMega* - envy of philosophy can be found in those that boast of their own difficulty. “The latter think that their greater rigour authorises them to assume the role that philosophers and other humanists held before - like that of cultural critic, moral guide, guardian of rationality and prophet of the new utopia. Humanists, sustain these scientists, only have opinions, while scientists possess knowledge”.

The scientists that Rorty is referring to are biologists, evolutionary psychologists and especially authors in fields which combine various disciplines, currently known as cognitive sciences. That which philosophers such as Ortega and Gasset and other humanists doubt - he says - is the possibility that the work of these scientists will be able to provide “that which we appropriately call a theory of human nature, given that a theory of this type should indicate the type of person we should become”. Meanwhile it is difficult to imagine that the work that was once developed “a priori and badly” by philosophers could now be done “a posteriori and well” by scientists and that the objectives once desired or achieved by philosophy and by religion could now satisfy by means of evolutionary biology and the corresponding cognitive sciences.

What is clear is the idea that it is not possible individually in some scientifically disciplined environment to elaborate a thought or

3) page 306

theory as regards the nature of man as an *essence* to which behaviours and attitudes would have to culturally correspond: a thought or theory endowed precisely with a norm in character that were somehow ontologically founded. For Rorty, as “for historical philosophers” such as Ortega and Gasset, “there is no essence” to know or to recognize. “The unhappy idea that philosophy can reveal the difference between nature and convention and between what is essential in order to be a man and that it is only a product of historical circumstances has passed from Greek philosophy to luminosity. [...] But in the past two centuries, the idea that underneath all the cultural layers is hidden something called human nature and that this knowledge provides a valid moral or political guide has fallen precisely in discredit”⁴.

However, for Rorty, what is important with these issues is the conservation of a space in which to philosophise, not as the generic safeguard of an ancient practice, but as a continuation of the activity that asks and looks for answers to that which science cannot respond. Science does not have any moral or metaphysical implications given that it does not preach anything about what is real and what is truly valid. This “allows us to do things that before we were not in any condition to do [...] have acquired the capacity of putting forth new means”. When one preaches a *general* sense of positiveness and exclusivity, science opposes the philosophy that converts an apparently disenchanted vision into a conclusive affirmation, but in reality substantially closed, anti-historic; that is to say conservative in the sense of immobile.

In the essay *In Search of Human Nature: The Decline and Revival of Darwinism in American Social Thought*, Carl Degler⁵ offers a good narration of the attempts by biologists to occupy the terrain left free by philosophers. Finally, following the argument about the old dispute between *nature* vs. *nurture*, he concludes that “subscribing to what Pinker calls holistic interactionism” and Steven Pinker, in particular his work *The Blank Slate*⁶, assumes and expresses for Rorty an exemplary position: they sustain that scientific discoveries “give us reasons to adopt what he calls “a tragic vision” better than “a utopic vision” of human life - not trusting the capacity of men to transform themselves into new and better beings”.⁷ And Charles Darwin - the author whom Pinker, like many others, places

4) 5) 6) 7) page 306

himself close to, in a position of continuity and pursuit - has caused, without a doubt, an important break in the way in which we see ourselves, from the moment in which he did not believe in philosophical and religious theses of a divergence between the genuinely human part and the immaterial and the part which is merely animalistic and material. "But no teaching of Darwin's is worth the distinction between what we can assimilate from biological experiments and what we can learn only through history - a register of the intellectual and social experiments of the past".⁸

In spite of this judgement, Rorty takes Darwin to the inside of history in a greater philosophical degree and he recognizes his contribution and a way of thinking which is essentially philosophical. I believe this is important and completely shared. The historicism that Rorty refers to "is by all means due - he says - to a particular scientist", precisely Charles Darwin. His critics, Rorty reminds us, and with words that remind us of the pages by Freud that I've mentioned before

"They said that it had been reduced to the level of beasts, but in fact it has helped us to have the original audacity of a casual force comparable to genetic mutation. This has reinforced the historicism of Herder and Hegel, making us consider cultural evolution in the same way as biological evolution - both capable of creating something radically new and better. It has helped poets such as Tennyson and Whitman and thinkers such as Nietzsche, H. G. Wells, Geroge Bernard Shaw and John Dewey to dream of utopias in which men could be as surprisingly different from us as we are with respect to the Neanderthal man".⁹

With this *analytical* profile, we mainly find two theses that may require a reflection regarding this contribution.

The first is contained in the affirmation that Darwin, with Herder's and Hegel's historicism reinforced, has led us to consider "cultural evolution *in the same way as biological evolution*". If this comparative statement were understood even as an indication of a priority, then common sense would be modified - referring to one of the fundamental aspects of the Darwinian revolution. That is to say, the act of taking the historical dimension in the construction of "histoire naturelle", and that this leads us to consider natural evolution *in the same way as cultural evolution*. Or, in a more rigorous way, the fact that it changes categories from irreversibility into a macroscopic phenomenon, from the limited time of duration and, as an end in and of itself, but also as the beginning of a given

8) 9) page 306

duration from categories that can't be avoided, even systematically. With the comparison of Darwin's, conscious heir and, therefore, continuer of James Hutton and Charles Lyell's uniformitarianism, it is possible to precisely adopt the classic philosophy concerning history (based on *Quadro filosofico del progressi successivi dell'intelletto umano* by A. R. J. Turgot¹⁰ up to the *Lezioni* by Hegel concerning this argument: philosophy based on the difference between the cumulative evolution of intellectual capacities, of the abilities of the spirit and of conscious thought regarding freedom on the one hand and the repetitiveness and morphological identity of natural production on the other.

The second thesis is made up of the attribution of the work of Darwin, of the capacity to be provocative or at least susceptible to inscribing itself in a "utopian", not "tragic" vision of the world. This is naturally sustainable, keeping in mind the historical and transmuting event, in and of itself, and even the Darwinian recognition of the origin of a sense of duty and a moral sense¹¹. One thesis - admitting the classical acceptance of tragedy as a conflict between *unequal forces and equal reasons* - is presented as being contradictory to the representation of Darwin as an author with a vision of a living nature, capable of conceiving of a "devil's chaplain"¹² as his works illustrate, given that after *Viaggio della Beagle* (for example with references to slavery in Brazil¹³). The categories of tragic and principles of freedom are not mutually exclusive.

On the other hand, one can object to Rorty's meagre ability to persuade when it comes to the assertion that "the idea that human nature is hidden beneath all cultural layers and that knowledge of human nature acts as a valid political and moral guide. This idea has been discredited. When speaking of Rorty's meager ability to persuade, I am not referring to "precisely" (or, at least, to a personal conviction); rather to the exhaustibility of the assertion in the *state of things*. Just as in Italy, some have been presented¹⁴ with the name of Edward O. Wilson (Rorty himself quotes him and places him next to Pinker), the title of his work *Sociobiology. The New*

10) 11) 12) 13) 14) page 306

Synthesis, in the year of its publication, 1975, was the beginning of an unfinished era. An era in which a panorama of absence has not been configured, nor of silence, nor has it been “discredited”; rather, its presence has varied. A period that is conceivable as a painting in which, apart from the pendulum of Darwinism described by Degler, a parabola appears, or even a *loop* in Darwin’s work. In the beginning, support for a thought is invoked, that according to convention, we could call conservative and, after being rejected by this, and a straight segment along whose straight lines we can find the form of *naturalism* in more points, so argued by some as a recycled proposal and revindicated by others.

Biology, in its various branches and ramification, primate ethnology, from the examination essentially selfish and sympathetic to the reflection on the capacity of language with respect to music¹⁵, Neo-Darwinism in the sense of “new synthesis”, Darwin’s works, they are the disciplinary fields, the lines of investigation, the author who nourishes, unlike other naturalisms, *contemporary naturalism*, and which the critics of biological reductionism direct themselves to in this controversy, continually proposed again and again, about nature and culture and culture and nature and reason. Grounds where ideas about the origin of ethics clash and grounds for hegemonies to clash - of lay inspiration and of diverse religious derivation.

2.) In the same *Almanacco di Filosofia*, Carlo Augusto Viano directs an historical, critical glance at the history of the superation of the “nightmare of nature” from the end of the 19th century to the present¹⁶. “At the end of the 19th century - he says - it did not seem that there would be a season favourable to naturalism”. At the same time, science and philosophy had “purified” the idea of nature to the point of reducing it to an intellectual order, which Kant positioned in a lower plane to that of reason. This different disposition was reflected in the Humboldt university project. Precisely in the German universities, the development of scientific and technical knowledge had consumed the Kantian domestication of nature. After the French defeat in 1870, it was Nietzsche who firmly pushed against the reduction of ancient knowledge to philology, of religion to theology, of knowledge about nature to laboratory knowledge. He looked for “life”, which he found even in books by evolutionists. If the submission of life to mechanical laws now seemed impossible, one could take the pragmatic route in a science conceived not as pure knowledge or as the construction of an object; rather, as an instrument of action. The road begun is the same road laid out by

15) 16) page 307

Jaspers, Husserl and Heidegger and by a cultural anthropology willing to support the methodological principle as the primacy of culture over nature.

However, this road forked in various analogical directions, in the critical direction towards a modern culture, and paths have been walked that lead to speak of a “return to nature”.

On the one hand, nature has not been represented only through biology. In an atmosphere of “nostalgia for the past”, between Margurgo and Friburgo, Leo Strauss, for example had matured: critical with modern society, of the type of mathematical, empirical knowledge that had taken over, of the theology that this had generated. In reality, not that distant from the critics of modernism argued by Horkheimer and Adorno and by the philosophies of “crisis”. Or even - I consider that they can be added - by philosophies of “decadence”, like the one that, at first, fooled Thomas Mann.¹⁷ Strauss has tried to recover the tradition version of the law of nature, removing it from the “improbable marriage between natural law and a mechanical interpretation of nature”¹⁸.

On the other hand, even many religious confessions, over time, have adopted the theory of evolution, interpreting it as a story whose result has been the appearance of man: a being that is and continues to be distinct, due to constitution, from everything that has gone before. Traditional Christian theology, in particular, Catholic - that for a long time had expressed reservations regarding the doctrine of human rights, considered an inheritance of naturalism and liberalism - has led an authentic and just recovery of nature as a source of rules.

With their thoughts directed towards other areas, scientists who are sensitive to theoretical confrontation and conscious of their own cultural predisposition, surely we won't speak of the *return* of nature. Rather, we will speak of an *extension of the theoretical field* on the part of authors who have already criticised the rigid nature-culture opposition framed according to Neo-Darwinian parameters and intonation, authors who have contributed to converting the figure and work of Charles Darwin into a “collective”¹⁹ event, as Italo Svevo would say, in the final decades of the twentieth century. An example of this is the work by N. Eldredge, *Perché lo facciamo. Il gene egoista e il sesso*²⁰. The controversial verse, “fixation with the

17) 18) 19) 20) page 307

selfish gene”, supported on the other hand by a type of principle of continuity that brings to mind, transferred in the dimension of time, a type of continuism, almost nominalism, sometimes hidden by Darwin²¹, this work constitutes a comprehensive representation of a plurality of behaviours in such a way that the complexity of cultural behaviours doesn’t contradict itself, but which can even be considered a natural evolution. If one considers having to adopt an explicative, principal and general category, suggests Eldredge, this can be *economy* as the “management of energy with the outcome of survival”, given that an *alternative* of behaviours is observed in individuals separately - selfish beings dedicated to individual survival, altruists dedicated to other individuals and cooperatives dedicated to safeguarding what is just. We may wonder if this implies a revision of the traditional idea of economy as, primarily, time and saving time. This certainly leads Eldredge to conclude that it makes no sense to appeal to a presumed Nature to justify religious, social or political institutions.

However, the essay by Viano draws us closer to the more recent protagonism by exponents of Christian confessions in the debate about characters and the acceptability of the evolutionist theory in general and Darwinian theory in particular. Even when some interpretations of evolution have considered species as a whole closed, different from real leaps, the difference between the human species and other animal species has become a normal biological feature, devoid of implication and philosophical and religious meaning. On the other hand, religious confessions, still holding onto the theory of evolution in one way or the other conceive of a final, hierarchical order in nature to establish a separation between the human species and other animal species, either by projecting the hierarchical doctrine of beings over evolutionary history, or conceiving of a restitution of natural evolution as a detailed description of the Biblical story, or sustaining that the evolutionary process as a whole is carrying out an “intelligent project” whose culmination is man. “It’s about indirectly validating the notion of the soul without directly naming it”²².

3.) The word “soul” and later annotation by Viano regarding the “incompleteness of human beings”²³ brings up the theme of adaptability that is peculiar to man. The theme of adaptability in

21) 22) 23) page 307

man, given a cultural consideration and symbolic forms, can be inscribed in an openly declared naturalism and demanded as such.

In an article published with the title, *Tuto ci dice che Darwin aveva ragione*²⁴, severely critical with the ideology of *Intelligent Design*, Luca and Francesco Cavall-Sforza propose again that the nucleus of Darwinian theory is natural selection and place the idea of *cultural* evolution in linear sequence. In the new sentences from the defenders of the Intelligent Project, we can observe that they feel a certain affinity for the old deductive chains of the *Natural Theologians* in William Paley, who had fascinated Darwin during a certain time²⁵ - this article objects that it isn't necessary to invoke divine intervention to explain the complexity of life and all its form, each one of them so perfect and so perfectly adapted to the most diverse "planetary environments". Darwinian theory is accountable in the first place of the very possibility of evolution and later in the way that this takes place. "Each new DNA would be identical to its father's if it weren't for scarce, occasional mistakes, mutations that bring about change and make evolution possible". They make it possible because the condition of existence of each individual, including the one that has mutated, is interaction with the environment. However, the environment changes continually and only that which adapts to the environment in which existence takes place can continue living. "Natural selection acts in this way, automatically filtering [...] the types that are better able to survive and reproduce, environment after environment and circumstance after circumstance. [,,,) live species evolve under the impulse of chance (since mutation is totally by chance) and of necessity (since environmental conditions change due to the action of forces that are not under the direct control of live species)". Perhaps an apparent paradox, "the combined action of mutation and natural selection is an almost intelligent design, given that a lot of waste naturally exists, an infinity of tries and many failures".

While this essay as to how evolution happens may sound like Jacques Monod's²⁶ famous quote, the "infinity of attempts" locution, perhaps it alludes or at least goes back to the thought and also to François Jacob's²⁷ natural *do-it-yourself*. In any case, "it is the almost intelligent or semi-intelligent category of the project here

24) 25) 26) 27) page 307 - 308

that appears to sustain - it can also be read in an article by Cavalli-Sforza - cultural evolution. Also this mechanism of evolution is a product of biological evolution. In fact, it is present in all superior animals, though it has not reached the level in any animal that it has reached in man thanks, above all, to language, which has allowed for a more advanced communication". But if this category seems to also make up the base of a unique possible "conciliation" for scientific naturalism - for which the answer to the question of sense, which is a question about theodicy should, in consequence, be of the dominion of religious conviction and faith - continuity represented in this way later finds a *difference* that it proposes again, if not a natural theology, then one part intention and finality. In this part, on the other hand, this *do-it-yourself* is less and less a *do-it-yourself* and more and more, there are set procedures. Given that there are also cultural mutations. And "*for the majority, cultural mutations are desired and directed mutations with a purpose in mind*, while biological mutations are not directed at a better result, but are determined by chance".²⁸

4.) In this way, however, the scene gets complicated. It gets complicated because this difference includes the possibility that the interaction between the organism and the environment will be modified and, as a result, the representation must be modified. Up to what point can the environment be considered the object of an analogue of *natural selection* and from what point of view must it be considered the object of an analogue, however, from the point of view of *under domestication* selection? And then things get complicated by the fact that - observed Samuel Johnson in his *Dizionario della lingua inglese*, referring to synonyms - "few ideas have many names", so that names "often have many ideas" and words within the vicissitudes of history, taking on new ideas, changing the prevalent meaning (where it even happens where the meaning of a word at time tends to coincide with that of another) and the original meaning, which is only analytical, at times gets added to the evaluative meaning.

And so it has been with *evolution* and *progress*. The naturalism of the Darwinian theory of evolution can be presented - and is presented, for example to Amartya Sen²⁹ - as a type of spontaneous progress that the work of government instructed in nature by man must oppose. Political economists have gone back to Darwin more than once for inspiration. In this case, he is considered more as a controversial speaker. "The Darwinian prospective, understood as a general vision of progress, suggests centring

28) 29) page 308

attention more on the adaptation of species than on adjusting the environment in which species live". But those who think that the Darwinian vision of progress can give an adequate understanding of *progress in general* should consider the problem, among others, of the "limits of genetic manipulation through selective breeding. As a world vision, this perspective of progress must battle it out with implications that are contrary to the values that we find important, including autonomy and freedom". The premise of this vision of progress and its critical imputation is obviously the interpretation of what Darwin called the "view of life". If one keeps a general religious *Weltanschauung* in mind - from a creationist religion - the most radical aspect of Darwinism concerns the negation of a "simultaneous design of creation for all species". However it is important to point out - says Sen - that Darwin's interest is directed towards a "vision of progress as a spontaneous, unplanned order". Even the notion of *order* - I believe should be pointed out - can be understood in different ways. It can be understood as the representation of a disposition or a sequence of elements or events that serves as an explanation of its correlation, without any intention of preaching something effectively real. Or it can be understood as the representation of a set of elements or events, translated in its totality, made of determinations and relations found in the feasibility of what's real. This second ontological form of understanding seems to be that of Sen's. The Darwinism that he has in mind - as opposed to - a doctrine of *planned* order is the Darwinism of eugenetics, or of Galton, or of Elisabeth Nietzsche.

The idea of a spontaneous order, progressively and conclusively attained from a certain disorder or a conflictive and disjointed appearing chaos, seems to me to adhere more to a Smith-like³⁰ political economy than to a Darwinian representation of the legality of a living nature: a representation that is not diminished by the conclusive statement in the *Origin of Species*³¹, that seems to go back more to a feeling of *sublimity* than to theology or theism³². Among Darwin's readers, one of the greatest geneticists, Marcelo Buiatti³³ speaks about the rest, the benevolent *disorder* of nature. Now Sen presents us with a Darwin who subscribes to the tradition of an economic-political nature driven forward, the author of a silence

30) 31) 32) 33) page 308

as regards the transforming praxis, inspired by a substantial acquiescence, even when its appearance is an operative one. The Darwinian vision of order and progress, he tells us, can be directed in two different directions. One proposes and pursues genetic selection, an act which projects and promises better adaptability. The other suggests a passive confidence toward the spontaneity of order, progress and adaptation. Both share a silence as regards the possibility of aligning the world with objectives that satisfy the needs of man. Both produce the same results following the same judgement as regards progress, which is based on the nature of species instead of on the type of existence implied by them. “Springing from the shared base typical of Darwinism, the activist vision leans towards genetic manipulation; the more passive vision suggests confidence in nature. Neither of these two leads us to better the world in which we live”. And this cannot happen because in the depths of Darwin’s work, we find the work of Malthus, this “authentic and peculiar “guru”, says Sen, as an inspiration for Darwin and for the theory of evolution.

5.) The Malthus that we’re dealing with here in this representation by Amartya Sen, certainly isn’t the author who unexpectedly, but decisively, suggests assuming the *Standpunkt* in a “way” in order to write *Zoonomia* realistically, not speculatively, but conceives of a legality of living nature that doesn’t simply repeat the idea of transmutation put forth by grandfather Erasmus: certainly an evolutionist idea, but still linked with the beginning of the final cause or, at least, the First Great Cause, of the Cause of Causes. To summarise, it is not the author that leads to thought: “doing the same for the way that Malthus shows to be the final effect (however, by way of will) of this populousness as regards the energy of man” that therefore leads to representing that “a force exists like one hundred thousand wedges that try to force their entry into any type of structure that is convenient in the voids of natural economy or even to form voids by throwing out the weak” and to conclude that it is necessary to speak of a final cause, “the final cause of this compartmentalising “ may only be this: “to select a structure that is convenient and adapt it to change”³⁴. The Malthus that is critical with Godwin, Condorcet and other authors is distinct, as can be seen in the subtitle of the first *Saggio sul principio di popolazione*; the Malthus of doctrine transferred to the animal and vegetable kingdoms, as noted in Darwin’s introduction in chapter III of *The Origen of Species*³⁵; the pointer of a Darwin who was already known,

34) 35) page 308

although criticised by Marx, but also appreciated by Marx and by Engels, that doesn't accept the founding contribution to theistic criticism right away.³⁶

Today, this Malthus represents the theory of natural inequality between the two "powers" - that of land production and that of population production - and the law of nature that maintains its effects in balance through a vibratory movement, an oscillation of phases, altering the "retrograde and progressive movements": a law "which pervades all animated nature"³⁷. This is the best possible theoretical Malthus as opposed to the theses of perfectibility³⁸. However this Malthus - we can object to Sen - isn't a generically *passive* theoretician in comparison with external nature, a nature that is so far removed from the good nature of physiocratic theoreticians and hereafter thought of under the sign of decreasing output. This is the theoretical change from a *subordinated labouring* to a *natural* one, externally imposed by man. As a reader and interlocutor of the "archdeacon Paley"³⁹, it is also Malthus who naturally asks for as much as he offers, after religion - in this labouring, in religion's constrictions - the argument to justify evil. He is an exponent, in the strict sense, even formal, of a sense of religion and religion which Darwin conclusively confronts in the chapter *Religious Belief* in his own *Autobiography*: he is opposed to the terrain of the horizon in the sense of "suffering"⁴⁰, as he is to the terrain of the "personal" and "intelligent"⁴¹ work of God in the making of the universe of life. Or of the terrain - to use Ure's metaphor transferred from the organic world to the inorganic - of an "intelligent agency" in the construction of this universe⁴². And this God is the God of the Church of England, in which the Darwins from Charles's generation were "baptised and confirmed"⁴³. It is that of

36) 37) 38) 39) 40) 41) 43) page 308 - 309

the God of the old argument of “designnature”⁴⁴, that today is represented, not only in the creed of various Protestant *denominations*, but also in the declaration of faith and reason of some accredited exponents of Catholicism.

6.) Following these declarations, the framework shows us more or less clearly than what one could imagine *a priori*. Some of these have been persistently critical comments by Telmo Pievani. Referring to the theses sustained by Cardinal Schönborn in an article that appeared in the “New York Times” in July of 2005, this affirms that “the Cardinal of Vienna, disregarding the indications of the former pontiff, defines Darwinian theory as an ideological falsehood and adheres to the theory of Intelligent Design, sustained by the American right”⁴⁵. In reality, it isn’t so much a supposed dialogue between faith and knowledge, as it is a negative behaviour with respect to science that Pievani deals with from the point of view of contemporary epistemology. “The ‘rehabilitation’ of Darwin by Pope Wojtyła in 1996 was based on an exceptional argument: we explain the natural world by means of selection, but we make an exception for the “ontological leap” that gives rise to the human spirit”. However, the difference between Schönborn and Wojtyła, believing that such rehabilitation meant the fall of “any incompatibility between evolution and the Catholic magistry” would be a mistake: it wouldn’t take into consideration the fact that “the radical naturalism of Darwin is not a materialistic interpretation of evolution, but is *the theory of evolution*. On the one hand, the same naturalist reductionism in which Darwin’s thinking is forced by some is amply unfounded: this “teaches us as a human species that through culture we are also capable of ‘disobeying’ the fundamental evolutionary laws such as natural selection”.

That which in Cavalli-Sforza appears as a *difference* within continuity, appears in Pievani as a *discontinuity* in the realisation of a law. While this reading of Darwin isn’t new, after such “disobedience”, “dialectical development” is repeated, the “reverse effect” of evolution proposed by Patrick Tort⁴⁶, the one who stated that Darwin’s naturalism isn’t an interpretation, but “is the theory of evolution”, is a strong statement that subscribes to the concept in the very idea of science. Just like Copernicus’ heliocentric theory or Einstein’s theory of relativity, the theory from which continents

44) 45) 46) page 309

spring, Darwin's evolutionary theory, is an explanatory framework which has obtained so many confirmations from observations and experiments that have been carried out - David Quammen has written in *Le prove dell'evoluzione sono schiacciati* - and should be considered a fact.

"This is what scientists understand by the term "theory"; not some fantastic speculation, but an explanatory statement that matches available data. And until conflicting data regarding this emerges or until an adequate explanation is proposed, this should be considered the best explanation of reality"⁴⁷.

It is coherent with a similar idea supported by Pievani: the authentic relation that one can sensibly speak of is not the "clash" between science and faith, but between "a dogmatic reason and a fallible reason that is confronted by empirical evidence". Considered with current eyes, Darwin's long reasoning⁴⁸ has all the typically scientific traits of a plausible framework, with its potential confutations than an article of faith will ever have".

When one considers Darwin's long reasoning⁴⁹ with present-day eyes, one can see that it has all the appropriately scientific traits of a "plausible framework, with the potential confutation that an article of faith will never have". The explanatory power of Darwinian theory is, on the contrary, so strong that scientists have learned to newly evaluate intuition as regards the "always somewhat 'imperfect' character of the adaptations that have led to understanding organisms as the fruit of contingent arrangements between structural links and external pressures. This is another confutation - concludes Pievani - that is less known, but not less effective than any other design"⁵⁰.

7.) Once more, so much depends on the meaning of words. If the creation of the universe and the Intelligent Project are objects of faith, by definition, these are not susceptible to *confutation* by means of tests and empirical evidence. Events and experiences could lead to not respecting faith. If the product of Design is not thought out according to a projection of human *perficere* - if when faced

47) 48) 49) 50) page 309

with “the beautiful hinge of a bivalve shell - one abstains from considering how “the hinge of a door” that has been made by man, as exemplified by Darwin to argue that, on the contrary, against the *protectionism of the human project* within nature’s intelligence⁵¹ - the project of Intelligence could contemplate these imperfections in the adaptations and that contingency in the arrangements of which Pievani speaks, supposing, naturally, that the speech hasn’t been carried from the theoretical plane to the moral plane, where imperfection is conceived of as a lack of respect, for which one must ask for justification.

Before that, though, just thinking about imperfection, conceiving it as a *lack of respect*, brings up a borderline question. The limit - like *Genze*, as a line of transition “to another genre” - is represented by the idea of understanding “that it has as its base the form of the concept”, such as knowing that according to the classical tradition of “development in line with knowledge”⁵², according to the tradition of *remounting* from the abstract to the concrete, well exemplified in the phrase from the Speech about method in the Introduction to the *Grundrisse*: “that which in inferior animal species alludes to something superior can only be understood if one is already familiar with the superior form. The anatomy of man is a key to the anatomy of monkeys”⁵³. The implication of this tradition is that *theism is the way in which human knowledge is manifested*. So significant and, as a result that has not had an end or a finality and, being conscious of how many “metaphorical expressions” science has scattered, faces the difficulty of not “personifying nature”⁵⁴, of conceiving of her as an object that exists before and outside of thought.

However, in logical abstract terms one can find a conciliation between faith in a creator God at the beginning of the universe and evolutionism: it is the terrain of the conciliation between Darwinism and Natural Theology identified by Huxley in the work, *On the Reception of the Origin of Species*, written for the first edition of *The Life and Letters of Charles Darwin*, a work by his son, Francis⁵⁵.

Let us admit the simple meaning according to the doctrine of Genesis, says Huxley; let us accept the idea that if does not profess

51) 52) 53) 54) 55) page 309-310

to be more than it really is, i.e. a simple “repository” of venerable traditions, that does not pretend to have any scientific authority. And let us admit for knowledge of nature, her no less simple meaning, the mere knowledge of nature. Then the mind is free to recognize that Darwinian theory has not substituted anything extrinsic in nature or supernatural or theological, to the concept of a living nature whose categories had been, up to that point, those of a providential vision. Assuming that variations are produced by chance, Darwin has not reintroduced another divinity, a new divinity - or an old divinity, the old pagan divinity of Chance in the place of a “Providential Design”. It is enough to remember the assumption of uniformity and the regularity of the course of nature in past times, the so-called Uniformitarianism. And it is enough to remember how Darwin warned that *spontaneity* preached about certain phenomenon does not mean anything other than ignorance of causes that are defined as “spontaneous”. Sensibly, no one can believe that “things occur in the universe without a reason or without cause” or think that any event “could not have been foreseen by anyone with enough intelligence about the order in nature”. What is not a problem to admit is that science is based on an act of faith that makes it possible: the confession of validity at all times and in all circumstances of the “law of cause”⁵⁶.

So here is the classic borderline theme of the random reconstruction chain that is proposed by Huxley and that can be found in the conceptual framework of the original Newtonian, mechanical-celestial inspiration⁵⁷ that is attributed to Darwin. This framework, in which *chance* doesn't belong to natural reality, but to human intellect, becomes, for Huxley, a framework in which Darwin's thought and Natural Theology are reconciled, given that Natural Theology has been for Huxley the framework of a reconciliation between Morphology and the less banal and rough forms of Theism. In an essay about the *Genealogia degli animali* published in “The Academy” in 1869, Huxley has argued that while the doctrine of evolution is the most formidable “oppose” of all the “more common and coarse” forms of Theism, the Darwinian doctrine of evolution is the terrain where Theism and Morphology can be “reconciled”. This type of Theism believes that for every determined morphological structure, the doctrine of evolution has dealt a mortal blow to the current function of the reason for existence and original destiny. However, “there is a wider theism that has not been mentioned by the doctrine of Evolution, but which is based on the

56) 57) page 310

fundamental proposition of Evolution. This proposition is that the entire world, living or non-living, is the result of mutual interaction according to predetermined laws of the forces that belong to molecules that made up the original nebulous matter of the universe. If this is true, it is no less true that the world that currently exists potentially existed in the cosmic vapour and that a sufficient intelligence could have predicted, based on knowledge of the molecules in that vapour, for example, the state of British fauna in 1869 with the same certainty with which one can say what will happen with someone's breath on a cold winter morning"⁵⁸.

This Theism, wider in scope, isn't a proposition of the idea of finality - for the individual organism or for a part or for organisms in general - but an assertion of the predictability of origins, of the same principle of the universe. Understood this way, Theism isn't a term that refers to the opposition of the mechanism of finality as an opposition to necessity and ignorance on the part of an inanimate nature towards intentionality, in any sense, or of will (or "volition") on the part of living organisms. And the first person who might superimpose intentionality as a factor in nature. "The theistic vision and the mechanism of nature are not necessarily mutually exclusive". For that reason, Huxley can institute a "reconciliation", even with William Paley, and can write, with his thoughts looking back to Chapter XXIII of *Natural Theology*: "the subtle champion of Theism, Paley, didn't have any problem admitting that the "production of things" can be the result of a chain of preset mechanical dispositions by intelligent appointment and maintained active by a central power; it should be said that these accept the modern doctrine of Evolution in a proleptical form"⁵⁹.

8). With more than a hundred years' distance, with changes in the prevalent paradigms of science, undetermined, decisive terms in creationism, creation itself and evolution do not seem *a priori* irreparable. Several voices from the church itself have allowed for the imagining of different visions. "When Genesis in the first chapter talks about the origin of the world - wrote Paul Poupard, at the time President of the Pontifical Counsel for Culture - what is interesting is the reading that is presented in these texts. And this is that the universe did not create itself alone and has a creator. But the discussion as to the way in which creation came about has been open for centuries and continues to be open." The way can *consist* in evolution. "One can easily say that there is Creation even if it occurs by means of evolution", says Giuseppe De Rita on that same page

58) 59) page 310

that published the intervention by Poupard⁶⁰. What can perhaps be supported is that faith gets confused with dogmatic reason so that this “evolving form” implies an original predetermination or means, as it would have to literally mean, a series of special interventions from time to time and also have a relative implication in the extinction of species - relative to the object of Darwin’s unsettling reflection in 1836: “Tempted to believe animals created for a definite time, not extinguished by change of circumstances”⁶¹. But the crucial point is this: the difficulty or impossibility for some to firmly maintain the analytical terms of scientific discourse - in which the answer to why is always an answer to *how* and not a *why* question - without the answer to a *sensical question* being on that plane.

In the intervention that I’ve just mentioned, a little before the words about a possible evolving form of creation, De Rita makes a firm point that, in his opinion, is undeniable: the point is “knowing that the origin of the world exists due to an intervention by God and that, therefore, the universe is not the fruit of chance”. This point is also the subject upon which Cardinal Schöborn develops his argument in a piece that appeared under the title *C’è un disegno nell’universo*⁶². The point of this contribution is to bring the motive of faith and the reason of philosophy closer together in a scheme in which support of the vision of the Intelligent Project is not governed only by the relationship between faith and knowledge but that the relationship between intellect and reason also acts: a relationship that - having established a particular characterisation of science - precisely due to this, allows one to escape the question and answer regarding the sense of it all.

Is man simply a product of chance or is he a desired product? Is the world a product of chance or, behind the “fascinating birth and unfolding of the evolution of this world - asks Schöborn - is there sense, is there a plan?” Science has become what we understand it to be today as science through methodical delimitation: it has sought to look for “only what could be measured and counted [leaving out] all the issues that refer to the why of existence, where we come from, where we’re going”. Given that science with its methodical delimitation “does not take in all of reality”, not so much for reasons of faith as “for motive of reason that must be answered: “This is too little”. Human intelligence goes beyond the measurable and

60) 61) 62) page 310

countable. It even reaches as far as the great metaphysical questions to ask why. The reason is in the conditions and recognising the order, sense, connection and [...] *Design* of the universe”.

However limiting this recognition would mean limiting ourselves to a simply deistic position: a position that can be attributed, according to Schönborn, to the Darwin of the second edition of *The Origin of Species*, due to the conclusive statement that affirms the existence of a Creator, but that circumscribes that creator to acting only at the beginning. Now faith in creating, he declared, remembering Thomas Aquinas, “also means always believing that the Creator has not only created, but that he supports, maintains and guides creation to its final goal”. However this opinion becomes discriminatory. The deistic idea implies that God creates something in the beginning that then occasionally repairs elements with individual interventions. In Darwin’s vision, recurring to such interventions is considered superfluous due to the mechanism of evolution. On the other hand, the Creator must be considered as “the great Transcendent and all Immanent”, where everything that exists “can exist only because it is sustained by an Absolute Being”. This *being sustained* cannot be corroborated with the methods and instruments of the natural sciences and “it is a mistake on the part of fundamentalists [...] to think of being able to scientifically verify individual divine interventions”. What should be understood by *Design*; however is that each man can “recognise the light of reason” and the scientist is also a man with reasoning powers, capable of looking beyond the confines of his field of science. “To deny *Design* as a whole would be an abdication of intellect. When we look at the incredible nuances and subtle agreements that regulate the cosmos, reason tells us: “Rationality is at work here”. In this sense my position - concludes Schönborn - does not refer to faith, but to reason. Here, the Church defends reason. Because, as Paul affirms in a letter to the Romans, with the light of human reason, we can recognise the existence of a Reason that is behind all realities”⁶³.

9.) However more or less persuasive and exhaustive the representation that Schönborn offers regarding Darwinian convictions⁶⁴, what is certainly interesting about Schönborn’s intervention is the sought-after distance with regard to “fundamentalists”. But it is, above all, the definition, the delimitation of the embrace of Darwinian thought. An embrace that is defined, delimited, precisely with the difference in the category it indicated, that is truly unsettling and troublesome: random variation.

63) 64) page 310

“Evolution in the sense of common ancestry - says the article published in the “New York Times” in July of 2005 - might be true. But evolution in the neo-Darwinian sense - an unguided, unplanned process of random variation and natural selection - is not”.

If the idea of a process without a guide, without a project of random variation or natural selection, seems to be valid for Schönborn and takes in the partiality of deistic evolution attributed to Darwin - in this way different from the radical naturalism projective attributed to neo-Darwinism, not even Charles Darwin or any other Darwinist theoretician or neo-Darwinist are examined by Emmanuel Carreira Pérez in the article *Scienza E Fede: Caso E progetto* published in “Civiltà Cattolica” in February of 2006.⁶⁵ Only evolution in general is considered here. The initial distancing taken by the “fundamentalist evangelical Americans”⁶⁶ is analogous and also more severe. But more severe, because it was decided in this way, is also the delimitation of the universe on the part of scientific speech, that does not come from a methodological self-confinement, but consists of defining the same projects: “science” in the meaning that we attribute to the term to designate a type of knowledge different from humanistic knowledge, takes care of the “*interactions of the material*”⁶⁷. The transposition of the entire subject to the individual plane of philosophy and theology is also very affirming. No even “chance” or “finality” can be discovered in some experiment and reduced to a number in an equation. However the data and methods, limited by science, leave some like Schönborn unsatisfied⁶⁸. For this reason, the intention of Carreira Pérez is to indicate a “third way”⁶⁹ whose vision of creationism is not deduced from reason, but seems to be based more on the “Anthropical Principle” of Barrow and Tipler⁷⁰. So, on the one hand, within the conception of a world that is animated and inanimate, here it is not about finalism in the organisation of material, but finality in the existence of the cosmos.

65) 66) 67) 68) 69) 70) page 310

On the other hand, the consequential determination already forms part of the definition:

“Authentic creation *necessarily implies an infinite power*, with knowledge of all the unlimited possibilities for creating a universe and the election of parameters for that which is effectively created. This election implies finality”⁷¹.

In this way - as well - reason, in one point of the argument, similarly refers to a proposal by Huxley relative to *spontaneity* - “one could say that “chance” is only a more pleasant term for responding to a question for which we have no answer before saying “because it’s this way”. Carreira Pérez’s reasoning repeats a set of reasons put forth by Huxley concerning the perfect predictability on the part of sufficient intelligence, with an obvious flexion that leads us to think of Giambattista Vico - not concerning what is naturally certain, but what is predictable: “a Creator who has an objective [...] *can and must* choose the initial conditions with full knowledge of the future consequences for having *made* the universe in a special way, even to the deepest part of each particle in nature and the amount of energy of each activity in *each moment of cosmic evolution*”⁷².

10.) Creation, not as a simple act of doing, but as an act with an objective. Existence, not as simple existence, but existence with a purpose. Purpose, not as a determination that becomes the goal of existence, but as the reason for existence. Existence, not simply as existence, but as the result of the will and decision to make something exist, as a necessity for all existences. The answer to the question about why as an answer to the question of sense. An answer given in terms of *for the sake of*; an answer that asks its own question; the formula as a why question that is reflected in analytical terms.

“We are not a random, senseless product of evolution. Each one of us is the fruit of thought of God. Each one of us is wanted, is loved, is necessary”.

If the very Catholic magistrate is a sign of the times, that the barely mentioned words appear in the *Omelia della Santa Messa per l’inizio del Ministero del Sommo Pontefice Benedetto XVI*, it is more than a little transcendental. The very fact that it is presented as an

71) 72) page 310

expression of the *Spirit of the Age*, as William Hazlitt⁷³ titled it, of the spirit of the age. A spirit marked, on the one hand, by a new necessity of *foundation* that looks for and finds in nature, at least in the nature of man, the first place of certainty. And marked, on the other hand, by a reaffirmed courage of the intellect that contemplated nature as someone notorious should be known, that wants to understand her in her *autonomy* that does not suppose that existence is an end in itself and that doesn't even conceive of other existences, their varieties, their variations as an existence for man. That emblematically reasons this way, how it continues.

Imagine an architect who has to construct a building without using cut stones, without choosing from the base of a precipice, wedge-shaped stones to build domes, oblong stones for the construction of architraves, flat stones for the roof. We admire his skill and consider him the driving force behind the final result. The form of the stone fragments at the base of the precipice can be defined as accidental. Obviously, rigorously, it isn't so. The form of each one of them depends on a large sequence of events, each one of these conforms to natural law: the nature of rock, the lines of sediment and crossing, the shape of the mount, that depends on being dug up and on the later superficial erosion, finally the storm or the earthquake that caused the precipitation of the fragments. But with respect to how these fragments have been used, we can say that its form is random.

Let us admit to an omniscient creator. An omniscient creator should have foreseen each consequence as a result of the laws that he established. Is that why one can reasonably affirm that the creator has intentionally made certain fragments of rock take on certain forms, so that the builder could construct his own building? The stone fragments, which are indispensable for an architect, maintain the same relationship with the building that the fluctuating variations in organic beings maintain with the various and splendid structures acquired in the end by their modified descendents. If the different laws that have determined the shape of each fragment have not been predetermined *for the sake of the builder*, we can affirm with a greater degree of probability that the creator has left them there especially *for the sake of the breeder*, each one of the innumerable variations that take place in our plants and domestic animals - with many of these variations being useless for man, neither beneficial, what's more, more often than not, harmful for these same plants and animals. If we don't affirm the beginning of a case - if we don't admit that the variation in a primordial dog has been intentionally guided with the end that it could create, for

73) page 311

example, a greyhound, with its perfect image of symmetry and vigour - then

“there is not a smidgen of reason that can be given so that the belief in variation, the same in nature and the result of general laws that have been the base through natural selection of the formation of animals more perfectly adapted to the world, including man, have been specially and intentionally guided”⁷⁴.

Choice, or what is the same, selection, are analogues of the architect, they are the primary force, whether you are dealing with a choice carried out by man in the formation of domestic races or of selections carried out by nature in the production of vegetable and animal species. Certainly, we can wish to believe what an important interlocutor of Darwin's, Asa Gray believed, that “variation has been guided along certain charitable lines” like a current along certain lines of precise and useful irrigation. However, if one presumes that each particular variation has been pre-ordained since the beginning of time, then even the plasticity of the organisation that carries out so many detours that are harmful for the structure, even a redundant power of reproduction, that leads to a fight for survival, should appear as superfluous laws of nature, useless and irrelevant. And this is what puts us in front of a difficulty, face to face with it, then it is necessary to recognize: this difficulty is analogous to what the relationship between predestination and free will raises for us, face to face⁷⁵.

11.) We know what interests us. We are interested in overcoming the border limit beyond that which we will find “travelling *beyond my proper province*”, as well as the territory of my competence, as Darwin says on these same pages as the *Variazioni* in their domestic state.

However, avoiding the passing of the border is difficult.

A quote by Leo Strauss that I mentioned earlier seems like the opening of the work of Larry Arnhart, *Darwinian Natural Law*⁷⁶. Leo Strauss - once the rejection of the old theistic concept of the world had been assumed and, consequently as well, the right of nature on the part of modern science - has spelled out the following dilemma: or we try to develop a human science that is not theistic, explaining this behaviour in terms of purely mechanical laws (or of the

74) 75) 76) page 311

mechanistic type) or we try to maintain a separation between a non-theistic science of nature and a theistic science of human existence. None of the alternatives has seems satisfactory to them. The mechanistic explications of human behaviour don't measure up adequately with the finalities of human life. However, insisting on a complete separation between natural science and the science of human existence is intellectually incoherent⁷⁷.

The most complete original formula of the right of nature has been given by Aristotle, whose conception of it was based on the theistic representation of man as a naturally social and naturally political, rational animal. And the fundamental importance, apart from fusing, of Aristotle's biology through his works on ethics and politics has been illustrated by the studies, among others, of Martha Nussbaum and Gotthelf and Lennox⁷⁸. Roger Master's contribution, published at last with the title *Evolutionary Biology and Natural Law*⁷⁹ puts forth the full compatibility of Aristotelian political thought, based on the biological intelligence of human nature, with modern Darwinian theories of social behaviour. The thesis that the Aristotelian concept of nature is fundamentally supported by biology more so than physics and - contrary to Straus - who believes that modern physics has rejected any theism that does not work for modern biology is a crucial point of Master's argument. This study has offered important conceptual instruments to Arnhart's investigation, sustaining in the individualising of a substantial analogue between the Aristotelian vision and the Darwinian vision of a natural human sociability and of the derivation of morality for nature - morality represented in Darwin as a derivation of a brand of natural moral *sense*, according to Arnhart, "smokes" in the wake of Hume - and as a natural adaptation of man: an adaptation created through the course of its evolutionary process.

