

## *The Formative Years*

The Conversation.

2500 Years Ago.

We view the first Adam, the one placed upon our planet, along with his Eve, as a privileged pair, asked to abide only one admonition, which, according to the narrative, they had failed to honor. Thus began, early, the Fall Of Man.

With a more 'modern' outlook we also trace a lineage with a more indistinct beginning, which we might label AnthroAdam. The second is confused in perception and use of language. It is often claimed that man has descended from the apes, whereas at the same time he has also arisen upon the evolutionary ladder.

The rib of the first Adam is purported to have caused all subsequent 'descendants', of an incestuously begat progeny, to have been cast out of Paradise forever, as punishment for an apple infraction, by an angry Deity. The Deity placed an apple before a no account innocent woman, who was fashioned from a rib, admonishing that weak presence to ignore the apple. The Deity did not ask her to refrain from adultery, to refrain from killing Adam, to refrain from stealing, or coveting, or taking the name of the Lord in vain; he stuck the apple in front of her, playing the silly 'temptation' game; a rigged game (since the inventor also created the weakness).

There wasn't any reason at all for Adam, even though it is generally recognized, even today, there really isn't any, for killing one's look-a-likes. To the extent such an act is severely frowned upon, to kill his Rib, or for either to engage in adulterous behavior (incest was another matter), or to steal, or to covet (only an apple), or to take name of the Lord in vain, considering how he had provided for them, it was unnecessary to lay down the Law.

A lunkheaded, bored, warped Deity, created a Paradise with only one tenet to be observed for the privilege of occupancy. The Deity fashioned from a Rib a luscious presence with more passion than brains, knowing full well she would Fall. This author maintains this was done deliberately to relieve the boredom of the Eternal Bliss of the creator (the author of all these works).

We switch now to the other view, where also 'commandments' were absent. The evolutionary Aegis is Deityless. There can be no Fall, only Descent, or Ascent, depending on how you view things. AnthroAdam seems to have more options than the First Adam in his choice of partners. However he is depicted as wielding a club which he uses not only to subdue wildlife (the livestock provided by

## *Long In Coming*

the Aegis), but also to subdue a mate, whom he grabs by her long mane to drag into his lair. The setting for this view may be considered paradisiacal, or it may be considered a bare bones environment for those with a strong constitution, and a will to live and survive, with or without admonitions, i.e., without notice, from above.

Are we now prepared to enter our conversation?

With the first Adam, we are dealing with a creation that has fallen early, for whom there can be no hope of redemption. Things just got worse. His incestuously begat descendants killed each other, stole, coveted, engaged in adulteries, raped, pillaged, cussed, and generally made a mess of things.

With AnthroAdam, hope was never a consideration. He did all the things the first had done, but his actions or behavior were not regarded as 'fallen'; they merely came with the territory.

To this day, man is undecided which of these views satisfactorily prepares him for a discussion of the human condition as it has developed throughout the ages.

Neither of these views offers any hope, most likely precluding the possibility of hope.

There exists a third view which dismisses the other two as irrelevant to what exists now. That man is neither Fallen, nor evolved. Because man no longer aspires to live in caves, or wears a thin veneer of fabric over his frame does not of him make anything but what he is in the landscape, neither fallen, nor evolved. If you take away his gun, he cannot readily harm any other form of life. He becomes a vulnerable as any other form of life to the prevailing conditions, against which his gun is minimally useless in any case.

Of course, other views do exist, ones originating in the 'Far East', ones originating in the 'Middle East', ones originating in the 'Near East', ones originating north of there, and south of there, in developed cultures, or in less developed, or aboriginal cultures.

The origins of man are irrelevant to what exists now. If man understood in detail his origins it would not alter in the least the way he conducts himself now. Those who do claim to know his origins seem unable to make a connection between then and now as to bring about a more desirable creature.

Even if he thought he understood the purpose of life, it would not alter in the least the way he conducts himself now.

## *The Formative Years*

This might be the point where the conversation ceases to be one sided, for the din and clamor of those others wishing to challenge the assumptions that are beginning to prevail.

“How can you say that if man ‘understood the purpose of life, it would not alter in the least the way he conducts himself now?’”

That statement is a tongue in cheek euphemism for what is the glaring purpose of life. The dominion of one over the other, and I’m not my brother’s keeper, purpose.

“That’s not a purpose.”

