

1.- “The Origin of the Universe” Second part. (The philosophical grounds)

The most important metaphysical finding I made in my philosophical research is that our Universe may be *connected* to an unknown and mysterious dimension; a space interlaced among us that we can't touch because it is made out of an insubstantial nature. From our earthly perspective such dimension appears to be like the same Nothingness, but I theoretically demonstrate that it has to be “there” anyway. Those who may dare to explore this subject matter in my book will find out that the concept “Not to be” doesn't necessarily means the opposite of the “To be”: the *Not to be* is a Universe which has to exist, no matter how we call it; scientists may speak of it as the Antimatter Universe, philosophers could say it is the ethereal Dimension while mystics, since very remote times, refer to it as the “Great Beyond”. I simply named it “The Field” or “The Spiritual Dimension”. The main idea is that the “To be” (our real Universe) and the “Not to be” (the “other” dimension) are part of the same Totality –in a Hegelian manner- and both of them complement each other because they are intimately interlaced or interposed; they are “parallel” universes *connected* among each other. When I say “connected” I pretend to explain that the Spiritual Dimension is infiltrated inside every existing particle of matter, either organic or inorganic; the point is that it does such contact at an *atomic level*, that is to say, each and every tiny little atom of the Universe is just like a porthole opened to “the Great Beyond”, or if we look at it in an inverse angle, we could use another analogy and say that the atoms, all atoms, may be like terminals connected to a unique Web server. The preceding sketch is just a philosophic conjecture, of course, but very consistent if we part from some premises proposed in my book.

(Translated from Spanish)

2. - The evolution of species. The Divine Connection

Important note: *In this article I won't discuss about the Natural Selection process, because it is an incontrovertible fact. Natural selection helps living beings to straighten their lineage taking the best natural qualities they already have. Instead, I will talk about Evolution, which is a very different issue.*

In this work I present some evidences to support the idea that the evolution of living beings is not caused precisely due to “the need to get adapted to environmental changes, in order to survive”, according to the Darwinism's assumptions. The later turns to be a controversial issue when we notice that *such adaptation need* should necessarily appear individually in each living creature at a certain moment, but if we

take into account that the genetic changes take hundreds of thousands of years to occur, then, we would be forced to infer that, somehow, every specimen should have to inherit such a “need” to his descendants in order to gradually keep evolving, generation after generation, until this lineage obtains certain physiological attribute to finally overcome the initial insufficiency. The later hypothesis turns to be even more complex when we find out that some beings seem to “envisage” the whole solution for their problems since the very beginning; sometimes it gives the impression that some specimens achieve a specific goal as if they would’ve foreseen the exact feature they needed to develop. As an example, let’s mention the famous Ant Bear; its long head and its huge tongue seem to have been constructed with the unique purpose of reaching the ants in their deep anthill. “First the anthill and then the bear’s extended head”, would say some Darwinists. **Here we could have a construction project for evolving purposes...**

...but the difficulty, of course, is that it is practically impossible to sustain that an irrational specimen could be able to conceive and to transmit a project to its descendants.

On the other hand, the Darwinism’s harder wing sustains that Evolution is the result of an indeterminate succession of **genetic accidents**, but such causality idea would be opposite to the same “adaptation need” concept -conceived by some more liberal Darwinists- since fortuitous mutations, perhaps, wouldn’t be able to accomplish certain special tasks requested by living beings in order to overcome challenging circumstances. Here it seems to be a disagreement among the same Darwinists that needs to be solved.

A good analogy to describe the classic Darwinist standpoint about genetic accidents is the following: *What would it happen, for example, if the famous Mona Lisa was employed just once to make a reproduction (by hand) and then, from the copy another one, and from that duplicate one more and so on, until there would be more than a million copies, each one of them based on the previous?* Darwinists would say that if we’d get to compare the last Mona Lisa’s reproduction with the original, after so many tiny mistakes they would not be identical at all. I couldn’t agree more; I also believe we would see two very different Mona Lisa’s; nevertheless, what I find very hard to accept from Darwinists is that after a million of erroneous transcriptions the Mona Lisa could end looking just like Marilyn Monroe in bikini. Experience shows us that after N number of mistakes it is quite possible that the last copy would rather be an undefined and blurry painting because errors and accidents can only bring chaos and disorder.

