

**Beyond the Framework
of Modern Thought**

A Scientific Discovery

by Seymour Lessans

Copyright©1976 by Seymour Lessans (1918-1991). All Rights Reserved including the right of reproduction in whole or in part, in any form or order including the right of reproduction in whole or in part, in any form or order. This book contains material protected under International and Federal Copyright Laws and Treatise. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopy, fax transmission, recording, or any storage information and retrieval system, without the written permission of the publisher.

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

Printed in the United States of America

Philosophy – Free will and determinism. 2. Good and Evil
3. Peace–Psychological aspects. 4. Interpersonal relations.
5. Psychology — Popular works. 6. Lessans, Seymour —
Philosophy.

Safeworld Publishing Company

TO ALL MANKIND

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

Please note that when the 20th century is mentioned, it is referring to the time period this finding was first uncovered. The prediction that in 25 years man would be delivered from all evil was based on the conviction that a thorough investigation would have already have taken place. Although it has been more than 60 years, there has been no such investigation and until today this discovery remains in obscurity. Although some of the author's references are dated, the knowledge itself couldn't be more timely.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction.	i
Chapter One: The Hiding Place.	1
Chapter Two: The Two-Sided Equation.	11
Chapter Three: Automobile Accidents.	19
Chapter Four: Words, Not Reality.	27
Chapter Five: Premarital Relations.	35
Chapter Six: Our Posterity.	41
Chapter Seven: The First Blow.	49
Chapter Eight: The Displaced and the Guarantee.	55
Chapter Nine: The Medical Professional.	69
Chapter Ten: Until Death Do Us Part.	75
Chapter Eleven: Parents and Children.	83
Chapter Twelve: Teachers and Students.	91
Postscript.	97

INTRODUCTION

Who...in his right mind or with a knowledge of history...would believe it possible that the 20th century will be the time when all war, crime, and every form of evil or hurt in human relations must come to a permanent end? When first hearing of this prophesy, shortly after Hitler had slaughtered 6 million Jews, I laughed with contempt because nothing appeared more ridiculous than such a statement. But after 15 years (8 hours a day) of extensive reading and thinking, my dissatisfaction with a certain theory that had gotten a dogmatic hold on the mind, compelled me to spend nine strenuous months in the deepest analysis, and I made a finding that was so difficult to believe, it took me several years to thoroughly understand its full significance for all mankind.

I tried to get several professors to let me explain what I had discovered, but such a world was so far removed from their own knowledge and capabilities that they looked at me as if I was a crackpot. But I couldn't be angry because I was the same way before I made my discovery. And the theologians I contacted, though they admitted they pray to God for deliverance from evil, also believe it is impossible for man to accomplish this apparent miracle. Humorously enough they are right in a way because the law that was discovered is equivalent to the law that inheres in the solar system, over which we have no control. This natural law, which reveals a fantastic mankind system, is the long awaited Messiah. It was hidden so successfully behind a camouflage of ostensible truths, that no wonder it wasn't found until now. But by demonstrating the power of this law, a catalyst, so to speak, is introduced which compels this fantastic change in the direction our nature has been traveling, performing what will be called miracles though they do not transcend the laws of nature.

Laugh if you will because your skepticism is normal, but your smile of incredulity will be wiped from your face once you begin to read the text chapter by chapter of which the first two are most fundamental. Just bear in mind how many times in the course of history has the impossible (that which appeared to be) been made possible by scientific discoveries, which should make you desire

to contain your skepticism enough to investigate what this is all about. It was Nageli, the leading authority of his time, whose pride refused to let him investigate the claims of Gregor Mendel whom he judged a semi-amateur because he regarded as impossible the very core of Mendel's discovery. But he was wrong as history recorded, and though Mendel was compelled to receive posthumous recognition for the law he discovered, he is now considered the father of modern genetics. So don't be too hasty to use your knowledge and intellectual capacity as a standard to judge what hasn't even been revealed to you yet. But when it is, should you decide to give me the benefit of the doubt, deny it and two other discoveries to be revealed, if you can.

PART ONE

THE FOUNDATION AND SCIENTIFIC
DEVELOPMENT
OF MY FIRST DISCOVERY

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

CHAPTER THREE—AUTOMOBILE ACCIDENTS

CHAPTER ONE

THE HIDING PLACE

Many years ago man formed a theory that this earth was flat because he could not conceive of it floating in space. It became a dogma, such a fixed idea that when the first astronomer wished to explain the reason why a darkness came over the sun in the middle of the day, he was denied an opportunity to present his findings because the hiding place of his discovery called into question this sacred belief. How dare anyone say the earth is round!

You may look back and smile at the unconscious ignorance of our ancestors, but pay close attention to what happened to me as I draw up a perfect comparison with which you can identify.

Because I had considered my discovery completely scientific, my attention was drawn to an article by Eric Johnston who is now deceased but was then, among other things, the President of The Motion Pictures Association. It appeared in the November 6, 1960 issue of This Week Magazine of The Baltimore Sun.