To elaborate his own vision of the genealogy of morality, Darwin has turned to the philosophy of the British moralists - of the authors; we know of the "derivative school of morals", in particular the most recent form of the *Greatest Happiness Principle* as regards the form preceding the beginning of *Selfishness*⁸⁰. What's more, we know that he has turned to the psychology of Brodie, in this way

77) 78) 79) 80) page 311

distancing himself from the theses expressed in *Utilitarianism* by J. St. Mill⁸¹. And in his treatment of the origins of moral sense and sense of duty - for the first time "from the side of natural history" in *The Descent of Man, and Selection in Relation to Sex* - even beginning with a quote from Kant⁸², Darwin openly evokes the morality of sympathy.

Arnhart has found a reinforcement for his persuasions in the contribution of Alaisdair MacIntyre's *Hume on "Is" and "Ought"*⁸³, which states that - in opposition with the Kantian dualism between nature and morality - the smoky idea of *moral sense*, as rooted in the natural pretensions or aspirations of man, belongs to a tradition of ethical naturalism originally begun by Aristotle. And, in this way, Arnhart has conclusively outlined - with a profile containing values and behaviours, a tradition of thought that conceives of natural right based on the biological structure of man, whose specie-specific nature causes him to lean towards certain ends and certain objectives. A not enharmonic tradition, in his opinion, even with the mosaic law contained in the Bible and with the theology of Thomas Aquinas, in which it is possible to distinguish the recognition of a "natural self-sufficiency of morality based on human nature as aiming towards the earthly happiness of human beings"⁸⁴.

Considering the work of Arnhart critically, perhaps one would have to observe that the principle of human sociability incorporated by Darwin is probably more closely related to Adam Smith's idea of sympathy - sympathy of a half-filled connection, of reflection, of recognition - not only that of David Hume's *moral sense*. And perhaps one would have to observe that, with respect to modern biology, the majority of times it would be more appropriate to say *teleonomy* instead of theism, according to the distinction made by Ernst Mayr⁸⁵. However, what is important in this see is that the tradition outlined by Arnhart is just that, a tradition as observed, *including* selective evolution - from Charles Darwin's evolution of "blind chance"⁸⁶.

81) 82) 83) 84) 85) 86) page 311

Vice versa, an answer to the necessity of foundation that I've mentioned above when speaking about the "spirit of the age" - an answer that looks for and finds a first place of certainty in nature, at least in human nature - also consists of a reposition of the idea of natural right, according to a vision that firmly *excludes*, just as we have seen, categories and prospectives rooted in Darwin's works:

"The dignity of man and of his fundamental rights - wrote Joseph Ratzinger - represent values previous to any state jurisdiction", because fundamental rights "are not created by a legislator, but are written in the very nature of the human person and, therefore, are ultimately adjoined to the Creator"⁸⁷.

If fundamental rights are not considered as a legislator's work, and they are also not conceived as pertaining to an ethical *self-comprehension* that the human species has elaborated and elaborates in the course of its *evolutionary process*, then if these are defined by a *doctrinal authority* who interprets the work of creation, then this *reposition* of natural right evidently also reposes the possibility of a conflict with the philosophical idea of the "completely political State" such as that State which - having put in place and recognised the existence of the civil society whose area corresponds to acting on the religious conscience as such - does not presuppose any other ideal and authoritative principle other than the principle of authority to itself. This State constitutes the closest approximation to the condition of freedom. A constitutional State does not recognise its own citizens in terms of a "Blut und Boden" identity, but in terms of a state of citizenry; this is the equality of each one in terms of rights and respect towards duties. Likewise, without confusing it with the civil society, guarantees a religion, even for the faithful or for the henchmen of an ideology regarding the empire, in the eventuality that that very religion or ideology become "established".

It comes as no surprise that the formation of the idea of a new stability implied by the adoption of European Constitution, has also elicited a passionate discussion with respect to the opportunity to define a cultural and historical-geographical area in terms of origins and religious identity. This discussion leads us to think that the problem of the *autonomy* of state, which was so well represented years ago in the musical drama sphere, with respect to Don Carlos with Felipe II and Felipe II with the Great Inquisitor and the masses⁸⁸.

87) 88) page 311

19-Flexibility and practise

Intellectual speculation regarding definitively basic themes that could orient a future project for human beings has borne little fruit, up to now. Delving more or less deeply into knowledge of the past until the recent past of the previous two millennia, the result is to confirm the subjectivity of historians. However, the many numerous diagnosis that are made of the present change each day, but orient, however insufficiently. The sharpest impression, among others that we should consider, is also the subjectivity of ideologues. It can't be any other way, because it responds to the fact that everyone, like the rest of human beings, is an individual and therefore subject to individuality. This is not a problem if everyone coincides in the final objective.

This reality has reinforced the idea that there is no possibility of placing a base on a future project that guarantees evolutionary continuity and with an orientation that is determined by human beings themselves. One only has to never forget, not even for a moment, that due to possession or acquisition of an identifying nature based on an individualisation that is morphologically perceivable and accepted by all as regards the soul, explained by the empirical knowledge that genetics has given us, the difference that denies sameness, but not compatibility and even that human beings are complementary, forces us to learn to accept ourselves as we are. (24) The relationship, though not exhaustive, is not tedious either. In the previous sections regarding believing and knowing, it leads one to believe that the negated or affirmed nature of humans exists. But inside the same algorithm. Which is to say, evolutionary nature and therefore different from one time to the next, not only in humans, but also everything that affects them. The challenges that must be faced in all periods of time and, therefore, present-day problems, that whether they are faced correctly or not - due to the work of human beings themselves, pure algorithm - others that are more or less difficult to face will come out of these.

And finally, always and right now, there is no evolutionary path other than that of constant trial and error, which means constant change, adapting the result of an action on the part of all the collectives that interact in the world, a result of the interaction of all its components. One sets off walking and creates his own path as he goes. Though trying to analyse the episodes as correctly as possible, not of those who are called glorious, generally military and religious people, but of those who have caused evident evolutionary regressions.

While Europe continues her eternal speculation, still with metaphysical reflexes, the other half of the West, the USA, isolated evolutionary zones in the world, and the Orient, as well, are designing their future with their own systems. "Obsolete" they say of

China, of India and of Southeast Asia, who by inhumanely exploiting their populations, are able to elevate their technological and productive capacity to the point of being able to compete with the West.

Now the results of the fast-paced advance of these emerging countries, supported by politically irresponsible multinationals won't take long. Possibly in the space of half a century - the same time used in the fruitless discussion in Europe, who has to be herself - the consequences of opposite actions on the part of multinationals due to a lack of concerted action with the West, especially with Europe, can definitely leave the entire world without a positive reaction and the benefit of the cultural contribution - science and technology - and economic - finance and human support - that the West can provide, for its own benefit as well.

The failure of the European Union can bring with it the failure of the West. Because failure means that the general problematic of the world will have to be solved by other collectives that emerge thanks to intense work, also considered inhuman, that indispensable economic means, necessary for all positive global actions, are providing them. The Pharisaic demonstrations of disapproval towards the labour system of the emerging Third World nations scandalize. With an educational level that is much higher, the colonisations of barely two centuries ago used slave methods. Working hard is the only system by which emerging nations can evolve, given that the petition of welfare on the part of voters in the First World makes it impossible for poor countries to take off evolutionarily unless that process is financed in its entirety by rich countries. Imposing a socio-economic system parallel to that of the First World on countries of the Third World would be the same as condemning them to eternal poverty.

Emerging countries, although they move at a much faster rate, have to run along the same road that the West has already travelled in order to become evolutionary motors through a change in the political system. This would be a waste of time for everyone and one of lost opportunities for the West.

It is then evident that the evolution of the Second and Third worlds, in the end energised by multinationals and liberated from the Marxist idea that has completed a necessary mission - that of rationalising the liberal capitalist idea based on the selfish character of human beings - is much less impossible or difficult through a negotiated action on the part of the three established worlds than to relinquish the contribution of values acquired by the West. In spite of the signs of exhaustion in its evolutionary force, when checking the tardiness of the process of union among European countries, the divorce between Europe and the USA and the lack of definition in the future of Russia, all afflicted more or less with the biological aging of

its autochthonic populations. Each one of the symptoms of exhaustion in one of these three blocks conditions the other two. A Western agreement is not possible - with or without Russia - if Europe doesn't first get started on the path to a true internal union. And this union is not possible through the Nation-States. Each one of them represents a factor of disunion. Europe can only be organic using a federal formula based on its magnificent diversity of peoples, well identified and capable of competing loyally among themselves. Without close competition, among vicinities, there is no selection or evolution. For Mediterranean people, Finland is very far geographically and socially.

If Europe and the USA coincide along this path and decide, know and can take it on, it is possible that Russia's indecision will disappear and that the Russians will also adopt a truly federal system. It would be the first time in their history that they acquired the value of authentic liberty, based on the only formula: respect for the person and individuality. A population that has been shaken up by successive imperialisms that have governed it since its founding as an Empire and in the post-communist scattering that wavers between a return to dictatorship or a connection with the West, with the Orient or with both deserves it.

And if the three blocks, competing loyally among all the cultural and economic fields, were to reach an agreement of common action to deal with this problem, not as an inventory but as an example that we have identified, the governability of the world would be assured. And many concrete problems would disappear, such as the silent invasion - more or less - of the regions that many of them occupy in Europe, the USA and North America due to the immigration of settlers from areas of the world that are not well educated and poor and, as a result, introduce a cultural, economic and competitive watering down effect in the First World. Because poor and uneducated people coming to the West, particularly to Europe, do not improve the economy or culture. It would be Westerners going to the Third World with the intention of creating compatibility among all the Worlds, without the First World losing anything, could rapidly improve the Third World.

Immigrants to the First World, especially those that go to Europe and the West as a whole, bring labourers to build infrastructures and perform basic services. Apart from the construction of vacation homes or long-term tourism, the infrastructures that are built will be used by the immigrants themselves in the coming generations. And the services that they perform in the short term will be taken over by robots. This is the focus that Japan uses since they don't have immigrants and with hard work on the part of the Japanese, this is a good direction.

In reference to the Second World, one can say something similar, even though the intensity in the political change doesn't

need such a drastic reorientation. South America, in order to attract it by putting in place a process of elevation to the First World. And finally and parallel to these actions and as a basic condition, put an end to the uncontrollable population growth of the poor and uneducated population of the Third World, which makes it impossible to establish it in these countries using only repressive methods to avoid migrations.

In the development of a global plan such as the one described here, it wouldn't be necessary to complete the entire process in order to get Islam to renounce terrorism. The demonstration that the First World were to decide to fight for the same causes that are the argument to Islam's violence would make them lose the support of the obedient masses - even in their own area - now motivated by the forced Islamic conviction that the First World is unjust with the rest of the world, particularly with Islam.

(25) But is a global system of government possible?

If the USA, resentful of the cultural wavering of Europe, looks towards the Pacific for a change in allies - and not without certain symptoms on the part of Europeans for the indifference that the existence of the circumstances causes - and disappointed by what they consider a lack of recognition of their repeated support of the Old World. If Europeans don't resist the first onslaughts of the third World in the form of tolerated immigration - in a way encouraged by the uncontrolled desire to grow in all areas, as if the Earth also had the ability to grow - in order to solve the problem of the professional elevation of its population that, due to this elevation, is reluctant to perform certain jobs. And if the West as a whole hasn't been able to find a system to organise its economies given the competition from countries upon which it has imposed, for temporary interests, the free circulation of merchandise, the question can only find an answer along with another question:

Is there an alternative solution to the current problem of world globalisation that is not a global government? Considering reality and the cause of the current situation, the answer to both of the preceding questions blend together in one answer: the reality that the world is already constructing a global form of government, obligated by each one of its multiples problems. But without the necessary intention to coordinate this process, precisely because of conservative believers resistant to the inevitable change that this situation demands. Especially the change in the formation and way of acting of the governments of the First World.

With the immense quantity of episodes of regression within civilisation, showing that the evolution of the great human collective is not ineluctable and of indefinite continuity. And that this continuity has always and will always be made possible by the action

of human beings themselves, especially due to the initiatives of individuals who have above-average abilities to promote them. Everyone through individual actions in search of their own enjoyment (each acquisition of knowledge also is), and for large periods that can be measured in centuries, during which there have been advances, stagnation, and regressions, with a final result that is largely positive. Due to this, we deduce that what is primordial is to eliminate regressions through analysis, which is possible today. Beginning with the reality of human nature, innate or created by human beings themselves within the Darwinian algorithm.

The government leaders of the twenty-first century will be responsible for a regression that is just as transcendental or more so than the ones already mentioned if the challenge of the believers centre it on Islam, mistake upon mistake, if they present the problem with a solution through a new lay “crusade” with updated techniques in the same way in which it was done in the first and fateful crusades, carried out with the support of Christianity. Because believers are not only Islamists and their opposing and imposing direct religious people. There are many other believers that know little. In the end, Abraham, Moses, Julius Caesar and Marx, considering the cultural state of humanity in their respective historical times, would turn out to be more intelligent than government leaders in the twenty-first century, if these ignore or despise the patriotic believers of polygenetic and imperialistic root, strict ultra-liberals when it comes to economy, short-sighted socialists with a nostalgic Marxist base and, among them, the most numerous and fateful: those who believe exclusively in themselves and in the right to pleasure without any interference from pain, even at the expense of the pain of “others”, humanity in general.

From the UN to the most remote municipality in the depths of the Third World, there are hundreds of organisations that work in vain to solve their specific problems. And that work is in vain because if problems are specific, all revolve around a centrepiece: the human world is becoming globalised by sectors, but constantly. And government rule continues to be divided into fractions and with ferocious resistance to change in order to adapt to this process. National, religious, and corporate resistance and, above all, that of conservative people who refuse to accept reality based on monogenism: that we are one species, one family. Families without a responsible father and mother, much worse than having them, even though they are imperfect. Biological fathers and mothers are learning to be parents from the beginning of their existence. Fathers and mothers of the human family that should be government leaders still haven’t initiated their learning experience. Without asking any other question, it’s not risky to say that this is the right moment to begin it. It has surely been the appropriate time to begin for a long time. We don’t need to ask ourselves how the learning process with

be. We know. Moving each cell of the human body, each individual, each family and all the Ethnic Group-Nations of the world.

(26) And we also know how to direct this activity. Our People have taught us through ancestral instinct more than through reflection, they had known and have been able to - because they didn't have Nation-States that absorbed them violently - organise themselves in nuclei where everyone knows everyone: the autonomous villages of Finland, the Swiss cantons, the German lands, the states of the USA and Canada. All of these are on the front line. In second place, the People with enough humanity to convert themselves into more or less decentralised Ethnic Group-Nations, like Sweden, Norway, Ireland, Belgium, Austria, and Denmark. And outside Western geography, in third place, federal states, such as Australia and New Zealand.

Within these countries, there is a great anthropological variety and political organisation. But what they have in common is the proximity between real power and their citizens. As for the rest, they differ in some very important aspects, such as the future of clans and homogenous tribes, the Scandinavian and Swiss, of being the result of a forced secession, such as Ireland and Austria or being the result of a certain reflection that goes beyond instinct, although it is not fully conscious, as in the case of the USA, Canada and Australia, made up of indescribable racial and ethnic alluviums.

An important aspect to consider also is that all of these countries have had historical onslaughts of wars or liberation and resistance from Empires or absorbent nation States that have held back their evolution until they were definitively liberated so that they could become true countries on the advanced road of democracy. They can be counted in the hundreds since the last century. And definitively, without any need for more argumentation, all of these Ethnic Groups-nations, not just due to a will born of dire experiences because they have suffered aggressions, but not because they didn't have any chance of success in hegemonic businesses do they have a lukewarm sense of patriotism, of defence and even of a certain humility when it comes to States nation, cultivators of an aggressive patriotism in the worst case scenario, but always arrogant and with a clear intention of domination in aspects of mutual and international relations. From these one can expect few initiatives for a renovation of a system faced with considering the pacification of the poor based on adequate aid for their evolution. More economic actions than the cost of maintaining large and very costly armies that are now becoming obsolete when faced with new forms of resistance based on terrorism and fear can convert into atomic terrorism. All that's needed is to take apart these States nation and construct federations, large and true federations, such as the European Union. And Russia. And South America...

20-From aristocracy to partitocracy

It is not only the challenge of Islam that prevents the renovation of the system of world government. It is also the strong but silent resistance of other conservative believers, ensconced in all the established Worlds, especially in the First. And conservatives are, by necessity, not only the political parties that have this label, but also all the nation States maintained by fearful humans who are more powerful than ever, with a fear that is ungrounded given that in a renovated world according to the educational level that can be reached, the government rulers of the nation-States would feel much more comfortable than in the present atmosphere created by terrorism.

Anonymous citizens who contemplate how an educated society that they identify with is being destroyed without any solution to detain the deterioration process, evidenced by acts of radical religious extremism. Faced with this challenge of active and declared believers that in reality are only conservative, not operative, becoming an authentic problem for the operating collectives at the beginning of the twenty-first century. And driven away from the public thing by the eternal system of an insufficiently established democracy, made to the satisfaction of government leaders, the decidedly conservative mass increases. All of this without the possibility of laying the blame of this situation on leaders, from a municipality to any governmental or higher administrative level. Blaming this situation on any collective or corporation seems unfair, but it is inevitable given the lack of sensibility when it comes to the citizen answer in the form of abstencionism, which only receives the reaction of massive propaganda to get them to participate in elections. Their first, though not only, reason for blame is a lack of knowledge, although any low level politician has more of it than great leaders of mistaken movements ever have. Their blame, the determining one, is their incapacity to change the system of which they are prisoners and victims, in spite of identifying with it, though not comfortably, due to professional deformation. Their ambition is to live with the minimum effort. Without changes.

(29) This situation can be summed up by saying that society is formed by believers and conservatives on the one hand and rationalists and renovators on the other. And that the partitocracy that is set in place within governments is formed by believers and rationalists, but all of them conservative. The system produces this phenomenon because those who aspire to renovate are in the opposing party. But the exercise of power destroys their critical capacity when they discover the colossal problems at any level of government, particularly at the global level. After that, it's an undoubtedly inevitable sense of arrogance due to a lack of adequate professional formation, not academically recognized, in spite of

being the most important and transcendental. Each person who is incapable of an impossible personal job understands and justifies all the incapable governments in the world - attached or unattached - and themselves for not being able and not knowing how to solve global problems from the positions they hold.

How many of those who belong to the current partitocracy have been able to see that there are no leaders or governments capable of governing the collectives created with rules that have never been renovated? They have followed the Empires, maintaining all their defects and getting rid of their main quality: the consciousness that the Empire shouldn't try to unify the Ethnic Group-Nations, but just the opposite, associate them. An autocratic federalism, vainfully attempted by a few emperors, interrupting dynastic lines.

Making free human beings is difficult, as much so as educating them. Educating collectives to build just one, that of humanity, has never even been tried until the present, neither in theory nor by suggestion.

Bestiary humans in their many primogenital origins allowed their leaders, with all their flaws, to have greater ease in governing them than do current leaders. Extraordinary characters, always and now, have been few. Simple people with average intelligence and education have increased greatly. The classic ones, considered beyond Greece and Rome, Ur Namur, Hammurabi or Abraham, didn't rule beasts anymore, but beings a little beyond the halfway mark between a barbarian state and the current state of civilisation. Now what is necessary is a new order that considers the different rhythm of evolution of multiple politicians and government leaders, but with less professional weight faced with an immense mass that in the First and Second World feels poorly governed and that is conscious of the limitations of its government leaders. Between Rivers, Mesopotamia six thousand years ago was more advanced than Europe. What is to keep someone from thinking that within a thousand years, Europe could take a back seat not just to the Orient, but to Africa as well?

It could be that the very action of the First World provokes extreme Meteors like the formation of glaciers. In any case, aside from the catastrophic future, what is evident is the absolute necessity of all human beings in this small world banding together out of self interest, because of real, existing factors in order to avoid social and destructive explosions of all types of values.

The relative well-being of the First World is all together unstable. In general, it is accepted that the European Union, up to where it reaches, has been a good idea. The reality is that all the countries of the Union have improved their economies. This improvement has been tremendously discriminatory in a positive sense for countries in the South and in a negative sense for Germany,

that has barely reached an increase in its GNP by a difference of \$23,630 (1993) and \$26,200 in 2003 because of its contributions to subsidise the South, but above all, because of the incorporation of sixteen million East Germans that watered down all the economic, social and cultural parameters measured since 1990. In the same period, the USA increased its GNP from \$24,700 to \$36,300. And China has multiplied its GNP by eighteen from \$370 to \$5,000. (The comparison of these data shows the result of a bad system, the communist, that provoked acute apathy in East Germany, still present today. And China has taken off from misery since abandoning its bad system.)

The economy is a reliable indicator of evolution and economy and culture are usually two concentric circles. The technological and scientific advances, above all in biology, continue to happen mostly in the USA. And following their steps, Japan in computer sciences has achieved spectacular advances in robotics. In Europe, the lack of creation of capital and therefore savings due to dedicating all the value produced to increase the zero well-being that consumerism produces has lessened research and has induced a large number of well equipped brains to immigrate to the USA. It's argued that those who introduced consumerism were the Americans. What isn't said is that Americans consume what they produce directly and they export, as well. Europe produces by means of an extension of colonialism in the world, now in its own backyard with the colonised at home. The average productivity per GNP is not a sufficient indicative of the divergence between the two parts of the West. The average monetary availability for Americans is what we commented earlier and, in this sense, reflects the level of well-being compared to that reached by softened Europeans. What is essentially indicative is the maintenance of the work ethic in the USA and the Orient and the demerit and discredit of work in Europe where leisure in all its forms is cultivated as a cultural good. For this reason, at the same time that a renovation of systems of government is promoted in the large blocks to be established, human values must also be created parallel to those systems, redirecting them towards the truth of a cultural good: work done in a satisfactory manner as an important part in the interference between pleasure and pain. No European party has had the necessary valour to provoke a change in attitude in its citizenry until recently in France where a semi-foreigner announces a positive intention in this sense. We must wait and see what he can do when he governs, if he is finally elected and when the forces of inertia act. The great difficulty will be to promote a change in the mentality of the population, influenced by the European hedonistic atmosphere, spontaneously produced, but due to the action of the USA preserving the existence of the European collective by liberating it from a double totalitarian project: Nazism and communism.

Europe will be a parallel problem and perhaps more serious than many suspect with human beings who have never found a motive for enjoyment in work -millions of evolutionary retarded who from a miserable soft life are inclined to a soft life of wealth without a bit of physical and intellectual effort that the West has put forth to gain this wealth. Not knowing what those who are in a comfortable position have done to achieve that position is what causes others, who will not achieve that position, to take off; in general emigrants. Political parties and union acolytes are not only inoperative, but they also produce dysfunctions, such as those that have provoked the attempt to renovate the process of a change in orientation, proposed now in France.

As in all large collective problems, that of an important majority of settlers of the First World that is adrift, with Europe in the lead, towards a life fed by sensitivity and at odds with human responsibility in work and procreation, cannot be resolved through systems that take the initiative or intention of individuals while most of those individuals continue being masses of believers, of conservatives or politically neutral as their base of action.

In the twenty-first century, with extraordinary advances in all areas of life, the idea is taking root that human beings have as their main objective, their only objective, that of achieving happiness and so they proclaim it as a toast to the sun in the majority of Constitutions. The concept of happiness is what needs to be cleared up. It is possible to have almost everything and to be unhappy due to a lack of something that the rest of mortals don't even know exists. There is evidence that a totally happy human being who is always happy doesn't exist because in a hedonistic life as well as in a rational one, there is the inexcusable interference of pleasure and pain, states which all human beings inevitably participate in and without which life would be tediously unbearable. For this reason, the idea of evolution, as a means of advancing towards the achievement of a larger intensity in the feeling of pleasure and of a lesser intensity in that of pain, it is necessary to accept that the value of happiness insofar as it refers to governmental action is simply to facilitate the greatest sense of well-being possible through citizen action, resulting in physical education and the practise of sports from childhood on. A reflection which leads us to conclude that physical and mental activity oriented towards concrete objectives in order to intensify the feeling of pleasure and reduce that of pain, without the possibility of eliminating it, isn't only to be applied to individual persons, but also to their collectives. And collectives demand methodologies of co-existence.

If, as we have repeated, the assembly is inoperative, and the global assembly in unthinkable - although perhaps in the future it will be a

possible objective -representation by means of ideal people that we insist can't exist in the current system of "representation known as democratic", the constatation of parallel realities that demands the necessity of changing the system appears. But not just to make the existence of apt representatives possible - government leaders - but also to make it possible for the governed to accept that they must collaborate so that government leaders can free themselves of demagogy, hypocrisy, lies and dependence on uneducated elector votes.

The system so that electors can be educated is not easy, but clear and sure: to install a rational education all over the world.

The system for having apt government leaders is within immediate reach, reducing the areas in which to act because there are enough people in the current world to govern in a regime of representation of collectives that have been reduced as much as possible and of possible elevation due to the educational level of present-day human beings. It isn't an irony or a paradox: there are plenty of them among those who currently govern, being so little educated within their profession, and they are the ones who must mobilise the rest of human beings.

(16) The Popular Party in Imperial Rome initiated the perversion of the partitocracy. Their equivalents in Europe are fulfilling it and are dragging all the parties to participate in the demolition of the goodness of work. Educating the immense human mass in order to demassify it in the first place, and doing so by means of a rational education, would necessarily be a long process but, above all, difficult due to the struggle with themselves - the true Islamic jihad. That means recognising that each person depends on his own will when it comes to the challenge of believers, all challenges, and especially the challenge that each person must set as a vital objective. This is the first condition to get over this difficulty, which is none other than a change in the political system. And its Parties, based on what has been constantly repeated: decentralise government even as far as small areas in order to adapt it to existing human capacities in each moment, correlated to the level of political culture reached by the population. Which is to say, federate according to natural collectives at all levels - and where they don't exist, create them - and with a well established representation and tiered levels, achieving a short number of well structured, coordinated nuclei that would make world government possible by attending to collective and personal identities and learning to respect their diversity. And with the intention of making them compatible for a peaceful co-existence.

The positive result of governing by means of small collectives has multiple explanations that, in general, are known and it is unnecessary to insist on them. But the most important is that human beings have been in a process of permanent learning in order to live

together and have had and have difficulty in doing so given the selfish nature of all living beings. We have repeatedly mentioned the examples of Scandinavia and Switzerland in Europe, whose settlers have maintained their ancestral custom of ordering themselves basically in small nuclei that come from tribes that have grown over time and, because of this, they have known how to situate themselves at the head of the evolutionary process. And not because they have been more endowed genomically, but because they are governed in collectives of an adequate size in line with the capabilities of their settlers and, above all, their government rulers that follow one after the other without becoming known outside their area of action. They are closely watched by those who elect them. They don't pursue a minimum effort in their actions. And in this process, they have ended up possessing the genetics of the most elevated group. The genome continues to be the same, but the personal genetics that have given rise to collective genetics produce effects that are not only phenotypical. Also genotypic, such as those that have been observed in a wild state that still exists and in the most advanced civilisation.

Why then when it is possible to change the system of parties and governments, that afterwards the lifestyle of the electorate has to be changed through rational education, they don't do whatever is necessary to simply choose the best?

Because there is not current world order and the previously established orders, especially multiethnic Nation-States, there is the contradiction - only apparent - between renovators and conservatives. And these associate change and bloody revolution. And that's how primitive revolutions were. Not anymore. They can be and, in many cases are, cruel, but positive, even for conservatives.

Because the two poles, capital and work, are under the control of unions and capitalists who don't adapt to social changes, continuing in the old battle that makes them opponents when they should be and could already be complementary. The Orient has advanced in this sense, the same as China, Japan, and Scandinavia, as well.

Because the West, which could be the principle agent of change, is divided by issues that are not essential, the main one being the persistence of feelings which destroy rationality. Patriotism, today and in Europe, a feeling that has been pampered by the economically and socially elite, who transmit it to society in a similar way in which Churches try to maintain faith. And in the USA, the explosion of a feeling of superiority, wounded by the attack of Islam and of the indifference - when it's not complacency, if not on Europe's part, on the part of many Europeans. Even more because of the way in which, despite more or less respecting the separation of church and state, the trauma caused by the division between

believers and rationalists persists. Due to negative synergies that are always there - in this case, a government made up of believers who are Christians and Jews, a circumstantial event, but crucial - the reaction to the Islamist attack has given it a religious character, making the game favourable to Islam, which has initiated the conflict and confuses religion with government, giving rise to the so-called "clash of civilisations", giving the category of civilisation to a simple religion with a totalitarian character.

Because governments have lost their best thinkers, now devoted to science and to technological investigation, fed up with a political task that doesn't know how to renovate itself.

Because an important part of the older population makes the existence of beliefs possible, that some incredulous clergy - with the exception of some older clerics who received a deformed education - exploit the interracially conserved faith in a moment of definitive decadence in esoterics. On the other hand, a large number of people that have renounced all religious belief and, due to a variety of causes, such as a feeling of patriotism, practice substitutes that reach an irrationality superior to any religion and obstruct the educational system.

Because the enrichment of Islamic countries, especially oil-producing Arab countries, has brought about the second phase in their particular war, now violently, elevating the tone of the first phase, which they have won, the petroleum phase. And within the unending list of "whys", the ridiculous but almost tragic why of politicians and government leaders in their impotence to act accordingly given the current situation, as a counterweight to this little understood reality, they have allowed themselves to fall into an addiction that is worse than drugs, "media addiction", which in them is more powerful than sexual impulse. And because of this ridiculous vanity, they have ceded a good part of their power to the new and shameless power that is the media. Corporate interests have displaced general ones and have created a self-powered binomial that has caused reversion instead of evolution in the democratic process. For the most part, electorate, readers and spectators lack political criteria to elect representatives that they don't know. The opposite of when they are elected within small collectives more because they are known than because of the political filiations. The result of so many whys has created populism that certainly advances in time and with a lot of detours, with regressions in the always present evolutionary path, can't create an electorate and reader-spectators that are suitable for breaking the current political system. But with a slowness that is not typical of the present educational level of the First and Second Worlds, despite the ill will of the egalitarians, the reality is that educated human beings in the world in general are a very small minority. And this favours conservatism.

There are a lot more “whys” making a process of synergies with thousands of dysfunctions in the system of co-existence, the so-called democracy, invented in Greece and tested for the first time in Rome when the Empire at its peak brought together one hundred million settlers. And even with this diminished population, but excessive for the capacity of it Emperors began its decline. What substituted the Republic, the Empire, seemed to be a new and effective system, not wanting to change it when it was possible and, on the contrary, returning to old formulas of dynastic succession, the Empire succumbed. In Constantinople, at the hands of Islam. In Rome, at the hands of the so-called barbarians. Is it possible that the West can succumb because of a sick addiction on the part of its government leaders and the rest of the related “whys-because”? No. We can save ourselves the reflections that invite us to believe in premonitions. The current situation in the West, successor of all the European Empires, has logical explanations that don’t allow for believing in any premonition of total ruin.

With this amount of causes that have created the reality of an intercommunicated world and, on the other hand, one that is divided into fractions by deep cracks, not into the economically and culturally established three worlds, but in all the worlds where the “whys-because” are at work so that they are the way they are, makes us ask another question: Should we trust a political-type formula that overcomes this situation without the drama that the Roman Empire experienced when it disappeared and now only by means of pacific actions?

A resounding yes. More than possible, it is inevitable. Just as democracy has improved since the time of the Roman Empire, the citizenry by means of a hard-won freedom has continued evolving, less than is possible, by steadily. For this reason, we should trust that while democracy and its governments continue their slow advance of the past two thousand years, the Global Society that is born in a birthing process with forceps, by means of an existing government entity (a new UN) or one to be constituted, will find the formula for peaceful co-existence that doesn’t provide happiness, but that can educate the multitude of ethnic groups-nations through competition among them. With a previous sentence: situating the people that don’t possess a structure to compete. With the black Africans in first place and in varying scales of degrees, three fourths of current humanity as well.

21-Renovation

Attacking the System is only valid if it is accompanied by a proposition of change. And there are many systems that could be proposed. All of them arguable. But what is not arguable is the need to change the current system.

In Europe, even finding the way to choose the best people to govern (it would be necessary to find a way to do so), these cannot deal with the work that being in charge of the corresponding party would entail, that of Head of Government for the States-nation, that of Commissioner for the European Union Commission, and that of establishing political policy at a world level, though nominally the representative management would be carried out by the Foreign Minister. Each one of these tasks requires a head, as well as a specialised team. Not only to advise, but also to decide. And this always leads us to see how necessary it is to reduce the dimensions of the different areas of government, to adjust them to the capabilities of present-day human beings. The evolution of humanity as a whole has taken place due to the cultural elevation of large human masses, which has brought about a greater levelling so that the more evolved, supposedly government leaders, have not maintained the rhythm that is necessary to preserve the distance with the less evolved, that has been the only reason to justify the separation of some from others in the evolutionary process. And this, which was a bad sign, no longer is. It augurs an interventionism on the part of non-professionals in politics in the not-so-distant future or even sooner.

The main difficulty in regenerating the current system is that the necessary social collaboration cannot be achieved precisely because of the same system. State governments, which are the ones that make decisions, don't have any chance of uniting societies that are diverse due to language, ideas and distinct sensibilities that have been established during centuries or millennia of co-existence and, in the majority of cases, legitimate interests created at different levels, according to the environment of each of these diverse communities. For this reason, even though it's repetitive, it is necessary to agree that a solution to basic problems depends on changing the system and, also to repeat a point, to say that the system doesn't have to be invented. The classical Greeks did so in their time. And it is as simple as dismantling the pyramid of power with multiple candidates to occupy the top in a fierce struggle destroying each other and establishing juxtaposed powers, such as People who are juxtaposed and the people all over the World.

(25) It may be useful to investigate the reasons the Greeks didn't continue developing a system of co-existence in small communities that went so well for them during the time that they followed that system. But it is enough to conclude that they didn't know how to or couldn't avoid the steamroller that was the Empire when the empires of the Ancient Orient were already in decline. Without a doubt, it is more interesting to explore the causes that now continue to operate, that keep us from adopting it given that it is evident that possibility of action doesn't need greatly enlightened human beings to project and develop it. It is being carried out in a

natural way with exasperating slowness. Empires are not born; on the contrary, they disappear and new countries are reborn. There is not an overabundance of political geniuses - not from the other class either of wise men and scientists included - and the demand for acceptance and articulation of differences of all types is becoming increasingly louder: Racial, Ethnic, of Groups of People and, finally, individuals. And above all of these, the differences in the double aspect of economy and culture among the three established Worlds.

Apparently Europe is a mosaic without order. This gives rise to the States-nation; the larger ones in particular argue that a federation of Ethnic Groups would be anarchy. The reality is another. Adding together the twenty-five countries that are now united, the sixteen remaining countries (pg. 1 Synopsis), we see that among the remaining forty one countries, only seven have more than eleven million inhabitants that, apart from Turkey and the Vatican, are Germany, Spain, France, Italy, Holland, Romania and the United Kingdom.

These countries do not mean seven distinct problems. Spain and France are a problem with a common base. Recognition of the Ethnic Groups that make up these two States, that were they to be countries with their own States, would increase the total number of European States in a very limited quantity.

Italy, in a similar manner, although with greater indefiniteness of the Ethnic Groups that truly maintain their identity or wish to recoup it.

Germany, the Landers would simply be States of the Union.

Holland has assimilated in a manner that could be an exception as far as its demographic dimension in relation to the rest of European States. In this sense, Belgium could exit the ambiguous situation created by two communities that don't complement each other and that live without violence, but do not like their union under the Crown.

Romania is the biggest problem. It has been crossed with the rest of the countries of Eastern Europe, a region that is very divided, not only by the existence of Peoples from different territories, but also by distinct ethnic groups in areas that should be States.

A territorial readjustment, ethnic and of People with their own identity, confirmed by plebiscites in which the natives of each region to be harmonised participate, without the need of an exodus, either forced or induced. And a federated European Union in which its members are free to change their residence, regulated and with a strict respect towards the collectives and the people not born within any area of the Federation, would not only give rise to an interethnic pacification among Peoples, but would also create an area of co-existence that was more peaceful and efficient than federations such as in the USA and others that currently exist. This was created

artificially and because of a need for defence towards the metropolis, England. (And in spite of this being the base of its success, it continues having difficulties when it comes to harmonisation, especially with the descendents of black slavery).

In Europe, the assimilation of immigrants is close to becoming a bigger problem than with the descendents of slaves in the USA. The experience of others should help here.

Both aspects, the territorial and the human need definition. The diagnosis is easy. Channelling is difficult, but not impossible.

England is a separate problem. Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland are problems for England, but not for Europe, in spite of the fact that in the short or long term an agreement between both parts will be inevitable, even in the case that the world blocks that we insist on were to become formalised, there would be a formal pact between the USA and England. The issue of Ireland is more problematic, but if they continue along the same lines of negotiation, now well focused and on the road to a solution, the country will be an example among others in Europe of Ethnic Groups-nations that have suffered under the dominion of more powerful neighbours and that have prospered once free, at the same time that England has been freed of a heavy load. The success that is reached can affect the orientation of others. Externally, in relation to the European Union and the USA can convert the United Kingdom in a nexus between the two shores of the North Atlantic parallel to how Turkey could do the same between the European Union and Islam.

It's not just ethnic diversity, or differences in cultural and economic levels of Peoples, nor the technical difficulties and problems with procedure that prevents Europe from being a federation and making her a model for constructing large human collectives with aptitude in order to become valid interlocutors in themes of global character. Collectives that in any case wouldn't be completely artificial with greater or lesser differences, all have basic affinities a priori that would make dialogue and agreements possible. They would be Russia, Central and South America, China, the Pacific Islands, Japan, India and the enormous quantity and diversity of the Peoples of Africa.

As difficult as it may be to accept it, the difficulty for this project are the "why-because" that we have considered that, up to now, have impeded it.

The Jewish and Christian religions have led us to this situation, but have done nothing to avoid it. The Mahommedan, the true creator, is the principle part of the conflict, that in extreme situations such as the current one, has been motivated by causes that are not essentially religious, although government leaders of all political tendencies in the area of Islam try to justify themselves in their challenge to the rest of the world saying that they are fighting against the unfaithful. Just like a millennium and a half ago. But the

attitude on the part of Jewish and Christian churches, profoundly conservative, is to abstain from intervening and only censure violence - as though they have not been more violent in political and religious episodes where they have intervened - an attitude that originated to defend their precarious presence in the current world.

It is not necessary to even insinuate the possibility that a religious collative in the 21st century could have the most minimal possibility of imposing on the world the educational level that religions reached at the time of their foundation and, in particular, the Muslim religion, the most decided combatant of rationalism. But because of this extreme dogmatic character and the certain existence of thousands of Islamists who are willing to blow themselves up - along with the possibility that atomic weapons that can be personally manipulated appear - has to move religious people and atheists to work to overcome the conflict now when Islam is also immersed in a great instability that, once more, provokes internal division. Shiites and Sunnis. As well as Iran and Arabia. If Europe, Russia and China had shown themselves to be favourable to energetic actions against all the challenges made by believers, the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq wouldn't have happened. One can hope that in some extreme situation where a challenge is made, these three blocks will accept the absolute necessity of coming together decisively in what is essential and putting aside secondary interests; in the first place, petroleum.

Once past the last world war, and having begun the associative movement in Europe and created a cordial relationship with the USA, it seemed that the world had definitively entered into a peaceful era and one of possible great economic and cultural development. The forced decolonisation on the part of the USA helped to create this impression. Fifty years later, Europe is not associated and the relationship between the two parts that make up the West is not cordial and the disbanded colonies are experiencing their worst moment due to the uncontrolled birth rate.

The increase in well-being of an important number of people in the First and Second Worlds does not compensate for the malaise of the rest of the world, which has grown in the last half century to the point of almost doubling. Having increased the conscientious population and not the believers, the opposite, true believers or feigned believers, declare the challenge that could create an unforeseeable situation that establishes the alternative between general chaos due to the definitive fracture among the three established economic-cultural worlds. Or contrarily and given this perspective, the First World of the West and of the Orient, the Civilisation of Knowledge in general, proceeds to the total renovation of the system of global co-existence.

The current system functions through inertia. It doesn't create new human values. Government in general can rightly adduce that it can't depend on a prepared population to take on an effort such as a renovation of the system entails. The reality is more serious. This population is losing the ability to put forth this kind of effort. And this is the responsibility of governments. The more pending each new generation is of hedonism, the more the possibility of a positive reaction to deal with the problems of globalisation diminishes because it is not intentionally directed towards objectives of superior value other than to gain benefits from the only entities that are really globalising the world: multinational businesses. Islam takes advantage of this circumstance and creates a barrier between these two parts. This has inclined their believers to reaffirm their faith and, just as has happened since the beginning of existence, the worst part of their opponents is their best argument to pat themselves on the back for what is theirs. In this sense, the Islamists are not alone. The banality of lifestyle that the unbelieving youth in the World of well-being lead has left them incapacitated to carry out positive actions of a social nature. In a world full of problems - and of pain in those parts where hunger and deficient nutrition and lack of cultivation due to lack of education has placed them in a position in which they are conscious of their sorry state - feeds the believers so that they establish comparisons. And these are that the faith they profess has a superior value to the knowledge that science produces. The comparison among the religious missions that have never been able to nor will they be able to provide any solution to global problems is easy, though it's sophism and that which produces differences among humans who have evolved distinctly because they have been brought up in a different environment. The comparison of these scarce results due to the action of religious orders with the showy scientific application in nuclear technology that requires a lot of science is, at the least, flashy. But sophism and all, the argument is accepted by all believers as a reality. The missions are the parallel of the duty of Islamic charity. And neither of the two actions can resolve global problems, but they don't cause havoc and alleviate pain. The atomic bomb is demoniacal, the daughter of science. But the increase in knowledge in all fields of knowledge is what in more or less prolonged terms moves the general evolution of human beings, although unequally. Even knowing this reality, Islamic governments, because they don't have the possibility of developing nuclear technology, exploit the ignorance of their faithful, charging the countries that have this weaponry, except for Mahommedan countries that have it, such as Pakistan, or that try to have it, like Iran; in this way they justify their guerrilla warfare provocation.

The fault of the World of well-being, that is not only the West, is not having the knowledge that has allowed for the creation of the well-being that it enjoys, including the production of nuclear

energy. With overwhelming logic: it is the use, the bad use that has been made of science and the consequent knowledge that agnosticism has created instead of active rationalism when dealing with mythology. And the indifference as well towards logic and very natural rebelliousness of the part of the world that can't even imagine how the natural process of evolution through natural selection or induced selection has functioned, functions and will surely continue functioning.

The blame is shared by believers and disbelievers of the World that has achieved a state of well-being. The first due to ignorance or hypocrisy. The second due to neglect, not being motivated within a system that doesn't allow them to carry out an effective action, apart from electing some previously elected representatives by a partitocracy that has become as obsolete as the very system, but which must continue being its spinal column, a column that could be used for an effective system. Renovating the obsolete that was invented in Athens, developed with advances and regressions in Rome, and carefully maintained by European conservatives - perhaps, in the end, more or less everyone - for two millennia.