I beg to differ. Explain to me if you will if there is any other purpose to one person, or one corporation, owning, or having control over, all the arable land, excluding all others; at the point of a gun, one should add?

“Even the UN Charter of Rights sanctions ‘private property’.”

When the UN was formed, certain selfish (nationalistic) biases made it impossible to couch things in any other way.

Private property, like Nationalism, is a comfort to those who can hang onto it with the gun. In some cases the gun is an instrument of the law and in some cases it is the means of removing tacit owners, whether legal or not. Afterwards one reads the obituary notice with an eye to opportunity.

Huge land holdings are a comfort to those who have sovereignty over them, whether reasonable, purposeful, or unreasonable or without purpose.

The first law of dominion is achieved, and the second law concerning one’s brother is also achieved.

“This is not a conversation, it is a cynical tirade.”

Improve upon it if you will.

Recall, if you will, what Thrasymachus said at the beginning of *The Republic*, that ‘Justice was in the interest of the stronger’, whereupon a lengthy bit of sophistry ensued in effort to refute something as plain as day to the rest of us. One may argue that the one with the gun might be prone to err in his judgment, where it may be deemed he might not be serving his interest after all; and so forth and so on. The gun speaks louder than words. He that wields it is the stronger; whether or not he wields justice is

## *Long In Coming*

irrelevant. He wields what he wields. He may be wielding what others perceive to be injustice, but are powerless to effect any change in the status quo. The wielder is insensitive to the quibblings of others. Of course, the whole notion of justice may be absent from any consideration by the stronger. To 'have and to hold' seems to be uppermost in his mind. We quibblers, who sit on the sidelines, attempt to cut down to size the one who lords it over us.

"Let's assume for the moment that I agree with what seems obvious, while it may not be so obvious that the stronger does harm to himself by following the path he chooses. In the first instance, it would seem that he can never sleep, unless he has trusted underlings, who will act on his behalf, while he sleeps. Let's also make that assumption.

"Quibblers we may be, but this does not remove the cynical judgment contained in your presentation.

"You are implying two things, that man is fated to be what he is, regardless of how you describe him, and that he cannot change what he is, regardless of how you describe him. That he is what he is incontrovertibly, to our way of reckoning, essentially a wanton beast, not made in heaven, occupying a place, not made in heaven."

Put a lot less cynically than I had, which proves less than you had expected, by trying to cast my words in a certain light. It goes to say what at first seems cynical, may only be hard truths presented in way that irks one's sensibilities. The truth is most often unsubtle in its delivery. Are your words any less cynical? Perhaps, but no less truthful. Which leads us into the debate proper, regarding what is the human condition today, despite any other notions we may entertain regarding man?

Blunt words are intended to get us where we want to be in a statement of the realities. To say that the 'dominion of the one over the other' is what man desires, and that 'he not be obliged to have a care for his fellow man', is also a condition he desires, may seem cynical, but also truthful. Each as a matter of convenience to himself.

Beyond these words, we enter into idealities, rather than realities. You might want to argue that 'peace', or tranquil surroundings is as beneficial, or more beneficial, than an armed camp.

"I would so argue.

"However, I suspect these opening remarks are intended to set a stage for another kind of debate, where origins play no part, where

## *The Formative Years*

reality becomes a painful realization, regardless of any preconditions, causes, or purposes. Also it seems to require that we accept certain realities as given, rather than something debatable. I cannot assent to that presumption.”

As long as you tell it like it is.

Yes! we may want to, for the purposes of argument, without ever the hope of changing things, engage in hypotheticals, in the manner of the sophists, who, if you will note, were arguing these very conundrums two thousand five hundred years ago.

The arch Sophist, almost as an admission of guilt; that is to say, that he engaged in barter with his sophistries, before his dying breath remarked, ‘I owe a cock to Asclepus; will you remember to pay the debt?’

The foregoing is another of the many possible preliminary constructions that can be made to set the stage for a discussion of meaningless matters.

Perhaps the matters are not meaningless; it is the words that lack something from which we are unable to extract what we need from them. Pith and rind without any juice.

It might be assumed if we could obtain some juice, we might better our ways. ‘Better’ is a relative term, that does not in any way suggest ‘Best’, also a relative term.

Given that our ways are what they are, and that they have propelled our kind to this redundant occupier of a purposeless universe, it seems that improvement, in relative terms, is also purposeless.