“If there is one word which characterizes our world in this exciting last half of the twentieth century, the word is change.

“Change in political life...change in economic life...change in social life...change in personal life...change in the hallmark of our times. It’s not gradual, comfortable change. It is sudden, rapid, often violent. It touches and often disrupts whole cultures and hundreds of millions of people.

“Behind it all lies an explosive growth in scientific knowledge and accomplishment. Some 90 percent of all the scientists who ever lived are living today, and the total accumulation of scientific knowledge is doubling every ten years.

“But this is reality. If we remember that, then we will never flinch at change. We will adjust to it, welcome it, meet it as a friend and know it is God’s will.

Since my discovery would bring about the greatest change in all of history, it appeared that this man would be willing to let me

explain my findings. By convincing him on the phone that it was now possible to put a permanent end to all war as a result of my discovery, he agreed to meet me on a Sunday afternoon in Washington, D.C. Our conversation went as follows.

“I’m really not a scientist, Mr. Lessans, and in all probability you should be talking to someone else. Besides, after you hung up I became more skeptical of claims such as yours because they not only sound impossible but somewhat ridiculous in view of man’s nature. I don’t mind listening if it won’t take too long. I do have another engagement, but I can devote at least one hour.”

“I will be as brief as possible, but in order for me to reveal my discovery it is absolutely necessary that I first show you its hiding place because they are related to each other. You see, Mr. Johnston, most people believe, consciously or unconsciously, that man’s will is free....”

“What’s that! Did I hear you correctly? Are you trying to tell me that man’s will is not free?”

“That is absolutely true, Mr. Johnston, and my discovery lies locked behind the door marked Man’s Will is Not Free, just like the invariable laws of the solar system were concealed behind the door marked The Earth is Round — until some upstart scientist opened it for a thorough investigation.”

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

“It is true that determinism was investigated by people who were presumed profound thinkers, but in spite of their profoundness none of them had the capacity to perceive the law that was hidden there.”

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

Now stop to think about this for one moment. A discovery has been made that will go down in history as that which will change

the entire world of human relations for the better, yet because it lies hidden behind a theory that 98% of mankind are compelled to believe true, there is a hostile reaction when it is questioned. Where is there one iota of difference between this attitude and that of our ancestors regarding the shape of the earth? One person actually said to me – “What difference does it really make what I think about free will and determinism? My opinion can never change what our will really is.” This is true enough, but if the will of man is definitely not free, isn’t it obvious that just as long as we think otherwise we are prevented from discovering those things that depend on this knowledge for their discovery; consequently it make a difference. The opinion of our ancestors that the earth was flat could never change its actual shape, but just as long as the door marked The Earth Is Round was never opened thoroughly for an investigation by scientists capable of perceiving the undeniable but involved relations hidden there, how were we ever to discover the laws that allow us now to land men on the moon? Therefore, it is necessary to point out that I am not going to reveal a theory or an opinion about how this new world will come into existence, but will give a scientific demonstration, and your awareness of this will preclude the possibility of someone adducing the rank of his title or the long tenure of an accepted belief, as a standard from which he thinks he qualifies to disagree with anything that contains within itself undeniable proof of its veracity. In other words, your background, the color of your skin, your religion, the number of years you went to school no matter how many titles you hold, your I.Q., your country, what you do for a living, your being some kind of expert like Nageli (or anything else you care to throw in), has no relation whatsoever to the undeniable knowledge that 3 is to 6 what 4 is to 8.

Will Durant opened the door to the vestibule of determinism, and then after looking around, wrote – “Let the determinist honestly envisage the implications of his philosophy”, which indicates that all his reasoning in favor of free will was the result of inferences derived from the inability of logic to accept the implications. What are these implications that made him also write – “If there is an almost eternal recurrence of philosophies of free will, it is because direct perception can never be beaten down with

formulas, or sensation with reasoning.” What made it so obvious to him that man’s will is free, and why do theologians treat this as if it is an undeniable reality?

The belief in free will came into existence out of absolute necessity not only so theology could relieve God of all responsibility for evil since he was considered good, but primarily because it was impossible for man to solve his problems without blame and punishment which required the justification of this belief in order to absolve his conscience. In other words, if you were called upon to pass judgement on someone by sentencing him to death, could you do it if you know his will is not free? To punish him in any way you would have to believe that he was free to choose another alternative than the one for which he was being judged; that he was not compelled by laws over which he had no control. Man was given no choice but to think this way, and that is why our civilization developed the principle of an “eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth,” and why my discovery was never found. No one could ever get beyond this point because if man’s will is not free it becomes absolutely impossible to hold him responsible for anything he does. Well, is it any wonder the solution was never found if it lies beyond this point? How is it possible not to blame people for committing murder, rape, for stealing and the wholesale slaughter of millions? Does this mean that we are supposed to condone these evils, and wouldn’t man become even less responsible if there were no laws to control his nature? Doesn’t our history show that if something is desired badly enough he will go to any lengths to satisfy himself, even pounce down on other nations with talons and tons of steel? What is it that prevents the poor from walking into stores and taking what they need, if not the fear of punishment? The belief that will is not free strikes at the very heart of our present civilization. Is it any wonder that Johnstone did not desire to go into this matter further? Right at this point lies the crux of a problem so difficult of solution that it has kept free will in power since time immemorial. However, before I demonstrate how it is possible to resolve the implications, it is necessary to know that I will proceed in a step by step manner that brooks no opposition. Therefore, the first step is to prove undeniably that whatever your reasons for