22-Territory and nation

The preceding pages suggest a direction for renovating the democratic system in terms of how to elect the representatives of the People. Not in vain, democracy comes from the Greek "demos", a synonym of People. And how it has been expressed in different ways, kindness, the quality of the representatives based on the correct functioning of all types of society. And in the global society, the representatives have to represent the People and bring together the best citizens within the quality that is achieved in each moment by the whole of humanity.

The savage anarchy in the third World and the imitation of democracy in the Second, without exception, limit the options for renovating the system for the First World.

Within the First World, it is not only the West that has a system to renovate. It's everywhere. Even in Islamic countries that are far removed from the necessary model of association that is necessary for a global world, there are deep signs with an affinity for the transcendental. It's when upon seeing the decadence of the West - above, all the European - they support their belief in the insufficiency of "logos" and, because of that, favour the "mythos", considering it necessary to avoid the chaos that rationalism creates to demystify religion without creating new values that avoid what they consider the animalisation of the West. In this aspect, all the religions still present in the First World coincide. An aspect to consider, given that the renovation of the system means speaking with all true believers. With those who feign, dialogue isn't

necessary. They will happily accommodate themselves to the rational world, above all if new values are introduced that the “jihad” that Mohamed preached demands, in words less theistic but equivalent, the struggle of each one with himself to elevate himself culturally and economically.

Within the First World, there is a diversity of systems. As for choosing one that brings together the best conditions for renovation, there is no doubt that this is only possible by depending on those whose development demonstrates the best result and these are all the cases that have been decentralised. The greater the decentralisation, the better the results.

Decentralising means always governing small collectives. No great State-nation, even the most homogenised like France that through a double policy parallel to that of the stick and the carrot that in this country has produced the best result of any other centralised country, has not been able to avoid the existence of rebellious territories. And also Ethnic Groups-nation that are more or less assimilated and gratefully accept the recognition of their specific identity, which would not have impeded a special relationship due to the affinity created with the political-administrative trunk of the French State-nation.

(25) The smaller European countries are ideal candidates to convert into federal States given that the majority only have one ethnic group that during six millennia have been converted into independent Ethnic Group-nations with their own language, a sign of affinity by means of a natural route. And, what’s more, the majority of them, given that they’re partially recognised, already have government practice and active Parliaments.

Large or small countries that historic chance has centralised, always under the hegemony of one, the most numerous, the most warrior-like, decentralisation can be more problematic, but in no way impossible.

Europe can be a model for other large collectives with common affinities and interests, with a reasonable decentralisation that could answer to vocations of a certain large dimension and bring together at most 80-90 federated States as opposed to the current 40-42 States nation - except for England and Turkey that should be privileged associated States, as a bridge between the USA in the first case and with Asia and Islam in the second. The 24 States nation that already belong to the European Union, not counting England, have a total of 394,836, 897 inhabitants. The current non-European Union countries, fifteen States nation, excluding Turkey, have a total of 71,261,151 inhabitants. In total, 466,098,048 for eighty federated States, which would mean an average of 5,826,225 inhabitants per state. An average that is similar to that of the States of the USA and the German Landers.

The evolutions of Turkey and England in their particular independent roles could mean greater ties to Europe or to the USA. And possibly greater ties to these two blocks; rebuilding the West could mean a definite tie between Turkey and the EU and England with equal possibilities with one of another part of West. And decades into the future, even the union to the West with the West being the main interlocutor with the Orient, meaning the Pacific Islands and the Asian sub-continent. With the American sub-continent. And with the African continent, bringing together six interlocutors. Or seven or eight if Islam and Russian free themselves from being swallowed up by the West and/or the Orient in the case that the Orient decides to federate and becomes two more, in the case that the six achieve positive results in their reorganisation through a closer approximation to democracy.

That is how the six-eight human blocks would be established, that now aren't collectives with the exception of the USA, which is. Or the blocks would disappear as the empires have disappeared and the States-nation are disappearing. The European Union, in spite of being formally constituted - though badly constituted - is only a reunion of the truly existing collectives: the Ethnic Groups-nation. Meeting and without any dialogue among them. Ethnic Groups-nation, true collectives for having been able to and having known how to become States or not recognised for not having become independent. These differences are fundamental. They belong to the ethnic mosaic that is Europe and in spite of a poorly understood sense of modernity, racial and ethnic issues are separated from the socio-political problems when it is so easy to accept them and articulate them. And because of that, the EU continues to be only a project, all with the objective of maintaining the homelands of the States-nation.

Faced with the challenge of believers, far-off frontiers and those who are poorly integrated within their own collectives, possibly in a similar way to the effect that communism had uniting the West temporarily, could be the cause of a definitive Union in Europe, which would, without a doubt, be a decisive factor for an agreement involving the West, Europe and North America.

The USA is a little devalued human collective thanks to their true federalism. The difficulty in definitively articulating the differences with Europeans are nominally religious and related to immigration integration, but in reality, economic due to the detours in the functioning of the market and especially because of the divergent political systems of co-existence with its respective ethnic collectives that have evolved in divergent directions. In spite of the fact that an immense part of its towns have an ethnically common origin, the political systems, centralised in the States-nation in Europe and federal in the USA have caused a lack of understanding.

There hasn't been a method or a system to articulate these differences. There is a Constitution in the USA and as many Constitutions as there are States in Europe. The divergence stems primarily from this circumstance. In spite of the pragmatic character due to ascendance and the need to overcome the double effort of becoming free of English domination and of conquering the resistance of the natives. All of these conditioning factors have produced a tremendous force of inertia that has created a seemingly impossible number of people who are believers, still and parallelly in Gods of an amazing diversity and the genetic superiority of certain ethnic groups and races. And this is what originates the mistaken idea that the divorce between the two parts of the West is due to religious differences. With this erroneous idea, Europe would be scientific and the USA would be anti-Darwin. The opposite is true.

In this way, different from the Europeans who depend on themselves to overcome their lack of affinity, Americans depend on the result of their actions abroad and mostly on the circumstances that the exterior causes in them. And if the Europeans have character to overcome the arrogance of the unconfessed aristocratic residuals, of the pragmatism of the other "Arians" in America, then one can also expect them to overcome their own no smaller doctrinal arrogance. The two parallel. If one or both are insurmountable, the world had better wait for other now emerging collectives, perhaps because of the experience of western failure, they will take up the baton of the civilisation in which we live without any other that can be called so - with the exception of the Orient. If arrogance is overcome and the causes caused by conservatism are eliminated, the world can be managed from the moment in which a Western Union happens, better and more easily than just using the model that the EU can give, although it is able to conquer its own and build an effective collective. A united West can be a positive factor in the challenge of the believers. Acting as a wake-up call.

And it can be so for Russia as well. The believers of Islam point the finger at the west in their verbal expression, but it is because Russia is currently in no man's land. What takes away from the communist intellectuals that are absorbed in restoring a political system that is still far from democratic. And definitely far removed from communism. What was the maximum expression of planning, though with false factors, has become the paradigm of improvisation. The USSR was not dissolved. It was destroyed by power - that is almost the only real power on a world scale - that of the USA, forged by a mosaic of collectives, developed in accordance with their distinctly competitive character, one could say Darwinian, in spite of the inclination for religion that creates the idea that our current world has an inconvenient leadership. An idea strengthened on a world scale in part because Europe gives the impression of being more civilised when, in reality, it is conservative, as well as fearful.

Conquering the cold war has turned out to be as positive as conquering a conventional war. The Nazi and communist totalitarianisms were a danger that has been overcome and has allowed for the beginning of a globalising movement in which Russia has stayed on the sidelines, though with clear signs of wanting to be a part of this movement. The richness of its subsoil can speed up the homologation of Russia within the First World more than the entire democratising movement, though this were truly desired.

Russia, not so much due to vocation as to a socio-biologically created nature, is the antithesis of Finland as far as system and results. Though both countries have Finnish ethnic roots in different degrees, they have diverged for the same reason of a lack of leadership that the entire world deals with. Evident in Russia because of its dimension, centralism and ethnic diversity. Barriers that do not exist in Finland. We mustn't be fooled by the revolutionary Marxist explosion. It wasn't a revolution of the masses and the select like the French revolution. It was one of elite classes. And the current counterrevolution, in its successive stages, is also one of elite classes, all of them formed during the communist period, with sectors that are nostalgic for the previous regime, along with renovators. These renovators who don't have any other programme than to benefit from the dismantling of communism.

The Finish on the contrary, in spite of their misfortune caused by the domination of bellicose neighbours, finding refuge in the almost family-like lifestyle of their autonomous villages, no doubt vestiges of their primitive tribes, after their independence in 1917, even during the Soviet domination, have tested different types of government more so than in the rest of Europe put together. Each amendment or each constitutional change - given that changing the Constitution in Finland hasn't suffered the taboo of constitutional consecration as in the South of Europe - has always responded to the elimination or change of what has been considered inconvenient of what has been reformed. The result has been to always have a guideline of co-existence that is better adapted to the circumstances of each moment, than those that are considered untouchable, attributing to them their greatest merit precisely when it is their greatest flaw: the forced prolongation of their vigour, like a new Bible and guide for achieving happiness.

The difference in results between the recognition of mistakes that force changes and the arrogance of autocratic and providential regimes, obsessively conservative, can be appreciated between the related Fins and Slavs, a paradigmatic example of what in politics is pragmatism. And it's not a matter of genetics, an aspect that has been amply overcome. It is simply due to the possibilities that the Finish have because they are a small collective, made smaller by the predominance of autonomous villages from their primogenital base.

The very opposite of Russia, oversized in all aspects, particularly when it comes to territorial dimensions that greatly increase difficulties in the intercommunication among inhabitants and between inhabitants and Government.

(23) The dramatic history of Finland, intermittently subjected to their aggressive Germanic, Scandinavian, Teutonic and Slav neighbours, demonstrates, through the leap from economic mediocrity imposed by their dominators to the current situation, which took place in the brief space of a half century, the effectiveness of a good government, made possible by collectives of reduced dimension. One of their “villages”, Nokia, developed under the shelter of a forestal-paper company founded by Frederik Idestam in the distant 1865, now exhibits its capacity to transform. The industry named the “village”, a normal occurrence that shows the “village” patriotism created by a feeling of Finnish community spirit through belonging to a village, created when the central Asian tribes established themselves in this territory. This sentiment co-exists with that of personal identity. In the world called modern, these sentiments are considered xenophobic and old-fashioned. In Scandinavia, they deny this description. They are the most self-identified countries and, paralelly, the ones who show the most solidarity. Their contributions to defend the rights of those who have been left out demonstrate this. They are more than the designated 0.7% (what’s needed is probably two or three times this amount), with contributions of different kinds and, not unusually, not in the name of individuals.

The custom of cultivating what is local - or cultivating through what is local - has similar signs in Switzerland, where many companies take the name of the place where they reside. Zurich and Winterthur are examples. There is nothing religious that is similar to Oriental Taoism or Shintoism. It’s simply a matter of loving one’s own roots. And distilling the idea, seeing the Scandinavians, Germans and Fins share this respectful character with their ancestors, like the Helvetica Celts, that taking the custom of how they name their businesses one step further, apply the name to their own Helvetica Confederation. All are mixed breeds of autochthonous Europeans and Central Asian tribes, maintaining identities that can now be heard in the names of their communities; these countries have the advantage that they are considered more modern and, in reality, continue to be modernistas. A style that like all styles will be a simple temporary description.

Nokia not only shows how it is and why the Finish character is the way it is. Before reaching the privileged situation of its main activity, it was an example of the capacity of villages to associate and with business providing a supporting role - the main means of communication since Guttenberg - has gone from being a technical support by associating first with the rubber industry and afterwards

with another producing cables. This association was formalised in the recent 1967. Until then, it not only provided miniscule toys to present-day European young people, that needed it for their personal communication. What's more, and this is the main part, it has active markets open in China, in the USA and in all the industrial poles of the world with the revolutionary technologies of the moment and of the immediate future, such as in radio communication, microwave transmission, digitalisation of cellular systems, even the famous DX200. Reflection for ethnologists and anthropologists who exaggerate the relationship between Finish roots and Slav apathy. It is possible that it exists in the form described by ethnology and anthropology. In that case, another confirmation of the effect "struggle to exist" would exist. The Finnish first and the Estonians now would have overcome their own primitive nature created millenarily, which is the same as to same in a time range of millions of years, in the brief temporary secular space. And what's more, it would give an example of what collectives such as an Ethnic Group-nation can do, thanks to the foresight of technological change that silicone makes possible and having changed the educational system at just the right time. The "school teachers" that in the rest of Europe are considerably better paid in comparison with Finland and not well considered; in Finland, on the other hand are the most prestigious collective. Respected by the students, with reminiscences of what the disciples of the "masters" of Magna Greece were. The formation of young Finns could be a model to straighten out young people in the rest of the EU, with a tremendous dropout rate and undesirable formation to rejuvenate Europe and Russia through study and work carried out with affection and vocation.

The Civilisation of the Orient, which Islam has not attacked in its religious struggle because religion has not meant in the Orient what monotheism has meant in the West and even the original philosophies of Asia as a whole, in historic times from the middle of the first millennium A.D. (Buddha (560-480 A.D.), Lao Tse, the creator of Taoism (VI century A.D.) have not had any other objective than to moralize the population in general with moderate or inexistent ambition where power was concerned. The Japanese Meiji, who borrowed from the Shintoist philosophy created in Japan in the same century that China created Taoism, did not participate in any type of Messianism and the concept of divinity has been ethereal with some parallels to the divinities of Roman emperors. The texts which can be considered doctrinal without a bit of sacramentalism are, in reality, philosophical essays that, as such, do not obligate their followers like the dogmas of the monotheistic Christian-Mohammedan mosaic.

The civilising process of the Orient, without sudden starts like those that took place in primitive civilisations, from that of the Nile

and the Mesopotamic Between Rivers to the current West - in reality one civilisation with distinct geographic and ethnic nuclei in a chain through time periods similar to those of the Oriental Civilisation - appears slow and bored. But precisely the absence of sudden starts parallel to those of the West, full of mistakes, explosive appearance of prophets and dogmatic religions and of idealistic exuberance that has still not been extinguished, has made the continuity of the cultural process of the Orient possible. After ten millennia, at the beginning of the current third A.D., the positions are balanced in relation to Japan and notably imbalanced as regards China, though this with the advantage of not having to fight their lukewarm believers - and little, with their diminished Islamic passionists - along with an extremely pragmatic evolutionary acceleration, perhaps charged with the moralising theses and practices of its absolutely pseudo prophets and without a bit of self-attributed divinity, it becomes something fierce and to be feared more than westernized Japan.

China, ever since accepting the failure of the communist system, quite cruel in its own way, is following in the footsteps of Japan as far as becoming westernized - with somewhat extravagant signs, such as the passion of its citizens to surgically alter their perforating black eyes and round out their eyelids - but without forgetting to imitate the Machiavellian behaviours in the area of productive activity and trade that they have imported from the West. A dangerous combination.

They have been rash in the twentieth century imitating Russia. And determined to erase the black pages of that adventure. They are now rash in imitating the West. Surely they won't need to erase this rashness in the future. In the end, their sin is a challenge for westerners: they produce, save and invest. A world that practices this behavioural trilogy would be a world with a tremendous evolutionary capacity.

The USA, the European Union, Russia and the Orient. Four inevitable nuclei or active binding poles for the globalising process. The four in the Northern hemisphere.

Nuclei or poles to be created: the American Subcontinent, the Asian subcontinent, Islam, sub-Saharan Africa, a great component of the Islamic mass.

In view of what we have considered until reaching the current situation, it is evident that it is not possible to articulate a system of co-existence for the six-eight proposed nuclei ideally presented. The aforementioned extraordinary European heterogeneity is extraordinarily multiplied in the whole of the Planet. Not only nor mainly because Europe is multiethnic and the world is multiracial. It is because Europe has notable affinities as far as its educational level

and also as regards its economic capacity and, in spite of this, we see difficulties when it comes to connecting after fifty years of trying to do so.

(25)

Governing through the nuclei of the Northern hemisphere and those of the South as we have described or in a different way following other coordinates with the same outcome should only be a project. A project that is thoroughly thought through and, just as in Finland, stubbornly tested. A process that should be started after having definitively constructed the blocks that should make up the Global World. Therefore, it can only be a project that is thoroughly thought out and tested and that is carried out over time. Only the EU can easily and immediately convert into a nucleus that is parallel to the USA with its twenty-five current countries or, preferably, with the totality of the Ethnic Groups-nation of Europe. If a UN that was reconstructed based on the three established worlds would allow the slower countries of Europe to receive aid from the federated States of the EU, it would be much easier if the help for all the Ethnic Groups-nation of the world came directly from the estate of the First World within the remodelled UN.

The dangers of the challenge of the four reactionary countries that caused the last world war, worse than conservative, given that Italy proposed retrieving the Fascios from the imperial phalange; and though their action in Africa was ridiculous, mending their ancestors, it was enough to reopen two other ideas: that of the Spanish Phalange of the Empire based on God and that of the Project of a new millenary civilization ridiculously called Arian in Germany, as if this central Asian root were exclusive to the Germans. And these three historically nostalgic challenges the closely followed mimetism of Japan, a notable military force, using the most effective force of a future project of Nipponese civilisation.

Together they created a challenge that did not leave any room for doubt as to the danger for the evolutionary process in general. In spite of wavering and pendular movements on the part of the rest of the world, with advances and recessions, the danger was conquered. Roosevelt embarked on an immensely more dangerous adventure than Bush in Iraq. And if the circumstances are different, taking into account the possible final consequences of a defeat for the West in a new world confrontation, the power of the combatant forces in the previous world must be compared with the opposite that will intervene now, that are not afraid of war or of death according to their declarations, and some of them possess atomic weapons. In the previous episode, Russia was on the side of the West. Also and more importantly, because of the intervention of the USA, not only forced by them, but desired and requested by an

almost defeated Europe. And, finally, in the event of a new conflict, Russia still has not taken sides. Its imperialistic revival is a bad sign. But, apart from the atomic danger, there is the challenge of the believers and it seems a caricature of the conquered challenge of the totalitarians of the twentieth century. It is neither a caricature nor a miniature version. After conquering the enormous totalitarian force of Germany, Japan, Italy and Spain, it would not be acceptable for its conquerors to succumb to simple believers, although a part of them (one quarter part of humanity, Islam) is profoundly belligerent. But these believers are only one part of a total religious mass. It is necessary to evaluate the other believers. Not only those that could take on new crusades that aggravate the Mohammedans. Especially those that we have mentioned that are of a social nature, as well. Everyone, the defiant and the resistant, without trenches or positions where they can settle their differences. The entire world submerged in cruel guerrilla warfare with possible impacts, such as those that have happened since 9/11, corrected and increased.

This perspective could be assumed as an inevitable evil to be overcome through reason, with the necessary slowness, and to hope that the balance weren't catastrophic. Though there is no reason for this challenge to be faced, at least as far as Islam is concerned (that is dealing with an extreme situation created by its very beliefs and its negative synergies, the main one being the demographic explosion in its area), there are other more or less important lessons other than avoiding the catastrophic result of a confrontation between this collective and the rest of the world. With part of the blame belonging to the First World, the challenge of the believers could become the challenge of the poor. Just counting the more or less terminally ill (aids, malnutrition etc.), the battery of suicides could grow until reaching an extraordinary number. With millions of inhabitants from the First World and part of the Second, there would be the three thousand, seven hundred million from the Third, supported by a Muslim column incrusting in the First World of seventy million immigrants (pg. 11 Synopsis).

Supposing that this tremendous uneven fight were inevitable, a profound action to make them compatible is also equally necessary, not due to mercy, or charity, or alms-giving duties, but because the globalisation that is in motion is inevitable, it is in the general interest to establish a world population in accordance with what the Earth can maintain and, at the same time, for all the constituted collectives on earth to enjoy an autonomous economy that is sufficient to their needs.

The First World is obligated to make an extraordinary effort, not looking for palliatives, but for a solution to this problem, which in reality is the Total Challenge of the XXI Century. A solution that is only possible by rational means, which means creating collectives that can become interlocutors at the world level.

23-The human dream - Kant

Dreaming is free. The human dream, parallel to Kant's world federal has not existed up to here. We will persevere. The nuclei that we have established, ideally as protagonists of a Project of political renovation, need a drawn-out period of time to become reality. Certainly longer than what is available to avoid human disasters and in the troposphere. And, what's more, with the current educational system, it is possible that it wouldn't ever be created.

To say it again like a broken record: a Global Government for a Global World is inevitable and urgent.

It's necessary to return to our origins: government through representation. Valid interlocutors don't exist; one can only try to create them. And until a new cultural state is achieved with well-defined human groups, which requires previous changes, above all in education.

Now the action that is possible can't be any other than that of starting from the current socio-economic reality: a world divided in three Worlds, created by circumstances and chance. These, apart from existing, are not marked off approximately, but almost perfectly. By economy, a basic part of any political project. And by culture, considered strictly as knowledge. It's not necessary to consider the other "cultures". They are not realities, although at one time, they were. Now they are only history, which is convenient to know. Nothing more.

Not only is it useless to try and get the Second and Third Worlds to take initiatives to establish a new political system. It's completely logical that the initiative can only come from the First World, the one that has the most to lose by taking the path of violent confrontation among the three. And likewise, it is logical that if everyone is situated in a false balance with an abyss that separates them enough to deprive them of a common action, then it is now necessary to adopt a strong position and use it unilaterally. With an anti-Machiavellian disposition - recognising that Machiavelli was inevitable and connatural to our species to culminate the process of leader specimens in their role of politicians operating pragmatically. But also converting Machiavellianism and offering the means to eliminate the cause of discomfort relative to the Second World, and the profound discomfort of the Third. To achieve this, it is necessary to force a not-so-difficult dialogue with these two worlds, given that it means simply giving them, without asking, nothing material. Not due to a moral sense of life, but to a pragmatic sense that considers present-day human beings, leaders or those who are guided to be in possession of an educational level that makes Machiavellian pretexts obsolete.

The proposition of the two Worlds in need of support - with a very elevated cost for the First World - has to make an acceptance of peace unrenouncable in exchange for civilised behaviour on the part of those who have to know, in order to stop growing. But for this, as for everything, it is necessary to make contact, to choose the level of collectives that have to negotiate agreements; it is a priority in order to reach this objective. Impossible between individual physical persons, it is only possible among the three Worlds described in our Synopsis. As real and as naturally constituted as races and ethnic groups. In spite of not being a formal corporate entity, they are the casual result, but real, of the action of settlers during millions of years. The exact opposite of the States-nation, more rapidly eroded than its ancestors, the Empires. These three worlds, restructured in accordance with the result of the creation of Ethnic Groups-nation grouped in large federations of between eight and twelve in the entire world, in a slow-moving process over one or more centuries, would be the fulfilment of Kant's dream. All with their own language and all with a parallel language in common. And all government leaders in with total autonomy. It isn't necessary to create any. They exist and only need to be given the means to become functional administrative units or their conversion in federations of independent Ethnic Groups-nation for the operation of an exchange of peace by means of a higher level of life for those who don't live well. Parallel to this process of normalization of co-existence among those who are different, advance towards a change in political system directed at establishing a sufficient educational level so that the relation between Ethnic Groups-nation is the equivalent of what exists among families. With a framework of laws and obligatory compliance on the part of everyone and respecting their customs - and even better, cultivating them - derived from millenary, millenary or secular processes of creating peoples, ethnic groups and races.

A remodelled UN can serve to carry out the first test run of a world government project. Without taking any risks. Using the physical material that it has - headquarters and their facilities - and possibly a good part of the human content that the Organisation has created and maintains. The reorganisation may be profound, but it only means that, reorganising an organism that has met the best or worst objectives for which it was created. Avoiding wars. Bringing about peace.

Its government has been a commission called Security Council, taking in the main objective, which has been to preserve security and the established world order in the post war.

Not even this government or its parliament - the Assembly - have avoided aging and becoming inoperative. That this happens is not strange. It has been the norm and inevitable in the evolutionary processes that have taken place algorithmically according to Darwin.

What is unusual, given the means that it has and the economic and intellectual backing of its members, is that there have not been any initiatives to adapt the entire Organism to each of the changing situations during the half century of its existence. But unusual and all, there is an explanation for why this has happened: the dimension of the Organism, its bureaucratisation, its organic and geographic centralisation, the duality of apparent power in the Assembly and Security Council, but really exercised by this Council. These factors have created the eternal fear of the States nation to lose power. The same fear that paralyzes the European States-nation to federate. But above all, the right of veto that is the paradigm of anti-democracy and produces the same effect as the power of government leaders of the States nation when they deprive the Ethnic Groups-nation that make them up - considering the word nation etymologically as a natural collective, from the Latin *natio* - to be realized as such. And in the assembly, fear of giving operating capacity through a valuation of the vote according to the contributions of its components and only attentive to the appearance of democracy instead of paying attention to the possible positive results through a programme of aid to the Third World. They have opted for cheapness, which is not economy, given that the results are worse than neutral: negative, putting in evidence the open abyss between rich and poor countries. And because of this, a multitude of economic and cultural organisations have appeared to try to do what the UN couldn't do given its structure of a defensive, centralised and centralising nature. On the other hand, the objective of creating security as concerns possible episodes such as fascism, Nazism, phalangism, and Nipponese imperialism was not very ambitious and still hasn't been dealt with. Totalitarian movements have had their own way, especially in the Third and Second Worlds. It was inevitable, considering that the pseudo government of the Security Council has taken in two members with veto rights - the USSR and China, as equally totalitarian as the totalitarians on the opposite end of the spectrum that were a real danger for world security during the period of the cold war. A war won by the USA without the collaboration of the resistant collectives that did operate in the last war and in the so-called cold war behind the backs of the rest of the countries that are now permanent members of the Security Council. And now, another totalitarian war is developing because all the religious movements are totalitarian. The adjective of fundamentalism more than says it. Any religion that excludes the rest is totalitarian. We can use the classification of aggressive religion or defensive. There are differences among them that make it necessary.

What opens perspectives that could make an action of provisional world government possible in the destiny of the very UN is precisely

the fact that religious and social collectives have a place there, as well as countries. Its renovation can consist of establishing an effective system of representation. Broaden their objectives to take in current problems, foreseeing other future problems that are clearly announced on the present-day horizon. And when articulating world diversity, reorganise the diversity of power going from municipal powers to the world.

This last objective leads us once again to consider the behaviour of small collectives and to repeat once more the example of Scandinavian countries and other parts of Europe and the world. The EU does not take advantage of an opportunity to correctly organise the process of union when ignoring the Scandinavian model and the Finnish in particular. The UN and the world make the same mistake.

Europe possesses its own model within its own borders, easily adaptable due to the permanence of a spirit of greatness of the large States - losses of greatness reached during the second part of the second millennium - completely avoids even looking at the model of the Scandinavians, even though it's prepared and in optimal conditions to do so.

For the world as a whole, the adaptation is possible, but more difficult. The model of system to organise the co-existence of thousands of Peoples requires a minimum of cultural and economic affinity that, while not being that of the Scandinavian countries, at least is that of Europe. This objective is the appropriate one for a UN in its first stage of preparation so that a radical change of federated government dreamed of by Kant becomes, at least in the dreams of present-day humanity by means of groups that are close enough in affinities, extracted from the three socio-economic worlds that now exist. Using the realities of these three worlds as a starting point so that the bond among them is achieved by means of a system that is understood and accepted by the maximum number of people. With a flexibility of action that can be applied to new situations, a constant renovation through systems that are easily amendable and even profound changes by means of legislation to be incorporated in its Constitution, and a firm intention of working with a short number of Federations apt as valid interlocutors within a reduced world government, the final objective to be reached in the long term. But now what is possible in the immediate future in this essential and necessary change of system is to obtain solutions to urgent problems through the very same UN and, parallelly, to channel scattered human beings towards a future of large federations that will have a short number of interlocutors for a World Federation. The eight or slightly more nuclei that we have mentioned.

Reconvert the UN, an idea that is tremendously difficult to carry out due to the constant inertia expended to preserve organisms and people who are active in the field of politics and also because the UN's structure is convenient for many of its components. They know that this Organism doesn't solve many or any problems, but it also isn't dangerous for their so-called national interests. Especially if those interests are also nationalistic.

With or without reconversion and use of this organism that is so well equipped to function on a world level, whoever takes the initiative to be a support for a change in the system, will have to do so following some basic principles: accept the reality of being out of step brought on by government bodies - including the UN in this case - and the modern created societies, that the positive evolution of humanity in the First World has occurred as a whole with a relative levelling off of all the social layers and not linearly, that the abysmal differences between ancient thinkers and polytheists and their contemporary masses, among them slaves, have been drastically reduced. And also accepting that, parallelly, the number of followers capable of participating in a revolutionary movement of the political system has increased. The creators of this bridge-system for the creation of a world government will have to have the aptitude to do it in a way with allows for their own constant renovation as the world society achieves an adequate educational level to directly participate in political action.

The symbiosis among Peoples can be encouraged but not forced. One must accept the necessity of a political system that groups together human beings who not only have different characters, but even opposite ones.

Representation is the system and, in order to be effective, it must allow for the selection of the representatives. Selection is only possible when there is sufficient knowledge between representatives and those they represent. This is only possible in small collectives that already exist: municipalities and municipal districts. And that the electorate and the elected learn from their respective roles, which is possible and even easy in these areas and that there are people elected to act at higher levels of government; which is to say, the same system that we have suggested for the EU. Because a sudden change is not possible, not even a fast one on a global government level and it is necessary to limit the depth of that change so that this UN can be begin to act immediately through the three truly existing divisions now. That of the three spontaneously established economical-cultural Worlds that the Synopsis takes in from a decade ago, changing day to day as it does statistically until becoming much more reliable to become a true guide of the state of each human group with the objective of bringing about solidarity. Not because of the lie of any God or even due to an intelligent design

that doesn't have any physical personality, but due to a familiar logic extended to the world that indicates that united families are those who live longer and better and progress.

In this foreseeably long process to regroup the Ethnic Groups-nation and associate them, it is possible to create three Estates within which everyone knows who is who and with a supportive treatment for the less favoured, recognised statistically, but within the UN.

The reduction of the number of components of the UN to six or eight large federations or confederations would be subordinated in time to its possible establishment. In the meantime, the three Estates corresponding to the three existing Worlds already made up of different economic and cultural levels would be updated annually.

If this proposition were to come about by means of the current democracy, with totally falsified representation by the system, we would have the same as now with the same or different names: an Assembly that doesn't decide anything, and a Government instead of a Security Council. The Assembly would be with voting parity, the same for a large and prosperous Federation as for a poor and miniscule State. All are exclusively dedicated to defending the immediate interests of those it represents: States nation of the world and because of that, mutually neutralising each other and never reaching agreements that are satisfactory for everyone, thus arriving at a state of total lack of operation in the Assembly. This inoperativeness is not rejected by the most powerful countries that can definitively influence in reorganising current politics. They know that no Assembly made up of assembly members with the same voting power: irresponsible States and States with enormous commitments to the world can be operative.

The estate of the first world, led by a permanent active commission representing the USA, the EU, Russia and Japan, as possible countries that bond with the large federations of the future. And the rest of the countries belonging to the First World grouped together geographically and socio-economically through an exact classification and updated constantly according to personal GNP of each represented country. This First Estate would finance a project of economic and cultural regrouping of the Third Estate coinciding with the Third World. And in the preparatory phase, finally group together all the tax havens, Andorra, Antigua and Barbados, the Bahamas, Bahrain, Barbados, Cyprus, the Arab Emirates, Gibraltar, Jordan, Lebanon, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Panama, San Marino, Switzerland and Singapore and up to fifty territories belonging to the three Worlds. These countries would have an additional charge, apart from the quotas to be paid to the World Solidarity Economic Fund, created and fed by the components of the First World. A first step towards regularising the world fiscal aspect

that, in its first phase, would have the result of creating the possibility of an agreement with the countries who receive duties from non-residents, since they are able to maintain their banking operations in secrets, in exchange for knowing the exact amount of capital deposited in each country. In a second phase, keeping in mind that the operative multiplicity at the world level has room for agreements to regulate authentic world Banks for which the ones that currently exist in tax havens are prepared. The tax havens that did not accept these guidelines would be politically excluded from the organization of the new UN and, economically, would negotiate trading conditions with the First Estate.

The Second Estate, made up of countries from the Second World, would be divided into four groups. The first, according to countries whose GNP does not reach six thousand dollars a year. There are nine. And successively groups that don't reach seven or eight thousand dollars, which are the remaining twenty-seven. It would be financed to cover the organisational and maintenance expenses of its own Estate using quotas for its components, with a system calculated according to the First Estate. And it would receive aid in the form a medium-term loans to finance development and internal reorganisation projects in preparation for the future world federal perspective, approved by the First Estate. Delivery from the credit parties at the pace that each project is realised. Fixed loan payments. Without contributions for the Third World. The programming of projects with the support of the First World would be coordinated within the same Estate following an order of application according to the economic situation of its components, initiating the application with the lowest levels in reference to the personal and general GNP.

The Third Estate, corresponding to the Third World, would be divided into five groups. The Third Estate corresponding to the Third World would be divided into five groups. The first with nineteen countries whose GNP per year were less than one thousand dollars. And successively, groups that don't reach two, three, four and five thousand dollars, that are the remaining eighty-two. It would work as in the second, but instead of receiving loans, it would receive direct aid as laid out in the programme of the First Estate.

The combined function of the three estates would be directed at projecting and carrying out contracts of collaboration with all the countries of the Third World. Aid in the form of technical and economic assistance, preferably developing infrastructures projected by the contracting parts and administered by the UN and principally the development of an extensive and intensive cultural programme.

As a counterpoint, the acceptance on the part of governments of the countries receiving contributions of conditions such as: governments that have been freely elected with controlled elections, public education that is free and lay, non-discriminatory treatment of women, commitment to controlling birth rate to reach zero growth in the Second World and a diminishment of the birth rate in the Third World, guarantee of no emigration outside each Estate without formal agreements with the countries of the other two Estates according to guidelines to be established by the UN.

All the countries of the Third World as members of their own Estate in the UN would have the obligation of accepting these contracts and the right to enjoy aid in the order of their current productive capacity, initiating the programme of aid to the less favoured and continuing in ascending order until reaching the totality of them.

The contribution quotas of the components of the First Estate to a World Solidarity Economic Fund would be in proportion to the GNP of each country with a progressive percentage according to the personal GNP.

The tax havens belonging to the First World would contribute a second quota by means of a surcharge on top of the basic charge, by a percentage to be determined through joint negotiation within the First estate. Those belonging to the Second World would contribute only the computation of the surcharge over the calculated base with the lowest type of percentage corresponding to the First World, to serve as the maintenance of the same Estate. Those belonging to the third World would compensate the surcharge quota by means of a diminution in proportion to the contributions received from the First World.

The renovated ordinance or constitution of the UN would be considered as a provisional text to later arrive at a definitive and future world ordering based on the creation of a short number of interlocutors. Well-traced nuclei and established as a result of the phase of government based on the UN. The provisional nature, although it were in force during a period of secular time and especially the intention of successive adaptations to the situations consolidated in each phase of development of the process of compatibility of all the Ethnic Groups-nation would be inspired in generic-like premises. For example:

-Right of entry and exit from the organisation, totally free.

Perseverance-stubbornness testing innovative formulas, the opposite of the stubbornness that is existent in the “conservation” of what is current and even past.

-Separate rules and regulations for each Estate.

In general, rules of organization and autonomous functioning in each Estate, fixed or changed, as long as they are not contrary to the basic Programme to be developed by the Organisation.

-Establishment of nexus of contact and consultation among the three Estates by means of a Permanent Commission made up of two or more members representing each estate.

-Rules and regulations to establish groups made up of countries that have common economic and cultural interests, that could be operative in order to define their collective vote on issues that directly affect them. Politically components of States-nation, not only those that have grouped together more or less integrated Ethnic Groups, but also those Ethnic Groups that for anthropological or political reasons have felt comfortable within their corresponding States-nation; economically oil-producing countries, for example; and above all culturally, countries with their own personalities that have diversified customs of labour or acute apathy and hundreds of contras such as these, even believers and non-believers.

These differences wouldn't necessarily change the structure of the economic base of world solidarity, but would formally be attended to and recognized, although the cost would be picked up by them, considering that this recognition isn't necessarily a stimulus for them to proliferate, but an anticipation to avoid internal problems during the long, very long phase of the creation of a truly humanistic Kantian sentiment.

-Obligatory fulfilment of the decisions made by the First Estate as concerns an established Programme, with the possibility of changes, to carry out the basic objectives of the Organisation.

-Free circulation of capital, goods and people within each free space covered by the respective Estates with the goal of encouraging self-improvement to foster personal and collective self-sufficiency.

-Subventions of all kinds are strictly prohibited within each Estate. And among Estates, they are regulated to make them compatible to the three by a general programme to be developed through specific sub-programmes in appropriate and possible spaces of time.

-The prohibition of buying and selling weapons for armies and limited to the organs of internal order in and among all the estates.

As for possible armed conflicts, if they take place between members of the UN, the aggressor would be expelled and if they take place between countries that are not members of the UN, all

political and economic relations would be broken, also only with the aggressor country. And if the one attacked were a member of the UN, this member would receive all the necessary aid from this organisation, including military, for which an Army of rapid intervention would exist, made up of units from all the countries belonging to the Organisation. The dimension of the Army and the units to be contributed, would be according to the order of position as regards the number of inhabitants and the GNP for each country and from the first moment, would be framed in super units with the most linguistic affinity possible and with bilingual commanders, who would speak their own language and English, and attend to the territory of proximity among units.

-The decisions subject to vote within each Estate would be according to the majority of settlers through Representatives of each group of countries. In the First Estate, apart from increasing the number of votes parallel to the progressive increase in the percentages of GNP by contribution to the World Solidarity Fund. The sum of both factors, divided by two, would give the number of votes represented by each group of countries. The issues subject to vote should be included in the Agenda of the Day so that the countries affected by this Agenda can exercise their vote by sending their own representative to the meeting.

--The number of representative from each Estate should be limited to a much reduced number of persons, given that what counts is the number of those represented and of the contributions to the World Solidarity Fund in the first Estate.

-The work to be done by this UN, suggested as a parallel creation in intervals of the large federations, similar to what has been repeatedly proposed for Europe, would be in and of itself a programme of political action to be developed in during the stages over a prolonged period of years. Each interval that is reached would be an operative and democratic benefit. It would be a change in the system carried out in phases, allowing for the enjoyment of results in each phase, and in that way the process would be controlled in order to introduce changes in the system when it was necessary.

These suggestions have an extension in the fourth part and both texts attempt to show that there is nothing impossible about the idea of initiating a movement of approximation among the spontaneously and naturally created three Worlds. And, what's more, as an example of this approximation, it is unthinkable to carry it out based on foreseeing an Imperial World, with government organs in the image of the deceased empires and even less so in the image of the

States-nation: because diversity not only is desirable. It is inevitable. And absolutely necessary in order not to die of boredom.

(1)

A lot has been added to Darwin's idea, some of it essential, owing to advances in biology. If Darwin had had this knowledge when arguing argument with his opponents, possibly within his family circle, as well, he would have been able to argue not based on the logic used then, but with the same that neo-Darwinism and genetics use now: the perfection of the vital system of the individual in all things, omnipresent and absolutely spontaneous, that up to now, we have tried to define. How does one explain it? With the ideas born of atheists, impatient with the permanence of things imagined that are collected in all the creationists' bibles. A question hangs in the air: God or Darwin? If it turns out that God is real, one last question remains: What can God be? It's up to believers to come up with at least a hypothesis, because a valid answer is only scientifically possible - astronomy, robotics, interplanetary navigation (...) - in a remote future.

FOURTH PART

Synthesis

24- Darwinian synthesis

(5)

There are thousands of arguments against biblical veracity. Not many, but a lot against the current systems of government, of which the only part that is salvageable in part is the approximation to democracy, not provoked, but accepted in general, although it's developed against the will of those who should promote it. However, religion and politics, given the current cultural state of humanity, can be considered positively as a factor of evolution. Together with many other positive factors that are more or less transcendent. And opposite them, negative factors too. The eternal Good and Evil. Classifying them is obligatory. We can advance that the immense majority have been initially positive, the work of human beings with the ability to create Good. Later they have turned negative for lack of human beings with sufficient evolution to continue them. The result of this lack of evolution is reflected when we see that the *mythos* (from the Greek *musteion*, closing eyes) has not evolved with respect to rationality; just the opposite, it has lost in all the monotheistic religions, comparing them to the primitive and simple oriental belief of Good and Evil. This also shows the process in the decline of theogony, as well as the decrease in the number of excellent human beings for having ceded the management of the evolutionary process to professional politicians.

Ever since the year 2000, twenty percent of believers in the world have ceased to be so with the beginning of the sixth year of the XXI century. In Eastern Europe, the decrease has been thirty percent. Only in Africa is the profession of faith maintained. In Asia, the decrease in believers is less spectacular, given the scarce number of practitioners of any religion (in spite of these being the least dogmatic and the least inclined to believe in Messiahs and miracles). Thailand heads the list of incredulity, with sixty-five percent of a non-believing population. And with everything and maintaining a high rate of believers, the USA doesn't remain untouched by this decrease; in the same period (2000-2006) the number of parishioners has gone from 91 to 71 percent. But the worst expectations are not due to a lack of believers, an aspect that due to opinion polls can be manipulated in any sense; the most dramatic evident for churches is that lack of vocational priests, particularly in Catholicism because their clergy practices celibacy. And all of them have suffered a decrease in the intellectual level of their seminary students and

candidates for monks and nuns, many of them now coming from the Third World.

With all the understanding directed towards Abraham, it is difficult to understand the mystifying and conservative attitude of monotheistic churches.

(8)

The constant increase in evolutionary inequality that we have repeatedly commented and that has now become unbearable for those who have remained in the worst positions is the main cause of the great problems and the challenges that these provoke. When equality was general in the social area and afterwards when it began producing inequality, there was no consciousness or appreciation of equality, which was only social. Now social equality has disappeared and genomic, biological equality is well known, concrete, but insufficient. Coinciding with globalisation and the migration of people and goods of all classes and with the rise in the media and information all over the world, they have made people more or less conscious, but sufficient for almost all of the socially unequal human beings. This process is the clear sign that there has been a creator of the Universe; it may have been RANDOM - chance. To attribute this to a being that is like or unlike humans and omnipotent; that is, to say, this would be terribly unfair. If it could in its omnipotence construct the universe, do so with a sense of justice that has a human criterion, then why design a solar system that makes the evolution of biologically equal beings different by situating them in different climates and environments that have made them more or less evolucionable?

Chance has always operated by recombining the mocosomes and individualising human beings. And if the Universe is the All of the All, why resist believing that All that exists in this universe, we as human beings can through innate or acquired autonomy, have the projected and not random evolutionary capacity that leads us to greater knowledge? If not everything, that which is necessary to do justice as far as distributing well being and misfortune more equally. Not the same because, apart from being different due to genetic chance, we are also compatible due to sociological causes that we ourselves originate, which is perfect, but which makes one think that if there is a creator of the universe, it is not in the likeness of human beings. Ignorant beings in an earthly environment.