In the first part of my work I make a research of animals, insects and plants which have mimetic skills and the amazing ability to be like other specimens, but from a complete different kingdom: A fish that looks like a stone, flowers

appearing to be insects and insects which are easily mistaken for sprigs. The later examples don't seem to match with the idea that their evolutions would've been forced by environmental challenges that would have been in direct contact with their bodies, that is to say, we are not talking about a polar bear in the need to get a greaser and bolder skin to face freezing temperatures or about a leopard that might have required to get faster in order to catch a prey, not at all, in this case we are dealing with creatures that show a greater mysterious evolution. For instance, the *stick insect* (*baculum extrudentatum*) is an odd insect that looks just like a tiny dry bush's sprig which helps it go unnoticed by its predators. If we try to imagine this specimen's origin, we have to infer that in an earlier period it must've survived showing a different morphology than it does today (based on the idea everything evolves and supposing it didn't appear on earth just like it looks today) and, also, we must presume it had to practice an adequate *Modus Vivendi* back then, because of the simple deduction it was existing (no matter if its method to get away from predators might've been mediocre). The problem is to understand how and why the stick insect **decided** to transform itself in such amazing feature, because more than **feeling** a physiological need, it seems our insect picked up a wish, and more than a wish, a caprice: it wanted to be just like a specific sprig!

And this is not all; there are many other species that don't match with the Darwinist hypothesis either. Take as an example all those creatures capable to fly: did they develop such amazing wings because suddenly they found themselves facing a free falling and in the need to avoid crashing? Obviously not; they were creatures that originally had to remain on the ground surviving in one way or another, as any other specimen of the *first living era*, and then, in a given point in time –for a reason impossible to figure out- they started to fly. And here appears an interesting question: who on earth told them flying was possible anyway? Where did they get that crazy idea if nobody was flying yet? How did they develop such astonishing flying engineering, if there was not a model to copy? More over, why did they *envisage* that flying would be the solution for their “problems”, when being in surface was not necessarily a problem? Or did they do it just for fun? In any case, all appearances lead us to deduce the airborne beings' flying abilities was not provoked by any given adaptation need.

But let's get back to genetic mutations since the heart of the issue we are dealing with seems to be precisely in such phenomenon; the scientific literature describes it as follows:

“...genetic mutations are errors or mistakes which spontaneously occur during DNA replication, causing changes in the nucleotides' sequence”, (organic molecules known as Adenine, Guanine, Cytosine and Thiamine).

The later definition is essentially correct, nevertheless, most of the *spontaneous* mutations science is acquainted with are those that lead to cell degenerations, like cancer, but this happening should be interpreted as an *involution* or a *negative evolution*, more than anything else. Also, there have been detected mutations which not necessarily produce cell degenerations; scientist believe this sort of genetic changes are precisely the ones that could end in useful physiological transformations (positive evolution) however, the later has not been totally demonstrated yet because it would take thousands of years to document a natural evolution, and biology history has just begun.

Fortunately we have already distinguished two types of genetic changes:

1. - Negative mutations, which are degenerations or involutions.
2. – Positive mutations, which lead to a functional or benefic evolution.

Obviously we are interested in the study of positive mutations since thanks to them Nature has come to this wonderful and mysterious state.

For starters, positive mutations face a paradox very difficult to understand because it is necessary a succession of millions and millions of continuous genetic “accidents” to obtain, at last, a result that could not be taken as *an error or an accident in any possible way*. For example, the probabilities that a fish could develop wings by chance of genetic accidents are mathematically nil; nevertheless, it is a fact there exists a peculiar flying fish in the Caribbean Sea that does have wings and flies very well, and just for this reason we are forced to accept that such “mathematically nil probabilities” have to occur over and over again in one way or another.

But, then, how could we solve such a paradox?

