Introduction:

- The only long term solution would be the return of Jesus Christ, and establishment of the Kingdom of God on earth. However, if He doesn't show up very soon, maybe the following can be a temporary solution to prevent the world from destroying itself / self-destructing. People have been trying to "solve" life and human society for 2,000 years, and in a way before that too. This is my try at the same goal. This is just a rough draft, and may be a bit on the cerebral scribble (or general scribble) side at times. I feel I need to say or do something, and I don't subscribe to the modern American bipolar viewpoint, which seems to have spread elsewhere too.

- I'm here to articulate bits and pieces of what many people are already thinking or are aware of. If this seems redundant or unnecessary, then please ignore it. I think it may be of use for many people.

- My primary goal with all this, is to start, preserve, and progress a conversation that leads to Life. By no means am I personally covering here all details to all topics, and I'm not claiming originality to any point mentioned. Nor am I asserting that any point mentioned here has not been previously discussed by others.

- If you are a true Christian, you are probably fine. I would urge you to simply remain committed to your faith, and continue in your walk with Christ. This website is primarily intended for others. If you are a truly religious person of another religion, you are probably not far from salvation either. Though acceptance of Jesus Christ into your life, as your redeemer and atonement for sins, is the only way to find True Life.

- Although Christians may understand the points found here far better than others, however I might say that a true Christian would have little to no benefit from reading what I have to say here, but should just continue on their very correct path. Such things may or may not help them in their spiritual/religious path.

- The types of religious/racial/social/intellectual topics discussed here, are not exclusive to bitter, irritated, angry old people. In fact, I suspect that the youngest person born today would find solutions to such topics to be far more urgent than anyone of previous generations. Because those born today, were handed the mess created by laxity or errors of those that came before them. And they have no means of escaping the resulting very real realities that we find in this world today.

- My goal in this is not some covert attempt to further a "White Supremacist" agenda. It is also not an attempt to deceitfully plug minority views into a mainstream context, such as Jewish, Black, Hispanic, or other perspectives. What I have in mind is just exactly what I am writing. If you believe that a truly unbiased viewpoint is impossible, kindly read it, and disagree as needed.

- It may seem like I'm just stating the obvious. But in the event that that is in fact the case, maybe there is a point to stating the obvious. If the obvious becomes more commonly obvious, maybe this will be a different world.

- If you are 100% certain that your own views are the correct ones, and that everyone else is absolutely wrong, or if you otherwise view various populations outside of your own race/culture/religion to be nuisances that need to somehow be eliminated in order to allow for a wonderful life, then my message here will probably not appeal to you. But you are welcome to read what I have to say.

- The ideas mentioned here could be accused by Christians as being those of an antichrist. And others may say that it's just insanity or evil. But I would suggest that a reader evaluate each point, and if it is deemed to be faulty, then by all means- come up with an alternative plan. A person should be ready for the arrival of Jesus Christ today. But nothing guarantees that in fact He will come today. I don't think He wants His followers to simply be washed out to sea by whatever tide happens to show up. If you consider my views as religious fanaticism, likewise, please evaluate the real challenges in the world, and come up with better solutions. I'd love to hear them.

- If you consider all these ideas as being overly idealistic and bordering on naivety, or alternatively- of being too lax as in the form of a people-pleaser, I would assert that I think such things are required as the only antidote to where this world is heading. Pure Truth only, but with beautiful cups to pour it into.

- Many of these things may not appeal to everyone, but once everyone is convinced that their opponents and others they disagree with are not simply going to vanish or be eliminated, maybe it would be clear that such a solution is absolutely necessary.

- I would note that the vantage point here is often related to the specific heated political and social environment in the USA, but in theory many ideas mentioned here could apply in a more generic fashion. Specifically, America has a crisis of potential and fear of losing a White European-descended majority of population, which demands examination of whether or not that is in fact a real concern, and what remedies may be possible to address the concern- whether the concern is actually real or not. Then of course there are the standard tensions that can be found in many locations- religious versus secular, right versus left, etc.

- I don't doubt that many ideas presented here, are things that can potentially be found in writings or speech of others in the past or present, phrased in a different way. That should be no problem, since my main goal in this is that which may be practically relevant. Even if I were quoting the entire text from someone else, I'd gladly present that here if I felt that it could be of use.

- There will be points mentioned here that can seem to be repetition of other points already mentioned. Sometimes they may be that, but usually there will be at least a slightly different perspective, or one or more added details.

- In the social and political climate of today, which is more like a brainless barking match, I frankly question whether there are even a handful of human beings that would both understand and also see relevance to ideas I'm presenting here. Yet, I think that such ideas are vital for the preservation of life on this planet- a fact that can either be addressed while there is still some amount of a cushion around, or it will suddenly become clear once it may be a bit too late.

Outline:

The USA returns to the U.K.

While other former British colonies have gained their independence through peaceful means, the USA still carries the fierce rebellious mentality that brought about their freedom- and it is often to a greatly exaggerated and nonsensical degree. The result is a country that lacks the dignity and human responsibility that the others have as an obvious default. It has also spread its "religion" of rebellion to the rest of the world. The glaring problem with such a mentality, is that eventually there is no one to rebel against anymore, which leaves a train car full of raving lunatics that are heading off a cliff. (How can today's America not be viewed as the Great Prostitute mentioned in the Book of Revelation?)

Other former European colonies return to their origins
On a purely voluntary basis, all former colonies under a given European country, may return to its particular roots- loosely or more fully.

The official religion of England changes to Roman Catholic
Today's Roman Catholic Church is not very different from the Church of England, but merely includes different leaders and figures. The Church of England has its roots in a squabble by a former king, several hundred years ago, over a divorce the Pope would not grant. It may be time to put all that aside, especially if there may be many other reasons and benefits to such a change.

The Roman Catholic Church adopts many of the reforms presented by the Protestant Reformers and others
These points can be found explained by countless authors, but the basic idea would be that the Roman Catholic Church should step down on statements and observances that have no clear Biblical basis. For example, veneration of the Virgin Mary, Papal infallibility, insistence on the true transubstantiation of the body and blood, and all other major elements that are of great contention with Protestants.

All Christians subscribe to a central authority as a single Catholic Church
The Protestant Reformers would probably be shocked and appalled at the state of Christianity today, with thousands of denominations all claiming to be the only true version of religion. Recall that the Israelites in the Old Testament at one point each "did what was right in their own eyes" (Judges 21:25), leading to an undesirable chaos that required the introduction of judges and leader-prophets, then kings. Martin Luther himself warned against taking his reforms to an extreme (see end of his book titled "Concerning Christian Liberty", 1520). Merely honestly reading about the early Church as it is described in the New Testament, one cannot help seeing that it is the Roman Catholic Church but in an ideal condition. Namely, there are central authorities, there is an order, and there is one Church. St. Paul often ridicules division, such as in 1 Corinthians 1:12-13: "One of you says 'I follow Paul'; another 'I follow Apollos'; another, 'I follow Cephas'; still another 'I follow Christ'. Is Christ divided?". Ideally, maybe the central authority should be based in Jerusalem, where it sat before the Roman destruction of the city.

Crosses, statues, images, paintings, etc., to be removed from all churches, and the nature of God and the Trinity to be more accurately articulated
From a sober judgment based on the New Testament and early Church Fathers, it would seem apparent that crosses, statues, paintings, and the like, have no place in a Church of God. Likewise, the Trinity as defined in the Bible and by the Church Fathers, is very much the same God that was worshipped before Christ- it is unfortunately not the version of God often encountered in modern Christianity. Not only could this improve the spiritual condition of participants in a prayer service, which would be the primary benefit and objective, but it may also open a door of peace with adherents of Islam, since Muhammad (PBUH) made it clear that his goal regarding the other Abrahamic religions was that they observe their religions properly.

All the beautiful art and architecture can certainly be appreciated, and it must be recognized how important of a role such things must have had in the lives of Christians throughout the ages past. Before removal and modification, such things can be expertly filmed in great detail using 3D filming methods, for preservation of those elements, in effect allowing future generations to visit and appreciate those wonders using the saved renderings. St. Paul recognized all contributions to the furtherance of the Gospel message, whether ideal or not: "The important thing is that in every way, whether from false motives or true, Christ is preached. And because of this I rejoice." (Philippians 1:18).

The ancient Roman Empire is reestablished, as is the Ottoman Empire, both governed by a reformed United Nations
The full Roman Empire is revived, and simultaneously the Ottoman Empire is also revived. The official religion of the Roman Empire will be the single Catholic Church, now compatible with Islam. The Ottoman Empire would include Islam as its religion. Some territories would need to be shared, such as modern day Turkey. Both empires would voluntarily submit to a reformed United Nations that has effectively removed bias against religion from their midst, and has drastically improved its operational efficiency.

Select countries and cities to be designated as exclusive to residents of a specific race
An average person today is not a "racist" in the modern sense of the word, and most people do not believe that their own race is innately truly superior to all other races. However, at the same time, an average person would not feel comfortable with the idea of their race simply disappearing overnight, or being replaced by a torrent of immigrants from elsewhere, effectively turning their race into a very mixed race. For simple peace of mind, it would seem reasonable that carefully selected geographical locations be assigned as an exclusive home for specific races. The method of selecting such territories should be based on true justice, with no hint of supremacy or the like. Today's world already has certain locations that tend to have a majority of a specific race, and it would probably make sense to simply select such locations when designating such areas. The rest can be designated as "melting pots". In a connected world of today, there needs to be such melting pots, and they already do exist, which makes the process more simple.

Each major religion should be provided a geographical location which it can claim as its own
As with race, quite a lot of religious people today are not hateful towards those of other religions- but they often do strongly believe in their own religion as being correct. To ease tensions, the world should designate in a fair manner, slices of areas that each religion can claim as theirs. Yet this must be done in a truly just and balanced manner, that does not imply superiority of one over the other.

Queer movements can be acceptable, within limits
It is doubtful that humanity will effectively eliminate those identifying themselves as "queer", either in gender or sexual orientation. But clearly there are many parts of society that find such identities to be harmful. Therefore, the rights of those identifying themselves in such ways, must be fully respected equally to all others. But society should not be encouraging such identities as being solutions to broader life issues, nor should there be pressure for children to adopt such identities. The focus of society needs to shift to something more of a religious nature, and something more enlightened, where such topics as gender and sexuality are not a prominent focus.

Rogue states need to be gently but firmly warned that their agendas will not produce desirable results

Rogue states, such as China, North Korea, Iran, Russia, and the like, must be reminded of the game of tic-tac-toe, that has no possibility for a winner. And that their quests will not bring the results they desire, but will simply cause purposeless destruction- possibly of a very large scale, which will include destruction to their own countries as well.

A "Universal Basic Income" should be implemented
Today's world can easily afford to provide a basic income to all human beings alive. Merely taxing the super wealthy at the same rate as all others, could possibly provide the bulk of funds for such a program. Capitalism has shown the benefit of competition, and the unique possibilities that arise when an individual feels an immediate risk to their basic sustenance. However, Capitalism on its own does not appear to have a long-term potential, as can be seen with the terrible problem of homelessness in many supposedly first-world countries at this very moment. Providing just enough for people to survive comfortably, can possibly still allow the creative juices that Capitalism produces, to continue to flow unabated. But it will also allow a modern citizen to be able to look themselves in the mirror, without having to pretend they never saw the shivering and starving homeless person on the street, as they just walked on by.

Generic IDs over traditional methods
It may be sensible for IDs to be based on a person's genes or the like, rather than based on their name and birth date and gender. Many people do not like disclosing their birth date. Many people today seem to be uncomfortable with being identified by their gender. And names can change and often aren't ideal means of identification. Additionally, if medicine advances to a point where a male age 100 looks, acts, and feels like an 18 year old non-binary person, it would be unreasonable to retain historical methods of categorizing people.

Eliminate puberty in children
If A.I. is properly developed to a point where it takes care of most areas of human life, it would not make sense for humans to have to undergo puberty. Teenhood with puberty is often a nightmare, and adults are often essentially dead people trying very hard to convince themselves and others that they are still alive.

Borg-like technology to replace food and drink
There is little reason for humans to remain bound to necessity for eating and drinking. Perhaps only need for an occasional "recharge" using electricity or sunlight, could be a good goal.

All fields of scientific research should return to being a branch of the Church
Traditionally, all scientific pursuits were under the Church. Most of the largest and most highly esteemed of modern universities, had their origins as centers of Christian study. The inventors or discoverers of most of the foundations of modern math and science, have been devout Christians. For example, the one credited as being the father of the modern study of genetics, was a Christian monk named Gregor Mendel. Names many would be familiar with in the field of mathematics, would be Blaise Pascal, Leonhard Euler, Gottfried Leibniz, and the like- all of whom were devout Christians.

The field of philosophy should return to the Church
The ancient philosophers were deeply religious people- Aristotle, Plato, and the like. Though they were not Christian. Once Christianity took over all of the pagan religions around it, the major philosophers were Christian. It was only relatively recently, that things in the field of philosophy took a turn away from the Church. For example, many would know the name Friedrich Nietzsche, as a 19th century philosopher who was very much against Christianity, claiming that "God is dead". Yet his philosophy was based on groundwork done by another philosopher named Soren Kierkegaard, who was a deeply devout Christian whose primary goal was to dig deeper into what he viewed as a more true and correct version of Christianity. There

were some contemporaries of Nietzsche, philosophers who lived at his time, that held religion in high esteem. One was named Ludwig Wittgenstein. It is fairly simple to correct all the detours made by the atheist philosophers, and there is no reason that should not be done properly, and that the field then return to its former home. (Many earlier opponents of Christianity were actually strong believers in a God, but didn't like the complexities presented by the Bible. One example was an outspoken critic of Christianity, a philosopher named Voltaire, who famously stated in the year 1776, that by 100 years after his death, the Bible will be a museum piece. Of course that didn't actually happen at all. It's actually by far the best selling book of any book ever printed. A survey from 2021 found that close to 90% of households in the USA own at least one Bible, with most of those owning multiple copies.)

Aim for a pre-Babel language
Each human language of today, has developed based on a specific environment, and with a tendency in a certain direction. Some have more action-oriented viewpoints, others have more emotional. Some take for granted that time is not linear in a single direction- that things simply "are", while others are deeply bound to linear time. And there are countless other tangents along such lines. It would seem reasonable for humanity to aim for an ideal language that predates all the forking languages. Regardless of your view on religion, and whether you believe that there even ever was a single original language before all others, it would still be a sensible goal for all of humanity to not only speak one single language, but that the language be ideally in sync with both the human being and with this reality.

General topics:

Politics
- Extremist Liberals need to realize that they will not be able to merely wish away the Conservatives. This past U.S. presidential election has just proved that. If your desire is for equality and respect for all people, it will need to genuinely include *all* people- even those you disagree with.
- Conservatives and the Far Right should acknowledge that it has no long-term solutions for this world, much as the Far Left has no viable solutions. Both can be general forces, but neither can truly take the helm on its own. Anyone with a level head would agree with such a view.
- Post War Europe has had to stand in the corner, like a child punished on a "time out", which certainly seemed warranted as a breather to reevaluate the world's direction. The atrocities of Nazi Germany was just a final note in a long symphony of other European wars, and a generally questionable path of colonialism and the like. However, I don't believe they must remain in that position, nor should they have to permanently lay prostrate at the feet of (the Great Prostitute of) America. The USA has contributed greatly to the world, in ways that are unequalled at any time in known human history- from modern democracy, to science and technology, to art and music, and anything in between. But maybe the talented daughter of Herodias should not get her wishes fulfilled.