Culture is elevated through education. And education that is not stagnant, but rerouted, can be realigned through an NPO, which could be churches in decline. Four millennia in a straight line overcoming every difficulty, have only served to maintain the belief, practically imposed by Abraham on his tribes and through the opposite prophets of their respective churches, have persevered until

the believers begin to disappear or ask for a change of direction that recoups the value that Abraham created in his time. It is not difficult to think what he and many like him who were not only religious men, but politicians as well would think in the circumstances in which we live and knowing what we know. Four millennia ago and with the knowledge that ancestors such as Copernicus-Bacon-Galileo-Newton-Hume and Malthus transmitted to Darwin and Mendel, if by an authentic miracle, Abraham has acquired it - breaking the civilising syncretism that, without being a universal law, is a constant operative in all areas of human activity - the Bible would be at least a version of "The Origin of Species" and possibly with much more definition than what Darwin achieved. Artificial and biological Intelligence overlapping knowledge acquired by humans. What will be produced in the next four millennia?

The conquered religious "realities" and the ones to be definitively conquered can only be attacked through their dogmatic obdurateness, which is why they are extinguishable. For this same reason, all the closed social-political systems are or should be. The empires, the monarchies and the aristocracy were. The states-nation are and, in general, all the conservative systems that are reluctant to change and renovation. There is no law that says so. It is simply a reality: that with does not evolves, disappears. Just as theologies have disappeared, without dramatic episodes. Silently. Imperceptibly for human beings that slowly go about substituting them for the latest syncretism in beliefs and knowledge through science. Can this be a sign that this clear perception also exists within churches and to avoid being substituted, is the latest syncretism happening there too - from theogony to knowledge - that without preserving religion, preserves churches from being forgotten as mythology was?

In Darwin's Wake

Parfois je pense; et parfois, je suis.

Paul Valéry

Valéry's "*Variation sur Descartes*" excellently evokes the vanishing act that has haunted philosophy ever since Darwin overturned the Cartesian tradition. If *my body* is composed of nothing but a team of a few trillion robotic cells, mindlessly interacting to produce all the large-scale patterns that tradition would attribute to the non-mechanical workings of my mind, there seems to be nothing left over to be *me*. Lurking in Darwin's shadow there is a bugbear: the incredible Disappearing Self. One of Darwin's earliest critics saw what was coming and could scarcely contain his outrage:

In the theory with which we have to deal, Absolute Ignorance is the artificer; so that we may enunciate as the fundamental principle of the whole system, that, IN ORDER TO MAKE A PERFECT AND

BEAUTIFUL MACHINE, IT IS NOT REQUISITE TO KNOW HOW TO MAKE IT. This proposition will be found, on careful examination, to express, in condensed form, the essential purport of the Theory, and to express in a few words all Mr. Darwin's meaning; who, by a strange inversion of reasoning, seems to think Absolute Ignorance fully qualified to take the place of Absolute Wisdom in all the achievements of creative skill.

This “strange inversion of reasoning” promises-or threatens-to dissolve the Cartesian *res cogitans* as the wellspring of creativity, and then where will we be? Nowhere, it seems. It *seems* that if creativity gets “reduced” to “mere mechanism” we will be shown not to exist at all. Or, we will exist, but we won’t be thinkers, we won’t manifest genuine “Wisdom in all the achievements of creative skill.” The individual as Author of works and deeds will be demoted: a person, it seems, is a barely salient nexus, a mere slug in the fabric of causation.

Whenever we zoom in on the act of creation, it seems we lose sight of it. The genius we thought we could see from a distance gets replaced at the last instant by stupid machinery, an echo of Darwin’s shocking substitution of Absolute Ignorance for Absolute Wisdom in the creation of the biosphere. Many people dislike Darwinism in their guts, and of all the ill-lit, murky reasons for antipathy to Darwinism, this one has always struck me as the deepest, but only in the sense of being the most entrenched, the least accessible to rational criticism. There are thoughtful people who scoff at Creationism, dismiss dualism out of hand, pledge allegiance to academic humanism-and then get quite squirrelly when somebody proposes a Darwinian theory of creative intelligence. The very idea that all the works of human genius can be understood *in the end* to be mechanistically generated products of a cascade of generate-and-test algorithms arouses deep revulsion in many otherwise quite insightful, open-minded people.

Absolute Ignorance? Fie on anybody who would thus put “A” and “I” together! Serendipity is the wellspring of evolution, so it is fitting that an evolutionist such as I should adapt MacKenzie’s happy capitalization for a purpose he could hardly have imagined. His outraged scoffing at the powers of Absolute Ignorance has an uncannily similar echo more than a century later in the equally outraged scoffing at those who believe in what John Searle has called “strong AI,” the thesis that *real* intelligence can be made by artifice, that the difference between a mindless mechanism and a mindful one is a difference of design (or *program*-since whatever you can design in hardware you can implement in a virtual machine that has the same competence) .

Darwin’s “strange inversion of reasoning” turns an ancient idea upside-down. The “top-down” perspective on creative

intelligence supposes that it always takes a big, fancy, smart thing to create a lesser thing. No horseshoe has ever made a blacksmith; no pot has fashioned a potter. Hence we-and all the other fancy things we see around us-must have been created by something still fancier, something like us only more so. To many-perhaps most-people, this idea is *just obvious*. Consider this page from a creationist propaganda mailing:

1. Do you know of any building that didn't have a builder?

YES/NO

2. Do you know of any painting that didn't have a painter?

YES/NO

3. Do you know of any car that didn't have a maker?

YES/NO

If you answered "YES" to any of the above, give details:

But however strongly the idea appeals to common sense, Darwin shows us how it can be, in a word, false. Darwin shows us that a bottom-up theory of creation is, indeed, not only imaginable but empirically demonstrable. Absolute Ignorance *is* fully qualified to take the place of Absolute Wisdom in all the achievements of creative skill-*all* of them.

John Searle's Chinese Room thought experiment is a variation on the desperate joke of the creationists:

Do you know of any machine that can understand Chinese?

YES/NO

If you answered "YES" give details!

While the creationists' rhetorical questions merely gesture towards the presumed embarrassments facing anybody who tries to "give details" of an instance of bottom-up creation, Searle's challenge offers a survey of possible avenues the believers in strong AI might take in their attempts to "give details" and purports to rebut them one and all. The believers in strong AI have been remarkably unmoved by Searle's attempts at refutation, and the comparison of Searle's position with creationism shows why. Biologists who cannot *yet* explain some particular puzzle about the non-miraculous path that led to one marvel of nature or another, who cannot *yet* "give details" to satisfy the particular critic, nevertheless have such a fine track record of success in giving the details, and such a stable and fecund background theory to use in generating and confirming new details, that they simply dismiss the rhetorical implication: "You'll never succeed!" They calmly acknowledge that they may need to develop a few new wrinkles before they can declare victory. Believers in strong AI are similarly content to concede that all AI models to date have been deficient in many respects, orders of magnitude too simple, many of them pursuing particular visions of AI that are simply mistaken. They go on to note that Searle isn't challenging particular details of the attempts to date; he purports to

be offering an argument for the *in principle* impossibility of strong AI, a conclusion that he insists is meant to cover all *imaginable* complications of the underlying theoretical framework. They know that their underlying theoretical framework is nothing other than the straightforward extension, into the human brain and all its peripheral devices and interfaces, of the Darwinian program of mindless mechanism doing, in the end, all the work. If Darwinian mechanisms can explain the existence of a skylark, in all its glory, they can surely explain the existence of an ode to a nightingale, too. A poem is a wonderful thing, but not clearly more wonderful than a living, singing skylark.

Unsupportable antipathies often survive thanks to protective coloration: they blend into the background of legitimate objections to overstatements of the view under attack. Since the reach of Darwinian enthusiasm has always exceeded its grasp, there are always good criticisms of Darwinian excesses to hide amongst. Likewise, of course, for the excesses of the ideologues of AI. And so the battle rages, generating as much suspicion as insight. Darwinians who are sure that a properly nuanced, sophisticated Darwinism is proof against all the objections and misgivings-I am one such-should nevertheless recall the fate of the Freudian nags of the 50s and 60s, who insisted on seeing everything through the perspective of their hero's categories, only to discover that by the time you've attenuated your Freudianism to accommodate *everything*, it is Pickwickian Freudianism most of the way. Sometimes a cigar is just a cigar, and sometimes an idea is just an idea-not a meme-and sometimes a bit of mental machinery is not usefully interpreted as an adaptation dating back to our ancestral hunter-gatherer days or long before, even though it is, obviously, descended (with modifications) from some combination or other of such adaptations. We Darwinians will try to remind ourselves of this, hoping our doughty opponents will come to recognize that a Darwinian theory of creativity is not just a promising solution but the only solution in sight to a problem that is everybody's problem: *how can an arrangement of a hundred billion mindless neurons compose a creative mind, an I?*

William Poundstone has put the inescapable challenge succinctly in terms of "the old fantasy of a monkey typing *Hamlet* by accident." He calculates that the chances of this happening are "1 in 50 multiplied by itself 150,000 times."

In view of this, it may seem remarkable that anything as complex as a text of *Hamlet* exists. The observation that *Hamlet* was written by Shakespeare and not some random agency only transfers the problem. Shakespeare, like everything else in the world, must have arisen (ultimately) from a homogeneous early universe. Any way you look at it *Hamlet* is a product of that primeval chaos.

Where does all that design come from? What processes could conceivably yield such improbable “achievements of creative skill”? What Darwin saw is that design is always both valuable and costly. It does not fall like manna from heaven, but must be accumulated the hard way, by time-consuming, energy-consuming processes of mindless search through “primeval chaos”, automatically preserving happy accidents when they occur. This broadband process of Research and Development is breathtakingly inefficient, but-this is Darwin’s great insight-if the costly fruits of R and D can be thriftily conserved, copied, and re-used, they can be accumulated over time to yield “the achievements of creative skill.” “This principle of preservation,” Darwin says, “I have called, for the sake of brevity, Natural Selection.”

There is no requirement in Darwin’s vision that these R and D processes run everywhere and always at the same tempo, with the same (in-) efficiency. Consider the unimaginably huge multi-dimensional space of all *possible* designed things-both natural and artificial. Every imaginable whale and unicorn, every automobile and spaceship and robot, every poem and mathematical proof and symphony finds its place somewhere in this Design Space. If we think of design work or R and D as a sort of *lifting* in Design Space then we can see that the gradualistic, frequently back-sliding, maximally inefficient basic search process can on important occasions yield new conditions that speed up the process, permitting faster, more effective local lifting. Call any such product of earlier R and D a *crane*, and distinguish it from what Darwinism says does not happen: *skyhooks*. Skyhooks, like manna from heaven, would be miracles, and if we posit a skyhook anywhere in our “explanation” of creativity, we have in fact conceded defeat-“Then a miracle occurs.”

What, then, is a mind? The Darwinian answer is straightforward. A mind is a crane, made of cranes, made of cranes, a mechanism of not quite unimaginable complexity that can clamber through Design Space at a giddy-but not miraculously giddy-pace, thanks to all the earlier R and D, from all sources, that it exploits. What is the anti-Darwinian answer? It is perfectly expressed by one of the 20th century’s great creative geniuses (though, like MacKenzie, he probably didn’t mean by his words what I intend to mean by them).

Je ne cherche pas; je trouve.

-Pablo Picasso

Picasso purports to be a genius indeed, someone who does not need to engage in the menial work of trial and error, generate-and-test, R and D; he claims to be able to *leap* to the summits of the peaks-the excellent designs-in the vast reaches of Design Space without having to guide his trajectory (he searches not) by sidelong testing at any way stations. As an inspired bit of bragging, this is *non*

pareil, but I don't believe it for a minute. And anyone who has strolled through an exhibit of Picasso drawings (as I recently did in Valencia) looking at literally dozens of variations on a single theme, all signed--and sold-by the artist, will appreciate that whatever Picasso may have meant by his *bon mot*, he could not truly claim that he didn't engage in a time-consuming, energy-consuming exploration of neighbourhoods in Design Space. At best he could claim that his own searches were so advanced, so efficient, that it didn't seem-to himself-to be design work at all. But then what did he have within him that made him such a great designer? A skyhook or a superb collection of cranes?

We can now characterize a mutual suspicion between Darwinians and anti-Darwinians that distorts the empirical investigation of creativity. Darwinians suspect their opponents of hankering after a skyhook, a miraculous gift of genius whose powers have no decomposition into mechanical operations, however complex and informed by earlier processes of R and D. Anti-Darwinians suspect their opponents of hankering after an account of creative processes that so diminishes the Finder, the Author, the Creator, that it disappears, at best a mere temporary locus of mindless differential replication. We can make a little progress, I think, by building on Poundstone's example of the *creation of the creator of Hamlet*. Consider, then, a little thought experiment.

Suppose Dr. Frankenstein designs and constructs a monster, Spakesheare, that thereupon sits up and writes out a play, *Spamlet*. My question is not about the author of *Waverley* but about the author of *Spamlet*.

Who is the author of *Spamlet*?

First, let's take note of what I claim to be irrelevant in this thought experiment. I haven't said whether Spakesheare is a robot, constructed out of metal and silicon chips, or, like the original Frankenstein's monster, constructed out of human tissues-or cells, or proteins, or amino acids, or carbon atoms. As long as the design work and the construction were carried out by Dr. Frankenstein, it makes no difference to the example what the materials are. It might well turn out that the only way to build a robot small enough and fast enough and energy-efficient enough to sit on a stool and type out a play is to construct it from artificial cells filled with beautifully crafted motor proteins and other carbon-based nanorobots. That is an interesting technical and scientific question, but not of concern here. For exactly the same reason, if Spakesheare is a metal-and-silicon robot, it may be allowed to be larger than a galaxy, if that's what it takes to get the requisite complication into its program-and we'll just have to repeal the speed limit for light for the sake of our thought experiment. These technical constraints are commonly declared to be off-limits in these thought experiments, so be it. If

Dr. Frankenstein chooses to make his AI robot out of proteins and the like, that's his business. If his robot is cross-fertile with normal human beings and hence capable of creating what is arguably a new species by giving birth to a child, that is fascinating, but what we will be concerned with is Spakesheare's purported brainchild, *Spamlet*. Back to our question:

Who is the author of *Spamlet*?

In order to get a grip on this question, we have to look inside and see what happens in Spakesheare. At one extreme, we find inside a file (if Spakesheare is a robot with a computer memory) or a basically *memorized* version of *Spamlet*, all loaded and ready to run. In such an extreme case, Dr. Frankenstein is surely the author of *Spamlet*, using his intermediate creation, Spakesheare, as a mere storage-and-delivery device, a particularly fancy word processor. All the R and D work was done earlier, and copied to Spakesheare by one means or another.

We can visualize this more clearly by imagining a sub-space of Design Space, which I call the Library of Babel, after Jorge Luis Borges' classic short story by that name. Borges invites us to imagine a warehouse filled with books that appears to its inhabitants to be infinite; they eventually decide that it is not, but it might as well be, for it seems that on its shelves--in no order, alas--lie all the *possible* books.

Suppose that each book is 500 pages long, and each page consists of 40 lines of 50 spaces, so there are two thousand character-spaces per page. Each space is either blank, or has a character printed on it, chosen from a set of 100 (the upper and lower case letters of English and other European languages, plus the blank and punctuation marks). Somewhere in the Library of Babel is a volume consisting entirely of blank pages, and another volume is all question marks, but the vast majority consist of typographical gibberish; no rules of spelling or grammar, to say nothing of sense, prohibit the inclusion of a volume. Five hundred pages times two thousand characters per page gives a million character-spaces per book, so there are $100^{1,000,000}$ books in the Library of Babel. Since it is estimated that there are only 100^{40} (give or take a few) *particles* (protons, neutrons and electrons) in the region of the universe we can observe, the Library of Babel is not remotely a physically possible object, but thanks to the strict rules with which Borges constructed it in his imagination, we can think about it clearly.

We need some terms for the quantities involved. The Library of Babel is not infinite, so the chance of finding anything interesting in it is not literally infinitesimal. These words exaggerate in a familiar way, but we should avoid them. Unfortunately, all the standard metaphors--astronomically large, a needle in a haystack, a drop in the ocean--fall comically short. No *actual* astronomical quantity (such as the number of elementary particles in the universe,

or the time since the Big Bang measured in nanoseconds) is even visible against the backdrop of these huge-but-finite numbers. If a readable volume in the Library were as easy to find as a particular drop in the ocean, we'd be in business! Dropped at random into the Library, your chance of ever encountering a volume with so much as a grammatical sentence in it is so vanishingly small that we might do well to capitalize the term--*Vanishingly* small--and give it a mate, *Vastly*, short for Very-much-more-than-astronomically.

It is amusing to reflect on just how large this finite set of possible books is, compared with any actual library. Most of the books are pure gibberish, as noted, so consider the Vanishing subset of books composed entirely of English words, without a single misspelling. It is itself a Vast set, of course, and contained within it, but Vanishingly hard to find, is the Vast subset whose English words are lined up in grammatical sentences. A Vast but Vanishing subset of this subset in turn is the subset of books composed of English sentences that actually make sense. A Vast but Vanishing subset of these are about somebody named John, and a Vast but Vanishing subset of these are about the death of John F. Kennedy. A Vast but Vanishing subset of these are true . . . and a Vast but Vanishing subset of the possible true books about the death of JFK are written entirely in limericks. There are many orders of magnitude more possible true books in limerick form about the death of JFK than there are books in the Library of Congress.

Now we are ready to return to that needle-in-a-haystack, *Spamlet*, and consider how the trajectory to this particular place in the Library of Babel was traversed in actual history. If we find that the whole journey was already completed by the time Spakesheare's memory was constructed and filled with information, we know that Spakesheare played no role at all in the search. Working backwards, if we find that Spakesheare's only role was running the stored text through a spell-checker before using it to guide its typing motions, we will be unimpressed by claims of Spakeshearian authorship. This is a measurable, but Vanishing, part of the total R and D. There is a sizable galaxy of near-twin texts of *Spamlet*--roughly a hundred million different minor mutants have but a single uncorrected typo in them, and if we expand our horizon to include one typo per page, we have begun to enter the land of Vast numbers of variations on the theme. Working back a little further, once we graduate from typos to *thinkos*, those arguably mistaken, or sup-optimally chosen, words, we have begun to enter the land of serious authorship, as contrasted with mere copy-editing. The relative triviality of copy-editing, and yet its unignorable importance in shaping the final product gets well represented in terms of our metaphor of Design Space, where every little bit of lifting counts for something, and sometimes a little bit of lifting moves you onto a whole new trajectory. As usual, we may

quote Ludwig Mies van der Rohe at this juncture: “God is in the details.”

Now let’s turn the knobs on our thought experiment, as Douglas Hofstadter has recommended and look at the other extreme, in which Dr. Frankenstein leaves most of the work to Spakesheare. The most realistic scenario would surely be that Spakesheare has been equipped by Dr. Frankenstein with a virtual past, a lifetime stock of pseudo-memories of experiences on which to draw while responding to its Frankenstein-installed obsessive desire to write a play. Among those pseudo-memories, we may suppose, are many evenings at the theatre, or reading books, but also some unrequited loves, some shocking close calls, some shameful betrayals and the like. Now what happens? Perhaps some scrap of a “human interest” story on the network news will be the catalyst that spurs Spakesheare into a frenzy of generate-and-test, ransacking its memory for useful titbits and themes, transforming-transposing, morphing-what it finds, jiggling the pieces into temporary, hopeful structures that compete for completion, most of them dismantled by the corrosive processes of criticism that nevertheless expose useful bits now and then, and so forth, and all of this multi-levelled search would be somewhat guided by multi-level, internally generated evaluations, including evaluation of the evaluationof the evaluation functions as a response to evaluation of . . . the products of the ongoing searches.

Now if the amazing Dr. Frankenstein had actually anticipated all this activity down to its finest grain at the most turbulent and chaotic level, and had hand-designed Spakesheare’s virtual past, and all its search machinery, to yield just this product, *Spamlet*, then Dr. Frankenstein would be, once again, the author of *Spamlet*, but also, in a word, God. Such Vast foreknowledge would be simply miraculous. Restoring a smidgen of realism to our fantasy, we can set the knobs at a rather less extreme position and assume that Dr. Frankenstein was unable to foresee all this in detail, but rather delegated to Spakesheare most of the hard work of completing the trajectory in Design Space to *one literary work or another*, something to be determined by later R and D occurring within Spakesheare itself. We have now arrived, by this simple turn of the knob, in the neighbourhood of reality itself, for we already have actual examples of impressive artificial Authors that Vastly outstrip the foresight of their own creators. Nobody has yet created an artificial playwright worth serious attention, but an artificial chess player-IBM’s Deep Blue-and an artificial composer-David Cope’s EMI-have both achieved results that are, *in some respects*, equal to the best that human creative genius can muster.

Who beat Garry Kasparov, the reigning World Chess Champion? Not Murray Campbell or any of his IBM team. Deep Blue beat Kasparov. Deep Blue designs better chess games than any of

them can design. None of them can author a winning game against Kasparov. Deep Blue can. Yes, but. Yes, but. I am sure many of you are tempted to insist at this point that when Deep Blue beats Kasparov at chess, its brute force search methods are *entirely* unlike the exploratory processes that Kasparov uses when he conjures up his chess moves. But that is simply not so-or at least it is not so in the only way that could make a difference to the context of this debate about the universality of the Darwinian perspective on creativity. Kasparov's brain is made of organic materials, and has an architecture importantly unlike that of Deep Blue, but it is still, so far as we know, a massively parallel search engine which has built up, over time, an outstanding array of heuristic pruning techniques that keep it from wasting time on unlikely branches. There is no doubt that the investment in R and D has a different profile in the two cases; Kasparov has methods of extracting good design principles from past games, so that he can recognize, and know enough to ignore, huge portions of the game space that Deep Blue must still patiently canvass *seriatim*. Kasparov's "insight" dramatically changes the shape of the search he engages in, but it does not constitute "an *entirely* different" means of creation. Whenever Deep Blue's exhaustive searches close off a *type* of avenue that it has some means of recognizing (a difficult, but not impossible task), it can re-use that R and D whenever it is appropriate, just as Kasparov does. Much of this analytical work has been done for Deep Blue by its designers, and given as an innate endowment, but Kasparov has likewise benefitted from hundreds of thousands of person-years of chess exploration transmitted to him by players, coaches and books. It is interesting in this regard to contemplate the suggestion recently made by Bobby Fischer, who proposes to restore the game of chess to its intended rational purity by requiring that the major pieces be *randomly* placed in the back row at the start of each game (random, but mirror image for black and white). This would instantly render the mountain of memorized openings almost entirely obsolete, for humans and machines alike, since only rarely would any of this lore come into play. One would be thrown back onto a reliance on fundamental principles; one would have to do more of the hard design work in real time-with the clock running. It is far from clear whether this change in rules would benefit human beings more than computers. It all depends on which type of chess player is relying most heavily on what is, in effect, rote memory-reliance *with minimal comprehension* on the R and D of earlier explorers.

The fact is that the search space for chess is too big for even Deep Blue to explore exhaustively in real time, so like Kasparov, it prunes its search trees by taking calculated risks, and like Kasparov, it often gets these risks pre-calculated. Both presumably do massive amounts of "brute force" computation on

their very different architectures. After all, what do neurons know about chess? Any work *they* do must be brute force work of one sort or another.

It may seem that I am begging the question in favour of a computational, AI approach by describing the work done by Kasparov's brain in this way, but the work has to be done somehow, and no *other* way of getting the work done has ever been articulated. It won't do to say that Kasparov uses "insight" or "intuition" since that just means that Kasparov himself has no privileged access, no insight, into how the good results come to him. So, since nobody knows how Kasparov's brain does it-least of all Kasparov-there is not yet any evidence at all to support the claim that Kasparov's means are "entirely unlike" the means exploited by Deep Blue. One should remember this when tempted to insist that "of course" Kasparov's methods are hugely different. What on earth could provoke one to go out on a limb like that? Wishful thinking? Fear?

But that's just chess, you say, not art. Chess is *trivial* compared to art (now that the world champion chess player is a computer). This is where David Cope's EMI comes into play. Cope set out to create a mere efficiency-enhancer, a composer's aid to help him over the blockades of composition any creator confronts, a high-tech extension of the traditional search vehicles (the piano, staff paper, the tape recorder, etc.). As EMI grew in competence, it promoted itself into a whole composer, incorporating more and more of the generate-and-test process. When EMI is fed music by Bach, it responds by generating musical compositions in the style of Bach. When given Mozart, or Schubert, or Puccini, or Scott Joplin, it readily analyzes their styles and composes new music in their styles, better pastiches than Cope himself-or almost any human composer-can compose. When fed music by two composers, it can promptly compose pieces that eerily unite their styles, and when fed, all at once (with no clearing of the palate, you might say) all these styles at once, it proceeds to write music based on the totality of its musical experience. The compositions that result can then also be fed back into it, over and over, along with whatever other music comes along in MIDI format, and the result is EMI's own "personal" musical style, a style that candidly reveals its debts to the masters, while being an unquestionably idiosyncratic integration of all this "experience." EMI can now compose not just two-part inventions and art songs but whole symphonies-and has composed over a thousand, when last I heard. They are good enough to fool experts (composers and professors of music) and I can personally attest to the fact that an EMI-Puccini aria brought a lump to my throat-but then, I'm on a hair trigger when it comes to Puccini, and this was a good enough imitation to fool me. David Cope can no more claim to be the

composer of EMI's symphonies and motets and art songs than Murray Campbell can claim to have beaten Kasparov in chess.

To a Darwinian, this new element in the cascade of cranes is simply the latest in a long history, and we should recognize that the boundary between authors and their artefacts should be just as penetrable as all the other boundaries in the cascade. When Richard Dawkins notes that the beaver's dam is as much a part of the beaver phenotype-its *extended phenotype*-as its teeth and its fur, he sets the stage for the further observation that the boundaries of a human author are exactly as amenable to extension. In fact, of course, we've known this for centuries, and have carpentered various semi-stable conventions for dealing with the products of Rubens, of Rubens' *studio*, of Rubens' various students. Wherever there can be a helping hand, we can raise the question of just who is helping whom, what is creator and what is creation. How should we deal with such questions? To the extent that anti-Darwinians simply want us to preserve some tradition of authorship, to have some *rules of thumb* for determining who or what shall receive the honour (or blame) that attends authorship, their desires can be acknowledged and met, one way or another (which doesn't necessarily mean we should meet them). To the extent that this is not enough for the anti-Darwinians, to the extent that they want to hold out for authors as an objective, metaphysically grounded, "natural kind" (oh, the irony in those essentialist wolf-words in naturalist sheep's clothing!), they are looking for a skyhook.

The renunciation of skyhooks is, I think, the deepest and most important legacy of Darwin in philosophy, and it has a huge domain of influence, extending far beyond the skirmishes of evolutionary epistemology and evolutionary ethics. If we commit ourselves to Darwin's "strange inversion of reasoning," we turn our backs on compelling ideas that have been central to the philosophical tradition for centuries, not just Aristotle's essentialism and irreducible *telos*, but also Descartes's *res cogitans* as a causer outside the mechanistic world, to name the three that had been most irresistible until Darwin came along. The siren songs of these compelling traditions still move many philosophers who have not yet seen fit to execute the inversion, sad to say. Clinging to their pre-Darwinian assumptions, they create problems for themselves that will no doubt occupy many philosophers for years to come. The themes all converge when the topic is creativity and authorship, where the urge is to hunt for an "essence" of creativity, an "intrinsic" source of meaning and purpose, a locus of responsibility somehow insulated from the causal fabric in which it is embedded, so that within its boundaries it can generate, from its *own* genius, its *irreducible* genius, the meaningful words and deeds that distinguish us so sharply from mere mechanisms.

Plato called for us to carve nature at its joints, a wonderful biological image, and Darwin showed us that the salient boundaries in the biosphere are not the crisp set-theoretic boundaries of essentialism, but the emergent effects of historical processes. As one species turns into two, the narrow isthmus of intermediates disappears as time passes, leaving islands, concentrations sharing family resemblances, surrounded by empty space. As Darwin noted (in somewhat different terms), there are feedback processes that enhance separation, actively depopulating this middle ground. We might expect the same sort of effects in the sphere of human mind and culture, cultural habits or practices that favour the isolation of the processes of artistic creation in a single mind. “Are you the author of this?” “Is this all your own work?” The mere fact that these are familiar questions shows that there are cultural pressures encouraging people to *make* the favoured answers come true. A small child, crayon in hand, huddled over her drawing, slaps away the helping hand of parent or sibling, because she wants this to be *her* drawing. She already appreciates the norm of pride of authorship, a culturally imbued bias built on the palimpsest of territoriality and biological ownership. The very idea of being an artist shapes her consideration of opportunities on offer, shapes her evaluation of features she discovers in herself. And this in turn will strongly influence the way she conducts her own searches through Design Space, in her largely unconscious emulation of Picasso’s ideal, or, if she is of a contrarian spirit, defying it, like Marcel Duchamp: Cabanne: What determined your choice of ready-mades? Duchamp: That depended on the object. In general, I had to beware of its “look.” It’s very difficult to choose an object, because, at the end of fifteen days, you begin to like it or to hate it. You have to approach something with indifference, as if you had no aesthetic emotion. The choice of ready-mades is always based on visual indifference and, at the same time, on the total absence of good or bad taste. . . .

There is a persistent problem of imagination management in the debates surrounding this issue: people on both sides have a tendency to underestimate the resources of Darwinism, imagining simplistic alternatives that do not exhaust the space of possibilities. Darwinians are notoriously quick to find (or invent) differences in *genetic fitness* to go with every difference they observe, for instance. Meanwhile, anti-Darwinians, noting the huge distance between a beehive and the *St. Matthew Passion* as created objects, are apt to suppose that anybody who proposes to explain both creative processes with a single set of principles must be guilty of one reductionist fantasy or another: “Bach had a gene for writing baroque counterpoint just like the bees’ gene for forming wax hexagons” or “Bach was just a mindless trial-and-error mutator and selector of the musical memes that already flourished in his cultural

environment.” Both of these alternatives are nonsense, of course, but pointing out their flaws does nothing to support the idea that (“therefore”) there must be irreducibly *non-Darwinian* principles at work in any account of Bach’s creativity. In place of this dimly imagined chasm with “Darwinian phenomena” on one side and “non-Darwinian phenomena” on the other side, we need to learn to see the space between bee and Bach as populated with all manner of mixed cases, differing from their nearest neighbours in barely perceptible ways, replacing the chasm with a traversable gradient of non-minds, protominds, hemi-demi-semi minds, magpie minds, copycat minds, aping minds, clever-pastiche minds, “path-finding” minds, “ground-breaking” minds, and eventually, genius minds. And the individual minds, of each calibre, will themselves be composed of different sorts of parts, including, surely, some special-purpose “modules” adapted to various new tricks and tasks, as well as a cascade of higher-order reflection devices, capable of generating ever more rarefied and delimited searches through pre-selected regions of the Vast space of possible designs.

It is important to recognize that genius is itself a product of natural selection and involves generate-and-test procedures all the way down. Once you have such a product, it is often no longer particularly perspicuous to view it solely as a cascade of generate-and-test processes. It often makes good sense to leap ahead on a *narrative* course, thinking of the agent as a self, with a variety of projects, goals, presuppositions, hopes, In short, it often makes good sense to adopt the intentional stance towards the whole complex product of evolutionary processes. This effectively brackets the largely unknown and unknowable mechanical microprocesses as well as the history that set them up, and puts them out of focus while highlighting the patterns of rational activity that those mechanical microprocesses track so closely. This tactic makes especially good sense to the creator himself or herself, who must learn not to be oppressed by the revelation that on close inspection, even on close *introspection*, a genius dissolves into a pack rat, which dissolves in turn into a collection of trial-and-error processes over which nobody has ultimate control.

Does this realization amount to a loss-and-elimination-of selfhood, of genius, of creativity? Those who are closest to the issue—the artistic and scientific geniuses who have reflected on it—often confront this discovery with equanimity. Mozart is reputed to have said of his best musical ideas: “Whence and how do they come? I don’t know and I have nothing to do with it.” The painter Philip Guston is equally unperturbed by this evaporation of visible self when the creative juices start flowing:

When I first come into the studio to work, there is this noisy crowd which follows me there; it includes all of the important painters in

history, all of my contemporaries, all the art critics, etc. As I become involved in the work, one by one, they all leave. If I'm lucky, every one of them will disappear. If I'm really lucky, I will too.

25- Biological Synthesis

The hypothetical transformation of churches into super non-profit organisations is only possible due to its own will, as long as there are parishioners and seminarians. A non-profit organisation that is now active and has enough economic and intellectual force, that was able to group together a fair number of believers in Good and Evil, and without any other objective than bringing together intellectual personalities from all over the world for a sociobiological labour, could surprise everyone by producing a change in the direction of churches, given that sooner or later, they will have to decide between disappearing or renovating. And all of them giving rise to a more or less accelerated movement of renovation. It may be that in the church's future to promote it, either by means of an open declaration or surreptitiously. It would be an action typical of a collective that has had intellectual moments of realisation in many of its periods of activity. It would be a way out of the current situation by allowing for a parallel activity in the opposing sense. A church of calculated extinction by natural death or lack of human elements and another prospering through cultural activities, excusing the first for its long resistance to renovation and thus connecting with the final religious syncretism by becoming scientific.

This truly terrible alternative that the maximum ecclesiastic authorities live makes the lack of initiative understandable. The case of partitocracy is quite different. Nothing is keeping professional politicians from bringing about change, more necessary for appraising themselves than that of churches. If it isn't their own intellectual incapacity for doing so, which is not an off-the-wall hypothesis. The show that professional politicians put on often tends to be grotesque, which is not a sign of intelligence.

The profession of both activities has the same antiquity, but in their beginnings, they were mixed together in the same person. Now that Jomeini is dead, and through his initiative - with Christian churches in search of reasons to substitute, seconding it - once again political activity and religion are confused. Specifically Islam. Implicitly, Christianity. A way of looking for both, an answer to laity.

An important number of church parishioners need the religious support and has conditioned their lives. They would not be able to tolerate a deep, esoteric rectification of doctrine. On the contrary to those of us who now tolerate the grotesque show of politics, those who do not vote, and, of those who do, they would cordially appreciate a change in the system that gave politics the appearance

and real depth that an activity that gathers the results of all human, intellectual and productive activity deserves.

The essence of a religious sense has disappeared, which was to earn heaven and fear hell. In order to preserve churches, they need essential values that are sufficiently important to substitute those that still move the soul (thinking-feeling complex) of a part of parishioners. Values already exist. The change from esoteric values to others that are real, that have nothing whatsoever to do with each other and are, within themselves, contradictory makes the substitution difficult and, up to now, impossible. On the contrary from politics, which only needs to give correct concretion to problems regarding the levelling of a socially diverse humanity and one that is now conscious of its genomic equality. The challenges that have appeared because they were not dealt with according to the difficulty of each problem as it arose - an essential duty of professional politicians - now is a concrete reason for seeing that these professionals don't need to create or substitute essential values such as religious spiritual ones. They are the ones who need to be substituted and there are no substitutes and so the alternative is clear: change their behaviour, which is now theatrical and only serves the personal objectives of each politician: the almost exclusive reason for them remaining active. A deep, formal action to re-evaluate the profession through arguments of specialisation that provides knowledge culture to be able to develop a new political system and make them able to take on global problems is also necessary for them.

The personal aspect of clerics is an extremely delicate subject. Those, who due to circumstances, work as teachers are in a situation similar to politicians. Those who work in areas of witnessing and maintaining the faith, even the highest hierarchies, a change in orientation of their respective churches also means a radical change in their personal lives. A job substitution brings with it a conceptual substitution of people, given that it is necessary to improvise an effective teaching staff based on activities developed while doing anti-culture, which is what parish clergy do. On the contrary, politicians too - and also clergy who teach, who only have to put forth the necessary effort to adapt to a new form of work, that has continuity with the previous, something akin to a change in curriculum. Old clerical teachers and politicians, recovering from the political, theatrical activity, are not the ideal choice for carrying out a change in the ecclesiastic and political systems. But for them, this change does not mean a break with their modus vivendi, such as one that non-teaching clerics would experience. The formation of new teachers and new politicians needs a notable space of time in years. Those who are recycled would have a long, professional teaching future ahead of them without changing their line of work. And

certainly, the discomfort of the change in “curricula” for one and all would be temporary. Soon they would enjoy the advantages of developing socially useful work and, at the same time, feel useful themselves.

The changes in lifestyle for teaching clerics would surely be possible. The decision does not depend on them. It depends on the highest levels of each of the churches, with all the difficulties that we’ve mentioned and many more. And, on the contrary, politicians as well. On their own, as a group or in smaller groups, they can always initiate a turn in the system of personal and professional life, which is relatively easy for young people and more difficult for older ones. It’s a risky bet for some, but if it is done consciously, the risk can be lessened given that, without this bet, they will remain in the current situation, which could get even worse and become unbearable with consequences that are difficult to imagine, but that could be catastrophic for them and for the groups they belong to.

If the initiative for a change in the political system springs from politicians themselves, there is no power that can make them develop it in certain manners and rhythms. They can do it in whatever conditions they believe they can assume. Just keeping in mind that problems exist which cannot wait long for the search for solutions to begin. They are problems that don’t affect the change in the personal system of life much. In general, they accept and even need the collaboration of independent technicians to supply the lack of political groups or politicians individually. And they are of great importance; they can represent a factor of promotion for those that make a personal or party objective. For example:

(6)

Demography and migration.

Politicians of all parties put themselves forward as modern and advanced, proclaiming themselves contrary to the Darwin’s Malthusian-inspired ideas. It’s a cheap kind of demography. They don’t need to use economic fund to cover “social “objectives that bring votes.

Malthus’ discredit, in part justified by the demographic behaviour during the period immediately following his death (1834) until the twentieth century, would not have happened if the population had continued growing at the same rhythm that existed during his lifetime. And much less so, if the English clergy and his idea had appeared after the first half of the past century when population growth, decisive in part, was the consequence of a longer life-span in humans. This circumstance can happen again. Not just because of advances in biology that show possibilities of restoration of limbs and organs, but also because if we achieve a more profound knowledge as regards the human genome, life expectancy could be much greater than it was a century ago.

What is truly important, without need for any methodology or system, is the evidence that in any limited space - in our case, that of Planet Earth - one cannot constantly and continuously add a continuously growing mass. The demographic shifts that allow for growth such as what really happened in the twentieth century, particularly in the past forty years, show the possibility that in the year 2040, the Earth's population could be twelve thousand million and, before finishing this century, it could be twenty-four thousand million. An explosive saturation, that without using it as a prediction, is alarming enough to make one consider Malthus' idea, especially when the pathological growth of characteristics of this or a similar scope would take place - as in the past century - among the less evolved, economically and culturally, population.

Though the lack of family planning were to produce an increase in population much less than that of the twentieth century, this supposed phenomenon of pathological demographic growth would cause an explosive situation that could produce an indescribable human cataclysm. In forty years - 1960 to 2000 - the problems of imbalance between population and production have become more severe, with current human beings barely noticing the situation, despite starvation, which occurs more frequently and with more intensity. The next forty years that, due to a socio-political circumstance that could happen, could cause a demographic explosion equal or similar to that of the end of the last century, which would be enough to radicalise the problems that can be controlled now by regulating the birth rate. Without committing any "crime" of genocide. On the contrary, by giving a higher quality of life to the poor and now prolific of the world. There is a statistic that, though not infallible, turns out to be more than close enough to the demographic reality. There are calculating systems that convert this operative into a mathematical problem that can be understood by the average citizen; and there are empirical positions that show the unpredictability of the factors to keep in mind. Maybe those of a sociological nature - migrations in the first place, wars, etc, of a socio-biological nature, such as pandemics, geophysical cataclysms, and biological, such as the expectations regarding life span, which we have just mentioned. This happens when just one programme regulates humanity demographically, with maximum oscillations of around 10%, based on a constant control in the world's birth rate, so that the vegetative growth is enough to apply the brakes to and/or stop the growth in time and in a way that is exempt from socio-political trauma. Leaving the problem unattended, apart from the difficulty of dealing with it in the future, would produce a negative synergy in which the solution would force a notable decrease in the population with an entire string of perfectly predictable additional problems that this would cause. We have the example of the birth

rate explosion of the Palestines in their forced exile. The most important factor that hinders a real agreement with the State of Israel.

The world population really acts as if the Earth had the ability to grow, or as if the transfer of excess population to another planet were a prospect to keep in mind, such as the negative and positive prospects that we have just looked at in terms of the vegetative growth of humanity. The obsession with growth even annuls arguing in Malthusian terms. Not due to the self-serving demagogy of government leaders, but to the pure intellectual filigram devoid of all realism. Attacking Malthus based on social and even religious ideologies seems to be a modern, liberal attitude. The subject isn't on the agendas of busy government leaders, which makes it taboo.

The creation of a demographic programme, applied on a planetary scale, can rectify any line of human behaviour, without any type of Orwellian pessimism or pessimism of any other nature. On the contrary. This circumstance doesn't have to make us reluctant to stabilise the birth rate and establish conditions for joining the club of our species, without even causing bitterness or deception towards those not yet born. The programme could be highly flexible and adaptable to each new situation that presents itself, precisely because of its own development. In that was there would be gratitude for the apparent "insensitive" Earth, but especially the very real and evident sensibility of the species. As a current whole, the settlers of the Earth represent an acceptable number to be able to maintain a balance that, more than desirable, is necessary so that an over-worked sustainability is real on all areas of life.

It would be a mistake not to take Malthus' idea into consideration: not to try to pressure the Earth by means of a process of increased birth rate, now created by certain people who unintentionally, because they have no idea of the problem, unload their sexuality without associating the sexual act with the idea of sustainability, the same as those who procreate in excess by default. The attacks on sustainability reduce the quality of the product, especially the main product of the Earth: humanity.

Demography has undeniable effects that don't allow for a consensus because their base is completely rational and mathematical. What's lacking is to test the factors that only the development of a demographic project can indicate with precision. And without letting go of future predictions, always random, but which essentially respond to the attitudes of such unpredictable beings as human beings are, means continued testing. One must assume the cost that the changes in methodology imply, which leads to sufficient knowledge to establish the dimension of humanity. It's necessary to achieve the best conditions for an evolution towards peaceful co-

existence, although the result may be burdensome as regards the commitment of current humans towards this objective. The operative doesn't have to be the base of futurisms, but exclusively based on the knowledge of realities, of those that exist in each moment. All future previsions, including the one that Malthus got right, can disorient instead of orienting. What is known must be the base. And the exploration by means of tests that don't suppose any impediment to exploring new realities. The prevision of imbalance of the excessive birth rate of the poor, the insufficient birth rate of the rich and the limited space on Earth are undeniable realities.

The exact number of factors is important, although it is not the most essential part. It depends on the results obtained through each tactical change and thoroughly examining them in order to prevent detours from the objective, almost sole, of establishing the population on Earth as regards the numerical dimension of its settlers. And also its adequate groupings, considering each different cultural and economic situation in the large number of nations that make up the earth. This demands only one condition: that the examination of each test result be correct. In the demographic aspect, we consider:

(20) The ideal fertility rate for humanity, taking into account the current rate of vegetative grown, is approximately 2.1 children per woman. Very small adjustments in the method for achieving this rate would give adequate birth rates for the maintenance of the population volume.

In developed countries, the cultivation of sexual pleasure without the counterpoint of birth, has situated the average under one child per woman. The result is one of aging populations with a ratio of 35 inhabitants over the age of 60 for every 6 inhabitants under the age of 15. If age had not been prolonged, the autochthonic humans of the First World would have become minorities in their own territory as a result of greater immigration.