Since we are what we are in a purposeless universe, we seem also improbable candidates to flesh out our own ideologies, the simplest of which we are unable to consistently master, to wit, the Golden Rule.

As any knowledgeable Sophist will argue, The Golden Rule is observed arbitrarily. It can be and is acknowledged at one’s convenience, and ignored at one’s convenience. That is to say, it is both convenient and inconvenient to those who would apply it to their conduct. As long as one is able to make a choice with regard to the rule, it might be said the rule does not exist, but only as a token guide, and that it is otherwise a useless arbiter in the affairs of men.

What might be said to remain is a state of anarchy, which may very well characterize our way of life. Anarchy does not necessarily

## *Long In Coming*

imply chaos, but it may very well describe most closely what is happening today. It may be more appropriate to describe something by how it manifests itself, rather than by its insubstantial avowals.

Anarchy is itself a relative term measured against time. Anarchy does not necessarily entail a violent display, which over time has often characterized it. In the background there has always been an individual response to the Golden Rule. If you are the 'stronger' you get extra swings, by fiat; the weaker can't keep pace with the stronger. The stronger will not allow himself to be compromised (disadvantaged) by the Golden Rule because he believes he is invulnerable to an assault that will harm him. The weaker, on the other hand, wants to don the Golden Rule as a shield.

This is a simple sketch of a basic anarchy implicit in all of our dealings with our fellow man. Regardless of all the other considerations that are brought to bear; altruism, humanitarianism, Christianity, love thy brother (sister) (look-a-likes), we are all in this together, the big over the little forms an irresistible persuasion. The bigger definitely have an easier time of it, despite what has been said about the meek.

History has had no bearing upon this basic relationship. It requires a conscious act to remove what is implicit from the relationship. As has been the case the monarch always sat higher than his or her subjects, even though the monarch might have been a shrimp.

Everyone is a potential adversary, we are in need of posturing to enable us to avoid direct confrontations with adversaries. We puff out our chests (hmn, some chest) in attempt to make ourselves appear larger (more awesome!), even though we do not have a leg to stand upon.

Do we behave differently amongst our friends? Where do friends come from? We trust that anarchy will not interfere with our friendships, although it must be said, that many friendships are provisional in nature, depending very much on the observance of the Golden Rule. Equal inequality. Perhaps the gravitation toward friendships are the response to a need to alleviate the constant apprehensiveness that exists because the Golden Rule fails us. There are of course other basis for forming friendships, one of which might be to amicably discuss the purpose of life, without having to answer for the consequences (supposing there are consequences) of one's openly expressed thoughts.

Group (herd, flock, school, etc.) psychology may enhance an imaginary comfort zone (reduce one's conspicuousness) with or without having formed any friendships, perhaps only look-a-likeness.

## *The Formative Years*

The foregoing are relatively simple precepts that may form the basis for a discussion.

Lets change the focus for a moment.

Way back when, T. E. Lawrence had observed of the Arabs that they could not get along. Their not being able to get along made it very difficult for them to get rid of their oppressors. Eventually, with outside help, the Arabs got things together enough to form nations with borders. However there still existed a few strings that tied them to their former oppressors. One of the strings involved the Balfour agreement with a certain non-Arab ethnicity that wanted a homeland. The proposed homeland involved an area of the planet where the Balfour ethnicity proclaimed its origins.

We know what happened.

This promised land was already occupied by others of a different ethnicity. The different ethnicity was part of the Arab world. The Arabs were coming of age, or, that is, the Muslims were reasserting themselves in world affairs. Many of them sat comfortably on a pile of oil. The occupying ethnicity was made very angry by this enactment (promise) of a former oppressor.

Former oppressors were being relieved of their sovereignties, France, England, Italy, Germany, even the US of A, and the USSR, as the world became a more egalitarian place. Of late, even oppressive regimes amongst Arab nations have met with disfavor.

We, of the more moderate makeup, viewed these happenings as fair and just. However, as T E Lawrence observed and speculated, the Arabs still did not get long, and they did not get along, even with the polarizing revitalized non-Arab ethnic occupant in their midst, although it did create a single unifying opportunity.

It should be mentioned that most of the Arab world did not favor democratic governments. Their history, until very recently, has been one of autocratic rule enforced by state power, usually under a Coup-de-Etat, dictatorial ruler, or by successor dominions.

It should be added that the Arabs, often referred as Muslims, while of one seeming ethnicity, are themselves of differing views, not unlike their former oppressors in the Western World. That is, they have formed sects that have warred with each other.