Religion
- Atheists and Agnostics should acknowledge that without religion this world is heading to its destruction. They may assert that religion itself is the culprit, which would be debatable, but it doesn't change the basic point. Therefore, would you like to conclude that this world was simply doomed from the start?
- Religious people in general would need to realize that other religions they disagree with, have no intention on simply closing up shop and leaving. And that the secular world has in fact excelled in many areas where religious circles have not performed very well. The point is

that no single religion or religious group will be able to live in their little isolated world indefinitely, excluding all others from their radar and from the list of things that exist.
- Abrahamic religions:
    - Islam should acknowledge that the Qur'an and Muhammad (PBUH) recognized the other two major monotheistic religions as being valid, provided that they are practiced properly.
    - Christianity should acknowledge that Jesus and the New Testament both recognized the validity of Judaism, provided it is practiced properly. And a true Christian will imitate Christ, and show love towards a Muslim, a fellow worshipper of the Creator of the universe.
    - Judaism is waiting for an unnamed Messiah. When that individual arrives, presumably he will clarify all things. In the meantime, all three Abrahamic religions are waiting and working toward the same Trumpet.
- Those trying to restore pagan religions and cultures over Christianity, would be best to imagine the reactions of their actual ancestors to such endeavors. Recall, it was their own ancestors that specifically chose Christianity over their pagan beliefs. You may claim that they made a mistake, but it would be pretty audacious to claim that you know their pagan beliefs better than they knew those, and that you can judge the decisions made by members of the highest tiers in their societies.
- If you believe that Christianity, or religion in general, is just fictitious myths, and is nothing more than fantasy that weak people or underdogs tend to find appealing- like an "International Losers Association" or the like, please realize that such religions did not survive thousands of years, through thick and thin, based on the weakest members of society finding them to be of interest. It was actually the top tiers in most societies, the highest of intellectuals, and the ones with most power, who are the reason religion exists today. Yes- true religion embraces the weak and the struggling. But it was the beauty of that fact which kept it alive, not the weak ones themselves.
- If the atheist philosophers of the recent past, had not died, I believe they would have inevitably realized that the very religion that was despised by them, in fact contains all the answers and solutions they've been vaguely getting closer to. In fact, I would say that if those religions are actually complete myths- which I don't think to be the case, that somehow they would need to be created afresh from scratch now, if humanity is to survive and thrive, and progress to a next stage.
- I would not deter any religious movement, or any social movement that feels it has something to offer. But there really needs to be attention paid to Jesus' statement, that the righteousness of His disciples must surpass that of the Pharisees (Matthew 5:20). You cannot preach that others should love their enemies, when you have a form of intense hatred living in you, in a manner that you will not find by most outside of your religion. Hating Evil is legitimate- and vital. Hating a human being that identifies themselves as something you disagree with, is not legitimate.
- Ultimately, there will be no need for religion, but religion is absolutely necessary in order to reach there. (See 1 Corinthians 15:24, and Hebrews 8:11 quoting Jeremiah 31:34.) A bike rider starts with training wheels, which are important, but doesn't keep them on. Yet if taken off prematurely, it may not leave a pretty picture. The parent decides when it is the right time.
- I think that if most monotheistic religions and denominations were followed properly, they each lead to a very wonderful place. They do have all the answers, and all the food needed. Such religions are part of God's supreme kindness.

Race
- It should generally be clear that no one today can confidently claim superiority of one race over another. Even in areas such as IQ, where there do seem to be measurable statistical differences, the social dynamics involved are far too complex to consider any conclusions on the topic as being worthy of the standards of a lab experiment. Additionally, for practical reasons, in a connected world of today it would not be sensible to view the world with a lens

that labels races based on such ideas. This isn't about forcing blindness about glaring facts. Nor is it about embracing mediocrity as an ideal. But it is a standard that Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. implied by his "dream" speech- he dreamt of a day when people would judge others by their character and not by their skin color. Notice that he did not advocate a mentality where no one judges anyone, or that human traits are ignored. The dream was for there to be the same judgment that is normal with all people, but that it not include skin color as a basis for determining such things. There can not exist a long-term future for a society where people interact with others on a daily basis, viewing some as human and equals, and viewing others as effectively nonhuman and without rights. Either the society must expel that which they deem to be foreign or undesirable, or some form of true respect and equality must be standard.

- White people should be recognized for their achievements, and for their right to exist and to enjoy the same things as anyone else. However, a notion of "supremacy" cannot be tolerated, both for practical reasons for all involved, and due to the error in such a perspective. Humanity has had world powers throughout its known history- the Egyptians, the Babylonians, the Romans, Asiatic races, and many others. The latest ones to hold the title of the dominant world power, has collectively been Northern and Southern Europeans. Such a position is like the Olympic torch- it passes from one population to another, and until this point in history, it has always been a vital part of life. Part of reaching and successfully retaining such a position, includes a necessity to view one's own race or culture as being superior to others. All races practice such "self pep talks". The problem is when it gets to your head, and you start to believe such things to be objective facts. A simple example to illustrate a bit more accurate of a perspective on this, can be to note that the common numerals used today throughout the world- 1234567890, are actually directly from Arabic. Roman Numerals were used before such numbers were adopted. Today, humanity is facing a difficult predicament: clearly, no single population can dominate the world any longer. Yet some form of coherent framework is still a necessity. Therefore, it would seem that ideally what is needed is for those identifying themselves as White, to be recognized as having rights like anyone else, and for society to adopt frameworks such as religion, to replace a dominant race or culture. But this can be more easily said than done. For the pillars of the world to simply let go and hope for the best, is not something they will find appealing. But it seems like the only long-term solution in fact is for something along those lines to occur, if humanity is to pass this stage.

- Black African people in the United States or other locations outside of Africa, should be respected as any other human beings. And it should be recognized that they were treated horribly in the past, through slavery and other such things. But it is probably very harmful to both them and all others, if they are encouraged to adopt a "gansta rap" style, and other such mentalities, as being what they stand for, and if they are viewed based on such mentalities. It would probably be far more respectful towards them, and helpful to all involved, if the tactic were changed. Instead of encouraging a stereotypical "Black" mentality of today, it should be taught clearly that historically in Africa, they had many very large and advanced cultures- albeit in a uniquely African style that was definitely not of a European nature, which included empathy, dignity, lots of work, and the like. They lived just fine for thousands of years with little to no interactions with "Whites". If such views became more common, then a lot of problems may be solved. Black Africans should therefore be demanded to act and behave with the same civility and standards as anyone else. It would be a major disservice to both them and to others, to lower the standards for them.

- Hispanics should likewise be respected as any human beings. It should be recognized that within the Anglo-Saxon population of the USA, there exists an often unconscious fear of Hispanics, due to a long history of wars between the British and the Spanish. There is also obviously a fear of losing the Anglo nature of the country. But such things should not justify discrimination. Yet, as with any others, they should be demanded to adhere to the same standards as everyone else.

- Native Americans and all other populations that have been badly mistreated and abused, should obviously be respected with the same rights as anyone else. However, it would probably be disrespectful to them to urge forms of compensation that border treating them like little girls. Any race that faced attacks or mistreatment, should certainly demand apologies and whatever relevant and practical solutions that seem reasonable. But it would violate their own dignity to demand more than that. In life, you win some and you lose some. And it can sometimes be oddly satisfying to swallow a failure with pride.
- The topic of Jews would not be simple to solve. Some would assert that it is no topic to discuss at all, as they are a very small minority. But it would seem that unless the topic is addressed in a satisfactory manner, this world can never find rest or peace. As with Black Africans and Hispanics and other minorities, they should be respected with the same rights and dignity as anyone else. And like the others, it should be demanded that they behave as decent citizens. As with other minorities, it is probably doing a big disservice to both them and to others, to urge a stereotypical Jewish mentality on them, or for them to adopt such a mentality as their identity. Namely, a mentality that urges mediocrity as an ideal, views females as being superior to males, urges a flipped version of inequality- a female dominated world, denies the importance of religion, and other such things. Instead, it may be best if they are recognized as being human like anyone else, and if they assert that as well. And therefore are subject to the same standards as anyone else, as well. Their long history of persecution must be recognized, and it must be recognized that it is therefore no small thing for them to simply interact with others as though on a level playing field. Sensitivity is definitely paramount. However, ulterior motives or hidden agendas on their part, cannot be tolerated. It may be next to impossible to demand that no forms at all of attempted manipulation be present in their behavior, due to their long history of persecution as a minority population. But what can be demanded is that their goals not be of a nefarious or sinister nature, and that they aren't trying to further an ethnocentric goal that would be destructive to society at large.
- Something needs to be made very clear: Second class citizens cannot exist. Either there is a consensus that a certain population must leave or remain isolated like former American Segregation, or *all* citizens must respect *all* other citizens as equally rightful players in their country. This may sound overly crude, but maybe if expressed in this way the idea can come across more clearly. A world where two people are in line at the bank, and the teller smiles at both, but views one as a fellow person, and for all intents and purposes denies that the other even exists, such a thing cannot remain for the long term.
- Often, as much as someone would like to offer equality to another, that is simply not possible. Equality must be something that exists originally, and that is expressed on the person's own terms. This is a part of this reality and cannot be changed, no matter how painful the result may be. In today's societies, sometimes painful compromises can be important for the sake of minorities or underdogs. I think it is important to keep this point in mind. When a minority or the like exercises such behaviors, causing disruptions and significant complications, it isn't a permanent condition, and it is something necessary. The others may simply need to learn to be temporary punching bags. (But this point needs to be coupled with other points mentioned, particularly a demand for decorum to be followed by all.)

Gender
- Gender equality may be a lofty ideal, but it must be enacted in a sensible way. In no way can merely a reverse version of what was perceived as the prior inequality, be something acceptable. A child is usually taught in kindergarten that "two wrongs don't make a right", and this should presumably apply across the board.
- It would seem that those trying to push for a lopsided and warped version of gender equality, where females are urged to act like fascists, or are otherwise encouraged to be free of all restraint and limits, are in fact harming the females in ways more than the males-

although the males certainly are harmed from such views as well. All elements in this reality seem to require some form of balance, and human gender is no different. Naturally, males balance the females, and the females balance the males. To claim that females should be given a license to free them from such things, would be a big disservice to the females themselves, and would obviously cause immeasurable difficulties for the males who are burdened with the consequences. For illustrative purposes, if there existed a "Men's Lib" in a truly equivalent style as the modern "Women's Lib", it would demand that males have a right to carry machine guns, and a right to mow down and kill people at random. Just because females aren't males, does not mean that they should have no social demands on them in the area of decorum and order and respect and the like.

- Traditional human masculinity is dead. But what should replace it? It should not be a watered down version of masculinity, nor should it be some form of macho arrogance. Males should not be neutered either, or turned into slaves of females. What is required is the ideal historical male that was always the goal but that was rarely found in practice. This is a male who is a strong gentleman and is essentially a saint, and is not weak or incapable in the slightest. What is needed is a generation of males that mostly resembles Jesus Christ, but can also resemble George Washington, Benjamin Franklin, Abraham Lincoln, Walter Disney, Nikola Tesla, Alexander Graham Bell, Alexander the Great, Napoleon Bonaparte, Aristotle, and others like them. Males that took for granted that their responsibility is to uphold, progress, develop, and solve life on this planet.

- Society today is faced with the results of trying to fix that which wasn't broken. Historical males were not always saints, but nor were the females. Someone decided that there exists an inequality, and the rest can be seen out your window. Males and females excel in different things, and to try and swap their roles, or to demand that humanity try and artificially recognize expertise in those who lack it, results in chaos and a severe slide downhill.

- Ideally, females should be expected to either live according to their traditional roles in human life, or to truly conform to whatever position they decide to adopt. It breaks society for there to exist a free-for-all mix and match game.

- There are certainly instances when a "single mom" can be a noble struggle- for example, if the spouse had died unexpectedly, or if the couple separated despite extreme effort to prevent that from happening. However, unfortunately today, many single mothers are the result of someone who seems to find it more convenient to break with their significant other, and thereby not have to deal with the inherent complications present in any such relationship. They seem to feel that they have a child now, so they do not need a partner. The biggest loser in all such situations, is the child. In plain language, it is called "child abuse". If it is a female child, she has a disproportionate burden of carrying her mother's emotional baggage. If it is a male child, he can often feel like he's being used as some form of a convenient replacement husband without the challenges that his mother would face with trying to get a real husband.

- For a male to mistreat a female for no reason, is something inexcusable. If you want to be a real male, you need to live by that rule. If you would like to gauge whether a given environment includes true masculinity or a defective version, you can look at the females. If they are crude, ugly, bossy, arrogant, and depressed and unhappy, then the males are probably clueless about what the word "masculinity" means. They are probably at a grade school level regarding such things, enjoying the fact that they have what the girls lack. If the females seem fit, pleasant, happy, friendly, cheerful, well-dressed, and the like, then something is in order with the version of masculinity in that environment. (Jesus Christ wasn't stupid when He said that to gain life you must first lose it. This is a general truth in many areas of life. Only the truly strong know how to be ideally sensitive.)

- I have nothing against a transgender individual, or one who identifies as nonbinary, and I believe anyone who treats such a person in any way differently than they would treat another human being, is committing an unconscionable act that denies the basic human rights they themselves take for granted. However, I also believe society must refocus and reform itself drastically. Because a society where all males feel forced to become Frankenstein females,

and all females feel forced to be lesbian anti-male fascists, or to become bearded women or to gender transition, is definitely not a great path forward.
- I personally have nothing against the feminine side of this reality. I'm very against illness and Evil.

Science/Philosophy
- There would appear to be nothing wrong with an attempt to master Artificial Intelligence and the like. But you cannot neglect the human side of things. Ancient philosophers and mathematicians have discovered unique numbers, such as the number three. Of course the Christian Trinity refers to that number as well. It would be best for a discussion to develop on the human side of such patterns, rather than using such math for solely practical uses to help the A.I. be better able to embody its essentially dead nihilistic nature. More clearly stated: Maybe the discussion should be about the following types of things, for example.
  - The difference between saying "I believe that my views are correct, and that yours are incorrect. And I do not believe that this reality is something subjective, and that everything is relative. Yet, if you believe that your views are correct and that mine are incorrect, I would fully support your right to hold your views, and to argue in favor of them." Versus saying "I believe that everyone should have a right to their opinions. I believe that this reality is something very subjective in its nature. And I believe that there are many paths to the same or to a similar destination. Let's just get along with each other and live in peace." (Many people would say "Yeah- such a distinction definitely exists. If only we can define such ideas more clearly." While others may say "What are you talking about? Those two statements are more or less the same thing.")
  - The difference between a child naturally and spontaneously offering to help an old person who mistakenly dropped a shopping bag full of groceries or other items, versus a religious person giving charity. (Many would claim that the former version of kindness is the only genuine type, and that the latter should be ignored as being laced with mediocrity or ulterior motives or the like. While others may opine that the latter version is the only relevant type, since it requires a conscious effort.)
  - One person may assert "Premarital and unmarried sex is so common in today's society, that it can no longer be considered as something wrong or immoral." Another may respond, saying "Are you kidding? The fact that it is so commonplace, only indicates the sheer level of moral depravity in today's society." (Clearly, once something is a norm, its status can in fact change. Yet seemingly, such a concept cannot apply for everything. The question therefore would be, what framework should be used to evaluate which norm can be acceptable, and which behavior would be considered as wrong regardless of how common it may be found.)
  - One person may claim "That was so brave to come out as a gay/queer person." Another may feel that it is not being brave but being morally corrupt.
  - There is an idea "Strong enough to bend." Some people may balk at such a concept, claiming that it is just a fancy way of describing "weak". (Clearly there is merit to both views. Presumably, as with many things, there can be more legitimate embodiments of that behavior, and less legitimate forms of it.)
  - Clearly, bad events or actions, can potentially lead to various positive results. Yet you definitely cannot belittle the negative nature of something that is considered to be bad. (The Biblical answer would probably be that a person should leave such things to God, since His mind is not our mind. But I think that a discussion should be brought up about this topic, to reach the limit of what the human can conclude about it.)
  - A truly religious path cannot marry a worldly path, and yet both must somehow coexist. As Jesus said "put God first, and the rest will be given to you as well". This is a topic that should be probed until it becomes clear that it cannot be understood. It cannot be understood, because the end result must in fact be some form of a marriage between

sacred and secular, but a person cannot choose to arrange the marriage. Yet if the topic is not understood to the limits of a human intellect, then it will inevitably cause various problems in a person's life- although it may not be clear that this topic is the source of whichever difficulties.

- For an adult to say a curse word on a rare occasion- for example if something had gone very wrong with what they were trying to accomplish, etc., is often considered to be relatively harmless, even if non-ideal. Yet for a child to say a curse word, regardless of the cause or circumstance, that would usually be considered as being completely unacceptable and wrong. Is the permit for the adult to utter such words simply due to the sheer low level of moral standards in society? Or is it that with a child, certain core disciplines are needed, and that only after such disciplines are in order, that as an adult later on they may be able to bend some rules without much of a consequence? (The core point here is this: once a person is mostly immune to evil, can they then go swimming in a black pond? Or is that self-deception? Is Good and Evil something relative, almost to the extremes of such guidelines? For example, can yesterday's evil usually turn into something ok for today, or are the Baptist "good and evil police" in the right on such things?)

- Protestantism shifted the focus to "saved by faith alone", and not by "works". Yet almost as quickly as it was born, there developed many different sides and views about what exactly true "faith" involves. Today, you will find a large number of competing views on that topic. Likewise, while Jesus tried to point out that the core of true religion is love for God and love for a neighbor, almost immediately after His ascension there began a process of defining who and what exactly is a "real" Christian. (The point in this is to notice that often one solution almost immediately breeds a similar problem or complication as the one it had just seemingly solved. If you read exchanges between Martin Luther and some of his opponents, this concept seems to pop out with prominence. While Luther was condemning their assertions that there can be a standard that is respected yet not always fully observed, Luther himself was all about something that was essentially the epitome of such an idea: justification by faith alone. Etc. The point in this is not at all about pointing out apparent contradictions by individuals, but to illustrate that there seems to be a standard nature to this reality, where patterns seem to repeat but in different styles that may at times make them indistinguishable from their counterparts.)