In countries in which the rate exceeds 2.1 children per woman, they have absolutely unsustainable growth. With nearly 5.9 children per woman in Africa in the second half of the twentieth century. With fertility rates between 2.5 and 6.5 children per woman in the rest of the underdeveloped world, together have produced 90% of the explosive birth rate in the past twentieth century. And the result is reflected in our synopsis, making it clear that where there is an excessive fertility rate, there is less cultural and economic development.

Except for the logic of this global result and, at the same time, accepting the irresponsibility of less developed humans and the lack of merit of the more and better developed, the values established by one and all remain.

In our reality, there are three differentiated worlds and we can only solve serious problems that we have designated as such and avoid the appearance of others whose solution becomes increasingly difficult if they are not dealt with in a timely way now. We have to be aware that the First and Third World are becoming culturally and economically distanced from each other at great speed. And the Second World is wavering between them, making its decantation towards one of the other possible due to chance circumstances.

But what is important for those of us who live now is not to consider how human beings will live within a millennium as a consequence of what we are now forming. What is really important is to consider that the predecessors that lived regressions, some of them for long periods, lived worse than their immediate ancestors who enjoyed evolution. A regression now could affect not just the immediate successor, but ourselves. We have witnessed failed regressive projects in the past century and it is inevitable to think how our world would live if it had conquered some of the retrograde Nazis, communists, and fascists of different stripe.

(25)

However strong the personality of a high level politician may be, it is very difficult to stir up the will to deal with problems such as those mentioned here and now. The presidential regimen is impossible for the World. There is no forum where those who think, but do not have the power to establish the necessary nexus between them in order to point out the realities that separately from the current global reality. The components of the renovated UN that we have proposed would have a constant function in this seminar - economically possible with the existing media - and the necessary source of information to act with the logic of the many proposals on the part of the hypothetically distinguished components of a forum of these characteristics is becoming more known, disorganised and not very effective. In part, they illustrate a civil society that is more evolved than that of government leaders and politicians, who have power and only think at the level of their own areas of action. And without any will to unite these areas in a federal system. As if each one of them believed himself to be apt for governing the world.

In the meantime, the process of globalisation is developing outside the margin of any type of planning and intervention from an organisation that is also global. The put upon government leaders, the most conscious of their own, almost happy ineptitude fight among each other instead of collaborating in the work that is beginning to seem impossible, given that they attack problems that are like satellites to the larger and more transcendental problems that are forming the future of humanity. An undesirable future that can happen in the space of a few years. Those which have already been identified and are of a global scale are not tended to because

their real value is not appreciated. They don't being in votes. It is evident that this system can't subsist indefinitely.

The consequences of constantly postponing won't have to be paid for just by our descendents. We are already paying for them now. And we will have to pay for them in the immediate future at a greater price. Rectifying is almost always possible, but doing so too late increased the costs extraordinarily. Now is the right moment to pay ecological attention, not only in terms of the geophysical aspect of the Earth. Also because of the ecological aspect of life on Earth. In an extreme synthesis, it is not at all an exaggeration to conclude that with the knowledge of the current situation of the Earth and of humanity, actions to establish a new, gradually developed system of co-existence at the global level are being put in place that will allow

Urgently

-To demographically level all of humanity, increasing the birth rate in the more culturally developed regions, the First World; establishing a brake until reaching zero growth in populations situated in the average cultural range, in the Second World; and drastically reducing the birth rate in the Third World.

Priority

Establish a place to meet and mutually collaborate among all the countries of the First World in order to impose a contributory system in line with the possibilities of each member and at each moment. Establish an Economic World Fund of Solidarity to create culture and wealth in the Third World.

In the immediate term

-Organise a military dispositive with obligatory participation of all the members who are part of the international organism (to create or be reorganised by the UN) to direct a sufficient power apparatus to dissuade the violent defiers of all type.

Gradually

Revalidate "the Rights of Man," defining them and making them operative. Use the federal system until it becomes global, starting with municipalities. Just one universal expenditure for the election of its Council, from which elections for higher level government posts will be initiated. A vote that is delegated to the representatives of each one of them that would be the carriers of the number of votes reached in each electoral process. Regulation of the system so that the losers-opposition were obligated to make sure that the proposed programme by the majority coalition was completed - free of being formed post-election with various level of federal government, such as:

Municipalities or District Municipalities
Regions (Cantons, Landers, autonomous Villages, Counties, etc.)
States
Federations

UN With three estates: Corresponding to the First, Second and Third
World. Each estate, three Councils. From the World Economic Fund,;
World Education; World Defence

Politicians who know the reality that everything that supports humanity is a work of humanity itself - and in part a considerable work of theirs - of their abilities in both cases, without getting into the subject of how, when, and the cause of these skills, accepting the challenge for them between choosing to continue their vital and collective path for humanity in the Darwinian algorithm. Or, on the other hand, converting the algorithm into a project that is open to all the changes that its development advises.

After this point, all the challenges that we have contemplated are practically nothing. The inscrutable Universe appears as the only real challenge. The first step: knowing what it's like. What it is. The Inscrutable Universe appears as the only real challenge. The first step to take: know what it's like. What it is. The experience of believing through religion in order to investigate the cause of human abilities in order to, even without consciousness, and after millions of years become the only known intelligent material helps us to keep from repeating the tests conducted along this path. Is there an alternative? No. But there are indications that it could appear. The first attempt allows us to speak about hypothesis as consequences of the result of the rebellion against the Darwinian algorithm.

No meditation, calm or agonising, made with the mind that we have, can give correct answers to these parallel questions. But it is necessary to ask if the search for questions with answers through multiple attempts can lead to having an answer for all the questions or at least to know what is useless within the search. It would be a waste of time and useless intellectual effort to do so now.

The sum definition of the meditations that have taken place in the preceding text leave questions in the air that have a possible answer to affirmations or negations of possibilities of evolution in the Third Millennium for decisions taken by human beings that we must live.

When trying to compress the speech about the challenges of the twenty-first century - which is what we have tried to do up to this point - based on the correct capacity of the genomic map and the central nervous system of human beings, one can infer that all the possible arguments that could be used, more than complex, are an impotent extension. To show that these questions that essentially

affect social realities of our time and biologically the state of evolution of the species are a circular set without end. Because the concatenation of causes is so intense that it practically demands a summary of everything that has come out of meditation in the human mind.

Not to lighten the complexity of the subject. Only to look for a path to explore the reality that we experience, we consider it necessary to break the vicious circle on the concatenation of causes mentioned and, even at the expense of disfiguring many realities that demand prolonged attention, space and time, centring the themes in order according to their essence and the category of their argument in order to determine the causes. If positive answers are obtained, it would compensate the exploration, no matter how difficult the path, if it is possible and in this order:

(25)

-Professional politicians must overcome the vices that we have manifested. And without more sacrifice than that of learning their job by means of a collective human organ - in which distinguished politicians should also be present - in order to deepen the study of existing realities in each moment.

Establish logic before all challenges.

-Master classes presented by the best thinkers, over the internet, with emphasis on a process of doctrinal desintoxication, directed towards the objective of regulating selfishness in human beings.

Establish reason.

-For the remaining clergy, without any Mea Culpa, to accept the existing realities and to establish a continuing connection with the seminar of professional politicians proposed in previous paragraphs. Exclusive activity: teaching and education in all areas of the Planet.

Establish the Truth.

-Develop a political project to achieve a demographic balance on the Planet by means of education, with a system created by professional recycled politicians, the acquiescence of the Churches, and the adhesion of citizens; to formally establish an economic-cultural compatibility of all the Ethnic Groups-Nations; the creation of a reasonable political programme in whose development, consciously on the part of a human contingency in constant growth through education, all the populations of all the world could participate, establishing a common language for each Ethnic Group-Nation.

Establish the ability to negotiate.

_And for science and technology simultaneously to establish new realities that would be known by the largest possible number of human beings in each moment of cultural development.

Entelechy?

In case there is a reconversion of professional politicians and ecclesiastics, the possibility of initiating a radical change in the political orientation of human beings would take place automatically.

In another hypothetical case, in which only professional politicians reconverted, the process would slow down, but with more or less violence between the political and clerical collectives, the process would move forward.

And in the case that neither of these two corporations by virtue of their own initiative and will decided not to recycle themselves, the programme could remain in entelechy, but not definitely. The struggle between professional politicians and society in general has already started. The result, up to now is a division in society in each one of the First and Second World countries, between professional politicians and naïve followers, only 50% of whom vote in elections. If politicians do not rectify, the process of increasing abstention will bring a rebellion on the part of those who are coming of age. The clash would be between professional politicians, without the help of followers, with those liberated from disappointing beliefs, what is how Politicians are considered today. Perhaps this future is unavoidable. A future slowly and secularly built. This perspective does not correspond with the level of knowledge acquired up to the third millennium. The percent of collaborators for professional politicians will increase as these politicians rectify the conservative course of the present-day political system. And the inverse will decrease if they continue along this path. The consequence would be to establish a real democracy. The government of the People. Something horrible if each one of them had not acquired the educational level to know what is and is not desirable. Something different for almost everyone.

COROLLARY

The responsibility of the conservative belief proselytes is, as it has been for a long time, extraordinary. The furrow begun by Abraham, directed towards the happy life, exclusively for believers in God, created, imagined or dreamed by him, was adopted by monotheistic churches and defended by the governments of human beings grouped together in empires that, in the end, became Nation-States. Meanwhile the Darwinian algorithm has continued serving its job of debunking myths, interfering in the furrow opened by Abraham. And this, postponing the evolutionary effect, not created by Darwin, but only intuitively discovered by him. Until this movement while decidedly entering the scientific area, becomes unnecessarily destructive, Until this movement is decidedly entering the scientific

realm, it unnecessarily becomes a destroyer of the furrow where the believers in God remain and of other dogmas, such as Marxism. An openly declared war or at least artfully hidden beneath layers of Equality, contradicting not biological law, but the intrinsically unequal nature of all human beings and of all living species and demonstrating so even in all inert species.

Clergy and professional politicians, due to passivity or misguided activity, without any change in orientation, accepting the word of Abraham as correct and thus neglecting Darwinian speech, also create interference and the two become one with two origins: the imaginary thoughts of Abraham, syncretism of other works of imaginative ancestors just like him; and the realities that have now become evidence for thinkers prior to and following Darwin. The result of the mutual interference has created the current situation. A third of humanity situated in the furrow of reality and the other two thirds situated in the furrow of imagination, the better part of them completely ignoring that they are condemned to hell for not believing in dogmas that no one has preached to them.

To transfer those situated in the furrow of imagination to the furrow of reality, is a labour with few fruits because of an education that is inappropriate to overcoming Darwin's algorithm and converting it into a process designed by human beings themselves. An education which would allow them to know empirically established realities has to have a third furrow opened, prior to the conjunction of the two existing furrows, making them coincide at a specific point, from which the only furrow that leads to a maximum knowledge of universal realities, among them the reality of our existence, can spring. It is not the same to choose between imaginary living and living based on knowledge of certain realities. Among them, that of the interference of pleasure and pain, the never ending source of desire to live, born of an acquired conscientiousness and the exclusive ability of the human family that can't be relinquished. The education for its development and that it be within the grasp of everyone, can only be a reality if it is designed by educational professionals, conscious of the transcendence of education for achieving a channelling of the interference of pleasure and pain as a result of a process of personal self-control - the Islamic jihad - that can lead us to be something universally essential. Before we run out of constant and eternal evolutionary possibilities, clergy and government leaders must become capable of making the restructuration of the educational system possible in order to create human beings capable of organising their peaceful co-existence and opening perspectives of definitively generalised civility in the world. It's either this or relinquish continuing to be principle factors of a system of education, at present, obstructed by its unfortunate actions.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Jorge Wagensberg Section.

- [01] Wagensberg, J. *Complexity Versus Uncertainty: The Question of Staying Alive*, *Biology and Philosophy*, 15(4), (493-508) , 2000
- [02] Spinoza Baruj. *Ética demostrada según el orden geométrico*. Editorial Trotta, 2000.
- [03] Wagensberg Jorge. *La rebelión de las formas*. Editorial Tusquets. Metatemas 84, 2004.
- [04] Kant, E. *Crítica de la razón pura*. Sopena, 1952.
- [05] Quine, Willard Van Orman. *Two Dogmas of Empericism*. In *From a Logical Point of View*. Logico - Philosophical Essays. Harvard University Press. Cambridge. Massachusetts. 1953.
- [06] Moulines, Ulises. *Exploraciones Metacietíficas. Estructura, desarrollo y contenido de las ciencias*. Alianza Universitaria
- [07] Lewis, C.I. *The Pragmatic Conception of the A Priori*, *The Journal of Philosophy*, 20(7), 169-177, 1923
- [08] Taube, M, *Evolution of Matter and Energy on a Cosmic and Planetary Scale*, Springer Verlag, 1985.
- [09] Dawkins R. *El gen egoísta*, Salvat editores, 2000.
- [10] Wagensberg, J. *El gozo intelectual*, Tusquets editores, Metatemas97, 2007
- [11] Arendt, H. *Los orígenes del totalitarismo*, Alianza Editorial, 2006
- [12] Young-Bruehl. *Why Arendt Matters*, Yale University Press, 2006

Lorenzo Calabi Section

1. «Considerable revolution» is, notoriously, an expression of Charles Darwin's as regards *The Origin of Species, by Means of Natural Selection* (London, J. Murray, 1859¹), ed. with an Introduction by S. W. Burrow, Penguin Books, 1968, 1984, p. 455. As for the characterisation of S. Freud, v. Idem, *Introduzione a la psicoanalisi (Lesson 18)* and *Una difficoltà della psicoanalisi*, a work in progress, a c. de Musatti, Turin, Boringhieri, vol. 8, 1976.
2. J. Habermas, *I rischi di una genetica liberale*, en Idem, *Il futuro della natura umana*, a c. de L. Ceppa, Torino, Einaudi, 2002, pg. 24.
3. L. Calabi, *Darwinismo morale. Aspetti della riflessione contemporanea*, Pisa, Edizioni ETS, 2002; *Tra Darwin e Habermas. Sul caso e l'«indisponibilità» dell'individuo*, in L. Calabi, B. Continenza, E. Gagliasso, M. Giovannetti, S. Tagliagambe, *Ai confini tra scienza e filosofia*, a c. de M. Giovannetti, Pisa, PLUS-Pisa University Press, 2004.
4. R. Rorty, *Invidia della filosofia*, en «MicroMega», *Almanacco di filosofia*, 4/2005, pgs. 127-134.
5. Idem, pg. 128.
6. C. Degler, *In Search of Human Nature: The Decline and Revival of Darwinism in American Social Thought*, New York, Oxford University Press, 1991.
7. S. Pinker, *The Blank Slate. The Modern Denial of Human Nature*, Great Britain, Allen Lane, The Penguin Press, 2002.
8. R. Rorty, *op. cit.* , pg. 133.
9. Idem, pg. 129.
10. Idem , pg. 134.
11. A.-R.-J. Turgot, *Tableau philosophique des progrès succesifs de l'esprit humain*, 1750; e v. también *Plan de deux discours sur l'histoire universelle* (tr. it. a c. de R. Finzi en Idem, *Le ricchezze, il progresso e la storia universale*, Torino, Einaudi, 1978).
12. Ch. Darwin, *The Descent of Man, and Selection in Relation to Sex*, London, J. Murray, 1871, Repr. With An Introduction by John Tyler Bonner and Robert M. May, Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey, 1981.
13. This famous expression can be found in *Ch. Darwin to J. Hooker*, 13 July 1856: "What a book a devil's chaplain might write on the clumsy, wasteful, blundering low and horridly cruel works of nature!" (F. Darwin and A. C. Seward, eds., *More Letters of Charles Darwin. A Record of his Work in a Series of Hitherto Unpublished Letters*, Cambridge, 1903, I, p. 94).
14. Ch. Darwin, *Journal of Researches into the Natural History and Geology of the Countries Visited During the Voyage of H. M. S. «Beagle» Round the World (1845²)*, tr. it. from M. Magistretti *Viaggio*

di un naturalista intorno al mondo, a c. de L. Lamberti, Torino, Eianudi, 1989, cap. II. Y cfr. pg. ej. F. Marengo, *Introduzione*, *ivi*, pg. XIII ssgg. O también, pg. ej., O. Albò, *El viaje del Beagle a partir del relato de Charles Darwin*, in Ch. Darwin, *Viaje del Beagle*, Edición y material didáctico: Oriol Albò, Madrid, Alhambra Longman, 1990, pgs. 51-52.

15. M. Ingrosso, S. Manghi, V. Parisi (a c. de), *Sociobiologia possibile*, Milano, F. Angeli, 1982.

16. Among the most recent themes, we will cite: S. Mithen, *The Singing Neanderthals: The Origins of Music, Language, Mind and Body*, Weidenfeld and Nicholson, 2005, «the first book-length exposition of Darwin's musical protolanguage hypothesis», though if one critically observes W. Tecumseh Fitch in «Nature», vol. 438, 17. Nov. 2005, pg. 288 - «nowhere in this long volume [...] does [the author] acknowledge that the core idea of the book is Darwin's».

17. C. A. Viano, *La natura invisibile*, en «MicroMega». *Almanacco di filosofia*, 4/2005, pp. 83-102.

18. with reference to O. Spengler, cfr. Th. Mann, *Della repubblica Tedesca* (1922), en Idem, *Scritti storici e politici*, in *Tutte le opere di Thomas Mann*, tr. it. a c. de L. Mazzucchetti, Milano, Mondadori, 1957, pgs. 145-146.

19. C. A. Viano, *op. cit.*, pgs. 87-88.

20. "Collectivity" is an expression used by Svevo in one of the pages that speaks about Darwin (I. Svevo, *La coscienza di Zeno*, in *Romanzi e «Continuazioni»*, a c. de N. Palmieri and F. Vittorini, Milano, Mondadori, 2004, 2006², pg. 957), this "heroe of modern thought" (just as it's mentioned in *Del sentimento in arte*, in I. Svevo, *Teatro e Saggi*, a c. by F. Bertoni, Milano, Mondadori, 2004, pg. 841).

21. N. Eldredge, *Perché lo facciamo. Il gene egoista e il sesso*, Torino, Einaudi, 2005.

22. Cfr. Ch. Darwin to A. Gray, 20. 7. 1856, in *The Life and Letters of Charles Darwin. Including an Autobiographical Chapter*, edited by his son, Francis Darwin, London, J. Murray, 1887, repr. New York, D. Appleton and Co., 1896, I, pg. 437.

23. C. A. Viano, *op. cit.*, pgs. 89-90.

24. The subject of the soul comes up again "through a question which genetic development has increasingly given more importance to. One of the characteristics of the human species has often been identified, not completed in human beings, which are to a great extent due to culture. Because of this, the doctrine of the soul could be understood as a prefiguration of the recognition of the importance of culture" (*ivi*, pg. 90).

25. L. e F. Cavalli-Sforza, *Tutto ci dice che Darwin aveva ragione*, in «La Repubblica», 3 November 2005, pgs. 46-47.

26. Cfr. Ch. Darwin, *The Autobiography of Charles Darwin 1809-1882*. With original omissions restored. Edited with appendix and

notes by his granddaughter Nora Barlow, W. W. Norton & Company, 1958, pg. 59.

27. J. Monod, *L'hazard et la nécessité*, Paris, Editions du Seuil, 1970.

28. P. es. F. Jacob, *Le jeu des possibles : essai sur la diversité du vivant*, Paris, Fayard, 1981.

Cavalli -Sforza, *Geni, popoli e lingue*, tr. it. by E. Stubel, Milano, Adelphi, 1996, 1999, pg. 254. The cursive letter is the author's.

30. A. Sen, *Sulla visione darwiniana del progresso*, in Idem, *Razionalità e libertà*, tr. it. by F. Alberti, C. Sandri, L. Zarri, Bologna, il Mulino, 2005, pgs. 325-345.

31. Admitting to a realistic interpretation by A. Smith, *Ricerca sulla natura e le cause della ricchezza delle nazioni*, 1776. If this work were consciously read and interpreted in the light of an essay concerning the *Principi che guidano e dirigono le ricerche filosofiche: illustrati dalla storia dell'astronomia*, the order represented by the *Ricchezza delle nazioni* would be true, but would have to be understood according to the first form indicated above. (Cfr. A. Smith, *Essays on Philosophical Subjects*, ed. by S. Black and J. Hutton, in A. Smith, *The Works of A. S.*, repr. of the 1811-1812 ed., vol. V, Aalen, Otto Zeller, 1963).

32. Ch. Darwin, *On the Origin of Species, by Means of Natural Selection*, cit., pgs. 459-460.

33. Ch. Darwin, *The Autobiography of Charles Darwin 1809-1882*, cit., pgs. 90-92.

34. Cfr. In particular, the fifth chapter of his *Lo stato vivente della materia. Le frontiere della nuova biologia*, Torino, UTET, 2000.

35. Ch. Darwin, *Notebook D*, pg. 135, in *Charles Darwins Notebooks, 1836-1844*, ed. by P. H. Barrett, O. J. Gautrey, S. Herbert, D. Kohn, S. Smith, British Museum (Natural History) Cambridge University Press, 1987, pgs. 375-376. *Zoonomia* is the title given to the first of these *Notebooks on the Transmutation of Species*. *Zoonomia, or The Laws of Organic Life* is the title of the work by Erasmus Darwin, London, 2 vols., 1794-1796. I have dealt with the theme of metaphysics and final cause in L. Calabi, *On Darwin's Metaphysical Notebooks. II: Metaphysics and Final Cause*, in «Biology Forum», 94 (2001), pgs. 277-292.

36. Ch. Darwin, *On the Origin of Species, by Means of Natural Selection*, cit., pg. 68.

37. K. Marx a F. Engels, 18 June 1862; F. Engels a K. Marx, 11 or 12 December 1859, (in K. Marx - F. Engels, *Opere*, vol. XL, Roma, Editori Riuniti, a c. by M. Montinari, 1973, pgs. 143 and 551).

38. Th. R. Malthus, *An Essay on the Principle of Population* (1798), ed. with an introduction by A. Flew, Penguin Books, 1970, 1976, 1979 pgs. 77 and 72. E v. Th. R. Malthus to D. Ricardo, 26 January 1817, in *The Works and Correspondence of David Ricardo*, ed. by P. Sraffa, Cambridge University Press, 1962, VII, pgs. 121-122.

39. I've written some pages regarding this in L. Calabi, *Il principio di Malthus, tra politica e filosofia. Thomas Robert Malthus «political moralist»*, in «Il pensiero politico», Anno XXVIII, no. 2, 1995, pgs. 178-209.
40. Th. R. Malthus, *The Crisis, a View of the Present Interesting State of Great Britain, by a Friend to the Constitution*, in W. Empson, *Art. IX—Principles of Political Economy Considered with a View to their Pratical Application*. by the Reverend T. R. Malthus, F. R. S., Second Edition. *To Which is prefixed a Memoir of the Author's Life* 8 vo. London: 1836, in «The Edinburgh Review», January 1837, vol. LXIV, pg. 482, repr. in B. Semel (ed.), *Occasional Papers of T. R. Malthus*, New York, Burt Franklin, 1963, p. 244.
41. Ch. Darwin, *The Autobiography of Charles Darwin 1809-1882*, cit., pgs. 73-75.
42. *Idem*, pgs. 78 y 75.
43. A. Ure, *The Philosophy of Manufactures: or An Exposition of the Scientific, Moral, and Commercial Economy of the Factory System of Great Britain*, London, 1835², pg. 32.
44. Though the distinction does not annul anything, it is a different God than that which is represented in the Unitarian Creed of the original environment of the Darwins and the Wedgwoods. Cfr. H. E. Darwin Litchfield, in *Emma Darwin, Wife of Charles Darwin: A Century of Family Letters. 1792-1896*, London, J. Murray, 1915, II, p.176: “In our childhood and youth — says Henrietta, Charle’s sister, referring to the mother — she was not only sincerely religious — this she always was in the true sense of the world — but definite in her beliefs. She went regularly to Church and took the Sacrament. She read the Bible with us and taught us a simple Unitarian Creed, though we were baptised and confirmed in the Church of England”.
45. Ch. Darwin, *The Autobiography of Charles Darwin, 1809- 1882*, cit., pg. 73.
46. T. Pievani, *Ma il banco di prova è la teoria di Darwin*, in «La Repubblica», 21 July 2005, pg. 36.
47. P. Tort, *Introduction à l’anthropologie darwinienne*, in P. Tort, *Marx et le problème de l’idéologie*, Paris, PUF, 1998; P. Tort, *La seconde révolution darwinienne*, in P. Tort, *Darwinisme et société*, Paris, PUF, 1992.
48. D. Quammen, *Le prove dell’evoluzione sono schiaccianti*, in *Darwin aveva torto?*, thematic edition of «National Geographic», vol. 14, no. 5, November 2004.
49. «One long argument» is, how Charles Darwin defined his own work in his autobiography.
50. T. Pievani has taken up this question in a more lighthearted manner in *Creazione senza Dio*, Torino, Einaudi, 2006.
51. Ch. Darwin, *The Autobiography of Charles Darwin 1809-1882*, cit., pg. 73.

52. G. W. F. Hegel, *Wissenschaft der Logik*, III, 3, 2, Hamburg, Felix Meiner Verlag, 1969, II, pg. 459.
53. K. Marx, *Eileitung zu den "Grundrisse der Kritik der politischen Ökonomie"*, in Idem, *Ökonomische Manuskripte 1857/58*, Berlin, MEGA, II. 1. 1, Teil 1, 1976, pg.40.
54. The two previously mentioned expressions are by Ch. Darwin, *On the Origin of Species, by Means of Natural Selection*, 6th edn., tr. it. by L. Fratini *L'origine delle specie*, Torino, Boringhieri, 1967, 1972⁶, pg. 147.
55. T. H. Huxley, *On the Reception of the 'Origin of Species'*, in *The Life And Letters of Charles Darwin. Including an Autobiographical Chapter*, edited by his son, Francis Darwin, London, J. Murray, 1887, repr. New York, D. Appleton and Co., 1896.
56. *Idem*, pg. 553.
57. Ch. Darwin, *Notebook B*, in *Charles Darwins Notebooks, 1836–1844*, cit., pgs. 195, 196, 219-20.
58. T. H. Huxley, *op. cit.*, pgs. 554-555.
59. *Idem*, pg. 555.
60. In «La Repubblica», 4 November 2005.
61. Ch. Darwin, *The Red Notebook of Charles Darwin*, ed. by S. Herbert, Ithaca and London, 1980, pg. 129.
62. Ch. Schönborn, *C'è un disegno nell'universo*, en «La Repubblica», 6 November 2005.
63. Chr. Schönborn, *ibidem*.
64. In light of his biography, which is generally intellectual in nature, and of his autobiography in particular, the profession of deity seems to be a part of only one stage in his life; or typical only of an esoteric Darwin or even only conclusively recognizing himself as agnostic: v. Ch. Darwin, *The Autobiography of Charles Darwin 1809-1882*, cit., pgs. 77-80. E cfr. J. Bowlby, *Charles Darwin. A Biography*, London, Hutchinson, 1990; J. Browne, *Charles Darwin: The Power of Place*, Princeton, Princeton University Press, 2002.
65. E. M. Carreira Pérez, S. I., *Scienza E Fede: Caso E Progetto*, in «Civiltà Cattolica», no. 4, Cuaderno 3736, 18 February 2006, pgs. 319-331.
66. *Idem*, pg. 324.
67. *Idem*, pgs. 322-23.
68. *Idem*, pgs. 320 and 321.
69. *Idem*, pg. 319.
70. J. Barrow - F. Tipler, *The Anthropic Cosmological Principle*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1986.
71. E. M. Carreira Pérez, *op. cit.*, pg. 322. The cursive letter is the author's.
72. *Idem*, pg. 323. «Hecho» is my own cursive. The rest of the cursive letters are the author's.

73. W. Hazlitt, *The Spirit of the Age: or, Contemporary Portraits*, edited by his son, London, C. Templeman, 1858.
74. Ch Darwin, *The Variations of Animals and Plants under Domestication*, 1875², repr. of the 1896 ed. (New York, D. Appleton and Company), New York, AMS Press, 1972, vol. II, pg. 426.
75. *Idem*, pg. 428.
76. L. Arnhart, *Darwinian Natural Law. The Biological Ethics of Human Nature*, State University of New York Press, 1998.
77. L. Strauss, *Natural Right and History*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1953.
78. M. Nussbaum, *Aristotle's "De Motu Animalium"*, Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1978; A. Gotthelf and G. Lennox, eds., *Philosophical Issues in Aristotle's Biology*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1987.
79. R. D. Masters, *Evolutionary Biology and Natural Right*, in K. L. Deutsch and W. Soffer, eds., *The Crisis of Liberal Democracy: A Straussian Perspective*, Albany, State University of New York Press, 1987, pgs. 48-67.
80. Ch. Darwin, *The Descent of Man and Selection in Relation to Sex*, cit., pg. 97.
81. B. Brodie, *Psychological Inquiries in a Series of Essays, intended to illustrate the mutual relations of the physical organization and the mental faculties*, London, Longman, Brown, Green and Longmans, 1854, pg. 192; J. St. Mill, *Utilitarianism*, London, Parker, Son, and Bourn, 1863, pgs. 45-46.
82. Ch. Darwin, *The Descent of Man, and Selection in Relation to Sex*, cit., pgs. 70-71. Darwin quote by I. Kant, *The Metaphysics of Ethics*, translated by J. W. Semple, Edinburgh, 1836, pg. 136.
83. A. MacIntyre, *Hume on "Is" and "Ought"*, en «Philosophical Review», 68, 1959, pgs. 451-468.
84. L. Arhart, *op. cit.*, pg. 15.
85. P. es. E. Mayr, *Evolution and the Diversity of Life*, Cambridge, The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1976. Criticism towards theology seems to me to have created the possibility of conceiving the Darwinian theory: cfr. L. Calabi, *On Darwin's Metaphysical Notebooks. I: Teleology and the Project of a Theory*, in «Biology Forum», 94 (2001), pgs. 123-160.
86. Ch. Darwin, *The Autobiography of Charles Darwin 1809-1882*, cit., pg. 77.
87. *Lettera di Benedetto XVI al Convegno «Libertà e laicità»*, organized by the Fondazione Magna Carta, in «La Repubblica», 16 October 2005, pg. 7. E cfr. J. Ratzinger, *Europa. I suoi fondamenti spirituali ieri, oggi e domani*, in M. Pera e J. Ratzinger, *Senza radici*, Milano, Mondadori, 2004, pgs. 47-72.
88. G. Verdi, *Don Carlos*, libretto di J. Méry e C. du Locle, da F. von Schiller, (tr. it. de A. De Lauzières, Milano-Napoli-Firenze, Ricordi), 1867

Daniel C. Dennet Section

Author Consultants:

Anonymous	-Jorge Luis Borges	-David Cope
Charles Darwin	-Richard Dawkins	-Susan Dennett
René Descartes	-Marcel Duchamp	-Thomas Edison
Bobby Fischer	-Philip Guston	-Douglas Hofstadter
Nicholas Humphrey	-Robert MacKenzie	-Tony Marcel
Victoria McGeer	-Ludwig Mies van der Rohe	-Pablo Picasso
William Poundstone	-William Shakespeare	-John Searle
Mary S��ller	-Paul Val��ry	

References

Paul Val  ry, *Cahiers*, ed. Judith Robinson, 2 vols. (Paris: Pleiade Edition, 1973-74). vol. 2 (1974), pg. 1388.

Dennett, D. 1984, *Elbow Room*, pg. 13.

Robert Beverley MacKenzie, 1868, *The Darwinian Theory of the Transmutation of Species Examined* (published anonymously "by a graduate of the University of Cambridge"). London: Nisbet & Co. quoted in a review, *Athenaeum*, no. 2102, February 8, pg. 217.

Searle, John, 1980, "Minds, Brains and Programs," Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 3, pgs.417-58.

This is obviously true of all competences of information-processing or control, but not of productive or transformative processes, such as lactation, which requires the transport and assembly of particular materials. Since Searle purports to distinguish the brain's "control powers" from its "bottom-up causal powers" that "produce

intentionality,” some have thought Searle imagines intentionality to be a special sort of substance secreted by the brain. Since he denies this, he owes us some other way to distinguish these mysterious causal powers from the control powers that software can implement and an explanation of why they are not implementable in a virtual machine.

This perspective helps to explain the visceral appeal to many onlookers of the various *apparent* alternatives to the Darwinian mechanism that have flourished over the years. The most prominent recently have been the appeal to “self-organization” “on the edge of chaos” (Stuart Kauffman, Per Bak, and others), and “dynamical systems theory” in both evolution and cognition (Esther Thelen, Walter Freeman, Timothy van Gelder, and others), and, of course, Stephen Jay Gould’s insistence that evolution is not, as I have claimed (building on the work of theorists from Darwin to Fisher and Haldane to Williams and Maynard Smith), fundamentally an algorithmic process. After the smoke of battle clears, these ideas can be readily seen to be, at best, interesting complications of the basic Darwinian mechanisms, just as connectionist architectures and embodied cognition models are interesting complications of the basic ideas of AI. These controversies are, at best, constructive disagreements over how to “give the details”, not challenges to the basic Darwinian vision.

William Poundstone, 1985, *The Recursive Universe: Cosmic Complexity and the Limits of Scientific Knowledge*, New York: Wm Morrow, pg. 23.

Charles Darwin, *Origin of Species*, Ch. 4 summary (pg.127 in facs. edition)

This tactic of mapping evolutionary processes and results onto space is a natural and oft-used metaphor, exploited in models of hill-climbing, and peaks in adaptive landscapes, to name the most obvious and popular applications. Its naturalness does not guarantee its soundness, of course, and may even mask its limitations, but since the basic mapping strategy has proven to be particularly useful in expressing *criticisms* of over-simple evolutionary ideas (e.g., Kauffman’s “rugged landscape”, Eigen’s “quasi-species”), it is not obviously biased in favor of simplistic visions of Darwinism.

John Maynard Smith and Eörs Szathmary, 1995, *The Major Transitions in Evolution*, Oxford: Freeman, identify eight occasions (major transitions) when the evolutionary process became more efficient, creating cranes.

Daniel C. Dennett, *Darwin's Dangerous Idea*, 1995, "The Tools for R and D: Skyhooks or Cranes?" pgs. 73-80.

See the famous cartoon by Sydney Harris, in which the physicist's blackboard is covered with impressive formulae, except for this bracketed phrase in the middle, which leads the onlooker scientist to say "I think you should be more explicit here in step two." (reprinted in Daniel Dennett, *Consciousness Explained*, 1991, p38).

I have been unable to discover the source of Picasso's claim, which is nicely balanced by a better known remark by a more down-to-earth creative genius, Thomas Edison: "Genius is one per cent. inspiration and ninety-nine per cent. perspiration." (in a newspaper interview. *Life* [1932], ch. 24, according to the *Oxford Dictionary of Quotations*.)

Yes, I intend the homage to an old favorite of mine, *What Happens in Hamlet*, by J. Dover Wilson (1951, Cambridge Univ. Press).

unless we find there is a Ms. Shelley who is the author of Dr. Frankenstein. . . . !

Borges, J. L. 1962, *Labyrinths: Selected Stories and other Writings*, New York: New Directions. [La Biblioteca de Babel, 1941, in *El jardin de los senderos que se bifurcan*, published with another in *Ficciones*. 1956, Emece Editores, S. A., Buenos Aires.]

Borges chose slightly different figures: books 410 pages long, with 40 lines of 80 characters. The total number of characters per book is close enough to mine (1,1312,000 versus 1,000,000) to make no difference. I chose my rounder numbers for ease of handling. Borges chose a character set with only 25 members, which is enough for upper-case Spanish (with a blank, a comma and a period as the only punctuation), but not for English. I chose the more commodious 100 to make room without any doubt for the upper and lower case letters and punctuation of all the Roman alphabet languages.

Steven Hawking insists on putting it this way: "There are something like ten million (1 with eighty zeroes after it) particles in the region of the universe that we can observe." *A Brief History of Time*, New York: Bantam, p.129. Michael Denton (*Evolution: A Theory in Crisis*, London: Burnett Books. 1985) provides the estimate of 10^{70} atoms in the observable universe. Manfred Eigen

(*Steps Towards Life*, Oxford University Press 1992, pg.10) calculates the volume of the universe as 10^{84} cubic centimeters.

The Library of Babel is finite, but curiously enough, it contains all the grammatical sentences of English within its walls. But that's an infinite set, and the library is finite! Still, any sentence of English, of whatever length, can be broken down into 500-page chunks, each of which is somewhere in the library! How is this possible? Some books may get used more than once. The most profligate case is the easiest to understand: since there are volumes which each contain a single character and are otherwise blank, repeated use of these one hundred volumes will create any text of any length. As Quine (*Quiddities: An Intermittently Philosophical Dictionary*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press. 1987) points out in his informative and amusing essay, "Universal Library," if you avail yourself of this strategy of re-using volumes, and translate everything into the ASCII code your wordprocessor uses, you can store the whole Library of Babel in two extremely slender volumes, in one of which is printed a 0 and in the other of which appears a 1! (Quine also points out that Theodor Fechner, the psychologist, propounded the fantasy of the universal library long before Borges.)

Quine *loc.cit.* coins the term "hyperastronomic" for the same purpose. The previous two paragraphs are drawn, with minor changes, from *Darwin's Dangerous Idea*, pp108-9.

For more on this concept, see my "From Typo to Thinko: When Evolution Graduated to Semantic Norms," forthcoming in the Fysen conference volume on cultural evolution.

Douglas R. Hofstadter, 1981, "Reflections," (on Searle) in Hofstadter and Dennett, eds., *The Mind's I: Fantasies and Reflections on Self and Soul*, 1981, New York: Basic Books and Hassocks, Sussex: Harvester

Shakespeare himself was, of course, a tireless exploiter of the design work of others, and may well have been poking fun at his own reputation, quoting a critic, when he had Autolycus describe himself as "a snapper-up of unconsidered trifles" in *A Winter's Tale* (Act IV, scene iii). Thanks to Tony Marcel for drawing this passage to my attention.

For the details, see David Cope, ed., *Virtual Music* (forthcoming from MIT Press), including my commentary, "Collision Detection, Muselot, and Scribble: Some Reflections on Creativity."

Richard Dawkins, 1982, *The Extended Phenotype*, Oxford and San Francisco: Freeman.

Three examples: Jerry Fodor's series of flawed theories of psychosemantics; John Searle's inability to account for how "intrinsic intentionality" could evolve when it has no "control power" consequences visible to selective pressure; John McDowell's quest for a non-Darwinian alternative to what he calls "bald naturalism," a struggle to secure a variety of normativity that is not the mere *as-if* normativity he finds discernible in evolution. See Dennett, *Darwin's Dangerous Idea*, 1995, and "Granny versus Mother Nature -- No Contest," *Mind & Language*, 11 no.3, 1996, pgs. 263-269, and "Review of John Searle, *The Rediscovery of the Mind*" *Journal of Philosophy*, 60, (4), 193-205, Apr. 1993, for my analyses of Fodor's and Searle's difficulties. My discussion of McDowell must be deferred to another occasion.

See "Do-It-Yourself Understanding," in *Brainchildren*, Cambridge MA: MIT Press, 1998, pgs. 59-80, for my analysis of this theme in Fred Dretske's search for a privileged place where the understanding happens.

Dialogues with Marcel Duchamp, Pierre Cabanne (transl Ron Padgett), New York, Viking Press, 1971, p.48. Thanks to Nicholas Humphrey and Victoria McGeer for ideas expressed in the previous paragraph.

In an oft-quoted but possibly spurious passage, see *Darwin's Dangerous Idea*, pg. 346-7.

I have been unable to locate the source of Guston's quote, but I have found much the same remark attributed to the composer, John Cage, a close friend and contemporary of Guston's, who [is said to have] said this about painting:

When you are working, everybody is in your studio-the past, your friends, the art world, and above all, your own ideas-all are there. But as you continue painting, they start leaving, one by one, and you are left completely alone. Then, if you are lucky, even you leave.

Like all other creators, Guston and I like to re-use what we find, adding a few touches from time to time.