believing free will true cannot be accurate because it is impossible to prove this theory since proof requires turning back the clock, so to speak, and demonstrating that man could have chosen otherwise. Since there is no way we can reverse the order of time, the most we can do is assume that he didn't have to do what he did. We justify our assumption by saying – “He didn't have to do it if he didn't want to”, which is one hundred percent true, but there is no way we can prove that his desire could have been otherwise at that moment of time. This means (now pay close attention to this simple equation) that if it is impossible to prove free will true, it is also impossible to prove determinism (as the opposite of free will) false, because if determinism was proven false, this would prove free will true, and we just demonstrated that this is impossible unless we can turn back the clock. But this doesn't stop a person from saying – “I believe. It is my opinion. I was taught that man's will is free”, but it would certainly stop him from trying to defend his position with an argument. However, once it is proven conclusively that will is not free (which takes into consideration the implications), there can be no more opinions or theories expressed on the subject, just as our ancestors stopped saying “I believe the earth is flat” once they knew for a fact it was round.

There is a great deal of humor here because the philosophers who did not know it was impossible to prove freedom of the will, believed in this theory because they were under the impression their reasoning had demonstrated the falseness of determinism, which was just shown cannot be done. Yet Will Durant, not perceiving this relation, wrote – “For even while we talked determinism, we knew it was false.” This is why it is necessary to proceed in an undeniable, not logical manner, otherwise someone will quote Durant, a priest, professor, lawyer, judge or politician as an authority for believing in freedom of the will. Remember, we are not interested in opinions and theories regardless of where they originate, just in the truth, so let's proceed to the next step and prove conclusively, beyond a shadow of doubt, that what we do of our own free will, of our own desire because we want to, is done absolutely and positively not of our own free will.

In reality, we are carried along on the wings of time or life during every moment of our existence, and have no say in this

matter whatsoever. We cannot stop ourselves from being born, and are compelled to either live out our lives the best we can, or commit suicide. Is it possible to disagree with this? But since it is absolutely impossible to be both dead and alive at the same time, and since it is absolutely impossible to desire suicide unless dissatisfied with life (regardless of the reason), we are given the ability to demonstrate a revealing and undeniable relation.

Every motion, from the beating heart to the slightest reflex action, from all inner to outer movements of the body, indicates that life is never satisfied to remain in one position for always like an inanimate object, which position shall be termed death. I shall now call the present moment of time or life – here, for the purpose of clarification, and the next moment coming up – there. You are now standing on this present moment of time and space called here, and are given two alternatives, either live or kill yourself; either move to the next spot called there, or remain where you are without moving a hair's breadth by committing suicide. If you are still reading then it is obvious that you are not satisfied to stay in one position which is death or here, and prefer moving off that spot to there, which motion is life. Consequently, the motion of life, which is any motion from here to there, is a movement away from that which dissatisfies, otherwise, had you been satisfied to remain here or where you are, you would never have moved to there. Since the motion of life constantly moves away from here to there, which is an expression of dissatisfaction with the present position, it must obviously move constantly in the direction of greater satisfaction. But let me elaborate on this.

Supposing you were taken prisoner in wartime for espionage and condemned to death, but mercifully given a choice between two exists: A is the painless hemlock of Socrates, while B is death by having your head held under water. Is it humanly possible, providing no other conditions are introduced to affect your decision, to prefer exit B if A is offered as an alternative? But if your will is free you should be able to choose B just as well as A. The reason you are confused is because the word choice is very misleading for it assumes that man has two or more possibilities, but in reality this is a delusion because the direction of life, always moving towards greater satisfaction, compels him to prefer of

differences what he considers better for himself, and when two or more alternatives are presented he is compelled, by his very nature, to prefer not that one which he considers worse, but what gives every indication of being better for the particular set of circumstances involved. The purpose of choosing is to compare meaningful differences to decide which alternative is preferable. A and B, representing small or large differences, are compared. The comparison is absolutely necessary to know which is preferable. The difference considered favorable, regardless of the reason, is the compulsion of greater satisfaction desire is forced to take, which makes one of them an impossible choice in this comparison simply because it gives less satisfaction under the circumstances. Consequently, since B is an impossible choice, man is not free to choose A.