- "Living as a religious person is for your own benefit! You're not doing anyone a favor by doing so. I'm not trying to brainwash you." Versus, "If you're not doing it for the right reasons- because it is what should be done, and based on commands of a God, then what you are doing is worthless." (It is clear that a certain human standard can negate a need for certain forced religious ideas- those things are then natural and obvious. But is that a better position or a worse position? Is it better to specifically choose that which is deemed to be good, or is it better when the entire social framework has seemingly been upgraded so that such demands are seemingly no longer required? In more clear language: Is a saint in a New York ghetto, who spends their time trying to help drug addicts, a better person than someone living in a chic upper level of society in San Francisco, where a random stranger would offer to help another person without thinking twice, just based on a higher norm and standard? Some people would immediately say yes- the more utopia-like environment is superior. Others would balk at such an assertion, claiming that the supposedly upper class people are merely hiding their selfishness.)

- This is just an illustration of an idea. Who is a better religious person, someone born in religion, who did as they were taught, and remained pure and clean, or someone who was born outside of religion, or who left religion, and had a wild and sinful life, until doing a turnaround and becoming a fiercely and devoutly committed person to the given religion? Some may claim the former is more ideal, as they aren't stained, and may have deeper and more nuanced insights into religious type matters. Others may claim that the latter is more honest and more committed, and less likely to fall from a random unexpected shake

of the environment. Etc. Jesus Christ clearly pointed out the positive side of the latter, but He also admired those who "made themselves like eunuchs for the sake of the Kingdom", or the like.

- One person will assert that a certain standard exists, regardless of whether or not they themselves observe it or stand up to that level. Another will claim that the person is a hypocrite- how can you demand that others abide by a standard that you yourself do not embody or live by? (This idea is a cause of tension in a lot of areas of life. A simple example can be parents and children. The parents will often demand things of their children, that they themselves do not always stick to. Clearly there is some validity to both sides. You cannot demand a standard that you yourself do not live by. Yet, more objectively speaking, what a specific individual does or does not do, has next to nothing to do with a given standard.)
- One says "Religious people are the salt of the earth, and are the gems that hold society together." Another may say that religious people are selfish, detaching themselves from social norms, causing unwarranted waves in the water, and can be a harm to others. (Clearly, any person who tries to be separate from others, while living among others, will in some way potentially be "selfish". Because they are essentially living apart from the others. But maybe a police officer can be a good example for this topic. By default, a police officer can appear to be a threatening, haughty, arrogant person with a gun, claiming that they have more rights than all others. But if the officer is not a particularly sick person, that is a badly defective perspective- the officer is there to help others, and to protect society, etc.)
- Quite a lot of people are realizing that sides of life they previously had considered to be completely incorrect or that were their enemies, may in fact have some valid points. In fact, many people today tend to feel that most views and sides in this world have something important to contribute. Yet, many would not feel comfortable to settle with that conclusion. Oddly, a person often feels that although most sides have valid points, you cannot however live with a perspective that enjoys the concert of voices. (In other words, there exists two ways of viewing something almost identical. One finds no problem bathing with the crowd, and the other believes that each should go bathe on their own.)
- Many people are facing an odd fact: it seems that the ones they are shouting at, who are shouting back at them as well, may actually in a way somehow have identical viewpoints as themselves. Yet, clearly the two sides are not the same, right? (The core of the question would be whether all sides are in fact somehow the same. And if that is the case, is there some genuine point in somehow creating "sides"? Meaning, is destruction somehow a necessary thing? How can that be?)
- In this reality, there seems to be a clear pattern. Yet, the pattern is never enough to define something or to fully predict something. For example, a person may start to realize that there exists a level in life, where reason isn't a priority- such as in a position of responsibility or power or intuition, or will and desire, etc. And in your mind you may then try to see how such ideas can apply across the board. And while such ideas may in fact apply across the board, all the bazillion books written on the various life topics, are all necessary. In other words, the solution is apparently not enough. Or stated differently: oddly, maybe the answer is not the solution, although it is still mandatory.
- There exist within a person many well-known apparent contradictory elements. For example, good and evil, mind and body, will for life and some form of a will for death, etc. Philosophers discuss concepts like truth and non-truth/untruth, existence and nonexistence, being and nonbeing, or the popular "beyond good and evil", etc. Clearly, a form of paradox seems to be natural to this reality. Why is that? (Personally, I would avoid conclusions that turn an objective reality into a joke, since such views have directly or indirectly resulted in a society that has gone badly off track from a healthy life and future.)
- Many people have realized that often apparently negative events or circumstances can result in various positive benefits. Yet clearly that which is bad, in fact is bad. Christians sometimes say "hate the sin; love the sinner". This reality seems to be packed with

elements that sometimes seem to require an impossible surgeon's scalpel to be able to see clearly. The point goes further too- sometimes it can seem that things like sadness or suffering or darkness can themselves in some way provide an insight into a more true version and definition of life. Therefore, will you say that life is death and death is life? That somehow as St. Paul says "to die is gain"? This is just a general idea that indicates a topic to be considered.

- If a person tortures or kills a domesticated dog, they have legally committed a crime punishable by fines and/or imprisonment. Yet on a daily basis, millions of animals are being raised in grossly inhumane conditions, and then being slaughtered in a calculated manner. Likewise, people regularly go hunting, legally murdering living animals in cold blood. Various animal rights groups would assert that the meat industry, and hunting, are no different than criminal animal abuse. And although they may in fact have a valid point, clearly there does seem to be a difference, which is human necessity. The point here is not about whether or not humans should consume animal meat- I think that lab-grown meat would be the obvious solution, which is a method that is being actively developed. The point here is whether "out of sight and out of mind" is something legitimate. Can you eat a hamburger, and ignore where it came from, without being a hypocrite or an evil person? Clearly there is some legitimacy to "levels" and priorities in this life, if treated properly. A person should ideally aim to approach a home infestation of insects or critters in the most humane way possible, but if there does not appear to be an alternative that can satisfy the conscience, sometimes drastic measures are needed. When that is the case, the person should probably feel genuinely bad about that solution, and truly commit to aim for such solutions to never be the choice chosen. And if that is the approach, maybe the otherwise wrong behavior or choice can in some way be acceptable. Etc.
- A person may say "I would like to do such and such, but I would not like to be forced to do it." Why? You will be doing the exact same thing either way.
- One may say "It's black and white- there is no third option or something in between." Another may respond that it most definitely is not at all black and white. And a never-ending argument can ensue, with each absolutely certain that they are correct, and each not at all willing to budge from their position. (As with the other examples, the point here is not to try and figure out which view is correct, but to illustrate that there is a deeper pattern involved. A pattern that should ideally be identified and understood.

For those examples, is one view or side definitely and absolutely superior over the other? Or may both somehow be necessary? And if both are valid, then in what way can they legitimately coexist in a real way? The goal is not at all about propping up one over the other, and adding barks to a barking match. The point would be about trying to bring these types of ideas into a realm of discussion, so that actual rational words can be used, rather than it being about a perpetual and never-ending "me vs. you" contest. Because such ideas are at the core of many arguments in society- albeit often not in a fully conscious way, and they can in fact be dissected and discussed like human beings.

- Technology can certainly seem to be of potential benefit to this world, but without focusing on the human aspect of life, what exactly are the robots going to be caring for? Dead bodies? There should certainly be an aim for religion and philosophy to be more true and relevant to a given here and now, but such things cannot be discarded until the prophecy of St. Paul "then God will be all in all", is the real and present reality.
- The most common public A.I. today, is called "Generative A.I.". It often uses what is called a "Large Language Model", or "LLM". What that involves, is basically programming a certain "model" or pattern, which is then fed enormous amounts of text, such as encyclopedias, news or academic articles, and the like. It eventually makes patterns from all that, to a point where it can seem to understand all the content of the texts. In reality, however, it does not understand anything at all. It can merely mimic understanding. An example could be a monkey that watched a lot of human movies, and can imitate reactions and behaviors to what it sees in real life, based on similar behaviors it saw in movies. But it may have no idea at all what any of those behaviors mean. There are other projects that attempt to program

models that actually "think", but those aren't the majority of those that are commonly used today. It would appear that the latter type will be a necessity as the "LLM" type reaches its limits. But some major problems arise for the more brain-like type. Do you give it freedom to think as it sees fit? If yes, how can you guarantee that the end result will not be like the movie "Terminator"? If you do not give it such freedom, you are causing an artificial dead-end to its abilities. Therefore, I believe that the only path forward regarding such things, will need to involve solutions to philosophy and religion and physics, as a prerequisite. Once humanity knows where we are, why we're here, and where we are going, the rest are just simple pieces to a puzzle. Otherwise the end is a big mess and a lot of destruction. I think that the blind jump into the Industrial Revolution, and then the constant progress in technology, without having first solved the big questions in this life, were likewise not the ideal choices.

- It is probably beneficial for humanity to have aspirations of space flight and space exploration. But if the goal is to run away from yourself, I don't think there is anywhere in space that is far enough for such a purpose.
- An honest physicist today will acknowledge that physics cannot actually explain anything. That it has discovered quite a lot, but has never gotten past the statement of an ancient philosopher "The only thing I know, is that I know nothing". The very nature of scientific endeavor in this universe, involves trying to reverse engineer something, while sitting inside of a box. There will naturally be a limit to what can be discovered using such a method. Likewise, an honest evolutionary biologist will acknowledge that the problems with Charles Darwin's Theory of Evolution, aren't problems that can be solved by finding a "missing link". Rather, there would seem to exist fundamental problems with the entire concept that one species can change into another species. I don't think you can avoid concluding that some form of a religious type solution will be required.

Miscellaneous
- It seems that moving forward, progressively the choice will need to be about becoming a saint, or facing death. As things progress, such a choice will no longer be a vague distant idea that is reserved for Catholic monks, but something vital for the here and now of any human being.
- I believe that idealism is increasingly not something optional. Either you will be on the side of Good, or not. A small speck of something questionable in a person's mentality or behavior, will throw them to a side they would probably prefer to avoid.
- Jesus did imply that when He returns, there will be little true Faith left on this earth. But that is no reason to slack off from idealistic standards. Maybe it implied a period before a revival that takes place before His return, or maybe it will occur in cycles.
- Those who have successfully destroyed religion and purged it from many spheres of society, have in my view done the greatest disservice and evil action towards the general public. If a random depressed hopeless angry lost person is introduced to religion, and comes to know that previous generations had religion as a norm, they will often be confused and surprised at why they were never before taught these things- things that provide light to life, reason for living, a coherent framework of viewing this world, and hope for a future.
- A perspective of "the world revolves around me/us", and the nuisant disturbances to such a view are just a detail that needs to be eliminated, clearly is a dead-end. However wonderful and appealing such a viewpoint may seem. The alternative may seem like a complicated and daunting stormy day, but it is the reality that must be faced.
- I really wouldn't have much to say to those with intense exclusive cultural, racial, or religious views, who believe that the solution to life is simply about eliminating all others that aren't of their specific group or viewpoint. But I would hope they realize the reason why during what was called the "Cold War", both the former Soviet Union and the United States never pulled the trigger on their advanced nuclear weapons abilities. Both realized that they cannot eliminate the enemy without a very real risk for the same result on themselves.

- Today's world consists of large populations that are badly off track, but have their ancestors to blame. This is a very difficult circumstance to face, both for each group and for others. It is not simple for someone to realize that their large castle is made of ugly looking paper and has been built on unstable sand that will be easily swept away. And it is not easy to tell someone that your castle lacks a foundation, as they will instantly consider you to be an enemy. In Christianity, this is called the "Fallen" condition of humankind, after Adam's sin. And much like the account in the Bible, the blame for errors will naturally be passed from one to the next to the next.
- An antisemitic Europe is an evil and irrational Europe. You cannot callously ignore the position faced by those identified as Jewish, and not violate either your moral conscience or your logical mind. At the same time, it must be made clear that no human culture can ignore social norms or have motives that will lead the world to destruction. Namely, those identifying themselves as Jews cannot have ulterior motives or hidden agendas that have an ethnocentric basis. I believe that Christianity is a simple solution, as it has already 2,000 years ago addressed all such issues related to their place in the world.
- The approach to mental health services needs to be drastically altered. A starting point could be the following: the patient is viewed exactly like a medical patient, with their dignity, freedom, and respect. The mental health system is not a proxy arm of a social agenda, or some type of social police. Gender expectations, secular versus religious views, supposed political and cultural norms, and the like, should be entirely off the table, unless chosen as a topic of discussion by the patient. Such things may not be simple to embody, but I believe anything less than such a standard is an inexcusable violation of the patient. It should also be acknowledged that today's psychotropic medications, by and large, do not actually cure anything, and often cause terrible side effects that outweigh whatever positive benefits. Surely much research is being done to find alternative medications and solutions, but in the interim the mentioned fact needs to be made very clear to prospective patients. A brutally honest disclaimer may read as follows: "We can possibly offer you some mediocre crutches or bandaids, and you might end up with more broken bones than you walked in with". Figuratively speaking, it seems that not infrequently a person enters such services for treatment of a scratch, and leaves fully disabled on a well-cushioned wheelchair.
- To illustrate a clear and significant problem with today's mental health services, note this fact: an average otherwise "normal" person, will cringe at the thought of erroneously being pushed into a mental hospital as though they were mentally ill. You should try and dissect the idea yourself, but I'll provide some pointers. The individual knows that once inside such a hospital, to claim that you are fine will generally cause them to assume that the person is extra ill- since after all, they are probably in the hospital for a reason. To continue to insist that there is nothing wrong with you, will continue to increase a diagnosis that there is something extra wrong. On top of that, virtually any person, if not actually every person, has at least some small element not sorted out in their life, or some behavior or habit that may be deemed as a bit abnormal. And although in society at large most such elements are considered to be expected and not requiring extra attention, however if being probed by a mental health professional, and you insist that you are 100% fine, clearly you are lying, since nobody is 100% fine. Then there is the next step- the time spent in such a hospital, including arguments with the staff and just simply time outside of society, will in fact eventually cause various forms of disabilities and lack of capacity for a coherent life. In effect, the person will presumably end up "mentally ill" in some way, after being delayed in such conditions. Etc. I'm not inventing a new idea- this concept or fear is pretty well-known, and most people would relate to it if they allowed themselves to imagine such things. There are horror type movies and TV shows involving such a premise. To quote G.K. Chesterton on a related topic, referring to the idea of locking up those deemed to be mentally ill: "Every tramp who is sulk, every labourer who is shy, every rustic who is eccentric, can quite easily be brought under such conditions", he continued "as if one had a right to dragoon and enslave one's fellow citizens as a kind of chemical experiment". That was at a time before modern "psychiatric

hospitals". I don't know of a simple solution, but I believe that the status quo on this subject really needs to be examined. (Maybe a good starting point can be to make it brutally clear to everyone involved, that such services are medical services like any other, and that no human being ever has ownership over another. But again- people are people, and to demand that those in that profession embody such a mentality in an ideal manner, would be demanding that all people be saints.)