At one hand we have the following premise:

Spontaneous and accidental genetic mutations can not produce functional evolving changes in living beings.

(Mathematical deduction)

However, in the other hand we have a second premise:

Positive genetic mutations lead to functional evolving changes in living beings.

(The evidence is that functional living beings exist)

In consequence, we can extract the following conclusion:

Positive genetic mutations can not be spontaneous or accidental.

This is precisely what I have been trying to explain since the beginning: The positive evolution of species can not happen by chance. However, the later statement contains a great complication because that which is not spontaneous or accidental has to be an intentional happening and therefore, *Intelligence* is required.

And here is where problems begin.

Can Evolution be the result of intelligent decisions? All appearances indicate it should be so, but where could we locate the source of such Intelligence?

The question is still in nucleotides; they are the ones that change their sequence, the ones that clearly make the great positive mutations (and the negative mutations as well). All evidences point the nucleotides as the only responsible for the phenomenon of Evolution, but it is clear they can not be intelligent in any possible way; something would have to direct them to provoke organized changes in Nature though. If there were some kind of organic intelligence involved in the matter, in any case it should be located somewhere above nucleotides in order to coordinate all of them; and even if above nucleotides is the living cell, there is no way to sustain organic intelligence could be found in an individual cell either: it would be absurd. Let's make it plain: it doesn't seem to be any sort of organic intelligence in tissues, organs and neither in any other part of a living body. The "organic intelligence" concept is a fallacy.

But intelligent influence is still necessary to understand positive Evolution; therefore, next I will present a revolutionary hypothesis:

The answer for the changes in DNA nucleotides' sequence could be found in the atoms.

A nucleotide, after all, is an organic molecule formed by a complex net of atomic links, which means it is made out of different atoms. The Guanine, for instance, has 5 carbon atoms, 5 of hydrogen and 5 of nitrogen plus one oxygen atom. What makes them get integrated specifically that way? It is undeniable atoms have to come out from some where to meet other atoms of different type in order to assemble new organic molecules; this kind of molecules are not everlasting, as inorganic can be. Based on the later, we might ask if the same atoms could be the ones in charge to transform the nucleotides' composition to change their entire nature; as for example, that a Guanine could turn to be a Thiamine (modifying instantly a DNA sequence). **Yes, I am conjecturing that organic molecules mutate themselves by loosing or gaining atoms.**

It is a fact that spontaneous excitation of atoms eventually happens and not only when they are exposed to heat or by the presence of any other sort of change/inducing agent. The previous reason makes me wonder if atoms might be able to freely move on by themselves, as if they were indeed intelligent, that is to say, that their *excitement* would not be precisely spontaneous and consequently, that they may pursue a determined plan. Certainly, nobody would give a single chance to the “intelligent/autonomous atoms” idea, because there are many logical reasons to conclude it is a bizarre suggestion; atomic particles, as molecules, could not be pointed as the “intellectual authors” of genetic evolution at all, period.

Nevertheless, I insist, into the frame of this hypothesis, organic molecules’ mutations would have to happen due to planned atomic shifts anyway, but if atoms are not intelligent at all, then, the question remains the same:

Where would it be located the intelligence that guides and puts in place the atoms?

Next, I’m going to complete a huge circle because at this point it’s necessary to recall the metaphysical theory of my first book, the one in which I propose that our material Universe has to be interlaced with another parallel Universe of spiritual nature (the Not Being Universe) and that both are linked by means of the atom. If it is accurate the idea that atomic particles are just like terminals connected to a unique universal web server, then, this server would be the one that directs the atoms in order to construct or modify nucleotides.

Am I speaking about a Universal Matrix? Sure I am. What I named “The Field” or the “Spiritual Dimension” in my first book can be conceived as a Universal Matrix as well; as a matter of fact, to make it easier, we can refer to it by the same old name we have used since consciousness exists: GOD.