Not to place too much emphasis on the Arabs seeming lack of unity in religious matters, the 'West' is still not in agreement upon the interpretations of the Christian ethos, and have conducted some fearsome campaigns against their different sects.

At the same time we acknowledge Buddha, Tao, Confucius; Hindu and Judaism, as well as sundry 'pagan' belief systems; and

## *Long In Coming*

the conflicts arising from the orthodox versus the reformed, and the reformers. Don't forget the agnostics, and atheists.

This is not a history lesson, but it is an effort to show that we are not all in this together.

Because two 'world wars' proved so devastating, the impetus to avert another was responsible for the formation of the United Nations. Good idea, No!?

Better than nothing, is what I say, however divisive and useless at times. The United Nations, besides being comprised of nations, is also riddled with you guessed it, Muslims, Christians, Buddhists, Hindus, Jews, their sects and orthodoxies, agnostics, atheists, and sundry pagans, as to quite dilute any chance at unanimity, so as to cause one to question the premise of 'United'; as an error in terminology, because it is so misleading.

Through the aegis of this well-intentioned august body, we may yet find our way to a third world war, simply for the failure of the body to act outside its various self-interests, that is, principles over self-interest.

The greatest flaw in that august body, is awarding to the more self-serving nations the power of the veto. In this case the veto in itself is a self-defeating thing built into the original design to preserve the we-are-not-all-in-this-together thing. Its not unlike the sign on the diner claiming the right to refuse service to those who do not wear shirts and shoes.

As a result of the former, the humanitarian thing is often forsaken (truly abandoned) and overrun by the self-serving. An overriding principle does not exist. Qualifiers like shirts and shoes does not exist in the United Nations. Let me give you a few examples.

The United States, in its efforts to support one nation, denies, through its veto, a vote assigned to it, by itself, as a founder of the august body, to another, the recognition and the right of self-determination on equal footing to those who occupy the area of the people they displaced as result of the Balfour agreement (these are condemned to the barrens without statehood). So be it. The US has done even more high-handed things in its interpretation of 'material breach' to essentially mistakenly and wrongly invade a sovereign nation in order to avenge the World Trade Center fiasco, while, at the same time, going for the oil, as well as serving the impuissant whims of the fascist dictator of the US. The USA has done even more horrible things by supporting dictators who violate human rights, while waiting in line for a handout, as they naysay the REDS.

Russia, also one of the founders of the august body, has likewise assigned to itself the right of veto. Its shows its complete lack of principle when it votes not to censure in any way acts



## *The Formative Years*

within a nation that are costing the indiscriminate wasting of human life within that nation. Obviously a message given to the rest of the world that it will not tolerate any interference from the world body when it slaughters Chechnyans. These guys haven't really adjusted to the idea of democracy.

China, an original founder of the UN under the tutelage of Chiang Kai Chek, was forced to yield to the larger Red China, under the great pressure from the world body. Its sheer mass of humanity could not longer be denied, even by the United States. Further in its immensity it was not possible for long to deny it the right of Veto. Because this new China is also self-serving it vetoes the same proposition placed before the self-serving Russia; plainly it does not want any outside interference from the august body when it comes to Tiananmen square; or Tibet etc..

OK, rife with political considerations, and influence peddling, the UN is demonstrating that it can not prevent a third world war, but, through its incessant unprincipled bickering, will bring about that very thing, all the sooner. Has the UN really forestalled that inevitability?

To remind you, this is just a conversation. No action required, none expected.

Conversation, cynical tirade?

The Golden Rule? If we are all in this together, the UN needs to grapple with the import of the Golden Rule.

You see, when we get into the third world war, the planet will be lucky to escape complete devastation. If a small corner of the globe should survive in some manner, the onus will still exist how any two, like, or unlike, individuals are to get along. Will they extract from the disaster a complete disbelief in any animal existence being able to find accommodation and accord? Would they even consider the Golden Rule as no longer viable; forget the UN?

What would you predict?

I realize there are those of you who feel you can escape the inevitable, that is, minimally being made answerable for your crimes against humanity, both through commission and omission. Perhaps some will; but they will get it in the history books, if books and history remain viable. (People like George W. Bush, and Alexander Putin will suffer the rebuke of history, whereas people like Michael Gorbachev and Jimmy Carter will become exemplary.)