- A rat or a mouse or a snake that finds itself in the house of a human, probably doesn't belong there. But it will defend itself to the utmost extreme it knows how to do. And an average person would not find that behavior of theirs to be abnormal. Someone deemed to be mentally ill, should be recognized as having at least the same rights as those critters mentioned. Ideally, such a person should be viewed with a saintly empathy that fully sees the human being present. But as a bare minimum, no one should claim ownership over the person, merely because they seem to have a deficiency of some form- either a temporary deficiency or something more long-term. Etc.
- You must first actually care about and respect a person identifying themselves as queer in gender or sexuality, before daring to assert a suggestion about a better way of life. Otherwise you are infringing on the life of another human being with the same rights as yourself, in a disgustingly violating and unwarranted manner.
- White people need to realize that their ancestors have invaded countless lands, and made quite a lot of enemies. Naturally, the races they have ticked off, will eventually rebel and not tolerate their arrogance or domination.
- Human progress historically has *required* a lot of things that today would be considered as unacceptably wrong. Yet they were vital to get humanity to this point. This must be recognized. It was all wrong, yet it was necessary.
- Someone of European ancestry should have a right to identify themselves as either White, or from whichever European country or countries their ancestors originated from, or can ignore such things altogether, identifying themselves as simply human or a citizen of a given country they currently live within.
- 2,000+ years of Jewish persecution is no excuse to behave as they please. Two wrongs never make a right. The Holocaust in World War 2 was a horrific stain on humanity, which could be a positive lesson. But those promoting a bratty revenge mentality on their behalf, are destroying the lesson that humanity has learned. Instead, people start to wonder if maybe Hitler in fact was correct in his mission to eliminate them.
- Regarding Jewish people, it must be recognized that due to the fact of living as an oppressed minority for so long, they have mastered the interpersonal side of life, in a manner that most other cultures have not gotten anywhere near. On the flip side, it should be recognized by them, that the various cultures that they have historically lived within, had mastered the practical and masculine side to life, in a manner that they aren't very familiar with. By today, the lines regarding such things seems far less clear, but the basic point would be important to recognize.
- This is only possibly valid. If you inspect societies in today's world, you will find that after World War 2, most societies with a negligible Jewish population, have adopted a strongly feminist and Liberal stance. It is countries and locations of today with the most Jews, who still have a sense of a traditional position of males and masculinity. That is an odd observation. Perhaps Hitler actually would need the Jews to fight a feminist takeover of this world, since they know the feminine and underdog world as second nature- a world that is mostly foreign to most historical human cultures. It was an inevitability for humanity to eventually face the female. And at that point, they come crumbling down, because they don't know what hit them. The Jews know that wavelength in great depth. (But they would need to be willing and interested in promoting life and the healthy position of masculinity. Otherwise they are just the threat they were viewed as by the Nazi party during World War 2.) (The book of Revelation in the New Testament, seems to imply that 144,000 unmarried male

Christians that are ethnically Jewish, will have an important place/role during the End Times. Perhaps it is those who can purely guide the world to a Godly masculinity.)
- Most people identifying themselves as White, would find an ethnic Jew to be an equal and no different than anyone else- provided they have no ulterior motives or agenda, and behave with respect and dignity. This should perhaps be the demand on them- that if they live in foreign societies, they need to be good citizens like anyone else. They cannot disguise an agenda, as though it doesn't exist. Yet if they do want to represent some form of a Liberal agenda, they should do so in a transparent way that does not hide the agenda.
- All races and cultures that have faced injustices by others, such as Native Americans, Aboriginal Australians, etc., should certainly demand justice, and aim to undo the wrongs done. But there never is an excuse to behave in uncultured manners due to historical abuses. I wouldn't belittle harm done to them, but it harms them and everyone else, if their response to such injustices involves reactionary childish responses. I might suggest the following: Would such populations actually genuinely want to be treated with silk gloves like they are incapable creatures? Before the brutish Europeans arrived, most if not all indigenous populations regularly fought with each other, taking land, making treaties, violating treaties, etc., as Europeans were doing in other parts of the world. They clearly have successfully fought the colonial invaders to a great degree, since they still exist as distinct races, cultures, and populations. That is something to be proud of. But real life is actually real life, and now there are lots of other races living in their former lands. Efforts of compensation, and for methods to increase their dignity and self-respect, and of course efforts to further their physical wellbeing, should all be a top priority. But I believe many people are living in cloudy worlds where central important points that are in front of their eyes, aren't being noticed clearly or noticed at all.
- I think that all people should be recognized as having the ability to swim on a wavelength of cultures that aren't their own. Provided they actually can do so. For example, a Black African should be recognized as having the right and ability to be a White person with black skin, or alternatively, to be an African. A White person should have the right to be recognized for being in touch with the soul of music, or rhythm, and with the interpersonal world that Jews pride themselves in mastering, or alternatively, to remain in a more comfortable world they are accustomed with. A Jew should have the right to be recognized for living in and mastering the White world, if that is their choice, or alternatively, to identify as a Jew. As Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., preached- a person should be judged by their actual character, and mostly just by that. The only time race should come into the picture, is if the person is clearly embodying a threatening mentality that is based on race.
- It would seem that two otherwise decent and rational human beings, with one from a dominant racial group and the other being a minority or underdog, clash as follows:
  - The one in the upper position does not realize the humanity and functional mind and strength in the other. All they notice is an apparent attempt to destroy them. If putting themselves in the shoes of the other one, however, they may see things differently. It is a human being insisting on something that every person takes for granted as being the necessary starting point for anything in life- will it violate me or put me in second place? No healthy person will tolerate a long term condition as anything but on a top tier or with clear potential to reach such a position. They aren't trying to destroy you- they're trying to exercise something that you take for granted.
  - The one in an underdog position does not seem to realize what they're doing. That there exists a coherent framework in life, and that if it is violated or destroyed, that life collapses. That wavelength seems to be almost invisible to the one in such a position. Additionally, they often cannot accurately sense when someone in a privileged position is being fair and a good person, and when that is not the case. That can be an element completely hidden from their sight, and the other one is perplexed as to how it cannot be seen. I would suggest that someone in an underdog or minority position both recognize the importance to social decorum, and also try to more correctly identify when someone is being evil, and when that is entirely not the case at all.

- This should probably be more clearly stated: It is highly unlikely that any one race, religion, or culture, will become the only one to exist on this earth. Many sides in today's world seem to be blindly aiming for a world where only they exist. I don't think that will happen, though no one can say that for certain. However, even if one race or religion were to be all that existed on this earth, it will naturally eventually face all of life's complexities all over again. Thus, they simply pushed off dealing with problems innate to this life, and caused a mess in the process. Or, if it used cruel and unjust methods to eliminate all others, that will come back to bite them in a big way. In other words, if you feel that your agenda to rid the world of all the "nuisant" elements is the best or only goal possible, I would softly suggest that you re-evaluate. Because it would seem that the only answer to this life involves True religion, philosophy, science, and things that aren't related to instant coffee or a quick fix.
- I will not claim that all religions are equal or the same, or that all paths in life lead to the same place. It should be clear that only one Truth actually exists- that is the definition of the word "Truth". The question merely is what exactly is that Truth. I would assert that Christianity has the correct answer, but I think that Islam has the right historical approach towards others with different but almost equal viewpoints- that they are acceptable but not correct. Therefore, I would suggest that each Monotheistic religion adopt such a position- treat the others respectfully as "almost right", yet mistaken. And work towards a common goal of spreading the consciousness of the Creator of the universe to all of humanity.
- All grand social ideas should be on the table for open discussion, much as a peer-reviewed university theory. But underhanded attempts to redirect the direction of the topic, must not be tolerated at all. All the ideas mentioned here are "open source", so to speak, and should be debatable with no protest to opposing views. The goal should be about life and truth. As long as no guns are brought to the table. I am convinced that Truth must prevail, as long as decency and respect is the prevailing guideline. Truth, in fact, must be the only destination for a room full of people with noble and good intentions.
- In my view, extremist feminism has destroyed society, in ways harming females more than anyone else.
- A watered down pseudo-masculinity, often promoted these days as being the future, is by no means the answer to a supposed arrogant and controlling masculinity. The masculinity found in the New Testament, that should be the correct goal. A holy and well-balanced male. Not a half-male, a quarter male, or essentially a female with male organs.
- Homosexuality and queer movements, while they need not be promoted in a disproportionate way, should be recognized as balancing forces in the world. They point out flaws within the established norms. However, queers should realize that they will necessarily face various forms of discrimination and persecution, simply because they often have a "pass" that those identifying themselves as straight do not have. They do not need the opposite gender, or they blur the lines of gender. The day they become saints, they will generally no longer face such problems. And you can see this in society- the older established queers often fit in far better than young queers.
- Humanity should aim to care more about prisoners. Yes- they often have harmed others. But if you represent the side of Good, then you will try to see the pitiful conditions that led the person to the point of the behavior that brought them to incarceration, in addition to having pity for a victim of a crime. For example, if someone had a tendency towards pedophilia, you may want to inspect their own defective childhood. Or a murderer may have been raised with terribly abusive conditions. A thief may have been raised in the foster care system. Etc. In my view, if humanity masters this point- demanding justice but also truly recognizing the humanity of the criminal, they have reached close to the Holy Grail of Jesus' message of "Love your enemy".
- I think the expression "The road to Hell is paved with good intentions", is particularly applicable to many sides of society today. Attempts to right perceived wrongs, have often resulted in extremely upside down results. Today, it is often assumed that belittling a male is something completely acceptable, and is even a service to society. That indiscriminately worshipping females as overlords, and femininity as the master of the class, is the road to

life. Etc. But such things are a worse dead-end than the supposed unjust patriarchal culture it is trying to replace. If you want a real dead-end, continue down that track.

- The basic goal in all this, would be similar to asking an A.I. model to provide a solution so that this planet does not destroy itself within the next 5 to 20 years. Except that I don't believe current A.I. could provide such a solution. And as a human being who identifies with Christianity, it also includes my own proactive religious beliefs and motives, which I would not at all deny. Would you deny that you believe the sun exists in the sky? I believe the Son will come in the sky. Traditional human life as it has always been, is over. But doing a trust-fall into the hands of the Devil, or into a chaotic abyss, is obviously not a bright idea. What's needed is a world of saints, and saints-in-progress.

- If you think that this world is doing just fine, and all these ideas are irrelevant, please consider this quote from C.S. Lewis: "A world of nice people, content in their own niceness, looking no further, turned away from God, would be just as desperately in need of salvation as a miserable world—and might even be more difficult to save." If you think these ideas are too extreme, and will cause anger and a lot of friction, please, by all means, try and come up with an alternative solution. I don't think there exists a solution that will not cause at least some form of irritated reaction by some people. It may feel pleasant to leave the train alone to go where it goes, but it is heading off a cliff.

- You might say that such a proposal is more like the brother of Moses in the Bible, trying to find a way to prevent the people from slipping to the worst types of idolatry, when they gave up on waiting for him to descend from the mountain- which in fact was going to happen not long thereafter. I think Jesus is returning very soon, so this would be like a preparation for that, or a type of stopgap.

- Virtually nothing I'm mentioning here would be relevant if you are someone who either doesn't believe in Good and Evil, or believes that to be Evil is no problem. If you have those types of views, I would welcome you to read the ideas discussed here, but at this point I'm mostly not thinking of you as an audience when writing these things.

- I have nothing against females, and in no way will I claim that all human males throughout history have been saints. But there have been very functional and largely happy societies in the past, even with those "evil males" in charge, or what is commonly called a "patriarchal order". If you try to fix that which is not broken, you will often cause quite a lot of problems. Someone decided that society is unbalanced in the direction of males, so there is an attempt to make it unbalanced in the direction females. Even if it were in fact unbalanced previously, the opposite extreme clearly is no legitimate solution. And if it was not actually unbalanced previously, well then you are simply introducing chaos that will lead to destruction.

- It would seem that Evil as it has been in the past, is mostly nonexistent. But there is a lack of proper religion to present something for people to live by. Today's world may be more like just a lost world, and not an Evil world. I think that religion can set the world ablaze- in a good way, if it is practiced and understood properly. (This relates to the condition of human beings themselves. However, I think the Devil and the spiritual side of Darkness, in fact holds power on a huge amount of people and large segments of society. The people aren't Evil, just unfortunately trapped by that great enemy of life, somewhat like possessed puppets.)

- Anti-religious individuals are often not speaking for themselves, but are unconsciously a mouthpiece for others with hidden agendas. Often today, a person takes for granted that agnostic or even atheist views are the default truth. But those aren't actually their own ideas. They have been pushed to believe such things by select groups of people with their own motives. They have effectively been hypnotized into believing something as fact, that an honest physicist today would never dare claim. And have been doped into believing that a nihilistic lifestyle that philosophers have methodically concluded to be a dead-end, is the best way to live.

- Clearly there does exist a "White" race as something distinct from races that are not White. But I think it is ridiculous to attempt an ethnocentric identity in a Nazi style, in a manner that G.K. Chesterton referred to as "Hitler's Judaism". An Anglo person would not like to be viewed as an Italian. A Frenchman would feel insulted to be mistaken as a Brit. An Irish

person may not react pleasantly to being labeled as a German. A Swedish person may not like being called a Russian. Etc.

- Much like with Hitler and his Nazi party, the current U.S. Administration's attempts to boost the position of masculinity and supposed Conservative values, may very well badly backfire. They are shooting themselves in the leg, by trying to prop up a version of masculinity that history knows quite well to be faulty. Exploiting opportunity and power, can never provide intended long term results- unless the core principles can potentially stand on their own without using such methods.

- It is no light thing for one culture to be discussing details about another culture, to the face of the other culture. Since the starting point of the conversation already takes for granted that the perspective is from a foreign direction. No one in their right mind would be interested in discussing themselves, their views, or their life, from the point of view of a third party who doesn't have the same version of priorities as themselves. Yet somehow that may be required if this world is to survive and thrive. Efforts need to be made on all sides, to be both understanding and caring and sensitive, and respectful and committed to true Good. Any standard that is less than this, would probably potentially be a catalyst to spark a typical Apocalypse scene.

- I obviously cannot say this for certain, but it appears to me that stereotypical "Jewish" culture, is far more complex than being related to something genetic. For example, suppose someone identifying themselves as Jewish, found out that genetically they are not, or if someone identifying themselves as a proud White person, found out that genetically they are mostly or fully Jewish, clearly they are each capable of a tectonic shift in their life and mentality. I believe that a role of a chronic persecuted minority, may be something inevitable in any long term complex society or group of societies. In fact, any social group seems to usually develop its "less-than-equal" members, and its "more-than-equal" members, whether such facts are acknowledged or not. Which means that to address the topic will require a philosophical and/or religious approach. Although clearly the approach of 19th century philosophers on the topic, which appeared to be carelessly half-baked, did not produce acceptable results. (I am aware that they were aware of the nature of their philosophies, including the risks involved and the fact that their ideas were not at all fully developed. But apparently their yardstick to measure such things was not ideal.)

- The question of "White" identity, and the like, although important to be addressed, is unrelated to the only facet of Nazi ideology that had substance to support aggressive behavior. A threat to masculinity was their only legitimate complaint, and the German alliance with Italy and Japan- two countries not composed of the ideal race of Hitler, could make that point clear. The rest of their ideology, in my view, would be fundamentally faulty.

- Modern society definitely needed and needs a correction, but it's a shame that it feels a need to use ping-pong for such needs, by going to one extreme then its opposite, and repeat. There are better roads to take- ones that don't lead directly and in plain sight to the destruction of the world.

- Although religions like Buddhism can seem appealing, in my view, even if Christianity in its most authentic form were introduced at a time after the actual period when it was in fact introduced, it would be faulty. This reality demands a certain order, and the timing and style of religious beginnings can be just as important as the content. Therefore, I don't believe that a world full of Buddhists can ever actually climb to a point that doesn't simply crash and fall like the Tower of Babel. Even if they hold a more generic and inclusive key to enlightenment, unfortunately I don't believe such things can be an ultimate solution for this world. There had to be an Adam, and Abraham, an Egyptian Slavery, a Moses, and a Jesus Christ, at exactly the times they appeared. To phrase it differently: There is an irritating point in the mind of an atheist, which notes that you can't argue convincingly against a claim about an event that took place 2,000 years ago. And that even if the event was entirely fictional, the believer can forever insist on the belief, and you cannot ever provide enough evidence to discredit such a belief, even if the belief itself makes no sense. That it is simply the gap in time, and the fact that the focus is on people that aren't around at this time, that itself gives a platform for the

belief to stand on. Etc. I'm referring to that general idea here, but not from an atheist viewpoint. That such elements are vitally important, just as the actual content of the given faith. Etc.

- Many people seem to be aware that trying to force equality for human beings, is a noble idea, but that "equal" and "same" are two very different concepts. An apple and an orange may be equal, but they definitely are not the same. The feminine side of this reality often finds that concept to be difficult to accept- and may fiercely oppose it. But I think it is fact. While such a viewpoint should ideally be embodied in a saintly manner- not merely with the very necessary sensitivity, it nonetheless must be a top priority regardless. The world is comprised trillions or more of very different elements that may all be equal, but they most definitely are not the same.

- Almost anything I'm mentioning as fact, can obviously have contradictory views that sound very convincing. Without attempting to address the topic here, I would suggest that this is where philosophy and religion become very important. A "Universal Theory of Everything" must be the goal, and it has already been given to us if we pay attention. Etc. (Take the previous point regarding equality as an example. Many females will find the idea to be either blatantly incorrect, or evil, or just unacceptable. While a small minority would argue that in fact this reality functions the other way around- "equal but not the same" is uniquely a feminine view, and that males don't seem to be capable of seeing such nuances. Take it a step further, and a small minority of males may be aware of a form of "super enlightenment" where this concept takes on yet a far more nuanced form, which easily silences the last female view mentioned. Etc. Does the cycle go on forever? Only potentially forever? If it stops, where and when and why does it stop? Etc.)

- The feminine side of this reality actually wants and needs True masculinity and authentic males that aren't watered down mediocre versions of what they represent. Yet its role is to censor the opposite side if needed, and therefore it must claim to oppose it. The masculine side needs to be aware of this setup, otherwise to the dismay and loss of the females, they just smothered a male for no reason- why did he allow that? The male is perplexed and says "because you smothered me!", but the female expected the male not to succumb to her efforts. Etc. Again- ideally all males and females should be saints towards one another- which is obviously different than codependency, trying to be truly a Godly being that sees and cares about another in an equal manner as caring for themselves. However, nonetheless, the general idea mentioned here can be an important concept to be aware of. (In case this is misunderstood, by "masculinity", I don't have in mind necessarily large muscles or fit abs. I'm referring here to the soul of masculinity that bred the scientists, philosophers, and religious and political leaders in past history.)

- When I refer to "masculinity", that is different from "human male". A male may or may not represent ideal or true masculinity at a given moment. Masculinity is vital for life, while the human male is subject to the rules that govern any interaction between people, or the guidelines followed by any living being. Meaning, the male deserves respect and rights like anyone else, yet should be criticized and corrected as warranted. It merely happens to be, that the male is often far more capable of being aware of and representing true masculinity, than others. If he chooses to embrace such a focus. Etc. In a way, this is similar to the principle Jesus taught, about dying in order to live. Namely, the male must somewhat die as a male in order to best be capable of representing masculinity. Etc. (However, I am certainly not advocating turning males into slaves of society or of females. This is a delicate topic, because it can easily slide to such very much incorrect positions.)