WORLD-WIDE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL
SYNOPSIS
YEARS 2003-04

EUROPEAN UNION

Nº	Years	DEMOGRAPHY-POPULATION			PIB/COUNTRY		World Mahometano		EDUCATION		DEFEN.		FERTILITY		Nº
		COUNTRY	KM2	INHABITANT	DENS.	Thousands \$	\$	Number/h	%	LANGUAGE	S/PIB	S/PIB	WOMAN / YEAR	VEGETATIVE GROWTH X 1000 HAB.	
1	1993/4	GERMANY	357.021	81.912.000	229,50	1.935.580.560	23.630		GERMAN	4,00%	2,20%		-1,30	1	
	2003/4		357.021	82.398.320	230,79	2.160.000.000	26.200	3.000.000	3,64	4,60%	1,30%	1,37	-1,74		
2	1993/4	AUSTRIA	83.858	8.063.000	96,14	186.416.560	23.120		GERMAN	5,80%	1,00%		1,50	2	
	2003/4		83.858	8.188.207	97,64	227.700.000	27.900			5,80%	0,80%	1,56	-0,26		
3	1993/4	BELGIUM	30.510	10.064.000	329,85	213.457.440	21.210		BELGIAN	5,10%	1,80%		1,30	3	
	2003/4		30.510	10.289.088	337,23	299.700.000	29.200	200.000	1,94	5,90%	1,10%	1,62	0,38		
4	1993/4	CYPRUS	9.250	733.000	79,24	4.588.580	6.260		TURKISH	3,90%	2,30%		9,00	1970	
	2003/4		9.250	771.657	83,42	9.400.000	15.000			5,40%	3,50%	1,88	5,14		
5	1993/4	DENMARK	43.098	5.223.000	121,18	146.818.530	28.110		DANISH	7,40%	2,00%		1,60	5	
	2003/4		43.098	5.384.384	124,93	155.300.000	28.900			8,20%	1,40%	1,73	0,80		
6	1993/4	SLOVAKIA	48.845	5.289.608	108,29	11.794.470	2.230		SLOVAK	5,70%	2,40%		4,00	6	
	2003/4		48.845	5.430.033	111,16	67.340.000	12.400			4,20%	1,90%	1,25	0,88		
7	1993/4	SLOVENIA	20.273	1.971.000	97,22	14.072.940	7.140		SLOVENIAN	W/Datum	W/Datum		-0,10	7	
	2003/4		20.273	1.935.620	95,48	37.060.000	19.200			5,50%	1,50%	1,27	-0,92		
8	1993/4	SPAIN	504.782	39.652.742	78,55	526.578.560	13.280		SPANISH	4,60%	1,60%		0,70	8	
	2003/4		504.782	40.217.413	79,67	850.700.000	21.200	291.631	0,72	4,50%	1,30%	1,26	0,60		
9	1993/4	ESTONIA	45.226	1.487.000	32,87	4.193.340	2.820		ESTONIAN	5,90%	5,00%		-5,20	9	
	2003/4		45.226	1.408.556	31,14	15.520.000	11.000			7,50%	2,20%	1,27	-4,18		
10	1993/4	FINLAND	337.030	5.101.000	15,13	96.153.850	18.850		FINN /SWED	7,20%	2,20%		3,60	10	
	2003/4		337.030	5.190.785	15,40	133.800.000	25.800			6,10%	1,30%	1,70	0,72		
11	1993/4	FRANCE	547.030	58.172.000	107,00	1.365.296.840	23.470		FRENCH	5,80%	3,40%		3,30	11	
	2003/4		547.030	60.280.529	110,20	1.558.000.000	26.000	5.000.000	8,29	5,80%	2,10%	1,85	3,49		
12	1993/4	GREECE	131.940	10.493.000	79,52	80.901.030	7.710		GREEK	3,10%	5,50%		0,50	12	
	2003/4		131.940	10.665.989	80,84	203.300.000	19.100			3,80%	2,60%	1,35	-0,07		
13	1993/4	HUNGARY	93.030	10.231.000	109,97	39.287.040	3.840		HUNGARIAN	6,70%	2,00%		-3,00	13	
	2003/4	"	93.030	10.045.407	107,98	134.000.000	13.300		"	5,00%	1,70%	1,25	-3,68		
14	1993/4	IRELAND	70.280	3.590.000	51,08	48.931.700	13.630		IRISH	6,20%	1,30%		6,00	1990	
	2003/4	"	70.280	3.924.140	55,84	113.700.000	29.300		"	4,50%	0,60%	1,89	6,69		
15	1993/4	ITALY	301.230	57.282.824	190,16	1.103.824.140	19.270		ITALIAN	5,40%	2,10%		-0,20	15	
	2003/4	"	301.230	57.998.353	192,54	1.455.000.000	25.100	410.587	0,70	4,00%	1,60%	1,26	-0,94		
16	1993/4	LATVIA	64.589	2.515.000	38,93	5.759.350	2.290		LATVIAN	6,70%	4,00%		-4,90	16	
	2003/4	"	64.589	2.348.784	36,37	20.990.000	8.900		"	5,90%	1,40%	1,20	-6,15		
17	1993/4	LITHUANIA	65.200	3.707.000	56,85	5.004.450	1.350		LITHUANIAN	7,00%	5,00%		-1,10	17	
	2003/0	"	65.200	3.592.561	55,10	30.080.000	8.400		"	6,40%	1,80%	1,45	-2,41		
18	1993/4	LUXEMBOURG	2.586	415.000	160,47	16.425.700	39.580		LUXEMBOUR.	4,30%	0,80%		4,30	18	
	2003/4		2.586	454.157	175,62	21.940.000	48.900		"	3,70%	0,90%	1,70	3,14		
19	1993/4	MALTA	316	372.000	1.177,2	2.976.000	8.000		MALTESE	4,60%	0,90%		5,80	19	
	2003/4	"	316	400.420	1.267,1	17.200.000	17.200		"	4,90%	0,70%	1,91	4,95		
20	1993/4	THE NETHERLAND	41.526	15.589.000	375,40	342.490.330	21.970		DUTCH	5,90%	2,20%		3,50	20	
	2003/4	"	41.526	16.150.511	388,93	437.800.000	27.200	400.000	2,47	4,80%	1,60%	1,65	2,65		
21	1993/4	POLAND	312.685	38.731.000	123,86	95.665.570	2.470		POLISH	5,50%	2,40%		1,10	21	

	2003/4	"	312.685	38.622.660	123,52	373.200.000	9.700			"	5,00%	1,90%	1,37	0,51	
22	1993/4	PORTUGAL	92.391	9.927.000	107,44	93.015.990	9.370			PORTUGUESE	5,00%	2,50%		0,04	22
	2003/4	"	92.391	10.102.022	109,34	195.200.000	19.400	5.296	0,05	"	5,80%	2,10%	1,49	1,24	
23	1993/4	UNITED KINGDOM	244.820	58.586.000	239,30	1.078.568.260	18.410			WELS /SCOT	5,20%	3,60%		1,80	23
	2003/4	"	244.820	60.094.648	245,46	1.528.000.000	25.500	1.000.000	1,66	"	4,50%	2,50%	1,66	0,78	
24	1993/4	CZECH REPUBLIC	78.866	10.345.644	131,18	28.241.850	2.730			CZECH	5,80%	2,60%		0,30	24
	2003/4	"	78.866	10.249.216	129,96	157.100.000	15.300			"	4,40%	2,30%	1,18	-1,73	
25	1993/4	SWEDEN	449.964	8.858.000	19,68	209.314.540	23.630			SWEDISH	8,30%	2,80%		1,10	25
	2003/4	"	449.964	8.878.085	19,73	230.700.000	26.000			"	7,80%	1,90%	1,54	-0,87	
		TOTALS 1993/4	3.976.346	448.310.818	112,74	7.655.357.620	17.076				5,63%	2,57%		1,35	
		TOTALS 2003/4	3.976.346	455.021.545	114,43	10.432.730.000	22.928	10.307.514	2,27		5,36%	1,68%	1,51	0,36	

EUROPEAN EXTRACOM.

Nº	Years	DEMOGRAPHY-POPULATION				PIB/COUNTRY		PXCAP		World Mahometano		EDUCATION		DEFEN.		FERTILITY		Nº
		COUNTRY	KM2	INHABITANT	DENS.	Thousands \$	\$	Number/h	%	LANGUAGE	S/PIB	S/PIB	WOMAN / YEAR	VEGETATIVE GROWTH X 1000 HAB.				
26	1993/4	ALBANIA	28.718	3.412.000	118,81	1.160.080	340			ALBANIAN	2,00%	4,10%		18,40	26			
	2003/4	"	28.718	3.582.205	124,74	15.690.000	4.400	2.507.543	70			3,10%	3,00%	2,22	11,72			
27	1993/4	ANDORRA	468	62.900	134,40	W/Datum	W/Datum			CATALAN	W/Datum	W/Datum		8,10	27			
	2003/4	"	468	69.150	147,76	1.300.000	19.000				W/Datum	W/Datum	1,27	3,91				
28	1993/4	BOSNIA	51.129	3.459.000	67,65	2.421.300	700			BOSNIAN	W/Datum	W/Datum		7,10	28			
	2003/4	"	51.129	3.980.018	77,84	7.300.000	1.900	1.592.007	40			W/Datum	2,50%	1,71	4,44			
29	1993/4	BULGARIA	110.910	8.351.000	75,29	9.687.160	1.160			BULGARIAN	5,80%	3,20%		-3,80	29			
	2003/4	"	110.910	7.537.929	67,96	49.230.000	6.500				3,40%	2,70%	1,13	-6,32				
30	1993/4	CROATIA	56.542	4.495.000	79,49	13.745.710	3.058			CROATIAN	8,00%	4,00%		-0,60	30			
	2003/4	"	56.542	4.422.248	78,21	43.120.000	8.300	57.489	1,3		4,20%	2,80%	1,93	1,51				
31	1993/4	ICELAND	103.000	269.000	2,61	6.614.710	24.590			ICELANDIC	5,60%	0,00%		10,20	31			
	2003/4	"	103.000	280.798	2,73	8.444.000	30.200				4,90%	0,30%	1,98	7,18				
32	1993/4	LIECHTENSTEIN	160	30.900	193,12	W/Datum	W/Datum			GERMAN	W/Datum	W/Datum		W/Datum	32			
	2003/4	"	160	33.145	207,16	825.000	25.000			"	W/Datum	W/Datum	1,50	4,07				
33	1993/4	MACEDONIA	25.333	1.968.000	77,68	1.678.704	853			MACEDONICO	W/Datum	W/Datum		9,20	33			
	2003/4	"	25.333	2.063.122	81,44	10.570.000	5.100	618.936	30		4,10%	3,00%	1,75	5,42				
34	1993/4	MONACO	1,95	30.500	15641,02	W/Datum	W/Datum			FRENCH	W/Datum	W/Datum		4,40	34			
	2003/4	"	1,95	32.130	16476,92	870.000	27.000			"	W/Datum	W/Datum	1,76	-3,36				
35	1993/4	NORWAY	324.220	4.382.000	13,51	116.035.360	26.480			NORWEGIAN	8,40%	3,10%		3,40	35			
	2003/4	"	324.220	4.546.123	14,02	149.100.000	33.000			"	6,90%	2,00%	1,80	2,45				
36	1993/4	ROMANIA	238.391	22.670.000	95,45	60.075.500	2.650			ROMANIAN	3,60%	2,60%		4,40	36			
	2003/4	"	238.391	22.271.839	93,43	169.300.000	7.600			"	3,50%	2,70%	1,36	-1,46				
37	1993/4	SAN-MARINO	61	25.300	414,75	W/Datum	W/Datum			ITALIAN	9,00%	0,00%		W/Datum	37			
	2003/4	"	61	28.119	460,97	940.000	34.600			"	9,00%	0,00%	1,31	2,63				
38	1993/4	SERBIA AND MON	102.350	10.473.000	102,32	15.814.230	1.510			SERB/ALBAN.	W/Datum	3,90%		3,00	38			
	2003/4	"	102.350	10.655.774	104,11	23.150.000	1.500			"	5,10%	W/Datum	1,77	2,12				
39	1993/4	SWITZERLAND	41.290	7.087.000	171,63	249.320.660	35.180			ROMANCHE	5,20%	1,90%		3,00	39			
	2003/4	"	41.290	7.318.638	177,25	233.400.000	32.000	300.000		"	5,50%	1,20%	1,48	0,77				
40	1993/4	TURKEY	780.580	62.650.000	80,26	153.492.500	2.450			TURKISH	4,00%	4,10%		17,00	1990 40			
	2003/4	"	780.580	68.109.469	87,25	489.700.000	7.300	67.767.921	99,5	"	3,50%	3,20%	2,03	11,64				
41	1993/4	VATICAN	0,44	750	1.704,54	W/Datum	W/Datum			LATIN	W/Datum	W/Datum		W/Datum	41			
	2003/4	"	0,44	911	2.070,5	W/Datum	W/Datum			"	W/Datum	W/Datum	W/Datum	W/Datum				

DEMOGRAPHY-POPULATION					PIB/COUNTRY		PXCAP		World Mahometano		EDUCATION		DEFEN.	FERTILITY		
Nº	Years	COUNTRY	KM2	INHABITANT	DENS.	Thousands \$	\$	Number/h	%	LANGUAGE	S/PIB	S/PIB	WOMAN / YEAR	VEGETATIVE GROWTH X 1000 HAB.	Nº	
		TOTALS 1993/4	1.863.154	129.366.350	69,43	630.045.914	4.870				5,73%	2,69%		6,45		
		TOTALS 2003/4	1.863.154	134.931.618	72,42	1.202.939.000	8.915	72.843.896	53,99		4,84%	2,13%	1,67	3,11		

NORTH AMERICA

DEMOGRAPHY-POPULATION					PIB/COUNTRY		PXCAP		World Mahometano		EDUCATION		DEFEN.	FERTILITY		
Nº	Years	COUNTRY	KM2	INHABITANT	DENS.	Thousands \$	\$	Number/h	%	LANGUAGE	S/PIB	S/PIB	WOMAN / YEAR	VEGETATIVE GROWTH X 1000 HAB.	Nº	
42	1993/4	UNITED STATES	9.629.091	260.711.000	27,07	6.439.561.700	24.700			ENGLISH	5,30%	4,90%		6,90	42	
	2003/4	"	9.629.091	290.342.554	30,15	10.450.000.000	36.300	6.000.000	2,06		4,90%	3,40%	2,07	5,70		
43	1993/4	CANADA	9.984.670	29.107.000	3,20	601.641.690	20.670			ENGL/FRENC	7,40%	2,00%		7,00	43	
	2003/4	"	9.984.670	32.207.113	3,23	934.100.000	29.300	300.000	0,93	"	5,50%	1,00%	1,61	3,38		
		TOTALS 1993/4	19.613.761	289.818.000	14,78	7.041.203.390	24.295				6,35%	3,45%		6,95		
		TOTALS 2003/4	19.613.761	322.549.667	16,45	11.384.100.000	35.294	6.300.000	1,95		5,20%	2,20%	1,84	4,54		

CENTRAL AMERICA

DEMOGRAPHY-POPULATION					PIB/COUNTRY		PXCAP		World Mahometano		EDUCATION		DEFEN.	FERTILITY		
Nº	Years	COUNTRY	KM2	INHABITANT	DENS.	Thousands \$	\$	Number/h	%	LANGUAGE	S/PIB	S/PIB	WOMAN / YEAR	VEGETATIVE GROWTH X 1000 HAB.	Nº	
44	1993/4	ANTIGUA AND B.	443	66.000	148,98	sin datos	sin datos			ENGLISH	W/Datum	W/Datum		W/Datum	44	
	2003/4	"	443	67.897	153,27	750.000	11.000				3,20%	0,60%	2,28	12,59		
45	1993/4	BAHAMAS	13.940	264.000	18,93	3.038.640	11.510			ENGLISH	1,95%	3,00%		17,00	1990 45	
	2003/4	"	13.940	297.477	21,34	4.590.000	15.300				3,20%	0,50%	2,25	9,89		
46	1993/4	BARBADOS	431	260.000	603,24	1.723.800	6.630			ENGLISH	W/Datum	0,60%		6,00	1990 46	
	2003/4	"	431	277.264	643,30	4.153.000	15.000				7,10%	0,50%	1,65	4,13		
47	1993/4	BELIZE	22.966	204.000	8,88	418.200	2.050			ENGLISH	2,00%	0,50%		30,00	1990 47	
	2003/4	"	22.966	266.440	11,60	1.280.000	4.900				6,20%	2,40%	3,86	24,41		
48	1993/4	COSTA RICA	51.100	3.308.000	64,73	6.616.000	2.000			CASTILIAN	4,50%	0,40%		21,50	48	
	2003/4	"	51.100	3.896.092	76,24	32.000.000	8.300				4,40%	0,60%	2,38	15,09		
49	1993/4	CUBA	110.860	10.994.000	99,17	17.370.520	1.580			CASTILIAN	6,70%	4,20%		10,00	1990 49	
	2003/4	"	110.860	11.263.429	101,60	30.690.000	2.700				8,50%	W/Datum	1,61	4,49		
50	1993/4	DOMINICA	754	73.900	98,01	183.230	2.510			ENGLISH	W/Datum	W/Datum		W/Datum	50	
	2003/4	"	754	69.655	92,38	380.000	5.400				5,10%	W/Datum	1,99	9,79		
51	1993/4	EL SALVADOR	21.040	5.768.000	274,14	7.613.760	1.320			CASTILIAN	1,60%	1,30%		27,00	51	
	2003/4	"	21.040	6.470.379	307,53	29.410.000	4.600				2,30%	0,80%	3,25	21,89		
52	1993/4	GUATEMALA	108.890	10.322.000	94,79	11.457.420	1.110			CASTILIAN	1,20%	1,00%		28,50	52	
	2003/4	"	108.890	13.909.384	127,74	53.200.000	3.900			"	1,70%	0,60%	4,67	28,27		
53	1993/4	HAITI	27.750	6.491.000	233,91	2.401.670	370			FRE/CREOLE	1,80%	2,00%		22,00	1990 53	
	2003/4	"	27.750	7.527.817	271,27	10.600.000	1.400			"	1,10%	1,30%	4,86	20,70		
54	1993/4	HONDURAS	112.090	5.302.000	47,30	3.075.160	580			CASTILIAN	4,00%	1,70%		29,40	54	
	2003/4	"	112.090	6.669.789	59,50	16.290.000	2.500			"	4,00%	1,70%	4,07	25,23		
55	1993/4	JAMAICA	10.991	2.497.000	227,19	3.345.980	1.340			ENGLISH	4,10%	0,70%		18,30	55	
	2003/4	"	10.991	2.695.867	245,28	10.080.000	3.800			"	6,30%	0,50%	2,01	11,93		
56	1993/4	MEXICO	1.972.550	81.249.645	41,19	304.683.750	3.750			CASTILIAN	6,00%	0,50%		24,00	1990 56	

	2003/4	"	1.972.550	104.907.991	53,18	924.400.000	8.900			"	4,40%	0,50%	2,53	16,95		
57	1993/4	NICARAGUA	129.494	4.340.000	33,52	1.562.400	360			CASTILIAN	4,10%	0,60%		31,00	1990	57
	2003/4	"	129.494	5.128.517	39,60	11.160.000	2.200			"	5,00%	0,90%	3,00	21,60		
58	1993/4	PANAMA	78.200	2.631.000	33,64	6.866.910	2.610			CASTILIAN	5,60%	0,00%		20,00		58
	2003/4	"	78.200	2.960.784	37,86	18.060.000	6.200			"	5,90%	1,20%	2,53	14,53		
59	1993/4	PUERTO RICO	9.104	3.522.037	386,87	24.308.844	6.902			CAS/ENGLI.	W/Datum	W/Datum		10,60		59
	2003/4	"	9.104	3.885.877	426,83	43.010.000	11.100			"	7,70%	W/Datum	2,02	7,32		
60	1993/4	DOMINICAN REP.	48.730	7.803.000	160,13	8.427.240	1.080			CASTILIAN	1,50%	0,80%		23,00	1990	60
	2003/4	"	48.730	8.715.602	178,85	53.780.000	6.300			"	2,50%	0,70%	2,92	17,06		
61	1993/4	SAINT CHRISTO.	261	41.800	160,15	183.270	4.470			ENGLISH	W/Datum	W/Datum		12,40		61
	2003/4	"	261	38.763	148,52	339.000	8.800			"	W/Datum	W/Datum	2,37	9,60		
62	1993/4	SAINT LUCIA	616	142.000	230,52	411.800	2.900			ENGLISH	5,50%	W/Datum		19,00	1990	62
	2003/4	"	616	162.157	263,24	866.000	5.400			"	5,80%	W/Datum	2,29	15,69		
63	1993/4	SAINT VICENT G.	389	110.000	282,78	234.300	2.130			ENGLISH	6,70%	W/Datum		18,10		63
	2003/4	"	389	116.812	300,29	339.000	2.900			"	9,30%	W/Datum	1,95	11,08		
64	1993/4	TRINIDAD AND TO.	5.128	1.265.000	246,68	4.718.450	3.730			ENGLISH	4,00%	2,00%		10,90		64
	2003/4	"	5.128	1.104.209	215,33	11.070.000	10.000			"	4,00%	0,70%	1,78	4,03		
		TOTALS 1993/4	2.725.727	146.654.382	53,80	408.641.344	2.786				3,83%	1,21%		18,94		
		TOTALS 2003/4	2.725.727	180.432.202	66,20	1.256.447.000	6.963				4,89%	0,90%	2,68	14,58		

SOUTH AMERICA

Nº	Years	DEMOGRAPHY-POPULATION			PIB/COUNTRY		PXCAP		World Mahometano		EDUCATION		DEFEN.	FERTILITY		Nº
		COUNTRY	KM2	INHABITANT	DENS.	Thousands \$	\$	Number/h	%	LANGUAGE	S/PIB	S/PIB	WOMAN / YEAR	VEGETATIVE GROWTH X 1000 HAB.		
65	1993/4	ARGENTINA	2.766.890	32.423.465	11,72	90.135.940	2.780			CASTILIAN	9,30%	8,60%		11,00		65
	2003/4	"	2.766.890	38.740.807	14,00	403.800.000	10.500				4,00%	1,40%	2,28	9,89		
66	1993/4	BOLIVIA	1.098.580	7.888.000	7,18	5.363.840	680			CAS/QUIT/AIM	2,70%	2,40%		24,20		66
	2003/4	"	1.098.580	8.586.443	7,82	21.150.000	2.500				5,50%	1,70%	3,23	15,62		
67	1993/4	BRAZIL	8.511.965	159.000.000	18,68	478.590.000	3.010			PORTUGUESE	4,60%	1,30%		18,70		67
	2003/4	"	8.511.965	182.032.604	21,39	1.376.000	7.600				4,70%	1,90%	2,01	11,54		
68	1993/4	COLOMBIA	1.141.748	34.520.185	30,23	44.530.800	1.290			CASTILIAN	3,10%	2,60%		19,90		68
	2003/4	"	1.141.748	41.662.073	36,49	251.600.000	6.100				3,50%	2,40%	2,61	15,96		
69	1993/4	CHILE	756.950	13.231.803	17,48	36.120.630	2.730			CASTILIAN	2,90%	3,40%		15,70		69
	2003/4	"	756.950	15.665.216	20,70	156.100.000	10.100				4,20%	2,90%	2,09	10,47		
70	1993/4	ECUADOR	283.560	11.221.000	39,57	12.006.470	1.070			ENGLISH	2,70%	2,10%		20,70		70
	2003/4	"	283.560	13.710.234	48,35	42.650.000	3.200				1,60%	2,50%	2,99	19,65		
71	1993/4	GRENADA	344	91.000	264,53	210.210	2.310			ENGLISH	4,60%	W/Datum		W/Datum		71
	2003/4	"	344	89.258	259,47	440.000	5.000			"	4,20%	W/Datum	2,45	15,41		
72	1993/4	GUYANA	214.970	730.000	3,40	240.900	330			ENGLISH	8,80%	2,70%		16,00		72
	2003/4	"	214.970	702.100	3,27	2.628.000	3.800	70,210	10,0	"	4,10%	0,80%	2,07	8,60		
73	1993/4	PARAGUAY	406.750	4.828.000	11,87	7.242.000	1.500			CAS/GUARAN	2,80%	1,80%		29,00	1990	73
	2003/4	"	406.750	6.036.900	14,84	25.190.000	4.300			"	5,00%	1,10%	4,02	25,50		
74	1993/4	PERU	1.285.220	23.489.000	18,28	34.998.610	1.490			CAS/QUITXUA	1,50%	1,80%		21,40		74
	2003/4	"	1.285.220	28.409.897	22,11	138.800.000	5.000			"	3,40%	1,40%	2,81	17,12		
75	1993/4	SURINAM	163.270	430.000	2,63	520.300	1.210			DUTCH	W/Datum	W/Datum		17,00	1990	75
	2003/4	"	163.270	435.449	2,67	1.469.000	3.400	87,090	20	"	3,60%	1,10%	2,40	12,57		
76	1993/4	URUGUAY	176.220	3.186.000	18,08	12.457.260	3.910			CASTILIAN	2,80%	2,00%		8,30		76
	2003/4	"	176.220	3.413.329	19,37	26.820.000	7.900			"	2,80%	2,10%	2,35	8,22		

continuation

SOUTH AMERICA

Page 3

Nº	Years	DEMOGRAPHY-POPULATION				PIB/COUNTRY		PXCAP		World Mahometano		EDUCATION		DEFEN.	FERTILITY		Nº
		COUNTRY	KM2	INHABITANT	DENS.	Thousands \$	\$	Number/h	%	LANGUAGE	S/PIB	S/PIB	WOMAN / YEAR	VEGETATIVE GROWTH X 1000 HAB.			
77	1993/4	VENEZUELA	912.050	21.644.000	23,73	61.468.960	2.840					CASTILIAN	1,90%	0,40%		21,10	77
	2003/4	"	912.050	24.654.694	27,03	131.700.000	5.400					"	5,00%	1,10%	2,36	14,88	
		TOTALS 1993/4	17.718.517	312.682.453	17,65	783.885.920	2.506						3,98%	2,65%		18,58	
		TOTALS 2003/4	17.718.517	364.139.004	20,55	1.203.723.000	3.305	157.300	0,04				3,97%	1,70%	2,59	14,26	

RUSSIA

Nº	Years	DEMOGRAPHY-POPULATION				PIB/COUNTRY		PXCAP		World Mahometano		EDUCATION		DEFEN.	FERTILITY		Nº
		COUNTRY	KM2	INHABITANT	DENS.	Thousands \$	\$	Number/h	%	LANGUAGE	S/PIB	S/PIB	WOMAN / YEAR	VEGETATIVE GROWTH X 1000 HAB.			
78	1993/4	RUSSIA	17.075.200	148.070.000	8,67	392.385.500	2.650					RUSSIAN	3,00%	12,00%		-5,70	78
	2003/4	"	17.075.200	144.526.278	8,46	1.409.000.000	9.700	20.000.000	13,8			"	4,40%	2,40%	1,33	-3,90	
		TOTALS 1993/4	17.075.200	148.070.000	8,67	392.385.500	2.650						3,00%	12,00%		-5,70	
		TOTALS 2003/4	17.075.200	144.526.278	8,46	1.409.000.000	9.700	20.000.000	13,83				4,40%	2,40%	1,33	-3,90	

EX URRS

Nº	Years	DEMOGRAPHY-POPULATION				PIB/COUNTRY		PXCAP		World Mahometano		EDUCATION		DEFEN.	FERTILITY		Nº
		COUNTRY	KM2	INHABITANT	DENS.	Thousands \$	\$	Number/h	%	LANGUAGE	S/PIB	S/PIB	WOMAN / YEAR	VEGETATIVE GROWTH X 1000 HAB.			
79	1993/4	ARMENIA	29.800	3.426.000	114,97	3.737.766	1.091					ARMENIAN	2,90%	2,30%		16,30	79
	2003/4	"	29.800	3.326.448	111,63	12.130.000	3.600					"	2,90%	2,60%	1,56	2,41	
80	1993/4	AZERBAIJAN	86.600	7.237.000	83,57	6.933.046	958					AZERI	2,47%	1,10%		20,20	80
	2003/4	"	86.600	7.830.764	90,42	28.610.000	3.700	7.282.610	93			"	4,20%	1,90%	2,34	9,60	
81	1993/4	BELARUS	207.600	10.332.000	49,77	29.342.880	2.840					BYELORUS.	5,30%	3,00%		-1,10	81
	2003/4	"	207.600	10.322.151	49,72	90.190.000	8.700					"	6,00%	1,40%	1,34	-3,87	
82	1993/4	GEORGIA	69.700	5.482.000	78,65	8.990.480	1.640					GEORGIAN	5,00%	5,00%		8,60	82
	2003/4	"	69.700	4.934.413	70,80	16.050.000	3.200	542.785	11			"	7,70%	0,90%	1,51	-2,92	
83	1993/4	KAZAKHSTAN	2.727.300	16.792.000	6,16	35.263.200	2.100					KAZAK/RUSS.	2,27%	5,00%		14,00	83
	2003/4	"	2.727.300	16.763.795	6,15	120.000.000	7.200	7.878.983	47			"	4,40%	0,90%	2,16	7,58	
84	1993/4	KYRGYZSTAN	198.500	4.422.000	22,28	6.854.100	1.550					KYRGYZ/RUS.	2,48%	1,00%		22,30	84
	2003/4	"	198.500	4.892.808	24,65	13.880.000	2.900	2.201.763	45			"	5,40%	1,50%	3,12	16,96	
85	1993/4	MOLDAVIA	33.843	4.439.502	131,18	3.803.640	870					MOLDAVIAN	W/Datum	W/Datum		2,50	85
	2003/4	"	33.843	4.439.502	131,18	11.510.000	1.100					"	4,00%	0,40%	1,74	1,61	
86	1993/4	TADJIKISTAN	143.100	5.359.000	37,45	5.626.950	1.050					TAJIK	4,00%	0,90%		32,60	86
	2003/4	"	143.100	6.863.752	47,96	8.476.000	1.300	6.177.376	90			"	3,90%	3,80%	4,17	24,32	
87	1993/4	TURKMENISTAN	488.100	3.714.000	7,61	6.313.800	1.700					TURKMEN	1,97%	W/Datum		27,20	87
	2003/4	"	488.100	4.775.544	9,78	31.340.000	6.700	4.250.234	89			"	3,90%	3,80%	3,50	19,15	
88	1993/4	UKRAINE	603.700	51.273.000	84,93	80.498.610	1.570					UKRAINIAN	6,1%	4,00%		5,80	88
	2003/4	"	603.700	48.055.439	79,60	218.000.000	4.500					"	4,50%	1,50%	1,34	-6,50	
89	1993/4	UZBEKISTAN	447.400	20.708.000	46,29	27.955.800	1.350					UZBEK	W/Datum	W/Datum		27,60	89
	2003/4	"	447.400	25.981.647	58,07	66.060.000	2.600	22.863.849	88			"	7,70%	1,10%	3,00	18,12	
		TOTALS 1993/4	5.035.643	133.184.502	26,45	215.320.272	1.616						3,30%	2,79%		16,00	
		TOTALS 2003/4	5.035.643	138.186.263	27,44	616.246.000	4.459	51.197.600	37,05				4,96%	1,80%	2,34	7,86	

FAR EAST

DEMOGRAPHY-POPULATION					PIB/COUNTRY	PXCAP	World Mahometano		EDUCATION		DEFEN.	FERTILITY			
Nº	Years	COUNTRY	KM2	INHABITANT	DENS.	Thousands \$	\$	Number/h	%	LANGUAGE	S/PIB	S/PIB	WOMAN / YEAR	VEGETATIVE GROWTH X 1000 HAB.	Nº
90	1993/4	JAPAN	377.835	123.612.000	327,16	3.143.453.160	25.430			JAPANESE	4,80%	1,00%		3,20	90
	2003/4	"	377.835	127.214.499	336,69	3.651.000.000	28.700				3,50%	1,10%	1,38	1,06	
91	1993/4	CHINA	9.596.960	1.133.682.000	118,13	419.462.340	370			CHINESE	2,40%	8,40%		13,00	91
	2003/4	"	9.596.960	1.286.975.468	134,10	5.989.000.000	4.700	100.000.000	7,77		2,90%	1,60%	1,70	6,22	
92	1993/4	MONGOLIA	1.565.000	2.182.000	1,39					KHALKHA	0,90%	0,90%		28,00	92
	2003/4	"	1.565.000	2.712.315	1,73	5.060.000	1.900	54.246	2,00		2,40%	2,30%	2,28	14,21	
93	1993/4	SOUTH COREA	98.480	43.520.000	441,92	235.008.000	5.400			KOREAN	1,90%	2,50%		10,00	1990
	2003/4	"	98.480	48.289.037	490,34	941.500.000	19.600			"	3,80%	3,10%	1,56	6,57	
94	1993/4	NORTH COREA	120.540	22.227.000	184,40	23.982.933	1.079			KOREAN	3,60%	12,10%		13,00	1990
	2003/4	"	120.540	22.466.481	186,38	22.260.000	1.000			"			2,25	10,68	
95	1993/4	TAIWAN	35.980	20.592.048	572,32	181.003.680	8.790			TRAD.CHINES	3,60%	5,40%		10,40	95
	2003/4	"	35.980	22.603.000	628,21	406.000.000	18.000			"	4,10%	2,50%	1,57	6,54	
		TOTALS 1993/4	11.794.795	1.345.815.048	114,10	4.002.910.113	2.974							12,93	
		TOTALS 2003/4	11.794.795	1.510.260.800	128,04	11.014.820.000	7.293	100.054.246	6,62		3,34%	2,12%	1,79	7,55	

AFRICA

DEMOGRAPHY-POPULATION					PIB/COUNTRY	PXCAP	World Mahometano		EDUCATION		DEFEN.	FERTILITY			
Nº	Years	COUNTRY	KM2	INHABITANT	DENS.	Thousands \$	\$	Number/h	%	LANGUAGE	S/PIB	S/PIB	WOMAN / YEAR	VEGETATIVE GROWTH X 1000 HAB.	Nº
96	1993/4	ARGELIA	2.381.740	27.029.000	11,35	54.598.580	2.020			ARABIC	9,10%	5,10%		25,00	96
	2003/4	"	2.381.740	32.818.500	13,78	173.800.000	5.400	32.818.500	100		4,80%	5,90%	2,55	16,85	
97	1993/4	EGYPT	1.001.450	57.109.000	57,03	35.978.670	630			ARABIC	6,70%	5,00%		23,00	1990
	2003/4	"	1.001.450	74.718.797	74,61	289.800.000	4.000	70.235.669	94		4,70%	3,50%	3,02	19,01	
98	1993/4	LIBYA	1.759.540	4.573.000	2,60	28.809.900	6.300			ARABIC	9,60%	14,90%		18,00	1990
	2003/4	"	1.759.540	5.499.074	3,13	33.360.000	6.200	5.334.101	97		7,10%	4,20%	3,49	23,94	
99	1993/4	MORROCO	446.500	26.494.000	59,34	27.288.820	1.030			ARABIC	7,40%	5,50%		21,00	1990
	2003/4	"	446.500	31.689.265	70,97	121.800.000	3.900	31.372.372	99		5,50%	4,60%	2,89	17,48	
100	1993/4	TUNISIA	163.610	8.757.000	53,52	15.587.460	1.780			ARABIC	6,20%	3,40%		21,00	1990
	2003/4	"	163.610	9.924.742	60,66	67.130.000	6.800	9.726.247	98		6,80%	2,00%	1,90	11,51	
101	1993/4	MAURITANIA	1.030.700	2.171.000	2,11	1.128.920	520			FRE/ARABIC	4,90%	4,30%		26,00	1990
	2003/4	"	1.030.700	2.912.584	2,83	4.891.000	1.700	2.912.584	100		3,00%	2,60%	6,08	29,12	
102	1993/4	ANGOLA	1.246.700	10.916.000	8,76	8.514.480	780			PORTUGUES	7,30%	34,00%		28,00	1990
	2003/4	"	1.246.700	10.766.471	8,64	18.360.000	1.700				2,70%	17,00%	6,38	19,74	
103	1993/4	BENIN	112.620	5.091.000	45,21	2.087.310	410			FRENCH	5,10%	1,70%		32,00	1990
	2003/4	"	112.620	7.041.490	62,52	7.380.000	1.100	1.408.298	20		3,20%	1,70%	6,04	29,50	
104	1993/4	BOTSWANA	600.370	1.406.000	2,34	3.936.800	2.800			ENGLISH	8,10%	2,80%		28,00	1990
	2003/4	"	600.370	1.573.267	2,62	13.480.000	8.500				8,60%	5,50%	3,27	-5,50	
105	1993/4	BURKINA	274.200	9.780.000	35,67	2.934.000	300			FRENCH	2,30%	2,10%		28,00	1990
	2003/4	"	274.200	13.228.460	48,24	14.510.000	1.100	6.614.200	50		1,50%	1,30%	6,34	26,02	
106	1993/4	BURUNDI	27.830	5.665.000	203,56	1.189.650	210			FR/KIRUNDI	3,50%	2,60%		27,00	1990
	2003/4	"	27.830	6.096.156	219,05	3.146.000	500	609.615	10		3,40%	5,30%	5,99	21,92	
107	1993/4	CAPE VERDE	4.033	350.000	86,78	297.500	850			PORTUGUES	2,90%	11,80%		31,00	1990
	2003/4	"	4.033	412.137	102,19	600.000	1.400			"	4,40%	0,80%	3,77	20,09	

continuation

AFRICA

Page 4

Nº	Years	DEMOGRAPHY-POPULATION			DENS.	PIB/COUNTRY Thousands \$	FXCAP \$	World Mahometano		EDUCATION			DEFEN.		FERTILITY		Nº
		COUNTRY	KM2	INHABITANT				Number/h	%	LANGUAGE	S/PIB	S/PIB	WOMAN / YEAR	VEGETATIVE GROWTH X 1000 HAB.			
108	1993/4	CAMEROON	475.440	13.103.000	27,56	10.744.460	820			FR/ENGLISH	1,30%	8,80%		28,00	1990	108	
	2003/4	"	475.440	15.746.179	33,12	26.840.000	1.700	3.149.203	20	"	3,20%	1,50%	4,63	20,19			
109	1993/4	CENTROAFRI.R.	622.984	2.998.000	4,81	1.229.180	410			FRENCH	2,80%	1,70%		25,00	1990	109	
	2003/4	"	622.984	3.683.538	5,91	4.296.000	1.200	552.530	15	"	1,90%	2,00%	4,68	16,20			
110	1993/4	COMORES	1.862	516.000	277,12	263.160	510			ARABIC/FRE.	6,50%	2,60%		30,00	1990	110	
	2003/4	"	1.862	632.948	339,93	441.000	700	620.289	98	"	3,80%	3,00%	5,21	29,64			
111	1993/4	R.OF THE CONGO	2.345.410	43.775.000	18,66	9.630.500	220			FRENCH	1,00%	0,80%		30,00	1990	111	
	2003/4	"	2.345.410	56.625.039	24,14	34.000.000	600	5.662.503	10	"	W/Datum	7,30%	6,69	30,25			
112	1993/4	IVORY COAST	322.460	13.459.000	41,74	9.421.300	700			FRENCH	7,00%	1,50%		31,00	1990	112	
	2003/4	"	322.460	16.962.491	52,60	24.030.000	1.400	6.784.996	40	"	4,60%	0,80%	5,51	21,60			
113	1993/4	CHAD	1.284.000	6.118.000	4,76	1.284.780	210			FRA/ARABIC	1,80%	4,30%		29,00	1990	113	
	2003/4	"	1.284.000	9.253.493	7,21	9.297.000	1.000	4.719.281	51	"	2,00%	0,70%	6,44	30,68			
114	1993/4	DJIBOUTI	23.000	565.000	24,57	774.050	1.370			FRA/ARABIC	2,50%	W/Datum		28,00	1990	114	
	2003/4	"	23.000	457.130	19,88	619.000	1.300	438.844	96	"	3,50%	3,90%	5,56	21,33			
115	1993/4	ERYTREA	121.320	3.317.000	27,34	W/Datum	W/Datum			TIGRI/ARABIC	W/Datum	W/Datum		26,00	1990	115	
	2003/4	"	121.320	4.362.254	35,96	3.300.000	700	1.744.901	40	"	4,80%	18,30%	5,74	26,21			
116	1993/4	ETHIOPIA	1.127.127	44.265.539	39,27	5.311.800	120			AMHARIC	7,90%	9,00%		29,00	1990	116	
	2003/4	"	1.127.127	66.557.553	59,05	48.530.000	700	33.278.776	50	"	4,80%	8,00%	5,55	19,64			
117	1993/4	GABON	267.667	1.280.000	4,78	5.734.400	4.480			FRENCH	5,70%	4,50%		28,00	1990	117	
	2003/4	"	267.667	1.321.560	4,94	8.354.000	6.500			"	3,90%	2,50%	4,83	25,37			
118	1993/4	GAMBIA	11.300	1.033.000	91,42	402.870	390			ENGLISH	5,20%	4,00%		25,40		118	
	2003/4	"	11.300	1.501.050	132,84	2.582.000	1.800	1.350.950	90	"	2,70%	0,70%	5,53	28,42			
119	1993/4	GHANA	239.460	13.482.000	56,30	5.419.764	402			ENGLISH	1,50%	1,20%		28,00	1990	119	
	2003/4	"	239.460	20.467.747	85,47	41.250.000	2.000	3.274.839	16	"	4,10%	0,70%	3,32	15,31			
120	1993/4	R. OF GUINEA	245.857	7.418.000	30,17	3.783.180	510			FRENCH	1,40%	1,20%		27,00	1990	120	
	2003/4	"	245.857	9.030.220	36,73	18.690.000	2.100	7.675.687	85	"	1,90%	1,40%	5,90	26,80			
121	1993/4	GUINEA BISSAU	36.120	1.036.000	28,68	217.560	210			PORTUGUES	2,80%	W/Datum		27,00	1990	121	
	2003/4	"	36.120	1.360.827	37,68	901.400	700	612.372	45	"	2,10%	1,50%	5,07	21,79			
122	1993/4	EQUATO.GUINEA	28.051	377.000	13,44	124.410	330			CASTILIAN	W/Datum	W/Datum		24,00	1990	122	
	2003/4	"	28.051	510.473	18,20	1.270.000	2.700			"	0,60%	1,70%	4,75	24,40			
123	1993/4	KENYA	582.650	28.113.000	48,25	9.277.290	330			SWAHILI	6,40%	2,70%		37,30		123	
	2003/4	"	582.650	31.639.091	54,30	32.890.000	1.100	3.163.909	10	"	6,40%	2,30%	3,47	12,80			
124	1993/4	LESOTHO	30.355	1.903.000	62,69	1.103.740	580			SESOTHO	4,00%	6,00%		25,00	1990	124	
	2003/4	"	30.355	1.861.959	61,34	5.106.000	2.700			"	10,1%	2,70%	3,52	2,68			
125	1993/4	LIBERIA	111.370	3.580.000	32,15	716.000	200			ENGLISH	5,70%	4,80%		29,00	1990	125	
	2003/4	"	111.370	3.317.176	29,79	3.116.000	1.000	663.435	20	"	1,10%	5,60%	6,23	27,44			
126	1993/4	MADAGASCAR	587.040	13.225.000	22,53	3.041.750	230			MADAGASY	1,90%	1,50%		29,00	1990	126	
	2003/4	"	587.040	16.979.744	28,92	12.590.000	800	1.188.582	7	"	3,20%	1,10%	5,73	30,28			
127	1993/4	MALAWI	118.480	9.480.000	80,01	1.990.800	210			ENGLISH	3,50%	2,30%		32,00	1990	127	
	2003/4	"	118.480	11.651.239	98,34	6.811.000	600	2.330.247	20	"	4,10%	0,30%	6,10	22,06			
128	1993/4	MALI	1.240.000	8.646.000	6,97	2.539.200	300			FRENCH	3,30%	2,00%		23,00	1990	128	
	2003/4	"	1.240.000	11.626.219	9,38	9.775.000	900	10.463.597	90	"	2,80%	2,20%	6,66	28,58			
129	1993/4	MAURITIUS	2.040	1.103.000	540,69	3.022.220	2.740			ENGL/FRENCH	1,60%	1,00%		14,10		129	