Just because some differences are so obviously superior in value where you are concerned that no hesitation is required to decide which is preferable, while other differences need a more careful consideration, doesn't change the direction of life which moves always towards greater satisfaction. The truth of the matter is that all through life man is under a compulsion to choose what he considers good for himself, but what one person judges good or bad for himself doesn't make it so for others especially when it is remembered that a juxtaposition of differences in each case present alternatives that affect choice. Now just take careful note of this simple reasoning that proves conclusively in another way, except for the implications already referred to, that will is not free.

Man either doesn't have a choice because none is involved, as when something happens to him; or he has a choice, and then is given two or more alternatives of which he is compelled, by his nature, to prefer the one that appears to offer the greatest satisfaction, whether it is the lesser of two evils (both considered bad for himself), the greater of two goods, or a good over an evil. Therefore, it is absolutely impossible for the will to be free because man never has a free choice. However, it is important to understand that the words good and evil, in this context, have reference only to what is a benefit or a hurt to himself. Killing someone may be good in comparison to the evil of having that person kill him. The reason someone commits suicide is not

because he is compelled to do this against his will, but only because the alternative of continuing to live under certain conditions is considered worse. He was not happy to take his own life, but under the conditions he was compelled to prefer, by his very nature, the lesser of two evils which gave him greater satisfaction. Consequently, when he does not desire to take his own life because he considers this the worse alternative as a solution to his problems, he is still faced with making a decision, whatever it is, which means that he is compelled to choose an alternative that is more satisfying. For example, when the alarm clock goes off he has three possibilities. Commit suicide so he never has to get up, go back to sleep, or get up and face the day. Since suicide is out of the question under these conditions, he is left with two alternatives; but even though he doesn't like his job and hates the thought of going to work, he needs money, and since he can't stand having creditors on his back or being threatened with lawsuits, the lesser of two evils is to get up and go to work. He is not happy or satisfied to do this when he doesn't like his job, but he finds greater satisfaction doing one thing than another. Dog food is good to a starving man when the other alternatives are horse manure or death, just as the prices on a menu may cause him to prefer eating something he likes less, even though he has the money, because the other alternative of paying too high a price for what he likes more, is still considered worse under his particular circumstances. The law of self-preservation demands that he do what he believes will help him stay alive and make his life easier, and he is willing to cheat, steal, kill and do any number of things which he considers good for himself in comparison to the evil of finding himself worse off if he doesn't do these things.

Great confusion arises when man uses the words – “I did it of my own free will”, for although it is impossible to do anything of one's own free will, he does everything because he wants to since absolutely nothing can make him do what he doesn't want to. Was it humanly possible to make Gandhi and his followers do what they did not want to do when unafraid of death which was judged, according to their circumstances, the lesser of two evils? Consequently, when any person says he was compelled to do what he did against his will, that he really didn't want to but had to

because he was being tortured, he is obviously confused and unconsciously dishonest with himself and others because he could die before being forced to do something against his will. What he actually means is that he didn't like being tortured because the pain was unbearable, so rather than continue suffering this way he preferred, as the lesser of two evils, to tell his captors what they wanted to know, but he did this because he wanted to, not because some external force made him do this against his will. If by talking he would know that someone he loved would be instantly killed, pain and death might have been judged the lesser of two evils. This is an extremely crucial point because though will is not free, absolutely nothing on this earth can make man do anything against his will. To repeat, he might not like what he did, but he wanted to do it because the alternative gave him no free or better choice.

And now I shall demonstrate how these two undeniable laws or principles – that nothing can compel man to do anything against his will because over this his nature allows absolute control; and that his will is not free because his nature also compels him to prefer of available alternatives the one that offers greater satisfaction – will reveal a third invariable law – the discovery to which reference has been made.

CHAPTER TWO

THE TWO-SIDED EQUATION

Now once it is established as an undeniable law that man's will is not free, as was just demonstrated, we cannot assume that it is free because philosophers like Durant cannot get by the implications. Therefore, we must begin our reasoning where he left off, which means that we are going to accept the corollary – THOU SHALL NOT BLAME – even though it presents what appears to be an insurmountable problem, for how is it possible not to blame people who hurt us when we know they didn't have to do this if they didn't want to? Because Spinoza didn't understand the full significance of this enigmatic corollary, though he accepted it by rejecting the opposite principle of an eye for an eye, he refused to defend himself against his sister or blame her for cheating him out of his inheritance. Neither had a free choice because the one was willing to cheat to get what she wanted, while he was willing to be cheated rather than hold her responsible. But the time has arrived to clear up all the confusion and reconcile these two opposite principles, which only requires that we keep an open mind and proceed with the investigation. However, let me show you how this apparent impasse can be rephrased in terms of possibility.