- To illustrate my general point regarding masculinity and today's societies, please ask yourself the following: If any of the major human figures in history had instead been born today, do you think they would amount to anything? I believe they would probably not amount to much at all, or would be working a night shift at McDonald's and be viewed as weird (- no offense intended to those working there for that shift). Or they would be locked in an insane asylum. (Moses: you saw God in a bush? Jesus: you think you're actually God Himself? Philosophers: you're seeing between shadows in a cave, and others can't see it?

So you think there is something beyond good and evil- how about beyond eating and drinking and breathing? Scientists: you think you understand why an apple falls from a tree? Do you honestly think this world is a different shape than what everyone knows to be fact? Political leaders: you think God told you to conquer the whole world and force Greek culture on everyone? So you want to be a king, cool, but that doesn't happen anymore. Etc. The point in all this, is that today, a person of either gender is expected to be- for all intents and purposes- a passive needy infant for life. Nothing more, and nothing less. That's not very ideal.)

- Very often, fire can ideally be fought using water. But often as well, the expression "fight fire with fire" is mandatory, and is the only method to extinguish the flames. Those who feel that idealism alone should be sufficient to fight against Evil, definitely have a valid point, since if your ideals are ultimately correct and true, then they should naturally prevail. But it is rare to find a version of idealism that can truly stand on its own- although if it exists it should be highly valued. More often than not, however, at least some form of meeting ground is necessary in order to effectively battle that which is deemed to be a threat. Practically speaking, I very much appreciate those who hold that fighting today's evils can be done by simply standing your ground and not budging. But I fear that the ground that most of those with that viewpoint are standing on, is not firm enough to accomplish what they have in mind. It would seem that other methods are required. Etc. (This is a very old and well-known topic and debate, as most other points I've presented. But I'm focusing here on that which I feel to be practical and relevant at the moment.)

- Beyond Good and Evil, exists either God or death. Take your pick. Those who have tried to twist the picture so that an alternative is possible, have been proven wrong in their views. (The existentialist philosophers themselves who proposed such ideas, were well-aware that they present some major risks. I guess they didn't realize the extent of such risks, and where it would lead society- to World War 2, then to today's nihilistic world that is either going to self-destruct or rot, if left on its current path. Etc.)

- I think that Islam has some very valid and important points to make regarding Christianity and other religions, and about life in general. However, in my view, militant Islam should not be the world superpower, since they are only human, much as are Christians. There needs to be regulation and balance, so that even their religion itself can bear fruit that is truly acceptable to the God they worship. In my view, a reformed Christian Church, should be enough to satisfy their quest to spread Islam to Christians, if accurately interpreting what Islam represents. Etc.

- Please be aware that I am most definitely not proposing a "utopia" based on absolute male domination, with misogynistic masochism and the like as the guidelines. Rather, I'm advocating what was called "sanity" in earlier generations. But maybe a better description can be found in the Bible: "...in the image of God He created them... male and female He created them" (Genesis 1:27). Which may be an ideal perspective- that each human being was created as potentially male or female, much as God cannot be defined by gender. Godly creatures like angels but superior to angels, because they can in fact include gender or other forms of independence, while not compromising on their spiritual status. Etc. (A convenient way to understand this better can be a gender identity of "nonbinary male", or "nonbinary female". Effectively declaring that you are embodying a Godly condition. Although of course such terms can also potentially be entirely void of anything noble or saintly.) I also strongly believe that God is love. (At least as far as His creations are concerned. Whether or not they ever understand it or see it clearly. Because this reality was created ex-nihilo, never actually earning anything but given everything. That is a mind-boggling concept. And add to that the giving of His Son Jesus Christ to teach and as a sacrifice for the sins of humanity, and your jaw has to drop in awe. And on top of that, He gives the Holy Spirit as an ever-present Helper and Advocate. All this, to beings that naturally have no interest in the God that created them. Etc.)

- "...Yes- but does a God even exist?". If it were proven to you from every direction and beyond a shadow of a doubt that in fact the God of the Bible does exist, you still must

choose to believe. Please try and sort out that idea. A person claims that an atheist or agnostic perspective should be the default, but that choice is always needed for faith. Which means you will never find faith, because you deny legitimacy to something that requires choice. Why wouldn't it be more sensible to view things like your ancestors- that the default is whatever form of faith, be it in a God, Zeus, or any other deity? (I'm not trying to explain this here, only presenting general points.)

- Philippians 1:18 implies that preaching Christ out of sincere or insincere motives both produce the desired result of Christ being preached. And I think to a large degree, therefore, most preachers of Christ (- or "denominations") should be tolerated, even if one disagrees with their views. However, I believe that true faith requires a level of nuance often out of sight in the modern day: Romans 9:3 implies that true love and care for another, requires that a person should be willing to even sacrifice their own religious life for the sake of the other. This can seem to be paradoxical, but the basic point would be important. If that verse were pasted on large signs in many church circles of today, maybe some behaviors would be different. Instead of stoning the adulteress, maybe they would imitate Jesus on such things.

- I think that abortion of a child during pregnancy, is murder of a human being, and there isn't much room to argue on that. If a woman does not want to have a child, then don't get pregnant. If females are angry at biology, and why they should be vulnerable to carrying a human life inside them, then they may present their case to God, or to Charles Darwin, depending on what they believe in. I don't mean to sound cold, but I think the issue is very clear cut. If a human baby were being grown in an artificial environment, would anyone in their right mind claim that it is just fine to murder those babies?

- When discussing the topic of God and religion, I believe it is vital that the basis and framework of the discussion be accurately in view. That if in fact the God of the Bible exists, that means that every iota and every breath in this reality is beyond exact, and that a God is present through and through everything, at any given moment. That is not a light concept to digest. Why mention this? Because if the framework of discussion is based on abstract ideas, and hypotheses, and the like, as though discussing an academic topic, you are not being honest in the discussion. A skeptic may feel that asserting such a thing is trying to wiggle religion into a place it should not have unless proven to be correct. But I don't think that is the case. It is simply about establishing an accurate view on what is being discussed. Etc.

- Is it possible that this reality is some type of sadistic experiment or entertainment for an Evil god? Certainly. But indications would suggest that that is not the case. But if it were, there would never be any way to truly be certain about such a question, and certainly nothing a puny creature can do to change it. Etc. (In other words, best to consider it to be something like that which is described in the Bible, regardless of what the actuality may be. Philosophy has already concluded that suicide is the only true sensible course in the long run, if a God and religious ideas are not real. Etc. Although I would highly discourage a religious life path based merely on this last idea.)

- Unless religion or the like takes a central position in human society, A.I. that pampers life will probably lead to an impossible-to-handle culture of substance abuse of a magnitude that has not been seen in human history. The fringe religious and philosophical ideas will no longer be optional, if humanity is to survive. Questions like "What are we doing here?", will not be answerable by distracting attention to the weather, or by insisting that such questions cannot exist, simply because there are too many contradictory answers. Etc.

- I'm not supporting communism or socialism as the solution. But in the long run, a society would seem to need equivalent to anything positive found in communist or socialist setups. This could sound like an attempt to disguise those social structures for something else, but I don't believe that is the case. Social Security was set up after realizing such facts. A police officer can be thought of as a thug with a license to be a thug, but generally that would be an inaccurate description. If things like Social Security are set up properly (- which I don't believe is the case today), it should be as acceptably non-communism and non-socialism as

an elected official is not a dictator (- unless they are, as with the newly elected former U.S. president).

- I have no problem with individuals wishing to argue with me, or those who claim to disagree with anything I may mention- provided their intentions are sincere. Because I believe that there exists one Truth, and therefore, if all sides are aiming for the same goal, the goal will inevitably be reached.

- Females and femininity, is by no means the de-facto moral authority for males, any more than males are the default unchallengeable gods of earth. The male side can be gods, if they are representing God as they should be. And the female side can represent the moral Truths of this reality, if they are equally submitted to God as the males are. And each side can regulate the other on a limited as-needed basis. But no one on earth holds absolute positions, other than God Himself.

- In my view, if the Bible and Abrahamic religions are false- which I don't believe to be the case, then human society would need create exactly what is contained within those, if they wish to both survive and also progress to a new stage. I don't think secular solutions, or non monotheistic religions, will have the ability for either of those in the long run. In other words, for example, Jesus would literally need to be "invented" as a belief, with all the details written about Him, if humanity is interested in staying alive and possibly reaching a novel new level in life. Etc. You can possibly refer to a simulated model of a chemical reaction, or of a stellar event: there are stages, including "loud" ones and calm ones, and then there is an eerie stillness which can almost seem dead, before the final segment. And only after that is the new product produced. To insist on remaining at the "peaceful" stage only, where the process is active but not with great potential for success or failure, will result in a collapse of whatever the end goal was. Etc.

- Today's secular society is based on a culture of science that an honest scientist will agree is fundamentally faulty. Science in and of itself, can at most "reverse engineer" that which already exists. For there to be any type of comprehensive and accurate view of this reality, some form of philosophy and religion are a requirement. Yet somehow the "masses" are taught that science has all the answers, and that the few "minor" things it hasn't yet figured out, will certainly one day be solved as well. That they're the reliable authority to lean on, because they don't discriminate- all they deal with is objective facts. Etc. But that is an absurdly false perspective. They understand exactly nothing- they have information only. And many of those "minor" problems that haven't yet been solved, are things that by their very nature *cannot* be solved. It is a fantasy to believe otherwise. And it is a very dangerous fantasy too, as it creates the type of nihilistic society of today, which seems to be happily walking off a cliff, with blindfolds over their eyes. Etc. If you think this view is religious extremism, please present this idea to a truly honest scientist with a decent degree, such as a PhD in Physics. If they are not a religious person, but are honest, I think they will agree that the mentioned points are correct. (An example of this concept can be the following: a college student decides that since they spend so much time in class, they might as well build a house inside of the classroom, and make it their home. That would sound like a ridiculous idea, but it is exactly what the modern "culture of science" has tried to do. They assert that since they're occupied with trying to solve many things about the physical world, why not drag everyone into their lab, making it their homes? If or when the final picture is solved, then their labs will become obsolete- however useful they may have been for a given service to society at a given time. Etc. An example about the general idea can be an ant born in a box- there would be no way at all for it to be certain of where it is and what exists outside of the box, unless it went out of the box, or if something reliable outside of the box had told it such facts.)

- Modern society seems to teach that since something is complicated, therefore it should be discarded. 3,000 years of human thought and religion, actually has solved virtually all sides to this life. But it demands quite a lot of effort to understand what has been written, and often the conclusions demand difficult changes to one's own life, or paths that are not fully

defined. But those are no excuse- it is like "throwing the baby out with the bathwater". Ideally, all that has been presented by human thinkers and religious leaders, should be organized into something simple and coherent. But until that happens, there is no sense to choosing what is a dead-end road that is effectively death itself. It's like someone saying "I'm too lazy to peel the apple- I'm just gonna drink some poison instead". Etc.

- A peace based on compromise, can never work in the long term. Many people seem to be realizing that the following is the only real solution: "I'm pretty sure that my view is correct, and I don't see anything that would legitimately cast doubt on that conclusion. However, if you feel similar about your own view, I will respect that, and your right to such a viewpoint, as long as you respect my right to my viewpoint." (This can sound like what modern democracy is all about- but is it? Modern democracy seems to assert that essentially everyone's views are equal. What I'm suggesting is something different. It is saying that there exists only one Truth, and I believe that "my" truth is the correct one, but if you respect my right to my view, I will respect your right to a very different viewpoint that also claims to be the only truth. Etc.)

- If thousands of people stand around a large mountain, and repeatedly hit it with their hands, not much will probably be done to the mountain, except for relocation of a few pebbles. Likewise, all of science and technology has less than zero implications on conclusions about a God, and on religious ideas that stand very well on their own. As they say "it's apples and oranges"- science and religion are two different things. Science cannot possibly invalidate religion, because it functions on a different plane. Etc.

- As a blunt mental exercise relating to race in America, perhaps the following can be stated: You hate Blacks, Jews, and Hispanics. But your ancestors literally forcefully abducted Black Africans, and transported them here. The ancient Romans, your cultural ancestors, destroyed the Jewish homeland, and took the Jews as slaves, or otherwise dispersed them into other lands all over the world. After Europeans conquered an entire continent called America, which was already populated with many human populations, they cannot truly believe that life will simply be smooth sailing for the indefinite future. This life usually does not allow one to "have their cake and eat it too". My point here is not at all to belittle or accuse anyone of being defective or deficient. I'm trying to point out simple logic. Before hating the "nuisant" others around you, perhaps reflect on why they are there. Blacks did not sneak into your countries to destroy them. Jews did not willingly leave their homeland with a plan to take over the world. And Hispanics are just trying to survive and attempt to live the best life they can find or achieve- which any rational being would aim for. Etc.

- The reason I'm mentioning philosophy, although many may not be very familiar with the topics quoted, is because existentialist philosophies is the only reason the modern culture of goddess science can get away with ignoring the massive irreconcilable holes in the worldviews they try to push. Those philosophers have given them a license to twist and bend truth, or ignore logic entirely, for whatever ends they desire. While the general public assumes that they're getting nothing but facts and an obvious truth. Etc.

- Much as quantum physics and classical physics need each other in order to explain many behaviors of the physical world, so too does science in general require philosophy, and philosophy requires science as well. And both science and philosophy require religion. Yet true religion does not require the other fields, even if it may find them to be beneficial.

- This isn't an opinion, but just an observation: Many males strongly dislike lesbian females, because they are like a dead weight on a society that is held up, developed, and progressed primarily by males. Such females are often not contributors to society in any way beyond a basic job to support themselves, or other activity to further their own wellbeing. While they themselves often seem to wish that all males were dead or nonexistent, although they need the males for their survival.

- In math, if I say 1 + 1 = 7, you may feel that to be incorrect. If I present a completely different equation- 1 / 3 = 100, although the new equation looks very different, you may say that that is equally incorrect. I think likewise exists in many areas of life: an opposite is not necessarily a solution to something faulty. For example, for males, social behavior is positive- it implies

discipline and maybe even a saintly direction. In contrast, females are naturally social beings, and socialization on their part may be almost entirely void of anything noble. Likewise, for a female to have things "put together", may be something positive or a good goal for them. A male that seems to have things put together, may be the most selfish and evil person you'll ever meet. Etc. You must judge based on a given framework. And I think modern society is on the one hand very advanced in that way, but on the other hand has attempted to almost destroy the ability to see things this way at all, deceitfully painting neutral or negative attributes as being positive when they are not that at all. Etc.

- The Abrahamic religions of Christianity, Islam, and Judaism, most definitely did not invent God. All known human civilizations had extensive beliefs in various gods, and most also believed in one God over all the others. On the other hand, the Abrahamic religions aren't religions in the ordinary sense of a set of beliefs and practices. They audaciously claim to report on objective facts about the history of this world, and its purpose. Those religions insist that they are not creating something new, and claim to be the true authentic heritage of all humanity. Therefore, to proselytize to pagan tribes, or to established societies, is not an infringement on their dignity or ethnic history and pride. It's like trying to return to them a lost item. The message is a rightful inheritance of all of humankind.

- I think that a revolutionary from any point in human history, would today be locked in an insane asylum instead of influencing the direction of human life on this earth. After all, isn't a person just a physical body that needs food, shelter, and an antidepressant? Why make a ruckus? We're happily walking off our cliff- live and let live.

- I mention philosophers from the past few hundred years, because I think they were significant contributors to the mess of today. Even if most people have never heard their names, they planted the seeds for a generation that is happily walking to its suicide.

- Regarding World War 2, Adolf Hitler obviously did not invent masculinity, nor was he remotely the first to discover its importance. Many people were actively aware of the looming threat from Liberalism, and other such potential problems for society. All he did was turn those ideas into something overly simplistic, and then tried to use a practical scapegoat to point at and eliminate. Etc. That was a cheap and twisted method of dealing with a very real issue that society had to face in a proper and healthy manner that led to life. Hitler's solution, in trying to claim existence of a perfect single race that was nonexistent and that was a figment of his imagination, and claiming that they are innately the answer to complex societal issues, while casting blame of the ills of society on another supposedly biological human race, was simply ludicrous. The reason he got away with it for a while, was since initially people weren't fully conscious of what he was about. Etc. But since he claimed to be a defender of the true Europe, and embodied a fiercely patriotic mentality, unfortunately his popular image has remained standing even until today. I think the cherry on top of the problem with him, was that he exploited the specific time in human history that was undergoing drastic change into a new era, and could claim to represent the coherent nature of all of life before the upcoming very volatile and chaotic period. But in reality, he did not represent the coherent nature of historical human life, since human life has always aimed for something more, and a future which may be difficult but necessary for a next step. Etc. The end result, is that today, some people have a romanticized image of that man, which is largely detached from facts of life. Etc.