	2003/4		2.040	1.210.447	593,36	12.150.000	10.100	200.934	16,6		3,50%	0,20%	1,98	9,29		
130	1993/4	MOZAMBIQUE	799.380	15.243.000	19,07	914.580	60			PORTUGUES	W/Datum	9,70%		23,00	1990	130
	2003/4		799.380	17.479.266	21,87	19.520.000	1.100	3.495.853	20		2,40%	1,80%	4,87	8,16		
131	1993/4	NAMIBIA	825.418	1.401.711	1,70	1.569.120	1.120			ENGLISH	2,20%	0,70%		31,00	1990	131
	2003/4		825.418	1.927.447	2,34	13.150.000	6.900				8,10%	2,90%	4,71	14,93		
132	1993/4	NIGER	1.267.000	8.516.000	6,72	2.639.960	310			FRENCH	3,10%	7,60%		31,00	1990	132
	2003/4		1.267.000	11.058.590	8,73	8.713.000	800	8.846.872	80		2,80%	1,50%	6,91	27,83		
133	1993/4	NIGERIA	923.768	91.549.000	99,10	29.295.680	320			ENGLISH	1,70%	0,50%		32,50	1990	133
	2003/4		923.768	133.881.703	144,93	112.500	900	66.935.851	50		0,70%	1,20%	5,40	24,99		
134	1993/4	RWANDA	26.338	7.817.000	296,80	1.563.400	200			FRE/KINYAR.	3,80%	7,50%		15,00	1990	134
	2003/4	"	26.338	7.810.056	296,53	8.920.000	1.200	359.262	4,6	"	2,80%	2,90%	5,60	18,38		
135	1993/4	SAO TOME Y P.	1.001	128.000	127,87	44.800	350			PORTUGUES	W/Datum	W/Datum		27,00	1990	135
	2003/4	"	1.001	175.883	175,71	200.000	1.200			"	3,60%	1,00%	5,88	34,76		
136	1993/4	SENEGAL	196.190	8.112.000	41,35	5.921.760	730			FRENCH	3,70%	1,90%		31,00	1990	136
	2003/4	"	196.190	10.580.307	53,93	15.640.000	1.500	9.945.488	94	"	3,20%	1,30%	4,93	25,35		
137	1993/4	SEYCHELLES	455	71.800	157,80	386.950	5.450			EN/FR/CREO.	8,50%	5,60%		15,10	1990	137
	2003/4	"	455	80.469	176,85	626.000	7.800			"	7,60%	1,80%	1,79	10,40		
138	1993/4	SIERRA LEONE	71.740	4.616.000	64,34	646.240	140			ENGLISH	1,40%	2,30%		22,00	1990	138
	2003/4	"	71.740	5.732.681	79,91	2.826.000	500	3.439.608	60	"	1,00%	2,30%	5,86	23,23		
139	1993/4	SOMALIA	637.657	6.667.000	10,46	1.000.050	150			SOMALIAN	0,40%	3,20%		24,00	1990	139
	2003/4	"	637.657	8.025.190	12,59	4.270.000	600	8.025.190	100	"	0,50%	4,50%	6,98	28,78		
140	1993/4	SOUTH AFRICA	1.219.912	40.763.000	33,41	118.212.700	2.900			AFR/ENGLISH	W/Datum	3,70%		26,00	1990	140
	2003/4	"	1.219.912	42.768.678	35,06	427.700.000	10.000	855.373	2	"	5,50%	1,70%	2,24	0,45		
141	1993/4	SUDAN	2.505.813	25.699.000	10,26	7.709.700	300			ARABIC	4,80%	7,70%		25,00	1990	141
	2003/4	"	2.505.813	38.114.160	15,21	52.900.000	1.400	26.679.912	70	"	7,60%	4,80%	5,10	26,89		
142	1993/4	SWAZILAND	17.363	883.000	50,86	927.150	1.050			SISWA/ENGL.	6,40%	1,40%		31,00	1990	142
	2003/4	"	17.363	1.161.219	66,88	5.542.000	4.800	116.121	10	"	1,50%	1,50%	3,92	8,29		
143	1993/4	TANZANIA	945.087	27.296.000	28,88	3.002.560	110			KISWAHILI	6,40%	1,40%		31,00	1990	143
	2003/4	"	945.087	35.922.454	38,01	20.420.000	600	12.572.893	35	"	2,10%	1,50%	5,24	22,12		
144	1993/4	TOGO	56.785	3.922.000	69,07	1.294.260	330			FRENCH	5,70%	3,00%		32,00	1990	144
	2003/4	"	56.785	5.429.299	95,61	7.594.000	1.400	1.085.859	20	"	4,80%	2,40%	4,97	23,72		
145	1993/4	UGANDA	236.040	18.194.000	77,08	3.456.860	190			ENGLISH	1,70%	2,60%		32,00	1990	145
	2003/4	"	236.040	25.632.794	108,60	30.490.000	1.200	4.101.239	16	"	2,30%	2,40%	6,72	29,62		
146	1993/4	ZAMBIA	752.614	9.132.000	12,13	3.378.840	370			ENGLISH	2,30%	2,40%		29,00	1990	146
	2003/4	"	752.614	10.307.333	13,70	8.240.000	800	2.473.760	24	"	2,30%	0,60%	5,25	15,23		
147	1993/4	ZIMBABWE	390.580	10.971.000	28,09	7.350.570	670			ENGLISH	7,40%	5,50%		29,00	1990	147
	2003/4	"	390.580	12.576.742	32,20	26.070.000	2.100			"	10,4%	3,30%	3,66	8,32		
		TOTALS 1993/4	29.746.427	659.115.050	22,16	447.699.684	679				4,39%	4,67%		26,91		
		TOTALS 2003/4	29.746.427	852.103.591	28,65	1.708.028.900	2.004	397.840.742	46,69		3,92%	3,12%	4,90	20,62		

ASIA

Nº	Years	DEMOGRAPHY-POPULATION			DENS.	PIB/COUNTRY		World Mahometano		EDUCATION		DEFEN.	FERTILITY		Nº	
		COUNTRY	KM2	INHABITANT		Thousands \$	\$	Number/h	%	LANGUAGE	S/PIB		S/PIB	WOMAN / YEAR		VEGETATIVE GROWTH X 1000 HAB.
148	1993/4	AFGHANISTAN	652.225	18.052.000	27,68	3.971.440	220			PASH/DARI	1,80%	9,50%		23,70	148	
	2003/4		652.225	28.717.213	44,03	19.900.000	700	28.430.041	99		1,50%	14,50%	5,64	23,48		
149	1993/4	SAUDI ARABIA	1.960.582	15.267.000	7,79	95.113.410	6.230			ARABIC	17,2%	30,00%		31,00	1990	149
	2003/4	"	1.960.582	24.293.844	12,39	268.900.000	11.400	24.293.844	100	"	9,50%	11,20%	6,15	31,41		

continuation

ASIA

Page 5

Nº	Years	DEMOGRAPHY-POPULATION			PIB/COUNTRY		PXCAP		World Mahometano		EDUCATION			DEFEN.		FERTILITY		Nº
		COUNTRY	KM2	INHABITANT	DENS.	Thousands \$	\$	Number/h	%	LANGUAGE	S/PIB	S/PIB	WOMAN / YEAR	VEGETATIVE GROWTH X 1000 HAB.				
150	1993/4	BAHRAIN	665	518.240	779,31	3.304.840	6.380			ARABIC	1,00%	13,50%		25,00	1990	150		
	2003/4	"	665	667.238	1003,37	9.910.000	15.100	667.238	100	"	3,70%	6,40%	2,71	15,03				
151	1993/4	BANGLADESH	144.000	110.602.000	768,07	22.120.400	200			BENGALI	1,80%	1,00%		23,00	1990	151		
	2003/4	"	144.000	138.448.210	961,45	238.200.000	1.800	114.912.019	83	"	2,50%	1,40%	3,17	21,27				
152	1993/4	BHUTAN	47.000	1.511.000	32,15	287.090	190			TIBETAN	1,30%	0,00%		25,00	1990	152		
	2003/4	"	47.000	2.139.549	45,52	2.700.000	1.300			"	5,20%	5,60%	4,49	21,35				
153	1993/4	UNIT.ARAB EMIR.	83.600	1.945.000	23,27	32.314.230	16.614			ARABIC	1,50%	4,30%		24,00	1990	153		
	2003/4	"	83.600	2.484.818	29,72	53.970.000	22.100	2.385.425	96	"	2,00%	2,20%	3,09	14,46				
154	1993/9	INDIA	3.287.590	844.324.222	256,82	295.513.400	350			ENGL/HINDI	3,20%	10,20%		20,00	1990	154		
	2003/4	"	3.287.590	1.049.700.118	319,29	2.664.000.000	2.600	125.964.014	12	"	4,10%	3,10%	2,91	14,79				
155	1993/4	IRAN	1.648.000	59.570.000	36,15	145.946.500	2.450			PERSE	3,10%	7,90%		28,00	1990	155		
	2003/4	"	1.648.000	68.278.826	41,43	458.300.000	6.800	67.596.037	99	"	4,40%	3,90%	1,99	11,69				
156	1993/4	IRAQ	437.072	17.903.000	40,96	73.581.330	4.110			ARABIC	3,80%	30,70%		38,00	1990	156		
	2003/4	"	437.072	24.683.313	56,47	58.000.000	2.400	24.683.313	100	"	W/Datum	W/Datum	4,52	27,82				
157	1993/4	ISRAEL	20.770	5.239.000	252,24	57.471.830	10.970			HEBREW	8,60%	12,80%		15,10	1990	157		
	2003/4	"	20.770	6.116.533	294,49	117.400.000	19.500	917.480	15	"	7,30%	9,20%	2,50	12,47				
158	1993/4	JORDAN	92.300	3.636.000	39,39	4.508.640	1.240			ARABIC	5,90%	12,70%		41,00	1990	158		
	2003/4	"	92.300	5.460.265	59,16	2.263.000	4.300	5.023.443	92	"	5,00%	10,80%	3,00	21,06				
159	1993/4	KUWAIT	17.820	2.212.000	124,13	35.723.800	16.150			ARABIC	5,00%	6,20%		23,60	1990	159		
	2003/4	"	17.820	2.183.161	122,51	36.850.000	17.500	2.183.161	100	"	6,10%	11,70%	3,08	19,38				
160	1993/4	LEBANON	10.440	2.803.000	268,49	2.859.060	1.020			ARABIC	5,00%	8,20%		18,00	1990	160		
	2003/4	"	10.440	3.727.703	357,06	17.610.000	4.800	2.189.392	58,7	"	3,00%	3,10%	1,98	13,36				
161	1993/4	MALDIVES	300	213.215	710,72	93.720	440			DHIVEHI	1,40%	10,00%		31,00	1990	161		
	2003/4	"	300	329.684	1098,95	1.250.000	3.900	329.684	100	"	3,90%	9,50%	5,26	29,06				
162	1993/4	NEPAL	140.800	19.795.000	140,59	3.563.100	180			NEPALI	2,80%	1,20%		26,00	1990	162		
	2003/4	"	140.800	26.469.569	187,99	37.320.000	1.400	1.058.782	4	"	3,70%	1,20%	4,39	22,62				
163	1993/4	OMAN	212.460	1.559.000	7,34	9.863.793	6.327			ARABIC	8,80%	34,40%		34,00	1990	163		
	2003/4	"	212.460	2.807.125	13,21	22.400.000	8.300	2.807.125	100	"	3,90%	11,20%	5,94	33,50				
164	2003/4	PALAU	458	19.717	43,05	174000	9000			ENG/SONSO.	W/Datum	W/Datum		W/Datum	164			
	2003/4	"	458	19.717	43,05	174.000	9.000			"	W/Datum	W/Datum	2,47	12,02				
165	2003/4	PALESTINE	6.257	3.900.000	623,30	W/Datum	W/Datum			ARABIC	W/Datum	W/Datum		W/Datum	165			
	2003/4	"	6.257	3.900.000	623,30	W/Datum	W/Datum	3.233.100	82,9	"	W/Datum	W/Datum	5,25	W/Datum				
166	1993/4	PAKISTAN	803.940	115.520.000	143,69	43.897.600	380			UIGHUR/ENG.	3,00%	3,80%		30,00	1990	166		
	2003/4	"	803.940	150.694.740	187,45	295.300.000	2.000	146.173.897	97	"	1,80%	4,00%	4,10	20,80				
167	1993/4	QATAR	11.437	520.000	45,47	8.247.200	15.860			ARABIC	5,60%	9,30%		20,00	1990	167		
	2003/4	"	11.437	817.052	71,44	15.910.000	20.100	776.199	95	"	3,60%	9,30%	3,02	11,25				
168	1993/4	SYRIA	185.180	12.958.000	69,98	13.217.160	1.020			ARABIC	12,2%	26,3%		W/Datum	168			
	2003/4	"	185.180	17.585.540	94,96	63.480.000	3.700	15.826.986	90	"	4,10%	4,50%	3,72	24,50				
169	1993/4	SRI LANKA	65.610	17.247.000	262,87	8.106.090	470			SINHALESE	4,70%	8,70%		14,20	1990	169		
	2003/4	"	65.610	19.742.439	300,91	73.700.000	3.700	1.382.041	7	"	3,10%	3,90%	1,90	9,66				
170	2003/4	EAST TIMOR	15.007	997.853	66,49	440000	500			TETUM/PORT	W/Datum	1,10%		22,00	1990	170		
	2003/4	"	15.007	997.853	66,49	440.000	500	39.914	4	"	W/Datum	1,10%	3,79	21,34				

171	1993/4	YEMEN	527.970	11.546.000	21,87	7.389.440	640			ARABIC	14,3%	21,90%		38,00	1990	171
	2003/4	"	527.970	19.349.881	36,65	15.070.000	800	19.349.881	100	"	10,0%	5,10%	6,82	34,19		
		TOTALS 1993/4	10.371.483	1.267.858.247	122,24	867.708.073	684				5,33%	12,0%		26,22		
		TOTALS 2003/4	10.371.483	1.599.614.391	154,23	4.473.047.000	2.796	590.223.016	36,90		4,42%	6,3%	3,83	20,28		

SOUTH EAST OF ASIA

Nº	Years	DEMOGRAPHY-POPULATION				PIB/COUNTRY		World Mahometano		EDUCATION		DEFEN.	FERTILITY		Nº	
		COUNTRY	KM2	INHABITANT	DENS.	Thousands \$	\$	Number/h	%	LANGUAGE	S/PIB	S/PIB	WOMAN / YEAR	VEGETATIVE GROWTH X 1000 HAB.		
172	1993/4	BRUNEI	5.770	268.000	46,45	3.561.720	13.290			MALAY	1,80%	7,10%		26,00	1990	172
	2003/4	"	5.770	358.098	62,06	6.500.000	18.600	239.925	67,0		4,80%	6,10%	2,37	16,29		
173	1993/4	CAMBODIA	182.040	8.974.000	49,30	1.166.620	130			KHMER	W/Datum	W/Datum		31,00	1990	173
	2003/4	"	182.040	13.124.764	72,10	20.420.000	1.600				1,90%	6,80%	3,58	18,02		
174	1993/4	PHILIPPINES	300.000	60.477.000	201,59	44.126.310	730			TAGALOG	2,90%	1,70%		23,90		174
	2003/4	"	300.000	84.619.974	282,07	379.700.000	4.600	4.230.998	5,0		4,20%	1,80%	3,29	20,70		
175	1993/4	INDONESIA	1.919.440	179.136.110	93,33	100.316.160	560			INDONESIAN	0,90%	1,70%		20,50		175
	2003/4	"	1.919.440	234.893.453	122,38	714.200.000	3.100	206.706.238	88,0		1,30%	0,60%	2,50	W/Datum		
176	1993/4	LAOS	236.800	4.409.000	18,62	881.800	200			LAOTHIAN	1,00%	10,50%		26,00	1990	176
	2003/4	"	236.800	5.921.545	25,01	10.400.000	1.800				2,30%	2,10%	4,94	24,54		
177	1993/4	MALAYSIA	329.750	18.630.000	56,50	46.016.100	2.470			MALAY	5,60%	2,90%		23,40		177
	2003/4	"	329.750	23.092.940	70,03	198.400.000	8.800	6.927.882	30,0		6,30%	3,00%	3,13	18,58		
178	1993/4	MYANMAR	678.500	43.486.000	64,09	17.394.400	400			BURMESE	1,70%	3,70%		19,00		178
	2003/4	"	678.500	42.510.537	62,65	73.690.000	1.700	1.700.421	4,0		0,50%	6,10%	2,15	6,98		
179	1993/4	SINGAPORE	692	2.762.700	3992,34	34.000.220	12.310			CH/MA/TA/EN	3,40%	5,10%		12,60		179
	2003/4	"	692	4.608.595	6659,82	112.400.000	25.200				3,70%	5,30%	1,24	8,44		
180	1993/4	THAILAND	514.000	54.532.000	106,09	22.903.440	420			THAI/ENGLISH	1,90%	1,60%		14,20		180
	2003/4	"	514.000	64.265.276	125,03	445.800.000	7.000	2.442.080	3,8		5,40%	1,50%	1,91	9,51		
181	1993/4	VIETNAM	329.560	67.678.700	205,36	15.565.940	230			VIETNAMESE	14,0%	19,40%		23,00	1990	181
	2003/4	"	329.560	81.624.716	247,68	183.800.000	2.300				2,80%	7,00%	2,24	13,39		
		TOTALS 1993/4	4.496.552	440.353.510	97,93	285.932.710	649				3,69%	5,97%		21,96		
		TOTALS 2003/4	4.496.552	555.019.898	123,43	2.145.310.000	3.865	222.247.544	40,04		3,32%	4,03%	2,74	15,16		

PACIFIC ISLANDS

Nº	Years	DEMOGRAPHY-POPULATION				PIB/COUNTRY		World Mahometano		EDUCATION		DEFEN.	FERTILITY		Nº	
		COUNTRY	KM2	INHABITANT	DENS.	Thousands \$	\$	Number/h	%	LANGUAGE	S/PIB	S/PIB	WOMAN / YEAR	VEGETATIVE GROWTH X 1000 HAB.		
182	1993/4	AUSTRALIA	7.686.850	17.562.000	2,28	292.958.960	17.080			ENGLISH	6,00%	2,70%		7,90		182
	2003/4	"	7.686.850	19.731.984	2,57	525.500.000	26.900				9,00%	1,90%	1,76	5,24		
183	1993/4	FIJI	18.270	738.000	40,39	1.306.260	1.770			ENGLISH	5,00%	1,20%		23,00	1990	183
	2003/4	"	18.270	868.531	47,54	4.822.000	5.600	69.482	8,00		5,20%	1,60%	2,81	17,36		
184	1993/4	KIRIBATI	811	74.700	92,11	56.240	760			ENG/KIRIBATI	16,1%	W/Datum		W/Datum		184
	2003/4	"	811	98.549	121,52	79.000	800				11,4%	W/Datum	4,28	22,61		
185	1993/4	MARSHALL ISLAN.	181	44.000	243,09	66.000	1.500			ENG/MARSH.	12,5%	W/Datum		W/Datum		185
	2003/4	"	181	56.429	311,76	115.000	1.600				8,80%	W/Datum	4,12	29,15		
186	1993/4	F.STA.OF MICRON	702	114.000	162,39	228.000	2.000			ENGLISH	W/Datum	W/Datum		27,00	1990	186
	2003/4	"	702	108.143	154,05	277.000	2.000				5,50%	W/Datum	3,50	21,37		
187	1993/4	NAURU	21	9.600	457,14	117.000	13.000			NAURUAN	W/Datum	W/Datum		16,50		187
	2003/4	"	21	12.570	598,57	60.000	5.000				W/Datum	W/Datum	3,40	19,01		

continuation

PACIFIC ISLANDS

Page 6

DEMOGRAPHY-POPULATION					PIB/COUNTRY		PXCAP		World Mahometano		EDUCATION			DEFEN.		FERTILITY	
Nº	Years	COUNTRY	KM2	INHABITANT	DENS.	Thousands \$	\$	Number/h	%	LANGUAGE	S/PIB	S/PIB	WOMAN / YEAR	VEGETATIVE GROWTH X 1000 HAB.	Nº		
188	1993/4	NEW ZELAND	268.680	3.434.950	12,78	41.688.760	12.140			ENGLISH	5,50%	2,20%		9,00	1990	188	
	2003/4	"	268.680	3.951.307	14,71	78.400.000	20.100			"	6,10%	1,20%	1,79	6,60			
189	1993/4	PAP.NEW GUINEA	462.840	3.772.000	8,15	3.243.920	860			ENGLISH	4,70%	1,40%		22,00		189	
	2003/4	"	462.840	5.295.816	11,44	10.860.000	2.100			"	2,30%	0,40%	4,13	23,44			
190	1993/4	SOLOMON	28.450	318.707	11,20	184.440	580			ENGLISH	4,70%	W/Datum		29,00	1990	190	
	2003/4	"	28.450	509.190	17,90	800.000	1.700			"	3,60%	W/Datum	4,34	28,33			
191	1993/4	SAMOA	2.944	159.862	54,30	116.070	730			SAMOA/ENGL	5,90%	W/Datum		27,00	1990	191	
	2003/4	"	2.944	178.173	60,52	1.000.000	5.600			"	4,20%	W/Datum	3,21	9,00			
192	1993/4	TONGA	748	96.300	128,74	96.960	1.010			TONGALO/EN	17,6%	W/Datum		24,00	1990	192	
	2003/4	"	748	108.141	144,57	236.000	2.200			"	5,30%	W/Datum	3,00	18,97			
193	1993/4	TUVALU	26	9.100	350,00	8.703	967			TUVALO/ENG	W/Datum	W/Datum		20,30		193	
	2003/4	"	26	11.305	434,81	12.200.000	1.100			"	W/Datum	W/Datum	3,05	14,24			
194	1993/4	VANUATU	12.200	142.944	11,72	150.520	1.060			BISLA/ENG/FR	W/Datum	W/Datum		30,00	1990	194	
	2003/4	"	12.200	199.414	16,35	563.000	2.900			"	7,30%	W/Datum	2,98	16,13			
		TOTALS 1993/4	8.482.723	26.476.163	3,12	340.221.833	12.850				8,67%	1,88%		21,43			
		TOTALS 2003/4	8.482.723	31.129.552	3,67	634.912.000	20.396	69.482	0,22		6,25%	1,28%	3,26	17,80			

SUMMARY

DEMOGRAPHY-POPULATION					PIB/COUNTRY		PXCAP		World Mahometano		EDUCATION			DEFEN.		FERTILITY	
AÑOS	COUNTRY	KM2	INHABITANT	DENS.	Thousands \$	\$	Number/h	%	LANGUAGE	S/PIB	S/PIB	WOMAN / YEAR	VEGETATIVE GROWTH X 1000 HAB.				
1993/4	EUROPEAN UNION	3.976.346	448.310.818	112,74	7.655.357.620	17.076				5,63%	2,57%		1,35				
2003/4	"	3.976.346	455.021.545	114,43	10.432.730.000	22.928	10.307.514	0,163		5,36%	1,68%	1,51	0,36				
1993/4	EUROPEAN EXTRAC	1.863.154	129.366.350	69,43	630.045.914	4.870				5,73%	2,69%		6,45				
2003/4	"	1.863.154	134.931.618	72,42	1.202.939.000	8.915	72.843.896	1,158		4,84%	2,13%	1,67	3,11				
1993/4	NORTH AMERICA	19.613.761	289.818.000	14,78	7.041.203.390	24.295				6,35%	3,45%		6,95				
2003/4	"	19.613.761	322.549.667	16,45	11.384.100.000	35.294	6.300.000	0,100		5,20%	2,20%	1,84	4,54				
1993/4	CENTRAL AMERICA	2.725.727	146.654.382	53,80	408.641.344	2.786				3,83%	1,21%		18,94				
2003/4	"	2.725.727	180.432.202	66,20	1.256.447.000	6.963				4,89%	0,90%	2,68	14,58				
1993/4	SOUTH AMERICA	17.718.517	312.682.453	17,65	783.885.920	2.506				3,98%	2,65%		18,58				
2003/4	"	17.718.517	364.139.004	20,55	1.203.723.000	3.305	157.300	0,002		3,97%	1,70%	2,59	14,26				
1993/4	RUSSIA	17.075.200	148.070.000	8,67	392.385.500	2.650				3,00%	12,00%		-5,70				
2003/4	"	17.075.200	144.526.278	8,46	1.409.000.000	9.700	20.000.000	0,318		4,40%	2,40%	1,33	-3,90				
1993/4	EX URRS	5.035.643	133.184.502	26,45	215.320.272	1.616				3,30%	2,79%		16,00				
2003/4	"	5.035.643	138.186.263	27,44	616.246.000	4.459	51.197.600	0,814		4,96%	1,80%	2,34	7,86				
1993/4	FAR EAST	11.794.795	1.345.815.048	114,10	4.002.910.113	2.974				2,87%	5,05%		12,93				
2003/4	"	11.794.795	1.510.260.800	128,04	11.014.820.000	7.293	100.054.246	1,591		3,34%	2,12%	1,79	7,55				
1993/4	AFRICA	29.746.427	659.115.050	22,16	447.699.684	679				4,39%	4,67%		26,91				
2003/4	"	29.746.427	852.103.591	28,65	1.708.028.900	2.004	397.840.742	6,327		3,92%	3,12%	4,90	20,62				
1993/4	ASIA	10.371.483	1.267.858.247	122,24	867.708.073	684				5,33%	12,0%		26,22				

2003/4	"	10.371.483	1.599.614.391	154,23	4.473.047.000	2.796	590.223.016	9,386		4,42%	6,30%	3,83	20,28
1993/4	SOUTH EAST ASIA	4.496.552	440.353.510	97,93	285.932.710	649				3,69%	5,97%		21,96
2003/4	"	4.496.552	555.019.898	123,43	2.145.310.000	3.865	222.247.544	3,534		3,32%	4,03%	2,74	15,16
1993/4	PACIFIC ISLANDS	8.482.723	26.476.163	3,12	340.221.833	12.850				8,67%	1,88%		21,43
2003/4	"	8.482.723	31.129.552	3,67	634.912.000	20.396	69.482	0,001		6,25%	1,28%	3,26	17,80
	TOTALS 1993/4	132.900.328	5.347.704.523	40,24	23.071.312.373	4.314				4,73%	4,74%		14,34
	TOTALS 2003/4	132.900.328	6.287.914.809	47,31	47.481.302.900	7.551	1.471.241.340	23,390		4,57%	2,47%	2,54	10,19

WORLD-WIDE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL SYNOPSIS YEARS 2003-04

FIRST WORLD

Nº	Years	DEMOGRAPHY-POPULATION			PIB/COUNTRY		PXCAP	World Mahometano		EDUCATION		DEFEN.	FERTILITY		Nº
		COUNTRY	KM2	INHABITANT	DENS.	Thousands \$		\$	Number/h	%	LANGUAGE		S/PIB	S/PIB	
1	1993/4	GERMANY	357.021	81.912.000	229,50	1.935.580.560	23.630			GERMAN	4,00%	2,20%		-1,30	1
	2003/4	"	357.021	82.398.320	230,79	2.160.000.000	26.200	3.000.000	3,64	"	4,60%	1,30%	1,37	-1,74	
2	1993/4	AUSTRIA	83.858	8.063.000	96,14	186.416.560	23.120			GERMAN	5,80%	1,00%		1,50	2
	2003/4	"	83.858	8.188.207	97,64	227.700.000	27.900			"	5,80%	0,80%	1,56	-0,26	
3	1993/4	BELGIUM	30.510	10.064.000	329,85	213.457.440	21.210			BELGIAN	5,10%	1,80%		1,30	3
	2003/4	"	30.510	10.289.088	337,23	299.700.000	29.200	200.000	1,94	"	5,90%	1,10%	1,62	0,38	
4	1993/4	CYPRUS	9.250	733.000	79,24	4.588.580	6.260			TURKISH	3,90%	2,30%		9,00	1970
	2003/4	"	9.250	771.657	83,42	9.400.000	15.000			"	5,40%	3,50%	1,88	5,14	
5	1993/4	DENMARK	43.098	5.223.000	121,18	146.818.530	28.110			DANISH	7,40%	2,00%		1,60	5
	2003/4	"	43.098	5.384.384	124,93	155.300.000	28.900			"	8,20%	1,40%	1,73	0,80	
6	1993/4	SLOVAKIA	48.845	5.289.608	108,29	11.794.470	2.230			SLOVAK	5,70%	2,40%		4,00	6
	2003/4	"	48.845	5.430.033	111,16	67.340.000	12.400			"	4,20%	1,90%	1,25	0,88	
7	1993/4	SLOVENIA	20.273	1.971.000	97,22	14.072.940	7.140			SLOVENIAN	W/Datum	W/Datum		-0,10	7
	2003/4	"	20.273	1.935.620	95,48	37.060.000	19.200			"	5,50%	1,50%	1,27	-0,92	
8	1993/4	SPAIN	504.782	39.652.742	78,55	526.578.560	13.280			SPANISH	4,60%	1,60%		0,70	8
	2003/4	"	504.782	40.217.413	79,67	850.700.000	21.200	291.631	0,72	"	4,50%	1,30%	1,26	0,60	
9	1993/4	ESTONIA	45.226	1.487.000	32,87	4.193.340	2.820			ESTONIAN	5,90%	5,00%		-5,20	9
	2003/4	"	45.226	1.408.556	31,14	15.520.000	11.000			"	7,50%	2,20%	1,27	-4,18	
10	1993/4	FINLAND	337.030	5.101.000	15,13	96.153.850	18.850			FINNI. /SWE.	7,20%	2,20%		3,60	10
	2003/4	"	337.030	5.190.785	15,40	133.800.000	25.800			"	6,10%	1,30%	1,70	0,72	
11	1993/4	FRANCE	547.030	58.172.000	107,00	1.365.296.840	23.470			FRENCH	5,80%	3,40%		3,30	11
	2003/4	"	547.030	60.280.529	110,20	1.558.000.000	26.000	5.000.000	8,29	"	5,80%	2,10%	1,85	3,49	
12	1993/4	GREECE	131.940	10.493.000	79,52	80.901.030	7.710			GREEK	3,10%	5,50%		0,50	12
	2003/4	"	131.940	10.665.989	80,84	203.300.000	19.100			"	3,80%	2,60%	1,35	-0,07	
13	1993/4	HUNGARY	93.030	10.231.000	109,97	39.287.040	3.840			HUNGARIAN	6,70%	2,00%		-3,00	13
	2003/4	"	93.030	10.045.407	107,98	134.000.000	13.300			"	5,00%	1,70%	1,25	-3,68	
14	1993/4	IRELAND	70.280	3.590.000	51,08	48.931.700	13.630			IRISH	6,20%	1,30%		6,00	1990
	2003/4	"	70.280	3.924.140	55,84	113.700.000	29.300			"	4,50%	0,60%	1,89	6,69	
15	1993/4	ITALY	301.230	57.282.824	190,16	1.103.824.140	19.270			ITALIAN	5,40%	2,10%		-0,20	15
	2003/4	"	301.230	57.998.353	192,54	1.455.000.000	25.100	410.587	0,70	"	4,00%	1,60%	1,26	-0,94	
18	1993/4	LUXEMBOURG	2.586	415.000	160,47	16.425.700	39.580			LUXEMBOUR.	4,30%	0,80%		4,30	18
	2003/4	"	2.586	454.157	175,62	21.940.000	48.900			"	3,70%	0,90%	1,70	3,14	
19	1993/4	MALTA	316	372.000	1.177,2	2.976.000	8.000			MALTESE	4,60%	0,90%		5,80	19
	2003/4	"	316	400.420	1.267,1	17.200.000	17.200			"	4,90%	0,70%	1,91	4,95	
20	1993/4	THE NETHERLAND	41.526	15.589.000	375,40	342.490.330	21.970			DUTCH	5,90%	2,20%		3,50	20
	2003/4	"	41.526	16.150.511	388,93	437.800.000	27.200	400.000	2,47	"	4,80%	1,60%	1,65	2,65	
21	1993/4	POLAND	312.685	38.731.000	123,86	95.665.570	2.470			POLISH	5,50%	2,40%		1,10	21
	2003/4	"	312.685	38.622.660	123,52	373.200.000	9.700			"	5,00%	1,90%	1,37	0,51	
22	1993/4	PORTUGAL	92.391	9.927.000	107,44	93.015.990	9.370			PORTUGUE.	5,00%	2,50%		0,04	22
	2003/4	"	92.391	10.102.022	109,34	195.200.000	19.400	5.296	0,05	"	5,80%	2,10%	1,49	1,24	
23	1993/4	UNITED KINGDOM	244.820	58.586.000	239,30	1.078.568.260	18.410			WEL./SCOTT.	5,20%	3,60%		1,80	23
	2003/4	"	244.820	60.094.648	245,46	1.528.000.000	25.500	1.000.000	1,66	"	4,50%	2,50%	1,66	0,78	

24	1993/4	CZECH REPUBLIC	78.866	10.345.644	131,18	28.241.850	2.730			CZECH	5,80%	2,60%		0,30	24
	2003/4	"	78.866	10.249.216	129,96	157.100.000	15.300			"	4,40%	2,30%	1,18	-1,73	
25	1993/4	SWEDEN	449.964	8.858.000	19,68	209.314.540	23.630			SWEDISH	8,30%	2,80%		1,10	25
	2003/4	"	449.964	8.878.085	19,73	230.700.000	26.000			"	7,80%	1,90%	1,54	-0,87	
27	1993/4	ANDORRA	468	62.900	134,40		W/Datum	W/Datum		CATALAN	W/Datum	W/Datum		8,10	27
	2003/4	"	468	69.150	147,76		1.300.000	19.000		"	W/Datum	W/Datum	1,27	3,91	
31	1993/4	ICELAND	103.000	269.000	2,61	6.614.710	24.590			ICELANDIC	5,60%	0,00%		10,20	31
	2003/4	"	103.000	280.798	2,73	8.444.000	30.200			"	4,90%	0,30%	1,98	7,18	
32	1993/4	LIECHTENSTEIN	160	30.900	193,12		W/Datum	W/Datum		GERMAN	W/Datum	W/Datum		W/Datum	32
	2003/4	"	160	33.145	207,16		825.000	25.000		"	W/Datum	W/Datum	1,5	4,07	
34	1993/4	MONACO	1,95	30.500	15641,02		W/Datum	W/Datum		FRENCH	W/Datum	W/Datum		4,40	34
	2003/4	"	1,95	32.130	16476,92		870.000	27.000		"	W/Datum	W/Datum	1,76	-3,36	
35	1993/4	NORWAY	324.220	4.382.000	13,51	116.035.360	26.480			NORWEGIAN	8,40%	3,10%		3,40	35
	2003/4	"	324.220	4.546.123	14,02	149.100.000	33.000			"	6,90%	2,00%	1,80	2,45	
37	1993/4	SAN MARINO	61	25.300	414,75		W/Datum	W/Datum		ITALIAN	9,00%	0,00%		W/Datum	37
	2003/4	"	61	28.119	460,97		940.000	34.600		"	9,00%	0,00%	1,31	2,63	
39	1993/4	SWITZERLAND	41.290	7.087.000	171,63	249.320.660	35.180			G/FR/IT/ROM.	5,20%	1,90%		3,00	39
	2003/4	"	41.290	7.318.638	177,25	233.400.000	32.000	300.000		"	5,50%	1,20%	1,48	0,77	
42	1993/4	UNITED STATES	9.629.091	260.711.000	27,07	6.439.561.700	24.700			ENGLISH	5,30%	4,90%		6,90	42
	2003/4	"	9.629.091	290.342.554	30,15	10.450.000.000	36.300	6.000.000	2,06	"	4,90%	3,40%	2,07	5,70	
43	1993/4	CANADA	9.984.670	29.107.000	3,20	601.641.690	20.670			ENGL/FREN.	7,40%	2,00%		7,00	43
	2003/4	"	9.984.670	32.207.113	3,23	934.100.000	29.300	300.000	0,93	"	5,50%	1,00%	1,61	3,38	
44	1993/4	ANTIGUA AND B.	443	66.000	148,98		W/Datum	W/Datum		ENGLISH	W/Datum	W/Datum		W/Datum	44
	2003/4	"	443	67.897	153,27		750.000	11.000		"	3,20%	0,60%	2,28	12,59	
45	1993/4	BAHAMAS	13.940	264.000	18,93	3.038.640	11.510			ENGLISH	1,95%	3,00%		17,00	1990
	2003/4	"	13.940	297.477	21,34	4.590.000	15.300			"	3,20%	0,50%	2,25	9,89	
46	1993/4	BARBADOS	431	260.000	603,24	1.723.800	6.630			ENGLISH	W/Datum	0,60%		6,00	1990
	2003/4	"	431	277.264	643,30	4.153.000	15.000			"	7,10%	0,50%	1,65	4,13	
59	1993/4	PUERTO RICO	9.104	3.522.037	386,87	24.308.844	6.902			CAST/ENGLI.	W/Datum	W/Datum		10,60	59
	2003/4	"	9.104	3.885.877	426,83	43.010.000	11.100			"	7,70%	W/Datum	2,02	7,32	
64	1993/4	TRINIDAD AND T.	5.128	1.265.000	246,68	4.718.450	3.730			ENGLISH	4,00%	2,00%		10,90	64
	2003/4	"	5.128	1.104.209	215,33	11.070.000	10.000			"	4,00%	0,70%	1,78	4,03	
65	1993/4	ARGENTINA	2.766.890	32.423.465	11,72	90.135.940	2.780			CASTILIAN	9,30%	8,60%		11,00	65
	2003/4	"	2.766.890	38.740.807	14,00	403.800.000	10.500			"	4,00%	1,40%	2,28	9,89	
69	1993/4	CHILE	756.950	13.231.803	17,48	36.120.630	2.730			CASTILIAN	2,90%	3,40%		15,70	69
	2003/4	"	756.950	15.665.216	20,70	156.100.000	10.100			"	4,20%	2,90%	2,09	10,47	
78	1993/4	RUSSIA	17.075.200	148.070.000	8,67	392.385.500	2.650			RUSSIAN	3,00%	12,00%		-5,70	78
	2003/4	"	17.075.200	144.526.278	8,46	1.409.000.000	9.700	20.000.000	13,8	"	4,40%	2,40%	1,33	-3,90	
90	1993/4	JAPAN	377.835	123.612.000	327,16	3.143.453.160	25.430			JAPANESE	4,80%	1,00%		3,20	90
	2003/4	"	377.835	127.214.499	336,69	3.651.000.000	28.700			"	3,50%	1,10%	1,38	1,06	
93	1993/4	SOUTH KOREA	98.480	43.520.000	441,92	235.008.000	5.400			KOREAN	1,90%	2,50%		10,00	1990
	2003/4	"	98.480	48.289.037	490,34	941.500.000	19.600			"	3,80%	3,10%	1,56	6,57	
95	1993/4	TAIWAN	35.980	20.592.048	572,32	181.003.680	8.790			TRAD.CHINE.	3,60%	5,40%		10,40	95
	2003/4	"	35.980	22.603.000	628,21	406.000.000	18.000			"	4,10%	2,50%	1,57	6,54	
129	1993/4	MAURITIUS	2.040	1.103.000	540,69	3.022.220	2.740			ENGL/FREN.	1,60%	1,00%		14,10	129
	2003/4	"	2.040	1.210.447	593,36	12.150.000	10.100	200.934	16,6	"	3,50%	0,20%	1,98	9,29	

continuation

FIRST WORLD

Page 8

Nº	Years	DEMOGRAPHY-POPULATION			DENS.	PIB/COUNTRY		World Mahometano		EDUCATION		DEFEN.	FERTILITY		Nº
		COUNTRY	KM2	INHABITANT		Thousands \$	\$	Number/h	%	LANGUAGE	S/PIB		S/PIB	WOMAN / YEAR	
140	1993/4	SOUTH AFRICA	1.219.912	40.763.000	33,41471	118.212.700	2.900			AFR/ENGLI.	W/Datum	3,70%		26,00	140
	2003/4	"	1.219.912	42.768.678	35,06	427.700.000	10.000	855.373	2	"		5,50%	1,70%	2,24	0,45
149	1993/4	SAUDI ARABIA	1.960.582	15.267.000	7,786973	95.113.410	6.230			ARABIC		17,2%	30,00%	31,00	1990 149
	2003/4	"	1.960.582	24.293.844	12,39114	268.900.000	11.400	24.293.844	100	"		9,50%	11,20%	6,15	31,41
150	1993/4	BAHRAIN	665	518.240	779,3083	3.304.840	6.380			ARABIC		1,00%	13,50%	25,00	1990 150
	2003/4	"	665	667.238	1003,365	9.910.000	15.100	667.238	100	"		3,70%	6,40%	2,71	15,03
153	1993/4	UN.ARAB EMIR.	83.600	1.945.000	23,26555	32.314.230	16.614			ARABIC		1,50%	4,30%	24,00	1990 153
	2003/4	"	83.600	2.484.818	29,7227	53.970.000	22.100	2.385.425	96	"		2,00%	2,20%	3,09	14,46
157	1993/4	ISRAEL	20.770	5.239.000	252,2388	57.471.830	10.970			HEBREW		8,60%	12,80%	15,10	157
	2003/4	"	20.770	6.116.533	294,4888	117.400.000	19.500	917.480	15	"		7,30%	9,20%	2,5	12,47
159	1993/4	KUWAIT	17.820	2.212.000	124,1302	35.723.800	16.150			ARABIC		5,00%	6,20%	23,60	159
	2003/4	"	17.820	2.183.161	122,5118	36.850.000	17.500	2.183.161	100	"		6,10%	11,70%	3,08	19,38
164	1993/4	PALAU	458	19.717	43,05022	174.000	9000			ENGL/SONSO	W/Datum		W/Datum	W/Datum	164
	2003/4	"	458	19.717	43,05022	174.000	9.000			"	W/Datum		W/Datum	2,47	12,02
167	1993/4	QATAR	11.437	520.000	45,46647	8.247.200	15.860			ARABIC		5,60%	9,30%	20,00	1990 167
	2003/4	"	11.437	817.052	71,43936	15.910.000	20.100	776.199	95	"		3,60%	9,30%	3,02	11,25
172	1993/4	BRUNEI	5.770	268.000	46,44714	3.561.720	13.290			MALAY		1,80%	7,10%	26,00	172
	2003/4	"	5.770	358.098	62,06205	6.500.000	18.600	239.925	67	"		4,80%	6,10%	2,37	16,29
179	1993/4	SINGAPORE	692	2.762.700	3992,341	34.000.220	12.310			CH/MA/TA/EN.		3,40%	5,10%	12,60	179
	2003/4	"	692	4.608.595	6659,819	112.400.000	25.200			"		3,70%	5,30%	1,24	8,44
182	1993/4	AUSTRALIA	7.686.850	17.562.000	2,284681	292.958.960	17.080			ENGLISH		6,00%	2,70%	7,90	182
	2003/4	"	7.686.850	19.731.984	2,566979	525.500.000	26.900			"		9,00%	1,90%	1,76	5,24
188	1993/4	NEW ZALAND	268.680	3.434.950	12,78454	41.688.760	12.140			ENGLISH		5,50%	2,20%	9,00	1990 188
	2003/4	"	268.680	3.951.307	14,70637	78.400.000	20.100			"		6,10%	1,20%	1,79	6,60
		TOTALS 1993/4	56.349.176	1.222.235.378	21,69	19.895.458.474	16.278					5,33%	4,10%	7,66	
		TOTALS 2003/4	56.349.176	1.295.821.003	23,00	30.857.376.000	23.812	69.427.093	5,36			5,23%	2,54%	1,85	4,91

SECOND WORLD

Nº	Years	DEMOGRAPHY-POPULATION			DENS.	PIB/COUNTRY		World Mahometano		EDUCATION		DEFEN.	FERTILITY		Nº
		COUNTRY	KM2	INHABITANT		Thousands \$	\$	Number/h	%	LANGUAGE	S/PIB		S/PIB	WOMAN / YEAR	
16	1993/4	LATVIA	64.589	2.515.000	38,93	5.759.350	2.290			LATVIAN		6,70%	4,00%	-4,90	16
	2003/4	"	64.589	2.348.784	36,37	20.990.000	8.900			"		5,90%	1,40%	1,20	-6,15
17	1993/4	LITHUANIA	65.200	3.707.000	56,85	5.004.450	1.350			LITHUANIAN		7,00%	5,00%	-1,10	17
	2003/4	"	65.200	3.592.561	55,10	30.080.000	8.400			"		6,40%	1,80%	1,45	-2,41
29	1993/4	BULGARIA	110.910	8.351.000	75,29	9.687.160	1.160			BULGARIAN		5,80%	3,20%	-3,80	29
	2003/4	"	110.910	7.537.929	67,96	49.230.000	6.500			"		3,40%	2,70%	1,13	-6,32
30	1993/4	CROATIA	56.542	4.495.000	79,49	13.745.710	3.058			CROATIAN		8,00%	4,00%	-0,60	30
	2003/4	"	56.542	4.422.248	78,21	43.120.000	8.300	57.489	1,3	"		4,20%	2,80%	1,93	1,51
33	1993/4	MACEDONIA	25.333	1.968.000	77,68	1.678.704	853			MACEDONIAN	W/Datum		W/Datum	9,20	33
	2003/4	"	25.333	2.063.122	81,44	10.570.000	5.100	618.936	30	"		4,10%	3,00%	1,75	5,42
36	1993/4	ROMANIA	238.391	22.670.000	95,45	60.075.500	2.650			ROMANIAN		3,60%	2,60%	4,40	36