Here I have to open a brief parenthesis to specify that the notion of God and the idea of the “Great Beyond” have historically been kept by mankind as two very different and separated concepts. My cosmogony, instead, assumes that both of them are exactly the same, so it may reach an important theological milestone: ***God, Himself, must be a dimension.*** (This standpoint will also be very helpful to understand ancient questions about the soul. See next chapter). In addition, it is clear to me my work could be placed into the catalog of so many creationist theories that already exist; nevertheless, I wouldn’t like to be mistaken as a religious creationist of any established trend. The fact is I’ve never believed God intervenes in the evolution of the Universe as if He were a bearded magician –seated on a distant cloud- making changes by means of a magic stick, not at all. I don’t perceive God as a separated

entity from us; on the contrary, I uphold He is among us because He is the Totality – in a Hegelian manner- and I firmly believe that the Almighty makes transformations in our reality from *inside*, touching our world’s most inner substance from His Dimension.

Certainly, it looks like a very simple solution to say that an intelligent Divinity is directing the Universe’s evolving changes by means of the atom, but in fact it isn’t that easy if we recall that this God/Spiritual Dimension nature has to be ethereal or insubstantial, which is equal to say He is like *nothing* (as explained at the beginning of this review). If we have an ethereal dimension impossible to “touch”, then, how it manages to make contact with the atoms of our material world? After all, there has to exist a shared linking point for both dimensions, that is to say, in some part of the atom must be infiltrated a terminal coming from the “Great Beyond”, or on the contrary, there should be inserted a component of the atom into the Spiritual Dimension in such a way that it may influence our Universe. Would it be possible to demonstrate some day this “Divine Connection” exists? Right here resides a great physical and metaphysical difficulty to be solved; the major of all mysteries.

The atom is in itself a whole universe, a very complex micro cosmos; so it will be necessary to make a detailed dissection of such tiny particle to search for that enigmatic contact point –the Divine Connection- where the two dimensions that form the Totality get intertwined. Wait for my next publication.

Suggestion: To better understand the previous review, it is likely to have knowledge of the philosophical grounds included in my published book “The Origin of the Universe”; in such way, the reader would get familiarized with my hypothesis about the characteristics and nature of the Divine Spiritual Dimension.

I recommend the E-book which is at very low price. If you buy it you would be helping me to sustain the expenses of this Web Site and you would be supporting me emotionally to keep on working and improving my literary work.

Your comments are welcome: [luis_oscar444@hotmail\(dot\)com](mailto:luis_oscar444@hotmail.com)

(Translated from Spanish)

3.- About the Soul, the Emotions and the Survival Instinct.

In this work I explore an issue enclosed in two magnificent questions made by T. S. Eliot:

***“Where is the wisdom we have lost in knowledge?
Where is the knowledge we have lost in information?”***

The human mind is a biological computer which originally had only one reason to exist: to provide our self-preservation; its wonderful functioning compensated our physical limitations because we were (and still are) weaker and vulnerable, compared to some other species. This organic computer we call mind, or brain, originally was subordinated to the survival instinct in order to keep a human being alive (by means of the immediate information provided by the five senses). Then, as millenniums of years went by, our biological computer developed a code we know as language (and after that the writing), which helped men to pass on the acquired knowledge to other human computers, achieving consequently an exponential data accumulation as it was transmitted from one generation to another.

It is a fatal mistake to believe our brain has biologically evolved in the past ten thousand years, because it isn't so; it has collected a lot of information; that much is true –especially nowadays when there are so many emitting fonts- but, organically, it is the same old natural computer we have had since thousand and thousand of years ago, in fact, it doesn't seem to be prepared to manage so much knowledge; its fragile and easy to get confused. It appears like if many natural human computers were lack of an efficient mechanism to help them identify a lie or a false data; certainly, it has a protecting device that leads the system to verify by its own senses all the incoming information –sometimes virulent- received from other biological computers (other persons) but, regrettably, that device seems to be turned off most of the time. Any clinical test can demonstrate the human mind is prone to accept and believe many data which is not even remotely based on reality; even those who show off having critical thinking skills some times are incapable to question their own religion or their political system, although they took this ideas from old generation computers that could have been wrong or maybe, that only retransmitted a false information they too received from an obsolete past. Above all, it is very hard to delete a program inserted in the childhood, when our mind is virgin and easily malleable (religions, for example, are powerful programs set in the early days and that's why not many persons change of creed when they grow old).