- Those identifying with a stereotypical Jewish culture, need to realize that the whole world is not necessarily purely Evil by disliking them or feeling uncomfortable around them. Because as with Pharaoh and Haman in the Bible, it is felt that they pose a potential physical or social threat to societies they may live in. To claim a permanently separate identity from all others, as a default, will naturally cause tensions. I think it is important for them to realize that. Such a point does not validate hatred or aggression towards them, but it can place the topic into a more accurate light. In my mind, the only solution for such a dynamic is that all sides proactively endeavor to be and act according to what is Good and right. But some degree of tension would seem to be inevitable. If a patch of sunflowers were planted and fenced within

a large elaborately beautiful rose garden, it may seem like an eyesore or an undesirable element. It would require a concerted effort to view it otherwise. Etc.

- Suppose Jesus Christ never existed, and that the Bible is a book of myths- something that I do not think is the case at all. Now suppose you were aiming to develop humans into something truly ideal. Would not reading about a figure like Jesus Christ be a sensible reference? If He never existed, then wouldn't it make sense to create Him, and aim for humans to reach the standard He preached and lived His life by? Etc. It's all there in the Bible, and there is 2,000 years of theology to pair with it. No need to reinvent the wheel. My point in this is, that any way you cut it, I believe it is the only rational path forward for humankind, to refer to religions like the major Monotheistic religions- even if you happen to question many of their more grand claims. Etc.

- I would not at all claim that all people have noble intentions all of the time, however I have seen some very severe harm caused by people who seemed unaware that anything was amiss. For example, I have seen those identifying themselves as Jewish, causing insurmountable turmoil and destruction in others that they claimed to be trying to help. And in my estimation, often it was genuinely an interest in helping. Likewise, I have seen those identifying themselves as "White", causing extreme internal anxiety and trauma in those identifying themselves as Jewish, without the slightest awareness that they were doing such a thing. I am just using two very pronounced examples, but such dynamics seem to exist across the board- be it with interactions involving Black African people, Hispanic people, Native Americans, Arabic people, or others. I will not try to present here a remedy for such misunderstandings, but something other than barking at each other may be warranted. Because if two people are not actually against each other, presumably some solution for peaceful coexistence can be reached. I assume. Etc.

- This could sound controversial, but it's something to consider. Perhaps the Nazi Holocaust of World War Two can benefit the world in two ways:
  1. It can be the obvious lesson it provided to humanity immediately after the war- that moral relativism is a very dangerous path. And that traditional versions of good and evil, and right and wrong, should not be treated lightly.
  2. Although I think the Nazi version of "White Supremacy" was simply delusional, and that an average White person today would probably feel that the Nazi views on such a thing are not something sensible or reasonable, etc., however maybe in some way what occurred then could be used as a limited and sensitively implied warning to any minority group that attempts to exploit the very required vulnerabilities in any free society. That a hidden agenda which involves deception and manipulation within a given broader society, will not be tolerated. Or in more clear language: if you are an enemy within, that cannot be acceptable, any way you cut it. Etc. Would you like to create another monster like the one that existed during World War 2?

- I think it needs to be very clear, that far right groups had little to no chance at gaining dominant positions in society, if not for two factors: 1) The Liberal Left becoming overly extremist, supporting a direction that is like walking the plank with your eyes closed. And 2) Christianity or some degree of a religious theme. Put differently, Adolf Hitler's views were clearly in the grave with him, permanently, unless the very Christianity he dismissed as being irrelevant, were integrated into such worldviews. I think this point needs to be more clearly recognized. Because there seems to be new (supposed) life to such movements, and if the supporters of such views aren't clear on this point, they are making big fools of themselves. They are like someone digging Hitler from the grave, and marching around displaying his dead body. It's all a dead-end without a Christian element. Etc. Since that is the case, I think anyone semi-rational with such worldviews, will realize that the solution for the world will need to be something very much on the religious side, and not related to the Nazi views. Etc.

- I have seen members of one physical human race, who were so thoroughly part of a culture of another race, that unless you saw their body and facial features, you would never have guessed that they were not a member of the race that is the majority for the given culture. I

think it is a futile endeavor to focus on I.Q. and race, or other differences that would create a hierarchy. Such views could have worked in history, and may even have in ways been beneficial- whether or not they had substance to them. But such views cannot work for a world that aims for a future with peace and unity. It seems to always come down to this: Maybe at this point in human life, if there is hope for a future, the goal of being a religious type saint is not optional. It is increasingly going to be very black and white- are you on the side of Light or on the side of Darkness? Etc.

- I don't think a German individual is innately any more evil than any other human being. However, what took place during World War 2, by a supposedly advanced first-world country of Germany, was so horrifically inexcusable, that I question whether they can ever again legitimately and acceptably lead in the world with any true military might. Put differently: Suppose someone accidentally killed the child of their neighbor, by running over the kid with their car. Even though it was an accident, I doubt they could ever truly be friends with that neighbor in the way that may have been possible if that incident had never occurred. People are responsible for their actions, one way or another. And the punishment may not always feel warranted. Etc.

- Personally, I can at times be tempted to question whether maybe in fact Adolf Hitler was right during World War 2, since the ones he accused of being the real threat to the world, have seemingly succeeded at progressively chipping away at masculinity and any coherent functional sanity, to leave us with the upside down dysfunctional world of today. ("Dysfunctional"- primarily on a human social level.) While that race may have felt it to be their only option as a long-term persecuted minority, it does not change the facts or end results. Etc. However, despite such apparently clear cause-and-effect logic, I think that reflection on broader reality will suggest that this is an overly simplistic conclusion, and one with no solution. Since it is highly questionable whether a specific race can be fully eliminated at this point in human history, and even if that somehow did succeed, presumably there would be other minorities or movements to develop, which would adopt a similar position in human society. Etc. And that is aside from the fact that the gender question, as with all philosophical and religious questions, needs direct addressing- it cannot be merely brushed to the side forever, simply since the guy has the car keys. Etc. Therefore, I think the only solution is religious or philosophical in nature. (This point would equally apply to the philosophies of the 19th century, about the way an underdog in society tries to sabotage the powers that be, in order to rise. Etc. Such views are equally overly simplistic, and provide no actual solutions. Etc.)

- Many males today can feel burning mad at what seems to be purely selfish females "getting away with murder". But maybe the problem isn't actually the females, since they are behaving naturally. The problem may be in the broader social setup. There is supposed to be natural regulation between people and genders, and for some misguided reasons, such things have been warped into something upside down and dysfunctional. I would not equate females with children directly, but children can be a good example to use as an illustration. If a child is acting up, and is wreaking havoc at home, usually the problem is with the parents and not with the child. Females naturally are not males. And to ignore that fact will just lead to today's mess. Etc.

- Despite what I think is obvious destruction to society caused by those identifying themselves as ethnically Jewish, I'm forced to conclude that they have also contributed to society in ways that possibly may otherwise never have occurred. Which sane male would entertain the idea that there is an actual real entire feminine side to life? They have introduced such ideas, and other fringe or outside-the-box concepts that an ordinary person may not have found any reason to consider. Etc. That said, often they have done so for motives that were non-ideal (- such as based on a desire for self-preservation, while claiming otherwise), or with sincere motives but with agendas that would simply destroy society (- such as a genuine desire to see justice in the world, but coming from a lopsided perspective that would actually destroy the world instead). Therefore, as concluded previously, I think some

type of clear guidelines are needed for this topic. They cannot be allowed to drag society to Hell, but their endeavors within society- although often with uncomfortable results- have produced some positives that need to be acknowledged. Etc.

- It should be acknowledged that Muslim mathematicians from long ago, were originators or discoverers of some mathematical concepts that are vital to today's A.I. It should also be clear that ancient Chinese mathematicians have contributed vital elements that are part of the foundation of modern math.

- If you think that religion is archaic and outdated, the Bible agrees with you. Hebrews 8:11, quoting Jeremiah 31:34, states "No longer will they teach their neighbor, or say to one another, 'Know the Lord,' because they will all know me, from the least of them to the greatest." Long before Jesus Christ arrived on the scene, Moses was once told that some people were prophesying without permission. Moses responded that he wished that all the Israelites would prophesy like that (Numbers 11:27-29). Clearly, the goal from the very start of the religion, was for a very real Divine consciousness in all. After Jesus ascended to Heaven, He sent the Spirit to dwell with and in His followers (Acts 2, Acts 10, and many other locations refer to the same thing). The difference between a modern atheist or an unbeliever, and the view of the Bible, is that the Bible believes that forms of religion are mandatory and very necessary in order to reach the desired destination. Those who feel that we've already reached the desired destination, or can reach it without religion, in my view, are badly mistaken. Religion has one more large segment of progress and development to offer to this world. Only after that, can the training wheels be removed. Etc. We want to get off the bus above ground, not while inside of a tunnel. Etc.

- Put bluntly: This world is facing a severe problem. Those identifying themselves as ethnically Jewish, have no will or intention on allowing their perceived enemies to triumph and remain intact. But their perceived enemies are most of the human world.
  - Those identifying themselves as ethnically White, have no interest or intention on giving up their position as the last human racial group in earth's history to claim the position of the world's dominant power.
  - Arabs, and others in the Middle East and Far East, have no interest or intention on compromising regarding their dignity or independence.
  - Likewise, virtually all societies today, have no interest or intention on stepping down from exactly where they view themselves to be. Etc.

Solution? Everyone needs to put in the little extra effort to see things a bit more clearly.
  - Those identifying themselves as Jews and those identifying themselves as Whites: You probably aren't going to eliminate all other humans on earth. Or each other.
  - All others: Life is fluid, and change is part of life. You aren't going to successfully force all others to respect your positions, if those positions are at odds with the rest of the world. Embrace the breath of life, which includes possibility for change. Etc.

- It should be realized that the atheist philosopher named Nietzsche, that many have accused of as having been inadvertently a significant factor in the eventual atrocities during World War 2, himself would probably not be considered to be an evil person. For example, he stated "Whoever fights monsters should see to it that in the process he does not become a monster." An evil person doesn't make such statements. I believe he was simply misguided or mistaken in many of his views, and on a more objective level- behaved irresponsibility by publishing half-baked ideas that could so drastically challenge traditional morality and social norms. Generally speaking, if you aim to change a very working lightbulb, you should have a fully functional second lightbulb in your other hand. To simply remove a working lightbulb and having nothing to replace it with, will leave darkness and that is all. Etc.

- I think it may be advantageous for it to be better explained to minorities living in countries with a European background, that an average person who identifies themselves as "White" is well-aware that conquest and domination over other races is no longer an option- that the limit regarding such things has been reached. However, due to the fact that European states

have been the last ones to be passed the "torch of life", so to speak, therefore an average person identifying themselves as "White" feels a responsibility to keep that torch held up and functional. They will not admit this idea, because that itself would compromise their position and need. Etc. In more simple language: An average White person has no interest in dominating others, and is aware that such a thing is no longer possible in any long-term functional way on this earth. However, since they have been the last world superpower on this earth, they need to retain their position, otherwise they themselves and everyone else collapses. But they cannot admit this fact, because that would harm their ability to fulfill the requirements that are needed for their position. Etc.

- This world is currently a living example of the parable of Jesus regarding the Evil spirits which returned to a clean and swept up house. A simple example can be this: A child turns 5, and tells its parents "I'm off on my own now- I'm all grown up!". When the parents object, the child asks "Am I not big now? I'm not 1, not 2, not 3, and not even 4!". The claims of the child are generally correct, but the conclusion is faulty. Turning 5 is a big milestone, but turning 10 is another one, turning 15 is another, 18, is another, 20, 40, 60, etc., are all further steps. This world has reached a greatly advanced stage by the late 18th century, and then launched forward at increasing speed. Until the 20th century discovered a whole new realm of science and technology and other advancements, leading to the present era. The problem is, the guiding force- the "parents"- has always been religion. And by no means has religion decided that it's ok for the child to be off on their own yet. The foundations of modern science- as well as philosophy and most other secular fields of study, have been developed by and large by monks in the Christian Church, or individuals with deeply religious views. Such people would be shocked that the future generations are picking up their contributions, and discarding the center of life. Religion had and has a full plan and manual for this life- almost like a map, and by no means has humanity reached the end of that manual yet. Etc. If you get off the bus at the wrong stop, you may have sabotaged whatever plans you had in mind. And if you got off in a dangerous ghetto at night, that's seriously not a great situation to find yourself in. Maybe humanity has tried to get off the bus early, due to ants in their pants. But I think it would be very beneficial to wait for the right stop. Etc.
- If you have atheist views, I would humbly suggest that you carefully and honestly study history, and the forces that dissolved religion, leading to today's secular societies. Because unfortunately, your views are not at all at the enlightened upper echelon of life, but are at the opposite end. The ones who were the pillars of society, were those with strong religious convictions. Elements that destroyed religion, were like cancerous viruses that had no substance of their own. Your Atheist platform is not a very pretty place, if viewed in full context of human history and of life. Etc.
- In today's world, it seems that it is expected for a person's brain to be the size of a pea (- and for their body to be the size of an elephant). And if that is found to not be the case, then there is pressure from every corner to change that.
- Maybe humanity's biggest lesson of the past few hundred years, is that just because you could, does not mean that you necessarily should. (For example, relating to things like plastic, gasoline, money, etc.)
- The Abrahamic religions aren't attempts by males to dominate females and put them into subservient positions. It also isn't an attempt by females or underdogs to manipulate their way to dominate society. Rather, all known human civilizations have had various forms of religion, and these Monotheistic religions happened to come out on top. Please do a little research and you will find this to be correct. If not for those religions, there would be a large array of very odd beliefs and religions, and the world would probably not be in the unified position it is in today. Also, the early Christians were often intellectuals of the highest caliber, on top tiers within ancient society. To try and dismiss those religions today, is like running a marathon and doing so well, that you say to yourself "why should I be dragging along these things called 'legs'?", and asking to have them amputated. Namely, it has been those religions that brought humanity to this point. And they have more to offer, and have complete

maps that go until far past where humanity is currently holding. It would be irrational to try and discard them at this point. Etc.

- I think modern religion should re-adjust itself a bit, to something more in sync with its true teachings regarding a person's own independence and capabilities. God in the Bible did command the first man to dominate earth- He did not say "you're an incapable rag that should feel permanently in need for others to lift you up". But true religion teaches something far more revolutionary: your greatest abilities and potential achievements, are less than nothing relative to the God that created and creates you. And proper priorities in life should urge a person to put things more into perspective. As Jesus taught- if you gain the whole world but lose your soul, what have you gained?

- This is more of a philosophical idea, but I think it's important to note. The concept of "non-truth", can only exist relative to "truth". And from what I have seen, most sides in this life- be it social/political or religious or anything else, often are very strongly based on a contrast with that which they disagree with or oppose. And I think that today's atheism, which is more just nihilism or insanity, is extremely dependent on the religious foundations of modern society, in order to function. But the proponents of today's secular social directions, will adamantly deny such an assertion. And I think they are denying something that is undeniable to anyone inspecting this world with any amount of honesty. Etc. In my view, those pushing for this world to continue on its current secular path, are like someone who put in significant effort to acquire enough funds to purchase a car, and then decides that since they have the car, they don't need fuel for it. But part of owning a car involves a need for some form of fuel for it. Etc. Society has reached this point based on religion, and I don't believe anyone can honestly argue with that fact. Yet there is a tendency to think that religion is no longer needed. What you'll end up with, is a car permanently parked in a garage, or a car breakdown in the middle of nowhere. Etc.

- A million books can be written to try and inspect and solve all aspects to today's societies. And I suppose that may actually be necessary. However, my point here is about trying to focus on the more core issues. For example, if there is a problem with a water supply, it would be sensible to try and go as far upstream as you can, to more of a source, and inspect that area. Etc.

- Contrary to what modern philosophy and modern culture would like to assert, I think that a focus on Good and Evil is actually the most enlightened core to this reality. I think that a person contemplating life for a thousand years, may eventually conclude that not only is a framework of Good and Evil the only solution for a sustainable existence of life, but that it's virtually all that is in the domain of choice of a created being. Etc.

- I think that the stereotypical loud criminal type Black mentality, is simply picking on a deep wound that developed starting from slavery in the USA, and the clash of cultures between the Africans and the Europeans. Such a history will naturally result in such problems- but only in potential. However, that mentality does not have to become an identity. And I think that those trying to push for acceptance of such mentalities as being a noble ideal, are in ways harming Black people more than anyone else. If your goal is justice and equality, then you should demand that the receiving end of your "empathy" also have the dignity and respect of other human beings. Which will require them to deserve such things. Etc. In other words, you are not even following your supposed idol Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., who had the sense enough to demand justice based on "character". What he was promoting was very different than the form of "equality" being promoted today. What he was demanding was that a person be judged not by their skin color. What he was NOT demanding was for White people to conveniently not judge Black people at all. Etc.

- In ways, those being hurt most by the destruction of the human male and of true masculinity, would be the average human female. The only ones "benefiting" from such destruction, would be some lesbian females with a particular love of Evil. Because without males in their natural positions and with access to their full abilities- including the ability to be a true "gentleman", females will naturally be violated to a point where they are left feeling like a

crude object. Their inner self which is cherished most, will be turned to stone. Etc. (A feminist will object, claiming that females do not need males in order to be a full person. Which may make sense, if you likewise claim that males do not need females in any way- which no feminist will accept. The point is, there does exist a necessary dynamic between genders. And trying to squash one out of the picture, will cause quite a lot of problems- and a very angry "fly".)