If someone is not being hurt in any way, is it possible for him to retaliate or turn the other cheek? Isn't it obvious that in order to do either he must first be hurt? But if he is already being hurt, and by turning the other cheek makes matters worse for himself, then he is given no choice but to retaliate because this is demanded by the laws of his nature. Here is the source of the confusion. In other words, our basic principle or corollary Thou Shall Not Blame (call it what you will) is not going to accomplish the impossible. It is not going to prevent man from desiring to hurt others when not to makes matters worse for himself, but will prevent the desire to strike the very first blow. Spinoza made matters worse for himself financially, but at that moment of time he had no free choice because it gave him greater satisfaction to let her cheat him out of what he was entitled to by law. Christ also received incursions of

thought from this same principle, which compelled him to turn the other cheek and remark as he was being nailed to the cross – “They know not what they do”, forgiving his enemies even in the moment of death. But they knew what they were doing, and he could not stop them even by turning the other cheek. In all these years no one has ever known what it means that man’s will is not free, but you will be shown the answer very shortly. In reality, everybody is and has been obeying God’s will – Spinoza, his sister, Nageli, Durant, Mendel, Christ and even those who nailed him to the cross, but God has a secret plan that is going to shock all mankind. This new world is coming into existence not because of my will, not because I made a discovery (sooner or later it had to be found because the knowledge of what it means that man’s will is not free is a definite part of reality), but only because we are compelled to obey the laws of our nature.

Do you really think it was an accident the solar system came into existence; an accident that the sun is just the proper distance from the earth so we don’t roast or freeze; an accident that the earth revolves just at the right speed to fulfill many exacting functions; an accident that our bodies and brains developed just that way; an accident that I made my discovery exactly when I did? To show you how fantastic is the infinite wisdom that controls every aspect of this universe through invariable laws that we are at last getting to understand, which includes the mankind as well as the solar system, just follow this: Here is versatile man – writer, composer, artist, inventor, scientist, philosopher, theologian, architect, mathematician, chess player, prostitute, murderer, thief, etc., – whose will is absolutely and positively not free despite all the learned opinions to the contrary, yet compelled by his very nature and lack of development to believe that it is since it was impossible not to blame and punish the terrible evils that came into existence out of necessity; and then permitted to perceive the necessary relations as to why will is not free and what this means for the entire world, which perception was utterly impossible without the development, and absolutely necessary for the inception of our Golden Age. In all history have you ever been confronted with anything more incredible?

We have been growing and developing just like a child from

infancy. There is no way a baby can go from birth to old age without passing through the necessary steps, and no way man could have reached this tremendous turning point in his life without also going through the necessary stages of evil. But be this as it may, the confusion of words, and the inability to perceive certain type relations, has compelled many people to believe that if man knows his will is not free it would give him a perfect opportunity to take advantage of this knowledge and shift his responsibility. He could just say – “I couldn’t help myself because my will is not free.” But let us observe what the perception of undeniable relations tells us.

If you know as a matter of positive knowledge that we are not going to blame you or question your conduct, is it possible for you to blame us, to extenuate the circumstances, to lie or try to shift your responsibility in any way? Isn’t it obvious that the answer must be – “No, it is not possible”, just as the same answer must apply to the question is it possible to make two plus two equal five?

This proves conclusively that the only time you can say “I couldn’t help myself because my will is not free”, or offer any kind of excuse, is when you know you are being blamed, for this allows you to make the effort to shift your responsibility. This means that only in a world where you are judged, where it is believed your will is free, can you use an excuse to justify what you do. It also means that you must assume complete responsibility for everything you do since you cannot shift it away from yourself under the changed conditions. Did you ever see anything more ironically humorous? The only time you can use the excuse that your will is not free is when we believe it is free, but when you know that we will never blame or judge you in any way, you cannot use that or any other excuse to shift your responsibility. We have been so confused by words in logical relation, that while we preach this freedom of the will, we say, in the same breath, that we couldn’t help ourselves, and demonstrate our confusion still more by believing that the corollary would lessen, when it increases, our responsibility.

“But”, this same confusion may inquire, “why can’t man just satisfy his desires to his heart’s content when he knows there will be no consequences or explanations necessary?”

Has it been forgotten already that we are compelled, by our nature, to choose the alternative that gives us greater satisfaction, which is the reason our will is not free? Consequently, to solve this problem it is only necessary to demonstrate that when all blame and punishment are removed from the environment, and when the conditions are also removed that make it necessary for us to hurt others as the lesser of two evils, the desire to hurt them will be the worst possible choice. In other words, the knowledge that there will be no consequences presents consequences that are still worse, making it impossible to consider this hurt as a preferable alternative. If will was free we could not accomplish this, because we would be able to choose what is worse for ourselves when something better is available, but this new law of our nature, soon to be revealed, will give us no alternative when we are forced to obey it in order to derive greater satisfaction. Let me show you what I mean.

At this moment of time in our present world of free will, you are trying to decide whether to hurt us in some way, but you have had everything removed that could be used to justify this act. You simply see an opportunity to gain at our expense, but should you decide against it you will not be a loser. In other words, you are considering the first blow, which means that you are planning to do something to us that we don't want done to ourselves.