Nowadays the human computer is not fulfilling the original task it was created for and it is turning a real menace for human beings. The problem with the human mind is that it is going wild, just like it happened to “HAL 900”, the famous spaceship computer from Stanley Kubrick's movie “2001, Space Odyssey”. Let's remember this advanced central processing unit started to “think” by itself, causing the death of the astronauts it should've protected. The human processor, likewise, seems to have freed itself from the survival instinct it

should obey and now it's going on its own to do whatever it pleases. The whimsical mind now is replacing the survival instinct's common sense and it's starting to take dangerous decisions by itself. If a virulent idea gets to capture the fragile will of a man's biological computer, he can go to the extreme of working for free to defend a stupid cause, give away all of his possessions or even offer his own life for nothing.

If a single man takes the decision to look after a political party for free, or if he wills to donate all of his fortune to his church's minister, it is a personal matter that should not be of our concern, but in the moment that a massive group of human minds is supporting ideas and causes which apparently are "noble" and "fair" but indeed completely wrong or false, then it's a moment to turn on the red alert lights. It's imperative to let us submit our mind under the survival instinct's orders once again, we have to return to the basic common sense and review which are our inner nature's real commandments.

We could define the instinct as a compound of emotional reactions living beings experience in front of irregular or dangerous circumstances, in order to compel the mind to rapidly act upon to solve such eventuality. If a given situation causes fear, courage or zeal (carefulness*), then, the mind has to do what ever it takes to quiet such emotions and return to tranquility. I repeat: the mind has to follow the instinct orders when it comes about vital matters.

It calls my attention that some biology texts teach that emotions are a reaction to certain physiological causes (endocrine glands and nervous system), but they are not accurate because it is in an inverse way: organic responses happen after an emotion appears. This is very important to keep in mind.

Charles Darwin was right when he stated that emotions are innate, but he also thought they were inherited, something I don't agree with, at all. Certainly, if a given lineage of individuals keep similar genetic features, it's easy to understand how come their behavior may be alike before the influence of the same emotion (that's why, precisely, emotions seem to be inherited), but the problem here, as we have learned, is that emotions don't seem to have an organic origin. The courage, the fear and the zeal are universal and pure emotions since we can find them in the whole animal kingdom and not just in a single lineage. Also, these basic emotions appear to be immutable, regardless of the diverse intensity grade each individual, race or specie may experience them; this strength variation doesn't depend on the emotions' innate quality, but on the kind of hormonal and energetic nature each living being has in order to embody and interpret an emotion. As a matter of fact, emotions are a mystery because nobody knows where they really come from.

There is always someone willing to risk the idea that emotions are an expression of the soul (in case we had one), because the soul would be the most interested to maintain alive the body where she resides, otherwise she would be forced to emigrate. Those who believe in the soul may say she is the one that gives us motion, the reason we are alive, or moreover, they would ultimately say she is the only one which is really alive. Maybe that's why it can be inferred that the soul promotes the body preservation by means of such peculiar emotional language. Certainly, under this speculation it is implicit the acceptance that every living being of the animal kingdom has its own soul, and not just humans.

I must confess that I like very much the idea and I almost agree with it, but the same cosmogony I developed for the Big Ray theory –to explain the origin of the Universe- forces me to keep a significant speculative divergence about the soul, which I think it's appropriate to explain it right away.

It is a very ancient belief the idea that we, human beings, have a personal and individual soul, and that this soul takes with her all the files which were stored in the mind in the moment she leaves the body (identity, memories, etcetera); the later conception about the soul is generally accepted all around the world, even though it should be simpler to believe that if our brain turns to dust after we die, then all of our information should get totally lost. All believers are sure they have a personal soul, but what would they think if I'd say there's no such thing we call "a personal or individual soul"? What would they think if I'd state there's only one universal common soul for everybody? Of course this is an affirmation not easy to demonstrate but I have good reasons to believe I am close to the truth; next I'm going to develop my standpoint but in order to do it well I will have to go back to the explanations I made in my first book "The Origin of the Universe", where I propose our material Universe has to be intertwined with another parallel Universe of spiritual nature (the Spiritual Dimension), and that both are connected by means of the atom. Especially, it is also very important to bear in mind some ideas of my second book, "The Origin of Life", in which I've concluded God and the Spiritual Dimension are just the same:

*...the notion of God and the idea of the "Great Beyond" have historically been kept by mankind as two very different and separated concepts. My cosmogony, instead, assumes that both of them are exactly the same, so it may reach an important theological milestone: **God, Himself, must be a dimension.***

Therefore, this is why I hold individual souls do not exist since there is only one universal collective soul, which is the above mentioned God/Spiritual Dimension. I sustain such idea simply because if the Universe's atoms are like terminals linked to the "Great Beyond" -which is God- in that case, each and every little

particle of our body would be *nourished* by Him. We, living beings, are not separated entities from the Totality, on the contrary, we are integrated and that's why we are like city lights connected to the same electricity power station. The power of God's spirit flows throughout the atoms keeping our bodies alive.

Well then, getting right back to the original subject matter, the pending issue we have left to answer is what T. S. Eliot really meant when he asked: "*Where is the wisdom we have lost in knowledge? Where is the knowledge we have lost in information?*" Next, I will allow myself to expose my interpretation to those questions, based, of course, on the entire previous premises I have provided.

The knowledge we have lost is located right in the Universal Soul that gives us life. This wisdom "speaks" to the animal kingdom by means of basic emotions in order to provoke biological reactions to compel the mind to solve survival problems.*

And why we, humans, seem to have lost such knowledge?

We have not really lost it; the instinctive wisdom is still there, but we just can't "hear" it. The problem is that the human mind deals every day with so much junk information and so much virtual knowledge that now is terribly dazed; our mind is confused and unable to listen to the vital messages coming from our Universal Soul.

If the mass media is confusing us, if our mystical beliefs teach us fundamentals which do not contain practical social progress purposes, if the political regime we are based on is disastrous, then it only proves we have allowed our mind to build up informative and living systems that are opposite to nature's laws and common sense. (Let's notice that the *Common Universal Spirit* concept is correlated to the *common sense* expression)

The question I can't stop asking myself is the following: if we could rationalize the feelings that come out from the Universal Spirit, which would be its fundamental message?

I suppose the first recommendation of the Universal Soul is enclosed in that expression we frequently use, "preservation instinct", which is: ¡subsist! ¡live! ¡exist! The later is a basic and irrational message that can be interpreted as an invitation for everyone to get better, to improve and to be superior in order to achieve the conservation mandate, but if we go a little deeper into the idea we may recognize the ultimate and wiser message of our Creator, which could be the following: "do what is right". I firmly believe we should make the right choice for ourselves to persist, individually, but this idea also has to include our families,

our people, the whole humanity and, in a greater extent, the Earth's ecosystem. "To do what is right" will not reach the highest Divine consent if it does not pursues the goal of making a perfect world, where finally there would reign the wellbeing, the order and justice. It is clear to me that the supreme command of God is that we, human beings, should build Paradise right here, on earth, for every living creature.

Suggestion: To better understand the previous review, it is likely to have knowledge of the philosophical grounds included in my published book "The Origin of the Universe"; in such way, the reader would get familiarized with my hypothesis about the characteristics and nature of the Divine Spiritual Dimension.

I recommend the E-book which is at very low price. If you buy it you would be helping me to sustain the expenses of this Web Site and you would be supporting me emotionally to keep on working and improving my literary work.

*The zeal, understood as an emotion that impels us to take care, to be careful, attentive, mistrustful, to be diligent, etcetera. It calls my attention that the experts on the instinctive matters do not take the zeal as a basic emotion and, in exchange, they include the happiness and the sadness, but I think is a mistake, since such emotions are only experienced by animals with advanced brains and not by the entire animal kingdom. There are some others that suppose the "eating need" is also a basic emotion but it can not be so, since the intense hunger sensation can only provoke anger –a real basic emotion- which is the one that indeed pushes an animal to look after its meal.