	2003/4	"	238.391	22.271.839	93,43	169.300.000	7.600			"	3,50%	2,70%	1,36	-1,46		
40	1993/4	TURKEY	780.580	62.650.000	80,26	153.492.500	2.450			TURKISH	4,00%	4,10%		17,00	1990	40
	2003/4	"	780.580	68.109.469	87,25	489.700.000	7.300	67.767.921	99,5	"	3,5%	3,20%	2,03	11,64		
48	1993/4	COSTA RICA	51.100	3.308.000	64,73	6.616.000	2.000			CASTILIAN	4,50%	0,40%		21,50		48
	2003/4	"	51.100	3.896.092	76,24	32.000.000	8.300			"	4,40%	0,60%	2,38	15,09		
50	1993/4	DOMINICA	754	73.900	98,01	183.230	2.510			ENGLISH	W/Datum	W/Datum		W/Datum		50
	2003/4	"	754	69.655	92,38	380.000	5.400			"	5,10%	W/Datum	1,99	9,79		
56	1993/4	MEXICO	1.972.550	81.249.645	41,19	304.683.750	3.750			CASTILIAN	6,00%	0,50%		24,00	1990	56
	2003/4	"	1.972.550	104.907.991	53,18	924.400.000	8.900			"	4,40%	0,50%	2,53	16,95		
58	1993/4	PANAMA	78.200	2.631.000	33,64	6.866.910	2.610			CASTILIAN	5,60%	0,00%		20,00		58
	2003/4	"	78.200	2.960.784	37,86	18.060.000	6.200			"	5,90%	1,20%	2,53	14,53		
60	1993/4	DOMINICAN REP.	48.730	7.803.000	160,13	8.427.240	1.080			CASTILIAN	1,50%	0,80%		23,00	1990	60
	2003/4	"	48.730	8.715.602	178,85	53.780.000	6.300			"	2,50%	0,70%	2,92	17,06		
61	1993/4	SAINT CHRISTOP.	261	41.800	160,15	183.270	4.470			ENGLISH	W/Datum	W/Datum		12,40		61
	2003/4	"	261	38.763	148,52	339.000	8.800			"	W/Datum	W/Datum	2,37	9,60		
62	1993/4	SAINT LUCIA	616	142.000	230,52	411.800	2.900			ENGLISH	5,50%	W/Datum		19,00	1990	62
	2003/4	"	616	162.157	263,24	866.000	5.400			"	5,80%	W/Datum	2,29	15,69		
67	1993/4	BRAZIL	8.511.965	159.000.000	18,88	478.590.000	3.010			PORTUGUE.	4,60%	1,30%		18,70		67
	2003/4	"	8.511.965	182.032.604	21,39	1.376.000	7.600			"	4,70%	1,90%	2,01	11,54		
68	1993/4	COLOMBIA	1.141.748	34.520.185	30,23	44.530.800	1.290			CASTILIAN	3,10%	2,60%		19,90		68
	2003/4	"	1.141.748	41.662.073	36,49	251.600.000	6.100			"	3,50%	2,40%	2,61	15,96		
71	1993/4	GRENADA	344	91.000	264,53	210.210	2.310			ENGLISH	4,60%	W/Datum		W/Datum		71
	2003/4	"	344	89.258	259,47	440.000	5.000			"	4,20%	W/Datum	2,45	15,41		
74	1993/4	PERU	1.285.220	23.489.000	18,28	34.998.610	1.490			CAS/QUITXUA	1,50%	1,80%		21,40		74
	2003/4	"	1.285.220	28.409.897	22,11	138.800.000	5.000			"	3,40%	1,40%	2,81	17,12		
76	1993/4	URUGUAY	176.220	3.186.000	18,08	12.457.260	3.910			CASTILIAN	2,80%	2,00%		8,30		76
	2003/4	"	176.220	3.413.329	19,37	26.820.000	7.900			"	2,80%	2,10%	2,35	8,22		
77	1993/4	VENEZUELA	912.050	21.644.000	23,73	61.468.960	2.840			CASTILIAN	1,9%	0,40%		21,10		77
	2003/4	"	912.050	24.654.694	27,03	131.700.000	5.400			"	5,00%	1,10%	2,36	14,88		
81	1993/4	BELARUS	207.600	10.332.000	49,77	29.342.880	2.840			BYELO/RUSS.	5,30%	3,00%		-1,10		81
	2003/4	"	207.600	10.322.151	49,72	90.190.000	8.700			"	6,00%	1,40%	1,34	-3,87		
83	1993/4	KAZAKHSTAN	2.727.300	16.792.000	6,16	35.263.200	2.100			KAZAK/RUSS	2,27%	5,00%		14,00		83
	2003/4	"	2.727.300	16.763.795	6,15	120.000.000	7.200	7.878.983	47	"	4,40%	0,90%	2,16	7,58		
87	1993/4	TURKMENISTAN	488.100	3.714.000	7,61	6.313.800	1.700			TURKMEN	1,97%	W/Datum		27,20		87
	2003/4	"	488.100	4.775.544	9,78	31.340.000	6.700	4.250.234	89	"	3,90%	3,80%	3,5	19,15		
96	1993/4	ARGELIA	2.381.740	27.029.000	11,35	54.598.580	2.020			ARABIC	9,10%	5,10%		25,00		96
	2003/4	"	2.381.740	32.818.500	13,78	173.800.000	5.400	32.818.500	100	"	4,80%	5,90%	2,55	16,85		
98	1993/4	LIBYA	1.759.540	4.573.000	2,60	28.809.900	6.300			ARABIC	9,60%	14,90%		18,00	1990	98
	2003/4	"	1.759.540	5.499.074	3,13	33.360.000	6.200	5.334.101	97	"	7,10%	4,20%	3,49	23,94		
100	1993/4	TUNISIA	163.610	8.757.000	53,52	15.587.460	1.780			ARABIC	6,20%	3,40%		21,00	1990	100
	2003/4	"	163.610	9.924.742	60,66	67.130.000	6.800	9.726.247	98	"	6,80%	2,00%	1,9	11,51		
104	1993/4	BOTSWANA	600.370	1.406.000	2,34	3.936.800	2.800			ENGLISH	8,10%	2,80%		28,00	1990	104
	2003/4	"	600.370	1.573.267	2,62	13.480.000	8.500			"	8,60%	5,50%	3,27	-5,50		
117	1993/4	GABON	267.667	1.280.000	4,78	5.734.400	4.480			FRENCH	5,70%	4,50%		28,00	1990	117
	2003/4	"	267.667	1.321.560	4,94	8.354.000	6.500			"	3,90%	2,50%	4,83	25,37		
131	1993/4	NAMIBIA	825.418	1.401.711	1,70	1.569.120	1.120			ENGLISH	2,2%	0,70%		31,00		131
	2003/4	"	825.418	1.927.447	2,34	13.150.000	6.900			"	8,10%	2,90%	4,71	14,93		
137	1993/4	SEYCHELLES	455	71.800	157,8022	386.950	5.450			EN/FR/CRIOLL	8,50%	5,60%		15,10		137
	2003/4	"	455	80.469	176,85	626.000	7.800			"	7,60%	1,80%	1,79	10,40		

continuation

SECOND WORLD

Page 9

Nº	Years	DEMOGRAPHY-POPULATION				PIB/COUNTRY		PXCAP		World Mahometano		EDUCATION		DEFEN.	FERTILITY		Nº
		COUNTRY	KM2	INHABITANT	DENS.	Thousands \$	\$	Number/h	%	LANGUAGE	S/PIB	S/PIB	WOMAN / YEAR	VEGETATIVE GROWTH X 1000 HAB.			
155	1993/4	IRAN	1.648.000	59.570.000	36,14684	145.946.500	2.450				PERSE	3,10%	7,90%		28,00	1990	155
	2003/4	"	1.648.000	68.278.826	41,43133	458.300.000	6.800	67.596.037	99		"	4,40%	3,90%	1,99	11,69		
163	1993/4	OMAN	212.460	1.559.000	7,337852	9.863.793	6.327				ARABIC	8,80%	34,40%		34,00	1990	163
	2003/4	"	212.460	2.807.125	13,21249	22.400.000	8.300	2.807.125	100		"	3,90%	11,20%	5,94	33,50		
177	1993/4	MALAYSIA	329.750	18.630.000	56,49735	46.016.100	2.470				MALAY	5,60%	2,90%		23,40		177
	2003/4	"	329.750	23.092.940	70,03166	198.400.000	8.800	6.927.882	30		"	6,30%	3,00%	3,13	18,58		
183	1993/4	FIJI	18.270	738.000	40,39409	1.306.260	1.770				ENGLISH	5,00%	1,20%		23,00	1990	183
	2003/4	"	18.270	868.531	47,53864	4.822.000	5.600	69.482	8		"	5,20%	1,60%	2,81	17,36		
187	1993/4	NAURU	21	9.600	457,1429	117.000	13.000				NAURUAN	W/Datum	W/Datum		16,50		187
	2003/4	"	21	12.570	598,5714	60.000	5.000				"	W/Datum	W/Datum	3,4	19,01		
191	1993/4	SAMOA	2.944	159.862	54	116.070	730				SAMOA/ENG.	5,9%	W/Datum		27	1990	191
	2003/4	"	2.944	178.173	60,52072	1.000.000	5.600				"	4,20%	W/Datum	3,21	9,00		
		TOTALS 1993/4	27.154.548	599.558.503	22,08	1.593.980.227	2.658					5,12%	4,42%		17,28		
		TOTALS 2003/4	27.154.548	691.603.565	25,47	3.629.963.000	5.248	205.852.937	29,76			4,83%	2,66%	2,55	11,49		

THIRD WORLD

Nº	Years	DEMOGRAPHY-POPULATION				PIB/COUNTRY		PXCAP		World Mahometano		EDUCATION		DEFEN.	FERTILITY		Nº
		COUNTRY	KM2	INHABITANT	DENS.	Thousands \$	\$	Number/h	%	LANGUAGE	S/PIB	S/PIB	WOMAN / YEAR	VEGETATIVE GROWTH X 1000 HAB.			
26	1993/4	ALBANIA	28.718	3.412.000	118,81	1.160.080	340				ALBANIAN	2,00%	4,10%		18,40		26
	2003/4	"	28.718	3.582.205	124,74	15.690.000	4.400	2.507.543	70		"	3,10%	3,00%	2,22	11,72		
28	1993/4	BOSNIA H.	51.129	3.459.000	67,65	2.421.300	700				BOSNIAN	W/Datum	W/Datum		7,10		28
	2003/4	"	51.129	3.980.018	77,84	7.300.000	1.900	1.592.007	40		"	W/Datum	2,50%	1,71	4,44		
38	1993/4	MOLDAVIA	102.350	10.473.000	102,32	15.814.230	1.510				MOLDAVIAN	W/Datum	3,90%		3,00		38
	2003/4	"	102.350	10.655.774	104,11	23.150.000	1.500				"	5,10%	W/Datum	1,77	2,12		
47	1993/4	SERBIA	22.966	204.000	8,88	418.200	2.050				SERB/ALBAN.	2,0%	0,50%		30,00	1990	47
	2003/4	"	22.966	266.440	11,60	1.280.000	4.900				"	6,20%	2,40%	3,86	24,41		
49	1993/4	BELIZE	110.860	10.994.000	99,17	17.370.520	1.580				ENGLISH	6,70%	4,20%		10,00	1990	49
	2003/4	"	110.860	11.263.429	101,60	30.690.000	2.700				"	8,50%	W/Datum	1,61	4,49		
51	1993/4	CUBA	21.040	5.768.000	274,14	7.613.760	1.320				CASTILIAN	1,60%	1,30%		27,00		51
	2003/4	"	21.040	6.470.379	307,53	29.410.000	4.600				"	2,30%	0,80%	3,25	21,89		
52	1993/4	EL SALVADOR	108.890	10.322.000	94,79	11.457.420	1.110				CASTILIAN	1,20%	1,00%		28,50		52
	2003/4	"	108.890	13.909.384	127,74	53.200.000	3.900				"	1,70%	0,60%	4,67	28,27		
53	1993/4	GUATEMALA	27.750	6.491.000	233,91	2.401.670	370				CASTILIAN	1,80%	2,00%		22,00	1990	53
	2003/4	"	27.750	7.527.817	271,27	10.600.000	1.400				"	1,10%	1,30%	4,86	20,70		
54	1993/4	HAITI	112.090	5.302.000	47,30	3.075.160	580				FRE/CREOLE	4,00%	1,70%		29,40		54
	2003/4	"	112.090	6.669.789	59,50	16.290.000	2.500				"	4,00%	1,70%	4,07	25,23		
55	1993/4	HONDURAS	10.991	2.497.000	227,19	3.345.980	1.340				CASTILIAN	4,10%	0,70%		18,30		55
	2003/4	"	10.991	2.695.867	245,28	10.080.000	3.800				"	6,30%	0,50%	2,01	11,93		
57	1993/4	JAMAICA	129.494	4.340.000	33,52	1.562.400	360				ENGLISH	4,10%	0,60%		31,00	1990	57
	2003/4	"	129.494	5.128.517	39,60	11.160.000	2.200				"	5,00%	0,90%	3,00	21,60		
63	1993/4	NICARAGUA	389	110.000	282,78	234.300	2.130				CASTILIAN	6,70%	W/Datum		18,10		63
	2003/4	"	389	116.812	300,29	339.000	2.900				"	9,30%	W/Datum	1,95	11,08		

66	1993/4	SAINT VICENT G.	1.098.580	7.888.000	7,18	5.363.840	680			ENGLISH	2,70%	2,40%		24,20		66
	2003/4	"	1.098.580	8.586.443	7,82	21.150.000	2.500			"	5,50%	1,70%	3,23	15,62		
70	1993/4	BOLIVIA	283.560	11.221.000	39,57	12.006.470	1.070			CAS/QUIT/AIM	2,70%	2,10%		20,70		70
	2003/4	"	283.560	13.710.234	48,35	42.650.000	3.200			"	1,60%	2,50%	2,99	19,65		
72	1993/4	ECUADOR	214.970	730.000	3,40	240.900	330			CASTILIAN	8,80%	2,70%		16,00		72
	2003/4	"	214.970	702.100	3,27	2.628.000	3.800	70.210	10	"	4,10%	0,80%	2,07	8,60		
73	1993/4	GUYANA	406.750	4.828.000	11,87	7.242.000	1.500			ENGLISH	2,80%	1,80%		29,00	1990	73
	2003/4	"	406.750	6.036.900	14,84	25.190.000	4.300			"	5,00%	1,10%	4,02	25,50		
75	1993/4	PARAGUAY	163.270	430.000	2,63	520.300	1.210			CAS/GUARAN	W/Datum	W/Datum		17,00	1990	75
	2003/4	"	163.270	435.449	2,67	1.469.000	3.400	87.090	20	"	3,60%	1,10%	2,40	12,57		
79	1993/4	SURINAM	29.800	3.426.000	114,97	3.737.766	1.091			DUTCH	2,90%	2,30%		16,30		79
	2003/4	"	29.800	3.326.448	111,63	12.130.000	3.600			"	2,90%	2,60%	1,56	2,41		
80	1993/4	ARMENIA	86.600	7.237.000	83,57	6.933.046	958			ARMENIAN	2,47%	1,10%		20,20		80
	2003/4	"	86.600	7.830.764	90,42	28.610.000	3.700	7.282.610	93	"	4,20%	1,90%	2,34	9,60		
82	1993/4	AZERBAITJAN	69.700	5.482.000	78,65	8.990.480	1.640			AZERI	5,00%	5,00%		8,60		82
	2003/4	"	69.700	4.934.413	70,80	16.050.000	3.200	542.785	11	"	7,70%	0,90%	1,51	-2,92		
84	1993/4	GEORGIA	198.500	4.422.000	22,28	6.854.100	1.550			GEORGIAN	2,48%	1,00%		22,30		84
	2003/4	"	198.500	4.892.808	24,65	13.880.000	2.900	2.201.763	45	"	5,40%	1,50%	3,12	16,96		
85	1993/4	KIRGUIZISTAN	33.843	4.439.502	131,18	3.803.640	870			KYRGYZ/RUS	W/Datum	W/Datum		2,50		85
	2003/4	"	33.843	4.439.502	131,18	11.510.000	1.100			"	4,00%	0,40%	1,74	1,61		
86	1993/4	TADJIKISTAN	143.100	5.359.000	37,45	5.626.950	1.050			TAJIK	4,00%	0,90%		32,60		86
	2003/4	"	143.100	6.863.752	47,96	8.476.000	1.300	6.177.376	90	"	3,90%	3,80%	4,17	24,32		
88	1993/4	UKRAINE	603.700	51.273.000	84,93	80.498.610	1.570			UKRAINIAN	6,1%	4,00%		5,80		88
	2003/4	"	603.700	48.055.439	79,60	218.000.000	4.500			"	4,50%	1,50%	1,34	-6,50		
89	1993/4	UZBEKISTAN	447.400	20.708.000	46,29	27.955.800	1.350			UZBEK	W/Datum	W/Datum		27,60		89
	2003/4	"	447.400	25.981.647	58,07	66.060.000	2.600	22.863.849	88	"	7,70%	1,10%	3,00	18,12		
91	1993/4	CHINA	9.596.960	1.133.682.000	118,13	419.462.340	370			CHINESE	2,40%	8,40%		13,00		91
	2003/4	"	9.596.960	1.286.975.468	134,10	5.989.000.000	4.700	100.000.000	7,77	"	2,90%	1,60%	1,70	6,22		
92	1993/4	MONGOLIA	1.565.000	2.182.000	1,39	W/Datum	W/Datum			KHALKHA	0,90%	0,90%		28,00		92
	2003/4	"	1.565.000	2.712.315	1,73	5.060.000	1.900	54.246	2	"	2,40%	2,30%	2,28	14,21		
94	1993/4	NORTH KOREA	120.540	22.227.000	184,40	23.982.933	1.079			KOREAN	3,60%	12,10%		13,00	1990	94
	2003/4	"	120.540	22.466.481	186,38	22.260.000	1.000			"	W/Datum	W/Datum	2,25	10,68		
97	1993/4	EGYPT	1.001.450	57.109.000	57,03	35.978.670	630			ARABIC	6,70%	5,00%		23,00	1990	97
	2003/4	"	1.001.450	74.718.797	74,61	289.800.000	4.000	70.235.669	94	"	4,70%	3,50%	3,02	19,01		
99	1993/4	MOROCCO	446.500	26.494.000	59,34	27.288.820	1.030			ARABIC	7,40%	5,50%		21,00	1990	99
	2003/4	"	446.500	31.689.265	70,97	121.800.000	3.900	31.372.372	99	"	5,50%	4,60%	2,89	17,48		
101	1993/4	MAURITANIA	1.030.700	2.171.000	2,11	1.128.920	520			FRE/ARABIC	4,90%	4,30%		26,00	1990	101
	2003/4	"	1.030.700	2.912.584	2,83	4.891.000	1.700	2.912.584	100	"	3,00%	2,60%	6,08	29,12		
102	1993/4	ANGOLA	1.246.700	10.916.000	8,76	8.514.480	780			PORTUGUES	7,30%	34,00%		28,00	1990	102
	2003/4	"	1.246.700	10.766.471	8,64	18.360.000	1.700			"	2,70%	17,00%	6,38	19,74		
103	1993/4	BENIN	112.620	5.091.000	45,21	2.087.310	410			FRENCH	5,10%	1,70%		32,00	1990	103
	2003/4	"	112.620	7.041.490	62,52	7.380.000	1.100	1.408.298	20	"	3,20%	1,70%	6,04	29,50		
105	1993/4	BURKINA	274.200	9.780.000	35,67	2.934.000	300			FRENCH	2,30%	2,10%		28,00	1990	105
	2003/4	"	274.200	13.228.460	48,24	14.510.000	1.100	6.614.200	50	"	1,50%	1,30%	6,34	26,02		
106	1993/4	BURUNDI	27.830	5.665.000	203,56	1.189.650	210			FR/KIRUNDI	3,50%	2,60%		27,00	1990	106
	2003/4	"	27.830	6.096.156	219,05	3.146.000	500	609.615	10	"	3,40%	5,30%	5,99	21,92		
107	1993/4	CAPE VERDE	4.033	350.000	86,78	297.500	850			PORTUGUES	2,90%	11,80%		31,00	1990	107
	2003/4	"	4.033	412.137	102,19	600.000	1.400			"	4,40%	0,80%	3,77	20,09		

continuation

THIRD WORLD

Page 10

Nº	Years	DEMOGRAPHY-POPULATION			DENS.	PIB/COUNTRY		World Mahometano		EDUCATION			DEFEN.		FERTILITY		Nº
		COUNTRY	KM2	INHABITANT		Thousands \$	\$	Number/h	%	LANGUAGE	S/PIB	S/PIB	WOMAN/ YEAR	VEGETATIVE GROWTH X 1000 HAB.			
108	1993/4	CAMEROON	475.440	13.103.000	27,56	10.744.460	820			FR/ENGLISH	1,30%	8,80%		28,00	1990	108	
	2003/4	"	475.440	15.746.179	33,12	26.840.000	1.700	3.149.203	20	"	3,20%	1,50%	4,63	20,19			
109	1993/4	CENTROAFRI.R.	622.984	2.998.000	4,81	1.229.180	410			FRENCH	2,80%	1,70%		25,00	1990	109	
	2003/4	"	622.984	3.683.538	5,91	4.296.000	1.200	552.530	15	"	1,90%	2,00%	4,68	16,20			
110	1993/4	COMOROS	1.862	516.000	277,12	263.160	510			ARABIC/FR.	6,50%	2,60%		30,00	1990	110	
	2003/4	"	1.862	632.948	339,93	441.000	700	620.289	98	"	3,80%	3,00%	5,21	29,64			
111	1993/4	R.OF THE CONGO	2.345.410	43.775.000	18,66	9.630.500	220			FRENCH	1,00%	0,80%		30,00	1990	111	
	2003/4	"	2.345.410	56.625.039	24,14	34.000.000	600	5.662.503	10	"	W/Datum	7,30%	6,69	30,25			
112	1993/4	IVORY COAST	322.460	13.459.000	41,74	9.421.300	700			FRENCH	7,00%	1,50%		31,00	1990	112	
	2003/4	"	322.460	16.962.491	52,60	24.030.000	1.400	6.784.996	40	"	4,60%	0,80%	5,51	21,60			
113	1993/4	CHAD	1.284.000	6.118.000	4,76	1.284.780	210			FR/ARABIC	1,80%	4,30%		29,00	1990	113	
	2003/4	"	1.284.000	9.253.493	7,21	9.297.000	1.000	4.719.281	51	"	2,00%	0,70%	6,44	30,68			
114	1993/4	DJIBOUTI	23.000	565.000	24,57	774.050	1.370			FR/ARABIC	2,50%	W/Datum		28,00	1990	114	
	2003/4	"	23.000	457.130	19,88	619.000	1.300	438.844	96	"	3,50%	3,90%	5,56	21,33			
115	1993/4	ERYTREA	121.320	3.317.000	27,34	W/Datum	W/Datum			TIGRI/ARABIC	W/Datum	W/Datum		26,00	1990	115	
	2003/4	"	121.320	4.362.254	35,96	3.300.000	700	1.744.901	40	"	4,80%	18,30%	5,74	26,21			
116	1993/4	ETHIOPIA	1.127.127	44.265.539	39,27	5.311.800	120			AMHARIC	7,90%	9,00%		29,00	1990	116	
	2003/4	"	1.127.127	66.557.553	59,05	48.530.000	700	33.278.776	50	"	4,80%	8,00%	5,55	19,64			
118	1993/4	GAMBIA	11.300	1.033.000	91,42	402.870	390			ENGLISH	5,20%	4,00%		25,40	1990	118	
	2003/4	"	11.300	1.501.050	132,84	2.582.000	1.800	1.350.950	90	"	2,70%	0,70%	5,53	28,42			
119	1993/4	GHANA	239.460	13.482.000	56,30	5.419.764	402			ENGLISH	1,50%	1,20%		18,00	1990	119	
	2003/4	"	239.460	20.467.747	85,47	41.250.000	2.000	3.274.839	16	"	4,10%	0,70%	3,32	15,31			
120	1993/4	R.OF GUINEA	245.857	7.418.000	30,17	3.783.180	510			FRENCH	1,40%	1,20%		27,00	1990	120	
	2003/4	"	245.857	9.030.220	36,73	18.690.000	2.100	7.675.687	85	"	1,90%	1,40%	5,90	26,80			
121	1993/4	GUINEA BISSAU	36.120	1.036.000	28,68	217.560	210			PORTUGUES	2,80%	W/Datum		27,00	1990	121	
	2003/4	"	36.120	1.360.827	37,68	901.400	700	612.372	45	"	2,10%	1,50%	5,07	21,79			
122	1993/4	EQUATOR.GUIN.	28.051	377.000	13,44	124.410	330			CASTILIAN	W/Datum	W/Datum		24,00	1990	122	
	2003/4	"	28.051	510.473	18,20	1.270.000	2.700			"	0,60%	1,70%	4,75	24,40			
123	1993/4	KENYA	582.650	28.113.000	48,25	9.277.290	330			SWAHILI	6,40%	2,70%		37,30	1990	123	
	2003/4	"	582.650	31.639.091	54,30	32.890.000	1.100	3.163.909	10	"	6,40%	2,30%	3,47	12,80			
124	1993/4	LESOTHO	30.355	1.903.000	62,69	1.103.740	580			SESOT/ENGL	4,00%	6,00%		25,00	1990	124	
	2003/4	"	30.355	1.861.959	61,34	5.106.000	2.700			"	10,1%	2,70%	3,52	2,68			
125	1993/4	LIBERIA	111.370	3.580.000	32,15	716.000	200			ENGLISH	5,70%	4,80%		29,00	1990	125	
	2003/4	"	111.370	3.317.176	29,79	3.116.000	1.000	663.435	20	"	1,1%	5,60%	6,23	27,44			
126	1993/4	MADAGASCAR	587.040	13.225.000	22,53	3.041.750	230			MADAGASY	1,90%	1,50%		29,00	1990	126	
	2003/4	"	587.040	16.979.744	28,92	12.590.000	800	1.188.582	7	"	3,20%	1,10%	5,73	30,28			
127	1993/4	MALAWI	118.480	9.480.000	80,01	1.990.800	210			ENGLISH	3,50%	2,30%		32,00	1990	127	
	2003/4	"	118.480	11.651.239	98,34	6.811.000	600	2.330.247	20	"	4,10%	0,30%	6,10	22,06			
128	1993/4	MALI	1.240.000	8.646.000	6,97	2.539.200	300			FRENCH	3,30%	2,00%		23,00	1990	128	
	2003/4	"	1.240.000	11.626.219	9,38	9.775.000	900	10.463.597	90	"	2,80%	2,20%	6,66	28,58			
130	1993/4	MOZAMBIQUE	799.380	15.243.000	19,07	914.580	60			PORTUGUES	W/Datum	9,70%		23,00	1990	130	
	2003/4	"	799.380	17.479.266	21,87	19.520.000	1.100	3.495.853	20	"	2,40%	1,80%	4,87	8,16			
132	1993/4	NIGER	1.267.000	8.516.000	6,72	2.639.960	310			FRENCH	3,10%	7,60%		31,00	1990	132	
	2003/4	"	1.267.000	11.058.590	8,73	8.713.000	800	8.846.872	80	"	2,80%	1,50%	6,91	27,83			

133	1993/4	NIGERIA	923.768	91.549.000	99,10	29.295.680	320			ENGLISH	1,70%	0,50%		32,50		133
	2003/4	"	923.768	133.881.703	144,93	112.500	900	66.935.851	50	"	0,70%	1,20%	5,40	24,99		
134	1993/4	RWUANDA	26.338	7.817.000	296,80	1.563.400	200			FR/KINYARW.	3,80%	7,50%		15,00	1990	134
	2003/4	"	26.338	7.810.056	296,53	8.920.000	1.200	359.262	4,6	"	2,80%	2,90%	5,60	18,38		
135	1993/4	SAO TOME	1.001	128.000	127,87	44.800	350			PORTUGUES	W/Datum	W/Datum		27,00	1990	135
	2003/4	"	1.001	175.883	175,71	200.000	1.200			"	3,60%	1,00%	5,88	34,76		
136	1993/4	SENEGAL	196.190	8.112.000	41,35	5.921.760	730			FRENCH	3,70%	1,90%		31,00		136
	2003/4	"	196.190	10.580.307	53,93	15.640.000	1.500	9.945.488	94	"	3,20%	1,30%	4,93	25,35		
138	1993/4	SIERRA LEONE	71.740	4.616.000	64,34	646.240	140			ENGLISH	1,40%	2,30%		22,00	1990	138
	2003/4	"	71.740	5.732.681	79,91	2.826.000	500	3.439.608	60	"	1,00%	2,30%	5,86	23,23		
139	1993/4	SOMALIA	637.657	6.667.000	10,46	1.000.050	150			SOMALIAN	0,40%	3,20%		24,00	1990	139
	2003/4	"	637.657	8.025.190	12,59	4.270.000	600	8.025.190	100	"	0,50%	4,50%	6,98	28,78		
141	1993/4	SUDAN	2.505.813	25.699.000	10,26	7.709.700	300			ARABIC	4,80%	7,70%		25,00	1990	141
	2003/4	"	2.505.813	38.114.160	15,21	52.900.000	1.400	26.679.912	70	"	7,60%	4,80%	5,10	26,89		
142	1993/4	SWAZILAND	17.363	883.000	50,86	927.150	1.050			SISWATI/EN.	6,40%	1,40%		31,00	1990	142
	2003/4	"	17.363	1.161.219	66,88	5.542.000	4.800	116.121	10	"	1,50%	1,50%	3,92	8,29		
143	1993/4	TANZANIA	945.087	27.296.000	28,88	3.002.560	110			KISWAHILI	6,40%	1,40%		31,00	1990	143
	2003/4	"	945.087	35.922.454	38,01	20.420.000	600	12.572.893	35	"	2,10%	1,50%	5,24	22,12		
144	1993/4	TOGO	56.785	3.922.000	69,07	1.294.260	330			FRENCH	5,70%	3,00%		32,00	1990	144
	2003/4	"	56.785	5.429.299	95,61	7.594.000	1.400	1.085.859	20	"	4,80%	2,40%	4,97	23,72		
145	1993/4	UGANDA	236.040	18.194.000	77,08	3.456.860	190			ENGLISH	1,70%	2,60%		32,00	1990	145
	2003/4	"	236.040	25.632.794	108,60	30.490.000	1.200	4.101.239	16	"	2,30%	2,40%	6,72	29,62		
146	1993/4	ZAMBIA	752.614	9.132.000	12,13	3.378.840	370			ENGLISH	2,30%	2,40%		29,00	1990	146
	2003/4	"	752.614	10.307.333	13,70	8.240.000	800	2.473.760	24	"	2,30%	0,60%	5,25	15,23		
147	1993/4	ZIMBABWE	390.580	10.971.000	28,09	7.350.570	670			ENGLISH	7,40%	5,50%		29,00	1990	147
	2003/4	"	390.580	12.576.742	32,20	26.070.000	2.100			"	10,4%	3,30%	3,66	8,32		
148	1993/4	AFGHANISTAN	652.225	18.052.000	27,68	3.971.440	220			PASHTU/DARI	1,80%	9,50%		23,70		148
	2003/4	"	652.225	28.717.213	44,03	19.900.000	700	28.430.041	99	"	1,50%	14,50%	5,64	23,48		
151	1993/4	BANGLADESH	144.000	110.602.000	768,07	22.120.400	200			BENGALI	1,80%	1,00%		23,00	1990	151
	2003/4	"	144.000	138.448.210	961,45	238.200.000	1.800	114.912.019	83	"	2,50%	1,40%	3,17	21,27		
152	1993/4	BHUTAN	47.000	1.511.000	32,15	287.090	190			TIBETAN	1,30%	0,00%		25,00	1990	152
	2003/4	"	47.000	2.139.549	45,52	2.700.000	1.300			"	5,20%	5,60%	4,49	21,35		
154	1993/9	INDIA	3.287.590	844.324.222	256,82	295.513.400	350			ENG/HINDI	3,20%	10,20%		20,00	1990	154
	2003/4	"	3.287.590	1.049.700.118	319,29	2.664.000.000	2.600	125.964.014	12	"	4,10%	3,10%	2,91	14,79		
156	1993/4	IRAQ	437.072	17.903.000	40,96	73.581.330	4.110			ARABIC	3,80%	30,70%		38,00	1990	156
	2003/4	"	437.072	24.683.313	56,47	58.000.000	2.400	24.683.313	100	"	W/Datum	W/Datum	4,52	27,82		
158	1993/4	JORDAN	92.300	3.636.000	39,39	4.508.640	1.240			ARABIC	5,90%	12,70%		41,00		158
	2003/4	"	92.300	5.460.265	59,16	2.263.000	4.300	5.023.443	92	"	5,00%	10,80%	3,00	21,06		
160	1993/4	LEBANON	10.440	2.803.000	268,49	2.859.060	1.020			ARABIC	5,00%	8,20%		18,00	1990	160
	2003/4	"	10.440	3.727.703	357,06	17.610.000	4.800	2.189.392	58,7	"	3,00%	3,10%	1,98	13,36		
161	1993/4	MALDIVES	300	213.215	710,72	93.720	440			DHIVEHI	1,40%	10,00%		31,00	1990	161
	2003/4	"	300	329.684	1098,95	1.250.000	3.900	329.684	100	"	3,90%	9,50%	5,26	29,06		
162	1993/4	NEPAL	140.800	19.795.000	140,59	3.563.100	180			NEPALI	2,80%	1,20%		26,00	1990	162
	2003/4	"	140.800	26.469.569	187,99	37.320.000	1.400	1.058.782	4	"	3,70%	1,20%	4,39	22,62		
165	2003/4	PALESTINE	6.257	3.900.000	623,30		W/Datum	W/Datum		ARABIC	W/Datum	W/Datum		W/Datum		165
	2003/4	"	6.257	3.900.000	623,30		W/Datum	W/Datum	3.233.100	82,9	W/Datum	W/Datum	5,25	W/Datum		

continuation

THIRD WORLD

Page 11

DEMOGRAPHY-POPULATION					PIB/COUNTRY	PXCAP	World Mahometano			EDUCATION		DEFEN.	FERTILITY		
Nº	Years	COUNTRY	KM2	INHABITANT	DENS.	Thousands \$	\$	Number/h	%	LANGUAGE	S/PIB	S/PIB	WOMAN / YEAR	VEGETATIVE GROWTH X 1000 HAB.	Nº
166	1993/4	PAKISTAN	803.940	115.520.000	143,69	43.897.600	380			UIGHUR/EN.	3,00%	3,80%		30,00	166
	2003/4	"	803.940	150.694.740	187,45	295.300.000	2.000	146.173.897	97	"	1,80%	4,00%	4,10	20,80	
168	1993/4	SYRIA	185.180	12.958.000	69,98	13.217.160	1.020			ARABIC	12,2%	26,3%		W/Datum	168
	2003/4	"	185.180	17.585.540	94,96	63.480.000	3.700	15.826.986	90	"	4,10%	4,50%	3,72	24,50	
169	1993/4	SRI LANKA	65.610	17.247.000	262,87	8.106.090	470			SINHALESE	4,70%	8,70%		14,20	169
	2003/4	"	65.610	19.742.439	300,91	73.700.000	3.700	1.382.041	7	"	3,10%	3,90%	1,90	9,66	
170	2003/4	EAST TIMOR	15.007	997.853	66,49	440.000	500			TÉTUM/PORT	W/Datum	1,10%		22,00	1990 170
	2003/4	"	15.007	997.853	66,49	440.000	500	39.914	4	"	W/Datum	1,10%	3,79	21,34	
171	1993/4	YEMEN	527.970	11.546.000	21,87	7.389.440	640			ARABIC	14,3%	21,90%		38	1990 171
	2003/4	"	527.970	19.349.881	36,65	15.070.000	800	19.349.881	100	"	10,0%	5,10%	6,82	34,19	
173	1993/4	CAMBODIA	182.040	8.974.000	49,30	1.166.620	130			KHMER	W/Datum	W/Datum		31,00	1990 173
	2003/4	"	182.040	13.124.764	72,10	20.420.000	1.600			"	1,90%	6,80%	3,58	18,02	
174	1993/4	PHILIPPINES	300.000	60.477.000	201,59	44.126.310	730			TAGALOG	2,90%	1,70%		23,90	174
	2003/4	"	300.000	84.619.974	282,07	379.700.000	4.600	4.230.998	5	"	4,20%	1,80%	3,29	20,70	
175	1993/4	INDONESIA	1.919.440	179.136.110	93,33	100.316.160	560			INDONESIAN	0,90%	1,70%		20,50	175
	2003/4	"	1.919.440	234.893.453	122,38	714.200.000	3.100	206.706.238	88	"	1,30%	0,60%	2,50	W/Datum	
176	1993/4	LAOS	236.800	4.409.000	18,62	881.800	200			LAOTHIAN	1,00%	10,50%		26,00	1990 176
	2003/4	"	236.800	5.921.545	25,01	10.400.000	1.800			"	2,30%	2,10%	4,94	24,54	
178	1993/4	MYANMAR	678.500	43.486.000	64,09	17.394.400	400			BURMESE	1,70%	3,70%		19,00	178
	2003/4	"	678.500	42.510.537	62,65	73.690.000	1.700	1.700.421	4	"	0,50%	6,10%	2,15	6,98	
180	1993/4	THAILAND	514.000	54.532.000	106,09	22.903.440	420			THAI/ENGLISH	1,90%	1,60%		14,20	180
	2003/4	"	514.000	64.265.276	125,03	445.800.000	7.000	2.442.080	3,8	"	5,40%	1,50%	1,91	9,51	
181	1993/4	VIETNAM	329.560	67.678.700	205,36	15.565.940	230			VIETNAMESE	14,0%	19,40%		23	1990 181
	2003/4	"	329.560	81.624.716	247,68	183.800.000	2.300			"	2,80%	7,00%	2,24	13,39	
184	1993/4	KIRIBATI	811	74.700	92,11	56.240	760			ENG/KIRIBATI	16,1%	W/Datum		W/Datum	184
	2003/4	"	811	98.549	121,52	79.000	800			"	11,4%	W/Datum	4,28	22,61	
185	1993/4	MARSHALL ISLA.	181	44.000	243,09	66.000	1.500			ENG/MARSHA.	12,5%	W/Datum		W/Datum	185
	2003/4	"	181	56.429	311,76	115.000	1.600			"	8,80%	W/Datum	4,12	29,15	
186	1993/4	MICRONESIA	702	114.000	162,39	228.000	2.000			ENGLISH	W/Datum	W/Datum		27,00	1990 186
	2003/4	"	702	108.143	154,05	277.000	2.000			"	5,50%	W/Datum	3,50	21,37	
189	1993/4	PAPUA NEW G.	462.840	3.772.000	8,15	3.243.920	860			ENGLISH	4,70%	1,40%		22,00	189
	2003/4	"	462.840	5.295.816	11,44	10.860.000	2.100			"	2,30%	0,40%	4,13	23,44	
190	1993/4	SALOMON	28.450	318.707	11,20	184.440	580			ENGLISH	4,70%	W/Datum		29,00	1990 190
	2003/4	"	28.450	509.190	17,90	800.000	1.700			"	3,60%	W/Datum	4,34	28,33	
192	1993/4	TONGA	748	96.300	128,74	96.960	1.010			TONGAN	17,6%	W/Datum		24,00	1990 192
	2003/4	"	748	108.141	144,57	236.000	2.200			"	5,30%	W/Datum	3,00	18,97	
193	1993/4	TUVALU	26	9.100	350,00	8.703	967			TUVALU/ENG	W/Datum	W/Datum		20,3	193
	2003/4	"	26	11.305	434,81	12.200.000	1.100			"	W/Datum	W/Datum	3,05	14,24	
194	1993/4	VANUATU	12.200	142.944	11,72	150.520	1.060			BISLA/ENG/FR	W/Datum	W/Datum		30	1990 194
	2003/4	"	12.200	199.414	16,35	563.000	2.900			"	7,30%	W/Datum	2,98	16,13	
		TOTALS 1993/4	49.396.604	3.525.909.892	71,38	1.581.873.672	449				4,10%	5,27%		24,56	
		TOTALS 2003/4	49.396.604	4.300.489.330	87,06	12.993.963.900	3.022	1.195.961.310	27,81		3,80%	3,02%	4,02	19,21	

SUMMARY

YEARS	DEMOGRAPHY-POPULATION			DENS.	PIB/COUNTRY		World Mahometano		EDUCATION		DEFEN.	FERTILITY	
	COUNTRY	KM2	INHABITANT		Thousands \$	\$	Number/h	%	LANGUAGE	S/PIB	S/PIB	WOMAN / YEAR	VEGETATIVE GROWTH X 1000 HAB.
1993/4	FIRST WORLD	56.349.176	1.222.215.681	21,69	19.895.458.474	16.278				5,33%	4,10%		7,66
2003/4	"	56.349.176	1.295.821.003	23,00	30.857.376.000	23.812	69.427.093	1,104		5,23%	2,54%	1,85	4,91
1993/4	SECOND WORLD	27.154.548	599.558.503	22,08	1.593.980.227	2.658				5,12%	4,42%		17,28
2003/4	"	27.154.548	691.603.565	25,47	3.629.963.000	5.248	205.852.937	3,27		4,83%	2,66%	2,55	11,49
1993/4	THIRD WORLD	49.396.604	3.525.909.892	71,38	1.581.873.672	449				4,10%	5,27%		24,56
2003/4	"	49.396.604	4.300.489.330	87,06	12.993.963.900	3.022	1.195.961.310	19,020		3,80%	3,02%	4,02	19,21
	TOTALS 1993/4	132.900.328	5.347.704.523	40,24	23.071.312.373	4.314				4,73%	4,74%		14,34
	TOTALS 2003/4	132.900.328	6.287.914.809	47,31	47.481.302.900	7.551	1.471.241.340	23,390		4,57%	2,47%	2,54	10,19

Lorenzo Calabi. Professor of Philosophy, University of Pisa (Italy)

Published Work:

Il caso che disturba. Spunti e appunti sul naturalismo darwiniano (2006)

Darwinismo morale. Aspetti della riflessione contemporanea (2002)

I quaderni metafisici di Darwin. Teleologia “metafisica” causa finale (2001)

Daniel Clement Dennett. Professor of Philosophy, Tufts University (United States).

Published Work:

Breaking the Spell: Religion as a Natural Phenomenon (2006)

Philosophical Obstacles for a Science of Conscience (2005)

The Evolution of Freedom (2004)

Darwin’s Dangerous Idea (1999)

Kinds of Minds: Towards an Understanding of Consciousness (1997)

Consciousness Explained (1995)

André Glucksmann. French Philosopher and Essayist.

Published Work:

A Childish Tantrum (2007)

The Speech of Hatred (2005)

East Versus West (2004)

Dostoyevsky in Manhattan (2002)

The Third Death of God (2001)

The Crack in the World: Ethics and Aids (1999)

Stupidity: Postmodernist Ideologies (1997)

The Eleventh Commandment (1993)

Jorge Wagensberg. Professor of Physics, University of Barcelona.

Published Work:

Intellectual Pleasure (2007)

More How and Less Why (2006)

The Rebellion of Ways (2004)

If Nature is the Answer, What is the Question? (2002)

Ideas Regarding the Complexity of the World (1985)

Josep M. Colomer. Professor of Political Economy, Pompeu Fabra University, (Barcelona).

Published Work:

Great Empires, Small Nations (2006)

Against Nationalisms (2003)

Political Institutions (2001)

How We Vote: The Electoral Systems of the World, Past, Present and Future (2000)

The Art of Political Manipulation (1999)

The Transition to Democracy: The Spanish Model (1998)