You realize there is a certain risk involved, if caught, because you must face the consequences. But if the crime, misdemeanor or offense is not that serious, although you know you will be questioned and blamed, you may be able to get away with it by offering all kinds of reasonable excuses as to why you had no choice. But if there is no way any excuse is acceptable as in a court of law after you have been found guilty, or when your parents, boss or any others know that you are obviously at fault, you could be sent to prison, electrocuted, hanged, gassed, spanked, severely punished in some other way, scolded, reprimanded, ostracized, criticized, discharged, beat up or any number of things. You don't want this to happen if it can be avoided, but if you can't satisfy your desire unless the risk is taken, you are prepared to pay a price for the crime of hurting others with a first blow. Under these conditions it is impossible for your conscience to exercise

any control over your desires, because you can't feel any guilt just as long as you are prepared to suffer the consequences. But observe what miracle happens when the two laws mentioned in the last paragraph of the first chapter, are brought together to reveal a third law.

As before you are trying to decide whether to hurt us in some way, but you have had everything removed from which you might have been able to justify your act. You simply see an opportunity to gain at our expense, but you will not be a loser if you decide against it. You are contemplating the first blow under changed conditions.

You know as a matter of undeniable knowledge that nothing in this world has the power, that no one can compel you to do anything against your will, for over this you know you have absolute control (you can lead a horse to water, but you can't make him drink). This means that you are completely responsible for your actions, even though, due to circumstances, you may prefer hurting us. But to make absolutely certain that you know this is an undeniable law, try to shift your responsibility to us or some extraneous factor when you know that no one in the world will ever hold you responsible. It cannot be done, which was already proven. This does not mean that other people are not often responsible for the hurt we do as part of a chain reaction, as when an employer is forced to lay off his employees because the money to pay them has stopped coming in to him, but no one is blaming him for what is obviously not his responsibility, and therefore it isn't necessary for him to offer excuses.

Now here you are contemplating this hurt to us in some way, while we know as a matter of positive knowledge that you cannot be blamed anymore because it is an undeniable law that man's will is not free. This is a very unique two-sided equation for it reveals that while you know you are completely responsible for everything you do to hurt us, we know you are not responsible. For the very first time you fully realize that we must excuse you because it is now known that man must always select of available alternatives the one that offers greater satisfaction, and who are we to know what gives you greater satisfaction. This prevents you from thinking excuses in advance because you know you are already

excused. You can't say "I couldn't help myself because my will is not free", because you know we already know this. You can't apologize or ask forgiveness, because you are already forgiven and no one is blaming you. This means that should you decide to hurt us with this first blow, or be careless and take the risks that lead to a first blow, and we would have to choose between retaliating or turning the other cheek, you would know that we would be compelled by our nature to find greater satisfaction in turning the other cheek because of the undeniable fact that we would know you had no choice since your will is not free. But remember, you haven't hurt us yet because this is still under consideration, and when it fully dawns on you that this hurt to us will not be blamed, judged or questioned in any way because we don't want to hurt you in return for doing what must now be considered a compulsion beyond your control, although you know it is not beyond your control at this point since nothing can force you to hurt us unless you want to, you are compelled, completely of your own free will (to be humorous), to relinquish this desire to hurt us with a first blow because it can never give you greater satisfaction under the changed conditions. In other words, it becomes the worst possible alternative to take advantage of not being blamed for a first blow because there is no advantage in hurting those whom you know must turn the other cheek for their satisfaction. Conscience, your guilty feeling over such an act, will not permit it, because you will get less satisfaction, not more. Let me review this.

In order to hurt another, man must be able to derive greater, not less satisfaction, which means that self-preservation demands and justifies this; that he was previously hurt in some way and finds it preferable to strike back an eye for an eye which he can justify also; or else he knows, absolutely and positively, that he would be blamed by the person he hurt and others if they knew. Retaliation is a natural reaction of a free will environment that permits the consideration of striking a first blow because it is the price man is willing to risk or pay for the satisfaction of certain desires. But when it is removed so the knowledge that it no longer exists becomes a new condition of the environment, then the price he must consider to strike the first blow is completely out of his reach because to do so he must choose an alternative that is less

satisfying, which is impossible to do when an alternative offering greater satisfaction is available. The answer to this impasse, which removes the implications, is now very obvious because the advance knowledge that man will not be blamed for the first blow since his will is not free (when he knows that nobody, absolutely nothing can compel him to do this unless he wants to, for over this he knows he has absolute control), enters a condition or catalyst never before a permanent factor in human relations, as this prevents those very acts of hurt for which blame was previously necessary as a normal reaction in the direction of greater satisfaction. However, to fully understand the fact that conscience (our feeling of guilt) was never allowed to reach the enormous temperature necessary to melt our desire to even take the risk of striking a first blow, it is only necessary to observe what must follow when a crucible is constructed wherein this new law can effectively operate.

It should be obvious that just as long as man is able to justify hurting others, he is not striking a first blow. But before I demonstrate how this justification is permanently removed, and to allow you an opportunity to see exactly what happens in a human relation where this is already removed, I shall reveal, in the next chapter, how all automobile accidents must come to a permanent end.