** Love, shame, guiltiness, etcetera, are emotions derived and composed of basic emotions and they are a consequence of our advanced mind, which is able to bring up memories from the past and to imagine scenes from possible futures as well. In this, my third essay, I will present my own classification of emotions.

Your comments are welcome: luis_oscar444@hotmail.com

(Translated from Spanish)

4.- The Inter-national Republic. Let us respect racial nations.

"A real antagonist meta-system to another one already established in a country, is not the one located at the right, or at the left, nor at the center; it is simply the one that is forbidden".

This literary work it's a political proposal which its main purpose is to give a solution to multiethnic republics or state-nations, where racial problems seem to be weakening their correct functioning. Nowadays all western institutions agree in just one goal: to annihilate the racial concept from all individuals' mind. The federal governments, the "universal" churches, the Zionist mass media, the non patriotic capital and some others are compromised to minimize the importance of the race. Some institutions –perhaps pursuing noble intentions- are against racial concepts because they believe it's the only way to battle the negative consequences of ignorant racism or just to avoid disintegration of multiethnic republics. Western institutions have indeed succeed in devastating the racial notion everywhere, but all they have got with it is that they have alienated many citizens by taking them apart from the natural social group they could really be identified with; now this citizens wander in life on their own, lacking of an authentic collective existential purpose and without having an aim to posterity. At the present time we all have the moral duty to be tolerant about persons whom are genetically different than us, but it seems to be a grave sin to love our own people because it makes us racists. As a matter of fact, the official propaganda (helped by Hollywood) has programmed our minds against the ethnic ideas in such a way –since our childhood- that just mentioning the word "race" in social meetings makes everyone feel uncomfortable (I don't doubt that you, my dear addressee, may be feeling already upset at this very moment because you are reading an article about races).

These days it is against the law trying to reunite and organize your own people around a political organization (unless you do it under a religious flag, as Jewish do), but the result of such legal impediment is that everybody is forced to go into a system we call "individualism", which, regrettably, ends as a predatory and selfish way of life. Selfishness doesn't recognize moral principles or ethics, and that's why corruption, crime, economical crisis and social declining are progressively increasing; we are living in immediacy (especially politicians), and we are not taking a minute to think about what could be important for the next generations. The solution for the republics' moral illness is completely opposite to the aberrant medicine prescribed nowadays to "neutralize" the citizens' ethnic tendencies. We must talk about races, even though we may not like it.

We must recall that the expression "nation" originally was employed to speak out of a particular race and not to indicate a multiethnic republic or a state-nation. Argentines, Colombians, Mexicans or Americans, for instance, do not constitute a nation, in a strict sense of the word, and they are not actually a single race before nature's eyes; those country names are in fact a recent artificial creation employed by republics to standardize, under a unique fictitious nationality, the identity and roots of the different ethnic groups that live inside its territory; nevertheless, nobody seems to notice it is precisely the illusory and

meaningless nature of such identity what actually is producing the nowadays moral decadence. If modern republics would honestly attach importance to their own different races -in accordance to eternal nature laws- they should be constituted as “Inter-national Republics”, since every race is in itself a whole nation. Someone said once that the Austro Hungarian Empire was in its time the prison of many nations, which I think is a wise analogy we could also employ to describe the current contemporary countries’ situation: are not federal governments oppressive empires that maintain in captivity innumerable nations too? The best way to subjugate an ethnic group is by divesting off all of its collective consciousness about its own existence. How could we give power to the people if there are not peoples anymore? Worse still, I must clarify that humanity is a chain formed by three vital and natural links: individual, family and race; the lost of the racial link has already caused a domino effect that nowadays is devastating the family link and so, this phenomenon is leaving a sea of lonely and selfish individualities lacking of a true existential purpose. The later are the consequences of 200 hundred years of republican liberalism.