- I think many people today are realizing an odd reality: those they disagree with, or even their arch enemies, have contributed to society in important ways. Effectively, they are faced with the concept of "It was/is genuinely wrong, yet somehow it is/was necessary". I think it is such topics that need to be discussed. Along with topics such as "I believe that I'm truly correct, and that your view is fully incorrect, but I fully respect you and your right to your views", versus a mentality of moral relativism and Liberal style worldviews with a version of equality that attempts to erase the concept of the existence of an objective truth. Etc.

- I think that after World War 2, the Jews had won a major victory, contrary to what may be assumed if looking at the destruction. They had effectively proven that their enemies weren't fit to hold a gun- a supposedly modern advanced country had just committed an atrocity against an unarmed population, that humanity had never before witnessed. And the Jews generally retained their faith through it all, which would be a form of strength that a well-fed Nazi soldier could never come close to. But then they seemed to have sabotaged their victory to a large degree, by somewhat proving their enemies to have been correct. They went on to fiercely push for a feminine-dominant society. And they also switched to an aggressive and militant mentality, proving that their prior passive mentality was an error. In my view, their behavior in such things was a shame. If they truly believed in a God, then they should have persisted just 5 more minutes, cementing their victory over evil. But thankfully the New Testament already has a comprehensive solution for them and for their place in the world. If they turn to it.

- I think that Adolf Hitler had many valid points, but his general conclusions were badly erroneous. A dog may bark loudly that the room temperature is too hot, and it may have a valid point. But it has no solutions. Hitler noted that masculinity is a vital part of life, and that those identifying themselves as Jews tend to often have an agenda of propping up the feminine side of life. Those were very valid points. The rest of his views were completely insane, as was his activity during World War 2. Many others were already well-aware of those two points, but they had the sense enough to realize that this is a difficult topic to inspect, and that it will require philosophy and religion and the like, to solve. Or they had the humanity enough to realize that the issue needs to be addressed using sensitivity and care. Etc.

- Related to all of modern technology and the Industrial Revolution, all based on a Capitalist framework: My view would be in the camp of those who believe that humanity has jumped into the pool before 1) Learning how to swim, 2) Actually thoroughly evaluating whether or not they would like to jump in, 3) Testing the water to make sure it is not scalding hot or ice cold, and to make sure it is free of snakes and gators, 4) Understanding and planning what their long term goals are in such an endeavor, 5) Making sure their clothing and wallet are securely set on the side, 6) Having enough financial income or savings to allow them the luxury of such a recreational activity. Life often requires a leap of faith of sorts. And often it is more wise to navigate something only once actually facing and dealing with it. However, in this type of case, I believe the leap has been a blind jump without either the logic or faith enough to take such a leap.

- I don't know of a solution to the tensions between those identifying themselves as "Jewish", with a stereotypical Jewish agenda, versus many others who feel very threatened by such a population living in their midst. But maybe verbalizing the problem, can be a first step. On the one hand, in the long term, I don't believe it can be tolerable for there to exist a minority population with a deeply ethnocentric worldview, trying to covertly push an agenda that will harm others. But on the other hand, anyone who has had a wife or girlfriend who said or did

something that was clearly wrong, knows that it is not the behavior of a gentleman to correct her outright. Gentleness is mandatory, unless you want to cause a flood of tears, or a year-long battle over nonexistent problems that are made up daily, etc. I'm not comparing them to females per se, but maybe there can be a lesson to learn from this idea. With a minority population that has been so badly persecuted for such a long time, and with the fresh memory from World War 2, of being rounded up as citizens of their respective countries, and systematically slaughtered, etc., I don't believe that common notions of equality can apply when addressing issues related to them. It demands a unique level of sensitivity to address such issues. Etc. They cannot be given a license to destroy human society, but you cannot legitimately bark such a statement at them, and expect it to have any positive effect. Etc.

- I think that many people are at least in some way aware of this idea, but maybe it should be explained in simple terms. This is just an example of the general idea: A male may sometimes accuse a female that is trying to correct their behavior based on moral grounds, as having ulterior motives, or as trying to manipulate, or the like- and that accusation may or may not be correct. Likewise, a female may accuse a male that is trying to correct them based on functional necessity, as though they are trying to be dominating, or that they are being insensitive, or the like. And again- the accusation may or may not have substance to it. Etc. Likewise with life in general. Whether we like it or not, the existentialist philosophers of the 1800s and into the early 20th century, have had significant influence in nuanced elements of modern society, by trying to invalidate traditional moral and ethical values, and basically idealizing a form of nihilism. Today in particular, society is being plagued with an extreme version of polarized versions of life, which are often not only badly inaccurate but can be very harmful. Specifically, a healthy human being is aware that being kind, is very much not remotely in the same hemisphere as being weak. Yet there are waves in today's society claiming that there does not even exist such a thing as being "nice", or as "empathy", "caring", etc. That anyone who advocates such ideas, is either naive, or that they must have ulterior motives, and really just want to dominate. Etc. On the flip side, there are elements in society that seem to advocate a warped and upside down version of "equality", which is just a dead-end for human life. And that side would accuse an attempt to correct their clearly deceptive or misguided versions of "good", as an attempt to be dominating, or the like. My point here is this: There does exist "good" and "evil", and that should be clear. Evil is evil, and evil is not good. Likewise, there does exist concepts such as being "nice", "caring", "empathy", etc., and those ideas aren't delusional naivety, or deceptive covers for something else. Etc. And on the other side, similarly: There very clearly do exist versions of "equality" that have nothing at all to do with that word, but are either badly misguided versions of such ideas, or are disguises for other agendas. Those advocating the first point, are not weak or deceptive. And those who advocate the second point, aren't necessarily evil, or trying to dominate or the like. Etc. But I think maybe the philosophical sides of such things need to be more thoroughly addressed. Because although those philosophers may have had valid points, such as noting that there exists multiple versions of "good", however Jesus's approach would be mandatory: "You should have observed the latter, without neglecting the former". Namely, that yes- a spontaneous and childlike notion of empathy due to an intrinsic and natural connection with others, may be far more ideal than "regular" kindness, where one is bending themselves to cater to the welfare of another. However, to throw out the "regular" version in favor of a "better" version, creates an Adolf Hitler. In contrast, a correct embodiment of such ideas, creates a fertile ground for the return of Jesus Christ.

- It may be sensible, or even desirable, to discuss more ideal versions of goodness and kindness, than a compromise style that looks somewhat like a form of codependency. But sometimes that seemingly more mediocre version of kindness is very important. To try and discard the entire concept of Good and Evil as being something for weak or naive people, will lead to the following verse of the Bible "…and power was given to him… to take peace

from the earth, that they should kill one another…" (Revelation 6:4). (And I suspect it does not have in mind that the strong are killing the weak, or vice versa. It seems more to imply that the successful top tier of human power, are left killing each other. That is what must take place eventually, if the foundation is not very resolutely something of a true religious nature.) Buddhism and some Western philosophers, and in fact many religions, have proposed a form of empathy that is more childlike in its nature- something organic, fluid, and instinctive. But I think it is very risky business to remove and discard bottom steps of a ladder as you climb, especially if the ladder isn't stable and you don't even know where you are going. In other words: sometimes, an idea of forcing yourself to pull out your wallet to give some money to a person sitting on the sidewalk, should not be dismissed just because it isn't the ideal form of kindness. Aim for the ideal form, but don't throw out everything else. Etc.

- Modern democracy, in my view, has been merely one part of a broader practical functional solution. But has most definitely *not* been some type of panacea to cure all the world's ills, nor can it replace things like religion or other vital aspects to human life. I think that in a way, it has been almost like a bandaid or a crutch. Because a peaceful world composed of a million different elements that actually completely contradict and oppose each other, cannot possibly be a long-term solution. And if it did somehow succeed in the long-term, you would probably end up with a neutered and clueless human population, waiting around to die. Etc.

- Some people may claim that Christianity and other religions, are a codependent method for weak people to deal with this world. Like a type of "International Losers' Association". Others may strongly believe that Christianity and other religions represent an ultimate Truth, and the most desirable enlightenment a human can find. Clearly, there are many ways of embodying a religion. Yes- some may embody a codependent style of it, and use it as a coping mechanism to deal with life. But by no means does that type of usage define what the religion in fact is all about. Most religions would welcome someone using it in a less-than-ideal way, simply in an attempt to cope with life, since the religion worships a God who loves His creation- especially someone who is struggling. But it would be erroneous to pick out those using it in such a way, and to define the nature of the religion based on their behaviors. Etc. Such religions did not survive for 2,000+ years, through thick and thin, based on "weak" people clinging to it. It survived for so long because the top tiers of intellects and strength and commitment and principles, had decided that it was something of great importance. Etc. Proof? Today's top tiers of intellect and power, are irrationally vehemently against religion. And the result is a society that is largely atheist or agnostic- even those claiming to be religious. As St. Paul noted about the last generation before the return of Christ- they will have a form of spirituality, but will not actually believe in its power. Etc. An honest physicist today will admit that science has no answers. It has discovered quite a lot, but has never gotten past the philosophical statement "The only thing I know is that I know nothing". Likewise, an honest evolutionary scientist will admit that the holes in Darwin's Theory of Evolution, are not holes that can be solved by finding fossils of "missing links". Namely, there seems to be a fundamental problem with the whole theory, since a leap from one species to another does not seem to be possible. The only reason the Theory remains a default belief, is because society is adamant about insisting that science must have the answers. It is illogical. Etc.

- Protestants should realize that Martin Luther had a background of intense discipline in a monastery. This was no random drunk from a bar, who happened to realize that faith in Christ can save him. It was only after a very serious and extensive life as a monk, that he discovered a deeper truth to the nature of Christianity. Likewise, St. Paul had an extensive and disciplined background in the Pharisaic religion. And it was only after that, that he found a better Truth- or rather, that the Truth found/chose him. Etc. My point is not that all Christians must become monks or nuns, or that all Christians must adopt the Pharisaic religion. Rather, it is to point out that the individuals you rely on for your freedom to declare "saved by faith alone, and that faith is by grace alone", themselves were extremely

disciplined individuals, who did not abuse their freedom but took it very seriously. Etc. There can certainly be instant faith and instant salvation. The thief on the cross gained his true salvation in just one moment. But it needs to be realized that he was probably dead serious about his faith, as he was to be dead shortly thereafter. Etc.

- Among the things discovered by this generation, may be that the smallest compromise a person makes on something important, will cause their great great great grandchildren to be very angry at them. Likewise, even just innocent mistakes like misplaced ideals, can have very significant consequences. Etc. For example, religious compromises that previous generations have made, created a lot of angry young adults of today. Social ideals of a Liberal nature- trying to establish a reverse inequality rather than a true equality, have left the world in a mess. Etc. Also- that principles, and even basic sanity, need to be proactively and consciously preserved and defended. You can have fun and enjoy life, but you must be sure to preserve what is most important as the top priority. Etc. And although such a balance may seem difficult to imagine retaining successfully in the long term, there is no alternative except to become a full-time religious monk. And it probably is actually possible to retain that balance and standard in the long term, if effort is put into doing so. Some other things learned:
    - That a human male is not merely a person with a male organ and extra muscles. Rather, it is someone who feels responsible for solving the nature of this reality, and who is tasked as a pillar of life, to uphold and progress society. (Many forms of the human male have been proposed over the past several decades, that were in contradiction to the traditional version of a human male. But they all seem to end at the same place- either castration or a slave position. It would seem clear that the traditional male should not be modified, but only improved to the condition that was always the goal- that of a strong saint.)
    - Compromise on vital points leads to a chaotic mess. But likewise, there must be a form of compromise in areas where it is called for. (A person born today will readily agree with this. We have today the a train wreck that is the result of the wrong compromises in the wrong areas, and the wrong lack of compromise in the areas where compromise was called for.)
- It may boil down to this: Do you believe that life of earth is like bacteria growing on a moldy rock, which was doomed to die from the start? Or would it be more sensible to believe that there may be more to it all? I don't think that a natural course for life on earth has potential to continue indefinitely. It will either end in a big bang or a big mess. But either way, it would end. Even if humans populated other planets, I fear that this human race has no long-term potential. Which leaves the question mentioned: would you prefer to believe the Bible or Quran or the like, giving meaning and potential for life, or would you be fine acknowledging that this whole thing was never meant to last forever. Etc.
- It can certainly at some point seem as though most points mentioned here may be more easily stated as "Hitler was right"- focus on the root and something simple and all-encompassing. Etc. But I believe that would be a gross oversimplification. I think he conveniently ignored the fact that the world would be facing a major problem with Liberalism and extremist Feminism, unrelated to the ethnic group he blamed for promoting such mentalities and worldviews. The ones he accused of representing such positions, although they seem to in fact often be active on that side of the spectrum, however they are by no means the only players on that side. They would be more like a convenient scapegoat to blame for a looming mess that you can't find an answer to solving. Etc. For example, if a dog comes running up to its human, barking hysterically, claiming that there is an intruder on the property, it is simply a dog barking. The intruder may be a cat, or a bird, or some critter. Or it may be a thief. It could also be a drunk person looking for money to buy more booze or a bite to eat. Etc. It is up to the owner of the house to evaluate and how to handle the intrusion. The dog may be a convenient security alarm, but it can't call the police, can't take out a firearm to face the thief, and can't evaluate the situation accurately. Adolf Hitler was a

barking dog- he accurately identified that something was of danger to the world. The rest he got very wrong.

- I would like to put into words a view that I think many people share, in one way or another. An appeal of Neo-Nazism, and of Hitler and his political/social ideas, will probably never fully leave the human realm, as long as there is any conflict, discomfort, poverty, or any other deficiency in human society. It simply is an appealing panacea to turn to. However, I think it clearly is just a faulty sugar coated panacea with poison inside. G.K. Chesterton called it "Hitler's Judaism". It is an illusory quick fix that lacks true logic, and has no long term potential or actual answers to life, much like an extremist ethnocentric Jewish perspective. Etc.

- I think it is important to realize that the Roman Catholicism of the day when Martin Luther was active, was a very different creature from Roman Catholicism of today. At the time, there were some very significant abuses to power within the Church, and many other corruptions within the Church. Someone had to say or do something to heal God's house. However, since that time, the Roman Church has reformed itself in many very important ways. If Luther walked in today, I suspect he may very well have little to no objections to what is called "Catholic". And if he saw the thousands of denominations that resulted from the Reformation, I wonder if he may reconsider his actions. Etc.

- "Who needs a God, and artificial religion?" You may as well ask why an infant shouldn't be left on the curb- after all, hasn't it already been born? If a God exists, and humanity is in an infancy stage or even not yet born, then presumably it would be very sensible to require proper adherence to the Creator's will and plans. Etc.

- I think this is a rational explanation that many would agree with: Any person who has been in a position of power- be it as a parent, and older sibling, a boss at work, an entrepreneur, an elected official, a police officer, etc., or even just a newly graduated college student that has found independence, will probably acknowledge that the component of power or dominion over something, can in and of itself arouse quite a lot of abilities and capabilities, vision, clarity, etc. Humanity has had various cultures in its history, that have conquered and dominated most of the world, at given times and for specific durations. The Assyrians, the Babylonians, the Persians, the Egyptians, the Romans, the Germanic peoples from northern Europe, the Arabic people, the Turks, various Asian populations, and many others. The latest ones to hold the title of world domination, has been a European population comprised of northern Germanic tribes, and southern European peoples and their cultures, collectively labeled as "European". Part of the role of occupying such a position, involves the benefits mentioned above- vastly increased clarity, capability, etc. But such benefits do not automatically imply an innate superiority over all other races. The world had come to a point where no one really was going to be "owned" by anyone else anymore. And therefore the last world power has been the Europeans. It is vital for them to realize that a position of power can give the mentioned benefits, and that such things do not necessarily imply their own natural superiority over all others. I will not get into a debate on IQ and the like, but my point here is that I don't believe the playing field has ever been level enough and clean enough to accurately evaluate such things. There may in fact be differences in intelligence between various human races, but at this juncture in human history, the complications of society and its development, has made it virtually impossible to accurate determine such things. Any decent scientist will tell you that for an experiment to provide reliable results, the setup must be perfectly clear of bias. And such a setup has never yet existed on this planet for a purpose of evaluating race and intelligence. But even if there were in fact hardwired differences in IQ between human races, I don't believe the differences would be significant enough to warrant labeling some populations as being inferior or superior to others. Etc. That said, I think humanity is facing a big problem. Because the role of a dominant power that is "the" default power or structure or frame of reference, etc., seems to be an important component to life. Dictatorships didn't work, and neither did attempts at totalitarian setups.

Democracy and Capitalism seems to be a wonderful solution, but it does not appear to hold potential as a truly long-term effective solution on its own, since ultimately you are merely setting up guardrails for chaos. I'm repeatedly left concluding that the only solution is that which today's society views as absolutely out of the question: religion. If the world tried to replace the dominant power with religion, and if Europeans did too, maybe we can achieve an ideal coherent default framework that isn't one exclusive race or culture. Etc.