CHAPTER THREE

AUTOMOBILE ACCIDENTS

To understand why all automobile accidents must come to an end out of absolute necessity, I shall show you exactly what takes place in our present environment before and after a collision, and then let you see the same accident under changed conditions. Actually the only reason we are willing to drive carelessly and take risks is because when we do have an accident, which means that when we have made a careless mistake resulting in a hurt to others, it is impossible to gain satisfaction by paying the price or shifting our responsibility. When it becomes impossible to do either, we must do everything in our power to prevent the accident as that alternative which is better for ourselves.

Not long ago a truck was heading west inside the city limits, doing 50 miles an hour in a 35 mile zone. It was past midnight, and very few cars were on the street. The driver was anxious to get home because he hadn't seen his family for a week. He had driven this same route many times, and knew it was safe to go this speed at that time of the morning. His only concern was to keep an eye out for a patrol car so he wouldn't get a ticket. Up ahead, four blocks away, he saw that a traffic signal was green. When about one half block away he knew that it would soon be joined with the yellow light and followed, in a few seconds, by the red, indicating that he would have to stop. But since this was a nuisance, since the amber light had not yet gone on, and since the darkness enabled him to see that no headlights were coming from other directions, he felt safe to increase his speed to 75 miles an hour.

But heading north was a car carrying five people. A father, mother, and their three children. They had just attended a wedding and were on their way home. The father had been drinking rather heavily and completely forgot to put on his headlights. He was also traveling along at 50 miles an hour when he slowed down to 35 so he wouldn't have to stop for the red light up ahead, but when he saw the yellow light go on for the other direction, and knowing

that the light would be green before he entered the intersection even if he resumed his 50 miles an hour, he didn't hesitate to do just that. Now just before the truck got to the crossing the light changed, which meant that the driver would have to go through on the red, and at that very moment he saw the car, without any headlights on, enter the intersection a fraction of a second ahead of him, but it was too late to avoid the collision. The father saw the truck at that instant too. They both jammed on their brakes and turned their wheels instinctively, but the truck ploughed head on, at a slight angle, into the rear side of the car. The parents were somehow only injured slightly, the truck driver was not hurt at all, but the three children were killed instantly. Standing on the corner was someone who noticed that the car's lights were not on. Now let us analyze this.

If the truck driver had any inkling that such an accident would have resulted from his trying to beat the light, he certainly would never have considered it, but he chose to do what he did because it gave him greater satisfaction at that moment. However, we are not concerned now with what he should or shouldn't have done, but with what he must do for greater satisfaction following this accident. It is obvious that he feels absolutely horrible over what he knows was his fault, yet he doesn't want to be blamed for the death of these children. There is certainly no satisfaction in feeling the weight of this responsibility, consequently, he is going to do everything in his power to shift it away from himself.

The police arrive and learn that the father was driving without headlights on, and that he was highly intoxicated. The truck driver kept saying over and over again – "It was not my fault. That man went right through the red light and didn't even have his lights on. The death of those children is terrible, but it was not my fault." Before long he was absolutely convinced that the accident would never have occurred had the headlights been on, and he was right because what made him speed up to beat the yellow light was his certainty that no car was coming. However, he could not tell the police the truth because the right-of-way still belonged to the father even though intoxicated and without lights, but it made him feel so much better.

In court the father was found guilty of manslaughter even

though innocent, which infuriated him, but because the death of his children was considered punishment enough, his sentence was suspended and he was placed on probation. His wife, however, was not satisfied with the decision since she believed him guilty of killing their children (she had warned him time and again about his drinking at parties), and got a divorce. The truck driver was awarded quite a bit of money in damages because he discovered that he was not physically the same after such a traumatic experience. If he felt the least bit guilty over causing the death of these children, he could always confess this sin to his priest or psychiatrist, or atone for it in various ways.

Had the conditions been slightly different making it impossible for the truck driver to shift his responsibility, the only avenue open for greater satisfaction would have been for him to pay a price for what he did. His insurance would have compensated the parents to a degree for their tragic loss, and they would have been satisfied to know that he was sent to prison. When released he would feel that he paid a price for what he did. The father, on the other hand, who was found guilty when completely innocent, builds up tremendous hate for the whole system of justice, and may desire to kill the truck driver in retaliation if he thinks he can get away with it. His life was ruined, and he wants to hurt somebody in the worst way for what was done to him. Had this accident not taken anyone's life, the driver of the truck might have volunteered that it was his fault so he could compensate this family for their inconvenience and property damage through his insurance company, which allows him to pay this kind of price for hurting others. Now pay close attention to the same accident under changed conditions, so you can see why the truck driver, when faced with the choice of speeding up or slowing down, is compelled to prefer the latter, which prevents the accident.