The races that still maintain a cultural and genetic uniformity should be freed from the republics’ domain whenever circumstances may permit it so, no matter if more than one republic disappears in the attempt. It wouldn’t be a tragedy at all if a *republic-empire* gets disintegrated if the reason of it is to give independence to ethnic nations in order to let them constitute their own state; it has happened before in the Balkans and in the Soviet Union as well, and surely it will happen again even though the world’s current powers may be opposite to the idea (federal governments, “universal” churches, global Zionism, etcetera). Nevertheless, the greatest impediment to freed ethnic nations today, perhaps, is that many of them are too spread –geographically speaking- all along the countries they live in, mainly in the great cities (not counting that, in many cases, they are also in different countries at the same time, like Mayans are), so it makes practically impossible to carry out the idea of massive population restructurings in order to give each and every racial group their own *lebensraum*.

The previous problems are precisely the reason I came to develop a new social theory that might be able to resolve the racial dilemma without moving a single person from his current residence and, of course, avoiding ethnical conflicts.

Within the frame of the Inter-national Republic’s political system nobody would have to be forced to leave the place where they live in and so, the new political rules could be peacefully established because more than changing constitutional commandments, this would be a revolution in every person’s mind. The Inter-national Republic constitution contains an original representative structure in which different racial nations would have the chance to coexist in the same

territory –all of them full of pride, ethics and a fulfilling existential sense- giving birth to an authentic cosmopolitanism.

I must add that the real cosmopolitanism is not the one that gathers a bunch of confused races which have lost the knowledge of their original identity, but, on the contrary, the genuine cosmopolitanism is the one that gets enriched with the participation of conscious races aware of their past and their existence. How can multiculturalism be useful if all citizens have lost the notion of their own culture? How good can it be if all citizens are forming just an undefined and confused mass? We are killing the most noble values of the racial sense by devastating the ethnic consciousness but, regrettably, such strategy has not succeed in eliminate the terrible reactions of ignorant racism which today exists without a cause. In an Inter-national Republic, instead, each individual could maintain his real racial nationality without getting in conflict with persons of different race; under this system everybody could put into practice the highest human virtues for their people's benefit, but also for the benefit of other peoples from the same republic, and why not, for the whole world as well. The later seems to be a utopia at first hand, I am aware of that, because these days most of all intellectuals and politicians agree that stimulating ethnic nationalisms would only bring disastrous consequences, nevertheless, I can assure that the Inter-national Republic model I'm going to propose is reasonable and feasible. Awakening the racial consciousness would trigger a great energy in peoples; that much is true, but if such energy is properly conducted it would bring a better individual responsibility (for the benefit of collectivity) than the current political system.

I'd like to finish the present review sending a message to all those who might be asking themselves: "To which race do I belong?" It is true that after living 200 hundred years in a virtual theoretical building -that has nothing to do with nature laws- today there are millions of persons that have lost their ethnic identities: the later happens mainly to those who come from parents of different races; to these individuals I want to address that everybody, no matter who he may be, forcedly has to have a racial nation to belong to. Those who come from a racial mix will always have the chance to get assimilated by one of the different races they descend, accordingly to their own physiological type and their intimate feelings, just as today occurs with sons of international marriages. Inevitably we all belong to a certain people; we must find them, and then we must fight to gather them under the same ethical nationalistic idea.

Certainly, it is easier to love those whom are alike ourselves, but loving our people must be accompanied of a sincere respect and esteem for other nationalities. Inside modern republics, just as in the world, there must be set a real inter-national law, urgently, on the contrary, we will keep building an earthly inferno.

Acknowledgment:

When I wrote the Inter-national Republic in 1995, I thought I had a new original idea. I was wrong. I have just learned that the president of Bolivia and his people, since 1990, were discussing about an idea very much alike and that it became a reality in the present year of 2010, when they established the Multinational State of Bolivia. Although the political Constitution I propose in the Inter-national Republic differs in important aspects from the Bolivian new Constitution, I must recognize that the fundamental purpose is the same: to grant ethnical groups their natural condition of nation. Congratulations to President Evo Morales for his braveness.

Your comments are welcome: [luis_oscar444@hotmail\(dot\)com](mailto:luis_oscar444@hotmail.com)