- Although I view Adolf Hitler's views on race to be pure insanity, however maybe the threat of such views hanging over a society, can in some way be of benefit. It basically tells the minority populations that while equality is a great ideal to aim for, any attempts to manipulate the majority populations towards some form of agenda, such as a reverse inequality, will not be tolerated. What is commonly called "racism" is something evil. But reverse racism is no better than the conventional version. Etc.

- It seems that often, someone trying to simply defend themselves and their right to live, choose, and be free, is accused of being "racist". This particularly applies to White people of European origin, but is definitely not a problem exclusive to them. Regarding White people of European origin, the problem is this: by defending themselves- which feels like a normal right, they are automatically also defending the history of Europe over the past 1,000 years or longer. And that history includes a lot of colonial activity, oppression, slave trading, wars, etc. They cannot simply detach their history from their existence, yet that history is incompatible with a world full of people that need to find a way to truly coexist. Etc. Similar would apply to many other races, but with a varying array of details. I'm forced to conclude, that any race with a history that smells or that involves a lot of blood, must swallow their pride, bite the bullet, and move on. Namely, it won't necessarily be all pleasant to try to fit into a world of people trying to coexist, but c'est la vie. Life will be good and will be fine, in my view. But it may face some very challenging and unpleasant conditions on a road to a better destination. Etc.

- People are being told that in order to be happy, they need to be truly free to be and do as they please- even if it causes harm to others. But I think a truly happy society can only exist when each person is so much of a decent human being, that they can be considered as a potential "pillar" of society. That if everything collapsed, they would not up and leave, they would not build a fort to defend only themselves, they would not mistreat others for the sake of their own survival, and they would not even agree to take charge of making sure everyone is cared for. Rather, they would live by the Christian teaching, which is found in some forms in other religions too- "do unto others as you would have them do unto you". On a practical level for any moment, that would involve simply shifting from a dog-eats-dog mentality, to one where you are aiming for a more truly balanced and caring society. You expect something from others- do you try to force it on them, maybe by implied threats or some types of attempt to dominate or manipulate, or do you attempt to be kind or decent, and urge the other one to try and see things on that level too. Etc.

- Stated simply: Without Christianity and the implied truths contained within it, I don't see how this human world can possibly transcend to a truly next level of existence, on its own and merely through a linear climb. It would probably either crash, self-destruct, or sink. Even a world full of Buddhists- which is doubtful to become a reality, in my view could never truly get humanity to a next level. As childish or simplistic as this may sound, it would seem that the only true path beyond the horizon, will be based on the God that created us, sent His Son Jesus Christ to redeem the world, and will send His Son again to finally transition this world to the next stage. Etc. (Philosophers have endlessly debated whether a truth is learned or is already in some way known beforehand. I think certain destinations simply cannot be reached by climbing a ladder. To climb onto a roof of a house, there must already exist a house, and a roof. To travel through outer space, you cannot climb a ladder and step into space. In the case of this world in general, I think that while humanity does need to do all it possibly can to progress and to sustain itself, however ultimately it may be dependent

on the same First Cause that got this world here with all its creatures and beings to begin with, to enact a closing sequence for this scene of the play. Etc. Such a view may sound borderline insane, but please try to honestly imagine a natural trajectory for this planet on its current course. Then, once you see the very slim chance of it surviving, let alone transcending to a truly next level of existence, dare to also allow yourself to honestly reflect on philosophical and religious ideas, and as they relate to practical reality. I don't think these ideas are far-fetched fantasies, but very rational and even vital truths. Etc.)

- Regarding race in America, I think a topic that needs to be reflected on, is the fact that any "functional totality" will usually require added elements. For example, a minority will usually not merely demand equality, but will aim for true independence as well. A majority dominant population will need to defend the functional side of society, whether it is fully just or not. Etc. Practically speaking, in a modern country with a majority population of European ancestry, you will have White people who cannot compromise on their position, since it is the life and function of the respective country. And you will have minorities who cannot settle for an "Animal Farm" version of equality- "hey, we're all equal, though of course the Whites have more of a say", etc. It would seem that there isn't really a clear solution to this problem, except for each side to focus on being as "good" as possible- saintly. And for each side to try and better understand the other side. Etc. But ultimately, I suppose some form of religious or philosophical clarity must be found. For example, maybe realizing that a solution may not be the sole goal- that there may be some sense or depth to lack of a solution. Such as discovering the love of a God, or noting that in this reality, the greatest pain is light and life, and the greatest limit is that which is unlimited, etc., indicating a deeper form of existence that isn't dependent on existing. Etc.

- Regardless of one's opinion about religion, the Bible seems to point out a very correct view on gender. Namely, that females are eternally jealous of males, yet need and want them. Which makes the females all the more upset or angry. Etc.

- Many people seem perplexed at why others don't allow them to just live in peace, wondering why they are being bothered. Etc. But I think it's important to realize that people alive today, have inherited this world from people of previous generations. And people of previous generations may have done many things that had a very questionable moral character to whatever was done. Their descendants- physical or cultural, have inherited the good, and all the bad as well, from those that preceded them. Etc. For example, your ancestors may have forcefully occupied the lands you now live on. And you wonder why those who lived there before your ancestors arrived, have negative feelings towards you. Or, your ancestors taught you that since you are an oppressed minority, anything is permissible for you. And you then wonder why others look down on your behavior. Etc. Or a major practical issue faced here in the USA, is White people of European descent, wondering why they are plagued with an aggressive and often angry or hostile Black African population. Yet of course the Black Africans never came here on their own, but were forcefully abducted as slaves by the ancestors of the white people of European descent. Etc. The point is not at all about a blame game. It is about recognizing the realities involved, and trying to iron out such things. We were given a mess, and it is our job to try and sort it out. It may not be simple to do, but it may be very necessary. (Phrased differently: "Why is everyone bothering me/us? Live and let live!", etc. You need to realize what came before you. Are you unjustly using the society you live in, without having an allegiance with it, simply because you were taught that your race has been persecuted for a long time? Or, are you living on the graves of societies your ancestors trampled over, stealing their lands? Did your ancestors forcefully enslave the ancestors of your neighbors? You really can't expect a peaceful existence, if you are somehow embodying an injustice caused to others. Etc. The minority doesn't need to compromise on its rights, and the majority or dominant population need not feel endlessly guilty for acts of their ancestors. But facts need to be recognized, and somehow sorted out so that there isn't a casual injustice caused to others. Etc. Without doing this, I think it would

be foolish to wonder why people are bothering you or look down on you or ridicule you. Etc.) (Again, you can use a convenient "shortcut", and turn to religion. The Biblical narrative puts all such things into a very clear picture: humanity has fallen due to the sin of Adam and Eve, and we are now in the long period of dealing with the results of that transgression, with an end destination of eternal life and a New Creation, according to God's plan. Etc. And therefore, in the interim, it would be expected to encounter innumerable complications in this life, often passed down to us from our ancestors. Etc.)

- I don't know how else to say this. Suppose Christianity didn't exist, if you inspected society, eventually you may conclude that something like Christianity needs to be *invented* from scratch, until it is perfectly like the Christianity that in fact does already exist. I see no future for human life, without such a thing. Etc. In my eyes, either the Abrahamic religions are true, or this planet is a moldy rock with bacteria living on it, and is doomed to rot or otherwise die. Etc. "Why not aim for a more enlightened version of religion, such as Buddhism?". Firstly, I don't think Buddhism is necessarily at all more "enlightened" than true Christianity. Second, if attempting to make a sober estimate about the chance of succeeding in developing an enlightened world based on Buddhism or another such style of religion, I think the chances are extremely slim that there could be true success at such an endeavor. Therefore, in my eyes, it's more of an observer's game at this point: is Christianity correct, and there may be hope for this world, or is it incorrect and there is little to no real long-term hope for this planet? Etc.

- It needs to be realized by minority populations living among others, that modern society did not materialize out of nowhere, while people were sitting around twiddling their thumbs. Rather, it took many intense wars and battles, dangerous travels across the globe, and a lot of otherwise questionable activities, such as slavery, revolutions, coups, etc., for humanity to reach the modern age. Therefore, you cannot discuss equality while neglecting to recognize that one segment of the population still feels responsible for holding up that which brought humanity to this point. Etc. Likewise, the majority population, or those in power, need to realize that what you are belittling in others, wondering why they don't just chill out and let things be, etc., are things that in your own lives would never remotely be "up for sale" or up for discussion. You do not realize how belittling and unfair it is to assert that two people walking down the same street, may include one who is recognized with dignity to have true freedom and a powerful say in life, and the other simply deserves a fake smile and not much more- if that. Etc. I think that unless both of these points become very clear to all parties involved, there will just be continued friction with no end in sight. (One side seemingly legitimately does not want to let go of the helm, lest the world it helped bring to this point, slip to oblivion. And the other side rightfully cannot tolerate being treated or viewed in a manner that a pet dog would not tolerate. Etc.)

- The point is that today it may be vital that real topics be discussed and dissected. Questions of philosophy and religion, may no longer be optional or remote theoretical topics. In the Old Testament of the Bible, Eve twisted God's words, adding "and may not touch the tree", which God never said. When you try to embody a slightly faulty version of an ideal, it can potentially cause significant problems. For example, for Christianity to try and push what may seem like mediocrity and a form of codependency as the solution to life, will naturally cause a negative reaction and response at some point. Getting larger crowds, and shouting louder, is not a long-term solution. What is needed is to identify true Good and Truth. Etc. (The Jesus who spoke of bringing fire to the world, probably did not have in mind a mass riot of milkshake-loving overweight people against the Wall Street businessmen. He probably had in mind something more along the lines of the awe that will naturally result when someone observes true Truth and convictions, and Love for a stranger. Etc.)

- A culture based on freedom as an ultimate end for itself, will breed the random mass shootings we have been witnessing, and a population that is disproportionately and heavily drugged with various psychiatric and other medications. Because freedom was never meant

to be a final destination. Independence is one thing, and an obsession with "freedom" is something very different. The former can be a reasonable demand, and the latter is an illness. Etc. (Many former imperial colonies have demanded their independence, but none has done so in the style of the USA. "Don't tell me what to do", can be a legitimate protest from a 20 year old child to a parent. But for a 50 year old to live by that motto, would be nuts.)

- The basic point regarding religion, is that it already has all the answers that are needed for this world and for this life. Therefore, it would make no sense to try and reinvent the wheel. For some reason, this world has decided to throw religion into the trash bin- at least genuine Faith and trust and the like. But it is now facing the effects of that, which is a very lost generation, where many people are trying to recreate some form of a coherent reality. Etc. Yet there is no reason to try and recreate what already has been thoroughly developed by human ancestors. It has been developed, analyzed, dissected, decorated, etc., and presented to us on a silver platter. Why on earth wouldn't we accept a solution to prevent the suicides and the drug addictions and the senseless mass murders, as well as the array conditions like loneliness, depression, anxiety, etc.- a solution that is sitting there well-prepared, asking and pleading with us to receive it?

- It must be recognized that Christianity has influenced and benefited human society to a significant degree, regardless of one's view of the nature of the religion itself. For example, before Christianity, it was common in the Roman Empire for unwanted babies to be killed or discarded in the streets. Those were effectively post-birth abortions, or in the best case scenario, a baby girl would be taken by a stranger to be raised and sold as a slave prostitute. There were also the famous Gladiator Games, where human beings would literally murder each other for the entertainment of the tens of thousands of onlookers sitting in the theater audience. While Christianity did not eliminate slavery entirely at the time it became a large religion, it did however drastically change the common view on slaves and how they should be treated. This fact can be seen by comparing letters of non-Christian Romans when referring to slaves, and letters of Christians when mentioning slaves. It took noble Christians living almost 2,000 years later, to fully eliminate slavery from being a norm among humans. But it did eventually happen. On the flip side, did Christianity weaken humanity? Did it cause the fall of the Roman Empire? That topic can be debated at length, but I strongly question whether the world would be the advanced and connected place it is today, if not for Christianity. Do you think that Columbus and others would have found the interest and nerve to travel the great distances they traveled by sea, if not for the Bible they carried with them.

- The Europe of today can seem so wonderful and amazing, but unfortunately it would seem to fit C.S. Lewis' statement about a Godless society: "A world of nice people, content in their own niceness, looking no further, turned away from God, would be just as desperately in need of salvation as a miserable world—and might even be more difficult to save." A continent that was once a land with depth and substance, seems to have scraped off the sandwich spread and thrown away the bread. To me it is just sad, and can make a person weep.

- As part of a temporary stopgap to address the trend of homelessness in the USA, which may be useful in other countries too, perhaps a program can be set up where a person who is determined to be at risk of homelessness is provided 3 month, then 6 month, and then 1 year's worth of rent or mortgage payments, with need to apply at each stage. If the individual has already lost their residence, then they would be provided with housing with the same 3 periods of application. If a person has been homeless already for a lengthy period, the same program can add 2 additional 1-year periods, since it is no small feat for such a person to get their bearing in society, finding a job or school or the like. Maybe a separate program can provide temporary "small houses" for those who remain incapable of supporting themselves after the other program has been used to the limit. The small house solution may provide incentive for the person to have a desire to upgrade their life, as soon as they have the ability to do so. (But these aren't true solutions, and are more like bandaids.

Such solutions will certainly help many people, but to address the massive scale of the problem, the root causes need to be addressed. Which in my view boils down to extremist Feminism and extremist Liberalism, as well as a world trying to purge itself of religion. If you are breaking the foundations of society, it would not be unexpected to witness such uncontrollable outcomes. Many people today can conveniently turn a blind eye, but that won't work once you are dealing with a scale of homelessness that overruns the streets like a plague of locusts. And when it includes your own children, your own brothers and sisters, your own friends, or yourself, you may reevaluate your previous view on this topic.)

- When it is said that God is love, it may be good to point out that it refers to the style of love of a parent. And when love is spoken about as an ideal, it is generally referring to a form of love that involves deep caring. It is not advocating a mushy hippie style mentality as being inherently superior to that of Wall Street. This can be proven by noticing God's discipline and other demands. He wants to breed humankind in His image- not a dependent child, not a passive mop, etc. And much as with a human parent, He is trying to teach His children the value of self-discipline, noble pursuits, conviction, dignity, correct moral values, etc. (Maybe you can even claim that the most painful and difficult things to understand in this reality, are like stereotypical "dad humor"- the father knows so well how perfect His plan is in the big picture, and how safe and well you actually are, that He can throw such things at a person with full confidence. Even if the "child" is at their wits end wondering what type of sadistic being is sitting up there, the Father is confident that at some point things will become clear.)

- I believe that ultimately there should be no point to have human leaders- elected or not. But things would need to be in a perfect order that doesn't exist yet at this time. There cannot be chaos as a result, nor the majority "democratically" dictating its will on others, etc. In the Old Testament, God was not happy that the people asked for a king. He gave them such leaders due to their weakness, but it would seem clear that He did not consider that condition to be ideal. St. Paul in the New Testament speaks of a future time when "God will be all in all", after Jesus Christ has subdued all human world powers. However, at this time, if Jesus does not step in tomorrow, I think that temporarily this world could greatly benefit from a very well organized governmental structure.

About:

Meaning of the website name: If society is hell-bent on running off a cliff of insanity, my aim is to humbly offer a small step of sanity that can be visited as desired.

_____

I urge a reader not to merely trust or distrust anything I say, but to evaluate it on their own, and research if needed. Then either agree, disagree, or come up with an alternative. My goal is not about me but about what I discuss. Please try to adhere to this guideline, and a lot of aggravation can be prevented for everyone involved.

I also do not have an agenda to prove that the world revolves around one race or religion or culture, over others. My goal is to be of potential benefit and assistance where needed or helpful. Therefore, if anything I say is determined to be incorrect, I fully retract such statements.

This may need to be added: On the flip side, please be clear that my viewpoint is not of a Liberal persuasion. I do not promote a mentality where a topic is considered to be up for endless discussion, with no intent on finding an actual conclusion, or with belief that no conclusion even exists. Nor is this intended to be purely of an academic style, in the sense of a topic remaining on an abstract theoretical wavelength, with practical implications being only a

distant possibility. The here and now exists, whether one likes it or not, and this website exists for that here and now.

———————————

The rants on this website may at times seem to ironically be more of an insane nature than particularly sane. But that is expected. If you are attempting to argue with a majority viewpoint, the lone voice will often sound like it's out of its mind.

———————————

In case this would need to be mentioned: I do not support the newly elected former U.S. president. While I may not have agreed with many views of the previous president, however this one will bring the world to the brink of destruction. In my opinion.

The ideas mentioned here may seem like merely another version of what the current U.S. Presidential Administration is trying to accomplish. But I would suggest that it is as different as night and day. If Jesus walked in on that leadership, would they welcome him? Would He feel comfortable there? That is highly doubtful. If the world were prepared according to the ideas listed above, in contrast, do you think the world will be in more of a ready condition for His return? All that would be needed would be to welcome Him to be the King He has always been.