The truck driver feels absolutely horrible over what he knows was his responsibility, but he also knows that no one in the entire world will ever blame him. The police will not come by in an effort to determine who was responsible. There is no more liability insurance to help pay a price for hurting others. The father is not going to attack the truck driver or say to him – “Look at what you

just did to my children”, even though he and his wife are crying bitterly. Now let us take a long look at the truck driver to see how he is making out.

He knows beyond a shadow of doubt that the accident was his responsibility because the father entered the intersection on the green light. He can't say to the police or the parents that it was not his fault, because they are not going to blame him in any way. He knows that nothing in this world has the power to make him do anything he doesn't want to do, because over this he has absolute control, and when it fully dawns on him that the parents must excuse what he cannot justify because he knows he was to blame (the two-sided equation); when he fully realizes that he cannot shift his responsibility in any direction whatsoever because nobody is holding him responsible, and that he cannot pay a price for the same reason, he finds himself in a situation from which it is impossible to derive any satisfaction whatsoever. This means that he is compelled to go through life with the death of these children, the sorrow of the parents, and the destruction of their property, on his conscience. How do you think he feels? Wouldn't it be wonderful for him if he was punished or could pay a price? But let's examine this from another point of view.

Supposing the father didn't see the truck at all and wasn't certain of what happened. He might actually believe that his drinking was responsible, that maybe it was the fact that he didn't put on his lights, or that he did go through the red light; and how do you think he feels knowing that his carelessness might have caused the death of his own children? How will he ever know that he is not responsible unless he is fully aware at all times of what he's doing. This means that the thought of hurting others is so terrifying when there will be no blame, punishment, or price to be paid for what we know is, or might have been, our responsibility, that when we are confronted with a similar situation as the truck driver we could never find greater satisfaction in speeding up, while the father, knowing that drinking might cause him to get in an accident, figures out a way to solve his problem so he can still drink without taking on the responsibility of driving. But if he has no one to drive his car but himself, and feels that drinking might cause an accident for which he knows, well in advance, there will

be no blame, he cannot afford the risk of placing himself in a position from which his conscience will torture him all through life.

The right-of-way system in the new world becomes a mathematical standard by which each motor vehicle operator is forced to judge only himself when an accident occurs. The truck driver knows he did not have the right-of-way and therefore struck the first blow when the collision took place. But if he had gotten to the red light and no cars were coming, he would be striking no blow had he decided to cross the intersection. By the same reasoning, his speed is controlled not by a patrol car being present or absent, but by what he considers safe enough so that he will never have to encroach on another driver's right-of-way. He can't afford to drive with bad tires or brakes because if the one should blow out and the other fail, forcing him to collide with other cars by entering their territory, he will know that he struck the first blow regardless of the reason. If the tires were new, but the mechanic failed to tighten the bolts on one wheel which came off, causing the accident, his conscience would be clear since this was something that happened to him. But the changed conditions will force every mechanic to be extremely careful so that they are not responsible for accidents.

Before we will desire to drive a car in the new world we will want to know everything that might make us responsible for hurting people in an accident which will not occur, and for delaying them from getting to their destination. If by not using directional signals when required (which does not include using them when we are alone on the street or in a lane that only goes to the right or left), or by not moving over far enough when making a turn, we see that we are holding up traffic for which we are not being blamed by the blowing of horns, we will soon find greater satisfaction in not doing anything to hold up traffic. As for whether we need permission from the government to drive.

In our present environment we do because many of us are irresponsible. But in the new world our responsibility increases to its maximum degree, and we won't be too anxious to sit behind the wheel until we know we can drive without causing accidents or delays. This means that the department of Motor Vehicles will be

displaced because we will never have to prove to anyone but ourselves that we are qualified to drive and our vehicles in good condition. The fact that certain inadequate standards were set up for others to determine our qualifications, only allowed many unqualified people to assume they were qualified because they passed the required test. Even driving instructors in school will never tell us when they think we are ready. Why should they assume this responsibility? They will teach us all the causes of accidents and delays, show us how to handle a car properly, and then let us decide when we think we're ready to drive without hurting anyone. However, to launch this new world and create the environment necessary to prevent accidents, wars, crimes, and all the other forms of hurt that plague our lives, is a separate problem which will be solved in a later chapter.

This belief in free will and the concomitant blame are equivalent to the thrust of a rocket in getting a satellite into space, for without it we could never have reached the outposts of this Golden Age. But just as the astronauts shed their excess baggage when their rocket has expended its energy in reaching orbit, so likewise will we shed this theory and all the blame that helped us reach this tremendous turning point in our lives.

Well, is it any wonder I titled my book as I did when the solution actually lies beyond the framework of modern thought and cannot even be understood in terms of our present knowledge? There are no precedents. If you are a little less skeptical and more willing to continue the investigation, I shall reveal my second discovery which will play a very important role in the new world.

PART TWO

MY SECOND AND THIRD DISCOVERIES

- CHAPTER FOUR – WORDS, NOT REALITY
CHAPTER FIVE – PREMARITAL RELATIONS
CHAPTER SIX – OUR POSTERITY

